

ISAIAH # 2, p. 12

your having to flee or anything like that, like they did when they came out of Egypt. They were fleeing and Pharaoh pursued them. But here King Cyrus is going to say, You are free to go. I am going to give you help from the Imperial Treasure to enable you to go

Isaiah # 3,

So that, then we have here a definite thought of deliverance from the exile in verses one through twelve. Yes, Miss= Chung? (Q) I am suggesting, and being I am not dogmatic on this, but I am suggesting that in view of the emphases in chapters ~~51 and 52~~ 51 and 52 thus far on deliverance from the exile, and then on rebuilding the devastated Zion, the devastated Jerusalem, in view of that emphasis, and in view of the fact that Cyrus gave order that they should be given the things that King Nebuchadnezzar had taken out of the temple, the vessels of the temple, in other words, the vessels in the Old English ~~was used~~ is used for the instruments, dishes, utensils, various kinds of movable things that were used in the temple. They were called vessels. In modern English we use the word vessel for a boat, and then do we use it for a gravy bowl? Do we use the word vessel for a gravy bowl? But I am not sure, but any way. Any way, we use the word for a boat which is quite different from the ships that go over the oceans, but in the Old English the word vessel is used for the things that they use in the army as their weapon, utensils and any movable instruments. And this means the vessels of the Lord would mean the things that were used in the temple. Now I don't think that this just this verse alone we would immediately say that for sure what that means, but I mean to say that when we have the whole context, when one- one of returning from the exile, when we have Ezra tells us that Cyrus gave order that they would

ISAIAH #3, p. 13

BE given the vessels of the temple, and carry them back, and then Isaiah says, "...be ye clean, that bear the vessels of the Lord," it seems to be a presentation of the promise that they are going to be delivered from the exile, but along with that promise, there is a suggestion that they are allowed to have a wonderful privilege of returning from the exile, and carrying with them the vessels of the temple, they then should then be sure that they do their very best to be _____ (13.15) they should be clean, and they should not be _____. How wonderful it is what God has done for us! Now it is up to us to reveal it, and there shows them the sins in their hearts and the need of exile, and it should lead ~~to~~ ^{them} lead ~~us~~ to think now how clean our hands are now to bear the vessels of the Lord, and so it leads quite naturally on to the new section that starts with the verse 13, which is dealing with the question how can we be clean, worthy of the vessels of the Lord. God is going to provide through His servant a way in which we can become clean enough to be ~~be~~ worthy of the vessels of the Lord. And so this makes the transition, and connection, between the idea ^{of} deliverance from the exile, ~~and~~ ^{is} which ~~the~~ greatest thing stressed in chapter 51 and 52 up to this point, and the part ~~wh~~ that has been stressed ~~previously in chapters~~ in the previous chapters. What good is the deliverance from the exile, if the sin question is not dealt with? Now you should be clean enough to bear the vessels of the Lord. How are you going to be ^{and P} cleaned? God is going to provide the means of atonement, the means of deliverance, and my Servant is going to accomplish that which is described here. So, we have a ⁱ ~~man~~ division between verse 12 and 13, and we have the last three verses in this chapter. Instead, we have a new section which should be ~~a~~ ^{one} chapter, these three verses, but chapter 53 is the description of the atonement, the declaration of the work that Christ is going to do as the only means whereby we can be made clean.

ISAIAH #3, p. 15

figuratively, I like salt, you take some stew, and sprinkle a little bit of salt _____ (8.40) But if you pour a whole bucket of salt in the soup, you will ruin the soup. If you take everything ^{all of} in its figure, it just doesn't make any sense. Now in this verse, what is literal and what is figurative?

"~~Awake~~ Awake, awake, is that literal? or figurative? It is figurative, isn't it? sleeping

He is ^{not} ~~not-trying-to~~ asking somebody that is ~~asleep~~ to wake up, but he is comparing something that in a condition somewhat ~~some~~ similar to that of sleeping to make a change, similar to the change which a person makes when he wakes up. Here is a person lying asleep. This person is alive. This person they say that may be in motion. For/when we sleep, we move a great deal. The person

_____ turn over a great deal (7.00) frequently. There is a motion when we sleep. We are to some extent conscious of it. We can be asleep, and some one may come in and steals things and we may ~~still not~~ it.

even ~~we~~ know/ We are not in a condition to accomplishment when we are asleep. So when he says, "~~Wake-~~ Awake, awake," he brings up the, he

makes the suggestion that the one to whom he is speaking is one who has been in a situation ~~where~~ of not being able to accomplish much, not being much of

accomplishment in motion. _____ (6.60) but not accomplishing much, and now there is ~~going~~ to be a great change in that ~~one's~~ condition, and so

this is an expression -ed in the words, "Awake, awake." Make a change in the change

your condition which is similar to ~~that which~~ occurs to one who is sleeping, who gets up and start doing something. Who is it who ~~says-~~ tells to awake?

Is it an individual? Who is called to awak^e? It is a city, Jerusalem, the Holy City. Jerusalem, the Holy City is called to awake. So that, it is clear that

ISAIAH # 3, p. 16

52:1
not just a bit of land, but the suggestion of the land ~~is~~ is included in it. ~~There-~~
You could take ~~Jers~~Jerusalem as a figure for a group of people, but in the context
--speaking about it being waste, etc. it is quite evident that it is more than that.
There is the ~~x~~ statement that Jerusalem ~~that~~ which is lying in a state of desolation
with very few people there ~~is~~ and not amounting to anything in the world--Jerusalem
is going to become again an important city. Awake , Awake, O Jerusalem. It is
going to become an important ~~x~~ city. He says , Put on your strength, O Zion. It
is going to be a city that is going to have some power. It is going to have some
meaning in the world . And it is going to put on its beautiful garments. It is going
to make quite a change in the ~~x~~ situation. Instead of being just a heap of ruins with
a few people in it, it is going to be a city of some importance in the world. It is
told to put on its beautiful garments. The people are to go there and build a wall--
build a temple--rebuild a city that will amount to something. It is called a holy
city--Jerusalem , the holy city, Jerusalem, a ~~w~~ city which is dedicated to the service
of God, ~~lx~~ There shall no more come unto thee the uncircumcised and the unclean.
This is a little difficult , to know just how much meaning there is in this last part
of the verse. Does he mean that never again will anybody who is wicked will come
into Jerusalem? Well, I'm afraid that the city never ~~win~~ went on for a single day
without any ~~lx~~ wicked person entering it. Does he mean that never again will any
Gentile come in, because the ~~uncirc~~ uncircumcised is often used as a ~~g~~ term for
the Gentiles? Well, I'm afraid that there weren't many periods when ~~the Jews~~
only Jews were in Jerusalem. Surely, they had visitors that were Gentiles from
time to time. Surely there were representatives of other nations living there , and ,
as a matter of ~~x~~ fact, after the exile, 400 years later, they had Antiochus Epiphanes

ISAIAH # 3, p. 18

this "shall no more happen" I believe is used many times in scripture ~~to~~ and I suggest ~~x~~ it as a matter on which I would be much interested if you found some evidence, that when it says it will no more happen, it doesn't mean that it never again will happen but that often means that something that has been happening over the years will stop being a present, vital factor. It will no more happen. This wont continue as it is. It will stop as it is in this situation... Now, at this time, the representatives of the heathen powers are coming through Jerusalem to make sure there is no revolt there. The Jews are completely ~~une~~ under their domination. He says there is going to be a change. Jerusalem is going again to be a Jewish city. There is going again to be a city, while it will still be subject to persecution will not be a city under absolute ruthless control of the Gentiles, but the Jews... will have a chance to be in control of Jerusalem. . .

ISIA- ISAIAH X # 4, p. 19

I would think of that as probably referring to the immediate return ~~of the Gentiles,~~ from exile, in view of the statement afterwards, "Ye that bear the ~~vesset~~- vessels of the Lord." Now there are three possibilities here, I must say. There is a possibility ~~tha~~ t this is simply referring to that return from exile. They are promised that that is going to happen, it does happen, and these ~~x-prophecit~~ prophecies are fulfilled. A second possibility is God is going to continue His blessing to Israel but there are going to be times ~~when~~ of special deliverance when this will happen, like that return from exile. Other times on through the history of God's dealings with Israel, there are ~~goig~~- going to be times when a period of terrible Gentile ~~x~~ domination and ruthless oppression is going to come to an end, that will be a second possibility. Now, the third possibility is, ~~x~~ if you take it in the most literal way, it would be that it wasn't dealing with that time at all, but that it was looking forward to the

coming in with his army and taking over Jerusalem, trying to force the people to do all kinds of things that were contrary to their religion. So this is not a prediction that from this moment on Jerusalem was never again to fall under Gentile domination. It is not that. Is ^{he} ~~Is~~ looking clear on ~~it~~ into the distant future and saying there is a time when Jerusalem will be permanently free of Gentile domination, when it will become ~~permanently free of Gen~~ strictly a ~~w~~ holy city. Now that is something that can be ~~suggested~~ suggested as possibly included in the verse, but you don't find much of it in the context and therefore I would not be ready now to say you ~~must~~ must find ~~the~~ ~~ta~~ that in the verse. I'm not ready to say it isn't in the verse. I would like you to think about it and see ~~if~~ if you find it in the context or if you find reasons to think that is also included in the verse a glimpse of a time which they will ~~feel~~ feel _____ in the millenium when Jerusalem will be entirely free from Gentile domination. I question that but I am not ready yet to rule it out. But certainly what seems most likely is that it is saying, "They will know more about ... He means their constant coming in is going to ~~one~~ come to an end rather than that they will not come in at all, not that there will be no more periods of Gentile domination--their was terrible domination under Antiochus Epiphanes~~k~~, and before that there had been Gentile domination by the ~~E~~ Egyptians, and then by the Assyrians. None of them ... but they simply continued the domination. ... but then of course when the Romans conquered, they left it a heap of ruins in 70 AD and then when the Jews revolted again in 134 AD when the Romans conquered that country, they drove the Jews ~~as~~ away and under pain of death every Jew was forbidden to come within ten miles of Jerusalem for the next couple of hundred years. Never again was the city to be under Gentile domination--after that the return from exile just ~~doesn't~~ doesn't fit. But this

millenium
beginning of the/~~exile~~ and saying that when that time comes, the beginning of the millenium, then all Gentile domination and wickedness in the land is forever coming to an end. Now, between those three possibilities, the third one is the most literal, but it does not seem to ~~me~~ fit with ~~the~~ context, because the context ~~is~~ seems to be dealing with ~~the~~ the return from exile, so for that reason I am inclined to think that though it is the more literal, ~~it~~ one of the other two is what fits in this particular, immediate ... of this verse. ~~the~~ The third is that this isn't return from exile at all but the beginning of the millenium, looking way forward, saying there is going to ~~come~~ come a time when Jerusalem is going to be permanently free from ... Now, I guess that our time is just ~~about~~ about up. I would suggest that previous to our meeting tomorrow afternnon, you can look further into what you find in this passage about historical background that fits with return from exile or any of the other particular ... See what you can find in this chapter--see wh at you can find, if you can. That is merely further thought on what you have already been doing and ~~contn-~~ continue to think about the meaning of these verses. Next week we will read these in the Hebrews~~x~~, but for now we want to go on and get as much as we can from the English of them.

Last time we looked a little bit at the general ~~natu-~~ nature of the book of Isaiah and especially the nature of the chapters following chapter 40, and then we saw how we have the various ~~emphasizes~~ emphases of these sections somewhat summarized in a particular chapter which we are looking at now--52. The last verses of it being entirely on salvation and tying closely with 53. The first twelve verses of it being quite strictly on deliverance from exile and tying ~~x~~ rather closely with chapter 51. We ~~g~~ began at the beginning of the hour to ~~look--~~ look at 51 and notice how this verse cannot be taken in strict literal, because he is not asking someone who is

asleep to wake up. The sleep is a figure, waking from it is a figure, coming back into active, vital life of a city which seemed to be deserted and pretty much at an end. And then we looked at the end of ~~the~~ this verse and we noticed the statement that no more shall come unto thee the uncircumcised and the unclean and we noticed three possible interpretations of that book. That is those interpretations would affect our interpretation of the rest of the sentence, and we noticed those three and we had to decide ~~xxx~~ among those ~~xxx~~ three in the light of the context. The first two that I gave rest somewhat on the meaning of this phrase that I gave, no more, and that is a matter which we cannot make a decision on, simply on the use of the English language, you would have to find the Hebrew ~~xxx~~ words and see how these ~~xxx~~ Hebrew words are used in other passages of the Scriptures. That is something which definitely ought to be done. And now I want to say ~~something~~ ~~about the~~ just a word about the books which we use for this course. Please after this, don't anybody come to class without the Hebrew Bible with him. I don't know how much we are to use it today, we certainly will use it for most ^{se four} of the class. This is the study of the chapters in ~~detail~~ ~~--And we will use~~ using the Hebrew very extensively. And we always want to be able to ~~read in~~ refer to it in Hebrew. ~~So~~, please always come to class with your Hebrew Bibles. Now when we check ~~a~~ ^{the} ~~matter~~ like this, I would recommend that you make a very abundant use of Brown, Brigg, Driver's lexicon, when it comes to a careful investigation, don't put any trust in any ~~pocket~~ little pocket lexicon that just gives you a couple of meanings of a word. For that is useless for a careful interpretation. It reminds me of the time when I ~~first~~ was first in Germany, and I had a pocket lexicon with me, and I ate my meal and I wanted to ask ^{for} ~~the girl~~ bill. They don't bring ^{you} ~~the~~ bill until you call them. So, I had to ask them for it. I didn't know

how to ask them. So I had to ~~find~~ take out the little dictionary out of my pocket, and look up the word, bill. It gave two German words: ~~Gekrümte(?)~~ - Rechnung und Schnabel. I did not know which to ask for, so I looked them up in a German-English dictionary. I found that Rechnung means account, and Schnabel means bill or beak of a bird. So, I said, ^{if you} ~~Bringe mir meinen~~ ^{den} Schnabel, ^{would have} They had no slightest idea as to what I was driving at. No body would ever ~~have-~~ connect the word ^{an} ^{bill} Schnabel with/account=in that sense. Our English word, bill is that these ~~two~~ two are utterly unrelated to it That is true of all languages. One word has several unrelated meanings, and one word has a range of meanings which overlaps the other words. And consequently if you are going to get a real idea of a range of the meaning of ^a ~~the~~ words, you have to use an extensive dictionary. _____

(6.10) So that, I hope that in connection with your reading the ^{se} /four chapters you/practically every word in B.D.B.'s lexicon. ^{will look up} Now there is another way of getting a quick idea of the meaning of ~~the~~ a word. ~~The~~ I use the way a great deal. After all, how ~~did they find~~ have they found ~~that~~ what the ~~lexi-~~ lexicon means. How do they find out? Well, one way they can tell is to see how the word has been translated through the ages. ~~How~~ did the Septuagint translate it? How ... (5.40). Another way is ~~to~~ by etymology. Etymology never insures correct meaning. Sometimes they don't even suggest a possible meanings. ~~The~~ Words often change from what ~~etymology~~ ^t would suggest. But the way it has been _____ly interpreted is always a helpful clue, ~~but~~ it may not necessarily true. The only way in any language to prove what a word means is its usage. If you get nothing but the use of the word, then you find out how that word is used in that language. You can tell by context. Consequently, I think that one of ~~of~~ the ~~most~~ most useful tools for studying

words is ~~Young's Concordance~~, Young's Analytical Concordance. ~~You look up~~
 If you know what the Hebrew word, look up the Hebrew word in the back, and
 you will find a list of English words by which the Hebrew word is translated
 in the King James Version with a number of times it occurs in ~~that~~ ^{each} sense. Now
 you find that a word is translated in ^a certain ways ~~twenty-fives~~ times, and only
 one ^{ce} ~~in~~ different way. You can well ask yourself and ~~yo~~ if it is ~~m~~istake at one
 time, or the twenty-five times give you a real clue to the new meaning, and just
 one is not valid. Should be twenty-fives times. ;;;... It is a question which
 Of course,
 may always be raised. / Twenty-fives times may not ~~prove a~~ be enough to
 prove anything, but it is pretty good in some occasions when you have two or
 instances, you don't get much out of it.
 three ~~occasions which don't give much~~ _____ (3.90). When you get
 words that are used a great many times with quite a number o f different meanings
 and see whether they are all variants of one central idea or whether they represent
 different, unrelated meanings which may be used of this particular word. Now, in
 a dictionary, like Brown, Driver, and Briggs, if they feel that it is an entirely
 distinct word, they will put them separately in the dictionary, but if it is the same
 word and just a variant rendering of it, ^{showing} ~~certainly~~ a different aspect of the meanings,
 well, you will find all these different meanings with the number of times, and that
 is tremendously helpful. Another helpful tool for interpreting is the Englishmen's
 Hebrew Concordance. I recommend this very strongly. It's published by Baxter's.
 in England and I believe it has been reprinted in the last few years. The Englishmen's
 Hebrew Concordance--you will look up a Hebrew word and then you find the places
 in the ~~seript~~ scripture where it occurs with the few words quotted from the King
 James Version, and the translation of the ~~x~~ word itself in italics. That ~~was~~ way you
 get an idea of the context. Sometimes it isn't enough context to tell much about
 the meaning, but as a rule it will give you a fair idea of how the word is ~~ude~~ used

52:1 and that is ~~tremendous~~ tremendously helpful in getting an idea of what the word really means. So those are three tools that I hope you will all use very extensively in connection with the course. Now we shall no more come unto thee. The strict English sense, if ~~the~~ this is an English phrase, you say he will no more come to this place. Well, when a person is dead, you say he will no ~~h~~ more come. If he used to come every day, and now he ~~a~~ has a disagreement, he will no more come. But the disagreement is ... and he might become friends again and he might start coming over again. And so it would be limited in duration. I think that you will find that this phrase in Hebrew simply shows ~~the~~ the ~~cessag-~~ cessation of a situation, rather than ~~necessary~~ necessarily an assurance ~~of~~ that that cessation continues permanently. But that we want to look at. Now, then that ~~w~~ question is, in the light of the context, is there a strong ~~arg~~ argument for meaning that here Jerusalem with the Gentiles holding it in subjection. There is going to be a change, the Gentiles will cease to hold it in subjection, it will ~~be~~ again become a Jewish city. It ~~k~~ will again become a city where the Lord is worshipped and where the ~~temple~~ temple is set up. Simply the end of ~~the~~ the exile that began under Nebuchadnezzar. The verse continues, "Shake thyself from the dust, Arise and sit down, O Jerusalem." You might say when the Jews come back to ~~Jerusalem~~ Jerusalem, they are going to do an awful lot ~~of~~ of dusting, but you wouldn't describe dusting the house as ~~sweeping~~ sweeping the house shaking itself from the dust. The picture is very clearly that of a woman who is lying in a pile of dust--she's just deserted, abandoned, now she gets up and shakes off the dust, but of course ~~when you~~ it's a figurative expression for a city that is abandoned.

Isaiah 4

But I would think of that as referring to the immediate return from exile. In view of the statement afterwards, "Ye that bear the vessels of the Lord". Now there are three possibilities here, I must say. There is a possibility that this is simply referring to that return from exile. They are promised that that is going to happen. It does happen. These prophecies are fulfilled. A second possibility here, God is going to continue His blessing to His people. There are going to be times of special deliverance when this ~~wou~~ will happen, like that return from exile and other times on through the history of God's dealing with Israel, there are going to be times when a period of terrible Gentile domination and ruthless oppression is going to be brought to an end. That would be a second possibility. Now ~~is~~ a third possibility is if you took it in the most literal way would be that it wasn't dealing with that time at all but was looking ~~forward~~ forward to the beginning of the exile and saying that when that time comes, the beginning of the Millennium, then all Gentile domination and wickedness in the land is forever ~~x~~ coming to an end. Now between those three possibilities, the third one is the most literal but it does not seem to me to fit with the context, because the context seems to be dealing with the return from exile, so ~~x~~ for that reason I am inclined to think that though it is the more literal, that one of the other two is what fits into this particular, immediate case. The third is that this isn't ~~refer~~ referring to the return from exile at all, but the beginning of the Millennium--He is looking ~~x~~ way forward and saying there is going to come a time when Jerusalem is going to be permanently free from such. Now, I guess our time is just about up, so I would suggest that previous to our meeting tomorrow afternoon, if you can look further into what you find in this verse about the historical background in this passage that fits with the return from exile or with any other particular time. See what you can find in this ~~or~~ chapter, give a little thought ~~ix~~ to that

if you can and further thought on that. And continue ~~to~~ thinking ..next read week we will read these verses in the Hebrew, but for now we want to go and see what you can get from the English ~~for~~ of them.

52
 Last time we looked a little bit at the general nature of the book of Isaiah and ~~xxx~~ especially the nature of the chapters following chapter 40, and then we saw how we have the various emphasizes of this section, somewhat summarized in ~~te~~ the particular chapter which we are looking now, chapter 52. ~~The~~ The last three verses being entirely on salvation and ~~trying~~ ^{tying} ~~being~~ closely with 53, the ~~last verses being entirely on sa-~~ first twelve verses of it being quite strictly on deliverance from exile and tying rather closely with chapter 51. We began at the end of the hour to look at verse one and we noticed ~~how~~ how this verse cannot be taken in strict literal/^{ness} ~~sense~~, because he is not asking someone who is asleep to wake up but the sleep is a figure and the waking from it is a figure for coming back into vital life of a city which seemed to be deserted and pretty much at an end. And then we looked at the end of this verse and we noticed the statement that no more shall come unto thee the uncircumcised and the unclean, and we noticed three possible interpretations of that verse~~x~~. That is, those interpretations would of course affect our interpretation of the rest of the ~~sense-~~ sentence. So we noticed those three and we have to decide between those three in the light of the context. The first two that I gave rest somewhat upon the meaning ~~x~~ of this phrase "No more, and that is a ~~mate~~ matter that you cannot make a decision on simply on the use of the English language, you would have to find the Hebrew words and see how these Hebrew words are used ~~x~~ in other passages of scripture, and that is something which definitely ought to be done, and now I want to say something about the books of this course. Please after this, don't anyone come to class without your

Hebrew Bible. I don't know how much we will use it today, but ~~ix~~ we certainly will use it most of the time. This is a study of these four chapters in detail and using the Hebrew very extensively, and you always want to be able to refer~~x~~ to the Hebrew, so always have the Hebrew Bible with ~~xy~~ you after this. Now, when we check matters like this, I would recommend that you make very abundance use of Brown, Driver, and Briggs lexicon. When it comes to careful investigation, don't ~~make~~ put any trust in a little ~~pocked~~- pocket lexicon, that gives you a couple of meanings to a word. That is usef- useless for a ~~ce~~ close interpretation. It reminds me of a ~~t~~ the time when I was first in Germany. I had a little ~~pocked~~ pocket lexicon in my pocket, and I ate my meal and I wanted to ask for the bill. They don't bring you the bill there until you call for it. It is very impolite to bring a person a bill until they ask for it, so I didn't ~~a~~ know ~~hae~~ how to ask so I took my little book out my pocket and looked into it and found two German words: _____ and _____ and I didn't know which to ask for. So I looked them up in the German to English and I found that _____ means an account, _____ means the bill or beak of a bird. So if I had said, Bring me the _____, I don't think they would have had the slightest idea what I was driving out. Nobody would ever connect up _____ with an account, or bill in that sense. O_ur English word Bill has two utterly unrelated meanings, but that is true ~~ix~~ of all languages. One word will have ~~two~~ - several ~~unrea~~ unrelated meanings, and one word will have a range of meanings, they overlap~~x~~ other words, and consequently, if you are going to get a range of meaning of a word, you have to use an extensive dictionary, and B., D., and B., is our fullest dictionary that we have in the English language, so ~~it~~ - I hope that in connection with your reading of the four chapters you will look at ~~ix~~ practically every word in B., D., B. lexicon. Now, there is another ~~wat~~ way to get a quick idea of the meaning of a word~~k~~

and the way which I ~~xx~~ use a great deal, because, after all, how are B., D., B. going to know what the word means, how do they tell. Well, one way that they tell is to see how it has been translated through the ages. How does the LXX translate it, how have other languages taken it. Another way is by etymology. ~~Ey-~~ Etymology never teaches the ~~x~~ meaning of any word, it only suggests possible meanings. Words often change and mean the opposite to what etymology suggests. But the way that it is ~~offic~~ officially interpreted is always a helpful clue, it may not necessarily prove it. The only way in any language to prove what a word means is usage. ~~To get enough~~ If you get enough instances of ~~x~~ the use of a word then you find out how that word is ~~xx~~ used in that language. You can tell by context, and, consequently, ~~xx~~ I think one of the most useful tools for the study of words is Youn's Analytical Concordance. You know ~~x~~ what the Hebrew word is, look up the Hebrew word in the back and you will find a list of the English words by which that Hebrew word is ~~trans-~~ translated in the King James Bible with the number of times it occurs in each sentence. So if you find that a ~~certi-~~ word is translated a certain way 25 times and only on ~~e~~ a different way, you ~~w~~ can well ask yourself ~~x~~ or does the 25 times give ~~xx~~ you the real clue to the meaning and is this one perhaps not valid, and the 25 . . . It is a question that one always ~~xx~~ has to ask. Of course 25 times is not always enough to prove the word but it is a pretty good indication, when you have two or three instances, it doesn't give you much help, but when you get words that you use a great many times, with quite a number of different meanings, you can look at those different meanings and see if they are all variants of one central idea, or whether they represent different, unrelated meanings which may be used of this particular ~~x~~ word. Now, in a dictionary, in any scientific dictionary, like B.D.B. if they feel that they are entirely distinct words

en even though they look exactly alike, they will put them separate in the dictionary and they may do that in Young's too, but if it is the same word and just a variant rendering of it, showing a different aspect of the meaning, well, you will find all these different meanings and the number of times, and that is tremendously helpful --another helpful tool for interpreting is the Englishmen's Hebrew Concordance. I recommend this very strongly. It is published by ~~Baxger~~ Baxter's and I believe there is a ~~reprint~~ reprint within the last year. You look up a Hebrew word and then you will find the places in the ~~scripture~~ scripture where it will occur, with the few words quotted from the King ~~James~~ James Version, and the word ~~itself~~ itself in italics. That way, you get an idea of the content, sometimes it isn't enough context to tell you about the meaning but as a rule it will give you a ~~fair id-~~ fair idea of how the word is used, and that is tremendously helpful in ~~getin-~~ getting an idea of what the word really means. So ~~that-~~ ⁵² ~~the~~ those are three tools that I hope you will always use very extensively in connection with this course. Now, ~~We-sh~~ They shall no more come unto thee. If this is an English phrase, you say You will no more come to this place. Well, when a person ¹² is dead, he will no more come, you will never see him again. If he used to come every day--now he has a disagreement with him and he will no more come, but the disagreement might be ~~fix-~~ fixed. You might become friends again, and ~~you~~ he might start coming over again. So it would be limited in duration. I think that you will find that this phrase simply shows the cessation of a situation rather than necessarily an assurance that that cessat~~ion~~ continues permanently. But ~~tha~~ t we want to look into --check in the original, check in other usages. Now, the next question is, In the light of the context there is a strong argument to be advanced for taking this as meaning, Here is Jerusalem with the Gentiles holding it in subjection. There is going to be a change. The Gentiles

will cease to hold it ~~xx~~ in subjection. It will ~~be~~ again become a Jewish city. It will again become a city where the Lord is worshipped and where~~x~~ the temple is ~~xx~~ set up at the end of ~~x~~ the exile that began under Nebuchadnezzar. Then we continue, Shake thyself from the dust, Arise and sit down, O Jerusalem. Well, you might say, when the Jews come back to Jerusalem, they are going to do an awful lot ~~ed~~ of dusting, but you wouldn't describe dusting the house as ~~pick~~ing the house shaking itself from the dust. The picture is very clearly that of a woman who is lying in a pile of dust. She is just deserted, abandoned. Now she gets up and shakes off the dust; that of course is figurative for a city abandoned.

ISAIAH # 5

Perhaps in the time of King James this made good sense...but today I don't think we ~~can~~ can understand what it means. It is very clear that what it means is shake yourself from the dust, Get up and take a seat, get up and assume your position of honour on your seat. If you arise and ~~x~~ sit down, makes you think of a person sitting down, standing up, and sitting down again. It means a getting up from a lying in the dust, get up and then not stand waiting ~~x~~ in the _____ but sit down in a place of honour, so in present day ~~x~~ English it would be much better if it were translated Arise and Take your position of honour, or take your seat or something like that. Get up and take your seat. Loose thyself from the bands of thy neck
 O captive daughter of Zion, continuing the figure representing the captive Jews as an individual, a woman representing a nation and the nation in turn representing-ed in turn by the one sitting. The city ~~x~~ of Jerusalem represented in turn by the portion of the city where David's palace was which is called Zion, so that here we have quite a series of pictures a nation~~x~~ represented by a woman, a woman representing a nation and a nation represented by a city, and a city represented by a part of the city where

the king's palace was. For thus says the Lord, You have sold yourselves for nought. What does that mean? You have gone into sin and what did you ~~at~~ get out of it? You became captives, you went into bondage. You didn't get anything worthwhile out of it. Reminds me of what a young fellow said to me in 1931. He said Back in the days of prosperity before 1929, ~~xx~~ lots of us were earning ~~lots~~ lots of money, some of us were saving it and some of us were spending it. Those of us who were saving ~~it~~ lost it, the banks crashed and they lost all their money and had nothing. We have nothing left either, but we have our memories, they don't have anything at all. Well, you here you say you have sold yourselves for nought, you have nothing left except your memories, and you shall be redeemed without money. That's hardly a parallel is ~~it~~. "Redeemed without money," particularly when elsewhere God says, He has given Ethiopia and Egypt for your ransom, here the figure is that not that God is ~~going~~ not going to give anything for you but ~~a~~ that you ^{want} have to do anything for it, God is going to show His wonderful grace toward you by delivering you from captivity without there being anything that you have to do ~~a~~ to get it. They are not going to revolt, many of them die...Cyrus is going to conquer Babylon and simply let them go. They shall be redeemed without money. Of course today, when we speak of redemption, we immediately think of redemption in the sense of salvation from ~~&~~ sin, but ~~thw~~ the word originally meant something much broader than that. It means redemption from captivity. It means buying back what has ~~ck~~ gone into slavery. It means like when you redeem a wife, ~~you~~ watch that you sell or pawn. You redeem it, otherwise you can't get it back. The application of ~~a~~ that figure describes our salvation. Here it could be used for our salvation, b t in the context it seemed to be deliverance of the Israelites ~~fr~~ from the exile. "For thus says the Lord God, My people went down aforetime into Egypt to ~~son~~ sojourn there and the Assyrian oppressed them without cause. I just don't quite know how to

62:3

>

to interpret "without cause." They went ~~down~~ down to sojourn in Egypt and then the Egyptians ~~oppresee~~ oppressed them. You might say the Egyptians ~~a~~ ~~said~~, said, Why should these Israelites have the best of everything in ~~E~~ Egypt --why shouldn't we ~~k~~ take it over ~~to~~ ~~from~~ them and make them pay for all they have gotten out of it. And so reduce them to captivity. They Egyptians might have some excuse for the way they ~~re~~ treated the Israelites, ~~tu~~ but in the case of the Assyrians--the Assyrians ~~had~~ had come ~~of~~ over into the land of the Israelites and had taxed them and taken them--they didn't even have a shadow~~x~~ of a ~~ax~~ right to it that the Egyptians ~~had~~ had. They ~~Egyptians~~ voluntarily went to Egypt but the Assyrians came and ~~atea~~ ~~ata~~ attacked. ~~Probably that is what is meant~~ Possibly that is what is meant. They oppressed them without cause. Now, ~~thereve~~ therefore, what about here, says the Lord. You notice ~~that what is here~~ all through here that the Lord is the one who is speaking. God is speaking to the people. God is ~~tall~~ telling them He is going to deliver them and they are to awaken from their long period of suffering. He says, What have I here, said the Lord, that my people is taken away for nought. "They that rule over them, make them to howl, says the Lord and my name~~x~~ is ~~continual~~ continually, every day is blasphemed." "Make them to howl," is the description of the suffering of the people as they are under the oppression of the conquerors who led them off into captivity. My name every day is blasphemed ~~is~~ of course means, they said their God couldn't protect them--their God amounts to nothing. They ~~a~~ had better quit worshipping him, and worship our God who ~~w~~ conquered them. Therefore my ~~x~~ people shall know my name. God is going to deliver them in such a ~~a~~ way that they will know that it is He who has delivered them. Therefore, they shall know in that day that I am He that doth speak. Behold, It is I. He is stressing here the fact that He is to be the one who

will deliver them. Back a few chapters back we had the Lord saying that He is going to predict the deliverance of the people , because if he doesn't predict it they ~~w~~ont give him the ~~credit~~ credit for it. You look ~~bak~~ back in chapter 48:3 "I have ~~dele~~ declared the former things from the beginning and they ~~x~~ went forth out of my mouth and I showed them. I did them suddenly and they came to pass, because I knew thou art obstinate, and thy neck is an iron sinew, and thy ~~be~~ brow brass; I have even from the beginning declared it to thee; before it came to pass I shewed it thee: lest thou shouldest say, Mine idol hath done them, and my graven image, and my molten image, hath commanded them." In ~~eter~~ other words, God said, I am predicting all of this in advance, so you will have to know that it ~~the~~ people is who did it, and that is the way that ~~we~~ know that God did it because he predicted it in advance. When we had a recession back in about 1933 after we were . . .and the war ~~x~~ was . . .Roosevelt said that he planned it that way, ~~that~~ but he didn't tell us in advance that he planned it that way and some of us were rather skeptical that he intended ~~that~~ there should be a brief recession in the midst of the ~~impe~~ improvement . . .The Lord said I am going to predict in advance ~~x~~ so that people will know that I really did it, and in this particular passage here He doesn't mention the fact of the prediction, but I think that is in the background of verse 6~~x~~, in view of ~~prev~~ frequent ~~w~~ stress in previous ~~x~~ chapters. You will all know that I am going to do this wonderful thing, the people are going to know ~~that~~ I am going to do this wonderful thing , but the people are going to know that it is I that do it and there again you have a little bit of an ~~insight~~ inference of the sin of the people, that if God didn't make it perfectly clear that it ~~k~~ was He who did it, they wouldn't recognize that He had and they wouldn't give ~~him~~ Him credit for it. And that again suggest the idea that people need some deliverance ~~from~~ from their sin. It is sin which has brought

is

them to captivity. and if ~~is~~ nothing/done about their sin, there will be another captivity. Something must be done with the question of sin, which is more important than the question of exile, and so we are dealing with the question of exile, which is the immediate things that bothers the people, but using it as a stepping stone to bring to their mark the much more important idea of the deliverance from sin.

So in verse 7, we have that verse familiar to all of us from the Messiah, that verse which can _____ the deliverance of God, because it does specifically deal with it, ~~-but~~ _____) 4/5-_" How beautiful on the mountains are the

feet of him that brings good tidings, that publishes peace, that brings good tidings, of good tidings, that publishes salvation; that ~~says~~ unto Zion, Thy God reigneth!" What says

How have the mountains have got to do with this? How beautiful are the mountains.... What have the mountains got to do here? What mountains are they? What do they have to do here? I hope some of you bring me a reasonable ~~resume~~ of explanation of that one of these days. I told you as a question, and I want you to look into that. How beautiful are the feet of them that

bringeth good tidings." Naturally we don't have any picture here of any individual bringing good tidings. We have the Lord speaking through Isaiah, saying that there is going to be a deliverance. God is going to bring them back, and he is going to prove to them that God is reigning, and then here we have the picture of someone way up on the mountains, coming to bring the news, Now we think that the people are right there ... "Thy watch, en, shall lift up the voice; with the voice together shall they sing; for they shall see eye to eye, when the Lord shall bring again Zion." Break forth into joy, sing together, ye waste-

~~places of Jerusalem~~ There in the Heb. the Lord shall bring them again Zion. We don't use that in our current usage, and I doubt if they used it in that century either. That translation of the Hebrew, to bring again... because

Isaiah #5

Zion shall return. It does not mean that Zion which was gone is brought back again, but that Zion is going to ^{be} brought to its former condition. It means the change of condition of Zion. I don't think Zion was taken to Babylon, Zion was left where you are, and Zion is going to be restored. Perhaps "restored," should be a better translation. It is a change of ^{the} condition, rather ^{than} the movement of a place. When we have a continuance of figurative expressions, "Break forth into joy, sing ~~o~~ together, ye waste places of Jerusalem: ~~for the Lord~~"

How would waste places be able to sing? It is a beautiful picture of the restoration. What does this mean? The places were ^{left} ruined, because Nebudhadnezzar had conquered the city, and left the place desolate ^{and barren.} These places are going to change, because the people are to be brought ~~a~~ back from exile. Here

_____ (2.20) "The Lord hath ~~ee~~made bare his holy arm in the eyes of all the nations; and all the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of our God." This is, we are so used to ~~save~~ ^{well} salvation from sin _____

This verse may go on ~~to prove~~ to prove that. But certainly the immediate significance ^{that it is} ~~situation - it is~~ referring to a situation of deliverance from the devastation and desolation, salvation of ~~God~~ our God when the land is restored, the people brought back, and he ~~makes~~ bare his holy arm - a figure of ~~speech~~ ^{one's arm}. ~~When a person is~~ - the one who is spreading ~~when~~ one wants to have someone do some thing, there one's arm is put for in actions in the eyes of the nations, that all the world will see. . . .

In verse 11, there is another command, another imperative, This imperative which may be taken more literally, "Depart ye, depart ye, go ye out from thence. . . ."



Out from where? From the Babylonian captivity, of course. It is a picture of the people who are to ~~be~~ return from the captivity. "go ye out from thence, " go ye out from the midst of the land which the Babyl~~y~~lonians hold as her possession. "Go ye out from the midst of her; be ye clean, that bear the vessels of the Lord."

52:11

The vessels of the Lord taken away from the temple ⁱⁿ ~~of the~~ Jerusalem to Babylon, these vessels are now to be given by the _____ Here is the picture of a ~~long journey~~ starting out on the long journey as described in the beginning of the book of Ezra.

ISAIAH #6

And for this can be literal, but there is an interesting idea in it, "Depart ye, depart ye, go ye out from thence, ..." God is going to protect you. "Go out of the midst of her." No body is stopping you, and you bear the vessels of the Lord. But that is not what it says. Here is another idea. "Be ye clean, touch no unclean thing; be ye clean...." There is a suggestion that these people are still in sin, that these people who are to be delivered from the exile ~~are~~ need something more than deliverance from the exile. They need

that sin question shall be ~~had~~ ^{handled,} so ~~here~~ we have a little touch ^{of} that provides an introduction to ~~53~~ ^{Ch. 1} 52:13 on through 55: ^{which deals w/ the q. of del. from sin.} There is still a question of deliverance from sin. This is the greatest climax for which all these sections have been working somewhere ch. 41, and then verse 12 no longer deals with the transition of that verse, (13.80)

ISAIAH # 6

the transition comes in verse eleven. Verse 12 is further assurance that God is going to make this possible. "For you shall not go out with haste nor by flight." ~~We when~~ When King Edward 1st of England, I believe, captured Scotland, he seized the stone of _____ on which all the Scottish kings had been ~~xx~~ crowned. But then when James 1st, a couple of hundred years later, ~~King~~ when James VI of Scotland became King of ~~Engl~~ England, they put that ~~the~~ stone in Westminster Abbey, underneath the chair ~~in~~ in which the English Kings were crowned, and James VI who was King of Scotland was crowned King of England by sitting on a chair which had under ~~it~~ it the stone of _____ on which all the Scottish Kings had been crowned ~~and King of England which had u-~~ and his son Charles I was crowned King of England and Scotland by sitting on the throne of England with the stone of _____ and all British monarchs were crowned with that. But about ten years ago some young Scotch students managed to get that stone out of Westminster Abbey without anybody knowing they had done it and in the morning ~~when~~ when the guards came into the abbey and unlocked the doors and went in~~k~~, they found that the ~~so-~~ stone was missing, there was tremendous ~~exciet~~ excitement in the papers about the disappearance of the stone of _____ out of Westminster Abbey and finally it turned ~~x~~ up somewhere in Scot~~land~~ and was returned to Westminster Abbey where it remains today. By careful, skillful plotting and scheming they managed to get ~~stx~~ that stone away, but they weren't able to keep it. Now, he says there is going to be nothing like that that is going to happen to you. God is going to open up the way so there will be no attempt to stop you. You ~~won't~~ won't have to use stealth or force, God does it strictly on His own ~~pee-~~ power. You are to return from exile. How would they ever get a chance to leave Babylon in that way. Well, in Isaiah's day it would be pretty hard to see

x You can make guesses as to how it would be, and the chances are that nobody would guess how , but what happened was that Cyrus the Persian would conquer Babylon, and that he would give a decree that the Jews would go back to their homeland and g would give them the vessels of the Lord to take back with them. So he said you will not go out by haste nor by flight . This is a wonderful prophecy that is literally fulfilled, a ¹⁵⁰ hundred years after Isaiah wrote . You shall not go out with haste nor by flight, for the Lord will go before you, and the God es of Israel will be your re-reward. Why would they have two rewards? Why would they have any reward? What is a re-reward. It is a rear-ward, and in English the letter W and G in many words ~~is~~ has ^{fallen} come together . In Old English you say they are under guard or under ward, and we have a ward ^{an} in a penitentiary and we have a guard ^{can} for a child under age. Both are the same original English words, the G and the W have developed in two ~~differe~~ different ways, and we don't use ward in that sense anymore. We speak of the wards in the hospital but they are really not places where they are guarded anymore. The word has quite changed its meaning --we use it in prison more than in a hospital. We speak of the guards as the people who are doing the guarding, and the wards as the place where people are guarded. But here x it means the one who is doing the guarding. It's funny that we should still spell rear, because in modern English rear is ~~spelle~~ rear. Rear ward--that would be much clearer than rear-guard, but what it means is x rear guard , but what it means is rear guard . The Lord will be ^{be a} for you and the Lord will be your rear guard. In other words, the Lord is all around you. There is no ~~interruption~~ interruption . ~~Anything-~~ Nothing can hurt you because the Lord is your rearguard. (Q) No, ~~unfortunat~~ unfortunately, we have very little knowledge of Jewish history. We have, in fact, just a few ~~insc~~ insc~~riti-~~

inscriptions by the Egyptians and the Babylonians--but very little about the Jews . In other words, if we have no knowledge of them prior to the end of the ~~old~~ Old Testament except what is in the Bible. If there was, if we had a definite evidence somewhere that ~~we~~ when they returned from exile they ~~z~~ had this book to read--that of course would utterly destroy the theory of two Isaiahs. But, unfortunately, we have no evidence of that period. The only period that we have on it is Josephus. Josephus ~~row - xz~~ wrote about 100 AD and what he wrote about Palestine in the time of the Jewish ~~w~~ Wars in about ^{AD} 70 is excellent first hand history. He was there and he observed and he visited all kinds of people as a young man and he has given an excellent account of what he saw and so that is excellent history but when Josephus writes of the Antiquities of the Jews , his only source is the Bible. He takes ~~whats~~ what is in the Bible and ~~x~~ he elaborates on it, like ~~Sz~~ Shakespeare does. He tells about Saul and how the Philistines were coming and Saul's Med~~ist~~ation was "To be or not to be" He doesn't give exactly those words but ~~x~~ that is the idea , which may be what they thought or may not but certainly suggests, ~~but~~ so Josephus is a first class authority on his lifetime, but on periods before he is not an authority because he has ~~x~~ no source from which to draw except the Old Testament , and the ~~hisot-~~ historian has to have several sources which he puts together and tries to get the evidence of what the situation is. If he only has one source , all he has to do is repeat it ~~x~~ or enlarge upon it from his imagination, so that we have no~~x~~ other

evidence on that period but the Biblical statements. We do not have the decree of Cyrus ~~permittin~~ permitting the Jews to go back but we do have the decree of Cyrus permitting other peoples to go back. We have those so we know that Cyrus ~~ox~~ did that, that his policy was to let the conquered peoples go home. The Babylonians tried to bind the peoples to themselves by taking them away from their homeland and leading them off to other lands where it will be easy for him to control ^{them} ~~that~~, but of course that makes him hate the conqueror. Cyrus having conquered the Babylonians thought that he would bind them to him by letting them go back and saying ~~ix ix~~ he was their deliverer and we ~~hae-~~ have evidence that he did that with other nations, and the Bible says he did that with the Israelites, so I don't ~~tha~~ think that anybody questions the historicity of that about Cyrus, even though our only evidence on it in relation to the ~~isrea-~~ Israelites is the statement here in the Bible, ~~kn~~ and in Ezra and Nehemiah, so that from verse one through verse 10 is a passage which is tightly tied to chapter 51, and ~~x~~ if there is going to be any chapter divisions between 51:1 and 52:12, it properly should come at 9 of 51, where you end your three paragraphs that begin with Hearken and ~~being~~ begin your three stanzas that begin with Awake, but this is the ~~th~~ third of those stanzas, and our primary interest in this course is not upon those, it is upon the picture of salvation in the succeeding chapters, but I wanted to start at the beginning of 52 and from the viewpoint of method to spend some time working on 52. Now, ~~ha~~ how many of you have your Hebrew Bibles with you today. ~~God~~ Good, so let's look at the Hebrew Bible together now and let's look at the beginning of this chapter. This reminds me of a story I heard ~~one-~~ once but I couldn't quite believe. A professor of Mathematics was trying to determine the exact height of his house and ~~h~~ the house rose up

a certain distance and ~~so it~~ go in a ~~little~~ little , and so it would be very difficult to drop a line down there and measure the exact height of the houses. And he wanted to know how high the top of that roof was from the ground, and he wasto figure this and ~~te~~ he was a professor of mathematics, and I heard he was trying to figure this, and some wayfarer came ~~ba~~ by and ~~said~~ said, Here I'll show you how to figure the exact ~~hie~~ height ~~o-t~~ of the house. He ~~said~~ said, Look ^{at} here, and he ~~he~~ took a point on the ground, and from that point he ~~erred~~ ^{sighted} to the top of the roof, and then from a little distance over, which he measured over, and then he found out how high it was, the point at which your sites from here would go from the ~~gea~~ ground to the top of the roof. You have a right angle down here, but a straight line up there, and the height is so much, and he says how high ~~is~~ it here to the point of the house. The ~~na~~ ~~na~~ man said so much, exactly the same because they are two equal sides of it. Well, a professor of mathematics should have thought of that immediately. He knew his mathematics , but he didn't know how ~~the~~ to apply it to life, and I doubt if there is anybody here ~~ck~~ who was not, if I ask him immediately from the form of word , if ~~o~~ he didn't, I would request that he sit back in the 1st year Hebrew. Because any body that gets into the second semester Hebrew should be able to tell the form of the word, and knows that, and it would be utterly ridiculous for me to say to Mr. Curry, Whenever you have a ~~book~~-word which has ~~h~~ both preformative and sufformative Eee____, I used to have the beginning Hebrew students repeat this word, and let them say from backward _____ 1.30) Therefore it would the last ~~ing~~ things to say to Mr. Curry, 2 person feminine singular verb. NAOOR. And so this Hebrew

2.10

word is a command addressed to a woman. "Awake, awake...."

And so then this Hebrew word gives you the idea that he is talking to a woman. And _____ knowing the Hebrew form, _____

He is talking to a woman. This is speaking of the Holy City in figurative expression. We don't learn Hebrew forms/ just for the sake of being able to parse. We learn it in order to get what is exactly meant in the ~~original language~~.

That is why it is very important to examine various forms of each word.

ISAIAH #6/ 7

So then your first word here contains an element of meaning that you English does not express. It is the second femine singular. He is addressing to a woman. _____ I ~~was~~ always think that the great value of learning of Greek and Hebrew is not the ability to take some very difficult verse. Skips

Scholars disagree as to what it means, and make your decision as to what it ought to mean. Some of these verses scholars may argue about them, and may eventually somebody may prove ~~that~~ ~~what~~ whether it is he ~~they~~ correct or/may not. But that is not the purpose of if by all means, but the purpose is to see the _____ right _____ that you cannot express I am not saying that you are not able to make a better translation than ~~this~~. these, ^{great scholars,} but you can immediately see these things if they can't get their translations or their translation may convey ^{possible} ~~some~~ ideas which the original may not convey. ^{like in English} Well, very often a

ISAIAH #7

Hebrew word, like in this case, is more ~~th~~ precise than another language.

In another case, an English word may be more precise than the Hebrew. There are so many obvious things ~~that~~ in various languages that the value of learning Greek and Hebrew.....

But here he says, כִּשְׂרָא כִּשְׂרָא And now what is the next word? This word is related to a noun clothing, and בְּשָׂרָא is a command

to a woman to put ~~a~~ clothing on, to put on some particular clothing, so that when you say, in English, put on your strength, it does not convey the whole picture at all. The picture is putting/something like a garment, putting on

a clothing, putting on a clothing of strength. But if you say were to say, "put on your coat of strength, that would not be a translation. But the idea of clothing is very good. "Put on as clothing your strength/which you are entitled.

Put on your strength. This is calling - me useless to (12.25) he come strong.

And then going on. Keep on going.. Yes, yes.... Mr. WAles? (Q) splendor

Now if you say, "the garments of thy strength," I think ~~of~~ the King James says, "thy beautiful garments." _____ (Q) There is a point of construct ~~can~~ the Hebrew usage that a consonant cannot take an ending or an article.

And consequently it is a regular usage Even when you have nothing, even if it has nothing to do with the word, to put the pronoun after the last word so that it does not mean that you are splendid. ~~which it~~ It just means

you the garments are splended, i.e., the splendid or beautiful garments. That means

The garments of your splendor is a very common Hebrew idiom./Your splendid garment. ~~which is~~ That is a Hebrew idiom which is very common in Hebrew. the

Put on your garments of your splendor would be altogether correct, but wear your beautiful garments is quite all right. Is there any one? Is the Holy

ISAIAH #7

City strictly literal? Yes... Is the Holy City a strictly literal expression?

It is very important in Hebrew that there are two kinds of adjective. There is attributive adjective, and predicative adjective. And the predicative adjective agrees in number and in gender, but not necessarily in definiteness, but in-

the ~~attribu~~ an attributive adjective agrees in number, in gender, and in definiteness, but in addition to that, וְיָשׁוּב is not an adjective. that modifies the city,

If it were an adjective, it could have an article unless the City also has an article, and it would be _____ with an article,

But this is וְיָשׁוּב, a noun which means holiness. Literally it is a city of an incorrect holiness, and a holy city is not a translation but I feel a little more literal to

translate exactly the city of holiness, the city of shrine. This may even refer to Jerusalem where the temple of God is. I am not sure whether וְיָשׁוּב is used for shrine, or whether it ~~is~~ could be used for holiness in general, or it has to be a shrine. The city of holiness or the holy place. Continue....

But the Hebrew... its Hebrew is ----- (8.90)

The form is masculine, and it could be rendered, he. But he is better here. meaning

In English we say, the ~~uncircumcized~~ and the ~~unclean~~ the uncircumcised people and the unclean people. And in modern English we never use in the singular.

This is here a singular, but it means an uncircumcized one and an unclean one.

It ~~m~~ really means the same thing. Uncircumcized people are unclean people. think

I ~~can see~~ that the English translation is not exactly literal, but it expresses the exact idea, and it is slightly different. I believe here it is a collective thing, one

that any uncircumcised /will not continue to _____ (7.50) I think

ISAIAH #7

our time is about up, and for the next time, please translate from the Hebrew verses from 1 to 12. I don't think it would be too much to ask you to write out all the verb forms, all the verbs in their precise form and the root of the verb, and turn them in by Friday. Just the verb forms, and exact meaning of the form, the exact form of the verb. But I 'd like to have it all translated before ~~X~~ next Monday up to verse 12, and I wish you would consider other ways in which it might be translated, and I might say that we might have a chance to look into the Revised Standard Version, _____ translation of Modern English(6.50) ~~Wycliff~~ translation by _____, the Holy Holy Scriptures by ~~trans~~ _____ and the Jewish translation, and Moffat's translations. Some of these translators are modernists, and some are believing men. It is interesting to see different possibilities, I ~~want~~ you to think of other possible works, When right suggestion is made, _____, (Rhaa) instead of saying _____, the ~~first~~- this word never means _____(Rhaa). In each of these words throughout this chapter ~~there~~ think of ~~may-be~~ other possible ways of rendering the word, and see whether you feel this is the best way of rendering it. That is not so important in this chapter, but this is a good preparation for the next chapter in which every word has been argued over tremendously. For such a preparation I would like to spend a fair amount of time. I would appreciate it if every body will turn in the verb forms ^{to me} /by Friday. Please be ready by Monday the translation of the whole chapter and the discussion of ~~the~~ words in this chapter. This is a work-class, not a lecture course, I am ~~so~~ sorry _____ . (5.50)

You really can't tell here in this first verse where it says, City of the ~~Sac~~ Sanctuary, city where the Holy Place is, or whether it means city of Holiness, in other words, the Holy ~~City~~ City. Both ~~ma~~ meanings are possible and there is no way to tell which the Hebrew means. Doubtless the King James made a good guess in the Holy City rather in the City of the ~~Sanctuary Sanctura~~ Sanctuary, because they translate the word) _____ as Sanctuary and the King James Version 68 times while they translate this noun _____ as if it were an adjective, being used in the genitive with the ~~cont~~ construct before 219 times, ~~se-you~~ as holy, so you see they have taken it as holy far more times ~~the~~ than they have taken it as sanctuary but the word could mean either one, so here is a case where you have to use your judgment as to what it means. It is suspectible of both meanings. Both are possible, just like in every sentence in English nearly--there are two or three possibilities. We have to decide from context and from our general knowledge what is meant, but the different possibilities in the ^English sentence will be different that the different possibilities in the Hebrew sentence, and ~~there~~ that ~~k~~ is the valuable of learning a different language.

(Q) It all depends on how definite the context makes it in that particular case. For instance , if you take a word that you think means two ~~x~~ but you are not sure. If you say, James gave him a box and Henry gave him a box , so ~~that~~ now he has two boxes. You see the context makes that usage clear there would be no question about it. If you simply had the sentence, That man had two boxes. You see there is nothing in the ~~x~~ context to tell whether that means 2, 3, 6 , beautiful, big , or little. It depends how ~~k~~ clear the context is, but in that case where it make s it perfectly clear: one gave him this and the other also, that makes it two . ~~X~~ One instance ^{le} which is ~~abl~~- absolutely clear will establish a ~~popular-me~~ possible meaning of a word. It will not establish that ~~to~~ that is the meaning which the word always has. There may

other possibilities. But if you have one case absolutely clear and unquestionable, then it establishes it. One case that is absolutely clear and unquestionable is far better than a dozen cases ~~wh~~ each of which might be questionable. But one clear case will establish it, but you have to be sure it is clear. It's a very good ~~queston~~ question. I'm glad you asked it. It's an important question. We have here then ~~teh~~ these two possibilities. Is it the city of the sanctuary or ~~ix~~ is it the city which is itself thought of as a holy city. Does it mean the ~~ix~~ whole city is ~~ix~~ set apart for God, the whole ~~ix~~ city is honoured by being thought of as having this quality which we call holy or is it the city where the holy place is, the city of the sanctuary. Now, both are possibilities. And this context does not decide between the two, but there are ~~ix~~ other contexts where it clearly means sanctuary, and there are other contexts where it clearly means holy. There is the abstract quality or whether it is a concrete place.

ISAIAH # 8

I am inclined to think that the translation that you suggested "no longer" is a very ~~excellent~~ ~~exd~~ excellent one. We often translate this ...Henceforth there shall no more come unto thee, the King James says, but I am inclined very definitely to ~~sat~~ say that "no longer" is a much better translation. The word _____ expresses continuance --he does a thing and then he does it again. To say that he ~~want~~ ~~d~~ wont do it again means that he wont continue to do it. I am inclined to question whether this is dealing ~~th~~ ~~w~~ with something that is going to be ultimate and permanent. I am inclined to think that it rather means continuance is broken rather than that there never again is a continuance. (Q) Yes, because "No more" will an uncircumcised and an unclean man enter into thee. Now, more freely, you can say, the uncircumcised and the unclean is a general idea of groups of people, but what it ~~acuta~~ actually says is an uncircum-

cised, an unclean. (Q) The word _____ can mean repetition; the word _____ in the Hiphil, as here, means a ~~repetition~~ repetition, or a continuance. You can get that idea from either of them alone, having them both together I don't think makes the idea stronger, I think it is just a frequent way of saying it, He will not add to come in, is rather literal but not exactly. "Add to come in" means he will not another time come in. He wont keep on coming in, and you notice the two imperfects, he wont _____ and he wont _____. It shows that it is an act that you see occuring and while I don't say that it is impossible that here they are saying Here is a wonderful promise to you. There is a time coming in the future when Jerusalem will be so holy that no unclean person ever comes into it. I question very much whether we are right in finding that in this verse. I am inclined to think the more natural meaning of it is ~~that~~ they are telling the people at the end of the exile to awaken, Jerusalem lies there prostrate. It is in heathen hands. He says cease to be something that is just ~~down~~ dormant, lying as if it were asleep. It's dead. It's in ruins. There ~~are~~ are very few people there and there are heathen governors who come through it ever once in a while just to be sure that it is still continuing as it is. This is going to stop --these heathen oppressors coming through--putting an end to any attempt to rebuild it. That's going to stop. You are to rejoice and wake up. The city is going to seem like an awakening city. I think that is a figure, if I can find a clear illustration, the experience I had in 1927 in going into Prague. Prague was the capitol of Czechoslovakia in the days of John Huss, and in the succeeding ~~centuries~~ two centuries, Prague was the capitol of that country. Then in 1621 the Austrians took it over, and they took the leading citizens and beheaded them all and reduced the city to a subject city and they gave ~~to~~ the orders that the Bible is no longer permitted in the city and they ~~cleaned all~~ seized all the Bibles that they could get and burned them, and there were,

however, a lot of people who hid their Bibles and it was 150 years later that the Emperor, Joseph II, permitted them again to have freedom of religion, and while, at that time, out of about 10,000,000 ^{Czechs} ~~Czechs~~, ~~prob-~~ probably 95% were definitely ~~Romas-Romas~~ ^{Catholics and Protestants} Romans and never heard of anything else, it was amazing ~~that~~ how many of those ~~Husi~~ Hussite Bibles ~~sc~~ came out of hiding where people had had them ~~hiden~~ hidden away and read them to their children and passed them on secretly to them 250 years, and then the Hussite Bibles came out but they were ~~still~~ under Austria, they were definitely subject to Austria and held that way for another 75 years, and then at the end of the First World War, they took this country again, and made it a new nation once more, which is not _____ for three hundred years. At the end of the First World War, Czechoslovakia which is just a part of Austria all this time, now became an independent nation with their capital there at Prag, and they named one of their railroad stations after their great President, ^{Masarek} ~~Nasserit~~ (?), and another after the name of ~~the~~ a president ^{gaining} of the United States, Wilson who had so much to do with ~~the~~ their ^{national} nationality. It became a new nation, and ~~Ceeho~~ ^{Czechoslovakia} is (really a ~~checking~~ ^{checking} of the nations, Slovakia is another _____ united one nations, and when I was there in '27, they were building everywhere, ~~Whe~~ and they were ^a crowding out of the cities, just as if it were ^{waken} ~~waken~~ up after three hundred years of being asleep. That was the way it went. And everywhere there was a light of activity, and, of course, that continued ^{then 1940} until 1942, and after that, they had to have a new start, when the end of the war came, but then ^M the Russians marched in, and took it over, and ^{Masarek} Jean ~~Nasser~~, the son of the President ~~Nasser~~ (?) was, after ~~the communist~~ it was taken over the communist, he was up in his room. Then they found his ^{the next morning} body lying on the ground with his Hussite Bible open on his table

I am picturing as just as waking up, just like Jerusalem here. This is only after seven years. _____ (8.50)

57:1
waking up, after _____ Yes? (Q) Literally, absolutely literally, it would be the garments of thy beauty, and if you want to say, thy beauty-of-the-iful garments, thy garments the beautiful one, using an adjective, instead of a noun,, However, we find in Hebrew that it is very, very common to have a noun put in construct form ~~followed-~~ and followed by another noun which expresses a quality, which that one has, if you want to say, ^{your} a golden sceptre, instead of saying thy sceptre, thy golden one, they are more apt to say, "the sceptre of thy goldenness". Of course, it doesn't have any goldenness. There are many cases, where it is perfect clear what it means. That is a most common way in Hebrew meaning, it is not thy beauty, but it is thy garments. ~~They~~ garments, ~~they~~ garments that are beautiful. So that, this would ~~not-~~ not be impossible as far as forms are concerned, the other is ^{by} far ~~more-common-~~ the more common usage. ~~Thy~~ beautiful garments here ~~more-~~ is ~~here~~ more correct, and I am quite sure that ~~these is a more common usage-~~ than these garments of thy holiness. It isn't that the beauty belongs to the person, but that it belongs to the garments, and there are many illustrations about ^{it} that this is by far a more common usage of expressing- sing that idea. That would be the correct way, I am sure. Let somebody go through all these cases, and find something that is interesting where ~~thy~~ beauty rather the beautiful garments. I ~~don't~~ think you will find ~~many,~~ great many, but you might find some ^{that} ~~which~~ would not be enough to make an argument/. I question. Then the next verse, please, Mr. Kim? (Q) The grammarians all way say that Hithpael is a reflected~~ive~~ or reciprocal. Reflexive or reciprocal or very rarely passive, but the grammarians are wrong. I went all through all the Hithpaels in the ~~at-~~ old Testament, ^{seriously} and we found

ISAIAH #8

that maybe a fourth of these cases are clearly reciprocal, and we only found places which are clearly reciprocal, like the way they have translated this, we have only found two places which could reasonably be classified as reciprocal, but we found maybe a fourth/cases or more where the passive meaning is required by the context. They all say, rarely ~~is~~ the passive, and we have found many passives,

iterative-derivative

and then we found that in at least a third of them has a different meaning altogether, it has the meaning of repetition, the meaning of doing things repeatedly, like the case where Enoch walked with God/ That doesn't mean ~~that he walks~~, and walks, and walks _____ with God. It shows skipping.

This is one of the most common usages of hithpael, but it is not in any of the grammar. Dr. ~~Speier~~ Speier of the University of Pennsylvania discovered that by analogy ~~in it~~ of the usage in the Babylonian. The Babylonian analogy does not prove it, but suggest that idea, and when you look into it, you find abundant cases, and I have looked into it a lot more than he did, and I still find a lot more. So that, in this case, probably the reflexive as translated is best, "shake yourself." Is there ~~is~~ anything in this word that we cannot translate into English?

It is clearly a feminine form and again then it is addressed to Zion or Jerusalem. It is ^a the City personified as a woman. Shake yourself! Yes, ? It doesn't say the dust, does it? ~~change thyself~~ Shake yourself from ~~the~~ dust. Of course, in English the dust, what dust? Any dust. If you say the dust. But actually there is no particular reason for its being so. It means to shake off the dust. ~~It~~ means to get up from the dust, it means ~~the~~ shake the dust off. Shake yourself ~~from~~ off from the dust. Shake the dust off. (You have been lying all this time in the dust.)

be

(Q) There is a possibility that this word should be _____ but it is more likely should be _____ in that case as a word. Arise, get up O Captive Jerusalem is not impossible but it is usually taken instead that this is the second feminine singular imperative from _____ ~~-taken~~ meaning to take _____ and picturing her as getting up where she is lying in the dust and sitting on a ^{throne} ~~stone~~. ~~g~~ Get up and take your seat. That is the way it is usually translated. _____ is very, very similar. It means _____. I want ~~to~~ say that is an impossible sense, but ~~I would~~ it would be more likely that there would be a He on the end of it, I believe. I notice that Kittel in the footnotes suggest that he recommends that it should ~~be~~ be _____ with the He on the end, ~~which~~ ~~or~~ which would be captive. The way it stands it is just "Get up and take your seat" ... and of course He being a vowel letter it is sometimes long. I wouldn't say that is impossible but I would say the ~~x~~ other is more likely. Get up and take your seat. Loosen the bands of your neck. Now this Hithpael ~~is~~ immediately suggests a word that I am sure is familiar word though you may not connect it with this. You Mr. Curry, happen to think of what that word would be. Another form of the very same ~~root~~ ~~of~~ would be familiar to everybody. And the word Pathah- Pathah which starts .. that is a word which means the most ~~open~~ open vowel. The most open vowel of ~~the~~ all the vowels they call Open, Pathah. Here we have a ~~word that~~ verb that seems to open _____ and this is a Hithpael, so it is connected with the name of the ~~vowel~~ vowel, and so the word _____ means to open. Now, this is a Hithpael. of it.

ISAIAH # 9

One ~~possibility~~ Possibility is to take it as reflexive. Now, ~~as regards~~ ~~open yourself/h~~ the bands of your neck. Some suggest that there should be two De. I think Kittel has that ~~suggestion~~ in the footnotes. Instead of taking it _____ ~~it~~ he has it _____ open yourself, or release yourself from the bands of your neck. Of ~~course~~ course there is only one D here. As it stands it would be an ~~accusative~~ accusative of specification.

52.2
 Open yourself as regards the bands of your neck. I can't help wondering that it might be that it is here again a form ...but repetitious. Starting opening the bands of your neck. Get busy opening the bands that hold your neck. Whether that is the meaning that is literally open the bands that hold ~~the~~ your neck down. But be open is the reflexive ~~sense~~ translation which is a rather ~~com-~~ common one. ~~-Lo-~~ Loose captive thyself, be open. ~~-Lose~~ Loose yourself from the bands of your neck Open O/daughter of Zion. The next one, Mr. Curry. (Q) This is the case--you see this Kittel Bible confuses you a bit as to the Qere and the Kethib, but other ~~R~~ Hebrew Bibles ~~xxx~~ like we use to have--they don't have any of these notes except the Qere and the Kethib, but they put those in. Qere is what is to be read, from the word _____ to read. The Kethib is what is written, the Aramaic passive participle ~~for~~ from the word kathiev to write. What is written here is _____ waw. If you read those consonants, you have to read it hithpathahoo. That would be a passive. Let them be loosed. Let the bands of your ~~h-~~ neck be loosed. That would be ~~a~~ taking a hithpael as passive, but evidently the Massorets while they found the ~~a~~ waw, most of their manuscripts, they may have found some manuscripts that had a yodh. ~~Th/~~ At least ~~the~~ most of the manuscripts had a waw. They keep the waw in the text. That is the kathiev, that is what is written. But the waw is to be read is what they put in the footnote. That is what is read as a foot-~~noted~~-note, or the vowels, see the vowels you find _____, they added WANT that. They add the vowels, and that means we ~~ought~~ to read this _____ hithpateuee. W But what is written is _____ hithpattchoo. What is ~~wir~~ written is a waw. We are going to read it as yodh. They read it as Yodh, and read _____ lose the value of it (11.50)/ _____ hith patthoo) which makes no sense, unless you reconize the possibility of the

ISAIAH 9

a passive meaning of hithpael. And I have that in many cases, ~~at~~ but Dr. Speier^s ^{not} denies that there are any. I have/taken time to gather together to provide the ^{theologically} proof for it to him. This becomes ^f great importance to ~~Elijah~~, because it says in Genesis that Abraham, in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth shall be blessed. And that "be blessed" _____ 10.75)

Reflexive, or passive or reciprocal. In thee shall all the nations of the earth shall be blessed. But in two cases it is in Hithpael, so all the liberals says. ^{must be _____ ed} that since two cases are hithpael, and hithpael cannot be passive, ^{therefore} _____ should be taken as reflexive and so they say that when God said, to Abraham in thee shall all the nations of the earth be blessed, the septuagint is incorrectly translated, and what should be translated, is in thee shall all the nations of the bless themselves. In other words, they shall ~~be~~ blessed themselves.... They will be fortunate enough to bless themselves. In other words, they will bless themselves and good by referring themselves to the fact ~~that~~ as to how fortunate ^{and good} they were, and that ^{way} they get rid of any Messianic prediction. That is why I am in-(9.90)terested in finding out whether Hithpael can be used as passive, and so I am now interested in adding that ~~it stands~~ as it stands here, it is passive. Let the bands of your neck be loosed. That makes a sense. Let the ~~bands~~ bands of your neck be loosed. or loose ~~them~~. the bands of your neck. _____ (9.80) So, it seems to me that it is better to ~~take~~ take it as passive, ~~although~~ ~~the~~ liberal scholars would not recognize it, they would take as a reflexive, and then put in a _____ (mem) before the band, and say, "Loose yourself from the band of your neck. There is no mem there.

So I= think that there is somewhat of an argument though not so strong as the others in ~~the~~ favour ~~of~~ passive meaning of the hithpael, which I think ^{has so} we need to have ~~it~~ in that Messianic promise in Genesis, and the Septuagint translated because they understood it. Yes, Miss Chae Myung? Yes, (Q) Yes, ^{you have} a very good question

there which would make a great doubt on the suggestion that I just gave. The translation I just gave really should have an imperfect rather than an imperative. Let them be loosed. The imperative (Q) ~~You cannot~~ yes, yes, yes, you cannot have a passive imperative. There is a passive niph'al imperative. You can have a passive imperative, but you don't ordinarily ~~you~~ have an imperative in the third person. _____ the bands of your neck be loosed. That is a very good argument against the the suggestion I just made ~~xx I am glad~~ which I am glad that you have noticed. I slipped ^{up} on that. I appreciate your calling attention to that. Then the, Mr. Curry the next, verse, number 3. /Mr. Kim, I am so glad that you have called attention to that, because it was so important to have some understanding of kathiev and Quere.

I want to be sure that everybody understands it. _____ (7.50)

I appreciate your raising the question.

Yes, Mr. Curry? You shall be redeemed, but not by silver, shalt thou be redeemed.

Yes, Yes? (Q) Change here from Feminine to Masculine, also from singular to plural.

You think of the city as a unit which is personified as a woman, ~~why/it/~~ You think a lot of it as ~~an~~ individuals, and you ~~can~~ refer to these individuals as men so that when you are addressing the individuals who are referred to as men, when you think of it as a unit, you think of it under a figure of a woman. So that you are thinking of it as an individual rather than thinking of it as a corporate whole. And of course, you are dealing more with it, and now it is their responsibility of dealing with the privilege of coming to that, think of the privilege of coming back to the city personified now you think of the responsibility they have for having got the city and having _____ skipping you think of an individual, so as you planned out the change

The

/Niph'al

was originally reciprocal, but then it came to take over the passive

meaning. It really takes place of the passive of qual. In most cases, the passive

ISAIAH #9

meaning fits in the context. But there are just a few cases where a reflexive fits better, so reflexive is not at all impossible. Reflexive is a well-established meaning of niphal, but I don't think it is common. In this case, it seems to fit the case better than the other, and they both are common. _____ skipping _____

_____ I think that really it should be possible, because what is the point of that? _____ (5.10) They went out to Egypt to sojourn there ; and the Assyrian oppressed them ~~with~~ without cause. " Now what does that mean? This is the point of it. They went to Egypt for a definite purpose in order to be saved through the family, in order to get some help from ~~the~~ Egypt. You might say then they have a responsibility. They went down ~~there~~ to Egypt, and partook certain ~~ge~~ good things / ~~and~~ which Egypt / gave them, Now the Egyptians turned against them. You might say that ~~the~~ the Egyptians have some claims on them. They and yet came down voluntarily. / God delivered them from Egypt, he led them through the Red Sea, and God ~~saves them~~ brought them out safely, and now he says, / I did this for

the people, but they have gone to Egypt in order to sojourn there _____ (.4.50) will _____ when they are here, How much ~~will~~ I do for my people? / here,? because the Assyrians simply ~~threw~~ through aggression and ~~conquered~~ _____ desire to conquer

They went down to Egypt to sojourn there. God delivered them from exile, but the Assyria simply through wicked / desire to conquer has taken them. Now he will certainly deliver them from Assyria. I think that is the point. I think that is correct. (Q) Well, again let us recite on that... They never were seized ~~by~~ again back to Egyptians and taken ~~by~~ Egypt. There was an Egyptian army under _____

at the time of Rehoboam... marched through the land, and they took a lot of booty. ~~Th~~ But they did not hold them _____, and when Solomon married a daughter of a Pharaoh, the pharaoh came up and seized a couple of cities that were under Solomon, and Solomon gave away.

them
1

Thus the Egyptians brought habits to the Israelites at various times, but they never actually held the people under their subjection as they had before, but Assyria did. Assyria came in, and conquered the land, and took the people off to the prisons into subjection, and of course that was the beginning of the exile. _____ (skipping)

5214 }3/-- (3.00) ~~vari~~ very often it is used in singular, and you notice here it is in masculine. Yes, it is used with a singular subject which refers to the people. Now there is another in this verse to which I would like to call your attention. What is the, I will ask Mr. Kim. ~~the fifth word of~~, one, two, three, four, the fifth word, of this verse, how would you pronounce it? Every sees that the fifth ~~verse~~ in verse four, you notice it, and then you look at verse five, and then if you have Kittel's Bible right under the verse five, you have the consonants, but are the vowels same? Vowels are different. Aren't they? See how different they are? Why are they so different? Now the reason is that the kathieve is yodh, he, waw, and he, which is the ancient name of God. And how do you pronounce the word in the Revised Standard Version? American Standard Version gives it Jehovah. That is ^{he} _____ . How it ~~is~~ works, no body knows. These letters, yodh, waw, he, represents the name of God. These letters, yodh, he, waw, he, represents the name of God. But the Jews at later time, instead of saying the name of God, usually, says, the Lord, which is Adonai, here in verse five, that is correctly pronounced adonai, it has ~~y~~ yodh, shewa, which is under it, and ~~y~~ the beginning of the word Adonai, it has the dot above the waw, which has ~~the~~ oh of adonai, which is a common underneath it, and ah of adonai, up in verse 4, you don't have those vowels, you have different vowels. you have a hiriq under the waw instead of qames. That is quite different. You cannot pronounce it-_____ adonai, adonia....

ISAIAH #10

~~Is there any sensible as to why~~ Does any body see any sensible ^{any sense} why they should be different? The ~~an~~ name of God is usually pronounced ADONAI, but if you have ADONAI right before it, they do not pronounce it ADONAI, but they pronounce it ELOHIM. And here it has the vowels of ELOHIM, which is just the same with the vowels of the ADONAI, except for the last one ^{which} instead of being a quames ~~it~~ is hiriq. So when you have that hiriq there, it is ELOHIM. It is the Lord's God when they say it, but what they have written there is the name of God. I am afraid our time is up.

If you take it as reflexive, open yourselves from them, release yourselves from them, but there is no ~~from~~. That has to be assumed, if you take it that way. Release yourselves from the bands of your neck. ~~x~~ You can take ~~xx~~ it as an accusative of specification, Release yourselves as the bands of your neck, and that would make pretty good sense, but the Kethib as it stands ends in Waw, and the only way you can take that, would be what? ~~x~~ Simple perfect, that's right. Third common plural perfect. Yes, they have loosed themselves. They have loosed the bands of your neck. Now, if you were to take it as a perfect, Shake yourselves from the dust. Arise and- O Captive and take your seat, O captive daughter of Jerusalem. They have loosed the bands of your neck O captive daughter of Zion. In other words, it ~~would~~ could be taken as meaning that someone has removed these bands from her neck which are holding her down and therefore she can get up and she ~~x~~ can rise from the dust. Instead of being two imperatives, it could be an imperative given in view of something that has ~~x~~ happened --now, of course, you would expect the Lord to say I ~~xx~~ have released you rather than they have, but maybe it could mean they have in the sense of Someone has or one that God sent to do it, the armies of the Persians. They have released the bands of your neck. And I think there is this advantage. They have ~~rea~~ released. They have kept on

releasing the bands. They are steps in it which are ~~rela~~ releasing the bands of your neck. I don't see why it ~~z~~ should be Hithpael. A Qal would be ~~z~~ better. And the ~~rel-~~ reflexive wouldn't make much sense. They have released themselves, that wouldn't make much sense. The bands of your neck have opened themselves. Maybe that's it. He says Get up, Bands have opened up. The bands have loosed themselves. They are no longer holding you. I think we would probably get better ~~ses-~~ sense from the ~~Kex~~ Qere than from the Kethib. (Q) Yes, thank you for asking that question. That's is very important for us to understand. The Kethib, that which is written is originally s mply consonants. The consonants are in the manuscripts. The synagogue manuscripts have only the consonants, but ~~z~~ that does not mean the vowels --anybody can use any vowels they want. The parents read them to their children, the Rabbis read them to their students, ~~z~~ so people had heard them read over and over. ~~th~~ They knew how it should be read, but the vowels were not written, then when they feared the pronunciation would be lost, as Hebrew was not used much any ~~more~~ more, the Rabbis invented a system of vowel marks --there are two or three ~~di-~~ ~~z~~ different systems. We have the Babylonian system, the Palestinian is a different system. They invented two or three different systems of vowel marks and they put vowel marks on to show what vowels they felt should ~~be~~ be used. Now, the ~~vowles-~~ vowels ~~z~~ are part of the Qere, not of the Kethib. The Kethib is what is written, the Qere is what the ~~Manuscripts-~~ Massorettes said should be read, and where the Masorettes said it should be read differently from the consonants which are written, they put in vowels to go with ^{consonants} what ~~z~~ they thought it ought to be, and in most cases they put in the footnotes/~~vowles~~ that they think should be read with the ~~vowl-~~ vowels that they put in the text. Wherever there is the Qere, the vowels are part of the Qere and not of the Kethib and the vowels of the Kethib you have to say what they ought ~~z~~ to be, because they are not written, so

the vowels of the Kethib would be a Shureq , but the ~~was~~ vowel of the Qere would be Hiriq, and the consonants of the Qere are put in the footnotes. And so when you get the name of God, that is the Kethib, the qere is either ~~Adonia~~ Adonai or Elohim., and they put in the vowels of the Qere but in that case they don't put ~~ix~~ it in the footnotes because it is so common ~~to people~~ people know what it is, and the same way in the book of Genesis. Whenever it says She ~~ix ix~~ it is _____ but the Qere they don't bother to put in the footnotes--they put a hiriq in with the vowels in Genesis ~~ix~~ because in Genesis it has the --but they put the vowels for the ~~k~~ right one . (Q) ~~Now~~ No, the hiriq under the He we read with the Yodh--we read the Qere --we read the Kethib --we put in the vowels that go with the Kethib. (Q) The lexicons never determine the ~~re~~ meaning. The ~~lexi-~~ lexicons can only give the opinion of the writers of the lexicon as to what the meaning is , and ~~they-~~ when all ~~out-~~ our lexicons were written, it is believed that the ~~Hig~~ Hithpael was reflexive or reciprocal and the fact , which is easily ~~w~~ proven now that the Hithpael is often a frequentitive, was not known. Therefore, they would say, Hithpael is the same as Qal. It it is the same as Qal why the Hithpael. The fact is that the writers of all ~~our~~ our lexicons did not know such a thing as a Hithpael Frequentitives~~ix~~, so they say Enoch walked himself with God doesn't make any sense ~~Job~~ Job says He has been walking himself up and down in the earth, but when you recognize that one meaning of the ~~He-~~ Hithpael is that the frequentitive, it makes perfect sense. Enoch walked and walked and ~~walked~~ walked with God, and I would question very seriously whether the Hithpael ~~wever~~ means exactly the same as the Qal. But when they say it is the same ~~a~~ thing as Qal, it means they don't see how a reflexive would fit, but of course , they don't know what to do with ~~ix~~ it so they say the same as Qal, but I'm ready to be proven that Hithpael is the same as Qal, but we have to have a few ~~ix~~ cases, but when we have a number of cases ~~wh~~ ere people ~~ix~~ have thought it to be the same as Qal, it is a frequentitive. Why, then, I am inclined to think that if it is not

~~fre~~ reflexive, it must be ~~κ~~ frequent^aitive. And that to me is the difficulty here. It would not then mean they ~~α~~ had watched, but they mean that they have opened and opened and opened, which may mean that something happens which releases them a little, and then a little further, etc. that would account for the Hithpael, but the same problem ~~perp~~ perhapswhen we take it with the K Qere. He says release the bands of your neck. Well, he ~~relae~~ releases it ~~one~~ once for all, but ~~it-~~ if it happens again, it is ~~frequentivi~~ frequent^gitive. Of course there is a real truth, when one is in slavery you don't just get released immediately. You have to get free ~~ακ~~ not only from the fact of slavery, but from the feeling, from the habit of slavery, so it may take several ~~fr~~-freeings before one is really free, like one who is really free ~~from~~, like from a habit. I heard of one man who ~~isx~~ was converted not long ago who was a chain smoker and he was converted and he said the next morning he woke up and he had no~~x~~ desire for tobacco, it just left him like that. Well, that is not usual. Usually, when people free themselves of a bad habit, they have to keep on doing it. It doesn't happen instantane^{ous}. And so I would be inclined to think that there is a possibility that it could be frequent^gitive. At any rate, to just take it exactly the same as Qal, I am inclined to think there must be a reason. Well, that's an interesting question that you have raised. Now, let's very rapidly read through, calling attention to any vital things and then let's go on from there. Miss Pickett, will you very rapidly read the first verse, and etc. and we will very rapidly catch up to where we are.

ISAIAH # 11

In English we have the word All and we have the word any. And somebody can ~~trans~~te translate the word all and ~~somebody~~ somebody can translate the word any. the ~~Qax~~ Waw. We have the word and and we have the word for and ~~wh~~e we have the word ~~--this~~ this ___ has all that range of meaning which in English we divide up and

give different approaches. We can say and for ~~or~~ , We can say and for but, we have greater distinctives of meanings in English than in Hebrew and if you say an uncircumcised and an unclean person will ~~never~~ never come into you, we mean that particular uncircumcised and particular unclean and all the rest will, or we may mean that everyone of that type never will. There will never be an uncircumcised nor an unclean person to come into you. There is an unclean and uncircumcised person ~~we~~ that we know will never come into you. There is a range of ~~a~~ meaning which ~~the Hebrew and the English~~ in English we often use quite vaguely and which in Hebrew is more vague than the English .

It's a bit vague at this point. The word _____ is literally a construct ~~for~~ before the genitive, but the construct before the genitive; this particular word _____ has two ~~particular~~ possible meanings. It can mean Holiness as an abstract or it can mean a thing which is characterized by holiness. and therefore what we ~~can~~ call a Sanctuary , a Holy place is ~~k~~ often called a _____ , but also in Hebrew there are many times when it is used for the abstract, when you say that he is a man of Holiness, it is a nation ~~of~~ of holiness, what you are really ~~saying in~~ saying is that it is a holy nation. And that is one of the commonest ways in Hebrew of giving a ^{material} _____ A ~~city~~ house of stone, or a stick of wood--it's describing its quality. It's much better to say a stick of wood than to say a wooden stick. It is much better to say instead of a house of stone a stone house. The other is a ~~xxxxx~~ sort of a roundabout way of saying it. When you say the gardens of thy beauty. What ~~is~~ it means is the ~~gardens of beauty~~ garments of beauty that belong to you, the you goes with ~~the~~ garments ~~we~~ rather than with ~~you~~. Well you have here no _____ to go with it. If it ~~x~~ were the city of your _____, I would have no doubt that it would mean your holy city, but when it is just the city of the _____, whether it is the holy city or whether it is the city of the sanctuary , I don't know if there is any way to tell. Now ~~is~~ if you would ~~be~~ find ~~that~~ the very phrase used, many

times with one of these two meanings , as proven by the context, you would have a pretty ~~xx~~ argument for saying this particular ... is that way, but when you don't and find the word _____ you are here ~~x~~ requiring other evidences to determine which is which, ~~xx~~ whether it means ~~x~~ Jerusalem the Holy place, or Jerusalem the place where God's holy place is , I don't think we can tell which is which. And it is not use translating it in English--when you ~~transl~~ translate in English , you ~~translat~~ translation has ~~to~~ got to select one or the other, and that is the problem of transation, You have two possibilities in your Hebrew and in your translation, you have to ~~x~~ take ~~xx~~ one of the two, because there is no word in the other language, and the other problem is that when you ~~trans~~ translate the language into which you ~~trans~~ translate often whatever you say has two possibilities , only which one corresponds with the original, so in my opinion, the ~~value~~ value of Hebrew and Greek or in order to ~~x~~ get the precise ~~xx~~ meaning of the original--in my opinion it is ~~x~~ even more important to see what's _____ in the original that just can't be translated. I think that it is even more important. Well, we were going to read this first verse rapidly--we ~~want~~ want to get through the chapter for sure, and so let's read verse two very rapidly. You have sold yourselves without cause--sold yourselves is a perfectly ~~correct~~ correct way of ~~xx~~ translating the Niphal as a reflexive. There is an equally correct way of translate it to take it as a ~~passive~~ passive--you have been sold for nothing, and the last part of it is also a Niphal, and you did not say . And without money, you will redeem yourselves. You did not translate it that way. It is a Niphal, it could be reflexive. It is quite evident that they were not ~~x~~ able to redeem themselves at all, so in the last case ~~xx~~ it is quite correct to say it is a passive. The first of the two--it can be either passive or reflexive --~~whether~~ whether they sold themselves or whether they were sold it does not ~~x~~ tell--

that is a matter which our knowledge of the facts or of the context must determine for us. Number four, Mr. Curry. You say, Now, therefore, which is now therefore?

Ordinarily, "now" is _____ atta, Ayin, tau, he. This is, therefore is ordinarily, _____ alkin, on account of such, therefore, I think it would be better to

translate the _____ ki, as "for" or "because", and the _____ ko, thus. How

does the English word express the the word sojourn? I don't know what we can do with it, because ~~fo~~ "sojourn" is an Old English word that is not used today.

The idea of the word, "sojourn" is quite common today, but I just don't know of any word for it. You meet an English _____ to this country

~~Here is a man who came from England 20 years ago, and he is working in this country, and he is living here, but he is intending to go back to England.~~ ^{is} He/only here temporarily. He is sojourning. He is not ~~going to become a citizen here.~~ becoming a ~~citizen.~~ ^{Old} dweller. He is ~~living here temporarily.~~ one who is living here on a temporary basis. In ^{the} English that is "sojourn", but I don't know, I never heard of ~~a~~ word used except in the

Bible. I doubt if an average person when he reads the Bible would know what it means. You say, I am going to sojourn. I doubt if they will. So it would be good if we could find a word that express that idea. The idea is simply to dwell.

It is not living, because _____ goor, has that definite idea of living as a stranger living as a foreigner, ~~staying~~ living as one ~~that~~ who is there temporarily. ^{better}

I don't know of any way of ~~saying~~ [✓] saying it. I don't think the word, ~~sojourn~~ ^{is a better, understand it} one, because an average person would not ~~know what it means,~~ unless they have read

the Bible many times. I am just wondering how many people are reading the Bible and spend ~~so~~ ^{to} much time on figuring out what the word ~~'sajourn'~~ ^o means. I don't know.

ISAIAH #11

It is interesting to ask. Ordinarily many Christians have read the Bible, but have never taken time for special studies, ask them what "sojourn" mean. It would be interesting to see how many of them have a real idea. So, any way they went down there for a definite purpose, out of their own volitions, ^{It was that} they went ~~th~~ down there

to sojourn. That is much better. It is a very strange word. It means an end, it ~~is~~ ^{it} means an end. But ^{from} has come to be used for that ~~which~~ you get something. therefore for nothing because that is beyond end. You are going to the end of a railroad, you are going to no country, in the wilderness, beyond the end, ~~to~~ so it comes to mean

nothing. They oppressed them without cause. That is quite a jump from ~~the~~ the original meaning of the word, but it may result in reaching ~~it~~ it. So it was not a real cause, a serious cause, or a real purpose in the Assyrians' coming and devastating the land. ^They did not go to Assyria. The Assyrians came and ^bgrabbed

52:5 them. They have done this without any real justification. Number 5, Mr. No. 5? ^{Kim} How is that? Oh, yes, very.... that last word is _____ (aeshahooko), and that is a form which we rarely learn int/ the beginning Hebrew, but which occurs quite prominently in the Bible, ~~But, what which~~ It is a simple word, _____ ashach.

3rd masculine singular, perfect Qual, but when you put a suffix on, it, it becomes _____ (im). 3rd masculine suffix, you change the accent, and therefore, the 1st letter drops to a shewa, and the second becomes quames and ^{then} you have a ~~holem~~

----- at the end. It is interesting that if ~~you have the~~ ^{if you have that} instead of infinitive, which the infinitive construct be _____ shove, if you want to say, _____

(4/5-0), _____ Hiphil perfect(?), that would be _____ ashobho. In other words, the form of the subject would be just the opposite in its focal(?) sense. _____ asheck, with a subject, becomes a _____. shove, _____ with a subject becomes _____ ashka. It is rather important to have that in

ISAIAH #11

mind, because quite a few appear in this ~~fre~~ form. So I would appreciate it if you all try to remember that. Quite a few times they appear in the Scriptures. We usually don't mention in the first year Hebrew. All right, please, continue, Mr. Kim. In Hebrew it is very important to have in mind of ~~two kinds of~~ ~~of~~ sentences. There is a verbal sentence where this did something to that. There is a noun sentence, or a nominal sentence where this is that. A noun sentence can have a verb in it as an integral part of the sentence. He is standing is a noun sentence. standing is an adjective describing what he is doing. He is standing is a nominal sentence. He is standing or _____ is a noun sentence (nominal sentence). So this one here, it is a noun sentence, It is a question. It is a question, and the subject of it is ^{is} ~~is~~ a question as to what and the predicate is to me. "What is to me? or what do I have? What is the reason of my being here? I think that is what the King James has translated. What am I doing? What am I doing here? What do I have to do here? I think that is what K.J.V. translates. Because to me is very often used for I have. When I was in college, it was very regular to use the expression "to...", so we would say, this is the book which is to me, instead of saying "my book" _____ SHOMZI, . They use the word _____ SHEO, JUST SHEMI _____ as a relative. My books is, has to be the book which is to me. _____ sheomi. It is very common in/Hebrew. ^{Modern} The road that is to me, the rose to the service, So, when I go up that is to me.

station I saw a man with Shem Lameth on it in capitols and I said what is he
~~es-y~~- saying belongs to him, and then I realized ~~tha~~ t it stood for ~~x~~ Shell Oil
 s
 Company . Now, what is to ~~me~~ here, what is the form of _____. In beginning
 Hebrew we would say this is a Pual, the form which is exactly like a Pual, ~~w~~
 but when you get into advanced Hebrew you realize that there are quite a few
 cases where it looks ~~like~~ like a Pual --it is used as the passive of Qal rather than
 the passive of Pual, and so it is usually considered to be a Pual, used of the ~~Passive~~
 Passive of Qal rather than the passive of Pual, and so it is usually considered a
 remainder of an old passive of Qal which has been lost by the time of Biblical
 Hebrew. By the time of Biblical Hebrew there are very few cases of the passive
 of Qal but there are a few cases where it occurs, so this we would say is the
 passive of Qal...

ISAIAH # 12

Yes, but in this case there is a Qere, a one, there would be in full writing a Yodh
~~or-a~~ before the final Waw. Active Qal Participle, _____, one ruling. I always
 remember the word _____ as one who rules or directs or oversees. _____ is
 to rule, and _____ is the one who rules. _____ is the ones who are ruling
 him. His ruler . Yes, but what form is it? It's a Hiphil, and ordinarily you ~~x~~
 translate the ~~Hib~~ Hiphil as a causative, -as-a--they cause to cry --they make him
 wail . His rulers mistreat him so they make him wail. H₁s rulers , they are constantly
 causing wailing. (Q) Well, it is a strange form. As it stands, it does not fit with
 any form known. The usual interpretation in the past has ~~x~~ been, should be _____
 passive of Hithpael, a Hithpoel, the _____ has been assimilated into the Nun so you
 get a double . That is, _____ ~~x~~ ~~bee~~ becoming _____. In the Kittel Bible they

52:5
52:6

raise the question , would it not be ~~k~~ better to read this as _____, in other words, if you just change --~~don~~ away with the doubling of the Nun change the Mem to a Shewa, then you would have a Pual Participle . My name is blasphemed --they suggest that as ~~k~~ a question. It is interesting that they have a footnote in the Kittel Bible which says the Greek adds "among the nations" so in the Greek it the word is added "My name is blasphemed among the nations, because ~~ff~~ of the things that have happened among God's people. I don't think ~~k~~ you ~~k~~ need to have among the nations. The fact that His people can't be protected , ~~α~~ so on ~~anx~~ account of this His name is continually blasphemed among the nations. Number six, Mr. Kim, the word "Behold Me" is very often just the equivalent in English of Here I am. I ~~ix~~ tried once to ~~word~~-ou work out ..(Q) This word _____--the word does not exactly correspond with any form that we have and consequently, it has usually been taken in the past as being a passive of Hithpael with Taw assimilated into the Nun, so that does occur , but very rarely, ~~se-the-present~~ so therefore a question was raised, so ~~the~~ present interpreters ~~ix~~ largely suggest that instead of being _____the way the Masoretes have pointed, it should be Minoa with a ~~whe~~ shewa , and in that case it could be a Pual Passive Participle. Well, I'm not sure we can say this. The situation is simply that the Masoretes pointed it this way. Why did they point it this way. Why didn't they ...it looks as ~~ix~~ if they saw that ~~kit~~ made sense , and the only ~~wye~~ way I know that it can make sense is to say that ~~ix~~ it is the passive of the Hithpael, but then the Taw is assimilated. How can the taw be assimilated into the nun, that doesn't occur in the Hebrew , well, it doesn't occur much anyway. It doesn't occur much in Hebere

5217
 Hebrew, and , consequently, if that isn't right, ~~there~~ then there has been a mistake in the transmission. It might be that it has been erroneously transmitted, but if it is correctly transmitted , that's the only ...Yes, Let's see . We've finished six, now we are ready for ~~w~~ seven. Mr., Kim, would you read us seven. Now, this word _____ ~~is~~ ~~wh~~ this ~~work~~ word in the Hiphil , this word means give good tidings, give good news, and so in Aramaic they call the gospel the _____ the gospel , the good news, it is all one word, but in English there is no word to express it, and we have to say in English , the one who brings good news. The one who brings ~~a~~ good news is _____. This word _____ which is the last word in verse 7, this word ~~a~~ comes as a noun, and the root _____ the name of Jesus. It is ~~a~~ the very same word and it means that it is the ~~abstrane-~~ abstract Now , I ~~ask~~ you to get this whole chapter in shape this week. We have been dealing mostly ~~a-which-~~ with small points of grammar, but I think that is very worth while, and I think it vital, the most interesting thing ~~we~~ ~~is~~ is going to be chapter 53, but I think a little practice before getting into the chapter is very helpful, so please for next time, finish the Hebrew of the chapter, that's only three verses, but finish those three additional verses in first class shape ~~first~~ ~~pele~~ please for next time. Then, in addition to that, please, everyone of you take some other translation ~~and~~ of chapter 52 --I don't care if you get the American Standard ~~ed~~ , The Revised Standard ~~ed~~, whether you get the so-called Chicago Translation --Moffatt, get any translation at all but ~~a~~ get a different ~~tra~~ translation and see how that translation differs ~~is~~ ~~is~~ from the King James and be prepared to tell us how it translates different from the King James and to show whether you think it is better or worse. I think it would be good if you would write that out--could you get that to me by Monday--I would appreciate it if you ~~or~~ could get it to me by Monday Noon so I would have a chance to look it over by class time . Please put it in my box there before Monday noon. Some other trans. and your opinion of how it differs.

We compare various versions for today of this 52nd chapter. I don't think we find in the first part nearly as many ~~inte-~~ interesting ~~prog~~ problems as we will find toward the latter part. The one who is making people hear peace, not just the one who is saying peace, but the one who is really bringing news of peace. We have "Cursed is he that saith Peace, peace ~~and-~~ the false proclamation of peace telling people there is peace when there isn't. But this is one who makes them real news of peace, causes people to hear that there is peace. This word Shalom doesn't just mean cessation of war, it means well being. It's not peace in the sense that the people of ^{East} West Germany are at peace now, now that those who ~~revole~~ revolted ~~w~~ against the Communists ten years ago were seized and put in prison and the others were forced to the very limit of their ~~x~~ endurance with hardly any energy left, to produce ~~to~~ for the Russian war machines. That's peace in the sense that they are not ~~figu~~ fighting, but it's not peace in the sense of Shalom. It means well-being, ~~new~~ things are good, ~~new~~ not just free from war. ~~Procalim~~ Proclaim is to tell loudly. Now that seems strange doesn't it, the King James says reigneth --how do you get reigneth out of Malak. When you say reigneth, that is Old English for reign, and you would think that reign, isn't it, and you would think that reign --you would ~~not~~ expect to have ~~any-~~ a participle ~~and-~~ the something continuous but in this case the meaning is not incorrect in the King James but it is the ~~peculiarly~~ peculiarity of this verb. This word Malak does not mean to reign, it means to begin to reign, to assume and so when it says your ~~kins~~ king has reigned, what it means is that your king has taken over --your ~~g~~ God has taken over control. Your God has established ~~your~~ His power supreme. We have this word over and over ~~x~~ in the books of Kings and ~~Ps~~ Proverbs in the Old Testament. Such a ~~seuh~~ such a man Malak--he

began to reign, so the word ~~doen~~ doesn't mean to reign in the sense of continually exercising functions, it means to assume these functions, and ~~as you say, your~~ if you say your King has assumed those functions, ~~-it means that-~~ what it means is that he still continues to , and so Thy God reigneth is not an incorrect ~~transa~~ translation at all, but it is only a part of the meaning, it is not ~~a~~ simply a declaration of the general proof of the sovereignty of God. It is a declaration that God is beginning to exert His sovereignty in a very special way. He says to Zion Your God has taken over control. Your God has assumed the reigns. And then the next verse, Miss Luke. ~~Wex~~ The word _____ can be made ~~den~~ definite by having an article or by having a suffix on it, or ~~by~~ the voice of God, when you get ~~ix~~ it in the ~~conts~~ construct before a noun, it becomes the voice of . And the voice of what? The voice of thy watchman--there is a little difficulty with that. What is the difficulty of that? No, watchman couldn't be in ~~cont~~ construct. Yes, the ~~word is ----- and~~ voice of thy watchmen has been raised. That would have to have a singular verb to agree with a ~~sig~~ singular subject, ~~the~~ this is not a singular verb, it's a plural . How many plural words do you have. That will be possible. They ~~a~~ have raised up. I think you will probably find in BDB that ~~ix~~ it was _____ the very _____ to watch. And then if you have a very _____ you would have an Active Qal Ptcp. a watching one. It might take _____ as a noun. Very frequently participles become _____ so that if ~~ix~~ it is so, a watching one, a watcher can become a noun. It depends on the view. I have not ~~a~~ looked to see whether it gives _____ as a noun but ~~ix~~ at least it could be , and if it is a noun , it is derived from a participle. Thy ~~wath~~ watching one. The one who belonged to you who are watching. It is not common to use _____ with an indefinite article. Grammatically it is entirely possible that "they have lifted up the voice of your watchmen," but it

52:8

makes ~~xxx~~ better sense to say , O watchers have ~~He~~ lifted up the voice, have lifted up a voice, definitely, an object may have but doesn't have to have it. So Miss Luke you ~~w~~ say, your watching ~~n~~ ones have lifted up a voice and ~~continuti~~ continuing. They will sing a voice together, they sing so that it sounds like one ~~ei-~~ voice. Now this , you say they shall sing, you take ~~ix~~ it in the future , but it doesn't have to be. They will be or ~~x~~ they do this, so that they have lifted up the voice, they keep on ~~k~~ singing joyful notes together. The ~~xx~~ second one is the object of the ~~sene~~ sentence. I haven't looked to see just how they have placed it there , but everywhere else ...but the more literal way , it was very common but if that would be perhaps the more natural way, well, you ~~w~~ see the watchmen would see ~~hxx~~ high. That's a very interesting suggestion. The ~~watchem~~ watchmen ~~certainly~~ see ~~to~~ eye to eye, with the ~~px~~ physical eye, when the Lord comes back to Zion. There is that other idea of the watchmen being unanimous, ~~they~~ but if it were. To see with the eye, that would be more in line with this idea...the idea of unanimity

14
ISAIAH # 15

And then Tregelles an Englishman got out an edition. And Tregelles was a very ~~find~~ fine English scholar, but I don't think he did any where near as much work on the Old Testament as on ~~n~~ the ~~xx~~ New. He is not as much an expert in the Old Testament , but Tregelles ~~x~~ was an earnest scholar and a ~~x~~ very fine Christian, he will give his own interpretation ~~ix~~ in brackets, where he differs ~~stox~~ strongly and then B.D.B. got out an edition of Gesenius and then there has been another edition since B.D.B. but it is only in German, and that is much later but there are two or ~~sthe~~ three other dictionaries, but if they don't take an earlier edition of Gesenius and

then they call it by their own name, but B.D.B. put in ~~x~~ years of work . Now this one ~~with~~ which came out around ~~10~~ 1900 and then it was used for quite a while and then forgotten, and then they let B.D.B. get out of ~~pr~~ printing because they ~~happen-to-get-inted-~~ intended to get out a new edition which Professor Driver, *sum* one of the three--Driver of Oxford was going to revise it , but most scholars don't think he is anything like the ~~k~~ scholar his father was . . .I went to see Oxford *to* press and ask ~~they~~ them about it and absolutely wouldn't give anybody ~~este~~ else information, neither would ~~x~~ they . . .so when Erdman reprinted an earlier Tregelles it would be of tremendous help . And then Oxford reprinted B.D.B. . . .The translation of virgin in the RSV ~~is-~~ said if we are to be scholars and to be accepted as ~~as-~~ scholars, all of our leading Hebrew lexicons agree that virgin is young ~~w~~ woman rather than virgin. But in ~~x~~ his footnotes he named his three Hebrew lexicons and they are all three editions of Gesenius, and one of these editions is this one Tregelles and ~~x~~ you look up Almah in Tregelles and it says young woman of marriage~~able~~ woman and then in square brackets Tregelles says This utterly unwarranted interpretation of the word Almah which means virgin shows the anti-Christian presupposition of Gesenius and yet *Sore* quoted that as one of the three , ~~sk~~ one of which he said proves that all of the dictionaries agree. One of the three quoted denied it specifically, although he did what Gesenius ~~x~~ did. So that I am very interested in whatever Tregelles said but we want to check out the facts . But I would be very interested in what he said and we ~~wk~~ ~~x~~ will check out the facts. He is a very good man. He is a man that went to Rome and was ~~grea-~~ granted permission to see the Vaticanus mss. and ~~sk~~ in those days the ~~Poe~~ Pope would n't let any one see it, he got permission to see it and they would bring out and if they thought he was looking closely at something they would ~~imem-~~ immediately turn it over to another page and wouldn't let him look very long on any one page. But in some way he managed to

copy quite a bit of it. Then later the popes changed their attitude and they made a facsimile of it. A very interesting ~~the~~ thing is that Lasome made this statement and then he proceeds to give some very involved evidence from etymology ~~x~~ in relation to _____ and then he takes up usage and he points out the case in which he ~~x~~ takes a thousand ~~wives~~ and Lasome says in this case it must be virgin, and actually the only way ~~wx~~ you ~~x x~~ can determine what ~~w~~ a word is in any language is by usage. ...shows that in every case it was a woman ~~wxx~~ who was a virgin. It's pretty hard to prove by ~~ux~~ usage when you only have nine cases. If you had a hundred cases it would be very easy to prove. But Dr. Wilson said that there is no one of the nine in which the ^{root} ~~proof~~ can mean anything but a virgin, and of course the Sept. translated it Virgin 200 years before the time of Christ, they ~~x~~ rendered the word by the regular Greek word for Virgin, ~~x~~ so that shows that ~~they~~ they understood it to mean virgin, and the man, the Jewish man ~~x~~ who was on the RSV commission in his article about the RSV, he puts great stress on the LXX, its the final authority. Most do not think so, but this man does. He says the LXX ~~HAS BEEN~~ after it has been purged of the Christological additions, such as the word virgin, well, you have no evidence that the LXX ever had anything but virgin there--that must be a Christological addition, if you can purge anything you want out of it, its no ...but if you take the view that most scholars ~~tha~~ take that the LXX was translated well before the time of Christ, that this Jewish translators with no knowledge of the virgin birth, considering that that ~~was~~ word Almah meant virgin. So that is very strong evidence in my view. But of course if you have a ~~xxxx~~ clear case where it was used of ~~some~~ someone who evidently wasn't a virgin, that is a ~~ste~~ strong argument against it, but Dr. Wilson undertook to show that there wasn't any such case, like for instance, where it says that this young man went out and he ~~was~~ saw this young woman and he was interested in her and wanted to marry

her, it clearly means a virgin, not a young woman of ~~na-ri-~~ marriageable age whether married or not. He says it is not a specific, ~~techn~~ technical word virgin. There is another word that means that, the word _____ which means one withheld --it's not the specific word virgin, it is the word which describes a young ~~n~~ woman who is a virgin. So it is strange that the LXX should have translated it by this specific Greek word . Now that is getting into Isaiah 7 away from Isaiah 52. Now, we continue then . The Lord hath comforted His ~~peo~~ people . He has redeemed Jerusalem. Now He has ~~v~~ comforted His people is a word _____ and it is what form? Yes, Piel Niphal is alright but it could also be ~~Hiphil~~ Hiphil. You see, on account of the He you have to have a pathah under it, so it ~~co~~ can be He Piel, and ~~He~~ the Lord has caused His people to _____, but if it is used , you have to use it in the Qal, but if it is the subjective sense, it is ~~Nihapl~~ Niphal, if ~~it is~~ it is in the positive sense it is a Piel. The Niphal would be _____ with the Nun assimilated. The Lord has caused His ~~peopl~~ People to _____. _____ is often mistranslated --it doesn't mean repent in the sense of godly sorrow but it means a change of mind in the sense of ²belief --in the sense of changing from an unhappy state to a happy state.

ISAIAH # 15

...you simply say Piel intensive, but the fact is that there are a great many cases particularly with ~~x~~ more or less subjective or ~~abstract- s- abstrance~~ abstract ideas whereas the piel is not intensive but _____ and particularly in cases where it is not a qal but where the ~~nipa~~ niphal ...why, the Piel is the ~~causavit~~ causative of that --a very clear case of the causative is _____ in the qal and in the pielHe has redeemed Jerusalem --simple rescue...Verse 10 , Miss chung. I think ~~the~~ this is quite a clear case where it isn't the arm of His holiness that is laid bare but His

Holy arm. We have a case above where there was a question, but I think this is quite clear. It is a common way of putting the suffix on the genitive rather than on the words, but ~~for~~ first the ... He has stripped it for action. Before the eyes of all the nations. I think it is salvation rather than _____. It is from Yashah, to save or deliver. Number eleven. This word is _____ used for armour-bearer, but in ~~the~~ this case it seems to me more proper as ---the vessels of the Lord. They were not armor-bearers of the Lord, simply because they carried the Lord's armor, but they were people to whom Cyrus had given the things ~~for~~ from the temple. Yes, _____ means almost any sort of a movable thing that is used in connection with any function, it is used for ~~weapon~~ weapons. And ~~it~~ it is used in connection with eating, and we don't have an ~~an~~ English word that exactly corresponds--utensil is somewhat near but we wouldn't use utensil in that sense, we wouldn't use ~~utensil~~ utensil for guns and weapons. And I don't think we would use utensils for dishes --we would for ~~knives~~ knives, ~~of~~ forks and spoons, but I don't think we would for cups and saucers. That is all in Qole--it is a general word for movable equipment, and here is undoubtedly the things that were from the temple that they were given to take back. Then in verse 12, Mr. Curry. And of course it could be marked out --that is one particular way of doing it, but if they are going out to raise _____ this is saying you will not rather than. You will not depart in ^{hate} hate, you will not walk by flight. You will be perfectly free and easy in doing it. It won't be something that you have just been ~~a~~ barely able to do. Something that God is going to perform for them, ~~for~~ rather than they are going to be able to ... Yes, the Lord is one going before you--the Lord is ~~going~~ going before you. _____ literally is to ~~collect~~ collect but the word is ~~regularly~~ regularly used for ones who ~~going~~ go behind to collect the stragglers, to collect the ones who ^{lag} plough behind. And then it comes to mean the one ~~wo~~

Rear guard is a perfectly correct ~~transal~~ translation, but it is not ~~striek strin-~~ strictly literal. The Lord goes before you and leads you, ~~h~~ He ~~h~~ goes behind and gathers up the stragglers. So you don't need to flee , you don't need to fear.

In all these cases in this ~~xx~~ chapter it always starts the verse --we are going to take a whole new subject//...well, if we are, ~~ix~~ and then we are talking in the third person and we say, Somebody is going to /...George Washington crossed the Delaware and he attacked the _____ and won a great victory. ~~When you~~ And then I say , Will you please shut the door, would the you refer to George Washington --who would it refer to. To whomever I was looking at unless I used an expression -I said , ~~x~~ George Washington did so and so , and I would say Oh, President Kennedy you are different from George Washington, you never crossed the Delaware. Well, ~~ex~~ there, even though ~~KedX~~ Kennedy were not here, I ~~wou-e-d~~ would be addressing him metaphorically. ~~The name~~ But I would insert the name to ~~he wh~~ show who I was talking about. If I were talking about George Washington, and all of a sudden, I say You, nobody is going to think I am talking about George Washington. They are going to have some indication of who I was talking about or ~~k~~ what and if there is no indication in the immediate context, and if I previously ~~fx~~ for a long time ~~begin~~ being using you for a definite person~~x~~, ~~doesn't~~ does it not seem reasonable that that would be the most likely suggestion, that I ~~wal-~~ ~~x~~ was talking about the same one. Suppose I was ~~k~~ to say, Mr. ~~XXX~~ Curry , you ~~hae~~ have done a lot of work on this and I am interested in the way that you have gone into this, and then I say Oh, by the way, did ~~ex~~ you know that George Washington ~~was-~~ crossed the Delaware on one cold night and ~~w~~ he was energetic just like you are and he won the victory that time and he went ~~out~~ on to become ~~preseide~~ president of the U.S. Well, when I said he was

energetic just like you are , would the you refer to George Washington. It would refer- naturally refer to the person that I had been talking to . Now, we might say ...and somebody else came in and I turned to talk~~ed~~ to them but if you don't have any indication of that, it's hopeless. If you introduce a you, it would be very natural to expect some indication of who its ~~a~~ talking to and ~~the~~ if there isn't an indication it would be natural to expect ~~an~~ a continuation of the ~~pre~~ previous usage, and when we have all of these instances before where you is ~~Isr~~ Israel , Zion, Jerusalem, the people, ~~the~~ then all of a sudden when I am talking about My Servant, He is going to do this, and ~~he~~ He is going to do that, then I say like you do ~~so~~ so and so he is going to do so and so. Well, to say that the you is the same as He seems to me to be utterly ~~ridic~~ ridiculous. Why on earth would a man who is talking about He in the first place, all of a sudden for one person call a you and then go right ~~back~~ back to he. It is reasonable to think that the you ~~is~~ either is indicated in the context ~~or~~ ~~w~~ you look back to see who it is saying it to, and all ~~d~~ these many cases of the ~~chapter~~ chapter you have always ..never ~~one~~ once had any thing but Israel , so it would seem the most natural thing to say that He is talking about Israel, and in the RSV they say in verse 14, As many as were astonished at Him His visage was so marred (and then they have a footnote , Heb. you) and if the Hebrew was you why change it to Him ~~and~~. Wouldn't Isaiah be able to say Him if he meant Him. Why does he say you if he means Him. The you is in the Hebrew as it is in the Greek translation of it. Most versions have given you because there is not~~x~~ question of the you being in the ~~Hebr3w~~ Hebrew, there is no textual problem whatever. The Syriac and the Targum , according to this footnote say Him but I wouldn't trust the footnote in the RSV, I would want to look at the Syriac and the Targum and it is also that ~~xx~~ out of 50 manuscripts in the Syriac, one has Him, whereas one out of 50 in the Targum , one has him. I'm not saying that it is, but I have

struck cases in the RSV where the notes are just about that ~~reliable~~ reliable, and so when it says Syriac or Targum, I don't pay too much attention unless I check on it first. It gives you a clue to something to look into and see, whether they have correctly ~~h~~ given the evidence or not, but it doesn't really matter ^{much to us} ~~where whether~~ whether ~~or not much~~ the Syriac or the Targum says, we have the Hebrew. The Hebrew is you there is no question. Why does it say you. Well, if it has always meant you before why should it mean anything different. The Hebrew is you. If you ~~ax~~ always means you before, why does it mean anything but ~~ox~~ you here. Why try to make you ~~jea~~ mean something different. Behold, my Servant shall deal prudently. He shall be extolled and be ~~h~~ very high~~x~~, as many as were astounded at thee, His visage was so marred. Well, if you want to say as many as were ~~astor-~~ astounded at Him, His visage was so marred. I don't think that makes much sense, do you. What's the point of as many, what does the word as ~~ax~~ mean. Does not as ~~m~~ in English have a meaning of comparison, like, and if ~~somebody-~~ somebody were to speak about my ~~grea~~ grey hairs, Like his ~~hx~~ hairs are grey, his hairs are grey. If I were to say, Like ~~the~~ this man's ~~hairs~~ hairs are grey so this man's hairs are grey. But to compare one's hairs to one's own wouldn't seem to make much sense.

ISAIAH # 16

That's before we look at the Hebrew. At ~~a~~ that point we ought ~~h~~ to look at the verse before. Verse 13 begins with the words, Behold My Servant, and there ~~ax~~ have been some interpreters who have claimed that these last three verses are a part of 52 and there is a complete ~~h~~ break ~~w~~ between that and 53. Most interpreters ~~from~~ consider that the ~~br3a~~ ^{verses} break should come between 12 and 13. I only wish the Archbishop had been a little more careful when he made his division because if it belongs there it certainly confuses many people to have 53 start three ~~x~~ verses

after the start of the subject. I question seriously whether the ~~xxx~~ break which is in one of these two places is to be taken as a major break. There would surely seem to be a reason to feel that the break is a minor one instead of a major break. But at least there is a break . There is a division. From verses one to twelve we have been talking about Israel, about wonderful blessings coming to Israel but the principle emphasis always has been Israel is going to be taken back from exile, they are going to be delivered from the control of the uncircumcised and the unclean. The waste places of Jerusalem are to be ~~built~~ built up again. They are to take the vessels of the temple and to carry them back , not by stealth or by tremendous effort to get away from the Babylonian. God is going to deliver them and take them back. That is the thought from one to twelve. Now from 12 on in the rest of this chapter , we have no reference to return from captivity, at least no clear reference to return from captivity, nothing that is very definitely said to be a promise of deliverance for Israel from captivity. In fact, no reference that this is for Israel for certainty unless it is "As many as were astounded at thee," and incidentally, the Old English Astonied is mistranslated by the RSV as ~~astounded~~ astonished. Astonied does not mean astonished it means astounded. But of course we don't care particularly, it is interesting to know what the Old English says, but that is not our interest. Our interest is what the Hebrew says, and the Hebrew means to be appalled , it's not astonished. He was astonished at the wonderful ~~gift~~ gift he got, you would never use appalled. It is very different from astonied. Astonied notes a sudden change, which may be a sad one and may be a glad one, but ~~x~~ astounded is more accurately the translation. But astounded is ~~xx~~ never glad , it is always sad, always ~~in something~~ something that is unpleasant, and the Hebrew _____ is always something unpleasant. And so, it is just unfortunate that the Old English sounds like astonished and the RSV

translates ~~it~~ put it in their text. I'm ~~not~~ sure that everyone of them, if you ask
 them what Shamaen means they would/say astonished for any one of them who knows
 any Hebrew, knows that Shamaen doesn't mean astonish, unless it meant that he was
 appalled~~x~~, terrified, ~~is~~ filled with misery at a thing ...but I doubt if ~~he~~ he would.
 I ~~think~~ think the RSV did a very miserable job ~~in~~ translating this astonished, but
 in reading the King James I doubt if the average person knows what astonished means.
 Now, the discussion of these three verses are different from what precedes , there
 is a break, not a major break but it is a definite break and on the other hand, they
 are certainly connected with what follows. What makes us think they are ~~is~~ connected
 with what follows. We are ~~is~~ talking in the second person mostly before this, now it
 is third, it is describing an individual , it is an individual talked of in the third person
 and it continues to do the same thing, and we are not saying in the main how wonderful
 this individual is, and we go on ~~per~~ pretty largely about His miseries in what follows.
 There is such a great similarity and that is strange that it does not belong with what
 follows and then we find that it begins in verse 13 with the ~~is~~ words, Behold , My
 Servant shall deal prudently and when we get on to verse ~~122~~ 11 we read , By His
 knowledge shall my righteous ~~is~~ ~~is~~ servant justify many, so we have here not only
 a third person with a same general tone , but we ~~is~~ even have the phrase with which
 he ~~is~~ begins , My Servant , used about the end of 53, by His knowledg~~e~~ shall my
 righteous Servant justify many, so it would seem to bind it together as a definite
 section. Now, immediately we ~~is~~ ask , Who is this we talk about, who is ~~the~~ this
 that is my servant, and we find a very interesting ~~think~~ thing when we look into the
 Book of Isaiah . This word Servant ~~occ~~ occurs previous to Isaiah ~~is~~ 40 nine times,
 and of those nine times five of them are ~~is~~ in the plural. The four cases ~~is~~ in the
 singular, one is My Servant, Isaiah 20, my Servant, ~~Elig~~ Elijah, in chapter 22, and

and in 24, so that the word My Servant is comparatively uncommon in the first 40 chapters of the Book of Isaiah and when we come to the last part of Isaiah from chapter 54 on to 66 the word Servant occurs ~~11 times~~ 11 times, everyone of which is in the plural. But from 41 to 50, in those nine chapters we have the word Servant used 17 times in those nine chapters, and this word servant is ~~not~~ used in those ~~chapters~~ chapters in such a way as to suggest that there is prophecy that is being ~~traced~~ traced through about My Servant, this is Israel, My Servant, this is the ~~Lord's~~ Lord's Servant. It speaks of His servant Israel. It ~~freq-ly~~ frequently occurs to one who is called my servant or the Lord's servant ~~or 17 times~~ 17 times in these 9 chapters, so here ~~we have~~ have a unified concept ~~from~~ from chapters 41 on up to 50 ~~of the Servant~~ Servant of the Lord. This concept occurs ~~so~~ frequently that present day critics speak of Servant Psalms and some critics will say that the Servant ~~Psalms~~ ^{Songs} were not originally in this section of Isaiah at all but were inserted by a different writer, but they will at least recognize that ~~this~~ these ^{Songs} Servant Psalms are an outstanding ~~part~~ portion of the material between chapter 41 and the end of chapter 53, we have here these two ...which will bring it ~~up~~ up to 19 in these 14 chapters or 17 in ~~to~~ those ten chapters that I mentioned. Now, we have to look back at all of these previous chapters to see who this servant is and we will find evidence there that this servant is spoken of ~~as~~ in very much of an individual way and while this servant is Israel, yet he is distinguished from Israel and he is even compared with Israel in chapter 49 and he is spoken of as doing things ~~for~~ for Israel. That's a very important and interesting study. How much time we ought to take for it in this course where we ^{want} ~~once~~ get over these four chapters as soon as possible may be questionable. (Q) Some people talk about the ~~law~~ law of double reference, and if they do, I wish they would define it, because I don't think there is any such thing. That is not to say there may not be double reference, that's not

to say that at all. If I say , If anybody misses class 4 times , then I cant ~~give~~ give ~~the~~ ~~to~~ that individual credit in the course. Well if two did it, then I could say that there is a double ~~&~~ reference because it would apply equally to both, but if I said I asked someone to write their name on the board and then two people wrote~~x~~ their names on the board, ~~then~~ you wouldn't say I made a double reference , when I said one, I ~~s~~ meant two different people. YOu would say one of them misunderstood. A word can refer to two or three people, or to a hundred, it depends on the usage, but the idea that ~~the-~~ a person talking about one thing , and it is very clear that is wh at he is talking about, and yet you have to look for . . . ~~and~~ and if you start that kind of an interpretation , you can get ~~any~~ anything out of . . . that 's ~~why~~ why I am aga inst what is called Double Reference, . You ~~fx~~ find In ~~Isahat~~ Isaiah 7 ~~lx~~ where it speaks of Christ who is to be born in Bethlehem, and it speaks of someone who is to be ~~assigned~~ ~~to-~~ as a sign to Ahaz that before the little child reaches a certain age that the land will have been over~~k~~run by ~~lx~~ enemies. N^ow, some speak of that as a double reference. When I ~~sp~~ it speaks of ~~Christ-being-born~~, a son being born, it means Christ and it also means someone born in ~~Age~~ Ahaz's day. ~~S~~ You ~~has~~ ask who it means in Ahaz' day, they don't know of anybody . Some will say that ~~xx~~ it is ~~H~~Ahaz's son, and others say Ahaz did not have any son born at this time. Some will say that it is the prophet's son. Then ~~ven~~ when it says that someone born then before he reaches a certain age the land will be overu n , some people say, Well, this is double reference. . . Before a child reaches the age of four , say, ~~the~~ enemy will have overfun the territory. Before Christ reaches the age of four , Ahaz will have been dead ? yrs. One reference reference is to Christ, and one is to Ahaz. Each one has a single reference, to get a double reference out of it you have to imagine something for which there is no evidence.

You might have a primary reference and six secondary references and that would be seven-fold. In most cases you only refer to one, and where you refer to more than one, there must be some evidence in the passage to show that it is talking about more than one thing. My criticism is the idea that when ~~some one~~ somebody says that George Washington is going to give a speech against Entangling Alliances, it also is talking about President Kennedy. Now ~~is~~ if you say the President of the United States is giving the speech, he might refer to George Washington and President Kennedy and three others. But if he says the President will, he is talking about one person, not about six. If you say, The Time will come when the ~~pre-~~ President of the United States will ~~live-~~ live in the White House. Now, ~~Ge-~~ George Washington never lived in the White ~~Houw-~~ House. If someone says the Time will come, that could refer to all the times since and that could include a fourth of them, because it would refer to not one but a series of one. It is an ~~a~~ obscure ~~antus~~ method of interpretation .

ISAIAH #17

I do not ~~like~~ like to definite the double references, because I don't think there is such a thing as a double reference. But there are some people, you know, it is interesting that you can prove mostly anything to most people if you give some technical terms. If you use such long expressions as since so and so, because so and so... using long words, and that satisfies most people. I guess, later wrong after all. Sometimes these long terminologies satisfies

most people. Some times what we call a double reference, flung around people, that way, and the people ~~do not seem to~~ cannot explain it, so simply they use such a term like that. I will say, to one that claims that there is such a thing as a double reference, give the definition of it, and explain it, and let us examine if any evidence of it.

But a word normally refers to one thing, but it may be that it refers to a whole series, like where it says, after such a date President of the United States will reside in the Whitehouse, then it refers to the whole series of the president of the Whitehouse, and not just to the first first one president. A singular may refer to a series, but usually refers to one object, but not always. ~~But when~~

But I would say that this is much more apt to be a theory than _____ (13.35)

Well, in this case... this is a very interesting study to look back and see who the servant is. And as I said, it is Israel, but it is called, Israel, ~~by~~ yet somewhat it is distinguished from Israel, so there is an interesting problem. How can the Servant be Israel, and yet how yet can this servant be distinguished from Israel? That is ~~in~~ an interesting problem. ...

Yet it is a very vital background for this chapter, so I may somebody ~~instead of~~ to study through _____ the chapters one of these days. ~~At this~~ moment

I would like to go on and see what we learn about the servant. "Behold, my servant, ..." Suppose, Mr. Kim, Young Ik Kim, suppose you read for us, -----skipping

because, in present day ~~in~~ English, prudent is more like saving your money, and that sort of a thing. It is usually translated as dealing wisely, and occasionally very rarely the Bible translates as wise _____ skipping _____

And I think in every case the Hebrew word is translated as to do wisely

It speaks of one as doing things really in effective way. My servant shall deal wisely, and continue then, this is simply he will be lifted up, and now

he is lifted up in a figurative way, He shall be praised, He shall be extolled.

And it certainly is not literally what it says. He will be praised, because it is

he will be ~~not~~ lifted up. Jesus said, *ff* "... I am lifted up, I will draw men unto myself...". They don't translate that as I am praised, and I will draw men unto

myself. That would not be an impossible translation. Somebody could say that

it means that ^{the people lifted up} the Lord Jesus ~~was lifted up and -- and they praised, extolled,~~ and they ^{and they} exalted Him/~~extolled,~~ and they praised Him. This is a possible interpretation

of the verse, but certainly it is not the only possible interpretation of the

passage. Because ~~if~~ ^{to one} if you say, extoll, you are limiting ~~the possibility of~~ ^{the} interpretation of the verse, ~~thus limiting~~ that of a figurative expression. If

you say, lift up, the question is open as to ^{being} lifted up literally, physically, socially

... the servant is going to be physically lifted up, or is he going to be lifted

up with wor^{ds}, or lifted up with praise. How is he going to be lifted up? It seems

to me that it is much better to leave ^{near} the literal rendering and leave ~~near the~~

~~literal, and leave~~ and leave the reader to have a change to interpret ~~than to~~

put ~~the~~ one interpretation upon it so it does not seem to ~~me~~ that the King James

Version ^{Version} did a good ~~job~~ job at all in the translation of this verse. It certainly is ~~a~~

an exact parallel to what Jesus said when he said I, if I be lifted up, will draw

all men unto myself. This says He will be lifted up, and unless we are ~~not~~ going

to ~~say~~ change that other to extol, it seems to me highly questionable that it should

be rendered extol. He will be high and He will be lifted up and what else. Well, exalted is a word which can be literal but which is more commonly used in the sense of extol. It is commonly used in the sense of ~~have~~ having a position of importance or position ~~in~~ in the figurative sense, not the position in the spacial . . . literally, He will be high, ~~He~~ will be lifted up, He will be ~~very~~ very high. It's a ~~x~~ little strange to ~~x~~ put the ~~lx~~ very with it, because we have two words for a hill, we have ~~Big~~ Gibeah (it's from this root; it means a hill) and then we have Har , which means a mountain, but the hills ~~h~~ around Jerusalem are called Hars, so that Har can be fairly small and Gibeah fairly large but in general a Har ~~can~~ I think would be higher than a Gibeah, so I would be inclined to think that this is not necessarily like a high mountain but like a fairly sizable hill, He will take a high place, whether spacially , whether in honor, whether in position , whether in praise rendered Him. All these are possibilities of the meaning of these words and ^{it's} ~~they are~~ pretty hard , just from the statement , except that the Servant is going to deal wisely and His dealing wisely is going to lead to all of these things being said about ~~k~~ Him, and how they are said about Him is it honor simply-is He high~~k~~ in position, lifted up physically, or is He going to be given honor or be ~~give~~ given high position. The verse does not tell us a great deal about that, it's a rather general statement. Then we go on to verse 14, Miss Pickett? ~~k~~ Well, let's read it literally and in order as it stands. _____ is a term used as Like this so is that , it is a regular comparative, Just as . You will find no place where this ~~Who~~ Shaman is used. ~~It is-whether~~ where it means astonished unless it is astonished at being so bad. Astounded. They were appalled . They were horrified. You see our English Word astonished~~ness~~ the emphasis is on the suddenness of it. This word ~~Who~~ Shaman has no thought of suddenness in the word. It is the thought of something being bad, ~~s~~ causing misery. Something coming

suddenly upon one, and therefore have something in common, but ~~it~~ it is not in the word. ~~It~~ There is no suddenness in the word . Just as many were appalled, Yes, but what is the subject of _____. Well, alright , what is the last word in the _____. I don't see anyway to fit the Rabbin ? ~~and~~ in here. reasonably , unless you take it as a subject. There you have a plural verb and no other subject. There is no _____ anywhere in the context it's connected to except the Rabbim, so ~~h~~ why not say ~~Just~~ Just as many had been appalled concerning you. Well, is there anyway in which many people have been ~~h~~ appalled concerning ~~the~~ Israel. If somebody came ~~and~~ over from Greece and he visited Jerusalem, in about 600 BC and he ~~had~~ came to Jerusalem and there he found people who were getting along prosperously. They ~~were~~ - had very fine textile factories. They were selling these textiles, ~~making~~ making a good ~~no~~ income from them, living quite luxuriously, and a very high state of prosperity. He comes back 30 years later and he comes to Jerusalem and he finds it a heap of ruins. The buildings have been knocked over, they are just lying in ruins. The walls have been broken down , and the temple of the Lord has been burnt with fire and the ~~place~~ is just a ruins, and the people who were there had been carried hundreds of miles across the desert and they had been settled in a strange country and they said , How can we sing the songs of Zion in a strange land, and ~~they~~ - there are, and these people of Greece who ~~then~~ saw the situation in 600 now in 575 he comes back and ~~the people are~~ he sees what happened and he would be appalled. And he ~~is~~ would say , Isn't it terrible what has happened to Israel, and that would be the ~~situ~~ situation of many , many people who had seen what Israel was and how they had prospered, how successful, and all that. ~~They~~

. . . everything is going to be fine. It can ^{it} happen here.

Everything is going to ~~happen~~ be wonderful. Then there they look at _____)4/4-

(4.35) They would be appalled. They would be astounded. That is right in with the whole previous section of the chapters, because ^{all} ^{part of the} ~~the~~ earlier/chapters we can read/, "Awake for the joy, sing together, ye waste and desolate places of Jerusalem, for the Lord has comforted His people...." Why did the Lord comfort His people? Because they were in a terrible condition and they did need a comfort. Then verse 2, "Shake thyself from the dust; arise, and ~~st~~ take thy ~~sw~~ seat, O Jerusalem; loose thyself from the bands of thy neck, O captive daughter of Zion. " Now just as many have been appalled at you, many people from all over the world have seen the terrible condition of Israel. A great happy thought of this nation which might be not like that of a nation at all...

But a group of captivities ~~es~~ who^d had _____ Rome. Just as many people were appalled concerning you, continue Mr. Kim. How is this "so" naturally coming? As many were so, there is a comparison. But our King James does not bring it ^{out} ~~up~~. As many were astounded as thee; his visage was

so marred _____ skipping _____ but actually the English so is, a term of degree or it can be a comparison, or it can be a term of something is simply a comparative-. or it can be a comparison - - - - else.

The Hebrew here is definitely a term of comparison. Unfortunately the translation does not bring this out here. In the Hebrew, it is placed in the beginning.

And the Hebrew word ⁷² ~~does~~ not mean degrees, it means comparison. As many were astounded at thee, so (Q) שׁוֹמֵר that would not have this vowel

and it would not have this tau on the end. (Q) Yes, _____ Shin, chey, tau. It is an adjective derived from ^{the} ~~a~~ verb, שׁוֹמֵר, which means to injure,

to mar~~x~~, to be harmful. Is it figurative? Or is it figurative? It does not seem

like a nation. Because they - - - - - skipping. _____

So, yes, (Q) Yes, So, ... it is figurative. Israel ~~is~~ no longer looks like a nation. Because of the way it is treated here. He does not look ~~like~~ like a nation. Now this word, וְיָ is of course is a man, but וְ a preposition very common used which indicates an idea of separation, and is/in Hebrew to indicate the idea of separation which is compared with being away from, more than, another separation is going from this place to that. Here it may signify that he is so marred that he does not ~~like-like~~ look like a man. He is marred more than a man can be ~~be~~ marred. Is it a matter of ~~of~~ degree or is it a matter of not looking like a man at all. ~~He does not~~ He does not look like a man at all.

ISAIAH #18

Those are two possibilities of it. Away from being like a man or more than a man. Perhaps away from being like a man would be ^a more natural possibility. Just as you were, people were appalled, because ~~you~~ you did not look like a nation any more. So, he is so marred that he does not seem like a man. He is no longer look like a son of man, more marred than an ordinary man would be. _____ may be possible. Here then you have, just as Israel has been mistreated, ^{Here you have a comparison.} so is the servant of God is to be mistreated. / Just as the Israel ^{so} has ~~mi-~~ been/mistreated, /~~so~~ that it does not look like a nation, he is so marred than he does not look like a man. Now, the King James translators actually did not realize it, because the way they have translated it does not bring out ~~the~~ the idea ~~is~~ at all. The Revised Standard Version and other people who look at it ^{either} do not seem to realize it / (13/50) / But in the Hebrew it seems to me that this ~~seems to me~~ is very clearly expressed. Because just as ... so....

Anybody who has studied Hebrew is familiar with the expression like just as... ¹³ so that It is a regular, common usage, and I don't know ~~wh~~ how

the King James translators have missed it, and how many commentators have missed it. I have seen quite a few commentators ~~have missed it~~ who would simply take the word, as if the writer meant _____ why _____ so that? It, .. . such a translation would not bring out the idea of comparison. רָצָה does not mean degree, it means comparison. I am sure that all the translators have known that, but just somehow ~~it~~ they did not put the words fit together right. But I am afraid we have but a few minutes. We have opened up some interesting questions, and the next ~~time~~ ^{week}, I hope that you all will do _____ --- through Monday and Tuesday, and please do four hours of week before the next Monday, but I think it would be worthwhile to spend a little time on each three verses. For the next work on them. And I would suggest that this ~~word~~ ^{word} word, my servant / the usage of the servant. Another thing would be the verse 15. So shall he sprinkle the nations. The King James says. But the Revised Standard Version says, "stattle." Now, which does it mean, stattle or sprinkle? I would suggest that when you do four hours of work, find out the answers by putting about two hours on my servant, and about two hours on sprinkle. How is that? Let's everybody, please try to put in my mail box before Sunday, so that I can look at it before Monday. Two questions: (1) The usage of the word "my servant" from chapter 40 through chapter 50. You can easily get every usage of the word servant in the Englishman's concordance. Whom is he talking about? What can you learn from those passages? Spend two hours on that, and get an idea as to how the word servant is used. Then in the.... The other question is sprinkle. What is the Hebrew here? So shall he sprinkle many nations. How many times does the King James translate the word stattle? How many times does it translate it sprinkle? Does it every translate in some other way than

either way. If so in what way, and how the word relate to it? Let us look at those, and then we will, ... I think that probably/~~before~~ Monday and Tuesday on those two verses.

This thirteenth verse here is a/ very interesting one. ~~This three-~~ It is impossible to be absolutely dogmatic about what it means. "kBehold, my servant ~~shall~~-....." We ~~You~~ have to study that. Who is my servant? What is meant by that? My servant will be כְּעֹפֵיט. The King James version translates it as "deal prudently" Although/ the word עֹפֵיט occurs about 80 times, this is the only time where ~~it says,~~ it is translated "deal prudent, y". It is ~~once~~ translated, deal prudently, and twice adjective prudent in the participle form. These are the only times the word prudence is used in connection with it. In fact the adverb prudently is used ~~once-this once-~~ ^{this} only one time in the whole of the King James Version. The prudent which is used 20 times. The word prudent which is used 20 times in the Old Testament only translates this word twice. Mostly it is the word אֲדָרָה ~~which is translated/same~~ as the word prudent. Now the word prudence in English today ~~means~~ then would hardly seem to be a complete presentation of the meaning of this word. It is translated 8 times in the King James Version. It is possibly once as success, and so we see one time out of/8 the King James translates it as ~~prosperity or success.~~ ^{prosper or have good success.} So, we see one time out of every eight the King James translates it as prosper or have good success, but for the rest of the times, it translates deal wisely or be wise or make some one wise, or something like that. Alexander questions whether the word ever ~~really means prosper.~~ ^{to} ~~He thinks that it should mean-~~ because it means to do things wisely or do wisely... or be wise, or ^{as a result of that} prosper or have good success ... The word itself has always ~~exp~~ st ~~pressed~~ ^{on the} an action or an attitude of a person

the
rather than on ~~a~~ result.

At least in the case of the King James Version's translation in at least 7 or 8th of cases, though it is reasonable to say ~~that~~ to try to fit in every place as being wise or ~~do~~ ^{acting} wisely rather than prospering or having good success. The meaning of prospering or ~~acting~~ - having a good success is never a proper translation of the word. It would seem tome that it could be so only if the ~~reason~~ prospering or having success is a result of one's own activity. In other words, a man working things come wisely, and coming ~~out~~ right, may as a result of that action be prosperous. (6.00)

It may possibly as a result of the action. If you say that this man prospered, they had an unusual amount of rainfall, and so he had a large, prosperous harvest... Or His uncle died, and left him ~~s~~ some money or something.

Prosperous is not this word. This word is probably, generally descriptive of something as a one's wise, thoughtful action, and he is ever prosperous, it would be **because** result of such an activity.

~~of this careful activity~~. Therefore we are justified in saying that it means that this one who is my servant... this one is going to possess a wisdom or will exhort the wisdom in his activity, and ~~he~~ is to be one who will be respected because he does the things that are calculated to produce the expected desire, not simply just one who accidentally finds such a situation, or _____ very much himself

(5.10) others worked for him, and that he is not/responsible for it. Well, or then, this one is going to be wise, ~~and~~ to do wisely. I don't think you will

prove that this rendering is good. ~~In~~ In our present English language, the word prudent means to abstain from that which is dangerous or to avoid that

which is _____, but I don't know whether _____ is much in or not. (4.80)

This hardly covers the meaning of the word.

ISAIAH #18

(Not clear enough

But to deal wisely in such a way that it will produce certain effects. Then
either
what are the certain effects? It may be the effect or may be the way in which
he is wise? dealing wise. Both of these are possibilities. He is going to deal
wisely. He is going to deal wisely. He is going to do that which is wise.

He is going to do that which will produce the desired effect. Well, what will
happen? He will be high, he will be lifted up, he will be very much upon hills,

the word, הַרְבֵּה, the word for hill, _____ is high in the sense of
upon on

being high-of-a hill. It speaks of a mountain, _____. (3.45) It

does not suggest a great mountain. Now the translation of the King James :

"... my servant shall deal prudently, he shall be exalted and extolled, and
be very high. " " I don't think extoll means be lifted up at all. He can be
lifted up and be praised. It is possible, but it is only a part of the possible
meanings of the word. Then you take the word exalted, and extolled.

This one is going to be very successful, and is going to be exalted as a result of
his wisdom. Well, that is not an impossible interpretation. But you if you

take it more literally, he is going to show a real wisdom, and what he desires,
he is going to be showing in his being lifted up. being up on a hill. Well,

think about him that is on a green hill far away. Is not there words of Christ,

when he said, I will be lifted up and will draw all unto me... He must be
lifted up. If you take these words literally, then there is a literal suggestion

of a great wisdom which the Lord is going to show, and most of all, His

enduring the crucifixion for our sins. Of course, that is an idea which has

not been explicitly explained anywhere in the Old Testament. Certainly not

in the book of Isaiah. Why, it would be quite a bold thing to say that that is

~~the literal~~

ISAIAH #18

verse .
the literal, the exactly natural meaning of the ~~word~~... skipping. _____

_____ But if you take the word literally, I think that the _____
WOULD be much nearer to that idea than to ~~enot~~ any other idea. The word
King James Version translates, "my servant is going to do wisely, ..."
and to be highly praised, and be exalted...." that may be, I may have to
look it up myself., but I am not sure myself either whether we could be dogmatic
on that. The possible meanings... Whether this ~~is~~ a general statement^C
of the servant being ~~be~~ successful in what he is undertaking ~~of~~ and therefore
he is highly praised , or whether this is a specific statement as to the way
in ~~which~~ which the servant is going to accomplish this great work, is something
that we cannot be dogmatic about. But the rest of the chapter 53 certainly
is now viewed by the most Christians as the most wonderful _____
INAUDIBLE. _____

~~-ISIA-~~

ISAIAH #19

So, it ~~is~~ is a~~n~~ very interesting verse, and one which adds to all that assure
literature
you to read anything .. you can read any~~t~~ great things in your life. You can
read once and you can ~~read ideas~~ get ideas out of it, and ~~again~~ you can read again
more and then you can ~~interpret~~ get much more, because you interpret the early
I used to do that ,
parts in ~~ve~~ view of the later parts. /When I was a youngster, ~~and read~~-- If I
always
read a book, I nearly ~~all~~ read the last part first, and then I would start in the
middle, and then I would start from the beginning. And I have done it many
years now, and I enjoy that, because I knew all about it now when I read, then
I enjoy seeing how it is leading up to that, and then when I had all that ~~much~~

ISAIAH #19

tremendous interest of the last part, then to read the first part and to see the preparation ~~leading to that is~~ laid for that was ~~for~~ fascinating for me. When I read a Shakespearean play, especially one that I have never read, I would read through once to get an idea of it, then I have a general ~~of~~ idea of the whole movement, then when I have a general movement of the play, then I would read it for the second time, and then see how some parts fit together, and then after I have done that, third time when I read it, the third time, ~~the re~~ is so much in each sentences ~~as~~ that is related to the ~~think-~~ thing as a whole, that you just don't see until you have that, and I think it is ~~one~~ only ~~x~~ fair to say the same thing about the Bible . You don't read ~~in~~ a portion of the Bible as though it was something that stood absolutely alone, you read it in relation to the rest of it. God is the author of it all. He knew the end from the ~~beginning-~~ beginning and so when ~~h~~ He tells us this about His servant, He is just ~~sta~~ saying well, my servant is ~~going to~~ going to be very successful and be highly praised for ~~dx.~~ the very language ~~h~~ He uses taken literally, points to the way in which He is going to accomplish His great work. Well, I haven't seen that statement by any man, that that is the correct interpretation of this verse. It is ~~is~~ ~~such~~ such a specific, literal idea , that the lifted up means physically rather than being praised, but when we consider the contents of 53 and when we consider the fulfillment of the O.T., I don't see how we can rule out that that is at least a part of which is in the Divine mind, that the directive idea is to use these particular words, so it is a tremendous verse, actually. Just as you read in the King James He is going to be praised, and He repeats it three times in different language. Lifted up is what the ~~h~~ Hebrew says and if you want to translate it as extol , it is not impossible, but _____ says ~~is~~ it is lifted up. Now, we look at ~~the~~ the next

verse that we have already looked at to some extent. Let's read it very literally, and bring out in your reading exactly what it says. The ~~fix~~ footnote says concerning ~~h~~ Him rather ~~concern~~ than ~~is~~ concerning thee, and the translation takes ~~it as~~ ~~different from~~ it as if it were him but it isn't. ~~But~~ This is thee, ~~that~~ that is what it says, there's no ~~quest-~~ question that this is what the Hebrew says. I don't believe that there is a single manuscript that says him.. Just as many were appalled concerning thee. It is from which can have two possible meanings. From is separation (separation can be by ...it's a common way of ~~sy~~ saying more than man, but also from can be away from man, different from man). He was so marred that you would hardly know that He was a man. And His appearance was so marred that it ~~x~~ didn't seem to be human at all. Just as Israel was so marred that it didn't seem to be a nation at all. So He is marred, His appearance is away from that of a man. And ~~His~~ His form so that He didn't seem to be like humanity ~~is~~ at all. He was so marred and ~~corrupted~~ so injured that His form and appearance hardly seemed human at all. Just as Israel was so injured that it didn't seem to be a nation at all. There is a specific comparison expressed in these two lines. Just as, so ...In most ~~trans-~~ translations, instead of starting the line with so, you stick it over in the middle somewhere. His appearance was so marred. Well, I don't know. It's a very common word today, and whether people ~~would~~ would quite understand it--just as ~~ma~~ ny were appalled at thee. Astounded might be better. The word is very often rendered astonished but ~~th~~ that is not what the Hebrew is at all. They could not point to anything where Who Shamaim is used simply for surprise. Shamaim is always shock, astounded, not surprise. So it is an utter mistranslation, but it is a mistranslation that has been found a great many times and it is probably due to the misunderstanding of the Old English word Astonished, which originally

means ~~astended~~ astounded. Well, here is a comparison. Here we have ~~two~~ two steps. We have three lines in the verse, and two ~~xx~~ steps. Just as this ~~x~~ happens so (well, what had ~~xx~~ happened) why were they appalled at you, why, you were so treated that you didn't seem to be a nation anymore. Just as they were against Israel, so He is going to not seem to be human at all. His form is so marred. You can get this properly translated ~~xx~~ He is marred more ~~that~~ than that of a man and His figure more than that of the sons of men. What does that mean? How can your form be marred more than that of a man. Do you mean more than that of any man. It doesn't seem to me that the more than idea has sufficient in the verse to give warrant. There's no more than any man, it has more than man. More than is one way of interpreting the from, and equally possible here is the ~~x~~ from is the translation that ~~x~~ He was so marred that He didn't seem human, and in that case, man, or the ~~xxxx~~ sons of man, ~~humanity~~ - humanity in the general sense fits. But if you say He was more ~~injure~~ injured than a human, how is anybody more injured than a human, more injured than a man, you would have to say more injured than any man, and there is no any there, and the Heb. has a perfectly good word for any, the word _____ that is used over and over. The ~~serm~~ serpent was more ~~subte~~ subtle than any beast of the field. It has ~~Qal.Qol~~. It ~~don't~~ doesn't say more subtle than the beasts of the ~~field-fil-~~ field. The ~~Hebe~~ Hebrew puts in the Qol and it is regular and so for us ~~x-to-~~ in English to insert the any, to make it more marred than any man, there is an insertion of something that isn't ~~x~~ in the Hebrew. Marred so that ~~he-~~ He didn't seem like a man is a perfectly good ~~xx~~ translation. (Q) That seems to me as a different idea. If you would say, Helen Smith is more ~~n~~ beautiful than a woman. What sense is that? It wouldn't mean anything. Helen Smith is ~~noe~~ more beautiful than any woman. You are putting her up--all of these other women have beauty but none to compare

with ~~th~~ ~~heres~~. She is more ~~in~~ beautiful than any woman, but if ~~ex~~ you say she is more beautiful than woman, that ~~dox~~ doesn't make sense. There are some beautiful and some aren't . There is no standard of beauty which is called a woman. The same way , He was more marred than a man. Well, there are loads of men that aren't ~~mare~~ marred at all; ~~but~~ what does ~~x~~ it mean to be more marred than a man. They are two distinct ideas, and to get the idea of not more marred than mankind in general but more ~~mare~~ marred than any one of those men who are marred, you have to have an any to get that idea but there is ~~not-just~~ just not that idea. This does not seem to ~~k~~ me to be a valid ~~ix~~ ~~trans-~~ ~~translat-~~ translation. I'm not ready to say dogmatically that it couldn't be. The way to prove it is to ~~fx~~ find the parallels . Get a case where ~~k~~ you read that somebody ~~wzx~~ was ~~more-~~ more wise than man without the _____. Well, maybe He was more wise than mankind, more wise than you would expect a man to be. Well, if it is that , then that is the same thing ~~lastx~~ as the ~~stx~~ other. He is more wise than you would expect any man to be . Well, if you say that , ~~you-have-to-~~ it is not that He is more marred than any man who is marred, He was so marred that it doesn't seem that a man would be marred like that. If you say that, He was so marred that He doesn't seem like a man. You say He is ~~wised-~~ wiser than any man. You mean you take different scales of wisdom that people have, none of ~~the~~ m are as high as this one. If you ~~leas-~~ leave out the a ny, He was ~~x~~ more marred than man. It ~~don~~ doesn't mean anything unless it is , Here is ~~amem-~~ the amount of wisdom that man would have and He goes beyond it , He seems superhuman, He ~~doesn't~~ doesn't seem like a man at all. He is so marred that He doesn't seem like a man at ~~ta~~ all. ~~Not~~ He was so marred that He ~~doesn't-~~ didn't seem like a man at all. He was so marred that the evidences of humanity were just about destroyed, and

of course it is a parallel to what happened to Israel. Israel was led out of captivity, scattered into different sections of the Babylonian ~~Empire~~ so that they didn't seem like a nation; they lost their identity as a nation. He goes through such suffering that makes ~~it~~ Him not seem human. (Q) There are the two possibilities here. Does anybody have the American Standard Version --they used to have a footnote . There are two ways in ~~the S-~~ which this phrase _____ can be rendered, ~~one~~ once is ~~more~~ more than man, the other is away from being a ~~w~~ amn. Those are the two ways which it can be rendered. Now, most any commentary and most any Bible that has marginal ~~n~~ notes ~~given~~ giving alternate translations, give that as a possibility. Now, I don't know of any third possibility for these words. Now, if you take ~~the e~~ those two, more marred than man, they say More than any man (I'm questioning the right of saying any) but if you say more marred than any man, what ~~Miee-~~ Miss Chung just ~~refere-~~ referred to is very much in point. There were ~~thoun~~ thousands of people crucified. There were many other men , who from a physical viewpoint were just as marred as He was and so to say that He was marred ~~k~~ more ~~tax~~ than any man doesn't ~~seem~~ fit in fact ~~at~~ all, but He was marred as all of the crucified were, He went through such agony and contortion and such mistreatment that it ~~ick~~ didn't seem like a human being that was left, like something that ~~was~~ had been terribly ...and injured. It could be said of anyone who was ~~em~~ crucified but to ~~wax~~ say that He was more marred ~~tax~~ than any man was just ~~x~~ isn't true. There have ~~n~~ been many cases when people were just crushed so, there ~~are~~ have been all sorts of accidents which from a physical viewpoint was just as ~~bas~~ bad.

There was never another ~~x~~ crucifixion that was exactly identical with that of the Ord--

Lord, but there was ~~never another crucifixion that~~ -- probably no one particular element that was not a part of another. I ~~would~~ would doubt from a ~~purely~~ purely physical viewpoint. ~~He~~ His suffering was terrible, but that was ~~a~~ from a strictly human viewpoint, worse than that of any other person. There had been ~~--~~ ~~the~~ take the case of the thieves who ~~underse-undew~~ underwent the terrible suffering for a much longer time than He did. Their ⁱⁿ legs were broke ^{because} ~~because~~ because they were still living, in order to put an end to their ~~a~~ life they went through this terrible suffering for a longer ~~perid~~ period. Well, from the viewpoint of purely human suffering. Their suffering would be longer. Now whether the suffering at any ~~a~~ particular moment was more, we ~~fk~~ feel that He endured ~~merely the-~~ not ~~mere~~ merely the physical suffering but that He ~~was~~ as the ^S second person of the Trinity had our sins upon Him and that ~~He~~ what He bore was much more than simply the physical fact of dying ^{of} of the physical fact of suffering in the crucifixion, which was something that many thousands did undergo in this ~~se~~ ~~exceed~~ cruel ...and you take some of the vicious tortues have invented in recent years. Some ~~xx~~ of the tortues that the ~~Inquisition~~ Inquisitions performed in the Middle Ages, surely some of them, ~~x~~ from the viewpoint of ~~physic-~~ physical ~~k~~ suffering, I would think ~~k~~ would exceed the physical suffering of this particular case. Now, you take the crown of thorns. That was real misery to have the thorns sticking in his head, but I am sure other parts of the ~~xx~~ ~~crucifixion~~ crucifixion, would be much worse than that as part as ~~k~~ suffer- ~~xx~~ suffering is concerned. There would ~~k~~ be the humiliation of it. The mental suffering as well as physical suffering would be the worst part of it. I think you have a very interesting idea there. There would be a ~~possib-~~ third possible idea of this _____ away from man. It said He suffered away from man, He suffered in ~~xx~~ a way in a way in which no man could suffer. I think that

would be a very possible interpretation . Now this isn't suffer or corrupted or injured , now to be injured as a result of treatment that He was injured in a way different from which man could be ~~perp~~ perhaps would be possible idea --now, we have three possible ideas, He suffered more than man, He ~~suffered~~ was marred more than man (He was ~~un-man-~~ marred so that His appearance ~~α~~ was not like that of a man) , ~~His appearance~~ He suffered so that His appearance was not like that of a man, or He suffered in a way that no man could suffer~~α~~. The problem with that third is that the ~~appearance~~ appearance was ~~α~~ ~~marred~~ away from ~~an~~ man. It has the word appearance and the word _____ and I'm afraid that the word use of those two words would rule out ~~the-~~ this third ~~possib~~ possibility , ~~α~~ and I'm afraid that the use of ~~these~~ ~~these~~ ~~two~~ ~~word~~ then the other two would have possibilities in it, and ~~they~~ we have to recognize that we are not here given a description of the crucifixion afterwards by someone who observed it. We are here given a prefiguration in which the ~~prof~~ prophet is being ~~perme-~~ ~~permite-~~ permitted to give us a glimpse of the tremendous things that are to happen in the future, and in these glimpses he is gradually opening up truth and showing ideas, and in this case, the opening ~~α~~ up ~~α~~ of an idea is introduced with a comparative, just as they were appalled at you, so is His figure marred. Well, now, how was --what is the similarity between people being marred and appalled at Israel and --the similarity could not be that Israel suffered in a way that no human being could ~~see~~ suffer . They suffered in natural , human ways, and it can't ~~α~~ be that they suffered more than any other people ever suffered because other nations suffered just as much and more, ~~becaus-~~ because they had ~~not~~ no ~~g~~ God watching over them and protecting them ~~and-~~ but there is a very definite similarity just

20
ISAIAH #10

having just spoken about Israel how God has delivered Israel. ~~And~~ the chapters ~~thru the~~ 40 is going to bring back from exile. Now, he says, yet, the great work of the servant of the Lord is going to be accomplished. And in connection with that/ work we are here given a ^{comparable} ~~parable~~. Just as Israel, the people were appalled at the Israel, - - - - - at what were they appalled? ~~Because~~ They were appalled at Israel's suffering. They were appalled at the lot of the nation, for it is scattered, dispersed in different parts of the world. Then we find that just as people were appalled at what had happened to Israel, so will his figure ~~will be~~ marred away from man. What is the similarity? Not that Israel has suffered more than any nation has suffered. But that Israel was so treated that it did not seem to be like a nation any more. And he is going to so suffer that he will ~~be~~ hardly seem to be human. His figure will be disfigured so much that he will hardly look like a man as a result. So, it seems to me that the prophet seems to be introducing ~~this idea~~ these ideas in comparison. Here is Israel which has suffered terribly. Why did Israel suffer so? Israel suffered because of her sin. Now, the servant of the Lord is going to suffer, too. Why is the servant of the Lord going to suffer? Not for sin, ~~but~~ for he has ~~no~~ no sin. for which he should suffer. ~~But~~ he is going to suffer. He is going to be so marred that there will be a similarity between the way in which the servant is marred and the way in which Israel is marred. That is why the people were appalled at Israel. For Israel seems to lose its identity as a nation. He seems to lose his identity as a human being, because of the terrible way in which he will be treated.

Then, we have ^a ~~the~~ third case. You notice that we have the first line which

~~starts~~

starts with ~~לְכִי~~ and the next line starts with לְכִי, so. This so is a comparison. Again we have a לְכִי. I don't think לְכִי is the English so, degree. Degree... - - - That is not לְכִי, but it is a comparison, but another thing that ~~can~~ it may be is its result. Because this happened, therefore something may happen. In fact, the word therefore is לְכִי lachein. on account of something. And there we have a third line, which again starts with לְכִי. How would you read that third line? The beginning of the third line, which is a division made ~~reverse~~ and reversed(?) How would you read that first part of that line, Miss Luke? Thus ~~we~~ ^{He} shall sprinkle many nations. I am sure that anyone in Isaiah's time this would sound very queer. Just as people were appalled at Israel, so will his form be marred away from man. And so will he sprinkle many nations. What does that verse mean? It is a strange revelation that God gave, but what does that revelation mean? Well, it means that ~~he~~ as the result ~~in~~ of his suffering, something is going to happen, and that something is going to be that many nations will be sprinkled. Well, they may think right away, how is the word sprinkle used? It is used over and over again in the Old Testament to express the idea of being cleansed, cleansed from impurity, or from defilement, or the like. He is going to undergo a suffering so terribly that he is not going to seem like a human being. As its result, it is going to be that many nations are going to be cleansed, are going to be cleansed from impurity, and defilement _____ (5.00) Apart from our whole Biblical teaching ~~truth~~ on this matter, it is very hard to get much sense out of this passage. When we have the Biblical teaching, then it could make a sense, and when you have this word sprinkle, then you look into the Old Testament, and you find the word used so many times for cleansing. It is over and over again used, and constantly used in the book of Leviticus, ~~describing~~ ^{describing} the cleansing the temple, the sprinkling

ISAIAH #1 ²⁰

of the blood , or of water, or oil, ~~or~~ upon them that It would not seem

difficult for an Old Testament student to _____ 4.30)

some suggestions as to

Look up the usage of the word, and get an idea of what it should mean.
has

Israel ~~would~~ really undergone certain experience which had taught the

people to be sharp enough to see what happened to Israel. The servant of

the Lord is going to undergo an experience so terrible that he will hardly

seem like a human being. And what is the result of the servant's sprinkling?
the

of the nations? As you look at the Leviticus, and other parts of the Old

Testament, you will see how the word is used, and you can easily suggest

a meaning toward it, ~~an~~ but a meaning which you might find it difficult

to see if this is what it really means, Until you get on to the New Testament,

and until you get to certain other portions of the Old Testament, which bring

out the similar meaning. Well, the modernists of course, cannot believe that

Isaiah could have possibly dreamed ~~that~~ something like that. That is

simply an impossible idea to them. Therefore, they must translate the word

in some other way. And so they say, what else can you do with it? - - -

I imagine that the translators of the Septuagint could not get any sense out of it.

They came to this, and they said, what on earth does this mean? To sprinkle

many nations, how could he sprinkle many nations? What on earth does this

talk about? So , they made some kind of wild guesses. They ~~could not~~ translated it,
I don't remember exactly how

~~exactly get the~~ , but it is hard to say ... some thing like ... Some kind of

general effect on the nation. And perhaps one third of the nations would be

made to wander(?) something like that. That would ~~make the idea~~ fit the idea that

the nation, one third of the nations .. ~~ever~~ is very different to say what

it is. ~~One~~ The septuagint ... Many were appalled at you. ~~they are~~
and many nations are

going to be made to wander at what happened to him. And the septuagint

ISAIAH #20

does not give us anything of the literal translation of the word. But now the modern interpreters say, ^{ly} the Hebrew is perfect/clear, they shall be ~~startled--~~ sprinkled, and the only doubt that is raised against this is that a lot of people will say ~~that~~ how can you sprinkle a nation? You don't sprinkle a ~~nation-~~ nation. You sprinkle water. You don't sprinkle the altar, you sprinkle the blood upon it. You sprinkle oil upon something, you sprinkle blood, you sprinkle water. ~~That is-~~ You ~~repsm~~ sprinkle _____? That is absurd, they say. You have the word used in the Old Testament twenty times. It is used always in connection with sprinkling. He sprinkled the blood upon the altar. He sprinkled the water upon the priests' garments. He sprinkled oil upon this particular thing in the temple. How would ^{you} sprinkle a nation?

~~When sprinkle-~~ Do you ~~sprinkle~~ take up or pick a nation and then sprinkle it? That does not make any sense. In America today, you ^{often} hear people talk about sprinkling a lawn. How can you sprinkle a lawn? Do you ^{sprinkling} take up a lawn, and put it in your ~~pouring~~ can, and ~~and~~ then sprinkle it?

Of course, that does not make any sense. We use the term constantly, to sprinkle the lawn. When you ~~have~~ only twenty cases in the Old Testament, ^{are you going to} ~~how~~ ~~/dada/you~~ ^{not} say that the Hebrew could ^{not} have the same thought of the word ~~usage~~ that we have. When we use the word, sprinkle, ~~of the~~ ^{on} not of the thing ~~we sprinkle on,~~ ~~on~~ which we sprinkle, but of the thing ^{on} which we sprinkle. We don't have ~~the~~ proof that they did it, but if we say that it means sprinkling the nations upon something, it would be impossible, and it would be rather ~~fidicueu~~ ridiculous. It would be utterly impossible.

ISAIAH 21

It seems to me that it is ~~is~~ mucher better to say that this is waht it says. If we cannot understand it, we cannot understand it. But to think that you can insert something else, well, they have to try to figure out how to insert something else, ~~and how~~ Well, they have tried to figure out, and they find that there is an Arabic word . I don't know whether the word is used or not, but at least there is some evidence that the ~~is~~ Arabic word _____, which means "to jump," ^{it means sprinkle,} and they insert this word, ~~and~~ in the Hebrew used in Hiphil~~is~~, but used in the Qal, which means to ~~sprinkle~~ be quick. To be quick... sprinkled on his garment, that is in Qal. It is sprinkled is Qal. To sprinkle is Hiphil. But they say now that ~~in~~ Hiphil, must be a problem, so if hiphil is ~~sprinkle~~, ^{startle, or start(?)} ^{start} then that must mean to start to jump, that is, ~~to~~ leap . In Arabic they say is it the case. But I am not sure to what extent that is certain, except that But now they say that there must have been a Hebrew word that is lost, which _____ which mean to leap or to jump. And that word is never used in the Bible, never used in the Bible, except here just once. as "cause to jump" So many nations will ~~sj~~ jump. and if you cause to jump, ~~how many will insert~~ he will cause many nations to jump. How would you express~~is~~ that word? Well, he will startle. Many will be startled, and He will make many nations to startle. He will startle the nation. But ~~is~~ there is absolutely no ~~nation~~ evidence of that word ever being used as "startle" either in Hebrew or in Arabic. It is not logical _____12.75) So he will startle many nations, they say. But when we try to find an evidence in the context, many ~~wblil~~ will be astonished at the nations, they will be astonished at the nations, they were startled,

ISAIAH 21

It does not astonied, it means astounded. ~~astounded~~ does not mean astony.

_____ (shame in m) does not mean something like startling, ... appall, the meaning of it is, a shock at a misery, ... shut their mouth at him.

Well, why would they shut their mouth? Is that the way they would be surprised to shut their mouth? ~~is~~ You see, when a person is astounded at something is that the way he ~~is~~ is astounded? Does he ~~his~~ shut his mouth?

They they are surprised, do they really shut their mouth? When they are surprised, the general tendency is that they open their mouth rather shut it.

It does not fit the context at all. ~~How will they~~ The kings will shut their mouth. They would be unable to shut their mouth. It is an entirely

different idea. Entirely different. So that, there is ~~th~~ really, although ~~ch~~ being as you read it as in RSV... The idea of ~~astounded~~ cannot be there. And

it is not something of the mouth that will show astonishment. But the idea there is that they are appalled. So this idea of ~~astounded~~ ^{started} ~~is~~ ^{of something} without warrant/ in the usage of the word, without warrant in the context, ~~without-~~ and the

word occurs so many times as sprinkle, ~~an~~ but of course if somebody comes, well, what a ~~is~~ crazy idea is ~~that~~ it that they sprinkle the nations. Where do you find such an idea of sprinkling the nations? Where do you ever find such an idea ^{as} ~~like~~ that? Well, I think the Apostle Peter heard such an idea,

if you turn to the 1st ~~of~~ Peter ~~1~~: chapter 1 and read the first two ~~of~~ verses,

"Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ, to the stranger ^{scattered} throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, ^{is it not manifestations? about about them} Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ: Grace unto you, and peace, be multiplied."

ISAIAH 21

So here Peter says something that is described exactly alike by Isaiah the prophet.. that many nations will be sprinkled by the blood of Jesus Christ. So certainly, if

(9.65) ~~Thirdly, if~~ this translation~~is~~ is going to be called a Christian translation, it must consider that the apostle Peter knew what he was talking about, and it seems to me that it is pretty hard to mistake the ~~die~~ idea that Peter is actually here referring to this very verse, ~~Hex~~ he has exactly the ~~ix~~ idea that Peter is here ~~x~~ referring to this very verse. He has exactly the idea ~~ix~~ that ~~Peter is her-~~ is expressed ~~i-the-be~~ in the beginning of this epistle expressedAnd so shall he sprinkle many nations. That is the literal rendering , and seems to make sense, and is, after all, an ~~i-tro-introduction~~ introduction to the chapter which follows and which ~~ix~~ tells that He is going to redeem many nations. He is going to bear their ~~sax~~ sin, and if you~~x~~ read the R^Evised Standard Version and ~~ix~~ in chapter 53, you ~~x~~ find the atonement of Christ; other~~s~~wise, it is pretty hard to get any sense out of the chapter. That is surely what it refer s to ~~x~~ or there is no sense in it ~~ix~~ at all. If it refers to that why should not that bebut they go through , The RSV explains away ~~ix~~ just as many messianic passages as they possibly can, but they ~~ix~~ still have enough left to show that it is really there, and if it is really there, ~~why-s-~~ what is the point of getting rid of these. It's like Dr. Machen used to say, you take the gospels and they get rid of all that they can, and when they get ~~god don-~~ down to what they say is the original ~~x~~ Mark there is a little bit that is left, even in that, "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto but to minister and to give His life a ransom for many."

Now, we will look a little further on Isaiah ~~52-in-the-~~52 in the Hebrew now, and so Mr. Curry will you look at that verse for us. ..Some grammarians don't like

to call that a relative ~~is~~ pronoun, but whatever you ~~is~~ call it , it ~~doe~~ actually does about the same thing in Hebrew as our relative pronoun does ~~is~~ in English. Now, a relative pronoun in English introduces a subordinate thought, and this _____ usually does that, but one thing worthy of note is that in the relative pronoun , introducing a subordinate clause mainly refers back to a very in the main clause and sometimes there is no word expressed in the main clause. Like you would say in English, ~~why~~ what irritates me is the fact that he does so and so. Now, you see, the ~~was~~ what doesn't refer back and the whole thing ~~it~~ takes the place of the subject, What irritates me is, You might say the thing that irritates ~~is~~ me is, and then you would have a that or the thing which ~~is~~ irritates me, that irritates me , the man who ~~is~~ irritates me. But you ~~dox~~ could just say what irritates me and have it take the place of the ^{word} ~~verb~~ in the main clause and also of the pronoun in the subordinate ~~class~~ clause. Now , ~~theis~~ this is a tremendously important fact in Hebrew because we come across ~~is~~ it a great many ~~ti-es~~ times. Well, in this case, the ~~is~~ question you ask is when you have the Asher indicating the relative ~~class~~ clause, does the subject or the object of the relative clause, whatever it refers back to in the main clause have an antecedent to which it ~~is~~ refers back or does the relative clause stand as a whole in the place of the subject ~~or~~ or object or object of preposition or something. ...You remember people said to Christ, formerly we have heard of this but now we see it for ourselves, and now, they have seen something which had never ~~ben~~ been explained to them. This is something brand new in their experience. There is ~~someh~~ something that is an entirely new factor . They shut their mouths ~~bye~~ because they had to have experience of a new , vital ~~is~~ living factor. Because what they had never before been , now actually is

seen. And they had come to perceive , understand, ~~ing~~ to seek gain insight into something that ~~the~~ previously-unknown was utterly unknown, ~~but~~. Now in these clauses it is interesting to note that ~~the relation in~~ in the relation between them often we have to be specific as to what the relationship between them, often we have to interpret what the relationship is. Your clauses often do not get the whole meaning ~~litere~~ literal. You can't always take ~~the~~ things absolutely literal, because there is always a relationship between clauses or between expressions that conveys a meaning for ~~by~~ beyond what the ^{immediate say} literal words/and there is barely any of us who when we take all the things we ~~or~~ say in the course of a day and we find that a good many of them, ~~are~~ our tone of voice or its relationship to something else involves a tremendous lot. For instance if you meet somebody and you say, "~~It's--~~ "It's a fine day today." ~~Well~~ Well, why should you tell them it's a fine day, he can see just as well as you can, and in most cases if you say the opposite you wont argue with them. You agree with the opposite . Your statement that it is a fine day ~~don~~ doesn't mean to convey information to ~~a~~ them about the day , what you are really saying is, My, it's ~~nice~~ nice to see you. ^I ^{you and I are} They/want to give recognition to the fact that ~~they--they are~~ ~~x~~ human beings and are needing each other and expressing a real need for each other. And so you say, "It's a nice day," and the meaning is very, very different from what the words are, but it is perfectly obvious to all of us ~~x~~ what the meaning is, we may not express it in words, but we certainly understand ~~nk~~ fully what it is that we ~~na~~ mean , ~~certainly~~- very different from the words that we say. And very frequently we use the rhetorical question. We use statements which convey an idea that is perfectly clear to the other person but which is not expressed simply by the bare literal statements. And that is true of the Bible as it is in all other writings. Particularly in poetry that is true. And so I want us to think

of ~~w~~ exactly what these phrases mean. I have gone through these three and explained rather ~~xx~~ fully the relationship of them to one another and the meaning and I would like you ~~xxx~~ to do it all through the succeeding verses. To think through what do these phrases really ~~xxx~~ mean.

ISAIAH # ~~21~~22

It ~~some~~ sometimes stands alone. If I say , I know what you are ~~thinking~~ thinking, the what you are thinking is alone; that is, what does ~~x~~ not refer back to any word in the main clause. You might say, I know the subject that you are thinking about. Well, I know the ideas that are in your mind. The that would refer back to ideas, but if you ~~w~~ say I know what you are thinking, well, what is the object of your thinking. It's a complete relative clause which takes the place of the object in your sentence. And, in most languages, have that ~~x~~ kind of relative clause. Now, in Hebrew ~~As~~ ~~As~~ Asher introduces a relative ~~clause~~ clause which stands by itself taking the place of the ~~subject~~ subject, and object, and ~~of an~~ object of preposition some other position in the main sentence, or it may have an antecedent to which it refers back. In English we very generally have but not always. If I said , Whoever told you that is a ~~liar~~ liar. Well, what is the relative ? The relative is whoever, and whoever told you that stands as a unit --it could be your subject, or if you take the whoever in your main clause, whoever is a liar, makes no sense, but it ~~isn't~~ isn't whoever that ~~told~~ told you ~~that~~ that, it is whoever told you, and so the whoever is really fulfilling both functions. I think it is probably better to ~~x~~ say ~~xxx~~ whoever told you that is the subject. You call it relative clause but you mean a relative clause without an antecedent. It is a ~~real~~ relative clause , that is what is important. Now, relative clauses normally have ~~antecedent~~ antecedents but there are many cases where they don't have ~~antecedent~~ antecedents, and this is one of those cases. There is no specific ^{single} word to indicate

a relative clause without an antecedent. Now, I don't think that is an unimportant question, I think that is a very important question. Let's look now at our English Bibles. You notice that this section that we just started now beginning with verse ~~12~~ 13 begins, "Behold, my servant shall deal prudently." And you ask yourself, what is meant by this, My servant, and we notice that My Servant occurs again in verse ~~12~~ 11 of chapter 53. By ~~He~~ His knowledge shall my ~~righteous~~ righteous servant justify many. This phrase, My servant, which occurs here in 52:13 and 53:11 has not been used, the word servant has not ~~occured~~ occurred for two chapters, not since 50:10. And so it would be quite reasonable to ask, Who is he talking about? Behold, my servant shall deal prudently. He has been ~~tak~~ talking about the exile, you go out from there, be clean, God is going to protect you and take you safely through, and all of a sudden, Behold, my servant shall deal prudently. Who is this servant that He is talking about. Is this servant He is talking about the people ~~he~~ He has been describing who are going to be ~~rescure~~ rescued and able to leave without interference or trouble. Well, a strong argument against that would be the fact that the people He has been talking ^{as you} to- about and addressing/ He continues to address as you. As many as were ~~astonished~~ astonished at thee, He continues that, so that would sound as if the servant is ~~k~~ not a personification of the people but is something else, and the way the servant is used here in verse ~~15~~ 13 and ~~again~~ again in verse 11 of 53 would suggest that it is here used almost like a technical term, as a specific indication of some individual or group of individuals of considerable importance. Now, that impression is strengthened when we notice that this ~~wou~~ word servant is used about ~~25~~ 35 times in the Book of Isaiah, and of the 35 times that it is used, approximately half are 17 of them, no, more than half, 19 of them occur between chapter 41 and chapter 56 in this one section of the book. In fact, between 41 and

53 , in 15 chapters of the book occur more uses of the word servant than ~~in~~ in all the other 52 chapters of the book. That's an interesting thing isn't it? Using that word servant/~~is~~ frequently ~~in~~ in the particular chapters and very frequently using it with the pronoun my before it, my servant. Now, we have the word servant used 9 times in all the chapters from Isaiah 1-40, only 9 times, and of those 9 times , 5 of them are in the plural, so it only leaves 4 in the singular, of those 4 , one of them is My servant, Isaiah, ~~and other~~ Eliakim another is My servant, ~~Enathan~~, the next one in chapter 24 is a general statement, as a servant , so with the master, and then in chapter 37 he refers to my servant David, so we have in the course of the first 40 chapters we have my servant Isaiah, my servant Eliakim, and my servant David. The term My servant, used by the Lord of these servants. The ~~prophet~~ prophets of one of the officials and of David. And after 53 the word servant never occurs in the singular again in the book, but it occurs eleven more times and every one of them is in the plural. They refer to the servants of the Lord, never ~~again~~ does it speak of the Servant of the Lord. But between chapter 41 and chapter 53 we have these nineteen occurrences of the word servant and many of them being My servant, so that is sufficient to suggest that ~~we~~ here we ~~we~~ have a special technical expression. We have a special concept here expressed here by the ~~the~~ term my servant. And I ask you to make a study of that this week and to see just what ~~the differences are~~ is involved in the use of it, what did he mean by His servant. Here when he said My servant shall deal prudently , who is He talking about? Well, we had the phrase used before ~~xxx~~ in the context 17 times between chapter 41 and chapter 50 , ~~xxxx~~ so we might look at those ~~xxx~~ instances and see what they prove as to whom he is talking about. The first of them is ~~in~~ in chapter 41 verse 8 and that would seem to be very clear. Chapter 41:8, he says

But thou, Israel art my servant." Now, that certainly is clear. There He calls Israel His servant. Thou, Israel, art my servant. And then in verse 9 he says ~~tes-twe~~ toward the end of the verse, "Thou~~x~~ art my servant, I have chosen thee and not cast thee away." So here we have two uses of the phrase, My servant and both of them are clearly referring to Israel, and the whole meaning of it in the context is quite obviously is that the other nations are very much afraid of the international changes that are taking place ~~that-~~ described in the early part of chapter ~~51x~~ 41 but that Israel is God's servant and therefore Israel doesn't need to feel that God is going to cast them out and destroy them. In the same chapter 41 in verse 19 ; 42:19 we have again the ref erence , no, 42:1, in 42:1 we have the expression , "Behold, my servant." Now, before that we read twice that Israel was His servant, and He is not going to destroy Israel but he is going to preserve it because Israel is His serv~~ant~~, and that is a new thought that we have not had before. We have often read about God's wonderful blessings to Israel but now we read that the reason that God will not destroy Israel is because ~~Israe-~~ Israel is His servant, so naturally we wonder why He could call Israel is His servant and say that is the reason that He wont destroy Israel, and the only reasonable answer is that He has called Israel for form some specific purpose. And that purpose must be fulfilled, ~~h~~ and Israel won~~nd~~ be destroyed , because Israel is called for a definite purpose, and the purpose is not yet fulfilled. And then the third use of it ~~isx~~ in these chapters we notice is in Isa. 42:1 where we read that ~~z~~"Behold, my servant, whom I uphold." Now, is this still speaking ~~about~~ about Israel. He has just twice spok~~en~~ about Israel and now you say , Behold, my servant, well, the logical thing to say is that He has been talking about Israkel and He is still talking about Israel." My servant whom I uphold, my chosen one ~~whom-~~ in whom my soul delights, I have put my spirit upon H⁺m

He shall bring ~~it~~ forth judgment unto the Gentiles. Well, naturally, ^{if} ~~it is~~ he ~~is talking~~ is talking about Israel. Israel might bring forth judgment to the Gentiles, that seems very reasonable. But then we read He shall not cry nor lift up nor cause his voice to be lifted up in the streets. Some how that doesn't quite strike with your impression of Israel, which is apt to be very vocal, very ~~eee~~ vociferous, and very full of effort in accomplishing what they want or expressing their voice, "He ~~xxx~~ shall not cry, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street, ~~but through~~ a bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall He not quench." There we get an idea that the ~~se4~~ servant moves ~~deliv~~ deliberately, calmly, full of certainty, ~~ad-~~ and of accomplishment. It hardly fits with the whole ~~nx~~ nation. But we ~~hae~~ have been told that the servant is Israel, now this is what the servant is going to do. "He will not fail, nor be discouraged until He has set judgment in the earth, and the isles shall wait for His ~~law~~ law." So the Lord declares this is what is going to happen, ~~He~~ is going to do this wonderful thing ^{through} ~~to~~ His servant. We ~~hax~~ have a little ... is He speaking about Israel as a whole, is He describing Israel as a ~~x~~ whole as not failing nor being ~~disturbed~~, ^{2011/9/17} read the words of Jeremiah where he tends to give way to his misery and the situation where he tries to stand for God in a wicked and ~~perf~~ perverse generation/ he certainly is very far from not failing nor being ~~discur~~ discouraged. Can this be true of all of Israel. Can this be true of the wicked part of Israel. Is this perhaps true of a portion of Israel which can be described by this terminology. Well, it almost seems as if it would be strange if ~~x~~ a sizable ~~pro~~ portion can be worded or described this way, makes you wonder that it might even be that Israel is the Servant to do the work but that it is an individual out of Israel who is to represent ~~Israe~~ Israel in doing the work rather than Israel as a whole. It does not give you a clear

picture on that. It simply assures ~~x~~ you tha the work is going to be done and tells you that this ~~six~~ is a characteristic of how it is ~~gon-gon-~~ going to be done. The work for which God has preserved Israel. Now, ~~the~~ where is the next instance of the word Servant. ^{42:19.} ~~43:19.~~ There you read about the Lord's Servant again, "Who is blind, but my ~~serva-~~ servant, deaf , but my ~~x messenger-~~ messenger that I sent," "Who is blind as he that is perfect and blind as ~~the~~ the Lord's servant. " ~~Two-~~ Twice the word servant occurs, once my servant, once the Lo d's servant. How can he say that the servant is blind, when he just says these wonderful things in the beginning of 42 , that the servant is not going to fail nor be discouraged --he is constant, he doesn't lift up the voice in the streets, and yet who is blind as ~~x~~ His ~~servat~~ servant. How can you fit them together. Well, we look at the next usage of if, 43:10 where He says, "Ye are my witnesses," this is plural . Who is He talking to? Surely He is talking to Israel as a whole. "Ye are my witnesses saith the Lord, and My servant whom I have chosen." Surely then, ~~Israe-Israe-~~ Israel is the servant of God.

ISAIAH # 23

And then, we look at the next instance, which is 44:1, and there we read, "Yet ~~not~~ now hear, O Jacob my servant; and Israel, ~~wh~~ om I ha ve chosen." Surely , ~~ix~~ this makes it clear that Israel is God's servant, but of course the ~~x~~ question ~~x~~ must be before us, Is all of ~~Israe~~ Israel the servant. Israel is the servant. God has called Israel for a definite purpose . God uses Israel for a definite purpose. God uses Israel that this purpose should be accomplished. Israel has been preserved that this purpose may be accomplished; therefore, Israel is the ~~sev~~ servant. But in the more precise sense of the word , Is the servant which is to accomplish this work all of Israel, or is it a part of Israel, or maybe even one ~~inf-~~ individual

out of Israel that is going to ~~x~~ do the work which ~~Israe~~ Israel is ~~g~~ obligated to do, and for which Israel has been called. Well, the next after 44:1 is what? Exactly, and then on 44:2, "Thus saith the Lord that made thee, and formed thee from the womb, ~~whil~~ ~~x~~ which will help thee; Fear not, O Jacob, my servant, and thou, Jesurum, whom I have chosen. " Jacob is God's servant. Jacob is ~~goig~~ going to fulfill the ~~word~~ work for which God has called it . Modern English we use Jacob for a man, and Israel for all of his descendants, but ~~the~~ in the Bible we are told his name was changed to Israel and ~~it-all~~ then it often speaks of ~~his~~ him as Israel, and later on his ~~x~~ descendant~~s~~ are sometimes called Israel and sometimes called Jacob, ~~most~~ both can either stand for the man or for his descendants so in English we have special ...we never refer~~x~~ to Israel as Jacob. In modern English but the Bible ...Yes, I would think so, ~~becu~~ because Zion is the ~~geop~~ geographical area of part of Jerusalem, but I think it is used generally to indicate the whole. And it ~~acu~~ actually is a part of Jerusalem, whereas Jacob is a man's name ~~ans~~ as a young man, and ~~Israe~~ Israel is the name that God gave him later, ~~but-it-is-quite~~ - just like Abram and Abraham. There are two names for the same man at different times in his life and both are used for his descendants but the word Zion means a specific section~~x~~ of Jerusalem where David's palace was, ~~and~~ but it is used as a figure of speech for the whole city, and it's ~~like~~ like Zion and Jerusalem, sometimes used for the whole nation. So then we have here Jacob my servant, ~~refere~~ referred to in 44:2. It does not occur very frequently. but it is quite obvious in the context what he is talking about. He ~~at~~ calls him ~~Jacom~~ ~~Jaw~~ Jacob and ~~Jerushurum~~ Jesurun, and the letters~~ox~~ of Jesurun are (consonants) R- I S R N just like ~~ixn~~ Israel, they are I S R L, and so that it would seem most reasonable that it is another way of saying the same thing with the ~~subje--~~

substitution of an N for an L. I don't know as we have any ~~pr-~~ proof on it .

We have to make a conclusion on the facts, but the facts are , of course, that ~~is~~ it is here used strictly as a parallel. with the othe r and it is identical except for the final L. And then verse 21. He says, ~~remember-~~ "Remember these, O Jacob, and Israel (there He calls ~~them-~~ him both names); for thou art my servant: I have formed thee; thou art my servant: O Israel, thou shalt not be forgotten of me." Again, the assurance that Israel will be brought back from exile, ^{and} will not come to an end . That Israel, not simply that they are God's pets, and God therefore is going to protect them, no, they are His people for a definite purpose. He has definite purpose that He is going to accomplish through them. Therefore, ~~k~~ He calls them His servant, and they are His instrument, for the accomplishment of His ~~pur~~ purpose, and His purpose ~~was~~ was described in the beginning of 42, to bring judgment to the whole world, ~~the wo~~ to bring light to the Gentiles, to ~~k~~ bring judgment to the very distant ~~k~~ islands of the world. Israel is His servant which will accomplish His purpose and therefore Israel can be sure that He will not destroy them. Now, verse 26 would seem to be a little different perhaps. There , God said, "that ~~it co-~~ confirmeth the word of His servant, and performeth the counsel of His ~~messe-~~ messengers ." Now, in this case, surely it would seem that this servant here is Isaiah, ~~and~~ any of his prophets because they are a part of Israel, a part of God's Israel is ~~g~~ to bring light to the Gentiles for there are various aspects in that light, but one aspect of that light is to bring the Word of God, to be God's instruments for revelation. We ~~k~~ read in Hebrews that God spoke ~~in-diver- divers~~ at sundry times and in divers ~~m~~ nners ~~xx~~ spake in times past unto the fathers hath in these last days spoken unto us by His ~~xx~~ Son. ~~g~~ So God has used various instruments of revelation. Isaiah was one of the m, to bring light , and this light that ~~wou~~ was brought to Isaiah is ~~go+g~~ going to be

confirmed. Yes, there is one instance in the book of Jonah, where God sent J^unah to Ninevah in order to call upon them to repent and ~~was~~ when they repented God ~~put~~ was merciful and did not destroy them immediately but ~~postponed~~ postponed the destruction because ~~in~~ Jonah preached to them, but it is a fact that with the great force of evil in the world and the great success of leading men to put all remembrance out of their minds. In the Old Testament time s, God's method was ~~more~~ - to reveal Hⁱms^lf to a little group and in that group to keep alive the memory of God, keep alive the ~~more~~ knowledge of God and of H₁s ~~word~~ Word until the time ~~of all the~~ ~~was~~ - when the ~~whole~~ whole of the Old Testament should be given and the time when ~~the~~ Christ should be brought into the world. Then when that message was read, then to ...them out in all directions tobut in the Old Testament there is ~~ever~~ evidence ~~that~~ - of some ~~is~~ carrying the message to outsiders but not much. O^Nly in the one case. But through the Old Testament this was the method God used at that ~~is~~ ~~time~~ time. N_Ow, He did bring the message to some outside, like Job (who ~~was~~ probably was not an Israelite) and when ~~Abrah~~ Abraham came, there was Melchiss~~ed~~dek who was the ~~pre~~ - priest of the most High God to whom Abraham gave tithes but there is clear ~~ever~~ - evidence that there were those who knew God outside Israel but there were not many for most ~~see~~ people put God out of their ~~hears~~ hearts and wished not to know anything ~~is~~ about Him, and the Israelites were also proned to do that and many of them did, but God concentrated during the Old Testament period on keeping alive the ~~k~~ knowledge of God and using Israel as an instrument to give the Word of God to them and prepare the way, and so when that was accomplished Peter ~~say~~ said The times of this ignorance God ~~wink~~ ~~wink~~ - winked out but now He commands now men everywhere to repent. And very clearly the promises in the O.T. are that the

message is going to be brought[†] to the Gentiles. And here is one of the clearest
 verses. In chapter 42 where ~~ti~~ he says that the ^{servant} ~~Servant~~ is going to bring light
 to the Gentiles, and judgment to them. So, ~~hwe~~ here we have in verse
^G
~~entiles~~ 21 two mentions of Israel and the servant of God, and in verse 26
 we have reference to all the apostles, ~~whose~~ those whom God uses instruments
 of revelations that carry his message to the gentiles, that bring light to the
 servant of God, and that he will fulfill ~~his promises and~~ the message he give
 through them. And of course, in Hebrew he says that He spoke ~~through the~~ ^{instrument of}
 through the prophets, and later He spoke through[†] the Son who was the greatest/
 referring to
 revelation of all. But this is, of course, a prophetic message, ~~and~~ that Israel
 would be rebuilt after the exile. And then next, 45:4 which again, says, Jacob
 is my servant. Israel my elect. "For Jacob my servant's sake, and Israel
 mine elect, I have[†] even called thee by thy name; I have surnamed thee,
 though thou sarest not known me." I have even called thee by thy- Cyrus, thy
 name. He has called him, he has designated even 150 years ahead of him
 that Cyrus is mentioned by name in the last verse of the previous chapter,
 their has
 and the first verse of chapter 45. For ~~his~~ sake he ~~was~~ predicted him by name
 was
 150 years before that Cyrus is going to come and deliver Israel, not simply
~~because Israel is a pop(?) to whom special~~ ^{e-pepes} ~~are~~ [†] ~~peps~~, those to whom He
 wants to give special blessings, but because Israel is the servant, His instrument
 through whom He is ~~go~~ going to bring light to the Gentiles, but not necessarily
 all of the Israel. The work must be fulfilled through Israel, but maybe not
 by the whole of Israel, but by a ~~part~~ ^{part} of it portion of Israel, maybe by an individual
 among the nation. And when we look at the chapter 42, it sounds more like an
 individual rather than a large group. Then the next usage of the ~~next~~ phrase,

ISAIAH #23

the ~~servant~~ servant is on when you get to chapter 48, and there in chapter 48, we find in verse 20, where the people are given as ~~the Davidic~~ ^{the specific} promise of the deliverance from Babylon, where they are told, "Go ye forth of Babylon, flee ye from the Chaldeans, with a voice of singing declare ye, tell this, utter it, even to the end of the earth; say ye, The Lord hath redeemed his servant Jacob."

^{and}
So there again Israel is called His servant / ~~They~~ are told that they are to be delivered from ~~Babylon~~ ^{Egypt}, and they have previously been delivered from Egypt delivered from Babylon /, they are to be rescued and restored, and the reason is, God has redeemed His servant Jacob, so the Israel or the Jacob is going to do the work of the servant of God. And in 42, we have a brief idea of the work of the servant of God. Now, when you ~~ca~~ come to chapter 49, and there is

the chapter where the ~~ser~~ word servant used four times in that one chapter. ^{speaking}

And the chapter seems to start with some body ~~other~~ ^{through} the Lord through Isaiah, or simply Isaiah speaking. It starts with the 1st person.

Listen, Oisles, unto me; and hearken, ye people, from far; The Lord hath called me from the womb; from the ~~ve~~ bowels of my mother hath ~~me~~ he made mention of my name. " We have had that earlier just calling Is~~r~~ael from the womb.

----- could be Israel speaking. "... from the ^{be} bowels of my mother hath he ~~made~~ metnion of my name. " It could/Israel

or could be some individual. "And he hath made my ~~mouth~~ mouth like a sharp sword; in the shadow of his hand hath he ~~hid~~ hid me, and made ~~me~~ a polished shaft; in his quiver hath he hid me; And said unto me, Thou art my ^{....}"

servant, O Israel, in ~~whom~~ I will be-glorified.- Then Surely, that is Israel, isn't it? "Thou art my servant, O Israel, in whom I will be glorified." This

one who is speaking said, "He is my servant, Israel," But now, is ^{this} ~~he~~ the one

ISAIAH #23

who is speaking of the entire nation of Israel, including all the wicked people?
 really
 Is it one who is speaking, excluding the ~~wicked~~ people, but including the ~~the~~ even the
 really
~~even~~- indifferent people or is it perhaps ~~it~~ = just ~~the~~ righteous people or is this
^s
 just the particular one ~~who~~ are going to accomplish the work of the servant.
 Yes, how large is ~~7~~ the group here that is here speaking? He says, "Thou
 art my servant, Israel, in whom I will be glorified."

ISAIAH #24

Then we find that he continues, "Then I said, I have laboured in vain, I have
 spent my strength for nought, and in vain: yet surely my judgment is with the -
~~Lord, and my work with my God.~~ That sounds contradictory to what
 we read in chapter 42 in verse 4, "He shall not fail nor be discouraged, till
 he have set judgment in the earth: and the isles shall wait for his law."
 He says, "I have ~~laboured~~ in vain, I have spent my strength for nought, and
 in vain: " It seems that the servant is discouraged. It shows ~~the~~ at least
 seem to be working out.
 that the work is not ~~going to be worked~~ - Now, of course, he shall not
 fail, nor will he will be discouraged, may not mean that he will not have time
 of hesitations, or times when he looks back, but certainly he will not get
 away from _____ Here he says, "I have laboured in vain, I have spent my
 strength for nought, ... yet surely my judgment is with the Lord, and my work
 with my God." God is going to do the work. So, ~~the work of the~~ Servant,
 Israel as a whole merely
 whether it is an individual or whether it is ~~the whole of Israel,~~ or a part
 of Israel, or it is just the godly, the servant does not seem to be accomplishing
 the work, but he ~~is~~ is assured that his work is going to be accomplished,

ISAIAH #24

because the judgment is with the Lord. For His God is going to do it. But he continues in verse five, "And now, saith the Lord that formed me from the womb to be his servant, to bring Jacob again to him...." How can Jacob bring Jacob again? Here we seem to have the servant distinguished from ~~the man~~ the nation as a whole, even distinguished from the great bulk of the nation. You would say that the 9/10 of the nation is going to bring the other ~~1/20~~ 1/10 to Him, to bring Jacob to Him, He says, ~~1/10~~ "Though Israel be not gathered, yet shall I be glorious in the eyes of the Lord, and my God shall be my strength." So, this servant is such a glorious one that even ~~the the~~ if the Israel as a whole may fail, he will never _____, yet the work of the servant is going to be fulfilled, and the ~~servant~~ servant is going to do it. Then he ~~says,~~ says, " "It is a light thing that thou shouldest be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel: I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth." This reverses again what we have had in 42, because 42 shows that the servant is bringing ^a light to the gentiles, in 42 the servant is going to the judgment to the very end ^s of the earth, but now he says, it is not ~~enough to~~ enough to raise up ~~the~~ the tribes of Israel. You are going to be my servants to bring light to the very ends of the earth. Well, you might say, it's as if you see in 42 the great promises. God is delivering Israel to do the ~~work-~~ work. The work is to bring light to the Gentiles, to bring judgment to the whole world, to spread the knowledge of God's truth and to bring redemption to the ~~world~~ whole world. Well, that is the marvelous thing the Servant is going to do, and you think that Israel is going to do that tremendous thing, and you wonder how can it be, and then as we go on we find Israel in ~~bondage~~ bondage, Israel in exile, and Israel tending to give way to despair. How can we ever be rescued. How can we ever

be rescued. How can we ever be rescued, and God saying I am going to rescue you. You are my servant, and the work of the Servant must be done, finally comes to realization here in 49. Israel needs the work of the servant just as much as the Gentiles, but Israel has got to be redeemed from sin, Israel has ~~to~~ got to have the light of God's blessings, and the Servant~~s~~ then is a very small part of Israel, Israel is to ~~do~~ do the work, Israel has the responsibility, it must be one or more out of Israel to do the work, and it certainly sounds like one (?k) and now when we think of Israel needing the work so badly, well, we think what is the work of the Servant of the Lord. It is to deliver Israel. That's not enough, that's a light thing to bring Jacob ~~again~~ again. He said that you should raise up the tribes of Jacob and restore the _____ of Israel I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles that thou mayest be my salvation to the ends of the earth. So the tremendous promise of 42 which ~~is~~ sounds as if it might be the whole of Israel by this time ~~it seems~~ we have seen is the need of Israel ~~is~~ itself and you might think we have all that we can possibly do to reach ~~me~~ ~~to~~ Israel with the message but ~~no~~ that is not enough. No, the word ~~is~~ is going to be carried out, as described in 46, it is not merely that Israel is going to be alone the object of redemption but he is to be a light to the whole world and will bring judgment in the very uttermost parts of the earth. So ~~that~~ by this time we have the servant sharply distinguished from Israel even though He isn't. The servant is Israel but it is a part of Israel. In fact~~s~~, we see by this time one individual. This one, is glorious ~~is~~ in God's sight, even if the rest of Israel were to perish, but the rest of Israel isn't going to perish. He is going to deliver the preserved of Israel. He is going to bring them redemption, and He is going to fulfill the great hopes and promises of chapter 42, He is going to be a light to the Gentiles to the end of the earth. So this thought of the servant ~~is~~ ~~is~~ has been developed

in these chapters, and been enlarged from this and individualized at this point. [^]nd in verse 7 we read, ~~Just-~~ "Thus saith the Lord, the Redeemer of Israel, and His Holy One, to him whom man despiseth, to Him whom the ~~at-nation~~ nation abhorreth, to a servant of rulers," ~~Kings shall see~~ Israel, which should be God's servant to reach the ends of the earth has become a servant of earthly rulers, Israel has become one who is subject to the commands of those who ~~are~~ are not God's representatives. / ~~The true Israel~~ ^{Though} Israel which should be the servant of the Lord is a servant of rulers, yet God is ~~going~~ going to fulfill His tremendous work through Israel to that out of Israel which God has ordained to be His servant, He is going to accomplish His whole , tremendous _____ and then we find the word servant used ~~again~~ again in ~~the~~ chapter, 50:10. In chapter 50:10 we read , "Who is among you that feareth the Lord, that ~~obey~~ obeyeth the voice of His servant, that walketh in darkness, and hath no light? let him trust in the name of the Lord, and stay upon His God." Whether this is just Isaiah speaking, calling ~~himself~~ himself God's servant, that would be the natural thing to think, we have had ~~some~~ so many uses of ~~the~~ the word Servant , used in this rather technical way, ~~and~~ and we look back to verse 4 , "The Lord God hath given me the tongue of the learned, that I should know how to speak a word in season to him that is weary he wakeneth morning ~~and~~ by morning, he wakeneth mine ear to ~~and~~ ~~and~~ hear as the learned." The Lord God hath opened mine ear, and I was ~~not~~ not rebellious, neither turned away back. I ~~gave~~ gave my back to the smiters, and my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair: I ~~did~~ hid not my face from shame and spitting." Well, did Isaiah ever have that experience, ~~That is showing the~~ or is that describing the Servant of the Lord, showing that He is ~~going~~ going to have to undergo suffering in the course of His ministry. It ~~continue~~ continues, "For the Lord God will help me; therefore shall I not be confounded: therefore have I set my face like a flint, and I know that I shall not be ashamed." He is near that justifieth me; who will contend with me? Let us

stand together? Let him come near to me." Isaiah would never speak like this that I know of . Isaiah is here giving us the actual words of the Servant of the Lord. "Who is among you that feareth the Lord, that obeyeth the voice of His servant, that walketh in darkness, and hath no light? let him ~~trust~~ trust in the Lord, and stay upon His God." So ...but it certainly looks as if it is ~~bring-o-~~ bringing out an idea not previously suggested in the chapter that the servant who is to do the work that Israel has the responsibility to do but is going to have it accomplished by one who is representative of Israel is going to suffer and is going to have to go ~~thru~~ through tremendous difficulty in the accomplishment of the work. And Well, then, we have no further use of the word servant, until we come to the ~~the~~ 52:13 , "Behold, my servant shall deal ~~in~~ wisely, he shall be ~~life-~~ lifted up and ~~as~~ as many as were astounded at thee, ~~so~~ so shall ~~his-~~ His visage be marred . The ~~sug-~~ suggestion in chapter ____ of suffering of the servant is here brought out. The servant is to be marred --even as Israel so that it hardly seemed like a nation. So this way shall He sprinkle many nations, Now, this word ~~sprinkle~~ sprinkle is regularly used for cleansing. Now, is sprinkle always for cleansing? Is there anyone here who could say dogmatically that the word ~~sprinkle~~ sprinkle is not always used for cleansing. The word sprinkle is used in Leviticus repeatedly to describe cleansing, but now we have the word Nazah used in other ~~places-~~ cases in the scripture. And in the other cases ...II Kings 9:33 some of their blood was sprinkled, see if you think that was used for cleansing. Of course there is also Isaiah 63:30, And there blood shall be sprinkled . Take ~~the~~ those two and look at them and see if you think they indicate cleansing. ~~Don-~~ Don't do that now, but have a definite interpretation for me next time. Do those two instances indicate this word means sprinkle and not startle or something ~~like~~ like that. Do they indicate that all it means ~~etc-~~ cleansing or does it mean cleansing

without the ~~idea~~ of ...so there are two references to look at with that in ~~my~~ ~~a~~ mind. The second one is Isaiah 63:30. Now, we will not be meeting again for a week and ~~we~~ since we will have two days in a row then, ~~with~~ rather ~~than~~ have two hours of study it is better to give you a four hour assignment now. And so I would like for next time for you to get the first six verses of Isa. 53; that is , half of the chapter, in the Hebrew so that you don't have to look at any notes ~~to~~ for translation so that you know the meaning of ~~all~~ the words. It is only six verses for two lessons, so these six verses please have every word in them so ~~that~~ if at the ~~beginning~~ beginning of the hour we have a little quiz in certain of the words in their root form you will have no difficulty in telling what they mean. It is only six verses. Please get them well in the Hebrew. Now, that shouldn't take you more than hour. Get it thoroughly, but then please take the few of those ~~verses~~ verses and as far as you can think what they really mean. "Who hath believed our report." Is this a question or is it a ~~reth~~ rhetorical/^{statement}question. Does it mean ~~that~~ that no body has spoken. What does it mean? Who is talking here? Is it a prophet talking? Is ~~is~~ it a king ~~tak~~-talking ? Ask ~~var~~ various questions about this thing and ~~whwe~~ whether you can ...in some other way.

ISAIAH #25

As I looked up this word in Delitzsch, Alexander, and Lange, those commentaries, and I found that all ~~of~~ three of them says that this word וְסָר should be from a man, that is, ~~not~~ like a man, inhuman, so that ~~they all of them~~ three of them agree in feeling that it should be translated as "so was he marred that his appearance was not that of a man, his appearance was away from that of a man. See, the word וְסָר HAS the meaning of separation, that is different from, in the sense of but separation also may be separation ~~of~~ comparison, so that he could be more marred than a man. That is the way our King James Version translates the word. But that does not make the sense, that has to be more marred than any man. More marred than a man. Naturally that does not make a sense at ~~all~~. But marred away from a man, so that he does not appear to be a man at all. They all three agree in that interpretation of it. Now that, ~~the~~ ^{that}fourteenth verse then as we noticed starts with a ~~comparative~~, that I have not noticed in any of the commentaries ~~that~~ - the recognition of the comparison, but it seems to me that it is quite obvious. Just as you are, so is he. Nearly every one tries to make them both refer to the same one. Just as you have been, then he ~~suffe~~ suddenly turns and starts ~~to~~ talking that you is he. - skipping - I dont say that it is impossible, but I would say, it is rather silly/ I don't say-- say that it is impossible, but I would say, it is rather silly. He starts with He in verse 13, then changes to you, then changes to he. You has been Israel all throughout the scene, and it seems very definitely that you is Israel, and he is the ~~ssr~~ servant, but ~~he who is a part~~ a comparison, it seems much more reasonable to say, Who is Israel? ~~Israel is-~~ but who is a part of Israel compared with the whole nation of Israel. And so then we have ~~then~~ ^{is} the climax of the ^{first,} comparison, ~~the-~~ Israel's ^{is} mind and the servant's ^{is} is ~~marred~~ similar in fashion, but not for

ISAIAH #25

marred in similar ~~of~~ fashion, but not for his ~~serv~~ sin as Israel is for his sin.

Then the result of it, so he shall sprinkle many nations, and I asked you to look

up the particular two cases, I gave you two particular references to you, did I

not? At ~~by~~ the end of the hour? What was the one that you have? It is two.

All right, II King 9:33. What was sprinkled? Jezebel's blood, is that a

purification? (Laughters) Hardly. In that case, ~~the word~~ is, that is a clear
the word

case of/sprinkling, there is no question as to what it is. But/of course, the blood

was sprinkled upon the wall. The usage is usually that something sprinkled

upon something, and ~~that~~ quite a few commentaries take the idea that this

cannot be sprinkling many nations, because you sprinkle something on the

nations, but with only ²⁰ ~~30~~ cases, you cannot simply make a ^{ryke-- rule} ~~case~~ like that .

When ~~it is~~ very clear that the word ~~sprinkle~~ means ~~sprinkle~~, it is only reasonable

to say that if you sprinkle something on the nation, unless you have 200 cases,

and it means all sprinkle something upon something... We all sprinkle water

on the lawn. Why, you ^{could} ~~can~~ say, you cannot sprinkle the lawn, but you ^{sprinkle water} ~~know-~~

how common ^{in English} ~~is~~ it is/to sprinkle water on the lawn, and there is no reason with 20

~~except~~ or 25 cases to say. They can do the same thing. It makes a perfect

sense, ^{So shall he} ~~to~~ sprinkle many nations, not till _____ ⁻ⁱⁿ⁻ sprinkled. /The other

cases- I gave you, in ~~Isaiah 63~~ that was ~~a~~ ^{another} verse in Isaiah. Was that

a purification? ^{It was} /Not a ~~purifi~~ ^{the} purification, it was a vengeance. Sprinkling was not a

part of it, and it was just an incidental featured ^{the} ~~connected~~ with /vengeance.

We have these two cases where the sprinkling is the literal, physical sprinkling

with no thought of purification connected with it. But I believe that all the

other a cases ~~where~~ ⁱ are cases where it represents purification. "So shall he

sprinkle many nations" ^d with all these usages in Exodus and Leviticus, is perfectly

ISAIAH #25

to say that
obvious ~~that-~~ what is meant, that is, /whether it has a relation to a purification
of some sort. Then we find that in the I Peter 1:, there is exactly the same
statement that these people were sprinkled with the blood of Jesus Christ.
Incidentally you notice ~~that-~~ Peter says, ing, "~~unto-o~~" ...unto obedience and
sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Chirst...." He says that the se people are
sprinkled with the blood of Jesus Christ, even using the very same syntactical
form as the Hebrew form has, "So shall he sprinkle the many nations." It
seems to me that the climax of the _____ (9.75) So shall he sprinkle
many nations. After that you start a new discussion, that is a continuation of
a little break, So shall he sprinkle many nations, then we find that it continues,
Concerning him they shall shut the kings their mouth. That is a very queer
arrangement of the words. /Concerning him They shall shut their mouth. It is a _____
_____ verb, ... subject and object. Kings shall ~~their-~~ shut their mouth
concerning him, and that is ~~a~~ not an expression ~~fo-~~ of pride, or astonishment
It expresses the ~~a~~ ~~n/~~ inability to answer the ~~questions~~ situation. They are
faced with something that is unanswerable. Kings shall shut their mouth
concerning him. People are going to be convinced even against their will.
recounted to them they have seen, "...
"... for that which had not been ~~told them shall they see, and that~~ and you
notice there the emphasis on ~~the~~ experience, ~~X~~ they have seen. Someone has
said that What Christ is looking for is not lawyers, but witnesses. ~~W/~~ Now
we do need lawyers, ~~but~~ who explains and expounds the ~~duty of a Chris-~~ law,
but the duty of ~~a~~ Christian is ~~that Christians are~~ primarily to be witnesses,
and , of course, to train the theological leaders, is always the duty of laymen.
But every ~~/~~ Christian including has to do the witnessing. And here "they have
seen it. They have actually seen it. The best argument for Christianity is

ISAHAH #25

7.80

the evidences in the lives of those who have ~~beco me~~ become Christians.

That ~~is the most~~ carries more weight than any other. I was \checkmark at an intravarsity
they were leading a camp fire (?)
camp \checkmark at one time, when the leader of the camp, different ones who ~~have~~ had
become the Christians, ~~and~~ at a college through the work ~~of~~ the intravarsity
chapels, - - - - -

to give their testimony about their experiences, and when they got through,
~~they said/that~~ he said that you could see certain points in common ~~of a-~~ in
different
the ~~ex~~periences of all these ~~peo~~ple. He said that ~~there was~~ one thing ~~common-~~
was that everyone of them ~~ev~~ before they were saved ~~at~~ had heard a clear state-
ment of what the gospel is. It had been presented to them in such a clear fashion
that they knew what it meant, but then he said that in every cases where the
testimony was given there they had seen the lives of ~~bt~~thers that influenced
them, many features that were _____ (6.50) not at all. There are
cases where without any such observations, in fact they actually
see the work of kChrist in the lives of ~~th~~ others. He did not mention
that, but I think that is somewhat I think some people have troubles,
difficulties, some frustrations, and in most cases, they come to the end of
their arguments, of their answers, of their ~~satis~~rraction, ~~f~~ of their situations
like that..... - - - Some troubles ~~com~~e in and they
need help, and needing the help, already knowing what the gospel is, they
turn to Christ for help. Some can have all sorts of t5oubles and they never bring
them to the Lord, if they do not know about the Lord at all. I think that very often
to someone,
~~a-~~ people have given some testimonies, ~~and~~ that person hears the testimony, and
shows no ~~inte~~ sign of interest whatsoever. - - - - -

ISAIAH #25

But what is interesting, the meaning of it lodges in their minds, and then troubles come later to them, and when the trouble /comes, they come to the thing that they are already familiar with ~~them--their mind~~. So that it is like ~~of~~ the scattering ~~the~~ seeds by the wayside. You cannot tell what he is going to produce. God alone knows what is to be produced. But He does not bring forth fruit without ~~w/ seed--Very often~~ having seeds sown. We just never know what fruit the seed is going to bring forth. Here they ~~they~~ see, they shut their ~~mouth~~ mouth, because what had not been recounted to them they had seen, and what they had ^{perceived.} not heard, they had ^{It} ~~to see~~, shows a complete sense/, something in their lives.

Then in chapter fifty-three, of course, as you~~X~~ know, the chapters are purely matters of convenience, and there is no inspiration of the main divisions of the chapters. In fact, in many, many cases, he is quite wrong in making chapter divisions. But chapter fifty-three starts with.. Would you please read it very, very carefully? Myung Kim? Very, very literally, the ~~fr~~ first three words of the verse 1 of chapter 53. Well, the first two words you gave us a very literal rendering, Who has believed, put confidence in, trusted to.

That is all right, but then the next word, ^{this word} ~~and~~ I think this word I think /can be more literal. What is the form of it? It can be taken as a noun form, but it is a noun form which is derived from a verb, and it can be a verb. What form of a verb is it? Who has trusted or believed, to what has been heard by us? to what we have heard? Now, our report is not a good translation at all. The word occurs a few times in the English ~~X~~Bible, with the meaning report. It is the passive participle of ⲁⲓⲱⲩ, translated report. But report can have two different meanings_ _ _ _ _

But report, I just have heard an interesting report. You have just given me an

ISAIAH #25

something that interesting report. You see the report. A report can be ~~what~~/I hear, or ~~can-~~ ~~be~~/~~what~~ I-- or something that I ~~cannot~~.tell. Our English word report has both meanings, that is, something I hear, and something I tell. But the Hebrew word does not have both meanings. Hebrew word has only one meaning. What is that ~~one~~ meaning? It is what we ~~hard~~ heard. These are not the people who are telling the ~~story~~ story, saying who has believed what we have been telling? These are the people who have heard the story. They are saying ~~that~~ Who have believed what we ~~hard~~ve heard? You see? Who have heard our report is not an incorrect translation, but to ~~thl~~ an average person, that rendering can give an incorrect idea. It sounds as if somebody ~~is-~~ ~~were~~ saying, well, I am telling you this, why don't you believe it? Because it sounds as if somebody saying, I am telling you this, why don't you believe it? And ~~w~~ that is not what it is here at all. I hard them. ~~Who~~ ~~have~~ ~~belie~~ ~~e-~~ has believed what I hard heard. That is what it is. And consequently, I have the feeling that this word report in Old English may ~~be~~ have been exactly what the Hebrew word means, but in the present day English, it does not give the average person that meaning. It is quite important when you come to interpret the phrase. Who has has believed our report? Who is saying this? Who is the ~~s~~ our? Who has believed our report? Many people say that it must be the prophet. The prophets speak stories about Christ, and ~~h~~ they say, Who ~~has~~ believed what we have been saying? That is not it says, This says, Who has believed what we have heard. Now of course, the prophets may say, well, this message I get from God, I heard from God. That might be ~~t~~he case. That would be most natural for them to say that. So that the question

ISAIAH #25

to us question
immediately occurs/when we read this/ Who has believed our report? Who
is the our? Whos/ is speaking? Who is our? And one of you expressed
to me as the answer to that question.

ISAIAH #26

Moffat's
The ~~septuagint~~ translation is a very misleading translation. I have
it
taken a verse in Hebrew, and studied ~~very~~ carefully, and found exactly what
the word means. I did not have any idea as to ~~what~~ how to ~~express~~ can I
express this in English? And the struggle to get the English word that will in
a few words give the exact idea, led me to find the exact word in the Moffat's
Such a marvellous use of English!
translation. Then when I did the same for another verse, then I found that for
the next verse, he had thrown aside the Hebrew, and then put ~~it~~ something that
has no relation whatever to the Hebrew ~~at all~~ at all. It was what just he had
through ~~what~~ should be said. So you see, you cannot trust in him. I don't
~~believe~~ believe in anything that Moffat says. Moffat ~~is~~ does not care what the
original says. He tells you what the original ought to be. And he is way, way
away from the original/ many, many times. But sometimes he expresses
very exactly... He has a marvellous command of English, and so it has been
most helpful sometimes, when you get the meaning ~~it~~ from the Hebrew to find
Moffat's suggestion as to ~~wh~~ how to say it. There are many other cases
where he does not say what the Hebrew says at all. So, ~~they should no--~~ I
say never start with Moffat and then ~~go~~ to the Hebrew, go and start with the
Hebrew, and then go to the MOffat's ~~after~~ and see if Moffat helps you/ to
express what you find in Hebrew. Now, our message may be something that

ISAIAH #26 -

we have heard. That is entirely possible. But I don't think ordinarily it is understood that way. ~~I mean - do not mean the thing I heard, - but I mean the thing~~

Ordinarily, if I say this is my message, I do not mean what I have heard, but ~~what I~~ mean what I am telling. And there is a plenty way of expressing the

thing that we are saying. The thing that is heard. Who has believed the thing that we have heard? Well, who is it that is ~~pe~~ speaking? One suggests that

~~-----~~ ~~may~~ is the po It is a sort of funny all of sudden

when Isaiah is speaking, and giving God's message, that Isaiah would all of

sudden start including a lot of other prophets, Who has believed what we

prophets have heard? If that is what he wants to say, ^{why} then doesn't he say

out we prophets or something to show who ~~he-is~~ is talking about? And you could

say, I could... Who has believed my report? Who has belived what I ~~am~~ have heard

~~telling~~, my report? ~~Ø~~ That would be quite natural for Isaiah to say. But I do

not think that Isaiah would use that editorial we of our modern times.

I don't think _____ (12.25)

So, when he says, our report, it seems to be talking about a group of people,

and who is this group of people? Well, maybe Isaiah is associating other prophets with

himself. But I do ~~kn kno~~ know of any other cases where Isaiah _____

Therefore, it would be rather strange that he should be doing here. What other

suggestion would there be? That is a very interesting suggestion. And such a

suggestion can ^{fit} be ~~well~~ very well ^{if there} ~~the~~ with the general context. But ~~is~~ is there

anything definite _____ (11.55) Yes, is there? Do you

^{would seem to} find anything in the pssage that ~~gives~~ us the suggestion ~~of~~ something to be

died with the verse? (A) Is there anything? Yes, yes, there are watchmen

ISAIZH #26

way back earlier ~~in verse~~ in 52 who are speaking. So, there is a reasonable
there speaking.
suggestion. We find watchmen mentioned. Is this the watchmen who are
~~here speaking?~~ here asking the question, Who has believed ~~our report~~ what
we have heard? I am inclined to think that the watchmen are a little too
far away to be the people here in mind particularly since there is a vital
and verse 13
break between verse 12 ~~and verse 13~~ where we stopped the discussion of
the return from the exile and verse 13, ~~where~~ we started talking ~~as~~ specifically
about the servant of the Lord, getting his work done. So, I think that this
is an excellent suggestion for consideration of the watchmen. Since the watchmen
are specifically mentioned in the earlier chapter. I think that is an excellent
suggestion for consideration, but I don't think it one for adoption, ~~but— for—~~
Is there any other suggestion for consideration? Miss Pickett? Who is that?
They have not heard. Kings? The kings are specifically mentioned. Are they
not? We have the watchmen mentioned. That was an excellent suggestion,
but we have much ~~more~~ nearer than the watchmen. The kings shall shut their
This is a general statement.
mouth at. Now who are the kings? They are not Israelites, are they? These
kings are gentiles. These kings are outside. ~~There was no~~ Israel has no king
at the time ~~of the~~ when Christ comes, but of course when Isaiah comes, if he
is going to mean the Israelite king he probably will say the King will shut His
mouth, but this is kings, and if you think of kings, you are apt to think
of various nations for them to be kings of but it is most natural to think
that the kings are Gentile kings, at least ...and so kings are going to shut their
mouths. Why are the kings going to shut their mouths, because what they have
had not been told they shall see and what they had not heard they shall consider.

9-50

Who, the Kings. We are talking about the kings, that's 3/4s of verse 15.

~~Of~~ Of course, it is not the ~~the~~ important thing that these men are kings, ~~the~~ The important thing is that this shows ~~xxx~~ that what the ~~the~~ Servant is going to ~~do~~ do in positions is ~~some~~ important that it is going to reach to people/of great importance. And not merely in a ~~post~~ position of great importance but in positions of great importance. In other words, that carries with ~~it~~ it the idea that ~~gea-go~~ geographic distribution is going to go into various nations, because various nations are going to be involved. It is going to go to the ~~pep~~ people in leadership in these various nations. Well, ~~it is~~ if it is going to go to people in leadership, it is going to go to others too, so that the kings here are representative of the Gentile and so the suggestion that Mr. Curry quoted for us is I think an excellent suggestion but I don't think ~~it~~ it is a suggestion that we have to merely face on its general relevance in the contents, I think it is one that we can draw directly from this specific statement. We ended our ~~general-~~ general statement, the work of the servant, and He is exalted, lifted up. The servant is humiliated, ~~the~~ Israel is humiliated, He ~~loses~~ loses even the appearance of a man, but by means of this ~~is~~ He is going to sprinkle many nations. Now, this many nations then are going widely out, and then we look at the wide distribution of the word of the Servant and we find that it is going to be widely extended, even including ~~the~~ people in great positions of leadership. Kings shall shut their mouths at Him, because ~~the~~ what they have heard now they see before them and what do they say, Why, ~~who-~~ who would have believed it. Who would have believed our report; I think it is just as possible to translate it, Who will believe it. It is not a statement simply that there is going to ~~believe~~ believe unbelief; that is included in the statement.

of His coming up and of His starting out. They said , Can any good thing come out of Nazareth. It ~~is~~ is not the way man would expect it to happen , and so , who would have believed what we have heard it seems to me is the idea that is involved. The ~~Atom-~~ Atonement is God's wonderful working in the Divine way, not the way ~~the~~ human beings would expect or imagine. And ~~xxx~~ so who has believed what we have heard , and then continuing, Mr. Kim....I would make it the arm of. The word is definite ~~because-~~ because it is in the construct so unless you put an you can't put a the, so I would rather ~~put~~ say the ~~are~~ arm of, so the arm of the Lord upon or ~~concerning-~~ concerning has ~~been~~ been revealed or exposed or laid bare? Now, it is very difficult at this particular point before you have more context to be altogether sure of the full meaning of this phrase. I'm not even 100% sure of it anyway. ~~Q~~ To whom is the arm of the Lord been revealed. As it stands in our King James Version, you might immediately say it's just merely a parallel , a repetition, saying, Who has believed our report; to whom has the arm of the Lord been revealed , but I think there is more to it than that. The ~~xxx~~ arm of the Lord...Jesus said to Peter, Blessed art thou , Barjonna, for flesh and blood hath not revealed this to thee, but my Father which is in heaven. It is not the thing ~~who~~ which the human being would naturally ~~expea-~~ expect. It is a divine act to reveal the arm of the Lord. It takes the Holy Spirit in our hearts to do it, so it can be to whom hath God revealed the meaning of ~~the~~ this, who are the elect of God , those who believe this and who receive the ~~understa~~ understanding of it. Now, that can be or Al may mean concentering. Al is used to mean to at times though properly , I think, to should be El rather than Al. Al is more ~~is~~ upon . NOW ~~if-~~ you might be upon whom the arm of the Lord is revealed--that might point to the Divine act of the Lord in regenerating individuals ~~who~~ through what Christ

1

suffered . If is concerning, it might be a reference to the servant, ~~concernin~~
concerning whom the arm of the Lord is revealed. How would you come to ~~thing~~
think that this should be the one who is the ~~fulfillment~~ fulfillment of the prophecy.
Now , those are the three possibilities, and I'm not sure whether you can say
dogmatically which is the meaning of this word here .

ISAIAH #27

People sometimes are dissatisfied that we do not say that this means exactly
this, but it is true in any language that there are different possibilities of
meaning, and it seems to ~~mean that~~ me vital to see what the possibilities are
and then see what there is not a possibility. And that way we get what the
meaning is in the context. In any language a statement has a various possibilities
of meaning. Here the statement as a whole is, this is something that would have
not been expected. This points out that this requires ~~the~~ Divine revelation,
The Divine intervention, to bring it to pass. It is so different from what
one might have expected. What is it that is so different? Mr. Curry?
in
Could continue please... . It could be that he goes up before us/this way.

Is there any body who like to ask some questions? We can say, who would have
Because him, before
believed it?/He would go up like this before, the one before whom you are
acting out. Who would have believed such a thing, because we would see it
this way. Or it can be before the Lord. We just cannot be too dogmatic. what goes up
Before the Lord. Or He goes up before the servant. I would be inclined to
think that it is ~~before~~ the servant, because it is explaining to us how _____
DIFFerent from what one would expect. Who would have believed this?
To whom is the the ~~L~~ arm of the Lord revealed. He goes up before him, He



He goes up before just like a tender plant, - - - - not a sudden, ~~not~~ marvellous vision of the ~~the~~ Lord's power, but a natural, gradual development where you might say, that is out of place. Then continue, Yes? (Q) Yes, yes, as a root that goes up in the desert place. The dry ground is not a bad translation, for it gives the idea, but it is not literal. From the earth, from the ground, which is a desert, which is a wilderness. The philosophers of Greece think that bring the the one who is going to give answers to the problems of life will come-up- certainly come up in Athens in the midst of all these great philosophical discussions. ~~The~~ The people of Rome think that the one who will bring all the answers to the problems of life will certainly grow in Rome, the center of power, and _____ intellectually way out there, the ~~is~~ in the little land of Palestine, in that desert region. They don't expect to be out in the corners ~~of~~ in the world that such a thing would happen. They expect ~~it~~ ~~to~~ - it to happen in ~~the~~ one of the great centers of life and thought. Who would have believed that this would happen in this corner in the first two centuries of the world? I am pretty sure that ~~many~~ there were many of them ~~who~~ who would have believed that You mean to say that the Redeemer is going to come there. That seems to be _____, just a like Miss Chung ? a root coming out from a dry land, out of a desert place. Yes? I would not say that יָבֵשׁ could ~~would~~/not be a construct state, but I don't think ~~it~~ the meaning requires it so. A land of a dry place, would not be impossible, but I think a land which is a dry place, a desert place, seems to sound better. A land which is a desert. You see, this is a word for ground, not for land. I would say that grammatically, as far as form is concerned, יָבֵשׁ can be a construct, but as far as the meaning is concerned, יָבֵשׁ does not mean ground, but it

~~means~~

ISAIAH #27

means a land, a region, or area, and a region of wilderness, I don't think, makes a good sense. So, on the basis of the meaning of אֶרֶץ, if the word, _____ which means ground, the ground of the desert. There I think the construct would be quite feasible. Thank you very much for the question, Miss Chung.

. . . . Well, we have not gotten too far, well, we will continue from there tomorrow.....

ly
 Certain^{ly} it seems to be the most reasonable interpretation. The only people that is mentioned in the context, ~~whoc~~ who would be reasonable to have said this^{or} in the previous verse the kings will shut their mouth^{at him} it is logical to think that they are the ones who must have said, Who would have believed what we have heard? It is not what they expected to ~~give~~ be, and it is not what they would have expected, and it is not just the kings, even the kings say this, how, then, much more the average person would . . . they represent all the people^s / the nations, say, because it is so contrary to what they have expected. ~~It is~~ It is not astonished in the sense of some sudden change, astonishment in the sense of causing to jump, nothing like that. It is something that is very hard for them to believe. Because it is so different from what they have expected. Is any good thing ~~come~~ come out of Galilee? d Is any good thing come out of Galilee? Is this the way it is going to come? Who would have believed what we have heard? Mr. Curry, did you have a suggestion? That is a correct statement, but I would think perhaps it is not quite complete. That is . . . the kings ~~shall~~ shall shut their mouth in the previous verse says, Now, who are those kings? Are these kings the Jews? How many kings would there be among the Jews? At that particular time? It seems most~~ly~~ likely that

~~ISIAH~~- ISIAH #27 Z

when it is plural, it would seem that THIS IS not, but ~~this might~~ represents a number of different kings, ~~since it is in plural, and, of course,~~ of course, just before that, we have read that he will sprinkle ~~many~~ nations, so we have nations in view. and now we find that these nations including their most common people are going, some of them to come to the knowledge of truth. They are going to shut their mouth, and ~~there-~~ there is no answer they can give, but there are going to be surprises/d to what they find. This the way it actually is going to happen. So, they say ~~this-~~ these nations are represented by them, and may include the Jews, or it may not. But certainly includes the gentiles. They say, Who would have believed what we have heard? Yes? I do not personally think that that would be a correct answer. There are commentaries that have suggested that it is the prophets who said, Who have believed our report? But I would expect that the prophets would have said, Who have believed what we have told them.? This is what we told them, This is what we ~~hard-~~ heard. Of course, the prophets could have said, we ~~hard-har~~ have heard from God, and we pass it on. That would not be a logical one to say. ~~But you- that would not be a logical thing to say,~~ Who has believed what we have heard, and then say, Who has believed what we have told them? So, it does not seem to me that it fits with the prophets. And also it seems to me that the whole context ~~and the idea -~~ gives us the idea that the way it is going to be spread out, and therefore, it is not going to be believed by everybody, but it is going to be something which ^{seems} is strange to anybody to believe. It seems strange to anybody to believe, because it is so different from what they expect. And so, it would seem to me ~~that~~ to make a much ~~er~~ better sense to have the kings rather to have prophets... purely imaginary to assume the prophets

—EZF

ISAIAH #27

in, because there is nothing in the context that suggests the prophets. Unless way back in the previous chapter we find some watchmen. But ~~is~~ it is a long way from the mention of the watch-men. _____ It is in the context, it says, the prophets are amazed at what they hear. /Who has believed what we have heard? It is perfect to say, Prophets, there is, however, no mention of prophets before or afterwards. So, it seems to me that it is a sort of dragging apart out of the air, because there is no mention of it where as the kings are ~~ment~~ mentioned right there. That is the reason I ~~think~~ I would think it is much more like that it refers to something that is mentioned here than something that is not mentioned. Now I do not wish to be dogmatic on it. I don't say that it has to be this way. But I think that the evidence is far stronger for the kings who are mentioned than the prophets who are not mentioned in the context. (Q) Yes, ~~Y~~ yes, it is entirely possible, but I think it unlikely ~~that~~ because if that were the case, Isaiah would have said, Who would have believed what I have heard? /Instead of what we have heard? It doesn't seem to me that we fits with Isaiah. The we may appear to point to a group of prophets, but there is ~~no~~ nothing in the context that ~~proves~~ ^{suggests} the ~~group~~ group of prophets. Isaiah, of course, has heard, He is right. You could consider that it is something that Isaiah heard, but then it would certainly be expected to be singular then, / rather than plural. I would understand that Isaiah is here showing how kings shut thier mouths at him, they say, we have heard of something that we never dreamed of, and we find it true. He is just describing that as their attitude. And now he is picturing the very words they are using. They say, who would have believed what we have heard? It is just exactly

~~where~~

ISAIAH #27

It fits exactly what was in the previous verse, what was in the previous verse. ~~It~~ seems to me. It fits exactly in the context from that viewpoint. And then the passage goes on to say, He has no form nor comliness that we should desire him. Who are we that should desire? It might the people that are like _____ But we have no specific mention of the people there I think the people are included there, but it seems to me that the kings represent all the great multitude of the people to whom the message is brought about him. And they say, what a strange thing. He goes up like a tender plant/ from a dry ground. ~~How can~~ ^{Can any} good thing come out of Galilee? Who would have expected it to be this way? There is no form, nor comelienss that we should desire him. It ~~stress~~ ^{merely} expresses all the people to whom the message come, which include not ~~only~~ the kings, but also all the gentiles, but not only all ~~the~~ gentiles, but all the ~~Jess~~ Jews who have seen him. But I do not ~~X~~ think that there is nothing that suggests _____ O3.50)

We do not ordinarily think that the prophets are that skeptical. These people are rather skeotical, and rather surprised, when God shows them the truth. I think that they are included, definitely, but I think that it ^dincludes not only the people who see the thing, ^{isi brought} but to whom the message ~~comes~~ and ~~that~~ is ~~teh-way~~ the way ~~King James Version~~ it starts from the kings. The message goes out from ~~the~~ simple people of Galilee~~here~~, it goes out from them, and it goes out to many ~~n~~ountries and nations, and he says, he will sprinkle many nations. ~~It~~ And it reaches ~~not only~~ not only the poor people of the nations, but also some of the kings, even the kings may have to shut their mouth at him. They see what they did not expect, and so it includes the people of that ~~day~~, but it seems to me that it ~~is~~ very definitely also includes the gentiles, I do

ISAIAH #27

not think that it can be restricted to the Jews alone. Miss Chung, _____
not
is the reason why we have to say that God is ~~is~~ speaking through the prophets,
because== I do not see any basis for it. Now, if there is any I would be interested
in having it pointed out, but I see nothing in it. ~~I-mean-~~ I mean you can ~~of~~ take
any place in the Bible, and say that here is a dozen prophets talking, but I
do not see any basis for it. God spoke through~~ly~~ a group of ~~of~~ prophets at certain
times as such evidences are available in the Scriptures, but in most cases, he spoke
through ~~me~~ one prophet. And in this case where he ~~sya~~ says my servant, that
is not Isaiah, that is God, God is ~~is~~ speaking through Isaiah. I do not see
you can get any prophet then. Now there are many commentators who say it, and
ally say that it is wrong.
therefore I am not certainly dogmatic/~~about it--~~ But I do not see
any ~~evidence-basis-for-it.-God-spoke~~ evidence whatever on the basis and if
anybody finds any evidence, I would be interested. I don't see any whatever,
but there are many things that you will find ~~a~~ in commentators that are made by
taking a verse by itself and not paying any attention to content, and it seems to
me that they are cases where we have to ~~th~~ interpret a verse without a place
or context but I don't think that's the best way to do, ~~z~~ I think usually, and
especially here I think it is all ~~th~~ tightly tied ~~togete~~ together, God is speaking
to one prophet. I don't think any of them suggest a group of prophets, now, if
any~~d~~ you come across evidence, I would be glad to have it mentioned, but I don't
see any. But continuing, we noticed yesterday ~~th~~ t he said And upon whom ~~the~~
has the arm of the Lord been laid bare or ~~z~~ revealed and it seems to me that this
shows ~~the~~ how ~~diff~~ different it would be from what people would expect, that
these particular individuals here and there are the ones to whom God reveals
His ~~mea~~ message. That God gives His revelation, His message of salvation to

one here and here and here, and He reveals Himself. It is God who reveals. Again, I don't see any prophets ~~x~~ in it. It seems to me that He is pointing out the recipients of salvation and it is Divine selection not a human selection. It is not that these people are more clever than ~~other~~ others. ~~So that~~

ISAIAH # 28

So that it ~~xx~~ seems to ~~the~~ me that we have here the unlikelihood of the salvation being the way it is , it's not ~~man~~ what man would ~~x~~ have selected but it is ~~what~~ God's method and God's selection of those who were to understand, it is not what man would have picked. To whom is the ~~arm~~ arm of the Lord been revealed. ~~The~~ This is ~~the~~ surprising the selection that God has made. Well, I certainly don't see any ~~problem~~ prophets, whatever. The prophets are perhaps the ones you would expect to have , not the ones you would say, To whom . And then continuing there, Mr. Curry would you read . It ~~is~~ is very definitely , I would think, ^{a apposition,} /a land that is desert. A ~~der~~ desert land can be called a dry land but it is not a literal ~~k~~ translation, it is a land that is desert or a land that is desert. In other words, can any good thing come out of Nazareth. The Romans think, What would you think of any thing important coming from this ~~lx~~ little land of Palestine. I don't ~~thing~~ think the prophets would ever say that. Prophets would expect ~~x~~ it ~~to be~~ ~~him~~ to come from the land that He came from. This is the nations seeing how strange it is that God would bring His salvation in the way that He has, and then ~~contn~~ continuing there, Mr. Kim. It's always interested to ~~x~~ see how a ~~k~~ word like this is translated in the King James Version, and so we look up the word Toar in the back of Young's Concordance and we find that Toar is translated once, countenance, three times form, and once visage. Well, now countenance and visage are the same. They are two different ways of saying face. So, four times it is translated face and

three times it is translated form , so it would stand ~~for~~ for a human appearance, wouldn't it. A human appearance, a face, ~~and~~ an attractiveness, a face ~~or~~ or a figure. So there is no visage, it doesn't say ~~good~~ good visage or bad visage it just says visage, there is no form, well, he must have some kind of a form. Very ~~litter~~ literally, it is not a form to him, and this word to him is a ~~v~~ very common Hebrew idiom. The ~~id~~ idiom is when you say that some one has a horse --in Hebrew you will say, There is a horse to him. Someone owns a house , you will say there is a house to him. They ~~ave~~ have no word have. The expression to possess is used by this ~~proper~~ preposition . There is a form to ~~him~~ Him. That means He has a form. So there is not a face or countenance to Him, that means He has no face. And that doesn't seem to make much sense, does it? He has no face, there is no face to Him. He has no visage, no countenance and she ~~when~~ went on and said Dignity for _____. Well, now , dignity is not very bad for _____. I think it is just as good , as a matter of fact, as ~~k~~ what the King James ~~Sas~~ says, comeliness. I think one of them is just as ~~is~~ good as the other, but I think we can probably do better than ~~or is~~ either one of the m. The word occurs ~~in the~~ according to Youngs , there are two different words. I think one of them ~~probabl~~ probably is in reference to Aramaic, but the word that they give here (oh, yes, they give two here ~~for~~ Hebrew) one ~~is~~ they say countenance, honour , glorious. The other they say beauty, comeliness, excellency, glory, honour, and majesty. Seven times majesty which ~~set~~ certainly isn't far from dignity at all, five times honour , and six times ~~k~~ glory. So here we have nineteen times glory and honour and majesty , and dignity in one interpretation is exactly the same, not being dignified but having a dignified standing or position, ~~and~~ in that sense dignity is not bad at all. Now it is ~~tran~~ translated comeliness twice. It is translated beauty four times and excellency four times. Now

comeliness is not bad but it ~~sees~~ seems to me glory or majesty or something like that is better, and so if you say that He has ~~not~~- no face and He has no ~~glory~~ glory , is it not likely that ~~it~~ you are ~~put~~ putting two things ~~to~~ together as is often done, in Hebrew, meaning there is no glory of face, there is no attractiveness of appearance. It ~~is~~ certainly doesn't mean that He hasn't a face. It means that it is not a face that is an ~~attractive~~ attractive one. He has no glory of face. And the next word, Miss Luke inserted a few things that I don't find in the Hebrew. So I stopped her to look at this first one, and ~~now~~ now the next word, would you read that ~~again~~ again to us Miss ~~Lue~~ Luke. And we shall see Him, He has no face and there is no glory when we shall see ~~Him~~ Him . I m not sure but what and could be taken that way but it seems to me a better way to take the and is to take it as so that , especially when it is preceding an ~~imperfect~~ imperfect, so ~~that~~ we should look at Him, ~~there is~~ there is no beauty that should attract us to look at Him, there is no beauty of ~~face~~ face, so that we say, My, what a wonderful man, Isn't it marvelous. There is not ~~that~~ sort of attractiveness that He has. He came with marvelous teaching. He came with a wonderful life but it is not the kind of glory of a great conqueror or a great philosopher who comes and attracts people in that way. There is no ^{glory} ~~beauty~~ in this ~~w~~ one as the thing that attracts people to Him that we ~~should~~ should look to ~~in~~ Him. Alexander rather ~~rejects~~ rejects this because it doesn't say ~~look-upon~~ look upon Him, it just says see Him, ~~But~~ I don't ~~the-think~~ see any great difference ~~in~~ in see Him and look upon Him. At any rate, the Waw here ~~is~~ seems to me is exactly the same form as ~~the-~~ you have the last word in the line and usually clauses like that are parallel, and especially ~~wh~~ en they have the identical form. Let's look at the rest of the verse. Miss Chung, would you read on please. The Asher is sometimes used for a relative clause , the one whom we will do or which we will do this, but very often the re is usage to

ISAIAH #28

that germs gets you. But they did not have germs ~~that-~~ in those days.

We may say ~~that~~ it is something that virus gives you. They were not aware of virus in those days. Literally the word, _____ means something that removes your ease or comfort. So, the Hebrew word does not distinguish ~~between~~ something that germs give you and ~~some~~ thing that man gives you. A man may stick a dagger in your side, and it does not kill you, and it gives you a discomfort, a dis-ease, physical unpleasantness. So the word is ~~used~~ usually used for physical unpleasant-ness. So the word is ~~used~~ usually used for physical unpleasant ness/ whether ^{caused} by a physical thing like a blow./ or ~~by a~~ fall, or a break or something like that.

~~Then from that, whether it is caused by a germ~~ it may be ~~covered by-~~ passed on to cover anything, but when we say that one is acquainted with griefs, why, that is a little too general. More it refers to his ~~weariness of ph his-~~ awareness of physical infirmities, and difficulties like that. But here it describes him as not one who simply _____ skipping.

)3.00) ~~How he is hurt, when one is - he~~ How he is hurt, when he suffers ^{the} ^{of} and things like that. One, who enters into ^{to} infirmities ~~in~~ human life in that

_____ have seen the power of God/ the Galilean peasants, to the average persons who suffer. "Acquainted with disease or ~~su~~ misery or _____

AND THAT very/ⁿ next word which I have just had, Mr. Kim, what does the word mean, you can tell us. Do you have a question? Yes, it shows the humiliation of the servant of God these verses show// (Q) So different from what they expected/ for a great, marvellous, miraculous inter^yvention of God's ~~re~~ tremendous power. And we may have to stop there. We have assigned six verses for this week, but we have got to only three of them. This time I will assign only three verses, but please review the whole nine.

show that something has a certain ~~ref~~ result and the result ~~was that~~ clause is usually in the ~~impre~~ imperfect introduced by a Waw. He did this that ~~that~~ would happen, He did this ~~as~~ and that would happen. That ~~is~~ in that case is not ~~He~~ like a relative clause. It ~~don-does~~ doesn't mean an appearance that we will desire it means ~~in~~ an appearance so that we will desire. It is a ~~xxx~~ result ~~clac~~ clause, so that we will desire. Then, verse three, Miss Chung. There is no question that they who is that we ~~w~~ should desire ~~him~~ and so it is translated in all translations, I know of, Well, if you take ~~k~~ it that way, it seems strange not ~~to~~ to take the identical form before in the same way. That's ~~why~~ what seems strange to me that the identical form shortly before in the same way.

That is what seems strange to me that the identical form is taking the _____ one. But now in this case, we are _____ (5.45) to switch to take it, we will despise or being despised. What is the next word? יָדוּעַ (Yadoo) is Qal passive participle, just like עֲבוּרָה. And this is a construct/. It is the construct of the Qal passive participle. from יָדַעַ, to know. It is the construct of the Qal passive participle. I did not put that on the best, because I knew that every body would know it. This particular word, יָדוּעַ. to know. He is one who ~~is~~ is known of, one who is acquainted with. And disease would be the interpretation given for דָּבָר. דָּבָר is very often used in the Bible for illness, or disease. And there we want to realize that the Bible is written in words used ^{two} / thousands years ago. And there are ideas that ⁱⁿ recent we have today, as a result of the ~~developments~~ / science which the people ~~that-~~ at that time did not have. Therefore, they did not have the word _____.

_____ . What is the disease? They say that disease is ~~something~~ ^{something}

THAT a germ gets ~~x~~ you, but they didn't have germs in those days. You say it is something that a virus gets you. But they were ~~x~~ not aware of ~~x~~ viruses in ~~ix~~ those days. Literally the word _____ in English is something~~x~~ that ~~se-~~ removes your ease, your comfort, and so the Hebrew word does not distinguish between that a germ gives you and something ~~xxx~~ that another man gives you. Man sticks a ~~eg~~ dagger into your side and it doesn't kill you, it gives you discomfort, a physical unpleasantness, so the word is usually used for physical unpleasantness whether it is caused by a germ or a physical thing like a blow or a fall or a break or something like that, and then from that it may be passed on to cover any type. But when you say acquainted with grief, why that is a little too general, I think it is more referring to the awareness of physical infirmities and ~~idf-did~~ difficulties, but here it describes Him as one not ~~goi~~ who simply ~~grew-up-with-the-proper-~~ flew up to the top of the temple and ~~simply~~ threw ~~h~~ Himself off and showed how He wasn't hurt, He suffered in all things like~~x~~ as we do, who entered into the infirmities of human life. He did not seem to have the power of God, He seemed to be a Galilean peasant to the average ~~m~~ person. Acquainted with ~~dies-~~ disease ~~am~~ and misery and suffering and that is very ~~much-~~ next word is one which we just had on our ~~x~~ test so Mr. Kim you can tell us what the next word is. You have a question? It shows that ^{humiliation} the/~~degradation~~ of the Servant of God, different from what was expected of the marvelous miraculous intervention of God's power. And we are going to have to stop there, we assigned six verses but we have only gotten~~xn~~ over three of them. Next time, I will only assign three new ones. Please review the whole nine. Three More in real good shape.

ISAIAH 29 #

_____ surely it is a literal rendering of that fourth word in the last section half/of the ~~last verse~~ -- second verse, so that we should see him, or we should look at him. Otherwise, the translation, And when we see him, I never heard of this imperfect form with waw ever meaning and when we see him. What would be the ordinary way of ^{saying in} Hebrew when we see him? This line~~s~~ has two clauses which are exactly parallel. So it seems to me that that would be the most ^{taking} preferable way of ~~saying it~~. so that we should see him. There is no ~~sign~~ glory or sign that would lead us to look for it... that we should see him. And ^{Hebrew} continue. Yes, both of them are quite regular, normal ~~and natural~~ way of expressing ~~such ideas in~~ a result. It is a common thing. And that it is exactly ~~to each other.~~ ~~parallel.~~ It seems that ~~parallel~~ to each other. It seems as if _____ is...

I just don't quite see how we can get this out of that. What about the waw that follows it? See, we have four waws in the verse. And what is the point of ^{to go} the waw next to the last waw, if it is not ~~the~~ separate the main part of it, and _____ when we shall see him, there is beauty that we should desire him. ^{out} If you take it taht way, why, you have left/~~the~~ waw, the next waw ~~to get~~== altogether. It is not a big point, but it does seem to me that the two parts are parallel.

Let us go on to verse three, Mr. Young Ik Kim. Probably this necessitates/a ^{the infirmity as} subjective genitive. One made known of the ~~infer~~ infirmity would be one to whom the infirmity is made known. ~~Antou~~ Although acquainted with ~~gret~~ grief, acquainted with infirmity is not a translation at all. For it does not say that at literally. Literally, it is passive, being made known. ~~Byt~~ But the pain or the infirmity is made known. Pain is made known. So, I think that ~~of~~ acquainted with ^{English} it is probably a good idiomatic~~y~~/translation ~~of~~ but not a literal rendering. And continue. Like one who causes to hide his face from him. Like one who

ISAIAH #29

to esteem

In the present day ~~English~~, English, ~~it~~ means to think highly of, but I do not think עזר has the idea of thinking highly, but just ~~considering~~, to consider or to give estimation, or maybe to give a good estimation or bad estimation. I think it would be more of an idea not so much that he is ^{not} one of whom we highly think ~~of~~, but ~~as one~~ as one whom we did not think it necessary to think a lot about him. One whom we do not specially consider. He was despised and set aside ~~and~~ without consideration, rather than not thinking ~~of him~~ highly of him. That is of course comparatively a small ~~and~~ point. The next one that, Miss Luke, can you read the next one please? Number four? Yes, what does this word, surely mean? It means that it is certain. I noticed that the word is translated as certain in one case. In Zephanaiah 3:7, it is translated, but. In Isaiah 15:15, therefore, I suppose then that it just means it is quite a, it is of course, it is ~~definite~~ definite that This is of course definite when you are sure of ~~it~~ a thing, or you can say so when it is contrasted. Yes? Definitely so and so. I still think this word conveys the precise meaning. Surely, then, certainly, truly. Yes, yes, this word, עזר means to ~~lift~~ lift up. It is often used as lifting up something, importing. This word, שׂוּב is very similar to ~~but the basic meaning is to transport~~ the emphasis there is on the transporting. It means transporting something something by means of lifting it up ~~something~~ and carrying it. Both have the emphasis on the lifting up something. The word, שׂוּב, the emphasis ~~of~~ on the שׂוּב is more of lifting up and this עזר is more of carrying it along. Both of them can express the lifting up and carrying it along. In that way, they can be synonyms in that sense. מ So you could take שׂוּב first, lift up ~~and~~ עזר as carry along. He lifts up and carry it along. In other words, he is lifting ^{it} up and carrying along.

ISAIAH #29

(Q) Yes, he takes away a out sicknesses and our pains away. Yes. And the translation of the King James is ~~truly--~~ , "he has borne our ~~greif~~ and ~~carry--~~ carried our sorrows. Sickness or disease. Pains are sorrows. But I think the Hebrew words are more specific than these words. So that it would seem more to refer to specifically to his physical things rather than his general things. Physical pains may have been used as figures of speech for ~~general things~~. But as is given it is physical ~~pains~~ pains. ~~Something--~~ therefore think that this, ~~therefore~~, shows that healing is in the atonement. Here he has borne our grief and carried our pains. Therefore Jesus ~~D--~~ died on the cross ~~and-~~ to take away our ~~sicke-~~ sicknesses from us. And we have no right to get sick. It shows like ~~k-~~ a faith, we should say. we might say, we are not sick. we are not sick. It is ~~m~~ just a matter of mortal errors, or it is just a matter of my having not faith enough. This ~~cancer- can-~~ cancer is growing, and growing. But they say they do not have ~~faith~~ enough. If they have enough faith, that cancer should go away. For our Jesus did take ~~we~~ away our disease and pains from ~~our-~~ us. Because after all Jesus bore our pains and our ~~dise-~~ sick sicknesses in the atonement. Now, is there anything wrong ~~with-the~~ with that argument? You do not bear them, and there is ~~no reason for your~~ They say that your sins are laid on him. There is therefore no reason for your needing to your complaining feel bad, feel sorrowful , repent of your sins, Christ has borne them, you are free. You should ~~w//~~ learn to sin no more. /Over the house. As far as _____ - Christ has ~~take~~ taken that. Well, now, if this says, this does not say that he has borne our sins. The King James agree that he has carried our sorrows, but they are ~~phys~~ physical/sorrows. That is ~~what-~~ what t he word is. ~~If the word - (Heb.) - word~~ If the Hebrew word says, he has ~~carried~~ borne

~~our pains~~

ISAIAH #29

our pains, our sicknesses, it is just like _____ (6.95) (Q) I do not know whether there is a real parallel or not. But I think this is a big argument that this shows that in the atonement he took away our pains and our sicknesses. then why should we have to bear them? But the question is what does this verse have to do with the atonement? Have we had anything about atonement yet? Miss Chung, what would you like to say? (Q- (A) That is a very interesting suggestion. I have never heard it. I have never heard of that before, but I think there should be a lot to be said for that. I never thought of it before. As I understand it, the question seems to be a very good one. If this is a picture of ^{the} atonement, _____ he has on the cross borne ~~the~~ suffering which we deserved, for our sake, and therefore, it refers to his suffering rather than our suffering. His ~~be~~ suffering ^{as} being the suffering that we deserved, therefore, that is ours in that sense. But the difficulty with it is that he says that he ~~has~~ taken away and and he carried and borne, not borne in the sense of undergoing. In English, the word has two meanings ^{to take away} The common rendering of the word _____ is ~~more~~ to endure. Surely he has endured the suffering that should have been ours. That would be very different. If you take the word in that sense. But the Hebrew word is to take away, not simply to endure, but to ^{if} take away to free us from, so ~~to free us from~~ if it means to free us from/this is a picture of atonement, it would mean to say that our pains and suffering have been taken away as a result of what he has done. Now it is true that eventually all our suffering is going to be taken away from believers as a result of what He ^s had done on the cross. Physical suffering is related to sin, even though it is not necessarily related to our ^{own} sins, ^{but} it is related to sin

ISAIAH #29

450.

resurrection
 in the world, and when that is removed we will be given our ~~resurrected~~ body.
 And eventually we will be all free from any suffering, and we would not be if
 he had not performed the atonement. But the basic thing that people overlooks
 is, why should ~~they~~ they be the descri^aption of the atonement any way. Now,
 they say, Isaiah 53 is ~~the-greatest~~ passage on the atonement. That is right.
 It is. But if the whobe chapter is a great passage on the atonement, does it
 mean that he is lying about the atonement? As a matter of fact, up to the
 present point, what have we had about the atonement? He Just a statement
 that he will sprinkle the nations. That is all that we had as yet in chapter 52
 and 53 about the atonement. There is no other mentioned made about the atone-
 ment. And then all the sudden he says, surely he bore our pains and our
 sick~~nesses~~nesses. We did not have the atonement. That is reading into it.
 That is readi ng into it. Isn't it? What ground now do you have to read into
 it? If you have been ~~He is~~ talking about the atonement several verses ago, then you have
 another verse, it is a natural suggestion, if that can be a statement referring
 to the atonement? When you have not had the atonemebt, except for the
 brief
 one simple statement several verses back, if he is ~~still talking about the-~~
~~atonement?~~ starting to talke about _____, you have to prove if that is
 the case. But _____)3.00) (Yes) There is
 a point. The New Testament says, ~~A/~~ by his stripes, we are healed. The
 New Testament say s that is the description of the atonement. And that in
 much
 Isaiah 53 raises ~~a~~ a presumption that there may be ~~more~~ in Isaiah 53
 about the atonement also , because it directly proves the particular _____
 more
 about, Because it suggests that there may be much about it in Isaiah 53 than
 about the atome ment alone. Then how about this particular line? ~~He has~~

Do

ISAIAH #29

We had nothing about the atonement yet/ up to this point~~x~~, except the statement that he shall sprinkle ^{many} ~~the~~ nations. That, of course, after you notify it very clearly, but at your first feading/ of the verse whom Isaiah gives that would not be very clear. But when you come to this statement, what would somebody in Isaiah's day mean as he says that somebody has taken away our ~~sins~~ sicknesses and carried off our pains? He would immediately say that he is ~~/~~ describing the atonement. What would he say he is describing? And, also, in touch with what Miss Pickett said, Is ~~it~~ there a New Testament statement that says this is dealing with the Atonement. Well, do you have any N.T. quotations of this particular statement that we are looking at now. John The Baptist said, "This was the Lamb of God which takes ~~the~~ away the sin of the world. That word, Take away, ~~x~~ is the exact ^{duplicate} ~~wo~~ of this word here, but this says that He has taken away our sick~~ness~~ and our pain, that says He takes ~~x~~ away the sin of the world. I don't think we could say that John ~~bx~~ the Baptist's ^{is} ~~statement~~ in the ~~xx~~ quotation of this verse, because there is only one word in the passage. Is there any ~~x~~ statement in the N.T. where there is what we would say ISAIAH # 30 is a quotation of this verse. Mr. Curry? We look at Matt. 8:17 and see if we have~~x~~ there a quotation from this ~~vere~~ verse and if we do see how it is used. What does Matt. 8:17 say? When the even was come, verse 16, they brought out to Him many that were possessed with devils. This is just after telling about Peter's wife and Mother and then it goes on. Many others who were possessed with devils, and He cast out the spirits with His word, ~~th~~ and healed all that were sick: That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities, and bare our ~~sin~~ ~~sicken~~ sickness." Now Jesus ~~id~~ did not then Himself ~~tal~~ take on the ~~sicke~~ ~~sin~~ sickness that these ~~px~~ people

had. He cured them of it. He took it away from them. He carried it away. It doesn't say He took it on Himself but He took it away from them. There is no explanation in this verse, Matt. 8:17 has no ~~reference~~ reference to the Atonement but it does refer to Matt. 8:16 describing the healing ministry that Jesus performed in His earthly life. And ~~verse~~ verse 17 says that Jesus earthly ministry was a ~~fulm-~~ fulfillment of this verse ; therefore, Matt. explicitly ~~tes~~ tells that this verse in Isaiah is a description of Jesus' healing ministry, and we have your Bibles that have references to them sometimes will ~~have~~ refer to a verse in I Peter about His taking away our sins. It ~~xxx~~ could just as well refer to the ones in John the Baptist's Day, ~~z~~ but there is ~~xx~~ only one thing in common, the word ~~ti-~~ took ~~w~~ away, and actually we have no N.T. Reference to say what we just read these words are speaking about the Atonement, but we have a specific statement in Matt. that this is a ~~prediction~~ prediction of Jesus' healing ministry. And when we claim ~~heal~~ healing , ...but I don't this ~~very~~ very particular verse in Isaiah has anything to do with that. This particular verse in Isaiah , according to Matt. is a prediction of the healing ministry that Jesus performed in ~~his~~ his earthly life. And that is all that it is . Now there are other verses that bring out those wonderful ~~truths~~ truths , but this verse is talking about Jesus ' earthly ministry and so this particular verse cannot be used as an ~~eve~~ evidence of healing in the Atonement because it is not about the Atonement --it is about Jesus' earthly ministry. Yes? As we study the atonement, we see that the Atonement eventually will be the complete release of all Christians from all ...eventually, but this particular verse is not speaking about the Atonement , this particular verse is speaking about Jesus ' ~~early~~ earthly ministry,' therefore, any argument about the Atonement meaning that we don't need doctors, that we get healed simply through

our faith in Christ ~~is~~ cannot be based on this verse because this verse is not talking about the Atonement , that is , this part of the Atonement . This part of the verse is picturing some people ~~we~~ who see Christ. These are the ones who are saying, Who could have believed what we have ~~ea- ha~~ heard? Who could think that out of a dry ground here would come something ~~is~~ so wonderful as you say. They are very skeptical. Well, they say, it is true that He took away our ~~sicknss-~~ sickness. It is true that He took away our diseases but we esteemed ~~him-~~ Him stricken, smitten of God and afflicted. He ~~shows-~~ showed wonderful healing power. ~~is~~ He said , If you won't ~~belief-~~ believe my words, believe me for my ~~Word-~~ Works ~~sake~~ sake. They say, we ~~saay~~ saw your works but we did not believe. In spite of the fact that He performed these miracles, when He was taken , we said He ~~is~~ ~~is~~ was smitten of God. It is ~~is~~ ~~is~~ a further elaboration of ~~unbelif~~ unbelief described ~~is~~ in the first verses of this chapter; that is, that He did not come any immediately ~~apparte-~~ apparent evidence; and here they refer to ~~one~~ evidence and this is a great evidence of His deity and His power ; that He was able to perform these mighty miracles of Healing and they said, Who hath believed ~~wh~~at we have heard. Why, even when we saw this, like the men on the road to Emmaus, who said, We thought that He was the one who was going to redeem Israel. He has been taken by ~~wid~~ wicked hands and slain. He isn't the one that is going to redeem Israel. ~~There~~ are those who suggest that on the basis of the ... and there are one or two verses that have been ~~interpre-~~ interpreted that way. Most have not been ~~it~~ interpreted that way. Most take it that the suffering that Christ bore on the ~~cor-~~ ~~cor~~ cross ~~is~~ that there He bore the pain which takes the place of what we ~~is~~ would bear, but that He went to Hell to suffer there is ~~not~~ no basis for that . There is a verse which may mean that He went to the abode of the departed spirits to announce ~~th~~ what He had done on the

cross. ~~There-~~ That is a possibility but there is much dispute, but there is no verse that would indicate that He went to Hell to suffer. (?) No, as you pointed out the last part of the chapter is still the reference to the ~~α~~ Atonement. Verse twelve has it in it. Verse eleven has it in it. It's not specifically in nine but the definite reference to the crucifixion. Eight has it in it. Seven had a reference to Messiah rather than to the crucifixion. Six has the Atonement very definitely. ~~Five~~ Five has it very definitely. So when you have the Atonement in verse after verse from five on. We do not have the Atonement ~~described~~ described in verse one, two, or three. So your question is, "Does the ~~describe~~ description of the Atonement start with verse four or verse five, and the answer is ~~the-a~~ that the first part of verse four is specifically interpreted in the N.T. as a description of ~~Jesus-~~ Jesus' healing ministry. There is no quotation in the N.T. for the second part of verse four, but ~~yes-~~ verse five is specifically quoted in the N.T. as the Atonement. And verse four here is a parallel to ~~yes-~~ verse one rather than to verse five. ~~R~~ Verse four is carrying on the idea of verse one, that this thing is not what men would have expected. Who would believe it. This is something that is the way that God has done it but not the way that man ~~has-~~ would expect it. So they say, Well, it is true that He healed --He did marvelous ~~words-of-~~ works of healing. We should have recognized that He was the Son of God when we saw Him doing these miracles, but when they took and killed Him we did not think ~~the~~ this was the Son of God. We ~~had-seen-Him-stricken-~~ esteemed Him stricken, smitten of God and afflicted. ~~We-simply~~ The disciples, on the road to ~~Emmaus~~ Emmaus, they said, We thought He was the one who was going to redeem Israel. He did these wonderful miracles, we thought He was the one who was going to redeem Israel, but He has been taken by wicked hands and slain, our hopes were all ~~sht-~~ shattered. This ~~α~~ is a description of the people

who did not believe, they were shattered until the ~~resue-~~ resurrection came and they proved it. So the description ~~that~~ of their feeling ~~that~~ way is given in verse four and then we go on to verse five to get the true explanation. He wasn't one who was smitten of God and afflicted. He was one who was bearing our sickness. So verse five shows the error that was made in the last part of verse four. And the ones who ~~w~~ are describing the next to the last part of verse four are admitting that they shouldn't have made such an estimate, because they saw His wonderful ~~word-~~ works. That is verse five which is giving the true explanation of that of which the disciples gave a false explanation. Verse four is first the wonderful miracles of healing, second, the false explanation given ^{when} by the disciples and ~~there-then~~ they saw the ~~true-~~ crucifixion, they did not interpret it as the Son of ~~God~~ Glory doing a great act, but as a man who they thought was the great Redeemer but proved not to be by the fact that He was ~~xxx~~ thus mistreated. ~~He said~~ They said, We esteemed Him smitten, stricken, of God and afflicted. We thought He was ~~xxx~~ going to ~~be~~ be the one who was going to redeem Israel, but they go on to say how wrong they were in this false ~~impressis-~~ ~~occurred-~~ occurred. impression. It's an exact picture of ~~what/occured-~~. We find actually the meaning of the Atonement is in verses five and following, and ~~xxx~~ in so doing it ~~predicte~~ predicts His marvelous healing ministry. (?) The latter of verse four shows the erroneous misinterpretation of the ~~crucifis-~~ crucifixion by those who did not understand its true meaning. and then verse five goes on to show its true ~~men-~~ meaning. They ~~simpley~~ simply thought that He was one smitten of God and afflicted. Actually ~~He~~ He was one who laid down his life voluntarily, not smitten ^a of God. He Himself laid down ~~his~~ His life for the atonement. Verse 5 ~~/~~ gives

ISAIAH # 30

the true explanation. Verse 4 gives the false interpretation of it. So that this verse is not a verse on which ~~the-~~ any argument of healing in the atonement can be properly made, because Matthew specifically says it is the ~~fulfillment of-~~ prediction of Jesus' healing ministry on earth. And we know Jesus did not heal every body, ^{today} and Jesus/can heal ~~him~~ whom he chooses. But there is no promise that He will heal everybody now. He will eventually give us ϕ bodies that are free from corruption, and weakness, but there is no promise that we will have it now.

Now we are given some more energy, some left energy, and we have responsibility to use the amount of energy given us for His glory, not to waste it. So ~~the,-~~ then , the latter part we anticipated the latter part of the verse in considering the meaning of the verse. Surely it is true that he bore our sorrows and and our ~~pain-~~ pains, that he carried ~~away~~ our sins. That is true. But what was our attitude? Do you know the emphatic we here. We do not usually put in the word ^{it is} we, /carried in ~~the~~ verb. The last part of ~~the~~ ~~we-~~ word has been we. It is right there. The first part has ~~been~~ the _____, he. - - - - - You do not have _____ he. Surely, this is what **He** did. That is **His** part. But as far as we ~~are~~ ϕ concerned, ^{as for us/} /are we completely misunderstood in the meaning of ~~its~~ what happened to Him. ^{en} He was smitten of God. He was stricken, and smittedn of God. We thought he ~~had been just one that-~~ was just one that just had _____ that had a great _____. We did not realize that He was the Lord of glory who was doing ~~this~~ in order to accomplish the great work. And in verse five, it goes on to describe ^{this} what ~~the-great force-~~ work was. This was what we thought of Him, but as for Him, He was doing so and so, and then verse five goes on and tell us why really He was smitten. He was smitten of God. The pbor fellow who got in a way of events which ~~if~~ he could not help himself. He is, however, the one who was bearing our sins. Yes? (Q) Also it is true that He says,

Also, it is true that He said , No man taketh my life from me. I lay it down of myself. Yes, He is the Redeemer. He is the one who ~~deliv~~ deliberately gave Himself, as verse five shows. Well, I guess we don't have time to get to verse five .

Isaiah #31

And the fourth one is _____, nun, ayin. We were looking last time at verse 4, and could you please turn the in the papers? Thank you / Bring them up to me please. I might forget them later. Thank you. Thank very much. Uh, uh, (Q) How do I mark them? I cannot answer them. Because I usually do not seem them any way. Verse four of chapter fifty-three here, We notice that the first of it, surely he has carried away our pains, our sicknesses, and he has removed our pains. Matthew eight says, that it was fulfilled in what Jesus did in taking away the pains and sicknesses from the people. And so, the people says that surely it is right that he did do that. Surely our sicknesses he. You notice the emphatic he. Then we we have the contrast in the next one. There is he, and there is we. You do not ordinarily write _____ they in Hebrew.

or--(he) or _____. For the verb carries with the idea. He did or they did.

It is only for the purpose of contrast or emphasis that pronouns are expressed.

So you have the emphatic contrast between what he did and what we thought.

Surely he did that, but as for us, נאנחנו (enachnoo), we thought נאנחנו (Heb.)

we are impressed by his being one who is אשר עשה לנו (Heb.) that

was our opinion of him. But as far as he was concerned, he actually did these five again

wonderful miracles of healing. Then verse has the emphatic thought. Here we we had an idea

have he did such and such. But we consider, נאנחנו we thought.. we have have

esteemed this one. But as for him, now here it is again contrasted by _____ (hoo)

which is ordinarily not apparent, except to bring out vividly the contrast. But

as to him, he was _____ we have not yet translated

Would you this, have we? Miss Chung/translate that, please. _____ (meeii) it is

literally from, isn't it? He was stricken from this, he was crushed from this.

That is the common meaning of the word. From, of course, is a separation, ~~from~~ away from. That is the most common meaning. But that does not seem to make any sense here. away from ... Now another common idea of the preposition is the source, that proceeds from this place, ~~wh~~ that comes from this background. And so, doubtless, the source here gives the new meaning. ~~He~~ was pierced. ^{he} The source of piercing came not because/simply ~~he~~ fell a victim to the hands of fate, and was crushed/ under the circumstances of life, _____ circumstances, ^{it} (11.00) but ~~he~~ came from our transgressions, that which lead to his piercing. It came from our iniquities, not from wickedness or sin of His own which has produced from His being a poor victim of ~~the poor~~ circumstances or blind fate as ~~the~~ is said in our modern times as active _____ of God. By that they mean not a wonderful ~~grace of God, but actually~~ ^{acting} gracious God ~~acting~~ ^{active} in kindness, but the course of nature which man cannot control, and so that in contrast it is often understood without _____ an act of God entering in like a great storm of disaster way out of the ordinary effecting .. . But in this _____ it is not ~~h~~ used here. Here it was not circumstances. ^{our wickedness,} It was not His ~~q~~ wickedness, it was our sin, /our ~~ei~~ iniquity that caused Him to be bruised and crushed. Now, the next word, 7070 ~~is~~ what form is it? (A) 707, 707, which means, yes, but actually though it is from 707 it is a noun. This is a noun, yes, it is a noun. Yes, this word is used very often it says, Seek after _____ (moosar) for _____ (moosar) in Proverbs where _____ / (Moosar) your father. _____ (moosar) which the Probers often tell us to seek is something we are to desire. _____ (Moosar) is not knowledge, ~~thought~~ ^{it often tells us} _____ (moosar) is ~~m~~often more like discipline. The _____ moosar is that which may be disagreeable, but which is to accomplish a good purpose. The word chastening is altogether different from the word, punishment.

ISAIAH

OSAGAI #31

Punishment is often retribution ✓ for what is bad. Chastening is an attempt to bring one in line with good. This is a discipline. It is that which may be difficult, may be disagreeable, but which is to lead to a desirable effect. Some years ago I gave a talk on _____ (moosar) in chapel/. . And then they put up on , in front of the library the word _____. And then it remained there for some years . A sign which says, "Halls of _____ (Moosar)" They called the name of the library the Halls of moosar. It is the place where ^{one} ~~students~~ disciplines ~~themselves~~ -- oneself to accomplish that which one ~~is discipline-hi~~ should ~~oneself~~ 7.50 train oneself put in line with what he desires And so here it is very hard to know just exactly how to express the idea in this particular sentence. But I think you can catch ✓ exactly what it means . You know what the word _____ (moosar) means. Yes? Because it is a noun which is derived from a root like form . Now in some cases a word is exactly ~~in a right form~~ ⁱⁿ ~~right with-~~ the verb form, and the meaning of the word perfectly fits ~~with~~ the context. And in that case, you often can ~~be~~ not be sure if the word is the verb form, a verb, or if it has become crystallized into a noun derived from/But in other cases it is derived from the root ~~ev-a~~ of a verb, but ~~it is derived from-~~ has simply become a noun, and sometimes the meaning has no relation to the ~~verb-~~ apparent verb form that it would. In this case it is not related to the hophal participle. It simply is a noun. The mem is not a participle ~~suffi-~~ ^{prefix} ~~prefix~~ here. It is a noun ~~suffi~~ prefix like / our English -dom, or Ness, or something ~~ly~~ like that twchich is pu t to the end of a word to make an abstract ending. The mem is put before a word. Somebody gave an illustration which is not a proper illus- *then we put an m before it.* tration, yet it is similar. In English we say, neat, and that is a noun. ~~We put~~

ISAIAH #31

We eat meat, &
that is what we eat.

אכל

Just like in Hebrew, אכל (akael) is eat, and _____

(maekol) is food. It is similar except that in English it is not that form at all.

Purely accidentally it looks like it. But it does illustrate the idea, even though

that is not an appropriate one. ~~Then it is very hard to~~ But this then is very

hard, and the word discipline does not give the idea here at all, and ~~it~~ in

Proverb, you say, seek chastisement. That would ~~not~~ give the idea. The English

word, discipline, chastisement are within the area this word _____ (moosar),

but we do not have any words that exactly express the idea. In this context,

probably chastisement is as good as anything, though I do not think that an

average English-speaking-person would not be quite sure of exactly what the

word means. That which is disagreeable, that which ~~is~~ requires effort or

endurance, but that which is for the accomplishment of the good purposes,

and here of course, _____ (moosar) is a noun, and its construct is _____

(moosaer). What is the next, word, Miss X Chung? Yes, our peace is _____

_____. ~~What~~ shalom (shalom) is the word. It is the ordinary Greek

in Hebrew. ~~If you are going to Israel today~~, If you ~~are~~ ~~going~~ going to Israel today,

every one you meet today, you ~~must say~~ will say shalom. That is the ordinary

Greek. It is ~~like~~ not like our ordinary G greeting like "How are you?" It is

more like our greeting, "Good-bye), that is, good be with you. It is more like

? or either one....

Just like

that. How is your peace or May you have peace. It simply says, peace. /In

Germany, in German, very often you hear them say, Mahlzeit! By that they

wish you to have a happy meal-time. But here, peace, may you peace, or

how is your peace? Either one. But the word, peace, _____ (wh shalom)

does not simply mean freedom from war, but it has a far deeper meaning than

ISALAH #31

in Hebrew has a number of usages. One usage is as preffix to ~~make~~ a
of MEM
participle of a verb. And another usage/~~is~~ to ~~make~~ an abstraction, to make an
abstract noun. Like the word that means to chastise. Chastisement. Juast as we
add -ment at the/~~end~~ they would put a mem before. Mem is very often used
like a word _____ (yalad) to bear. you put a MEM before it, and you get
meaning
a word, /kindred, so here, it is originally derived from _____ (yasar), but
the word _____ (moosar) is beating for a purpose. (Q)

~~ISIAH~~

ISIAH #32

Continue then. This is the discipline, or the chastisement which produces
our peace. Continue then. Yes, yes. - I think it is a noun, healing. Healing.
healing. If you had a verb, it would be an imperfect. We will be. I do not
think this has this form here. This is a noun. _____ nirpah which means
healing. I do not know. There is no _____ (13.20) And in his stripes
there is healing for us. Yes, now the King James says, by his stripes we are
healed, which is right, which is not strictly literal, but which gives a precise
meaning. We are healed, but literally it is ~~y-his-~~ in his stripes or by means
of his stripes there is healing for us. Yes, yes, the King/~~James~~ the good
translation of the idea. But it is not strictly literal. But, of course, a strictly
literal ~~y~~ translation often does not make much sense. You have to get a little
what
literal understanding of/~~the~~ idea of the word is , then put into your own lanauge.
His healing was to us. Yes? There is a noun, yes there is a noun. He does
not give as a noun, but he only gives as a verb form. the word _____ (nirpha)

ISAIAH #31

that. It means wel^a/being . It means/condition in which you are well, you are _____ . I have here the Jewish translation put out in 1917 by a Jewish C/ommittee of the Holy Scriptures accord ng to the masoretic text.

And in this translation they say that the chastisement of our wel^a/fare is upon him. Now welfare does not give the full meaning of the word shalom . But it may come nearer than, and perhaps ~~that~~ it may come ~~bea~~ a little nearer than simply peace, although peace in its _____ is nearer than welfare. Now what ^{that} does ~~the word~~ exactly mean? chastisement? - or welfare? - of our ~~of~~ welfare? What does that mean? That is _____ to an average English reader of the Scriptures. But when you think of what chastisement mean, it means something ^{the} which is to accomplish a good purpose, and then ~~that is~~-chastisement of something. Of course, the chastisement of ~~ou~~ could refer to one who receives the chastisement, but it would be even more natural when you think of the real meaning of it, ^{it} the chastisement of ~~peace~~, the chastisement that ~~will~~-produce s punishment of something , maybe the punishment that is the penalty for having done something, but the chastisement of something is- which is intended to produce something, Consequently the chastisement of our peace would be that here was a ~~disci~~pline here was something ~~that~~ to be borne, here was something that is disagreeable, here was something that requires a tremendous efforts, but it was something which was for the pupose of securing our welbeing, our peace, something that produces peace with God for us, and peace/^{with/}in our hearts for us. Chastisement of our peace. I think that ~~is~~- one is very clear . . . ~~The English word~~ In English the word chastisement is not used much any more , and so we do not really think of it as much. . . we do not have the full power of the meaning in mind.

Miss Chung? (Q) No, it does not fit the meaning at all. (Q)No, the letter MEM

ISAIAH #31

He does not give as a ~~n~~ noun, but he only gives as a verb form under niph'al.

But it is rather hard to get the meaning for that. (Q) Well, that is a problem.

If you take it as a ~~ph~~ Niph'al, it has ~~been~~ healed for us, or to us, it certainly is very unliteral. It doesn't... It has been healed for us. If it is an abstract idea, the healing for us would certainly make some sense, but we do not take it... but ~~y~~ if we do not have a parallel to it, it is pretty hard to be sure of it, and ~~o~~ the other in that exact sense it is pretty hard to find the parallel.

Yes, yes? (Q) ~~U~~/Yes/ In other words, that is his guess, and I think that is rather difficult to ... I do not know of any other case where that occurs as

a noun. If it would be found, that would make a much better solution. I do not know of any parallel to it. (Q) The great advantage of the Brigg, Drive and Brown //

is ... It is a very, very useful work. The reason that it is such a useful work ~~is~~ ^{his} is that it gives/evidence so fully, and, consequently, if he makes a statement without evidence, you ~~the~~ pretty well know that it is a guess, because he gives his evidence very fully. That's the great advantage of it. It is not that whatever Brown, or Driver, or Briggs says is the authoritative source. Dr. Robert D. Wilson in his early days ~~talk~~ told how he heard a great theological ~~x~~ discussion and said ~~there~~ there was this great debate on a theological point and he found that the debate was hingeing on the meaning of certain Hebrew and Greek words and the debaters ~~s~~ of ~~their~~ theology --these professors/were simply quoting the dictionary, and the dictionary said so and so, and he decided that he ~~was~~ wanted to get back of the dictionary, because the dictionary expresses the opinion of the dictionary writer, and that is the disadvantage of ~~the~~ a little dictionary, that it ~~is~~ gives you his conclusion but doesn't tell what they are based on, and actually, you take these three men: Brown was the ~~pred~~ president of Union Seminary in New York, not nearly as liberal

~~aw~~ as they are at Union today but pretty liberal, and Driver was the English
in
prof~~s~~ professor who ~~wro~~ wrote a commentary on the Psalms/which divides every
one of them into two or three ~~div~~- different documents ~~wit~~ which he fits together
and ~~a~~ very often in his commentary he will say, I differ with BDB on this ~~p~~ point
and then, Briggs was the professor of Old Testament in Union Seminary who was
put out ~~k~~ of the Presbyterian Church USA on account of his heretical ideas about
the Old Testament, but they were three men who put many years ~~ks~~ studying Gesenius'
Dictionary, examining the words and comparing this and ~~a~~ they did an excellent
piece of work, not too ~~mm~~ much for their conclusions as for the ways in which
they present their evidence, so that when they give you a word and they say it
means this and there is only one usage of it, you can say that that is their opinion.
But when they give you a word and they say it means this ~~and~~ ⁱⁿ eight cases, you
have a good deal of evidence, but it's good to look up the eight cases when they
do, see whether their conclusion is ~~en~~- correct. But if you ~~are~~ are working hastily
and you find eight cases the chances are they have some pretty good amount of
evidence, if they only give one, well, ~~ok~~ α look it and then look up the meanings
of the words that are most common and see whether one of them would fit better.
Brown, Driver, and Briggs were quite in touch with the critical thought of their
day and they reflected it in their dictionary, but they give the ~~occur~~ occurrences
and they arrange every word, and examine the different suggestions, so that the
putting together of the evidence and making it available is far better than any other
we have. Young's Concordance ~~wh~~ere you can ~~a~~ look up any Hebrew word and find
out just how it is ~~tran~~slated in the King James Version and if you find that a word
is translated a certain way 6 times and another way 88 times, you know that the
88 times probably is pretty close to the real meaning of the word, and ~~th~~ you can
examine each one of them to see whether it is really different from the 88 or not.

And the case where a word is only translated one way, then it is certainly very useful to question what the evidence is, now ~~they~~-~~they~~ there may be good evidence, but it ~~gives~~-~~to~~-~~you~~-~~the~~- raises the question immediately, and then this Englishmen's Hebrew and Greek Concordance, you look at the words and you see all the ~~x~~ uses of it with a little bit of context, very often at a ~~x~~ glance you get an idea of what the context is, because the only thing that proves what a word means is context, there is no other way to prove what a word means in any language, the history of it, the background, the ~~etymology~~ ^{etymology} ~~suggest~~ suggests possibilities, but they don't prove it. And of course ~~translate~~ translation of a word is helpful for suggesting the ~~orig~~- original knowledge of Hebrew comes from the translations into Aramaic --comes from the tradition of the Jews, comes from the translations into Greek. Those are very, very helpful and useful but they only suggest, they don't prove ~~to~~- translations. But Context proves, if you say, for instance, if you have a word and you say does that word mean a sheep or a lamb. Well, you read somewhere in the context, and it says that this is such and such. Why it's more than two years old. Well, you know immediately that the word doesn't mean sheep, it means lamb. but when you find that in the ~~context~~ _____ is ~~transl~~^{te}- translated sheep in every case in the New Testament, and when you find that _____ and _____ are ~~als~~- always ~~transl~~^{te} translated lamb, ~~by~~ you know that in the New Testament there are two words which the King James ~~Transla~~- Translators consider ^{two} / ~~one~~ of the ^{lamb} ~~m~~ to always mean ~~sheep~~, and one they consider always meaning sheep. But when you look at the Old Testament and you find that each ~~x~~ word used, and ~~theri~~- there are about five of them, it is ~~transl~~^{te}- translated about ~~hav~~- half of the cases lamb and about half of them sheep. You find that there is ~~on~~- no word in Hebrew which the

King James Translators consider the lamb rather than sheep. In other words ~~eight~~ age difference does not enter in as far as they can tell into the meaning of these words. Now, of course, we might find proof that they were wrong, but when you have a good ~~mea~~ many occurrences not just a few, it's pretty good evidence -so that looking at them in their context very often you will get a great deal of very ~~valuable~~ valuable information that way, and the advantage of Brown, Driver, and Briggs is that you see how many cases . When this is the only case ~~is~~ it gives you can know that the evidence may be very ~~k~~ slight. Well, the advantage of the English is that you have a lot of references that you can get from B.D.B but the references are arranged so that you have a little context, and from the context you can ~~h~~ get an idea of what the ~~m~~ basic meaning of the word is. Now, the translators of the RSV varied quite a bit on their view on certain things. I was much interested to ~~he~~ ar ~~that~~ one ~~o-the-~~ of the members of the committee speak one Sunday night ~~whic-~~ when they had ~~celeb~~ celebrations all ~~of~~ over the country of the publication of the RSV. and so I went to this church ~~wh~~ ere the Dean of Drew Seminary was speaking, and he was on the New Testament Committee and the N.T. had come out already, but now the whole Bible was published, and he spoke there in celebration of its publication, and in the ~~co~~urse of the talk he said , From ~~wh~~at the members of the Old Testament Committee, the situation was very ~~diff-~~ different there from us on the New Testament Committee. They tell me that time and time ~~and-~~ again one committee would get up and he would say this word has to mean this or I don't know anything ~~ab~~out Hebrew, this is what it must mean , and some other member of the committee said that word can't possibly mean that, if ~~ix~~ it does , I don't ~~mea-~~ know ~~axx~~ anything about Hebrew, and he said that happened repeatedly. And I'm not sure just ~~ha-~~ how ~~high-~~ high the level

of Hebrew knowledge of the Committee as a whole ~~actual-actual-~~ actually, but I think that they were all men of ~~very critically-~~ the attitude of accepting whatever ~~Higher~~ the Higher Critics said as true, and I was much interested up here in Jenkintown, one of the ~~synagogues~~ synagogues had a meeting up there in which they invited all the persons in this whole area to hear the ~~Jews-~~ Jewish member of the RSV committee speak on Bible translation. I went up there for about 5 hours he just spoke and answered questions. and it was most interesting what he told us. He ~~w~~ said someone asked him a question. He said Did Religion Religious ~~pre-~~ prejudice enter into the translation. He said I can only think of one case where it did. Well, what he said, it really gave an ~~inters~~ interesting sidelight on the work. He said they were examining--that that particular day there were seven members present of the committee, and he said they were discussing in Genesis where it says the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the ~~wates-~~ waters.., and the question was shall we ~~trans-~~ translate it spirit or wind. Moffatt says there was a ~~might-wind-~~ mighty wind which came ~~of-~~ over the face of the waters. Some ~~argued~~ argued for spirit and some ~~argues-~~ argues argued for wind and they argued for about an hour. ~~Final-~~ Finally they put it to a vote and three voted for spirit and three ~~w~~ voted for wind, and one didn't vote. And then the chairman turned to this man and said, ~~you-~~ You have to vote because we have a tie here and we have to break the tie. Well, all right he ~~said-~~ said, I vote for Spirit. So then they said, now shall it ~~s~~ be Spirit with a ~~capit~~ capital S or spirit with a small s, and ~~they-~~ this Jewish member of the committee said, Spirit with a capital S would mean Spirit in the ~~ses~~ sense of the Christian trinity, but Spirit with a small S would mean the ~~Se~~ Spirit of God in a ~~general-genera-~~ general sense. with no idea of the trinity.

And so ~~they~~ he said they argued again for an hour, ask to whether it ~~shoud~~ should be spirit with a capital S or spirit with a little S and at the end of that ~~α~~ put it to a vote and ~~agin- agina~~ again three voted ~~ef- for-it-as-~~ Spirit with a ~~cate-~~ capital S and three with a small . And the one who didn't vote was the same who didn't ~~km~~vote before. So they turned to him and they said you have to vote and he said he ~~d-dn't-α-wn~~ didn't want to vote , and he said you have to vote because it is a tie and so he said alright I vote for spirit with a capital S. And then the man who was speaking said after they adjourned he went up to this fellow, and said, Bob, why did ~~α~~ you vote for Spirit with a capital S. You know the idea of the trinity didn't even begin until 300 AD , he said, Oh, yes, I know that, but Harry, I voted as a Christian . So he gave that as the one instance where ~~α~~ he knew that ~~rig-~~ religious prejudice entered into his determination. But to me the interesting thing about it was three this way and ~~the~~ three that way and in the end one man's ~~determination~~ determining who didn't want to vote at all. So when you get through it it could have come out a mighty wind, but I think if it had been ~~en~~ mighty wind, the chairman of ~~the~~ big committee would have made ~~the m~~ change, because he was looking out for sales and they didn't care how radical they were in places ~~where-~~ not usually noticed but when it ~~eme-~~ comes to the very first page they wouldn't have allowed a mighty wind there. Just like ~~α~~ when the members of the RSV say we put in ~~wh~~ at the Hebrew says, we just tell the ~~tur-~~ truth , and we always follow the Hebrew, I would like to ask them, Did they ~~few~~ follow the Hebrew in the ~~Ex 23rd Pasa~~ ~~XX~~ Psalm, and my guess there wasn't a single man on that committee who believed in the shadow of death, ~~-but they-~~ I'm sure the Chairman would have ~~tok-~~ told them, This book has to ~~see~~ sell, you can't change the ~~24-~~ 23rd Psalm. And so, in the 23rd Psalm and other places they

follow ideas that they know hardly any of them believe, but where there wasn't a motive like that, they followed the critical suggestions that had been worked out in ~~commentary~~ commentaries by the ~~higher~~ critics through the years, and a great many are summarized in Brown, ~~a~~ Driver, and Briggs. ~~Some times~~ Sometimes they give us facts ~~they give~~; other times they give us possibilities. But when you see the suggestion ~~ther~~-- you can see there is no evidence for it in most cases--it stands isolated. And when they give ~~somefe~~ something for which there is good evidence, you will see how much good evidence there ~~ix~~ is, so it is a very, very useful book. The only authority is God's Word and the only --and when you can't find a parallel you should not be dogmatic. So here then we go on to that six verse and Mr. Kim, would ~~ou~~ you read us the six verse please. What is _____, piel, a pual, or a Hophal. It looks ~~ak~~ like a pual, doesn't it, except for the first syllable, but the ending looks like ... And what are we going to do with _____. When you put the all of us, you see, you don't need the _____. All of us have done this, this is what we did, ~~the~~ this is what the Lord did. We have about . 1.. Let's get the next three verses so that you will have the ~~whoe~~- whole of the 12 verses in mind and give particular attention to ~~the~~- verses nine and ten, eleven and twelve.

In a passage like this, the problem is explained in First Peter that the prophets were wondering what or what manner of time the Spirit of ~~Chr~~ Christ which was in them did signify. In other words, the prophets were speaking to their own day. They were dealing with the problems of their day. There is a great deal in the ~~prophets~~ which can't be ~~understa~~ understood. That is very important. But it is also important that we realize that God was leading them to give a suggestion of important things in the future ~~wh-i-~~ which He would gradually ~~lett~~- making known, and therefore, sometimes the language is such that ~~ix~~ it is difficult to

ve	12	52:11	<u>vessels of the Lord</u>
ve	13	52:13	new section dealing with how we can be clean, worthy <u>vessels of the Lord</u>
si			What good is deliverance from exile if <u>sin question</u> not dealt with?
le fe	14		on taking the Bible <u>literally</u> <u>figures of speech</u>
aw	15	52:1	"Awake, awake" . Condition of one who sleeps Jerusalem is called to awake
	16		meaning of lb
	17		time when lb will be fulfilled?
je re	18/1-5 6-10		<u>Jerusalem</u> is again going to be a Jewish city Context seems to deal with the <u>return from the exile</u> . Three possibilities of interpretation mentioned
	19/1-5		cont'd
	7-10		summary of previous study
li	10		not strictly <u>literal</u>
	20/1-4		summary of 52:1
il	9		Story when in Germany and asked for bill at restaurant, <u>illustration</u>
me	21/1-5		Bill = account; beak of a bird One word has a range of unrelated <u>meanings</u>
me			How to get at the <u>meaning of a word</u> Usage, etymology, way it has been interpreted
	22/1-6 7-10		Value of Young's Analytical Concordance " " Englishman's Heb. Concord.
	23/1-5		"shall no more come into thee": temporary or permanent cessation?
fi lw	8-10	52:2	<u>figurative expression</u> for an abandoned city
	24		Three possible <u>interpretations</u> the third one the most literal, but doesn't fit context
il	25		review
	26		repetition of <u>illustration</u> about the bill given on p. 21
	27		repetition of material given on p. 22
	28		" " " " " p. 23
	29	52:2	" " " " " p. 23
re			"arise and sit down" = get up and take a <u>seat of honor</u> . Get up and take your seat

ISAIAH

- p 29 52:2 a series of pictures represented by a woman; a woman representing a nation, a nation represented by a city, a city represented by a part of a city
- pi 30 52:3 You've gone into sin and what did you get out of it?
 Illustration: before the depression
 Nothing left but memories
 "redeemed without money".
Redemption from captivity
- re 30/5-10
- 31/1 52:4 "without cause" clear
- 31/6-10 52:5 "make them to howl"
 "my name is continually blasphemed" -their God amounts to nothing
- 31/9 52:6 God will deliver them in such a way they will know it is He
- pr 32 cf. 48:3 God predicted it in advance so people would know He did it
 If He had not made it perfectly clear, they would not recognize it or give Him credit
- si 32/10
 si 33 sin brings captivity
 question of sin is more important than the question of exile
- mo 33/3 52:7 what do mountains have to do with it??
 zi the Lord shall bring again Zion
- re 34
 "bring again" in sense of "be returned" to its former condition; be restored. A change of condition rather than movement to a place.
 ((Why not "the Lord shall return to Zion"???)
- 34/3-9 52:9-10
- re 34/10 52:11 picture of people who are to return from the captivity.
 Described in the beginning of the Bk. of Ezra.
- si 35/7 people are still in sin and need more than deliverance from exile.
 They need the sin question taken care of.
- il we re 36/1-8 52:12 Story of disappearance of stone from Westminster Abbey, Illustration
- 37 Discussion on "reward"
- 38 Josephus' use of the Bible. He is a first class authority on his lifetime, but not on periods before.
- cy 39 Matters of historicity - re Cyrus; his permitting the Jews to return 52:1-10 is tightly tied to ch. 51
- il 39/10 - 40/1-7 Math professor who knew math but not how to apply it to life in measuring height to top of his house. Illustration
- ho fi 41/1 52:1 Form of Heb. word indicates he is speaking to a woman; the Holy City under a figure.
 Value of knowing Greek and Hebrew
- 30 42 put on thy beautiful garments i.e. the garments of your splendor

ISATAH

- ho 43 52:1 the Holy City, viz. the city of holiness.
- 44 assignment, preparation for next class.
- me 45/7-10 Meaning of word determined by how definite/context ~~is~~ ^{the} is. One instance which is absolutely clear will establish a possible meaning of a word.
- me 46/1-5 ^a One clear case can establish the meaning. It is the "city of the sanctuary" or is it the "city having the quality which we call holy"?? Abstract quality or concrete place?
- 46/8 ^a "no more" = "no longer". Continuance is broken, rather than something that is permanent.
- ex 46/7-10 52:1 exegesis and interpretation Illustration from Prague, Czech. in days of Huss
- il 47 Illustration on Czech, continued. In 1927, they were awakening after 300 yrs. of sleep
- ga 48 "thy beautiful garments" rather than "the garments of thy holiness" The beauty belongs to the garments, not to the person.
- hi 48/9 52:2 Hithpael discussed
- it 49 Iterative durative meaning repetition, as Enoch walks and walks and walks with God. Doing things repeatedly.
- an 49/5 Analogy of usage in Babylonian
- 49/7-10 "shake off the dust"
- se 50 "get up and take your seat" on a throne.
- hw 50/7-10 "loose... from the bands". Hathpael of verb, "to open" acc. of specification
- 51 or start opening, get busy opening
- Qu Kethib and Quere
- 52 Importance theologically of the hithpael having passive meaning. "in thee..... be blessed" not "bless themselves"
- hi 52/7 "let the bands of your neck be loosed"
- 53/1-4 impf., not impv.
- af 53/5-10 52:3 exegesis and interpretation
- as 54 They went down to Egy. to sojourn there..God delivered them and the Assyrian thro wicked desire to conquer have taken them. Now He will surely deliver them from Assyria.
- an 55 Kethib and Quere vs. 4, cf. vs. 5 (adonai)

ISAIAH

	56	52:4-5	adonai
<i>ac</i>	56/3-10	52:2	"loose thyself....." May be <u>acc. of specification</u> Could be taken as meaning that someone has removed these bands from her neck that are holding her down, so she can rise from the dust.
<i>gu</i>	57	52:2	cont'd Kethib and <u>Quere</u>
<i>hi</i>	58		cont'd <u>Hithpael</u> - frequentive use. Enoch walked and walked and walked
<i>il</i>	59	52:2	releasing taken frequently ?? <u>Illustration</u> of one with habit of smoking. Have to keep on freeing self from that habit.
<i>gr</i>	59/8	52:1	
<i>tr</i>	60		<u>grammatical</u> and linguistical problems
	61/1-7		problems of a <u>translator</u>
	61/8	52:3	sold yourselves for for nothing
	62	52:4	sojourn
	63/1-3		cont'd
<i>as</i>	63/5		the <u>Assyrians</u> came and grabbed them without any real justification
	63/6	52:5	
<i>he</i>	64		Two kinds of sentences in <u>Hebrew</u> : the verbal, and the noun. Here it is a noun sentence What is to me?
	64a		discussion not clear
	65/1-5	52:5	
	65/5	52:6	"Behold me" = Here I am
<i>hi</i>	66	52:7	<u>Hiphil</u> -- give good tidings
<i>me</i>	67		The <u>meaning</u> of "Shalom!" and of "thy God reigneth" (malak)
<i>so</i>	68		Thy God reigneth == God is beginning to exert His <u>sovereignty</u> in a very special way.
	68/5	52:8	voice of thy watchmen
	68a	52:8	
	68a/7-10		Kinds of Hebrew Lexicons
	69		cont'd
<i>ri</i>	69/6		<u>Almah</u> <u>Vergens</u>
	70		cont'd

1/28/63

The course that ^{we} are covering now is to be a survey of the first six chapters of Isaiah and of approximately the last ten. Now this, you might say is two distinct courses because this does not really ~~make~~ make a homogenous section. They are two distinct sections. It seems to me that it makes a good unit deal for a course to put them together and so that's the way I'm going to take them. Now before we look into the sections let's look into the book of Isaiah as a whole. You look at the book of Isaiah and you immediately ask yourself the question "Did Isaiah write or speak everything in this book in exactly the order in which it is contained in the book of Isaiah as we have it today?" If I ask you that question and you turn to the first page of Isaiah what will your answer be immediately. Will it be yes or no? (14) Why not? Yes, I think that's a very good answer. This is a vision that he saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah. Did he write that in the day of Uzziah? He could not have written that in the day of Uzziah? He could not have written that in the day of Uzziah because he would not yet have known the names of the succeeding kings. Now if he wrote this after he knew the names of all those kings, then it would have to be that all of the other material was given later and it couldn't have been given in the years of Uzziah, Jotham and Ahaz, so that it would seem quite apparent that this verse was written long after much of the vision was received by him. Of course, someone might say he received it but didn't give ~~it~~ any of it until later., and that would ~~not~~ be possible for a man to have vision through the rings of fortune but never tell anybody about it or write any of it down until the end (13) That would be entirely possible but very unlikely and when you read the book you will see plenty of evidence (13) Yes Yes, it could be, but the thing that I'm stressing is that we don't start in verse 1 (12-3/4) verse 1 is written at the end of the whole business and we (12 1/2) we can at least say he had received a great many before he passed them on. So, that is that's true of verse one what about

Bi continued

verse 2 well, we have no or verse 2 is the first verse that he gave either. We ~~have~~ do look for evidence as to when verse 2 was given. Now then the book of Isaiah is not necessarily in complete chronological order. That isn't to say it isn't in chronological order but we want to see if we find evidence on whether it is or not. As we take up this book of Isaiah, these sixty-six chapters which go by the name of Isaiah and we ask ourselves how are we going to divide them into what divisions does this naturally fall we immediately know that out of the sixty-six chapters there is a group of four that is very different from the rest. Most of them are, in fact they are entirely they are messages which Isaiah gives whether speaking in his own name or more generally speaking as God's representative so that it is God ~~that~~ ^{who} speaks even though Isaiah utters the words. That is true of most of the chapters you open almost anywhere Listen awhile to me and hearken ye people from afar. 49. 48 Hear (11½) For the Lord will have mercy on Jacob and will yet choose Israel. It is a sort of material which we might call prophet in the true sense of the word. That is not prediction necessarily, it may include prediction. But its purpose is not necessarily to tell of the future but it is to give God's Word to man. He is a spokesman for God to those to whom he speaks and that is ~~is~~ true of all of the book) except for an occasional verse but for all of the book otherwise except the four chapters and these four chapters are strikingly different from the rest of the book. These are the chapters from chapter 37 ~~to~~ 39. These four chapters we would entitle . They are chapters which tell us about certain things happening. Chapter 36 through 39. 36 Now it came to pass in the fourteenth year of King Hezekiah certain things happened somebody went and talked to somebody and somebody else talked to him back and forth it is and we have no other long passage of narrate. No other long passage of narrate in the book of Isaiah except in these four chapters so it is immediately apparent that chapters 36 to 39 form a unit by themselves. They are a historical section of the book.

B1 continued

Now in these four chapters Isaiah occupies a prominent position. They tell about his dealings with the various kings, the things he does, they do, etc. They include prophecy. But the prophecy is in the midst of a lot of history a lot of narrative so we divide the book of Isaiah, immediately we have one section that is separated out and that divides the book in to (9½)

Now this historical which is in chapter 36 through chapter 39 and with a prediction that Isaiah gave to Hezekiah in chapter 39 verse 7 "Of thy sons which shall issue from thee, which thou shalt beget shall they take away; and they shall be eunuchs in the palace of the king of Babylon. Then said Hezekiah to Isaiah Good is the word of the Lord which thou hast spoken!"

That "good" is not a very good translation. It means I recognize it, I'm satisfied. God is the word which thou has spoken. He says Whatever comes from God is right and I'm glad to receive the Word of God but he said, moreover for there shall be peace and truth in my days. He says this is a terrible thing that you have predicted that my sons are going to be taken, slaves in the palace of the king of Babylon. My defence of the worse son in the Bible does not mean the things that our modern english means today. (8½)

We say that Jesus is the Son of David and if you speak somebody's name you say that man there is the son of Benjamin Franklin everybody will think you're crazy. The word son today means the next generation.

The word son in the Bible means anyone who is descended from the one named, Jesus was the Son of David, son of Abraham. It was for descent not for the next immediate generation. So then we have this prediction made to him and in chapter 40 we begin at this that which we to this prediction a section which Isaiah looks forward to the exile in Babylon and comforts God's people with the assurance that they will return. Chapters 40 through 56 approx. are dealing with this definite historical background. The exile into

Bi continued

Babylon which Isaiah foresees as coming he doesn't know when actually it is more than a ~~century~~ century later. Well, we will look into this later part of Isaiah later on in the course. Now, we note simply this relation between the historic section chapter 36 to 39 and what follows. Now we look at what precedes and we find in what precedes, we find that we have this verse which gives us a date in chapter 1 verse 1, "The vision of Isaiah the son of Amoz which he saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz and ~~Hezekiah~~ Hezekiah, kings of Judah. Then chapter 2 starts with "The word that Isaiah the son of Amoz saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem" and we will spend a little time later pondering what that verse means because it is a most interesting verse. We look on to Chapter 6 "In the year that king Uzziah died I saw also the Lord. So that is dated. But then in Chapter 7 we have another date. "And it came to pass in the days of Ahaz the son of Jotham, the son of Uzziah, king of Judah, that certain things happened and he goes on to describe these things and there is ~~an~~ a situation in Ahaz's day with which he deals from Chapter 7 to 12. So that we call that section the book of the ^{Emmanuel} ~~Manuel~~. Because in relation to those things in that specific historical background, the wonderful prophecy of Emmanuel is given and developed during these chapters. That is chapter 7 to 12 and then when you look at chapter 28 as we did a year ago this month in this class of Isaiah then, you look at chapter 28 you find that 28 had the same background as chapter 7 so I put into one course last Spring Chapters 7 to 12 the Book of Emmanuel and the ~~related~~ related material from Chapter 28 to 35 so that makes a section. Between those two sections there is a section from Chapter 13 through 27 which is a unit which I may cover next Fall or in the future. We will not ~~rough~~ touch on it in this present course. So that we have glance now at all of the book except the first six chapters. But we notice that chapters 7 to 12 and 28 to 35 are closely tied to a specific historical background and deal with the immediate situation of that time and that

B1 Continued

is
Chapters ~~xx~~ 40 to 56/closely/tied to a predicted historical background and deals with that situation but Chapters 1 to 6 which we are now going to look at do not tie themselves up tightly to any immediate historical background and so I present the suggestion that in ~~the~~ at least the first five of these six chapters Isaiah is giving material of general importance dealing with his general message rather than so much specifically with a particular situation. Now that may be the case or it may be that in the days of Isaiah he gave these five first chapters giving the general message which was first given to him before it was tied to a specific historical background to any great extent and then Chapter 6 is the story of his call. Now chapter 6 you might think ought to be chapter ~~xx~~ one but it isn't it's chapter 6 I prefer to call it An Inaugural Vision or something like that but whether it is the very beginning of his prophecy or not we don't know but at least it was very near the beginning. It was not a great time after the beginning of it that he had this great vision in Chapter 6 Now this material then from one to six is going to be the first part of our course ~~lxxx~~ this year 1 - 6 which we take as a unit because we have all of these other units that it is separated from, it sort of pulls it together and its more general nature does not relate a great deal to a specific immediate situation. In ~~which~~ which he is talking about what Ahaz done or what Hezekiah does or (2 3/4)

~~xExs~~ What is your question m (2½)

I think so. I think that in 6:1 his inaugural vision came the year Uzziah died and in 1:1 he got the message in the days of Uzziah, Jotham and Hezekiah and more than that the fact that Ahaz had become a leper and consequently the kingdom had probably been ruled by Jotham while Isaiah was still living and some scholars think that Jotham died before Uzziah did. Now we are not sure of that but it seems at least very good conjecture when you try to fit the dates together and consequently it would seem very likely that part of this material

B1 continued

might have been given prior to Chapter 6. ~~Or~~ (1 3/4)

I think that it is most likely although I would not be dogmatic about ~~but~~ it ~~would~~ but most likely that these five chapters were given before. They are more or less general in nature. The next thing we want to do -- we want to do one of two things, we would start on verse 1 and go forward step by step or we could glance at the whole of the sixth chapter to get a general idea of their contents and I think that is why I always think it is good to get a general idea of contents of a section before you begin looking at it. You cannot get a complete satisfactory idea of contents of a section until studied in detail but as you go at the detail ~~you~~ you do much better with that if you have a general idea of contents so the two must be done you might say side by side. That is if you approach something absolutely new and fresh you know nothing about it you must make a general survey to get the contents.

B2x

B2

You must make a general survey to get the general idea of contents before you are really in a position to satisfactorily work out all of the details. But you have to look at the details before you are able to make such a general survey so each one can prove the other, you can prove your division, you can prove your details but you have to (14 3/4) Like when an archeologist digs into an ancient city, he does not just go and start digging he tries to take a certain little section and there dig a hole way down to try to get right to rockbottom at the very beginning and to see how many different types of material he gets, how many different foundations he gets in order to get a general idea of the / a history of the city. Then having gotten the general idea then he starts at the top and tries to learn all he can about the top area.

The latest area and digs that off and then goes into next. As he does this he may greatly revise his idea of the general history but he will do much better if he has at least a good general idea to take as a basis to either to improve, hold to or reject, improve or change (13 3/4)

People talk about an open mind when you approach something with an absolutely open mind it is like trying to carry water in a can that is open at both ends you don't get anything. If you are going to work into anything it is good to make hypothesis, ideas and suggestions but don't cling to them make them for investigation. See how your material fits in but if you just go with an open mind with nothing to prepare it you come out with nothing. You should keep your mind open in the sense of being ready to revise any idea you have when you find proper evidence that requires it but you should have your mind set with certain definite problems which you are looking for answers, definite hypotheses which you are trying to accept or reject. If only so you can make progress in any type of study. So, we want to see if we can get a general idea of this and in doing that I bring you an observation which is based upon study of many sections of Isaiah and also other prophets, particularly Jeremiah. This

B2 continued

of the prophets
observation is that the great bulk of the material/falls into two categories.

A great part, probably the greater part of the material in the prophets is material rebuking people for their sin and calling upon them to turn away

from their sin. This material then just for a general term we can call rebuke and at least half may be two-thirds ~~is the material~~ of the material in the prophets is rebuke which in most of the sections of the prophets is rebuke.

Now rebuke consists ~~of pointing to a person that he is sinning~~

it consists of telling the person that if he continues in his sin he is going to have a terrible (11-3/4) or it consists in telling a person that if he continues in his sin he is going to miss certain blessings that he can get that he hadn't been continuing in it. Rebuke is trying to get people to turn away from sin. Now this rebuke is as I say in most (11-3/4) in a very great portion of the material. As you look at Jeremiah

and at most sections of Isaiah you find that the (11½) ^{Rebuke} devotes all of his space to review, although they devote very long sections but there are other sections which are very, very different as different as anything can be and

these sections I have given just for a title I call Blessings now that is not such a good title neither is "Rebuke" such a good title because they do not give a full idea of what I mean but I don't know of a better one. If you come

up with a better one I will be very glad to make a change but as long as you know what I mean by that this may do for this course. What I mean by Blessing

is that there is not something simply said about a ~~blessing~~ blessing, because a Rebuke passage can contain discussion of blessing. He can say if you hadn't sinned you would have received this kblessing and that one and that one. If you continue in your sins you'll miss this blessing and that one and that one.

That's talking about blessing but he is talking about them for the purpose of rebuke so that is rebuke. Blessing is a different sort of thing altogether.

B2 continued

What I call blessing is a passage in which the prophet is assuring God's people
in the future
that there are blessings for them./ It is not a passage in which he is
specifically trying to get people to turn away from sin but one in which he is
in the future
assuring God's people that God has blessings for them/ Now we find these
pa ssages very frequently in the prophetic books and I have come to the conclusion
which I have never come across (9½) I think it must be since it such a
reasonable deduction from the fact but I have come to this conclusion that the
attitude of the prophet may be thought of this way. They look at the people,
the nation as a whole and they see it going on in sin and they rebuke it. They
call on the nation to turn away from sin . They call on them to turn to God and
as they give this message great numbers of the people pay no attention they are
hardened in their sin, they continue as they are. It is obvious that the nation
is going to have to have great changes (8-3/4) But there is a portion
of the nation which hears the prophet's words and as a result tends to give way
to despair because this portion of the nation sees very clearly that all the
prophet says about the sin of the nation is true that this is true of the nation's
sin and they are implicated in the sin of the nation. They know the nation ~~is~~
deserves and must suffer for it . They know that they can not help suffering
themselves in ~~these~~ this implication. They are implicated in it even though
they are trying to get away from it trying to turn to God. So the godly
nation
portion of the ~~people~~ as it hears the ~~prophet~~ words of the prophet tends to give
way to despair and to say what's the hope, everything is hopeless . There is
nothing but (8) It is as if the prophet having given his terrible denunciation
and declaration of rebuke then sees a great tendency to despair and the danger
of despair in the people and says don't give way to despair God is not through
with his people God has great blessings ahead for them . There are wonderful
promises that you can cling to in spite of the terrible punishment that is bound
to come for the sin of the nation. So not all of the material by any means in the

B2 continued

prophetic books can go under these two headings but in many sections of the prophetic books most of the material can go under these two headings and they occur usually exactly in this order . First the Rebuke then the Blessing. The rebuke addressed to the nation as a whole . The blessing addressed to the godly among the people in order to keep them from giving in to despair. Now that being the case there is a sort of alternation which is often found in the prophetic books., between these two types of passages and the alternation often enables us to divide to divide into sections putting a rebuke passage and blessing passage together as one united section. Now this is particularly obvious when you look at the book written by a man who was a contemporary of Isaiah. This man is called Micah and people sometimes speak of him as Isaiah's younger contemporary but I don't know what they base that on . I have no idea how anybody would know him to be younger or older. I don't see how they can tell what his relation was in age. to Isaiah. This we know that he was in the same general period because the book of Micah begins with the words @"The word of the Lord that came to Micah the Morashthite in the days of Jotham, Ahaz and Hezekiah, kings of Judah which he saw concerning Samaria and Jerusalem." Now you notice he does not mention Uzziah he mentions Jotham, Ahaz and Hezekiah may be that is why they say younger because Isaiah mentions Uzziah. When you realize that Uzziah reigned a bout fifty years and he probably only actually reigned only about ten then was a leper the rest of the time and Jotham reigned for many years . When you realize that the fact that Isaiah mentions Uzziah and Micah doesn't , doesn't prove that Micah was any younger than Isaiah. On superficial examination you would think he was younger but it is very superficial. In this book of Micah you look at the beginning of the book of Micah and he says rebuke God is threatening the people with punishment for their sins. Therefore, verse six says, I will make Samaria as an heap of the field and as plantings of a vineyard; There is a terrible punishment coming for their sins and then you get to verse 12 of Chapter 2 and you have wonderful blessing

B2 continued

in two verses , return from exile. Then you have chapter 3 of Micah and he is rebuking them for their sins and he ends chapter 3 with "Therefore shall Zion for your sake be plowed as a field, and Jerusalem shall become heaps and the mountains of the house as the high places of the forest." A verse we are going to refer to again because although we are dealing with Isaiah , Micah can throw much light on Isaiah . But you notice he continued immediately after "~~and the mountains of the house as the high places of the forest~~" here is your rebuke pointing out their sins telling the terrible things that must come forth ending with verse 12 of Micah and chapter 4 verse 1 of these chapter divisions are (4)

But in the last days it shall come to pass, that the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established in the top of the mountains , and it shall be exalted above the hills; and people shall flow unto it. " Wonderful blessing that is coming you have rebuke followed by blessing. So the book of Micah is in three divisions Chapter 1 :1 to 2 : 11 rebuke Chapter 2:12 and 13 blessing that is one division Chapter 3 rebuke and Chapter 4 and 5 of Micah are blessing. Chapter 6 again "Hear ye now what the Lord saith: Arise contend thou before the mountains, and let the hills hear thy voice. Hear ye, O mountains, the Lord's controversy , and the Lord's controversy with His people . Rebuke in Chapter 6 and 7 and the latter part of 7 again is a prayer of wonderful blessing and so you have the three sections of the book of Micah. Each of them having rebuke followed by blessing .

1-3

Well, now, in general the outline of Isaiah/is quite similar to the outline of the seven chapters of Micah. You look at Isaiah the first chapter and it is practically all rebuke . God is going to punish his people for their sins. It starts right away in verse 2 "Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth; for the Lord hath spoken, I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled against me." Rebuke upon them for their sins verse 13" Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination unto me;" verse 20 But if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword;" verse 28 " And the destruction of the transgressors and

B2 continued

of the sinners shall be together, and they that forsake the Lord shall be consumed." The greater part of Chapter 1 is rebuke . Chapter 2 though begins with that marvelous promise of blessing just like Chapter 4 of Micah . Verses 1,2, 3 He shall judge among the nations and shall rebuke many people: and they shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruninghooks: . A marvelous promise of a day which has not yet come . This is one of the great millennial prophecies of the Scripture . It is the beginning of Isaiah ~~2/~~ ^{here} and it is almost word for word the first chapter and part of the fourth chapter of Micah. We are going to compare this and see how they agree and how they how they differ and how each of them throws light on the other. It will be an interesting study and a very important one because they are two of our most important (1½)

Thus we have I would say the first part of Isaiah (1½)

The first part consists in a long passage which is mainly ^{rebuke} ~~review?~~ Chapter 1 and then a short passage blessing Chapter 2

B3

You begin the second section of the Book of Isaiah and you find rebuke. Look at Chapter 2 verse 11 "The lofty looks of man shall be humbled, and the haughtiness of men shall be bowed down, and the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day." What does this mean "in that day" that is a very interesting phrase, "in that day" It occurs often (14½) We have two phrases that occur that are of interest to us. In Chapter 2 verse 2 It shall come to pass in the last days. Some people say that the "last days" are the period of the millenium, the very end of the age . And they find something that happened at the time of Christ that says in the last days. So it doesn't quite fit . What does it mean by the "last days" that is the thing we want to look into . How will you look into to see what the "last days" mean? One way is to see exactly the word is. Look at the Hebrew, look at the Greek see exactly what the word means. This may throw some light on it, it may not

I think it does when you look at it really carefully but usually people don't look at it carefully enough to see. Then it is not conclusive, the vital way to find what something means is not etymology (13-3/4) The way to find what something means use it constantly that's the way to find what it really means in any language. (13½) And so in this before the year is over I hope that you will look up this phrase in the "last days" in a good concordance and get all of the facts which will not be difficult and make a theory and look at the facts and see if your theory fits all of the facts and if it does may be your theory is correct. If it doesn't make a new theory and see what you can get to fit all of the facts. Now that is fairly difficult and I don't expect you to do that unaided. It will be quite a bit of studying before ~~you~~^I reach a conclusion on it. We will spend a little time doing and if you try to do it first you might prove I'm wrong in my conclusion which would be a valuable step forward. But even if you don't succeed in proving that I'm wrong, nor succeed in working out the correct answer but if you have done some work on it yourself first you'll get much more good out of our discussion together. Your mind will be ready (12½)

I'm not assigning it yet but I'm mentioning it as among the interesting things that we should look forward to in this course. Another interesting thing we should look into is this phrase "in that day" that is used a number of times here. Some people say "in that day" that means the end of the age. That is "that day" Why should the phrase "in that day" mean that, well, it could. You can take any phrase and make mean a specific thing that is with technical use of language something that occurs in every type of study people give technical uses to terms. I had a Professor of Botany once who was very, very happy to tell us that strawberry is not a berry. He thought that was wonderful that strawberry was not a berry. Well, of course, that is not the word berry and strawberry has been called a berry from time immemorial. It is a berry in the sense in which the word berry was used when strawberry was called a berry. n Some one else will say a whale is not a fish

Well, when the whale was first called a fish was anything that swims in the water permanently and the whale does , so a whale is a fish in the common sense of the word. ~~A~~Astrawberry is a berry in the common sense of the word berry but the scientists today chooses to take these words and use them in a technical sense and he has a perfect right to do that but he should tell us before . He says I'm going for the sake of my science to define a berry in a certain way , and this will fit most of those things called berries so I give it a technical sense . (10½)

Then I find that strawberry doesn't fit this one. Therefore, I say a strawberry isn't a berry . Well, it's nonsense to say a strawberry isn't a berry ., in the sense that the word berry has been historically used but in the technical sense will which/advance the science of botany you want to restrict the word berry to a certain (10½)

The same is true of a whale. A whale is a mammal. It is related to human nature. It belongs to the general type of animal that we belong to which is very different from the fish and even though it lives in water from a viewpoint of structure, it is much nearer to us than it is to a fish so that if we are going to take the word fish in a technical, scientific sense a whale is not a fish. Well, we have a right to take any word and make a restrictive, specific, technical use of the word but we must be sure that people know that is what we are doing . Now, I have a friend who said when ~~the word~~ it says "in the end" in Scripture it means a certain specific time . We showed him that it spoke of the end of Palestine, the end of Jerusalem, the end of different things that they were all different times. He said "Yes" but when I say the end I mean end is used absolutely that is nothing and something just "the end" . He is a professor of systematic theology and in a very fine seminary. He used to be a very good friend of mine and he said "the end " is the end use absolutely means that specific part and can't be any millenium because the end (83/4)

B3
Continued

Well, then I found the use of "the end" where it did not have anything to do with of this and was used absolutely . He said)8½)

Well, if the Bible wanted to use the "end" always in once specific sense it would be reasonable to tell us so and if it doesn't it doesn't have to (8)

We have no right to say this word always means that but these are non-technical they don't go under that. When we get to that we are in utter confusion . We have a right to build up the science using a word in a certain sense but when we go through a book that others have written we cannot insist they use the word in a certain sense we must examine the evidence to see whether they have. Now there are people who say "in that day" is a technical term which means a certain point. Now is it? That is a thing for investigation . If you find (7½)

Or, if you find forty cases where it always applies to the same kind and you find four more where it might apply to then you can say now with these four (7)

But no one of these four has clear evidence it does/~~say~~^{not} that then you can say there is a strong probability that this phrase is used technically for that . But if you find one case where it is very obvious that it doesn't fit that you have no right to say this is a technical phrase . Here is one that clearly doesn't fit . So we we want to look at this phrase "in that day" . Does that phrase "~~is~~ in that day" refer to a specific point in prophecy or does "in that day" simply ~~mean~~ mean the day we have just been talking about ./ Well, if that is not what it means what is it . So you see we have two possibilities/^{to examine}but they do not cover all possibilities . There may be something entirely different as I personally think there is so that if you find in all of these the day I have just been talking about now I'm going to talk about that part but if you find that doesn't (6)

But we offer in language on the assumption that such cases 53/4) that is to say we endeavor to interpret a word in one sense, of course one sense

doesn't stop like a period . (5½)

But we expect to find a general idea which will cover all (5½)

That is a procedure we have to in language if we want to (5½)

And then we find that there are two distinct words . That when you say "see" you open your eyes and when you say "sea" you mean the ocean. They are two distinct words unrelated. Well, you could easily find proof of that in the text then you will expect each of them to be unified meanings . (4-3/4)

And so with this phrase "in that day" we are anxious to see exactly what it means.

It just doesn't have a lot of different meanings . What is its usage as used by the prophet. What is its usage as used by Isaiah . Well, you find that he says

1-6

"in that day" in Chapter 6* he uses the phrase quite a number of times and there are sufficient number of times ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ that we can draw some conclusions just from these six chapters So, I hope you will keep

that in mind. but now we were speaking about the division we have a first division consisting of Chapter 1 and the division which is at the beginning of Chapter 2

Just how far ~~that~~ does that really go . This Bible I have here has the paragraph division at the beginning of verse six but I have another Bible at home that has a paragraph division at the beginning of verse five . Which place should it be.

Well, before we jump to conclusions we want to examine to see which it is . Isaiah didn't tell us so we (3½)

But now we have a new division starting at either 5 or 6 I want you to make a conclusion on that make a suggestion as to what you think is the correct answer and here we have rebuke through Chapter 2 and rebuke through Chapter 3 until you get to Chapter 4 and in Chapter 4 you read that in verse 5 "And the Lord will create upon every dwelling place of mount Zion and upon her assemblies, a cloud and smoke by day, and the shining of a flaming fire by night; for upon all the glory shall be a defence." verse 6 "And there shall be a tabernacle for a shadow in the daytime from

heat and for a place of refuge, and for a covert from storm and from rain."

A wonderful time of blessing. Chapter 4 is in general then a picture of blessing. So we say Chapter 2 and 3 are in general rebuke Chapter 4 the last verse of it is exclusively blessing, verse 5 is exclusively blessing v erse 4, verse 3 . We will say a blessing comes after a long rebuke . Two long chapters of rebuke a short chapter here is the whole of the chapter blessing or is most of it blessing . That is the thing for you to consider. Now I believe this division here was made by the Archbishop, he was a very godly man. He looked at Chapter 3 and said all of this is rebuke, but now we start the wonderful blessing we read about how the seven virgins ~~shall take a hold of one man~~ take a hold of Christ and join themselves with the Lord and band with him so we read in Chapter 4 verse 1 "And in that day , in the time of Christ, seven woman shall take a hold of one ~~man~~ saying . We will eat our own bread, and wear our own apparel; only let us be called by thy name, to take away our reproach." So that is the seven virgins coming to Christ and so that imparts the wonderful blessing that it contains in the next five verses. But there are many people today who don't ~~txaggx~~ agree with the Archbishop as to what that first verse means. As you look at it closely you may think it is not the seven virgins coming to Christ you may think it is something different especially if you look at the chapter before, at the latter part of the chapter. You may think it goes with the chapter before instead of with the rest of Chapter 4 and so that is a question . Just where does the passage of blessing begin but our present great interest at this point is not to decide where the passage begins but in noting the fact that you have two chapters of rebuke and approximately one short chapter of blessing . So you have a second section to our main part to our Book of Isaiah , now that is the thing I'm interested in now . Anything I don't make clear please ask me. Anybody's mind can wander a little, don't figure well I'll catch on. If you don't please ask me because I've been in lectures and my mind has wandered a little bit and as a result I've lost the trend and may be lost twenty minutes of lecture before to it. If you do, don't hesitate. Everybody's mind wanders occasionally. The only thing is today

I'm covering quite a few things that are background for our study rather than directly in it and some of them if you don't get now you can ask about later or I may repeat them. I know that some of you have had several courses in Isaiah and a lot of what I said today is just rehash and some of you may have had nothing of it (14)

But try to get everything that I gave you today either now or to have it later. Because it is very important what we went over today. But now we have these two sections of Isaiah that we looked at. The two parts I mean of this section that is Chapter 1 to 6. Now the third part of it begins with Chapter 5 which is practically all rebuke. Verse 13 "Therefore my people are gone into captivity, because they have no knowledge; and their honourable men are famished, and their multitude dried up with thirst. Therefore, Hell hath enlarged herself, and opened her mouth without measure; It is all rebuke practically all of Chapter 5 is rebuke and with light darkened in the heavens thereof. But then Chapter 6 is the story of Isaiah's inaugural blessing, a wonderful picture of God's ^{personal} blessing to the prophet. So it doesn't strictly follow this analogy but it is rebuke followed by a different sort and it follows more or less the parallel of Micah where you have rebuke, blessing, rebuke then blessing, rebuke and then a wonderful prayer. This is a little different but somewhat on that analogy. Now our first part of the semester will be ^{spent} /in the study of these six chapters and there is a tremendous amount in these six chapters. Many interesting problems in them many things that will throw light on all sorts of sections of the Bible. So we will take quite a bit of time on them. We will go more into detail on these things than we will on the last ten. There we have some very interesting (12)

Some remarkable things will come out but we will run over a lot of the less important details there. More accurately (11-3/4)

But these six are sort of a general introduction a general picture of Isaiah's message. Now there is one other thing I want you to look for in these chapters and that is the matter of prediction. The word prophet is unfortunately used in modern speech in English a great deal as an exact equivalent of prediction, it is not that.

B4 continued

Prophecy is forthtelling not foretelling but forthtelling may include foretelling , and if God is God and knows all the future it is bound to include some foretelling so since the forthtelling of God's message often includes foretelling the word has come to mean foretelling and a prophet is one who foretells and that is unfortunate. Foretelling is a ~~vital~~ or predicting is a vital part of prophecy but far from the whole thing. We are interested in these chapters in looking at all of the predictions and whenever we see a prediction we are interested in asking ourselves is this definitely a prediction or is it a description . Sometimes that is very hard to be sure about . Look for instance at verse 7 "Your country is desolate , your cities are burned with fire; your land, strangers devour it in your presence and the daughter of Zion is left as a cottage in a vineyard. " Is this a prediction of something that is going to come or is it a description of something that is then there. Well, it is not easy to tell from the verse which it is, whether he is saying this is a situation you are in now or whether he is saying it is a situation you are going to get in . Well, in the time of ^eSennachrib(sp) ✓ when he came ~~over~~ and overran the country this would fit it exactly. Is he writing this at that time, describing their situation or is he writing it earlier than that? So there are many cases whether it is a question ~~ax~~ if it is a prediction or not. Then if something is a prediction is it an absolute prediction or is it a conditional Look at verse 19 "If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall the good of theland. But if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword; " Here are two predictions they contradict each other. You'll eat the good of the land but you'll be devoured by the sword . They are exact opposites. How can he make two opposite predictions . Because they are conditional if you do this , this will if you do that , that will . Which of the predictions are conditional and which are unconditional . There may be an implied condition. There is always that possibility isn't. There may be an implied condition and so I say to somebody I say You will graduate in the Spring of 1964. I mean if you proceed at your present rate

B4 Contifued

of study if you do the same type of work you are doing now you will graduate then. I don't promise anybody I will graduate then . I don't promise anybody he will graduate in 1964 or 1965 anybody can change his work and lose his interest and quit showing the type of work he can do . All predictions of that type that we make are conditional but the condition may only be implied, it doesn't have to be expressed. Now how about these how much is implied how much is expressed . Where can we say this is an unconditional prediction. This is what God says is going to happen. Well, we certainly can say that in Chapter 2 . "It will come to pass in the last days that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, many people shall come" This whatever else it is , it is an unconditional prediction . He does not say if you do something, something is going to happen . It is not dependent on man , it is dependent on God . It is a promise that God gives that is absolutely unconditional. Now in this first chapter how much of it is conditional and how much is unconditional and if it is unconditional when is it going to be fulfilled . What is the time of it . That is an interesting question in all predictions , what is the time of it. Is it literal, is it strictly literal or is there a figurative element that is the thing we are interested in investigating about everything which we read . So we have these various questions we want to look into . Now I'm in a rush to get to Chapter 2 (7½)

But in Chapter 1 I'd like you to look through with these questions in mind What is prediction , what is conditional and what is unconditional . What are the signs of these conditions . Another thing that I am very anxious to do is to examine the differences between different translations. Now we have our King James Version which we all are probably (6 3/4)

I would appreciate it if you would always bring both to class because we never know when we will need ~~them~~ one or the other. I would appreciate it if you would ~~always bring~~ always have them here. That is the English Bible and the Hebrew Bible . But now we are not going to take time to read these chapters in the Hebrew Bible . I wish we could and examine them carefully you will find many interesting things . It would take more time than we have But there is what I want to do. I want to examine our passages in the King James Version also in the American Standard Version . How many of you have a copy of the American Standard Version ? I want to see how that differs and which is right. Now how many of you have a copy of the Revised Standard Version . I want to compare that and see what it says . How many of you have copies of the (5½) version which came out about two years ago . I'd like to compare that . How many of you have copies of Moffett's Version? (5¼)

Sometimes Moffett will translate a verse exactly right . He will give the precise meaning as no other translation I've seen . He expresses , that's a thought that's what I figured out exactly what the Hebrew means but I didn't know how to say it and Moffett said it. In the next verse he throws the Hebrew aside (5)

He is truly undependable as a translator you cannot trust him but he is wonderfully helpful but so often . On many occasion he exactly expresses in English the thought of the Hebrew . Now how many of you have the American Translation? This is a translation published by the University of Chicago (4 3/4)

Now I would like somebody to take everyone of these so we can have somebody here who know what the (4)

Is there somebody here who can look in the Library and see what copies we have .

If anybody could I'd (3½)

We trust that you all have the material ready that I asked you to write out for today. I gave you quite a bit because for one thing I wanted you to cover a bit of ground early in the semester and then we could take a little lighter later when other courses get heavier and then I was anxious to give you the assignment over the week than between Monday and Tuesday . But the passages I gave you to investigate were Micah 4 and Isaiah 2 and suppose we look first at Micah. We look then at Micah 4 and if you look at Micah 4 the first thing you ought to look at would be contexts that is all of in anything that you read, that you study, that you want to investigate to see what light can be thrown upon it from contexts. Somebody said that a text without a context is only a pretext and it certainly is true that you can prove most anything about anybody if they've written very much if you can grab something out of context. Now very often there is no context that proves much about a fact but if there is we have to determine it and when you come to Micah 4 there is no question that the context is tremendously important .

✓ Micah 3 is a chapter dealing with the sins of the people of Judah rebuking them for their sin and saying that as a result of it God is going to punish them and in verse 10 they say "The build up Zion with blood, and Jerusalem with iniquity. The heads thereof judge for reward, and the priests thereof teach for hire, and the prophets thereof divine for money: yet will they lean upon the Lord, and say, Is not the Lord among us? none evil can come upon us." Therefore, because of their insincerity , therefore because of their sin, therefore because of their thinking that God will bless them regardless of their sin and they can be His and yet be totally contrary to the type of people he wants them to be . Therefore, He says, shall Zion for your sake be plowed as a field, and Jerusalem shall become heaps, and the mountain of the house as the high places of the forest . Now I make the statement that the passage in Micah 4 :1-5 if it is going to be interpreted correctly must be interpreted in relation to this preceding context and I wonder if any one here can present a good argument why that is so or if you prefer why it is not

so. Do you feel that Micah 4:1-5 has to be interpreted in relation to what has just preceded it or do you think we can say "Oh well we finish a chapter, we finish a section may be Micah wrote this Chapter three and twenty years later started Chapter 4 and it had no relation to it whatever. What arguments would you give in one direction or the other on this point Mr. Abbott All right, Mr. Abbott suggested the starting point the fact that you have a (10) at the beginning of Chapter 4. Fifty years ago they never split (9 3/4)

Then, many scholars decided the reason to change (9 1/2)

Now it may be consecutive in most cases but there are certain books of the Bible which start with this sort of a (9 1/2) and therefore if a book can start with this sort of a it would seem to be evidence that it is possible to begin a passage with a that changes the tense of the verb with which it is connected without it being a continuation of anything. Therefore, while Mr. Abbott's suggestion is a very interesting one I don't think we can take it as conclusive evidence that Chapter 4 is necessarily related to Chapter 3. Mr. do you have any point to suggest on one side or the other in this question. Mr. suggests the analyses of the problem which is that it is very possible to have a passage which presents rebuke, evil and its punishment followed by a passage which points out blessing in the future and which is addressed to the godly to keep them from giving way to despair. Now that is a very common feature in the prophetic writing. Particularly in Isaiah and Jeremiah. And that being the case a strong presumption may be established that we have that here and yet may be we don't. May be Micah finished with Chapter 3 and he finished the book and he started a new one with Chapter 4 later on and the two simply got put together. May be there is really no relationship between them. I consider this argument to be one of considerable importance but I'm asking is it there anything of (8)

Mr. Curry would you have any suggestions? Now Mr. Curry is very close to what

which would require that any explanation of what these mean over here be shown in some way to have a relevancy to what is said about their destruction. Now you take them just by themselves you can use any term as a figurative term if you want . You can say the world of poetry, you are using the word "world" rather figuratively aren't you? You can say the "ship of state" using the word "ship" rather figuratively. You can say that the poetry marches forward like an army . You can take most any term and you can use it in a figurative sense but to speak specifically of a physical destruction that is going to come to these three things and then go right on to say the great glory that is going to come to them later and say Oh we are talking of entirely different things there is no relationship~~that~~ that seems extremely irrational. It would seem to me that we are compelled to say that ~~there~~ ~~is~~ when we say the mountain of the house of the Lord and when we say Zion, when we say Jerusalem, verses 1 and 2 we mean the ~~same~~ something as we mean back in verse 12 ? Therefore, they cannot be simply a description of the Church in America and in England of something A description of God's people scattered throughout the world, a description/used in a figurative way over here unless you can apply the same figure back in verse 12 . Then whatever else may be involved in the thought of these two verses there must be also involved in them a literal reference to specific place on earth which was described as being subject to terrible devastation .at the end of verse 12. Well, then if we have a literal background for the beginning of this passage that does not necessarily explain what the whole passage is going to mean and I do not say you have to take the whole passage literally . I certainly don't say that anybody ~~thats~~ that say I take everything in the Bible literally well, they have never read the Bible. You cannot take everything in any book literally it is impossible. If you have to take it predominantly literal, largely literal , mainly literal or you get into something so vague that it could mean almost anything at all but you can have figures of speech and many figures of speech in most anything and so we are not going to say we have to take this literally no, but we are going to say what is the central thought

of the passage . What does it mean and how much of it do we take literally?

If anybody says we can't take any of it literally well (2)

So we look at this first verse and we say what does that mean "But in the last days "well, we are not at present going into the "last days" does this mean the time of millenium, does this mean the end of the age , does it mean the period after the birth of Christ from then on or does it just mean after a while , later on. We are not going to go into that now. It is not important to our present problem . I'm not going to build any arguments in other words on the phrase "In the last days" . We are simply going to agree that it must mean at least something later than the destruction of Zion in verse 12 that we agree on. If someone later on wants to come forward and build for us a big argument based on the precise meaning of "the last days "~~while~~ why you are/~~privileged~~ ^{at liberty} to do so, but unless somebody has material and evidence on the basis on which they wish to make such an argument now we will lay that problem aside (3/4)

Mr. Abbott

B6

Yes, I would definitely say it is not something that precedes (15)

It is at least a while after vs. 1 but whether that while is fifty years or two thousand years , ten thousand years unless someone has some specific evidence they want to present and has all of the details ready we just won't go into that now . If you have evidence anytime later we will be very glad to hear it but for the present I want to direct our attention to other features so we simply take it that there is going to be a time this is going to happen. What is going to happen "The mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains does that mean the place where the temple stood in Jerusalem is going to be so lifted up that it is going to be higher than Mt. Everest that would be taken strictly literal

and you cannot do that because it goes on to say people will flow unto it and they don't flow uphill so that if you are going to say that the people flowing ~~inxxxxxxxixdixxxxxixxxx~~ not meaning that you throw them in the water and they just flow in a certain direction or they get in boats and the boats just glide along by the force of the water in a certain direction. If you are going to take that figure why there is no reason at all in the world to say why you have to take it all literally and it seems much more reasonable to take it ~~itxxx~~ ^{that} this doesn't mean a physical lifting up of the height of the hill where the temple is but rather an exaltation of its importance so that it is exalted in importance above Mt. Olympus which stands for Greek Art, Greek learning, Greek civilization above the seven hills of Rome which stands for great government and power. Above any force upon this world that which will be supreme, most exalted, most glorified will be the hill of the Temple of the Lord in Jerusalem. It is then an exaltation of glory but not only that people flow to it. It attracts people they come there. And now verse 2 goes on many nations come and say Come and say Come let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: Many people are attracted by getting that which has come from Jerusalem and they want to go there and get more because the law will go forth in Zion and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. This can be a picture of the message of belief in God and in the Old Testament going forth from Jerusalem. This can be a picture of the Gospel going forth from Jerusalem. It can be a picture of ~~authoritative~~ a series of authoritative commands going forth from Jerusalem. All three are possible. As far as these ~~two~~ ^{three} verses are concerned I do not think you can say that these three verses show which of these three it is but I do believe we are justified in saying it must be one of these three, one or more.

Yes, Mr. (11½) The first is, it might be after the exile described in verse 12? the Jews will come back to Jerusalem and then from Jerusalem they will go forth into all of the world telling people there is one God that created heaven and earth

He is the Supreme God. This Old Testament is his message and he calls on you to accept it and believe it. If that happens and they went forth all over the world carrying this message and many nations said come let us go to Jerusalem and hear more about this that could be a satisfactory fulfillment. Now you read in Acts 2 that they were gathered in Jerusalem Parthians and Medes and Elamites and the dwellers in Mesopotamia, people from many nations they were gathered in Jerusalem . They were there on the day of Pentecost and heard the disciples all speaking in their own tongues . Now was the fact that the Jewish religion was carried to other ~~count~~ countries and made a considerable impression/and many people came to Jerusalem to learn more about it. Was that sufficient to be a fulfillment of verses 1 and 2 It does not seem to me that it is . It seems to me that in quality that could be but in quantity it is insufficient because certainly these people who came to Jerusalem were at that time a tiny minority out of all of the people of the world. A tiny minority and in the eyes of the vast bulk of the people of the world Greek Civilization, Greek Culture, Greek Learning was far superior than anything they ever heard of as coming from Jerusalem and in the eyes of most of the people of the world at that time the political power that went forth from Rome was a far greater factor than anything that had come from Jerusalem so that first interpretation which I suggested as a possible interpretation of verses 1 and 2 here is something which was fulfilled before the time of Christ to a very slight extent qualitatively it was this ~~quant~~ qualitatively it does not and it is something which has not to the present been fulfilled sufficiently to be a fulfillment of this passage but it is something if it were to be fulfilled in the future so that the jews were to carry the message of the Old Testament to all of the world and from all of the world multitudes were to come to Jerusalem to learn more about them and it were to become a greater factor in the world than any other factor in the influence in the lives of the ^{vast} ~~majority~~ majority of the people of the world that could be a fulfillment of verses 1 and 2 . Now I see no possibility , I mean no probability of such a thing ever occurring and I see no

Scriptural prediction of such a thing ever occurring. But if it did occur that could be taken as a fulfillment of verses 1 and 2 . And of course if that was the only way to interpret these two verses I would say that's what is going to happen . Even if everything on earth looked against it . I would say that if these verses definitely mean that, that is what is going to happen , there is no question but I don't think it is the only possible interpretation . Now there is a second interpretation and that is that the Word of the Lord , the Law that ~~was fulfilled~~ goes forth from Zion and the Word of the Lord that ~~was fulfilled~~ from Jerusalem is the message of salvation ~~through~~ through the Lord Jesus Christ. Carried by the apostles , carried by Peter, Paul and the others apostles , carried out to many nations as a result of which many nations say "Come let us go to Jerusalem and learn more about this God who has given this wonderful gospel and so Jerusalem comes to have a position in human life far above that of Mt. Olympia or the seven hills of Rome or any other place and in order to take it that way you have to take the mountain of the house of the Lord figuratively . You have to take Zion and Jerusalem they are the place where the word started to go but the people aren't go back to those spots they are coming to the preachers of the Gospel. They are coming to centers where the Gospel is proclaimed. They are not in any great extent going to Jerusalem . So up to the present it is not fulfilled in a literal way in that sense. But taking it somewhat more figuratively you could say it has been fulfilled in the Gospel Dispensation up to this point . But strongly against that view in my opinion is the relationship to the context to ~~the~~ verse 12 which precedes which would seem to suggest that these are thought of literal places on earth rather than that they are thought of as being simply symbols for the Christian Religion or something like that. Yes, Mt(6 3/4)

Yes, the statement which you have in the first verse where it says that the mountain of the Lord shall be established in the top of the mountains and it shall be exalted above the hills above what hills? Well, if you take it strictly literally it would mean above Mt. Everest it gets higher than Mt. Everest but that doesn't fit with

people flowing to it. Anyway you don't find anything else in the scripture to say that == look it up thousands of feet above the earth that's not the thing we are interested in -- (6) it's exaltation . Now if it is going to become glorious , exalted above the hills does it mean it is going to become more important than the hill that Faith Seminary stands on here? ~~sBeasiss~~ Does it mean it mean it is going to become more important than some little hills down in Tennessee . It must mean the hills which are most famous most glorious and certainly in those days those were Mt. Olympus and the seven hills of Rome . I appreciate the question and I want to be sure that we make these things clear and sometimes it is very easy to think you have had made something clear when you haven't . So please ask whenever there is anything I don't make clear. Miss ~~_____~~ (5½)

No, thank you for that question. First of all, Zion will be plowed as a field Zion is the place where David's ~~palace~~ palace was. Well this is the great center of political life it is going to be plowed as a field. It was customary to the Romans at least when they destroyed an enemy city to run a plow across the middle . This is going to be plowed land this isn't going to be an urban center or a political center . Now that actually that did occur and to this day (4 3/4)

~~But I don't think~~ Zedakiah was killed and the people were taken off into exile and Zion which was ~~former~~ formerly this great city, the capitol part of the city in fact just becomes a ~~plow~~ plowed heap. And Jerusalem becomes heaped that is the destruction of course that it just becomes a mess, buildings that have been burned and knocked down wrecked as happened at the beginning of the exile . And the mountain of the house that's the hill on which the temple is , the mountain of the house is going to become just like a place out in the woods where there is a place a little higher than the ~~in~~ others . Just like a high spot in a forest not in a city, not a center of light, a center of activity just like a place out in the woods. That is what happened, she was just left ruins for seventy years during the time of the Babylon Just left her wrecked (3½)

So that verses 1 and 2 can be interpreted as a picture of the Gospel being carried out to the world resulting in Jerusalem assuming an importance today far greater than any other center of that day and many people would think a center greater than any other center today . Far greater importance many of us would think. And if we had only verses 1 and 2 I would say this may be what is predicted here . The Gospel going forth and having a tremendous influence throughout the world. It may be what is here predicted and if you look at Isaiah 2⁴² you find that Isaiah ends with a words and all nations shall flow into it . And many people shall say but this says that people shall flow in~~to~~ and many nations shall come and say so there is a difference that Isiah makes it all and Micah just makes it many . Today we can certainly say many look to Christianity as the great center of their lives. But can you say all or does that go to far Isaiah goes much to far to say that is has been fulfilled up to the present. As far as Micah is concerned may be you could say it. It is an interchanging regarding people and nations but I don't believe ~~Miss~~ Micah ever says all. It is only in Isaiah that you only get the all . Yes, Miss (1 3/4) No, many. Verse 2 in Micah says many nations verse 3 in Isaiah which is the parallel says many people but verse 1 in Micah and people shall flow unto it and verse 2 in Isaiah the parallel says all nations which makes it greater than Micah . In Isaiah you read that the mountain of the Lord's house will be established in the top of the mountains and exalted above the hills; In Micah we say the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains and it shall be exalted above the hills; It makes a little more emphasis but I don't think it really affects the sense except to make it slightly more

(3/4)

B7

So that we now have these two verses which we have two possible interpretations . Now there is a third which as you look at these verses you cannot help, well may be you can help but you might at least think of it as another possibility that would be that

these two verses are speaking of something more similar than what we have looked at yet to that which preceded it. Previously Zion was a center from which the ~~word~~ word of King Hezekiah went out to the little country of Judah and his law went out establishing peace throughout that little area and telling people what they should do. Now you could say these two verses mean that this place was Hezekiah's political center from which his orders went out, settling disputes and establishing peace and order to the little country of Judah. That this is going to ^{become} again ~~become~~ political center important as it was before but that it is going to become a political center of far greater importance than it ever was under Hezekiah. That in fact it is going to become the greatest political center in the world. It will be exalted above all other centers of political power in the world. It will be so exalted that many people from all over the world are going to say let's go there and learn about this place which is the greatest, most important political center in the world. We will let him teach us of his ways and we will walk in his paths the ways of the God of Jacob for the law will go from Zion and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. Not simply the word of the Gospel, not perhaps specifically the Gospel but commands dealing with the situation throughout the world that need attention in order to establish peace and harmony throughout the world. Now to the average Jew living in Jerusalem in the day of Isaiah I think this would doubtless seem to be the most natural interpretation of the two verses but ~~the~~ ^{anytime} the average Christian living ~~as~~ since the time of Christ it would not be the most immediately occurring answer to the question, As far as these two verses alone are concerned, because they lend themselves so readily to the idea of the gospel going out and people wanting to go there and learn more about it but we would recognize that at least it is possible interpretation of the two verses and the two verses don't stand alone they go on to another verse. We will look at that ~~first~~ verse and see what it is talking about. We read there "And he shall judge among ~~the nations~~, many

people and rebuke strong nations afar off; You ask can it be that this is a picture of the Gospel going out? It judges among people and rebukes strong nations afar off. Well, certainly the message of Salvation rebukes us for our sin, it judges us in our lives. It judges us and rebukes us. Yes. It is not the most usual way to speak about the Gospel. The more immediate ~~phrase~~ understanding of this phrase is that it deals ~~first~~ ^{forcibly} with what we do that is wrong and settle our difference and our errors. That is the more natural interpretation of that. But then you go on and they shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruninghooks; why would they do that? Nation shall not lift up a sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more. Now there are two possible interpretations to that. The most immediately natural one would be that since all disputes between nations are settled by the word that goes forth from Jerusalem and since whenever any nation does ~~anything~~ ^{something} that is wrong. The Lord rebukes this wrong nation (10 3/4) therefore, there is no need of having swords and spears and therefore they use the material that was in them to make agricultural implements. That ~~is~~ would be the most natural interpretation of that phrase. Nation will not lift sword against nation. They won't even learn how to fight because they don't need to because there is a force from Jerusalem that settles all of their disputes so that not only do they not need to prepare for war, there is no point in it because they couldn't carry on a war anyway. Well, you might say if in after the Revolutionary War the thirteen colonies here had each remained a separate colony. Each of them would have had barriers against all of the others and tariffs to go from one to the other. You would have to show a passport everytime you went over into New Jersey or New York there would be disputes between these different areas and inevitably there would ~~be~~ probably be war. It would be necessary for every state to have an army to defend it against an attack from another state. But we do not have anything of that kind now in our different states because every state knows that if a neighboring state does something to injure it. There is a federal government which will step in

and investigate and determine the rights and wrongs of the thing and enforce it, and no state has sufficient power to resist that so there is no point in getting ready to resist it or in trying to resist it and, therefore, our state as states do not learn war. They do not build armies, state armies. We have a national army which makes state armies unnecessary and useless and meaningless. The natural interpretation of this is that national armies will be unnecessary because the command comes forth from Jerusalem settling any disputes and putting an end to any aggression. That is the most natural interpretation of verse 3 but if a person interprets verses 1 and 2 in what to the Christian is perhaps the most natural interpretation of these two but this is a picture of the going out of the gospel then it is a possibility to say let's interpret 3 in line with that. All right you interpret 3 in line with that and that means is that the gospel judges among people and rebukes nations far away and these nations used to be warlike and hostile and making trouble and aggression they are going to change. They are going to quit being warlike they are going to beat their swords into ploughshares and spears into pruninghooks. There no longer will be any aggression and, therefore, there is no need of our having any army because we know that every nation near us is a christian nation which wouldn't think of injuring us. And so to interpret this as simply saying the gospel is going to go out and going to save many people. Impossible. It has to go beyond that. If it is a picture of the gospel going out it must mean that the gospel so converts every nation that the neighboring nations don't need to fear war and don't have to prepare for it. It must be the progress of the gospel to such a point that it brings a peaceful attitude throughout the earth. And it can only be said that such a thing has not yet occurred. Whether it is ever going to occur, it has not yet occurred. That can be definitely said. There were early interpreters in the third or fourth century A.D. who said Well, this is wonderful. This prediction is fulfilled because the gospel of Christ ^{cast} ~~has~~ its light backward as well as forward and from just about the time Christ was born the emperor Augustus established peace and throughout the

Roman Empire there was peace . There had been wars and difficulties in the three or four hundred years , but then on, just about the time of Christ there was peace throughout the Roman Empire. Paul could travel here and there without any fear . of wars and there was ~~was~~ a reign of peace which lasted two or three hundred years with an occasional uprising, an occasional difficulty but on the whole it was such a period of peace he said, here is what Micah and Isaiah predicted which is fulfilled . Christ came and peace was established throughout the Roman Empire and this peace has continued for two or three hundred years without a break . Then the barbarians broke through the walls of the Roman Empire and marauding armies marched back and forth across it and the whole thing came to an end . Then the unbelievers said Look here . You said the Old Testament predicted twice that peace was coming but look peace is all gone and there is war everywhere now . You are entirely wrong this isn't a divine book . (5½)

Well, certainly it was not predicted then . What was it predicting? That's the question and Yes Miss Pickett I don't know. I don't know whether much uniformity amongst jewish intrepeters whether you can speak of anything as the interpretation of the jews but I can't see how any jew could say that verse three had yet been fulfilled. I don't see any way that anybody could say verse three has yet been fulfilled. You might say within the Roman Empire there was peace, yes, they were learning war in the Roman Empire . There were swords everywhere and spears everywhere. You cannot say that this was in any literal way fulfilled. There was a remarkable period of peace for two or three centuries which came to an end and there has never been peace again during any sizeable period of time since that on this earth and that three has yet been fulfilled is pretty difficult to say. Now there are interpreters who say this is the picture of the Christian Church . It shows the Christian Church. There is peace in the Christian Church everybody is in harmony everybody loves each other . This is the proof of the Gospel it is so beautiful the peace in the Christian Church that you can describe it in figurative language by saying we all have beaten our ~~s~~words into ploughshares and our spears into pruninghooks but I

afraid that anybody who is an active pastor in these days for as much as fifty years or may be ten will find out that there are some people in his congregation who have not beaten their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruninghooks. That age has just not yet come upon this earth and some churches have some pretty violent times within the church. In every generation we have found that . This age has not come. It is in my opinion utterly unsatisfactory to say that this is a picture of something that has occurred as yet. It seems to me that it must be a picture of something that is still future and, therefore, I see no other possibility of interpreting verse 3 except that there is a time coming in the future when there will be universal peace upon earth when no nation will prepare for war and the reason they won't prepare for war will be because they are such good Christians but because there is nothing that they need to fear. They don't prepare for war because they don't need to prepare for war. Now that may be because all of the other people are christians, therefore, they don't have to prepare for war or it may be because there is a political power reigning in Jerusalem settling all disputes and making it not only become ~~unnecessary~~ unnecessary but improper for any nation to make war and therefore, nobody will feel like learning to make war because you couldn't do it anyway . Those are the few possibilities of this picture. It is a picture of a time of freedom from fear it is not a picture of a time when the peoples hearts are changed so (2) It is a picture of a time when the people around them (2) It is the end of fear rather than the end of aggression within the people's (1 3/4) And so it is impossible in my opinion to consider it as a picture simply of the church as it has existed up to this time but it must be a picture of something that is yet to happen and that thing which is yet to happen is universal peace a time when no nation need fear an attack from another nation and the reason for that may be because the gospel has converted the whole world . Or, it may be because there is a power at Jerusalem that makes it impossible for you to think of attacking. Now those are two possible interpretations of the end of the verse 2 . In the time of Micah I'm sure most everybody would have thought of it this

means a powerful force at Jerusalem that goes out. Among christian people most naturally would think the Gospel goes out . (1)

But whichever it is the result is universal freedom from fear and when you look at verse 4 here in Micah it makes it absolutely clear because verse 4 says they shall
 B8
 sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree; and none shall make them afraid;
 Now what does that mean. Well, somebody has said the vine is the Old Testament and the fig is the New Testament and it shows how people are going to get the benefit of the whole word of God . They are going to sit under their vine and under their fig tree . Well, that is a highly spiritualized interpretation but if you are going to try to find a real ~~sensitive~~ sensitive (14½) historical situation it would be much more reasonable to say what it means is that the people are not going to be as they were in the days of Hezekiah unable to go and sit out in the open somewhere without being on their watch lest somebody attack them .) We had a situation here about two or three years ago when two women in Illinois went to stay at a resort they went out to just a little walk in the country and the bodies of the women were found all bludgeoned there. The women were dead and it took weeks of investigation and finally they found an employee in the hotel had attacked the women in order to steal what little money they had. Well, that sort of thing does not happen all of the time by any means but it happens often enough that we just don't sit out/anywhere we feel like and know there is nothing to make us afraid . We still have locks on our doors, we have locks ion our cars. As you go into South America ~~into~~ into a land which has not had the Protestant heritage ~~possibilities~~ that we have here you will find that practically every building has great big iron bars over all of the windows on the first floor because they do not know when somebody is going to break in. Here it shows a situation in which none shall make them afraid. They don't have to be they are perfectly safe and that in the time of Hezekiah seemed very unlikely that it just didn't seem possible that there would ever be a time like this and so Micah says for the mouth of the Lord of hosts hath spoken it. This is a divine prediction.

This is a divine message. This is God's guarantee that this wonderful thing is going to happen. There is going to be terrible calamity because of ~~the~~ ^{the sin} ~~xxxxsxxx~~ of the nation Zion is going to be ploughed in the field . This awful overthrow is coming but God is going to bring a day later on no more war. There is no more destruction . There is nothing we need to be afraid of that day is coming. Now how is that day coming? Is it coming because there is a force in Jerusalem that compels the nations ^{to} be peaceful and settles all of their disputes. That is a very natural interpretation of the end of those verses or is it going to happen because the gospel has kept on spreading through the world and all of the nations have been converted by it. That is not an ~~impossibility~~ impossible interpretation of the end of verse 2 but whichever it is. It is a time when the whole world is free from fear when there is no longer danger ~~xxxxx~~ that is the picture which is here. It is freedom from fear. It is not individuals in the midst of a situation of danger on every hand and yet peace in the heart because the heart is stayed on the Lord . That is a marvelous promise of the New Testament . A marvelous promise that the christian can have no matter how terrible things are around you he can have absolute peace in the Lord and trust in Him and rest in Him but that is not the promise given in this passage . This is a different promise when we don't need to fear because there won't be anything around us to fear because either everybody else will be converted or everybody else will know that there is a power ruling the world with such control that they wouldn't think of doing anything injurious to us. It is one or other of those two. I asked you to look at different commentaries to see what these commentaries say about it. I have here a commentary of Crexmont(?) from which I read t o you last time what he says about Isaiah 2 . Now let me read you what he says about Micah 4. and follow it in your Bible and see how he interprets as you remember from last time. He quotes a phrase from the Bible which he has blacked and then he gives his interpretation in light letters. He says He calls this heading Chapter 4 "The Glory, Peace and Victory of the Church" Then he says for the heading here, the glory of the house of the Lord. verse 1

But in the last days in the great Messianic Period it shall come to pass that the mountain of the house of the Lord. typical of the Church of the True God , this is not a literal Jerusalem , this is the Church of the True God., Now I think that would be a very possible interpretation if it were not for the close connection with the verse preceding which seems to me to make it extremely ~~impossible~~ improbable that it changes the scene so abruptly from that to this . But he says then, it shall be established the top of the mountain the ideal Zion to be elevated above all else in the world and it shall be exalted above the hills, visible to the eyes of all men. And people shall flow unto it , members of all of the nations of the world shall be added to the community of the saints and many nations shall come, namely, in the representatives whom the Lord would choose to come and say Come and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord the place where Salvation is proclaimed and to the house of the God of Jacob , the church of the Messiah . This isn't at Jerusalem this is for the Church and he will teach us of His ways, the one way of deliverance and sanctification and we will walk in his paths in agreement with the revealed truth concerning the sanctification of the Lord's people for the law as the revelation of Holy and Righteous Will of God shall go forth in Zion and the Word of the Lord particularly in the revelation of the way of Salvation from Jerusalem the proclamation of the Word in speaking of sin and grace be in the hands of the church and He the God of the Covenant shall judge among many people teaching through justice and, of course, with His will and rebuke strong nations afar off to make them cease their enmity against Him and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks. Not in earthly temporal, millennial peace of which men are dreaming from time to time but in the spiritual peace in Him who is our peace Ephesians 2:14 In whom there is truly peace on earth. Nation shall not lift up a sword against nation neither shall they learn war any more. This being said of the inner peace and harmony of the Church of Christ., compare John ? Verse 4 But they shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree; in the rich enjoyment of the rich blessings of the New Testament . He doesn't say the Old (7½) And none shall make them afraid

All of the enemies of mankind having been overcome by the power of the Messiah . Up to this point (7½)

In other words he (7½)

~~which makes it clear that the passage~~
~~negates~~

His interpretation is wrong approach to this particular passage . This is not a picture of the inner peace and spiritual life of the church. This is a picture of a world in which danger has been removed and whether it is removed by everyone having been converted or whether it has been removed by a force in Jerusalem that it makes it impossible to have aggression, in either case it is a picture of a situation of universal peace and ^{security} ~~security~~ in which there is nothing around to (6½)

He admits that at the end ~~negates~~ negating practically everything he said before.

~~We have 34 commentaries~~ There were 34 commentaries used so that is quite a number ~~that were looked into~~ that were looked into. A good many were only looked at

by one person, some by two, some by three and two and three by by four. It is good to get wide coverage of commentaries this way . Please be sure to give me these

papers back again at the end of the hour . Now we were looking together at the last hour at this passage in ^{Micah} ~~Isaiah~~ as we are examining as being parallel to the

passage in Isaiah. I have not explained to you why we have looked at Micah before we have looked at Isiah. I think that we can discuss that a little later. Here in

Micah ~~we have you will~~ you will notice how it relates to the previous times? which I think has a real bearing on its meaning . I don't see how you can possibly interpret

it properly inside the context without taking the context into account and saying that both places referred to in verse 12 are the same places referred to in Chapter 4

verse 1. It is pretty difficult to say that the British are going to come to Washington as they did in the war of 1812 and burn the White House and leave the city

in desolation but the time is going to come when British representatives will come to Washington to ask for help in order to protect them against Hitler . Now if

- Page
- 1.6 The Book as a whole
- 1.8 Chronologically in order or not?
Hardly according to 1:1
- 1.20 Possible, tho unlikely, he received it all at once but did not tell it till later
- 1.26 1:1 written at the end
- 2.8 Four chapters very difference from the rest of Book
- 2:23 Chapters 36 - 39
Mainly historical
- 3:7 39:7 prediction
Meaning of "good" here
- 3:21 Biblical usage of "son" viz. anyone who is descended from the one named.
A descendant, not next immediate generation
- 4.3 Relation between ch. 36-39 and what follows noted
- 4.6-15 Dated sections of the Book
- 4.21 Ch. 28 has same background as ch. 7
- 4.27 Ch. 7-12; 28-35 tied to specific historical background
- 5.2-7 Ch. 1-6 have message & material of general rather than specific historical importance
- 5.14 Ch. 6 near the beginning of Isaiah's prophecy
6. General survey must precede detailed analysis
- 1.1-15 Some detailed work necessary before can make general survey
Like the archaeologist approach to digging into an ancient city
- 1.16 Open mind -- like trying to carry water in a can open at both ends
23 Have mind set with certain definite problems which you are looking for answers
- 2.1 Bulk of material of prophets falls into two categories
Rebuke
Blessing
- 3.6 Explanation offered for the blessing portions
- 4.3 Alternation between rebuke and blessing
10 Also seen in Micah's prophecy

- Page
- 5.1 Rebuke followed by blessing in Micah
- 5.14 Micah's three divisions
Each has rebuke followed by blessing
- 6.1-14 Isaiah begins with rebuke
- 18 Discussion of phrase "in that day"
- 7.3 Etymology not conclusive; usage is
- 7.24 Botany professor - strawberry not a berry in technical sense, but in common sense
- 8.1 ~~W~~ale is a fish in common sense of the word
- 8.20 The Prof. who insisted "the end" is always used absolutely.
- 9.18 More discussion on "in that day"
- 10.5 "See" and "sea"
- 10.16 Division between "rebuke" sections and "blessing" portions
11. ch. 2,3 rebuke
- 11.4 4:5,6 blessing (after long rebuke)
- 11.23 One short chapter of blessing after two of rebuke
- 12.9 ch. 5 practically all rebuke
- 14 ch. 6 Isaiah's inaugural blessing
- 29 Prediction
- 13.5 Foretelling not the whole of prophecy
Many cases where it is a question whether it is a prediction or not
- 13.19 If a prediction, is it absolute or conditional?
- 14.5 Condition may be implied and not expressed directly.
- 15 Various versions
- 16.6 Micah 4
17. Its relation to what precedes
Various suggestions
18. Same 3 things mentioned at end of ch. 3 are found in beginning of ch.4
- 19.4 Any term can be used figuratively if you want.
Discussion on literal and figurative.
- 20 No decision on meaning of "in the last days"

21 People "flow" unto Jerusalem

Not a physical lifting up of the height of the hill, but rather an exaltation of its importance -- an exaltation of glory.

Law will go forth from Jerusalem may mean:

- 1) A picture of the message of belief in God going forth from Jerusalem
- 2) A picture of the Gospel going forth from Jerusalem
- 3) A picture of a series of authoritative commands going forth from Jerusalem

21.26 First Possible Interpretation

The Jews will come back to Jerusalem and then from Jerusalem they will go forth into all the world telling people there is one God who created heaven and earth

22.3 As result many nations will want to go to Jerusalem and hear more about this

4 Acts 2 - many from these different lands present to hear the disciples

11 Insufficient to be a fulfillment of vs. 1,2
Quality sufficient; quantity insufficient

23.6 Second Interpretation

The Word of the Lord going forth from Zion is the message of salvation through Jesus Christ

18 People aren't going to Jerusalem to any great extent to get the Gospel

24.14 Center of political life will become plowed as a field

25.10 Isa. says "all" nations shall flow into it
Micah says "many" nations -

26 Third Possible Interpretation

26.5 Zion is to again become a political center, in fact the greatest political center in the world

27.4 Judging among many people and rebuking strong nations - not the Gospel

27.10 Nation shall not lift up sword against nation means: either:

- 28.6 1) National armies will be unnecessary because disputes are settled by command from Jerusalem.
- 12 2) As a result of the gospel judging among people, the nations cease being warlike and hostile. Impossible

24 Interp. of some in 3rd & 4th cent. A.D.
29.8 200 or 300 yrs. of "peace" broken

29.18 Noway to say 2:3 has been fulfilled.

24 Those who say that it is a picture of the Christian church where everyone is in harmony and love one another

30.4 Some churches still have some pretty violent times!

8 Not something that has occurred as yet, but still future

12 Universal peace, not because everyone is such good Christians, but because there is nothing they need to fear.

31 Don't prepare for war because don't need to prepare. Either because:

14 1) All the others are Christians

15- 2) Political power reigning in Jerusalem prevents it

32.13 Freedom from fear -- not the kind promised the Christian in this day

33. Micah 4:1-4 wrongly interpreted by a commentator

34.8 Picture of world in which danger has been removed, either by universal conversion, or by a force in Jerusalem that makes it impossible

1/7/63 Is. 27

Yes, but I have to have, but I don't think the same word is used, but I think
is (Q)

that/the word ~~is~~ related to different one. No, I say that the question is ~~the-~~

"~~Is~~ Does the use of the same word twice in a verse mean that it necessarily
refers to the identical thing?" Often it does, but often it doesn't. Often it

doesn't. In this verse there is no _____ (13.75) If there is any verse in

any statement you may, if you repeat the same word you are apt to refer to

the same thing, but not necessarily. You may use it ~~in~~ referring to two different
to

things/both of which it could refer to.' That may happen. And in this case if

in
you put a semicolon ~~at~~ the right place, you put a semicolon after _____

in advance, then you go on to the fact that you have used the same word again

which you used before doesn't necessarily mean that it is that you _____ (13.25)
would

I/say, if you take any sermon, and look through and see where you find any
in the same sense.

same word used here/ You will find that maybe in three or four/cases it refers
of

to the same one, but in the least of the fourth/cases it doesn't. You ~~will have~~

don't have to assume that the fact that the same word is used is necessarily

_____ (13.00) You will examine it and see it. But (Q) Yes,

Well, He is at the right hand of God and he makes intercession for us. Yes, but
greatly

is he not also/interested in ~~our~~ salvation? of our souls for whom He died?

Surely he is. But I don't think that is what ~~is~~ ordinarily ~~proved~~ under that
we include

phrase. But/certainly ~~is~~ a part of his activities. It is the word of Christ.

It is the knowledge of Christ. He is interested in it, and there is no question

as to the fact. I just question whether this particular statement is referring

to that phase,, but He is surely in evangelistic work constantly. Yes?Q)

I think, "Father, forgive them for they know not what they do. @ Yes, I

think that statement is a statement ~~not~~ so much expressing a particular desire

on the part of Christ as a desire that we should understand ~~something- something~~

deeds are
 that the worst ~~being~~ is not often the most heinous because people often do things
~~think~~ without realizing what they are doing, and in God's sight they are not
 nearly as ~~bad as~~ ~~hen~~ ~~hen~~ ~~hen~~ heinous as those that do not will, and those
 that ~~nearly~~ really. For instance, you take a person who , you take a person
~~who~~, some innocent person. He is an ordinary human, He is a sinner.
 But is not a person who deserves death. And they ~~heard of~~ ~~that man~~ ~~and see~~
~~and they say~~ and you will say, isn't that terrible. How he murdered him.
 Now you take somebody who has murdered the Son of God, the most ~~perfect~~,
 glorious, the most perfect individual who has ever lived. ~~He is~~ He is murdered .
 Isn't that five times worse than the others? No, it isn't, if he does not realize
 what he is doing. You see. "Father, forgive them for they know not what they
 do." ~~Certain He does not~~ He does not mean, ~~that he does not hold~~ do not hold
 sin of murder against them. They certainly are murderers. ~~Certainly are they~~
~~salves~~ ~~the~~ ones th-- they have slain the one who is innocent. They certainly
 are terrible sinners in doing this. But they are not as terrible sinners as they appear to
 be to one who realizes that this is the Son of God, and then killed Him.
 Surely they who killed the son of God is thousand times worse. Well, you might
 take like the, one time when I was going to ~~a field~~ a mission field down
 New
 in/Mexico, I talked to a man whom I met on the street, and I found him in
 the lobby, and he went along _____ (10.00)
 He went on and one, one word and another, and then he asked me what I
 was ~~going~~ to night, and so I answered him, I was preaching down here in a church.
 Oh, is that so, ~~how~~ well, it is nice to meet you. Excuse me for the
 language I was using. I am awfully sorry. I did not realize you were....
 Well, ~~how would anyone be worse~~ how is it any worse for him to commit
 that sin of using that language when I wasn't there than when I was.?

Isaiah, #27, Continued.

God was there all the time. It doesn't make any worse, if I was there. ~~It is~~ in any case. you say,
 If it is ~~is~~ sin, it is always sin. It seems like a ~~grae~~ greater sin. But ~~somebody~~ and
 says, you heard a story of a man who started to tell a filthy story, ~~he~~ says
 I see there no ladies present, so I will tell you, and then somebody speaks
 up and says, there is ~~is~~ no lady present, but there is a gentleman present. And the
 fact ~~is~~ ~~of it is the one~~ of it is that the thing which is wrong is wrong, and it
 was
 is wrong for these people ~~to~~ that crucified him, and the man whoever he was,
 but it would appear to be thousand times worse. In the Middle Ages they talk
 about Judas that he was the worst criminal who has ever lived. He was not
 probably the worst one of the criminals who ever lived. He seems to be the
 worse because he slayed the Lord of glory, but there are others who have
 done worse than he did, because ~~he~~ they had greater knowledge, greater
 understanding of what they were doing, and ~~the~~ I cannot help thinking that
 that prayer ~~that~~ that we should understand the person, it is the attitude of the
 heart rather than the fact is that we don't know, and well, I was, I was,
 you think of many ~~things~~ - cases where you do some little things and some
 terrible results come from them. Then you think it's terrible. Oh, you think
 it's terrible. You think your whole life is ... terrible thing came upon you.
 When it is something that ~~sounds~~ some other people have done and nothing
 happen to come from it, ~~the fact is that~~ It was wrong, Yes, but ~~this~~ particular one
 like this terrible ... does not make it worse than other similar acts which
 other people have done. _____ (7.75) We are judged
 by what we know. We all deserve our punishment before the Lord. But
 we deserve condemnation ~~in the~~ ~~to some extent into person~~ ~~what we have~~
 we have done ~~done~~ rather than necessarily according to the full results *of what we have*

done.

they know

I ~~would~~ I would feel like what _____ (7.50) / what they do I don't think
 that is b _____ because in this verse it was _____ I think it ^w~~should~~
 have been perfect, and I don't think it would have been imperfect. I think imperfect
 would be quite out of place here, if it is a continued _____, but it is
 adding a new thought, a vital thought, one which they wouldn't understand
 fully, one which we think so important that we include in our own creeds and
 everything
 _____, and we realize that it's already given here in this fifty-third Isaiah.

Yes? (Q) Well, this particular word... That is clearly Qal, but this is not Qal.

(6:75)

This is distinct from Qal. Now, He is making an intercession at the right
 hand of God. It is a similar word, yes. If you want to extend the word
 further, _____ I have no objection, but I am afraid that it is basically
 is _____ There is a difference if _____ I would think that _____

INAUDIBLE. When you translate two different tenses in identical way,
 run into a
 you ~~tend to make~~ a certain confusion. It is harder for people to get what
 you originally intend to say. Well, it's time to go. We have two more classes,
 / and

We are unfortunately rather crowded. I say, we are unfortunate in a way
 I think
 from your viewpoint. /unfortunate from your view point, in a-- from my viewpoint in a way
 fortunate, because I am tremendously interested in working into every detail of
 from
 this section, /forty to fifty-six, just as much as possible. And so far as I am
 have taken ~~for~~ on certain I have found
 concerned, the extra time we ~~take time to take~~ ~~some~~ details of it is/very
 stimulating and very beneficial, and I trust that you have to. But it means that
 we are jammed with getting through the two and half chapters in the course of
 because
 two days. / They are very interesting and vital chapters. First we have spent
 a fair amount of time on 53. I wish we could have more time on chapter 53.

I wish we could spend two three hours more on chapter 53. I wish we could spend about fifty hours on it, because there are tremendous amount of material of vital importance in it. But we notice that the chapter ends with "and he made intercession for ~~h~~ the ~~g~~ transgressors, and previous to that we have a description of the atoning work of Christ by which He died that whosoever believeth in Him might not eperish, but have eternal life. In chapter 54, we go on to the results of this, Fifty-four follows the fifty-three. 54. "Sing, O barren, thou that didst not bear; break forth into singing, and cry aloud...." There is a great rejoicing over what has been accompoished in chapter 53. There is a great are to rejoicing over the results that/come from it. These results are described, and pictured, and based upon, so on in this chap ter, then ~~in~~ fifty-five takes the results of fifty-three, and applies it in a more individual way. ~~It~~ ⁵⁴ is applying to it more to a larger group of people. 55 applies ~~to~~ more/individuals. In fifty-four there might be a considerable ^{disagreement about the} ~~degree of~~ interpretation ~~as to how to~~ of it as a whole, and even more about the interpretation of the particular section. Chapter 55 if you relate it to sixty-three, ~~and~~ it seems to me is hardly open to the question. 55 is much simpler to interpret it. It seems to me that it is only reasonable to interpret fifty-four in the light of fifty-three and fifty-five, both of them. And that being the case, I am going to ^{n move} ~~go~~ forward to fifty-four and fifty-five and take it before we take ~~fifty-four~~ sixty-four. If it actually follows directly upon fifty-three, we don't have to follow one commentator who says that fifty-five is supposed to be connected with fifty-three, and we must consider ^{need to} ~~we~~ fifty-three as an interpolation. ~~We~~ I don't think that ~~we~~ take that view at all. But I do think ~~the~~ view that fifty-five and fifty-four both of them proceed out ~~effrom~~ fifty-three, directly out from it, and he deals with one aspect

and then he deals with another aspect. And so, that ~~the~~, you can't take this directly after fifty-three, but it is ~~Isiah~~- Isaiah's message, ~~and~~- which deals with one aspect, and ~~y~~ and then with another aspect. We have a parallel to that over in chapter sixty-five where we have a prayer in the last half of chapter sixty ~~five~~ three and sixty-four, a prayer that God will come and help Zion, help Jerusalem, help His people, and deliver them and allow ~~them~~ the area to be rebuilt, and then at the end of that prayer in chapter sixty ~~three~~ four and we have in chapter sixty-five the passage that As Paul said, God is turning to the Gentiles, and we have , it sounds alike a very strong rebuke to Israel, and the after that we have a wonderful blessing to the Israel, and then the building ~~pf~~ of Jerusalem, which has been asked, and David says, at the end of sixty-four it starts with , after this ~~wonderful~~ , _____ prayer for God's blessing, and for God's help, God cannot but give a good, favorable answer. However, before He does this, He turns aside ^{for} a moment to rebuke ^{Israel} for certain things that need to be rebuked. Now it seems to me that that is almost as bad as the other ~~interpreter~~ who ~~sy~~ says that ~~it is~~ an interpolation because the two immediately follow the chapter. God deals with the prayer of ~~63~~ and ~~64~~ and ⁶⁵ the latter part of ~~65~~, and _____ ~~what~~- He is going to give what's in that, but first He deals with ^{an} ~~the~~ aspect of prayer which needs a careful attention. ~~which~~-- For they have shown a wrong attitude and a wrong spirit, and He shows there His turning from them to the Gentiles as a natural result of that.

No. 28

--- individual in the form of the wonderful gospel called..... We have no other passages like this quite in the Old Testament. And we have no gospel finer/presentation anywhere in the whole Bible than this presentation. It is a wonderful appeal to accept God's free grace given with no condition attached to it whatever. Here is ~~the~~ this in chapter ~~6x~~ 63. There is no conditions attached

TO it because God has already fulfilled the conditions ~~to~~ in Chapter 53. He has made the atonement, now, it can be taken advantage of by any who will come and accept the wonderful offer. Mr. Downs? (Q) In Hebrew? In Hebrew?

I don't claim to be an expert on Hebrew, but I have looked into it a certain

amount. (Q) Oh, I see it, it's applying to it, specifically to that. 'Heb. 4:4/ 2:

Let us therefore fear, lest, a promise being left us of entering into his rest,

... Verse 2, For unto us was the gospel preached, as well as unto them: but the word ~~prea~~ preached did not profit them, a not being mixed with faith in them that heard it."

It seems to me that the author of the book of Hebrews here is referring to the

conditions only in his ^{im}mediate time, isn't he? (Q) Yes, he gives the illustration

before those who were lost because of unbelief. Then you mean that he is speaking

here not about the saints lost in his days but referring back to the lost in the

previous time, and showing that it was the lack of faith which result~~ed~~ in

the preaching of ~~h~~the gospel.)Q) Well, the word gospel of course means

good news. ^{Calvary's} And the good news is that God sent His own son to die on ~~the~~ cross

that whosoever believeth on Him might ~~not~~ perish but have eternal life. That

^{But} is the good news. /Before he actually came, the godd news would be that he is

going to come to make the provision for sin so that whoever accept his provision

can be saved. And that of course wo^{ld}illustrated with the sacrifices and

forms, ceremonies which all of Israels started ~~to~~ revealed in advance.

The provision God is going to make now. ^{it=} But they didn't understand/as we

do, but they looked forward to the very thing which we look back~~ward~~ so that

good news would be God's provision for sin in either case, but here in

chapter fifty-five we have a good news presented in a way which tie right

up with the atonement ~~very clearly~~ ^{would} and definitely and ~~very clearly~~. We^{ve}have

no reason to think that^{the people} /in the days of Moses had a clear understanding ~~of~~

of it as one should have after reading Isaiah ch. 53. (Q) In the understanding yes. The Lord gives us a glimpse of something, then gives another glimpse, and then another glimpse, and then/clarifies ^{He} ~~the~~ it and enlarges it. He does not gives us anything that is false, but He constantly ~~gives us~~ is giving us more completely. Yes? (Q) Yes, yes, well, the world falls into sin _____ (10.75) and ~~wh~~ ^{he} the whole nature of man's mind is affected by sin. That is the point where ~~He~~ ^{he} doesn't ~~wna~~ want to know God, ~~H~~ he wants to turn away from God, he is antagonistic, and ~~he~~ his mind is affected as ~~d~~ well as his understanding is affected. And then God begins bringing ~~into~~ ^{to} the world that has turned away from God a knowledge of Himself and opening up ~~of~~ the understanding and revealing little by little in no to much that the difficulty is with him as with us, it is our ability to understanding. He is giving us, leading us on to ~~little~~ ^{the truth} by little and still reaches the point where we can understand ~~in~~ more. Yes, Mr.?

p (Q) We do, Yes. Peopled fail. Yes, certainly. But I don't think that when one says that one has a very scriptural material to back it up with it. If you go through the Scripture you find that ~~ti-~~ it is man's rejecting, and God gradually almost forcing ~~them-to~~ men to recognition of realization that and introduce to more and more understanding before him. The Scripture does not present man working things out, but it presents God revealing. (Q) no, No, this is what you have pictured is of course the attitude of a natural man. It is the general attitude of the natural man ~~in~~ which ~~it-is-possible-to~~ is possibly held by everybody. ~~Y~~ like this Mr. Kim I have seen to sign in one of the books, Why _____ (8.60) signed by man since the search of truth began. Well, now that is ~~nt-~~ not the teaching of the Bible. The Bible is _____ by God. But when man giving their human interpretation of the world in general, they try to fit ~~it-into~~ the Bible into it, and they find

This
 that it just doesn't fit. The Bible doesn't fit into their category. ~~It~~ is not an
 idea developed by anybody who goes to the Bible to see what it teaches, ~~He has-~~
~~developed on the~~ but an idea developed on the ground of human thought, and
 then go to the Bible, and they try to fit it into it, and it doesn't fit. Now as it
 is presented, it is somebody who knows little about the Bible to others who
 know nothing about the Bible. ~~---It sounds very~~ it sounds very true, but I think
 I told you how I was asked by ~~a group~~ this groups of the Westchester Teachers'
 College which was required to use the text-book e in the history of
 civilization that was written by ~~Professor~~ a professor of Rochester University,
 and he showed the progression in the context of God until you get to the
 second Isaiah who had a god who was so far away from ~~the~~ human being that
~~the Hebrew were not affected by him~~ he could not affect any human being on earth.
 It is the first) _____ the second Isaiah, ~~one~~ the one distant, so distant
 that he could say that My ways ~~not~~ are not your ways, and my thoughts are
 not your thoughts. I simply sat there, and read from the Book, and skimmed
 through there, and then I said, now we find this verse in verse nine of chapter
 fifty-five: "For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher
 than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts." But you look at the
 context, and verse 7 reads, Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man
 his thoughts: and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him;
 and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon. For my thoughts are not yours thoughts,
 neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord." The God of Israel is that, God
 is so interested humanity that He is ready to offer/means of deliverance which
 they ~~do not~~ know nothing about. He is so interested in them ~~that~~ you say,
 How can God ~~deliver~~ us who have sinned/so terribly be ready to do such things

6.50

9.2.2018

Isaiah No. 28, Continued.

while
 as this, ~~Why~~ he says, because my ~~at~~ thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are
 your ways my ways, . . . For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are
 my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts." So the
 thought of the verse is the great superiority of God's character over that of
 human being, because God is so interested in human beings, and so he is
 ready to help them. The man who takes the verse out of context made it teach
 exactly the opposite of what it teaches in the context, and presented that in
 this text book of the history of ~~ethi~~ civilization to show the evolution~~s~~ of the
 ideas of God in the Old Testament. And if you are going to take a verse out
 of context, I guess you can prove anything from any _____ (5.75).

But you go to the Bible and see what it has. It has a picture of God gradually
 revealing Himself to the world that puts ~~X~~ God out of His mind. And God is
 leading them ~~on, and still they get~~ ^{along} until they get a further understanding so that
 they ~~can more~~ more here the realization of what the true God wants us to do.
 Jesus said, I have many things, ~~but I cannot~~ ^{to} tell you, ~~because you cannot bear~~
~~these things.~~ you have no understanding. Then when he sends the Holy
 Spirit, He will lead you all into His truth, and then on the road to _____
 the people just did not have any idea as to the resurrection, and yet _____
 explicitly wrong. But we are in ~~the way same~~ the same way. We hear these
 things, but we don't understand it. It takes us a long ~~time~~ to get where you
 are able to take in place. And it is true of individuals and it is true of the _____
 (4.80). And so God is gradually bringing this teaching. And here ~~is~~ ^{fifty} in sixty-five
 we have a _____ given in a way that cannot be exactly ~~ap~~ parallel
 anywhere in the Old Testament. Is this call to receive the free gift of God
 with nothing to be given _____ There certainly is an information, but

here it is fully expressed in a way you cannot parallel for _____ (4.30)

" Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and the that hath no money; come ye, buy and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price." This is not meaning wine and milk, but this is the material provided free, and there is ~~nothing~~ to it. It costs nothing to get. No, God has ~~won~~ it.

God has prepared ~~by~~ what was prepared in Is. 53. He gave His ~~own~~ Son. He has ordered it in order to make it possible ~~to~~ that 55 and 56. exist. 55 alone, it is ~~meaningless~~. 55 is connected with 53. It is a marvellous presentation of the free gift of God. There is nothing ~~what~~ we can order, but God Himself

has provided the tremendous cost of it. So to us, it is without cost, without money, without price, but on His part it cost a tremendous cost ~~to make~~ ^{in making} it available to us. We better not go into the ~~detail~~- details of it. _____ (3.50)

Continued with the same thoughts in verse 2, "Where do ye spend money for that which is not bread? and your labour for that which satisfieth not? hearken diligently unto me, and eat ye that which is good, and let your soul ^{and} delight itself in fatness." Man is struggling ~~to~~ working to get that which will never ~~wa~~ satisfies him. God provides what satisfies without cost, without ^{had} money, but He ~~paid~~ a tremendous cost for it. "Incline your ear, and come unto me: hear, and your soul shall live; and I will ~~make~~ an everlasting covenant with you even the sure mercies of David." Now ~~how did David obtain mercies~~ ^{and} how does David _____ (2.80)

If you go through the book of Isaiah, you will find that David ~~mentions only three~~ is mentioned only three times. Back in chapter 9 where we find that "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 ... He is going to sit on the throne of His Father David. That _____ (2.60) from chapter 55. and then there is one other mention, now I do not know exactly

Isaiah 28, Continued.

where it is now. Many chapters back here now. Here we have incidental reference here today, and then in our whole present _____ ~~to~~ of forty and fifty-six, fifty-three only ~~mention~~ mentions David. Here he says, I will make an everlasting covenant with you, even the sure mercies of David. Now what are the sure mercies of David? Now first there are those who say that this means that as God shows mercy to David, He will show mercy to us, as God gave David wonderful blessings, He is going to give wonderful blessings to us. That is true that the ways of to David was
The unmerited favor was
an unmerited grace. ~~It was~~ a wonderful way in which God ~~provided~~ treated David. It is ~~an effectual~~ - the effects of ways he is going to treat those who come to Him to be saved. It is a wonderful picture of what it certainly ^{is} must be the full meaning of this verse by ~~many~~ means. Why does David mentioned here? It ties up with David. We have been reading about the , we have been studying about the servant, the servant of the Lord who suffered. He had nothing to tie himself up with a family, to tie him up with the house ^{to} of David, tie him up ~~with~~ the Messianic King who is to reign from David's line. But here ~~h~~ - we have the name of David brought in in connection ~~with it~~ - with it. / Sure mercies of David are involved in the covenant that is made with those who accept God's free grace which is provided through the death of Christ. And so he says, he goes on and say, "Behold, I have given him for a witness to the people, a leader and commander to the people." And some say, well, this goes back to David's line. David has conquered many ~~n~~ nations a round about, and as a result of ~~it~~ - his conquering them, ~~David~~ they received some

knowledge of the true religion. However imperfect, however little they have got, they have got something, and therefore to that extent, David witnesses to these people, and so I have given him for a witness, and he was, David was certainly was a leader and commander to all these nations round about him whom he had conquered. Well, that is all true, but it certainly is not the reasonable basis for giving the verse at this point.

Isaiah No. 29.

Throughout the whole record the (No. 29) the machine skips. (4, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20)

and

We are still interested in return from exile, ^{and} this would be a wonderful picture
 return from ^{and be led}
~~we draw from the~~ exile. You go out with joy, ~~and~~ you set forth peace, and mountains
^r
 and hills shall break forth before you/singing, all the trees will gladly clapp^r their
 hands," We have this statement back in one of the early chapters 40....

I would say that is what is described, and that is all. I don't think we have
 any right to look into further I would not say that that is in chapter
 40. We hope to have an hour or so at the end of the course to look back the 40
 the
 which is ~~a~~ prologue which lays the ~~m~~ emotions for it, and then we see how
 it ~~sums~~ up the whole of the sixteen chapters and chapter 40. But in chapter 40
 that might be, but in the 41 and following this would be a picture of return from
 exile, but here now the thought has been developed to the point where we are dealing
 not merely with return from excile, but deliverance from sin and with the whole
 course of God's dealing with the whole Gentile world as described and suggested
 in the previous ~~v~~erses, Surely verse 12 summarizes his dealings with all His
 people as a result of the atonement as described in 53. He says, You will go
 forth wi th joy, and be led forth with peace" is, of course, you might say,
 the
 this is true of the return from exile, but here he is ~~pe~~ speaking of/much later
 result, not a specific leading of the country, not a specific movement, it is
 more figurative, speaking of the ~~figu~~ future progress of God's people. They
 are to go out with joy, and be led forth with peace, and what does this mean, the
 mountains and hills break forth before your singing, all the trees of field shall
 seems to rejoice
 clap their hands? Does that just mean, all~~-the~~ nature~~/scenes~~ shall rejoice
 because you are so happy~~/~~? Well, you could say that way, you have the fifth
 verse alone. In the description of retu n from exile, it certainly would be a
 proper~~/~~ way to interpret the latter part of the verse as a figurative ~~description~~ ^{of reason}

of the great joy of all nature in God's delivery of His people from the exile ,
But it has to be taken ~~✓~~ in connection with verse 13, and verse 13 describes/
not merely a facilitation of a return to their own land, but a perpetual change
in the natural situation, instead of the thorn/~~that would~~ ^{s will} come first, instead of
~~bridles-~~ briars will come up the myrtle tree. This is to be perpetual, it is to be
the Lord's for a name for an everlasting time that shall not be cut off. Surely
you have the removal of the curse. The removal of the bridle, the myrtle~~s~~
trees are to be up, the ~~✓~~ removal of the curse, there will be the reestablishment
of the _____ condition, the nature free from the results of man's ~~✓~~ sin.
(11.75)
And man is given a perfect place in which to live, and no power is going to
be able to destroy _____ which God has _____ (11.60) (Q) We have no
way of proving that. But certainly Eden was in the period _____ that there
was on the earth. Whether the rest of the world was/~~ready~~ ^{al} in the condition in which/
it was when they went. It would appear to me ~~that~~ more likely that the whole
of the creation ~~of~~ was affected by it. We read, God said ~~to~~ in chapter 3 of
Genesis that ~~✓~~ , he said in verse 17, to Adam he said, Cursed is the ground
for thy sake; ~~for-thou-shalt-eat-~~ in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy
life; Thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat
the herb of the field;" There is a change in the condition. Now you might say,
in Eden the~~✓~~ey didn't have these things. He is going to put them out to the place
where they will have these things. But certainly the more _____ (10.45)
place is that now the whole world is now under affected as a result of this.
God placed a curse upon the creation. Of course, that suggests ~~he=~~ how he did
it. He could have put the rest of the world in the condition where it would
be a result of curse still _____. But we have no evidence that he did.

~~_____~~

I think it more natural to think that He laid the curse then upon the whole world. But at any rate we now have ^a ~~the~~ return of Edenic condition, wheheter that's the whold world or ~~whether~~ whether it resulted, it's caused by man being brought back to Egypt, [?] we are not told. The simple interpretation of it is that the world as a whole is changing. At any rate as far as man is concerned, Edenic condition is being restored, Yes, Mr. ?(Q)No, I would think that verse, the first part of verse twelve is a very general description of the whole future course of the world. (Q) Come, and receive the gospel, ^{you} and ~~ye~~ become a member of God's own people, and from now on ~~we look~~ you go out with joy, and be led forth in peace, and _____ (9.00) a tremendous blessing follows which would necessarily come to pass at once, but which would look forward over your course of _____. It is the result of the redeemed, and man immediately after the resurrection of Christ, he had, they were led forth, they went out with joy, they were led forth with peace, the peace of their God was in their hearts in the midst of the persecution, and the wonderful spiritual ^{it} ~~g~~ blessings God gave them, but certainly/looked ~~ed~~ ^{ing} forward to the time when first as a result of God's work/through them, and their loyally serving him the persecution to be brought about to an end of the whole Roman Empire is to become nominally Christian as a result of the Christian life in the people. The great social change would ~~skneck~~ come to the whole world, and there is a level of life on this earth that is different from what it would have been without the result/^s of the Gospel. But/^{then} looking ^{through} on beyond that/the change of Christ _____ (7.80) Millenium _____

in all things & they shall rejoice. yes?

(Q)++ There that is certainly included, that is certainly included, but if that were the main thought, it would be a strange way of expressing that. The emphasis on it is external rather than on the person, ^{it does} ~~thus it~~ speaks of joy and peace, and all the rest of it talke about what is round about us, and it ~~refers to changes~~ speaks of changes in the nature., and it says ~~there is~~ this is going to be, the Lord for a name of an everlasting that shall not be cut off.... It doesn't fit very well, ^{with} ~~∕~~ that being a primary purpose. That can be included but if this is a spiritual picture ~~of~~ simply of that, you might say anything....

(Q) In verse 12 alone without 13 that could be a very possible circumstance. When you ask 13, it gets ^{to be} ~~too~~ much for that to be ^a ~~very~~ satisfactory explanation. But certainly it is included. 12 alone certainly you could say it. But [∕] when you get to verse 13, you go through those specific changes in the nature, and then you are told that it not merely the nature, ~~but~~ is happy, but the nature is changing in 13. And it is to the Lord for an everlasting sign that wouldn't be cut off. That doesn't fit with "You are going to have peace in your heart, you are going to have joy, you are going to be spiritually better, and there will be to the Lord an everlasting sign that shall not be cut off.

That pictures that _____ put stress on it. (5.25) That would seem to me to destroy the possible of there being really _____ (5.15)

(Q) _____ ~~INGORDA~~
INAUDIBLE. _____

The myrtle, and _____ trees are both used for fine things. And the thorn and briers, [∕] are used for a sign of curse, but as to beyond that, whether you can get a specific suggestions as to myrtle tree or _____

_____ (Q) I would say....

~~I think that~~ I would say that the particular thing of having one brier disappear
up ~~yo~~ the big
and one tree come ~~is not being~~ thought of the passage, but it is ~~the~~ - a part
of the thought of the passage. It is a part of the thought of the passage/ which
~~stands~~ stands for the whole change that will take place, that there is ~~going to be~~
a great change in nature so that what formerly was disagreeable, it becomes
the change
pleasant, and this change in nature goes along with ~~it~~ in the entire world.
in the
The change ~~of~~ human heart alone might be all that is meant in verse 12.

When you stress a change in nature to this extent, there will be an everlasting
sign that shall not be cut off/. Specially this way I don't think we are
justified to think it is purely a figurative speech, that it is a literal change
from ~~s~~
the disagreeable feature/of the world which are ~~the~~ results of the
curse removed to the agreeable features. Yes, Mr. Grafton? (Q) Oh, yes,
you mean the predictions about Palestine? Yes, Palestine is desolate, but
it does not quite tie up with that. There the emphasis is on the removal of (1.75)

THAT which produces ~~p~~ food, and here we have the food stressed in the beginning
of ~~the~~ chapter, but here you don't get food from the myrtle or the fir. It simply is
more pleasant than the ~~xx~~ specific--I think that that makes it less likely that
it is a type (?) of Palestine. It refers more to the whole world. (Q) I ~~would~~
think that it is not nearly as explicit or as full. It is such a tremendous thought
that I ~~feel~~ would not
feel that I/feel justified in building this thought on this passage alone, but I would
feel that this passage is difficult to interpret satisfactorily in any other way
than that, and that we have that thought clearly taught ~~esl~~ elsewhere, and
this fits with this thought and ties it up, and that is the result of it, one of the
results of it. (Q) Now, exactly which section do you mean. (Q) Yes, I would
think it would certainly be a logical thing to think. Now, We have exactly one

--We have only one more hour . I wish we had much more time than we have had for this passage. There is such a ~~x~~ tremendous amount in it, but we must round it out, and so please look at 56, and make a definite ~~decisive~~ decision. How ~~much~~ much of 56 belongs to 40-55. Where does the break come. Do you want to stop ~~an~~ at the end of 55 and say Now, 56 starts a brand new subject, a brand new section of the book of Isaiah, or do you want to say , No, 56 belongs before 55. Give definite consideration of that, now if there is a break somewhere in the course, of it, then what does the first part of 56 deal with. What is ~~is~~ its purpose. What is its main subject. Well, now I ~~se~~ would like to go into it in detail but we don't dare because we have to look at 54, so look at 56 like that, then look at 54 , and as you look at 54 remember ~~that~~ it is ~~hun~~ hung between 53 and 55, and tell me this about each verse of 54. Is he talking about Israel? Is he talking about the church? Is ~~the~~ He talking about the Gentiles? Who is He talking about? Is all of 54 about the same ones or is it talking about two different ones and if ~~w~~ so , which part deals with one and which with the other. I hope that you will be able to have time to get some ~~definite e-~~ definite ideas on this thing. Maybe you had better give a week during vacation to consideration of it and be ready to discuss it, ~~and we~~

We last time looked at 55 and saw the marvelous gospel call in that chapter ~~but~~ about as explicit as anything you can find in the O.T. That is ~~x~~ certainly as fine a presentation of the free grace of God as you can find anywhere at all and surely it is quite appropriate that this should come immediately after the verses with which the previous chapter ends. This is the heritage of the servant of the Lord, and their righteousness is of me.--from me, ~~said~~ saith the Lord. Their righteousness is from me. ~~The~~ We have the servant of the Lord ~~inter-~~ introduced you know in Chapter 41, ~~x~~ long passage about him, ending with that great dramatic

passage from 52-53, after that we know longer have the servant of the Lord.

But we have the servants of the Lord, so these are the followers of the ~~the~~ servant of the Lord. And the heritage of the servants of the Lord, their righteousness is from God. It's a wonderful presentation of justification by faith. It is very clearly not simply a statement of God's mercy to Israel, but it is a statement of God's ~~the~~ marvelous blessing who are redeemed through the Servant of the Lord. Now, we want to look back into 54. I think before we do that we will look ahead into 56, because I want to be sure and look at 56 and it being the smaller of the two subjects we ~~a~~ can more easily judge our time on the larger one if we get the smaller one out of the way first. How many of you feel that all of 56 is a part of the section that begins with chapter 40. Well, how many of you feel that none of it is? Well, I would say this, that up from 40-55 we have practically no real rebuke. We have a sort of indirect criticism for certain features. But we ~~have~~ don't have anything like His watchmen are blind, they are all ignorant, they are all dumb dogs, they cannot ~~bark~~- bark; sleeping, lying down, loving to slumber, yea, they are greedy dogs which can never have enough, and they are shepherds that cannot understand: they all look to their own way, every one ~~seek~~ for his gain from his quarter. Come ye, say they, I will fetch wine, and we will fill ourselves with strong drink; and tomorrow shall be as this day, and much more abundant. The righteous perisheth, and no man layeth it to heart: and merciful men are taken ~~away~~- away, ~~and~~ none considering that the righteous is taken away from the evil to come.--Utterly different, whole atmosphere which we have in chapters 40-55. The end of 56 is certainly in an entirely different area. But now in the first part of 56 we have an exhortation and we ~~a~~ have ~~an~~ some definite promises, and this is quite different from what you expect toward the end of the chapter. It seems rather different from what precedes too, but

where would you say is the line ~~between~~ between the type of material you have in the ~~ifrst~~ first part and the type of the material you have in the second part of the chapter. How many think it is between 7 and 8 , between 8 and 9, between 9 and 10. Well, we have a certain difference of ~~n~~ opinion here. It would seem to me that verse 8 would go with what precedes because verse 8 is still ~~beles~~ blessing. The Lord God who gathered the outcasts of Israel says Yet, will I gather others to him besides those who are gathered unto Him. He is reaching out to other people and bringing them unto the fold. Here is blessing in verse 8 and in verse 6 and 7 we have the sons of the ~~star~~ stranger that join themselves to the Lord brought to the Holy Mountain and ~~mad-~~ make ~~joy-in-~~ joyful in His house of prayer. Surely verse 8 would go with verse 6 and 7. (Q) We want to look into that a little, but the general tone of 7 and 8 goes together. Now , you look at nine, and immediately one can ~~thing-~~ think of 9 as going ~~n~~ with 7 and 8 because they are bringing strangers to the temple ~~just-as-~~ gathering the outcasts of ~~Israea-~~ Israel, and nine is "All ye, beasts of the ~~n~~ field come to devour, yea, all ye beasts in the forest." But it comes to devour, and it ~~be-~~ goes on and speaks of the dumb dogs, the watchmen~~n~~ that are blind, ~~th~~at can't prevent the beasts of the field coming. So that verse nine quite definitely goes with ten rather ~~ta-~~ than with what precedes. And I would feel that the main break after chapter 40 , the main break ~~bew~~ between 39 and 40 -- an equally important break ~~between~~ verse 8 and verse 9. From nine on now, for many verses it is all rebuke and ~~fo~~ severe rebuke ~~fro~~ for extreme sin. It's quite a distance before you get to any blessing in what continues here . But it is ~~be~~ blessing or exhortation from verses one up to verse 8, and the general theme in verse one up to verse 8 is blessing~~that~~ is ahead for those who ~~truy-~~ truly belong to the Lord and particularly the cutting down of barriers that prevent certain

ones from being recipients of the blessing. Here we have the blessing here to those~~x~~ who are truly the Lords, in verses one and two, "my salvation is near to come, and my ~~right~~ righteousness to be revealed. Blessed is the man that doeth this and the son of man that layeth hold on it; that keepeth the sabbath, keepeth ~~his~~ his hand from ~~do~~ doing evil and then those others are included in this, the son of the stranger--he shouldn't say the Lord has ~~se~~ separated me from ~~his~~ His people. The ~~eunich~~ eunuch say, I am a dry tree. Regardless of the ceremonial circumstances which would seem to shut one out from the covenant of Israel, even to them God says in verse five, Even unto them will I give in mine house and within my walls a place and a name better than of sons and of daughters: I ~~will~~ will give them an everlasting name." In other words these ceremonial lines and ~~so~~ so on, if it were necessary to hold the --to guard the truth through the O.T. times, to keep it alive in a hostile world. These are to be broken down as the message goes out and ~~spe~~ spreads in all directions. And the Spn o f the stranger who joins himself to the Lord, to serve Him, to love the name of the Lord, to be his ~~and~~ servants, everyone that keepeth the sabbath from polluting it, and taketh hold of my ~~and~~ covenant, ~~and~~ even them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer: their burnt offerings and their ~~so~~ sacrifices shall be accepted upon mine altar; ~~sh-~~ for mine house shall be called an house of prayer for all ~~peopl~~ people." Well, Mr. Downs thinks this is a prediction that all people from all over the world are going to become Jews and carry on the sacrifices and going to recieve salvation through the extension of the O.T. sacrificial system then. Well, that is one possible ~~intrepre~~ interpretation, but it is not an interpretation that ~~it~~ would fit ~~it~~ with our understanding of God's plan, and the teaching that we find in the N.T. and the teaching suggested very clearly in other parts of Isai~~ah~~h is that God's blessing

is going to reach out into all the world but not necessarily in exactly the same form in which it has gone to Israel, and so I think ~~in~~ under the circumstances we either have to say there has been a mistake and we are all going to come back to circumcision and ceremonial serving, or to say that some ~~to~~ of these expressions are used in a somewhat figurative sense, and that when it says that God is going to accept their burnt offerings and their sacrifices on His altar, he is referring to that which all the sacrifices represented, the atonement of Christ as described in Isaiah 53 and pointing out that this is not for Israel, that it is for all of those who believe on His name, and, consequently, the thought of 56:1-8 ~~makes~~ - which may seem to us a little bit like an ~~anti~~ anti-climax, after the tremendous picture of the ~~An~~ Atonement in 53 and the marvelous picture of the gospel call in 55, it may seem to us a little like an anti-climax, but to the people who are right in the middle of it it wouldn't be at all, because it says the middle wall of partition is broken down and all ~~the~~ of these circumstances which _____ so large then are done away and the whole world is to ~~k~~ have a full opportunity to profit by what the sacrifices represent, the death of Christ on Calvary. (Q) Well, I think we have to say that a statement of I Peter 1:10-12, "of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently ~~who~~ ~~pr~~ 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 testified beforehand of 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 which are now reported unto you by them ~~k~~ that have preached the gospel. Now, in other words, the promise was given marvelous ~~glimpses~~ glimpses of truth of which they understood very considerable about but there was a considerable amount which they would get further into as they got more light, and which wouldn't

31 contd.

-31-

be fully understood until we had the N.T., and I think the principle teaching of the atonement through Christ could be understood from ISaiah 53 alone , without any further , later light at all. Then when you have that , then in the light of this, you would begin to get an apprehension of this but you ~~wul-~~ wouldn't fully understand it until the time of _____ (Q)

31 ended (32 on transcriber)

We cannot certainly observe certain things definitely 56. here I believe that this is predicting the outworking of what happened as described in chapter

53. And consequently it says that after the actual atonement is made ~~to~~ you are ~~is~~ going to find an increase in the outreaching of the Gentiles, so that it would certainly have a very great relevance to the present age. But ~~doubtless~~, it goes beyond the present age

~~on the examination of~~ _____ (Q) N_o, the ninth verse I believe ~~is~~ ^{new} ~~is~~ the confession of beginning of the entirely / section. Section of rebuke quite to Israel for their sin which is ~~a~~ brand new thought. I feel that after verse 8, we have to stop and say how Isaiah has another separate section dealing ~~with~~ in his presentation (13.80). Certainly we yesterday. Mr. Brooks?

(Q) Yes, it ~~seems~~ to me that the Archbishop made one of the worst mistakes ~~if~~ he made anywhere in the Bible, with making a chapter start with 57:1.

That chapter should have started with ~~57:1~~ 56:9. At 57, it should go right straight on continuing ~~if~~ the previous four ~~if~~ verses, and there is no break whatever, but at that is one of the greatest breaks in the whole book. I think it is the one of the worst mistakes in the chapter. Now Ken Morgan says, in 9 cases 9 out 10 chapter division is wrong . I think much of _____ (13.00) between) _____

My ~~own~~ guess is that at least part 10 were pretty well made. But there are some of ~~that~~ them that are rather bad, and fused like this that is here.

I think this one is very bad. I think the one that begins with 53 is _____ --
 because the previous three or four verses are definitely a part of that section
 of the presentat on of the servant of the Lord. There is no _____
 because one
 This is much worse than that. / That is a division into one section, ~~a~~ part of the
 big section whereas this is a division into one of the main section of the whole
 book. Yes? (Q) Yes, There are some who try to make a general judgment.

There is certainly no presentation of anyone saying so whatever. It could have
 the presentation of
 been / the judgment of the ungodly. That is the distinction that has to be made.
 Even some who are strongly opposed to pre-millennial interpretation recognizes
 the fact. Well, there are many details that ~~are very interesting~~ it would be
 very interesting to go into details // 56 here We could continue one more
 semester on this. We could spend two or three days....

But 54 we could spend two or three weeks on, if we had the time. All we can do
~~with~~ ^{with} guiding principles
 is to try to get a few main / ~~thoughts~~ in 54. And 54 is the chapter in which
 there are certain things ~~which~~ ^y which there would be no difficult / indefinitely
 interpreting, and I think there would be a great difficulty ~~it there would be~~ if you
 did not have the context that throw light upon it. But it does happen that we
 ly a lot of
 have a ~~some~~ tremendous ~~amount of~~ context in connection with 54, because we
 have 53 before it, the meaning of which is absolutely clear, because we have
 clear
 55 afterwards, the meaning of which is absolutely ~~clear~~ and we have the end
 of 54 coming, fitting right in with the blessing upon the followers / of the Servant
 of the Lord who are here called the servants of the Lord, and their righteousness
 from
 is ~~for~~ / ~~me~~, saith the Lord." The imputation of the righteousness of Christ, ~~and~~
 to them and their development in sanctification as the Lord gives to them. So that
 we have at the end of the chapter ~~54~~ ^{54 I think} 54, undoubtedly we have the whole of the people

who are the people of God saved through Christ/ regardless whether Jews or Gentiles. We have that at the end of the chapter. Now what do we have in the beginning of the chapter? Here after we finish the marvelous presentation of his going to the atonement, and then it ends up with ~~the~~ ~~sitting on the~~ right hand of God the Father, ~~the~~ making intercession for the transgressors, and then ~~he says~~ then we read: "Sing, O barren, thou that didst not bear; break forth into singing, and cry aloud, thou that didst not travail with child; for more are the children of the desolate than the children of the married wife, saith the Lord." Now I have here Skinner's Commentary on Isaiah ~~in~~ which is in general a modernistic commentary. There would a case where he has made a rather evangelical ~~observation~~ statement, but the interpretation which he gives on this passage will be a rather standard interpretation among those who do not look upon it somewhat thoroughly evangelical view, and he says, ~~the~~ This Zion, ~~is~~ addressed as a barren, desolate woman, is comforted with the assurance that her children are more ~~in number~~ numerous than those ~~who~~ she formerly had as the married wife of Jehovah. She is bidden to extend her tent so as to receive them, for they shall spread abroad on every side, peopling the deserted cities and taking possession of the territory of the Gentiles. Then over in the introductory chapters as a whole he discusses verses 1, 2, 3 as the ideal guidance called upon the rejoicing multitude of her children. More are the children of the desolate than the The contrast is not between Zion and other cities, but between Zion ~~and the~~ present and past. "Even now in her widowhood and barrenness she has more children than she had before her separation ~~from~~ from her husband. Now, of course, that is an interpretation, trying to fit it in with the idea that everything here is return from exile, deliverance from exile. And we have nothing here of any relation to

32

Christ or to the returning to the Gentiles or anything like that whatever. But that doesn't fit, it just doesn't ~~fit~~ fit at all. "Sing, O barren, thou that didst not bear; break forth into singing, and cry aloud, thou that didst not travail with child; for more are the ~~h~~ children of the desolate than the children of the married wife, saith the Lord." Does this mean that Zion was at one time the married wife of the Lord before the ~~e~~ exile, and then Israel had many ~~spiritura~~ spiritual children, but ~~not~~ now she is restless. Now she has no husband. She is not the married wife, she is in widowhood and yet now she has more children ~~than~~ than before. Of course that's nonsense. If Zion as Israel is not going to produce more ^{was} for the Lord, to be spiritually greater than before, if she ~~is~~ his bride before, she is many times more so now. To call her now the one who is desolate, the one who is barren, the one who is the widow now, it just doesn't fit. ^she is spiritually more productive now than she was before. It is because of God's blessing. It's because she is having a closer relationship ~~x~~ than before, and some say it means there were no children born to them during the time ~~x~~ of the exile, which of course is nonsense. But at any rate, there is a contrast ~~x~~ between two different ~~one~~ s here. One is spoken of as the married wife, literally the one who has the husband, the ~~one~~ other is spoken of as the one who has never had any children. "O barren one that didst not bear, the one who is desolate. ~~MOre of the~~ are the children of the desolate than the children of the married wife. And under the circumstances ^{having} and knowing what we do about the turning to the ~~Gentiles~~ Gentiles and ~~in~~ all the references to the Gentiles that have ~~occure~~ occurred in our section before, surely the most natural interpretation of this is to say that after the carrying out of this wonderful thing predicted in ~~x~~ chapter 53, that a ~~strant~~ strange thing is going to

32

-35-

spiritually
happen the one which has been previously/unproductive, which has ~~bee~~ seemed (7.1)
to be outside the covenant of Israel. The ~~barren~~ barren woman which was ~~bar~~ bare-
~~ing~~
ing nothing, from a spiritual viewpoint, ~~is~~ now has more children than the children
of the one that has been God's particular people all through these centuries. Surely
the reasonable interpretation in the light of 53 and 55 and of the N.T. teaching of
course ~~is~~ is that in verse one here we have a very definite ~~pic~~ picture of
the turning of- to the Gentiles. Not ~~that~~ there are not going to be many Jews who
are very profitable (?) members of God's kingdom, but that more ~~of~~ are the children
who seem to be outside the pale than the children of the married wife. And to say
that Israel is now the one who is outside the pale, who is definite (?), who does
not have a husband, very definitely contradicts Chapter 50 where the Lord said, Thus
saith the Lord, where is the bill of your mother's divorcement, whom I have put
away? or which of my creditors is it to whom I have sold you.?" The implication
being that I haven't sold you. I haven't givent up my relationships. Israel which God
had ~~that~~ a very a very special relation ~~is~~ still had a special relation ~~after~~ the
exile just the same as before. The barren ones, the desolate ones, is not a picture
of Israel. This is the Gentiles ~~is~~ surely and here, then, in the beginning of 54 is
the ~~tru~~ turning to the Gentiles, the gospel going ~~to~~ out to the Gentiles and having
an unusual and tremendous productivity, for more are the children of the desolate
than the children of the married wife, saith the Lord. "Enlarge the place of thy
tent, and let them stretch forth the curtains of thine habitations: spare not~~k~~, lengthen
thy cords, and strengthen thy stakes;" And William Carey in about 1798, if I
recall correctly, began, preached that great sermon which began the modern
missionary movement and this was the text which he used. The text that he used
to start the first great modern missionary ~~force~~ board to send out missionaries

32 contd.

to distant lands, "Enlarge the place of thy tent, and let them stretch forth the curtains of thine habitations." He said we ~~do~~ could send missionaries to India to carry the gospel over to these people in India. And you just read about that in the life of William Carey and you say, What a crazy thing, you just pick a verse out of the middle of the ~~te~~ context, ~~ta~~ talking about Israel going back from exile and going to have so many people that they can extend Jerusalem and he takes this and he spiritualizes this ~~and make th~~ text and makes it a call to start mission work. Well, a person just reading the text may think that way, just grabbing a verse to present an idea, and ministers do that a great deal, even sound ministers who ought to know better, but Carey did not do that, that is what the verse here is saying is that the gospel is to go ~~th~~ to the Gentiles, and they are called upon to reach out and to stretch out to all the world with the message of the gospel. It is ~~specifica~~ specifically a missionary ~~tes~~ text, and the modern missionary movement did not ~~stat~~ start on a foundation of incorrect interpretation. It started directly on a specific prediction of the Bible that the Word of God would reach out and extend and go to the very ends of the earth. "For thou shalt break forth on the right ~~an~~ hand and on the left; and thy seed shall inherit the Gentiles, and make the desolate cities to be inhabited." And so these first three verses, in the light of context, seems to me the only reasonable interpretation of it in the light of ~~tes~~ text, ~~it~~ is a prediction that the desolate, the ones formerly desolate, the ones who had not been the center of God's favor in the past is going to ~~be~~ prove spiritually productive, even beyond that group that God had set apart as the means by which He would keep alive the knowledge of Himself through the ages of darkness until Christ came and the message was ready to be taken out to the whole world, and so these first three verses form a unit, they are undoubtedly expressed primarily to the ~~Gentiel~~ Gentiles, these first three verses. But then ~~x~~ you come to the fourth

#-33- # 32 contd.

Is the fourth speaking to the same one or to someone else. "Fear not; for thou shalt not be ashamed: neither be thou confounded; for thou shalt not be put to shame: for thou shalt ~~for~~ ~~g-~~ forget the shame of thy youth, and shalt not remember the reproach of thy widowhood any more. For thy ~~Makes~~ Maker is thine husband; the Lord of hosts is His name; and thy Redeemer the Holy One of Israel; ^{The} ~~Thy~~ God of the whole earth shall ~~be~~ he be called." Surely here He is looking back to Israel a gain, and Israel is going to be delivered from exile. ~~Israel is going-~~ God is not through with Israel. Exiled Israel is to be delivered from sin. Israel is to have God's blessing continuing upon her. Israel is still to be the recipient of God's mercy, but He is, in ~~addo-~~ addition, going to ~~be~~ be called the God of the whole earth. "For the Lord hath called thee as a woman forsaken and ~~griev-~~ ~~gri-~~ ~~v-~~ grieved in spirit, and a wife of youth, when thou wast refused, saith thy God. For a small moment have I forsaken thee; ~~but~~ but with great mercies will I gather thee." This verse seven has no application to the Gentiles. God has not forsaken us for a small moment. We were outside of Israel. We had turned aside from God. The whole race had turned aside from Him. They put Him out of their minds. They didn't want to know Him, and in this situation where the whole world turned ~~be~~ against God, God called Abraham and selected Abraham and his family as the means by which He would keep alive the Word of God and prepare the way for the coming of His Son, and He has not forsaken Israel. He has still His purpose through Israel, ~~after~~ after the exile, on to the time when Christ comes to Israel. After that there were many of Israel who were members of the original church and through the ages there have been constantly some of Israel who have been won through the message of Christ, and in the end there will be a nation born in a day.

Isa. 31

We have only one more hour . I wish we had as much more time as we have had. Isa. 55 and 56--there's a tremendous amount in it, but we must round it out and so please look at 56, and make a definite decision about this. How much of 56 belongs with 40-55. Where does the break come. Do you want to stop at the end of 55, and say, now 56 starts a brand new subject, a brand new section of the Book of Isaiah, or do you want to say No, 56 belongs with ~~50~~ 40 to 55, or do you want to say there is a break somewhere in the course of it. Give definite consideration of that. Now if there is a break somewhere in the course of it, and then, what does the first part of 56 deal with. What is its subject, what is its main subject . Well, now, I would like to go into this in detail but we don't dare. We have to look at 54, look at 56 like that and as you look at chapter 54 , w remember that it is coming between ~~53~~ 53 and 55, and tell me this about each verse of 54. Is he talking about Israel , Is he talking about the Church , is he talking about the Gentiles, who is he talking about. Is all of 54 about the same ones, or is it talking about two different ones, and if so which part deals with one and which part deals with the other . I hope that you will be able to ~~answer~~ have time to have some definite ideas on the subject, and if any of you have any thoughts about the notes there, please get them in.

I wish we could ~~h~~ have added another hour and not have had to loose these seven or eight minutes. But I think if we go fast, we can touch the main things in the section that is still left to us. I hope that all of you have read that announcement put up about Isaiah because it is helpful to me in determining what to do next semester if I should find any strong desires one direction or another on the part of any students. We, last time, looked at 55 and we saw the marvelous gospel call in that chapter. But as explicit as anything as we can find anywhere in the Old Testament. And is certainly as fine a presentation of the free grace of God as you will find anywhere at all. And,

surely, it is quite appropriate that this should come immediately after the verse with which the previous chapter ends. This is the heritage of the ~~Lord~~ Servant of the Lord and their righteousness is from me, saith the Lord. ~~¶~~ We have the servant of the Lord introduced in chapter 41, long passages about him, and ending with that great climatic passage from 52 -53. After that, we no longer have the Servant of the Lord, but we have the servants, of the Lord, so these are the followers of the Servant of the Lord. And the heritage of the Servants of the Lord. Their righteousness is from God. It is a wonderful presentation of justification by faith. It is very clearly not a statement of God's mercy to Israel but a statement of Justification by Faith. ~~It is - Is is~~ It is a statement of God's ~~mercy -~~ marvelous blessing for those who are redeemed through the great ~~work~~ work of the Servant of the Lord. Now, we want to look back into ~~the~~ 54, but I think before we do that we will look ahead into 56, because I want to be sure and look at this prediction, and it being the smaller of the two, we can more easily judge our time, ~~if~~ if we get the smaller one out of the way first. I asked you to look at 56 today and 54 and how many of you feel that all of 56 is a part of the ~~see~~ section of Isaiah that begins with chapter 40. Would you raise your hand. Well, how many feel that none of ~~you~~ you Would you raise your hand. We have only one who feels that none of it is. We have none that feel that all of it is. Well, I would say this, that up from 40-55 we have practically no real rebuke, we have sort of an indirect criticism ~~from~~ of the people from certain features, don't but we have anything like, "his watchmen are blind, they are all ignorant," ~~in direct criticism for certain features, but~~ . . . utterly different, whole atmosphere than that which we have in chapter 40-55, so the end of 56 is certainly in an entirely different area. But now in the first part of 56 we have an exhortation and a ~~call~~ some definite promises, and this is quite different from what we have toward the end of the chapter-- it seems quite different from what precedes too, but where ~~you~~ would you say is the

2 0

Isa. 31

line between the type of material you have in the first part and the type of material you have in the second part of the chapter. Mr. Downs? Between 7 and 8, how many think it is between 7 and 8, how many think it is between 8 and 9. How many think it is between 9 and 10. Well, we have a certain difference of opinion. It would seem that ~~ex~~ verse 8 would ~~lx~~ go with what precedes because verse 8 is still blessing. The Lord God who gathered the outcasts ~~fx~~ of Israel ~~vx~~ says Yet, will I ~~ax~~ gather others to Him besides others who are gathered unto Him. Here, he is reaching out to other people and bringing them into the fold. Here is blessing in verse 8, and verse 6 and 7 we have the sons of the stranger join themselves to the Lord, brought to His Holy Mountain, surely verse ~~ix~~ 8 ~~gx~~ will go with 6 and 7. Well, now that's a problem we want to look into a little, but the general tone of 7 and 8 go together. Now, you look at 9, and immediately one can think of 9 as going with 7 and 8, because they are bringing strangers to the temple, ~~bringing-out-~~ gathering the outcasts of Israel, and verse 9 says All you beasts of the field come, and devour and then it comes on and speaks of the dumb dogs, the watchmen that are blind that can't prevent the beasts of the field ~~ix~~ coming. So, verse 9 very definitely goes with ten rather than what precedes. And I will feel that the main break comes after 40, ~~-you-spend~~ from 9 on for many verses it is rebuke, and the general theme from verse one to verse 8 is blessing that is ahead for those who truly belong to the Lord and particularly the cutting down of the barriers that prevent ~~every~~ certain ones from being recipients of the blessings. We have the blessings here for those who are truly the Lord's. And verses one and two, "My salvation is near to come, and my righteousness to be revealed. Blessed is the man that doeth this, and the son of man that layeth ~~it~~ hold on it; that keepeth the sabbath from polluting it, and keepeth his hand from doing any evil." The Son of a stranger, he

shouldn't say The Lord hath separated you from his people. The ~~Eug-d~~ Eunuch shouldn't say , "I'm a dry tree. Regardless of the ceremonial circumstance which would seem to shut one out of Israel, even to them, God says in verse ^{five} ~~one~~, "I have ~~g-in-v~~ given in mine house and within my walls a place and a name better than of sons and of daughters: I will give them an everlasting ~~ne-~~ name, that shall not be cut off. ~~X~~ Even unto them will I give in mine house and within my walls a place and a name better than of sons and of daughters: I will give them an everlasting name, ~~x~~ that shall not be cut off." In other words, these ~~cerem~~ ^{guard} ceremonial lines and so on that were so necessary to ~~hold~~ the truth of N.T. times , to keep it alive in a hostil world. These can be broken down as the message goes out, and spreads~~x~~ in all directions, and the sons of the stranger who joins himself with the Lord, to serve him, and to love the name of the Lord, to be his servants, everyone that keepeth the sabbath from polluting it, and taketh hold of my covenant; Even them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer: their burnt offerings and their sacrifices ~~x~~ shall be accepted upon mine altar; for mine house shall be called an house of prayer for all people. Well, Mr. Downs thinks that this is a prediction that all ~~pe~~ople from all over the world ~~xx~~ are going to become Jews and carry on the sacrifices and are going to receive salvation through the ~~ext4n~~ extension of the Old Testament sacrificial system. Well , that is one possible interpretation . But it is not an interpretation ~~wit~~ which ~~will wo~~uld fit with our understanding of God's plan. The teaching that we find in the N.T. AND the teaching suggested very plainly in other parts of Isaiah, but not ~~necessary-~~ necessarily in exactly the same form which had gone to Israel. But ~~xxxx~~ under the circumstances we have to say there has been a mistake and we ~~have to back and~~ are all going to come back to circumcision and ~~te~~ the ceremonial service , Yet, to say that some of these expressions here are ~~su~~ used in a somewhat figurative sens and when it says that God

Isa. ~~53~~ 31

42

is going to accept their burnt offerings and their sacrifices on ~~th~~ His altar , He is referring back to that which all the sacrifices represented the Atonement of Christ as in Isaiah 53 and pointing out that this is not just for Israel ~~but--~~, that ~~is~~ it is for all those who believe on His name. And, consequently, the thought of 56:1-8 which may seem to us a little like an anti-climax ~~and~~ is here a tremendous picture of the Atonement in 53 and the marvelous picture of the gospel call in 55 , it may seem to us like an anti-climax, but the people who are right in the middle of it, it wouldn't be at all, for it says the middle wall of partition is broken down , and all of these circumstances, are done away, and the whole ~~wo~~ world is to have the ~~profit by what the sacrifice~~ opportunity to profit by what the sacrifice represents, the death of Christ on Calvary.

(Q) Well, I think we have to say the statement ~~of verse~~ I Peter 1:10~~12~~ that 'bf 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 times, the spirit of Christ which was in them did signify when he 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 are now reported unto you by them that preach the gospe. Now, in other words as the promise was given marvelously of which they understood a ~~very~~ considerable amount which they would get further into as they got ~~more-r~~ more light and which wouldnt be fully understood, until we had the New Testament, and I think that the principle ~~teachi-~~ teaching of the Atonement through Christ could be understand from Isaiah 53 alone without any further major light at all, and then when you have that in the light of this, you would begin to get an apprehension ~~x~~but you wouldn't fully understand it until the time of ...

5

Dea 31

We can observe certain things about this, that this in 56 here I believe is predicting the outworking of what happened in 53, and consequently , that it says that after the actual atonement is made they are going to find an increase in the outreach to the Gentiles, so that it would certainly have a very great relevance to the present age, but doubtless reach on ~~been~~ beyond the present age to something. No, the ninth verse I believe is the beginning of an entirely new section, the section of rebuke to Israel for its sin , which is quite a brand new style. I feel that after verse 8 we have to stop and say how Isaiah has another separate section to deal with in his presentation. Mr. Brooks? It seemse d to me that the Archbishop made one of the worst mistakes anywhere in the Bible with making a chapter start with 57:1, that chapter should have started with 56:9, that at 57:1 it goes right straight on continuing the previous four verses, and there is no break whatever, but at 9 there is one of the greatest breaks in the whole book, so I think it's one of the worst mistakes in the chapters. Campbell Morgan said, "In nine cases out of ten the chapterx divisions are wrong, and I think there is _____ My ge guess is that in at least 8 out of 10, they are pretty well made. But there are some of them that are rather bad like this one. And I think the ones at the beginning of 53 ...because the previous three ~~of~~ or four verses are definitely part of that section, starting with 52:12--there is no reason to break 53:1 . But this is much worse than that, because that is a division into one section, one part of a big section where this is a division into one of the main sections of the whole book. (Q) There are some who try to make it a general judgment, but there is certainly no presentation of anyone saying that whatever. It is clearly a presentation of the judgment of the ungodly. Even some who are strongly opposed to pre-millennial interpretaxtion recognize that ...Well, there are many details are very interesting to go into in 56 if we could continue one more semester on this. ~~Is~~ If we could spend two or three days profit on it, but 54 we could spend two or three

6
9

Isa. 31

~~days with profit on it, but 54~~ we weeks on it as profit if we had the time. All we ~~could do can~~ can do in the time we have is to try to get a few main guide-posts in 5-43, 54 and 54 is ~~the~~ a chapter in which there are certain things in ~~it~~ which there would be no difficulty in definitely interpreting, others in which there would be great difficulty if you did not have context to throw light on it, but as it happened we have a tremendous lot of context in connection with 54, because we have 53 before the meaning of which is absolutely clear, we have 55 after, the meaning of which is absolutely clear, and we have the end of ~~55~~- 54 fitting right in with the blessing of the followers of the Servant of the Lord, who are here called the Servants of the Lord and their righteousness is from me, saith the Lord. The imputation of the ~~right~~ righteousness of Christ and a development in sanctification as the Lord gives it to them. And so we have at the end of the chapter of 54--undoubtedly, we have the whole of- of the people who are the people of God saved through Christ, regardless of whether they are Jews or Gentiles. We have that at the end of the chapter. Now, what do we have at the beginning? Here after ~~we~~ we finish this marvelous ~~speech~~ presentation of the Atonement, it ends up that he is going to be at the right hand of God making intercession for the ^{transgressors} ~~intercessors~~. Then we read, "Sing, O barren, thou that didst not bear, break forth into singing and cry aloud, thou that didst not travail with ~~w~~ child. For more are the children of the desolate than the children of the married wife, ~~it~~ saith the Lord. Now, I have here Skinner's Commentary on Isaiah which is in general a modernistic commentary, though he occasionally has some rather evangelical statements. But the interpretation which he gives on this is the rather standard interpretation among those who do not look upon it from a thoroughly evangelical viewpoint. He says of this Zion addressed as a barren and desolate woman. Is comforted with the assurance that ~~her~~ her children are more numerous than those she formerly had as the married wife of Jehovah. She is visibly extended her tent so as to receive them. She shall spread abroad on every side, peopling

1
8

Isa 31

the deserted cities and taking possession of the territory of the Gentiles, and then
~~ever-~~ discussion of 1 to ~~x~~ 3 it says the ideal Zion is called upon the rejoice in the
multitude of her children. More are the children of the desolate --the contrast is
not between Zion and other cities but between Zion, her present and her past, even
now in her widowhood and barrenness she has more children than she had before her
separation from her children. And of course ~~th-~~ that is an interpretation to try to
fit in with the idea that everything we ~~has-~~ have here is return from exile, deliverance
from exile. And we have nothing here of any relation to Christ or the ~~th~~ turning to the
Gentiles or anything like that ~~wa~~ whatever. But it doesn't fit, it doesn't fit at all.

"Sing, O barren, thou that didst not bear; break forth into singing, and cry aloud,
t hou that didst not travail with child: for more are the ~~eh-~~ children of the desolate
than the children of the married wife, " Does this mean that Zion was at one time
the married wife of the Lord before the Exile and then Israel had many spiritual children
but now she is desolate --she has no husband. She is in widowhood, and now she
has more children than before. Of course that's nonsense, if Zion ~~is-~~ and ~~W~~ Israel
is going to produce more for the Lord , is to be spiritually greater than she was ~~bf~~
before. If she was ~~her~~ his bride before she is many more times so now. To call
her now the one that is desolate-the one who is barren, the one who is the widow now,
it ~~is~~ just doesn't fit. She is spiritually more productive now because of God's blessing.
It is because they are having a closer relationship, rather than being further away.
And some say there were no children born in Jerusalem ~~du-~~ during the time of the exile,
which, of course , is nonsense. Clearly there is the contrast between two different
ones here, one is ~~for~~ spoken of as the ~~x~~ married wife, literally, the one that ~~x~~ has
a husband, the other is spoken of as the one who never had children, O barren one,
that didst not bear, for more are the children of the desolate than the children of the
married wife. And under the circumstances and knowing what we do about the turning

to the Gentiles, and having all the references to the ~~Gentile~~ Gentiles, and having
~~at~~ ^{occurred} the all the references to the Gentiles that have/occurred in our section before,
 & surely the most natural interpretation of this is to say that after the carrying out
 of this wonderful thing predicted in chapter 53 that a strange thing is ~~going~~ going to
 happen, one which previously has been spiritually unproductive, which is seen to
 be outside the Covenant of Israel, the barren one which was bareing one ~~for~~ from a
 spiritual viewpoint now & has more children than the children of the one who has been
 God's particular people all through these centuries. Surely, the reasonable interpretation
 in the light of 53 and 55 and of the N.T. teaching, of course, is that ~~th~~ in verse one
 here we ~~have~~ have a very definite picture of a turning to ~~the~~ ~~the~~ Gentiles, not going to
 be many Jews ~~that are going~~ who are very profitable members of God's Kingdom, but
 that more are the children of those who seem to be outside of the pale than the children
 of the married wife. To say that Israel is now the one who is outside the pale, who
 is desolate, who does not have a husband, very definitely contradicts 50 where the
 Lord says, Where is the bill of your mother's divorcement, whom I have put ~~away~~,
 away, to which of my creditors have I sold you, the implication being I haven't sold
 you, I haven't given up my relationship to you. Israel to which God ~~has~~ had a very
 special relation still had that special relation after the exile, just the same as before.
 The picture of the barren one, the desolate one is not a picture of Israel, this is the
^{then}
 Gentile surely, and here/in the beginning of 54 is the turning of the Gentiles, the gospel
 going out to the Gentiles and having an unusual and tremendous productivity, for &
 more are the children of the desolate than ~~the~~ the children ~~of~~ of the married wife,
 saith the Lord. Enlarge the place of thy ~~the~~ tent, and let them stretch forth the curtains
 of thine habitations: spare no, lengthen thy cords, and strengthen thy stakes. And
 William Carey about 1798, if I recall correctly, preached that great sermon which began
 the modern missionary ~~mov~~ movement, and this is the text which he used to start the

first great modern missionary board to send out ~~missionary~~ missionaries to distant lands. "Enlarge the place of ~~they, -t~~ thy tent, and let them stretch forth~~x~~ the curtains of thine habitations:" He says we should send missionaries to India, ~~to~~ carry the gospel over to these people in India, and you just read that in the life of William Carey and you say what ~~was~~ crazy thing, He just picked a verse out of the middle of the context, talking about Israel going back from exile, ~~and they~~ going to have ~~so~~ many people that they can extend Jerusalem, and he takes this and he spiritualizes the text and he makes it a call to start mission work. Well a person just reading that he used the text, ~~that he~~ may think that way, that he was just grabbing a verse to present an idea, and ministers do that a great deal, even good, sound ministers who ought to know better. But Carey did not do that, that is what t he verse here is saying, that the gospel is to go to the Gentiles, and they are called upon ~~the~~ - to reach out, and to stretch out and reach all the world with the message of the gospel. It is definitely a missionary text, and the modern missionary ~~mv~~ movement did not start on a foundation of incorrect interpretation. It started directly on the specific prediction of the Bible that the Word of God would reach out and extend and go to the very ends of the earth. "For thou shalt break forth on the right hand and on the left, and thy seed shall inherit the Gentiles, and make the ~~de~~ desolate cities to be inhabited. " And so, these first three verses, in the light of context seem to me ~~to~~ the only reasonable interpretation of them in the light of context is a prediction that the one formerly desolate, the one that had not been ~~x~~ the center of God's faith in the matter is going to prove spiritually productive, even ~~beo~~ beyond that group that He had set apart as the ~~mean~~ means by which he would ~~set apart~~ keep alive the knowledge of Himself through the ages of darkness. until Christ came and the message was ready to be taken out to the whole world. And so these first three verses form a unit as they are undoubtedly expressed

to primarily to the Gentiles, these first three verses. But then you come to the fourth. Is the fourth speaking ~~to~~ to the same ones or to someone else. "Fear not, for thou shalt not be ashamed: neither be thou confounded: for ~~thou~~ thou shalt ~~not~~ not be put to shame: for thou shalt forget the shame of thy youth, and shalt not remember the reproach of thy widowhood any more. For thy Maker is thine husband; the Lord of hosts is His name: and thy Redeemer the Holy One of Israel;" ~~The G~~ Surely here now he is looking ~~to~~ back to Israel again, and Israel is going to be delivered from exile. ~~Israel is going to~~ God is not through with Israel. Exiled Israel is to be delivered from sin. Israel is to have God's blessing continuing upon here. ~~It~~ Israel is still to be the recipient of God's mercy, but He is the Redeemer, ~~of~~ the Holy one of Israel. He is going to in addition to be called ~~ad-~~ at the end of verse 5 the God of the whole earth shall he be ~~called~~ called." For the Lord hath called thee ~~and~~ as a woman forsaken and grieved in spirit and a wife of youth, when thou wast refused, saith thy God. For a small moment have I forsaken thee; but with great mercies will I gather thee. Verse 7 has no application to the Gentiles. God has not forsaken for a very small ~~moment~~ moment. We were outside of Israel. We had turned aside from God. The whole race had turned aside from Him. They put Him out of their mind, they didn't ~~want~~ want to know Him, and in this situation where the whole world turned against God, God called Abraham and selected Abraham and his family as ~~the~~ the means by which He would keep alive the knowledge of God and prepare the way for the coming of the exile, and He has not forsaken Israel. He has still a purpose to Israel after the exile on to the time when Christ ~~come-~~ comes to Israel. After that, there were many of Israel who were members of the ~~original~~ original church and through the ages there have been ~~constant~~ constant so constantly some from Israel who have been won to the message of Christ, and in the end Israel is to be a nation born in a day. (Q)

11

Isa. 33

I would say definitely that in the ~~x~~ first three verses he is looking to the Gentiles those that were desolate and outside .. He ~~looks~~ looks to them now, the results coming to them now and shows the results coming to them . And then, after three verses of ~~ht~~ that , he looks ~~be~~ back to them, and of course our biggest emphasis is on Israel all through Isaiah, but we also have these definite emphasizes upon the Gentiles. And here , this verse three might be very ~~diffu~~ difficult to understand in that time. It might be very hard to see, it doesn't seem to make ~~sen~~ sense ~~x~~ on any basis that would seem natural to them, but then when Paul comes he quotes from other passages that are no clearer than this one to show God's mercy to the Gentiles, as predicted already in the Old Testament. This fits right in, this one which he doesn't specifically ~~remember~~ quote fits right in ~~x~~ with the others. (Q) I don't know whether he did or not. He may have understood it. He ~~may~~ ~~x~~ have thought now, I just don't understand exactly what the particularly ~~x~~ words mean.

⊗ There are certain suggestions which I don't quite catch, ~~there may have been~~ they may have said them, I don't know Because Peter said the prophets were questioning what or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify when he ~~prophesid~~ prophesied beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow. And when the thing comes, then you see how it fits together, and then Paul and the others could say, Look , this is what ~~e~~ you would expect. Jesus said to the men on the Emmaus Road, ~~xx~~ you think ~~x~~ everything is a failure, you thought you were going to be the one to redeem Israel, and ~~x~~ here Jesus died, and you think these are old ~~wif~~ wives tales that somebody has found ...but he says this is what the prophet says , the Son of Man must suffer and die and be raised again the third day. Well, it ~~x~~ was there in the prophets but they hadn't understood it. How many did understand it, we just ~~clont~~ don't know. Jesus said,

Isa. 33

they should have understood it. He said, Fools and slow of ~~h~~ heart to believe all the(Q) Yes, I would say it is that way. There are quite a number of passages which can only be understood on that account, that the Thou . . .and you have to tell from the words what is meant. Ordinarily, I ~~go~~ would quite agree with you that when you find a Thou, look ~~a~~ back to your context and see if you have light on who the thou is. Like the end of ~~54~~ 52, where we compare Him with Thee, and it shows exactly what it is , but there are quite a number of passages where ~~it~~ He speaks of one and then turns his attention to another, and you have to gather ~~it~~ it from the context. Israel is also spoken of as a nation. Well, the word Gentile here is -there is . . .The word Gentile~~x~~ is the Greek word meaning nation. No, Israel is called a Goa in the Bible. It is a nation, but since there are many many other nations, and Israel is ~~one-only~~ only one nation , when you speak of the nations, ordinarily ~~you~~ ~~you~~ ~~ma~~ means the nations other than Israel, but if you ~~a~~ can speak to one nation, and say you will reach out to the other nations, you can speak to a group of people from the nations; that is, the word Gentile~~x~~ here does not prove that the one addressed is not a Gentile. Well, I would say simply this, that verse 5 is very clearly addressed to Israel. Verse six is very definitely to the Jews: "The Lord hath called thee as a woman forsaken.' Now, ~~the~~ if that is to the Jews in 5,6,7 , who will 4 go with, with what ~~ke~~ precedes or what follows. And since four speaks of widowhood , and I don't think you could speak of a widow ~~he~~ ~~tho~~ who had not been united with God before. Therefore, it would seem to me the widowhood there suggests that the place where the break comes. You see, I would say that the last ~~two-verses~~ of 54 is addressed to all the people of God as a unit--all those who believe in the service ~~as-a unit~~ servant as a unit. I would say that is true of the latter . Then I would say that the first ~~k~~ verse is undoubtedly

Isa. 33

addressed to the Gentiles who come to believe, that small group of Gentiles who come to believe, comparing them with the group who had been God's chosen people, and in between these are many verses referring to Israel, and to decide ~~exac5ly~~ exactly ~~wh~~ re the transition comes may require very careful attention. I wish we had three or four hours to work over the details , but my present feeling is that ~~at~~ between three and four is where one of the ~~tr~~- transition comes , but the ~~big~~ big aspect we can be ~~den-~~ definite that ~~all~~ all the people of God who are saved through the suffering servant is verse ~~7~~ 17, that verse one is the Gentile believer, that verse 6 is Israel , and then before the transition (Q) The ~~re~~ reproach of thy widowhood , now ~~what~~ what does that phrase mean. That would refer to those who seem to have been forsaken, those who , God had let ~~his~~ His temple be destroyed, the capital of His worshippers be left a ruin, the people carried off into exile, they seem to be ~~like~~ like a people in widow-hood. He says, of course, God has forsaken me. What makes you think that God has forsaken me, where is your mother's bill of divorcement. I haven't forsaken you. It was on account of your sins that I sent you into exile . It was part of God's plan to purge them, to cleanse them, to fit them to be the people ~~who~~ through whom He is ~~going~~ going to bring the Messiah into the world and through whom ~~he~~ he is going to keep alive the knowledge of God until that time when the Messiah comes. ~~The~~ This widowhood is figurative to that extent, that ~~it~~ it means the ~~reproach~~ reproach would seem to be in widowhood rather than actually being. Of course the whole ~~approach~~ idea ~~is~~ ~~of~~ of the figure anyway, because they are not the wife of God, but because He speaks of Israel as His wife in Hosea, particularly you have that figure used of the one whose erring wife He is nevertheless true to and does so much for, and that is the same figure here. It doesn't seem to be that it ~~could~~ could refer ~~to~~ to anything except Israel. So that I feel

rather definitely that verse 4 is a reference to Israel , but I don't see how verse one could possibly be. (Q) Yes, "thy seed" in verse three could be your literal children or it could be your spiritual children, those that you bring to the knowledge of the Lord. It would have to be one of those. And of course we do have the term used of Abraham, Abraham's literal children is frequently used of the ~~the~~ descendants of Abraham according to the flesh, and then we have the reference to the seed of Abraham, those who are His spiritual children, so "thy seed" here could be either way. And if this were simply a reference to return from exile and ~~becoming~~ becoming numerous again back in their own land, it would stand for physical descent, but in the context it seems to me that it stands for the spiritual descent, the ones who are brought into the ~~knowel~~ knowledge of the Lord through their _____, AND it parallels back in 49 where we are told that as a result of the actions of the work of the Servant, that the Word is going to go ~~forth~~ forth. These will come from far --these from North and West, and these from the land of Canaan. (Q) Yes, where Paul there in Galations says this he spoke of Not of ...as many but of ...as of one. That is a very unfortunate translation. That ^{passage} ~~word~~ is ~~ud~~ used over and over as a proof of verbal inspiration, that the O.T. used the ~~singular~~ singular instead of the plural. It doesn't mean that at all. It is an exegesis of it, not a proof. He is not building an argument on the fact that it is singular , not plural because right in the same passage in the O.T. God says to Abraham , Thy seed shall be like the sand of the sea ...the word is collective, but Paul is saying this singular word in this case does not meanI guess that is all the time we can spend on this section ~~of~~ of 40-52.