Copy 2

Lecture 1 000641 ISAIAH Sept. 11, 1974

Reading of the roll.

There was a little misunderstanding in getting out the list of the electives. Instead of the description of this course there was a description put in for a course that I gave two years ago. That course was supposed to be limited to very top students in Hebrew, in using the Greek and the Latin. I did not have that in mind for this year at all, so it had been intentionally arranged on the schedule so that just about anybody who could take an elective if they wanted to could have this hour free. But then the other statement got put into the list. So if anybody took this thinking it would be a lot of difficult Heb. and Latin and Greek, why this is a different kind of course and I don't want anybody to be in it wanting something different from what we are giving, but my intention this year was to give a course that would be available to anyone, and we will make references to the Hebrew and to the Greek and to the Latin probably, but we won't have any prerequisites and we will not work directly hardly any with the languages. Now the announcemnt in the list of electives was not altogether wrong. That is it did not suggest an entirely different course from == for this reason: that the course it describes, the course I gave two years ago was an intensive study of Isa. 53, and It said in the statement "and related passages" but in the course of that semester we only got through Isa. 53. We did not get to any related passages. Well this course is definitely Isa. 53 and related passages, because it is Isa. 40 - 55 -- that section of Isaiah which has its great climax in Isa. 53. Properly to understand Isa. 53 we need to understand the section, to anderstand the related passages.

In fact, actually this course should be taken before that course because one isn't really ready to go into the little details of Isaiah 53 until one has the structure of that section of the book and the interrelation of its sections.

Now the book of Isa. is probably one of the greatest masterpieces of all literature. Certainly in the Bible is a wonderful collection of literature, from a literary viewpoint. But there is nothing from a literary viewpoint in the Bible that is superior to the book of Isaiah. In fact there is little that has ever been written that is superior simply from a literary viewpoint to the book of Isaiah. It is one of the outstanding masterpieces of writing. And it is largely poetical in form. Hebrew poetry is different from poetry in most of our western languages. It is more readily translatable, because it is not poetry that is based so much on rhyme or on meter ~~or~~ on matters like that that can't be translated actually from one language to another. If you are going to have them in a translation, it has to be altogether ~~fff~~ different. You cannot borrow anything of rhyme or of meter from a writer in a different language. But Hebrew poetry is a ~~poetry~~ poetry of ideas, a poetry of length of lines, a poetry of relationof thought of lines, of repetitions of thought at regular intervals rather than of repetitions of particular sounds like most of our western poetry is. Consequently the poetical value of the book of Isaiah shines through in any translation. It may not be as great as poetical value of the original, but a very great deal of it remains. One of the great things about the Bible is its wonderful ~~great~~ translatability. The Bible is not only a great literary classic in the original Heb. and Greek, but it has become a great literary classic in German. It is the very foundation of the German language, of the modern German language. And it is to

a very great extent the foundation of our present English language because the effect of the KJV on the English language has been very very great indeed. One of the great things about the Bible is its translatability.

Now the Mohammedans boast of the fact that the Koran is not translated, that the great beauty of the Koran is in the original Arabic, and it does have very great literary beauty in the original Arabic. Properly speaking it should be used only in the Arabic. Translations are only to give you some idea of what it's about. But the boast is that it is not really translatable. You have the opposite situation in relation to the Bible.

In the Bible Isaiah is one of the very great sections of the Bible and in Isaiah there is no section that is great than the section from Ch. 40-55. But unfortunately it is comparatively little known as a whole section in our Christian world. Now there is no Christian who has ever attended church who is not familiar with much portions of this from Isa. 40-55. Anyone who has ever heard the Messiah sung is very familiar with many of the verses of ch. 40 which has so much from the Messiah, and so do many other chapters from this section 40-55. Ch. 53 is certainly one of our outstanding sections about Christ in the OT, and most Christians who know much at all about the Bible are familiar with isolated verses from this section of Isa. But very few have any idea of the swing and progress of it as a whole. The present day critical scholars like to divide it up into little separate poems which they think of as having in some way come together, as being put together into one production but really not having much relationship to each other. And it is easy to see how they would get that attitude because very often the changes of thought are sudden. There is a relationship which seems

to me to be more emptional than logical. It discusses one particular idea that has great emotional content, and it drives it home and deals with it until you feel it rremendously, and then as if building up this emphasis you feel a lack of a different corresponding which seems to need emphasis, and then you suddenly jump from this one to the other one. So you have these sudden breaks and changes, but they are not at all accidental. There is a real emotional reason for them. There is a relationship, and this relationship is often not recognized at all. I think one of the most striking illustrations of how a very important break, a very important change can completely miss the attention of the student or translator, is if you will turn to ch. 29 - where the King James translators completely miss the thought. "Woe to Ariel, the city where David dwelt. Add year to year. Let them kill sacrifice." Now when he says, "Ariel, the city where David dwelt." it is clear he is talking about Jerusalem. Isa. here is predicting Sennacherib's attack against Jerusalem. "Yet I will distress Ariel. There shall be heaviness and sorrow, and it shall be unto me as Ariel." Now Ariel means the hearth heart of God -- it will be a place where there is great burning, great stirring, where tremendous things are happening. "And I will encamp against thee round about, and I will lay seige against thee with a mount, and I will raise forts against thee. And thou shalt be brought down, and shalt speak out of the ground, and thy speech shall be low out of the dust, and thy voice shall be as one that like a medium hath a familiar spirit out of the ground, and they thy speech shall whisper out of the dust." Here we have a picture of the situation of the city under seige, and it is a very vivid picture of the prediction that Isaiah made of how Sennacherib would attack Jerusalem.

But then look at v. 5. In the KJV it says, "Moreover the multitudes of thy strangers shall be like small dust." Well, what sense does that make? It suggests that so many people that are strange to you, there will be so many of them it will be just like the small dust, doesn't it. "Moreover they shall be." "And the multitude of the terrible ones shall be as chaff that passeth away." Now if you just want to show how many, many attackers there are going to be, you won't say they are going to be like chaff that passes away. Yes, it will be in an instant suddenly. Thou shalt be visited by the Lord of hosts with thunder, and with earthquake and great noise." And v. 7, "And the multitude of all the nations that fight against Ariel, even all that fight against her and her strongholds, and that distress her, shall be as a dream of a night vision."

You don't get the thought of it at all! in the KJV. And simply because of this one word that the v.5 ℣. starts with,"Moreover." It is just the Heb. letter waw, which often means "and", but is much more gentle than our English word "and." It can mean but , or it can mean while. It shows a transition. And it shows a much greater variety of transition than just our word "and." Now the KJV translates it "moreover." As if to say we are going on to tell you more of the same. And you could get the idea, but "but" would be far better. You have a situation here vv. 1-4. There is the terrible situation of this city in this awful seige. And then "but" there is going to be a change. "The multitude of your strangers is going to be as small dust, and the multitude of the terrible ones as the chaff that passeth away; yea it shall be at an instant suddenly." "You will be visited by the Lord, and the multitude of all the nations will be like a drea of a night vision." You remember that one morning, it tells in Chronicles and in Isaiah 38, how one morning a terrible pestilence had come. The angel of the Lord had killed

thousands of the troops in the night, and Sennacherib had nothing he could do but go back to his land and give up the seige of Jerusalem, because God had intervened and had delivered Jerusalem. Well all this is marvellously predicted here by Isaiah, but you completely lose the thought of it when they put in that word "moreover." The KJV was on the whole a marvellous translation, but here is one place where the translators simply went to sleep, and failed to see the transition which is not a moreover transition, but is a change. Something is a terrible thing, and then something happens. But it illustrates the sudden transition that you often find in Isa. and you have to get the thought of the v. and then see what is the word that will make a transition properly if there is a word. Often there is no word at all.

So we need to notice the transition and see the progress of thought, and when we do we see that Isa. 40-55 is a passage which starts in with a situation, starts in with a n idea, with a certain attitude, and then developes up and forward until it reaches that great climax in Isa. 53 with that marvellous prediction of Christ. And the progress of thought while given in an emotional way is really a tremendous logical progress forward in this passgge. It means that this passage instead of being a few isolated vv. that are interesting, is a continuous progress of thought that is I believe a passage that every Christian ought to become very familiar with because it is the foundation of our whole outlook on the very central matter of our redemption which of course is explained in clearer language in the NT after it occured, but is here predicted 700 yrs. ahead in a most marvellous way.

Now in order to understand it a little more, we have to know a little more about the background of the book. So we look at the first

v. of Isaiah and there we have a statement about when Isaiah was given. "The vision of Isaiah the son of Amos, which he saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah kings of Judah." So here we have it dated in general. The general dates of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah kings of Judah. Now if you'll turn to the first v. of the book of Micah, you will find that it says, "The word of the Lord that came to Micah the Morasthite in the days of Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah." Many writers of Bible dictionaries will speak of Micah as Isaiah's younger contemporary. And the only reason that I can think of that they call him a younger contemporary is that it says, He spoke in the days of Jothan, Ahaz, and Hezekiah whereas it says that Isaiah saw these visions in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah. Well, that might suggest that Micah was younger than Isaiah but actuallyalthough Uzziah lived reigned for 52 years, he was a leper most of that time, and his son Jotham during time when Uzziah was still nominally reigning even though he was shut off in his upper room with leprosy, and then Ahaz had a good part of his reign while Uzziah was still living. So actually the fact that Uzziah is mentioned in Isaiah is simply because Isaiah was so -- felt so keenly the experiences of Uzziah life and refers to them in Isa. 6. Actually there is no reason to think the time that Micah spoke was any different than the time Isaiah spoke here. It is no proof as to which of the two was older, but If I had to make a guess I would guess Micah was older and that ~~Mic~~ Isaiah was his younger contemporary. I have a rather good reason for that guess ~~yet~~, but the reason is based on a differnt part of Isaiah than ch. 40-55. so we ~~it~~ will not look into it now. But at any rate they were contemporaries. Now being contemporaries Isaiah and Micah writing about 722 B.C. (we mentione that

date, 6r 721 I guess is the present figure that is usually given. 722 to 721, that winter was the year that Samaria was taken by the Assyrian, and the Assyrian had attacked the northern kingdom of Israel and captured Samaria and the northern kingdom was three times as much area and twice as much population as the southern kingdom. Both Isaiah and Micah predict the Assyrian conquest of the northern kingdom. Then they expected that the Assyrian kings who came from Nineveh would also attack the southern kingdom. So the idea of exile is very much in their minds. In the bk of Micah and in the early part of Isaiah there are constant threats to the people If you don't turn away from your sin, God is going to send you into exile, God is going to send Samaria into exile, the northern kingdom. And if you don't turn form your sin He will send you away also. There is constand rebuke of the people for their their sin. There is constant dealing with this matter of the exile.

Now just let me call your attention to a couple of illustrations of this. Isa. 6:11-12 --(reading text. . .) Now this is clearly a prediction of the fact the exile is coming. This exile came to Samaria right during Isaiah's time, but it did not come to Juda until nearly 150 yrs. later, about 587 B.C. -- nearly 150 yrs. after.

(Question - Well, Isaiah then was prophesying before the fall of Samaria) Partly before and partly after, yes. Isaiah definitely predicted the fall of Samaria, and so did Micah. In Isa. 7 it begins with Rezin king of Syria and Pekah, the son of Remaliah, king of Israel went up toward Jerusalem to war against it. And in ch. 7 Isa. predicted that both of these kingdoms would be conquered by the Assyrians, and in ch. 7:18-20, he predicts the Assyrian army is also going to attack the southern kingdom. He says in vv. 18-20 (reading text . . .) So he tells about how the king of Assyria is going to attack Judah,

and how he is going to conquer Samaria. In ch. 8:4 he says, "For before the child shall have knowledge to cry, my father and my mother, the riches of Damascus and the spoil of Samaria shall be carried away before the king of Assyria." And v. 7."and behold the Lord brings on them the waters of the rivers strong and many even the king of Assyria." Se we have these threats of the coming of the king of Assyria to attack Judah. He is going to conquer the northern kingdom, he is going to attack Judah.

Now we have a great deal of this in the early part of Isaiah. Now I want to say a word about the higher criticism. That is not our subject this semester at all, but it is necessary to have it in mind a little bit as it == we deal with this section 40-55. The higher criticsabout 150 yrs. ago began to say that the book of Isa. was not all by Isa. They said, If you look at Isa. 1-39, you find that this is what Isaiah wrote. Isaiah tells about the coming of the king of Assyria to conquer the northern kingdom and to attack the southern kingdom. He rebukes the people constantly for their sin and he tells them to turn to God and he predicts that if they will turn to God they will not now go into exile, but he does predict that they will eventually go into exile. Now they said, when you get to ch. 40, from 40 on they said, you have a second Isa., that is you have a second part of the bk. of Isa. written by somebody else. We don't know his name so they call him the second Isaiah. And they said this second Isaiah, you look at ch. 40-66, you never find Assyria mentioned again. You hardly find threats of going into exile. Ybu don't find much rebuke for sin they said. It is comfort to the people. They said that Cyrus, king of Persia is going to come and deliver the peopee., and is going to allow them to go back to their homes. Therefore, they said, Isaiah 1-39 was one book. Then they said, 150 years

an unknown prophet, a greater prophet than Isaiah, wrote wonderful poems telling them God was going to deliver them and this someway got on the same scroll. So you have the first Isaiah 1-39; the second Isaiah 40-66. Now I don't know whether anybody ever noticed it before but I've noticed a rather interesting coincidence that in the Bible we have 39 books in the OT and 27 in the NT, and in the book of Isaiah according to these critics you have 39 chapters in the first Isaiah and 27 chapters in the second Isaiah. That's a very interesting coincidence, but I don't think it has any meaning at all, but it makes it perhaps a little easier to remember the situation. That they the had the first 39 chapters they considered the first Isaiah, and from 40 on the second Isaiah. Well, about 140 yrs. or so ago, when the critics began to give this theory then other students of the Bible began to say you are completely wrong! They said the last part of Isaiah has many rebukes for sin. They said the last part of Isaiah does not have the Babylonian background like you say it has, it has the background of Palestine like the first part does. Then somebody noticed that the arguments they were giving for the second Isaiah were nearly all from chs. 40-55. Whereas the arguments the others were giving that the last part of the book like the first part deals with Palestine rather than Babylonia came from chs. 56-66. So today, I don't think there is any critic believes in two Isaiahs; they believe in three Isaiahs. today. So they say the first Isaiah was ch. 1-39; the second Isaiah is chs. 40-55; then 100 yrs. after the second Isaiah, after the people came back to Palestine, a third Isaiah worte chs. 56-66. That's the present theory of the critics, although it isn't that simple anymore because they take more than half of the first 39 chs. - individual

sections and say they were written late --but by the second Isaiah or third Isaiah or other people, and some parts of the so-called second and third were written by the first Isaiah. So that it is a big hodge-podge now instead of the simple clear idea that it seemed when they/said first look at the first Isaiah and the second Isaiah. But now this would not directly apply to our course this year except for this very important fact -- that the critics are right in this: that chs. 40-55 are very different from chs. 1-39. Now that's not a difference of style like many critics have said. In fact later critics have said that these chas. are so much like the style of the first Isaiah that it is almost as if Isaiah had risen from the dead. The style while there are differences, the differences are due to a different subject. The actual style is very similar. Then the critics said, there are different viewpoints. But the different viewpoints are a matter of the difference of historical background. Tut the historical background here is different from the other. In Isa. 1-39, Isa. is talking to the people of his day. In Isa. 40-55 he is talking to people who are already in exile or imagining themselves in exile.So the difference between our view and the critical view is not that the critics say that Isa. 40-55 deals with exile whereas we say it deals with an earlier period (or?) not at all. (??) The critics say, Isa. 40-55 is wirtten to people who are in exile, while we say Isa. 40-55 is written in the first instance to the people of Isaiah's day who having heard his earliers prophecies and having seen what happened to the norther ki kingdom, and having seen how the nation was going on into sin, and its wickedness and refusing to listen to Isaiah, the godly among the nation knew that the exile was certain. They did not know when it was coming but they knew it was coming.

So Isaiah who has spoken to the people as a whole in Isa. 1-39, and rebuked them for their sin and told them exile will come; in 40-55 he speaks to the godly among them who know exile is going to come and these people have doubtless talked to refugees from the northern kingdom who either were taken into exile or escaped after seeing their friends taken into exile, and consequently to the godly in Judah exile was a very real fact in the later part of Isaiah's life. They knew it was/predicted something that was that was going to come, they would threaten to given way to despair if they realized this terrible thing was ahead. Isaiah tells them, God says " Comfort . . . exile is not the end; He is going to bring you back."

So he writes in Isa. 40-55 in the first instance for people who realize the exile is certain to come, the godly among the people knew it is to come, they know their implication in the sin of the nation and Isa. writes to comfort. Isa. 40 being with the words: Comfort ye, comfort ye my people..... Now that is old English. In modern English is should be comfort my people, comfort my people." You see most of us, I believe, when we see the words, Comfortye, comfot ye" we think it is saying, Be comforted. But it isn't. Is is comfort my people, comfort my people. It is ACTIVE not passive -- that would be a different form in the Hebrew. This is Piel, not Niphal. But it is comfort for the people in Isaiah's day who know exile is certain, and it is also written with God's intention that this shall bring comfort to people 150 yrs. later when they are in exile, and assure them that God is going to bring them back. So you see that from our viewpoint in this class -- now we could take 2 or 3 weeks looking at all the critical arguments and going into them. It is very much worthwhile. It is good to be

able to help young people who are having difficulties with these arguments, but it is not our purpose in this course. In this course our purpose is to understand chs. 40-55, but you can't understand them without realizing that fact.

Now I'm going to give you an assignment for next time in order that you will be able to see that fact, not simply take it on my word. But it is a fact, there is no question of it. You look into the evidence and you see clearly that ch. 45 have 40-55 ? as its immediate object to deal with the matter of bringing comfort to people who either see exile as immanent, or to people 150 yrs. after Isaiah wrote who are in the exile and assure them God is going to deliver them. That is the big starting point of chs. 40-55. Now the ending point of chs. 40-55 is ch. 53 with a marvellous prediction of the atonement of Christ. And ch. 55 with that wonderful gospel call: Ho, everyone that thirsteth come ye to the waters. . . .without money and without price." A gospel call founded on ch. 53, on what Jesus Christ would do at Calvary. Now how do you get from this matter of bringing comfort to people in exile, to that matter of the atonement that Christ is going to make. The two are intimately bound together when you study the whole passage. But just how, we have to get into the passage to see just how it is. So I would like --- that is our basic problem in the course, but as we get into it we will notice many subpoints dealing with how it developed that way and bringing out many spiritual lessons and many points that make this a living whole rather than a collection of isolated wonderful verses mixed in with other verses that just don't seem to have any meaning to them until you know the backgroudn. Yes?

(Question: What kind of is the last section,55-66?

56 to 66 is a little hard to say quite so definitely. It does

not speak of Israelite kings again like the earlier parts do. So whether Isa. is looking ahead still further to the people coming back, or whether he is giving things that would have real application to people right in his day, I think again it would be a little of both. That is, I think he speaks to very real problems in his day but also in a way that will also have great meaning to people of that later time. After they had been back a while. 56-66 is a very interesting section. There are many interesting things in it and it has much prediction of the 2nd coming of Christ in it. But it is a very different problem from the one we are dealing with now in 40-55. I have given courses in it two or three times. We may take it some later period. It has some very wonderful predictions of the return of Christ, and also of the calling of the Gentiles -- some very marvellous predictions, of this as he looks way forward to the end of the age. But 40-55 is our present problem.

Now I would like to give you an assignment which will have for its purpose to see the situation of these chs. in relation to the exile. So please note down four matters: (1) is Assyria and Ninevah. Assyria is the great forgign nation that conquered the N. Kingdom and that for 100 yrs. or more after the N kingdom was conquered still was conquering the regions round about and was the terrible aggressor, the great enemy, the great object of fear to every country in the area. Its capital was at Ninevah. The bk. of Nahum is entirely devoted to showing God's judgment on Ninevah. So #1 Assyria, Ninevah. (2) Is a nation that was subject to Assyria in the time of Isaiah, and later gained its freedom from Assyria and eventually conquered Assyria. There are 4 things to mention under # 2 -- Babylonian, Chaldeans. (The Chaldeans were a people in S. Mesopotamia which became very

important in Babylonia, in the govt. under Nebuchadnezzar. A great great number of the leaders were people called Chaldeans. For our present purpose you can think of it as a synonym for the Babylonians.) The next two words will be Bel (not Baal which is so important in thehistory of the Isaaclite kings, but Bel.)That is the Babylonian principal god. They call him Bel; his real name is Marduk. But they call him Bel which means lord. It is the Babylonian way of referring to their principal god. And Nebo. Actually it should be Nabu as it is in the Babylonian writing, but the Heb. wr-ting did not preserve vowels. It just preserved consonants, and so this appears as it is in our translations as Nebo -- the god Nabu, the second most important of the male gods in the Babylonian pantheon. These 4 are # 2.

(3) Threat of exile. (4) Promise of return from exile: Cyrus the Persian king. With these four heards, I want to show you looking at the passages we just looked at, I want to show you -- look at Isa. 7:20 :"In the same day shall the Lord shave with a razor that is hired, namely by them that is beyond the river, by the k. of Assyria, the head, the hair of the feet it shall also consume the beard." Now we are not dealing with this v. in our assignment. I want each of you to take 4 60 verses for the assignment, but they won't have much to do with these 60. You can run your eyes over them very rapidly. Here is what I want you to do: this is not one of the verses. If you looked at this v. you would day it specifically mentions the king of Assyria. So that will be # 1. There is no question that it is dealing with the k. of Assyria, so we will underline the # 1. You would put down that this was part of the assignment -- ch. 7, v.20 and then after it 1 underlined. Also this v. seems to be a threat of exile, doesn't it? He says that he is going to shave with

a razor that is hired, the k. of Assyria, the head the hair of the feet. He will also consume the beard." That is poetical lang. Looking at it in context, knowing the situation, you can say. It is a threat of exile. ~~But~~ that it is not quite so clear as the fact that it refers to Assyria. So I would put down the no. 3 after the v. number. I'd put down the no. 1 and the no. 3, but I would not underline it. Because it is not so clearly a threat of exile as it is a reference to the k. of Assyria. See the point? In other words there are 3 ways to indicate. If you take a v. and you see no. ref. to Assyria, you don't put any 1 down. But if you see an absolutely clear reference to Assyria you put down a 1 with an underline. If you see what is most probably a ref. to Assyria, you put a 1 without an underlining. If you see what might perhaps be but you are not sure, you put a 1 with a question mark after it. You see there are 3 possibilities. In this case I would recommend a 1 with an underline(if this were one of the vs. in the assignment), and a 3 without an underline, but without a question. It is clear that you ~~would~~ would not have to question .

I would like you to do that with about 60 vv. Mr.B. could you start with ch. 40 and go for 60 vv. Mr. Corcoran, start with 41. Dr. Christ with 42. Miss Johnson with 43. Mr. P. with 44. Mr. Knight with 45. Mr. Teacham with 46. Mr. Von Barren with 48. The reason I'm not starting with 47 is that 46 has only 14 vv, and 47 only 15. That's why I'm skipping that one. So Mr. Von Barren start with 48. Mr. Ward with 49. Again we strike a short ch. So Mr. Wilson start with 51. Dr. Phillips if you could start again with ch. 40. Mr. Kanish with 41. Mr. Pohrer with 42. Go for 60 vv. The first is 31 vv. The second is 29 -- so that makes exactly 60. So it would exactly 2 chs. In each of these cases usually 2 chs. will come near 60 vv. Two or three cases where it will take 3 chs. to reach 60.

As you see there is not much to do in ~~those~~ these vv. You can practically do it dearly as fast as you can read these vv. Because the questions are quite simply. There are very few that you will be stopped on. I'd like you to have that in shape to turn into me next week. We will discuss it first and then I'd like to collect it.

(Question: Is this verse by verse?

Yes, the particular subject may be dealt with in only a small part of the v. But v. by v. yes.

(Question: In English?

I don't care. Do it in Heb., Gk., Latin, Eng. Any lang. you prefer. What lang. do you speak in your part of India?

Ans. Telegu. If you want to do it in Telegu, it is all wight. Just so you write the figures in English so I can

As I say this course is open for everybody. We don't require the languages for it, but if you have the languages and want to refer to them at times, you will find interesting things in so doing. 99% of the value of this particular course can be secured without the languages.

I had spoken about the fact that Isaiah ~~is~~ is different from ordinary prose writings. It is addressed to the emptions though so there is great logical content. It is addressed to the emptions. So I have worked out an explanation of chs. 40-55, ~~of~~ which one whom I hesitate to mention in front of one who is well trained in music like Mr. Teacham, because my idea of music may be partly erroneous here. But the idea I have here is a good analogy to this section. It is an analogy to my idea of a symphony. That is to ~~sya~~ say, there are various themes, and you present one theme until you reach a certain mental need of balancing it, and then you jump to another theme. And

the themes just go from one theme to the other theme. These themes just develope your idea and your attitude, and one reason for this particularly is that this is addressed to highly emotional people. Imagine godly people in Judah in Isaiah's day - they had seen the northern k. (kingdom) taken into captivity which was twice as strong as their southern kingdom. They had seen them carried off hundreds of miles, loosing all their property, reduced to nothing. They were herded into groups (individuals) and marched off that way, and occasionally individauls have come back and tell about the brutality they have suffered and they know that is going to come to their people. They are going off into exile, Jerusalem is going to be destroyed.

(Question: Is there a ch. division where that cuts off . . .

It runs all through chs. one to 39. It will occasionally hit all through that section. But from 40 on you don't strike that

But these people have seen this. They are filled with emotion, realizing that is ahead for their nation. Now they don't know whether it is coming next year. Actually it was nearly 150 yrs. later. But they are filled with emotion thinking of being carried of to a foreign land somewhere and being in captivity. So ch. 40 begins "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people saith your God." "Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem and cry to here that he warfare . . . . double for all her sins." There is a theme of comfort here. You might call chs. 40-55, Isaiah's book of comfort. It starts right off with comfort. You have comfort in vv. 1-2a. It does not tell you why they are comforted, it just says, Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem. Comfort my people. They idea is comfort. They need comfort. They are being giving comfort from ch. 40-55. Comfort is a theme. Comfort, v. 1-2a. This is comfort to the people. But it is a great held to somebody, when a man lies on the street and he's been hit

by a car, and he lies there suffering, and you step and say, You're going to be alright. You're going to be alright. Oh, he feels better already. You've brought him comfort. But if you don't know anything about his condition, and if he stops to think of it, What does that mean? You say, you're all right. To amount to anything comfort should rest on something real. So we have the theme of deliverance. They are going to be comforted because God is going to deliver them. So we find I wrote down "Deliverance" 40"2b-d, in other words the last 3/4 of v. two is deliverance. "Speak confortably to Jerusalem and cry to them. Here we are comforting, but why are we comforting? That he warfare is accomplished, her iniquity is pardoned. She has received of the Lord's hand double for all her sin. Here is deliverance promised. So we have two very closely related themes. The general idea of comfort, and the specific idea of deliverance - God is going to deliver. Now you could make a theme of sin. Sin or iniquity is pardoned, she has received of the Lord's had double for all her sins. You could make a theme of redemption, but we don't find those two particular ideas stressed much in the first part of our section. So we won't make them themes now. We may make them themes later on. For the present we will call this comfort and deliverance.

Then you have got this idea of deliverance. God is going to deliver. How is God going to deliver us? We have been taken into exile. These people have worshippped Nebo and Bel, these gods. They have overcome Jerusalem. They have destoryed God's temple. They have destroyed His sanctuary. It seems to them that our God is helpless to deliver us from them. He culd not protect us. The very signs of the existence of our God have disappeared with the burning of the temple and our being taken off into a foreign land. If you are going to believe in this deliverance, you need to be assured that God does exist!

That God is powerful, that God is the ~~nly~~ only God that exists. So I call this nect theme, God's glory, God's power, God's uniqueness. If the promise of deliverance is meaningful~~?~~ it must be based on the idea of God's power, God's glory, God being the only true God. So immediatley you see we jump from this theme of deliverance to the theme of God's glory, power, and uniqueness. I put down vv.3-7 "The voice of him that cries in the wilderness . . . make straight . . . a highway for our God." You can think of the people in exile over there. How are they ever going to get hom? Make straight in the desert a highway for our God. Every valley shall be exalted, every mountain and hill made low. You think of these terrible big valleys across on the way back. Y'lu think of the ~~g+~~ big mountains that are in your way. It's all going to be straightened out so it will be easy for you to go. God has the power to do this. God can make such changes as He chooses. "The crooked places made straight, the rought places plain, and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed and all flesh shall see it together. . . . . All flesh is grass . . the breath~~s~~ of the LOrd blows on it . . .The grass withers the flower fades but the word of our God shall stand forever." So you see from v.3-7 you have the theme of God's glory, power, and uniquieness.

(Question: How does that relate to Jshn the Baptist?

That's a big question, a very interesting and important one, but don't have put half a minute left. Dring it up another day. It's very important, but not right at this moment. Here you have God's glory. But how do you know he even exists? His temple is destroyed. He could not deliver His people, they have been taken into exile. Well, God's knowledge. Here's the proof of God's existence, of His power. God's ability to predict the future proves He exists. ~~Fet~~ There is more

on prediction in Isa. 40-48 than perhaps in all the rest of the OT put together. More emphasis on this idea, that God can predict the future, and He proves His greatness by His ability to predict the future. Well, God's knowledge is only briefly touched on here. I've put 40:7d. Not 7d, it's 5. God's knowledge is 40:5 -- for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it . . . but the word of our God shall stand forever. That's barely mentioned here, but when you come on to vv. 50 13-14, and when you go to v. 28 you find the stress on the Lord's knowledge, the Lord's understadding, and when you get to the next succeeding ch. you find great emphasis: God predicts through Isa. what is going to happen 150 yrs. later so when it comes you see God really predicted it, so if God could know the fut. like this He has power to do what He says He will do. So the argument from prediction, the argument from God's knowledge is stressed here. Then the next thing is futility of idols which is vv. 19-20/ devoted to that. But he goes back and forth between these themes through the greater part of these first chapter. Our time is up.

The 60 vv. should not take you a great deal of time with the particular questions -- just the particular questions that I gave. Then if you feel like it and have a lot time to do more look with this idea of the theme from ch. 40 to whatever you get over, and we will continue there next time.

Now as we start this morning I would like to say a few words about the Hebrew language. In this class I did not list any pre-requisite. Two years ago I gave a course in Isa. 53 in which we went word by word, examining the Heb. seeing the different possibilities, studying it intensively, and we coverdd one chapter in the semester. Of course it was a rather difficult chapter. But this time our big interest is in the interrelation of passages, and the general flow of thought. The English translations convey that well enough so that you can get the most of the important matters from the English alright. Now at particular points of interpretation, or particular crises or turning points, it is vital to look at the Hebrew. Of course there are cases where the translators have missed the thought of it and therefore amongvarious possibilities of the Hebrew, I believe they have selected the wrong one. I'll call your attention to such places as this. There will be many more such places in a passage like Isaiah where you have rapid shifts of thought from one area to another, then there would be in something like the historical books where it is more straightforward narrative.

The Heb. lang. is very different from the Gk. lang. The Gk. lang. is a very precise instrument for thought, and we can get very fine shades of meaning out of the Greek. The Lord gave e it to us so that we could get the exact teaching about Christ and His work, and all these things that could not be revealed until after the events of his life had actually happened. They could be looked forward to through a glass darkly, ahead of time. But after they have occurred then they could be explained and their bearing could be explained in a more precise detail, and therefore the Lord brought it about in His providence that perhaps the greatest instrument for precise statement of thought that

ever has been used by men anywhere was in existence right at that time that is the Greek language, the classical Greek language. Of course it is not written the classcial, it's the koine, it perhaps is not quite as precise as the classical but it is very very precise, more than just about probably any other language.

Now in the Hebrew, you have an entirely different situation, God was looking forward to what was to come. The people could only see through a glass darkly, and therefore a great many things were given in sort fo shadow form; hints would be given of something and then this hint which might or might not -- the thought might or might not be there, the hint was there, you could not be sure. Then there would be another and another. You'd begin to think this was what God was actually teaching. Then you get a little fuller statement. Then later you get perhaps quite a considerably fuller explanation, but the complete results of it does not come until you get to the NT. The result is that I have always said, it is far better to have a thorough knowledge of Greek, and know Hebrew, than to have a smattering of both. I think a smattering of any language is of value, if you are going to deal with material in that language. But to have a very excellent knowledge of Greek is of tremendous importance, and if you can't get *them both* thoroughly, I would say put your stress on Greek.

Now it is very useful to know the Hebrew, because at certain points it is very obvious in the Heb. that there are two possible meanings, and the KJV or some other English translation has to pict one of those -- you always have to in a translation. And if you know there are these two possibilities, you may come to theconclusion that the other is correct. And even more importnat than that, almost any English language has various possibilities of interpretation. Some of these possibilities may correspond to possibilities in the Hebrew, but other possibilities

in the Hebrew, but other possibilities in English will definitely not be in the Hebrew and therefore you can with a little knowledge of Hebrew, you can see that - not that the English translation is wrong necessairly, but but that certain ways of taking the English translation are definitely wrong. You can see that at a glance. The great importance of learning Hebrew is not for being able to work out very difficult things and find exactly what is the correct answer. That is a valuable thing to do. But the great importance of the Heb., is the matters that are fairly obvious to the one who knows Hebrew. So a good foundation in Heb. is tremendously valuable.

There is another thing that is valuable in knowing Hebrew, and that is this: various languages stress certain aspects. There are certain things that are clear, and other certain things that are rather vague. in any language. Ie English -- English I think is perhaps the most ambiguous language there is. It is a very poor instrument for thought it seems to me. Words have so many different possibilities of meanigg. But there is a great value to know what is definite in a language and what is not so definite. Now one matter like that is the matter of gender. Ie English we don't put a great deal of stress on gender. We put a certain amount. We say a master and a mistress. We say a god and a goddess. But if we say an editor, it can be either a man or a woman. Now they are wanting to say congress person instead of congressman, but it has been customary in English to use the term man for any member of the human race. We have not laid great stress on Gender. in English. Now there are modern languages which lay tremendous stress on gender, but in which gender has little relation to actual physical gender. An example of that is German. In German gender is very precise, and it is important in interpretation of in Germany, because when --- you have two antecedents often in a sentence

and in English you refer back and we are not sure which of those two antecedents you refer back to. You have an if in English and you don't know which of the two things you have previously mentioned you are referring to, but in German one of them is apt to be masculine and one feminine. And your gender will always correspond to what was before it. Everything in German has a gender. In German a spoon is masculine. You say of the spoon, He is dirty. And when you say he, they know you are not talking about the fork because the fork is feminine. the fork would be she in German. And a knife is It in German, so that you can always tell by your pronoun whether you are talking about a knife or a spoon. Of course if you talk about a man, he is masculine. If you talk about a woman it is feminet But if you talk about a girl it is neuter because the word for girl happens to have a dimminuitive ending on it which is neuter. So any girl you use the neuter in German. German is very strict on gender in that way.

Now when I studied ancient Egyptian at the U. of Berlin the == we found that Egyptian was much the same as German in that regard. We found that for instance, that snake is feminine in German. All snakes are she in German, but in Egyptian all snakes are he. So we had to translate he when we were talking about === from the Egyptian he we had to translate she into the German. So when we talked about a myth that had a snake that had been in an accidant, there had been an accident in an earthquake and part of the island was destroyed, and the female snake that this one had been interested in was killed and how sad he was, and when we translated it into German we had to say how sad she was even though we were talking about a masculine snake, because a snake is always feminine in German. Now it is a silly thing. English is a funny == has got funny silly things in it too. But this is one of the silly things in German. This attitude toward gender, and ancient

Egyptian was much the same. But in ancient Heb., gender is ~~of~~ comparatively little stressed. In ancient Heb. there is no neuter at all. Everything is either mas. or fem. In addition to that in Heb., the mas. is normally used for just about everything. The fem. has quite a variety of meanings. Now here is Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar. This grammar == Gesenius, by the way, was a great linguistic scholar, of about 140 yrs. ago. A very famous scholar, he did tremendous research and he wrote a very fine ~~thesaurus~~ Thesaurus of Hebrew words, and a very fine grammar of Hebrew. After he got out sever ~~editions~~ editions; and after his death others got them/out so I believe this is the 26th edition of his grammar, which was probably about the fourth editor after him -- a man named Kautsch edited it, and there chances are that ~~is that~~ there is not over one word in three that was in Gesenius' original one. It has gradually been changed, but we still call it Gesenius'. Now Kautsch got out this edition and then an Englishman named Cowley translated it into English about 50 yrs. ago. This is the 2nd ed. of Cowley's translation of Kautsches' edition of Gesenius' Grammar. It is the most thorough and exhasutive Hebrew Grammar that we have. It is very difficult reading because he has such a tremendous amount of material packed together in it, but for studying any point of Heb. grammar this is the greatest presentation of the material that there is. Now on the matter of the gender, he only has p. 389 - 394 == five pages under syntax as under the significance of gender. He only has five pages! And those five pages are packed with a lot of stuff, a lot of references, but actually when you think of all that is packed into the book you see that gender is not a tenth as important in Hebrew as it is in German. In the Heb., while the mas. and the fem. are both used, the Pent. in all but 11 eases where there in the Pent. there is a reference to a pronoun, a third person pronoun, it is written with the three letters

which are used throughout the Bible for the mas. pronoun. And there are dozens of cases where it is speaking of a woman. Now this is only in the Pentateuch. The word we pronounce "hu" in English - we pronounce "hu" is the Hebrew for he, and the word we pronounce he is the Hebrew for she. But in the Pentateuch, in all but 11 cases where of the many many that refer to women, it is always "hu". Now from our conservative viewpoint toward the Bible that is very easy to interpret. We can say that in the Heb. the gender is very unimportant, and referring to the third person in the early days, the tendency was simply to use this pronoun for the third person regardless of the gender. Now the critics will not do that, because they hold that Genesis was written late.And Gesenius was one of the leaders of the Higher Criticism. They hold that the Genesis was written late and consequently that is not a satisfactory explanation to them. So they say in proof that that is not the case that there are these 11 cases where you have the other pronoun. Well 11 cases out of the whole Pent. -it seems to me could easily be errors of copying. It does not seem to me that is sufficient proof.

Their next argument for it is that parts of the book of Joshua, which belong to the same document as the patts of the Pentateuch, don't do this at all. They use the he and she definitely. Well now, that is a good argument if you accept the Higher Criticism. But if you don't if is easy to feel that the Pent. was written earlier and Joshua written later, and with so many other countries around definitely distinguishing he and she, that the distinction is clear in the Pent. and ihe-rest of the Pent. But in the Pentateuch nearly alwasy where it means she, it writes "hu" which means he ordinarily. So in the Pentateuch it is understood -- the Heb. puts the vowels underneath, and instead of putting underneath the vowel that would ordinarily go with hay, waw, aleph which is he, they put a hirek under it which doesn't make sense

at all, to put a hirek before a waw, but it means you understand it as having a yodh, as be he which means she. That's regularly done in our Hebrew Bibles. They write he but they pronounce it she in the Pentateuch. Elsewhere in the Bible they make this distinction between men and women. But as regards other matters the fem. in Heb. is not used a great deal, but when it is used it has a variety of possible meanings and these are meanings which are sometimes indicated by the fem. and sometimes not. Now as I said, Gesenius has 5 pages dealing with it, and let me just read you the main heads. First, he says, Hebrew like other Semetic languages distinguishes only a mas and fem. geneder. To distinguish the latter a special fem. ed ending is generally used, like when you have a common word ~~~ we often add ess on in English, words like that. But, he says, that's often done, but he says, on the other hand there are many words that are simply considered as fem,, and then too there are many cases where you have a different word. Like, a young man, a brother, a sisiter. Like we have in English, we have the rooster and the hen. In old English they had different words putting an ending on them. He says, very often you have a different word where there is an actual gender like this. But then he says, The following classes of ideas are usually regarded as feminine though the words that express them are mostly without the fem. endings. First, names of countries and towns since they are regarded as the mothers and nurses of the inhabitants. Now that's his interpretation because ~~ that they are regarded as mothers and nurses; we have no evidence of that. The fact is what he says that it is names of countries and towns that are not always, but usually, regarded as feminine. On the other hand he says, appelatives which are originally mas. remain so ~~like~~ when place names, like Bethel - the house of God. Well, that

will be treated as a mas. Whereas if you were speaking of Jerusalem you might use a fem. because it was not like house, originally a mas. word. Then he says nouns that represente a circumstribed space are apt to be fem. But then he says a majority of nouns denoting place the gender is variable. Sometimes it will be treated as mas., sometimes as fem., that is as far as the relationship to the verb or a reference back to the pronoun is concerned. He says, now the names of instruments utensils, and all parts of the body in man and beast are considered as fem. One v. that puzzled me for a long time because I had it simply as a v. to translate in grammar was: My son, his soul cleaves to your daughter. That's where the man came to try to get Dinah to marry his son in Genesis. And he said, My son, his soul cleaves to your daughter. And the word cleaves is fem. because the soul is fem., even though it is a man who is interested in her it is his soul. You speak of the hands, it is usually fem. The names of parts of the body are usually fem. but not always. Abstract ideas are apt to be fem. Collectives are, like if you speak of a travellee, a man travelling, that will be a participle in the masculine, or the feminine depending on which it is. But if you speak of a travelling company - that is use the plu. of it, - that will be fem. A company of exiles is fem. Population is fem. Consequently fem. is very often used for collectives regardless of what they are.

You see gender is not a matter from which a great deal can be told in Heb. It is very important in German and in Egyptian. But in Heb. it often does not tell a great deal.

Now I'd like to say a word in relation to the Heb., the two reasons why Heb. is most important is 1) is the syntax. In syntax the Heb. is quite different from our English. The word "and" in English is a rather ambiguous word, because it can connect two

clauses: We went and they came - two long clauses can be connected with it, or even simply two words, like I see over there the kingdoms of Israel and Judah. The "and" just connecting the two words. And can connect little things or big things in English, but it usually makes them more or less coordinate. But in Heb. the "and" is fastened to the beginning of the word instead of being a separate word, and in Heb. it not only has the breadth of the English but a much greater breadth. So sometimes in the KJV "and" is translated "moreover"; sometimes it is translated "but" or "however." Sometimes it is translated "while". It is a very loose connection, whereas in Eng. we would have a much tighter connection, and it is important to recognize that often. If you see the word "but" it is good to know whether there is a Heb. word that means "however" - a strong adversative like that or whether it is this little waw that would mean "and" or "but" or "while" or have this breadth of meaning. So for syntax Heb. is important, and there is a difference between tenses which somebody who knows even a little Heb. can usually tell whether something is a perfect or an imperfect. And there are only two tenses in Heb. -- perf. and imperf. Whether it is perf., or imperf. or a participle or an infinitive. Just telling that can be very important in your interpretation. That's why I have always put a great deal of stress on learning verb forms in learning Hebrew. I think even more important that syntax for the use of Hebrew, is 2) the meaning of words. Because the meaning of words differs tremendously from one lang. to another. By "meaning" I mean the breadth of possibilities of words. In English these possibilities seem to be almost limitless. Most of our English words have got 5 or 6 different meanings, and sometimes have just no relationship to each other. I often wonder how the word ever came to have so many different meanings connected with the one word!

Of course we've developed a lot of slang that's become a part of our English. Like we say, He's in the same boat with me when you are not near the water at all. It is common language and a stranger will find it very difficult to try and interpret our idiom. But our ordinaary words have so many different meanings. In Heb. they don't have as mea many meanings as English. The meanings are more uniform. in Hebrew and in Greek than they are in English. But the thing that is importnat is the breadth of meaning. The English word "boat" as commonly used can mean anything ou travel with. In its common use a canoe can be called a boat and the Queen Mary can be called a boat in common usage. A navy man would be shocked! is you called the Queen Mary a boat. Because to the navy man anything larger than a certain size is a ship, and a boat is up to a certain size. But the breadth of meaning within each term is something that varies from lang. to lang. very definitely. This is where, I think, of of the great values of the Hebrew (comes in). Now a person comes to a v. and you are not clear as to exactly what is meant by a certain word. The person who knows Heb. can look it up in the Heb. and see what the word is. Then he can look up this word in BDB dictionary. I would prefer/by farto the more recent Koehler Baumgartner. Because Koehler Baumgartner while it is later was written in German, and has German and English both in it and the English is often very poorly translated from the GErman So you've gone through an extra step. Mainly ~~it=it=i~~ in it it tells you what those scholars think it means. Now BDB tells you what those scholars thought it meant and they were modernists, and so their interp. is often biased. But the great value of KDB is that he gives you in most cases all the cases -- all the contexts -- and so when you look in Brown, Driver, and Briggs and you see it says that a word means this 60 times and it means something else in 3 cases, you can immediately question, Does it have this

definite meaning in these three cases? You can look at the context and you can make a judgment for yourself whether these men are right in these three cases. That is, BDB gives you and idea of the amount of evidence. That is tremendously useful. Now you can get an idea of that amt. of evidence by a concordance quickly. Right here where is/the person who knows no Heb. at all can get a great deal of value out of the Heb. by using Young's condordance. You look up an English word there and in Young's concordance it arranges all the instances of the occurances of the word according to the Heb. or Gk. word that is trans. that tat way. The result is that if you look up a word -- say the word drawn. In Young Gesenius that would just be under the word draw. They put of the forms of the word together. You look up draw, and you find all the cases where draw occurs in the KJV listed according to the Heb. and Gk. words that are translated draw. And you will find one Heb. word that is only translated draw once in the OT. When you find that you immediately say, Well, if you are going to draw water or even draw a picture of on the wall, or even draw a cart -- you see what/different three meanings these are? To draw up water from the well, to draw a cart along the street, to draw a picture on the wall! That's a tremendous range in English of that word draw. But you find that there are a no. of Heb. words translated draw but in this case in Isa. 28 you find the word draw and there is only this Heb. word that is used there is only tras. draw once in the Bible in the KJV. So you say, What kind of draw does this mean? Then in Young they give you the Heb. word but they also give you an English transliteration, and many scholars think that is terrible that the transliteration in Young's is so unscholarly, so unscientific! Maybe it is unscholarly, maybe it is unscientific. Maybe there is a much betterway to transliterate, but they do have a transliteration which represents the Hebrew in latin la letters, the kindof letters we use.

The result is that even if you don't know Heb. you can look up in the back of Youngs, in the index, and the index will tell you that this Heb. word athak is translated in the Bible as ancient 4 times and as draw once. You say right away, How can one word mean ancient four times and draw once? You look at the 3 of the four cases of ancient are in Daniel where it speaks of the ancient of days. One of then is in Chronicles where he speaks of the list of genealogies and gives === says these were the ancient ones. Then he goes on to tell the later people that fact. The other cases is this one. In this one the context is, Whom shall he teach knowledge and whom shall he make to understand doctrine? Them that are weaned from the milk and drawn from the breast. In today's English, instead of saying "draw' you would say withdrawn you would get the meaning of the original. That is, that's something behind him, that's back, that's ancient when they were being fed by their mother. You see that's ancient -- they were drawn from the breast. You would not get that from the English, you see - drawn from the breast From the context you have weaned just before it and he probably would guess what that meant. The weaned == But we'd never say, drawn from the breast - we mean withdrawn from the breast! The more recent translations usually make it "removed from the breast." From usage here I gather that this rather rare word athak originally meant removed. It is used very few times, but is used in this case for physical removing. But in most cases it is used for that which is removed way back from us, a so we translate it as ancient. You see how a person who knows no Heb. at all can simply look up this word "draw" and see what it is connected with that way. There was a book written a few years ago to try to show -- to explain the problems of evolution written by a very fine godly man, who was a wing leader in the British air force. He may have been a fine military man but he knew nothing about Hebrew and he did not know how to use Young's concordance or did not

bother to, because he said, Here we have the problem the scientist says the world was created over this long period of years and yet he said, you read the Bible and it speaks of six days. Of course, the Bible does not tell us how long these days are at all. The word day means a period of activity. Like we say this is the day of electricity and we say back in Lincoln's day they did not have autbmobiles. In Gen. 2 they used the word day to cover the whole 6 sx days of Gen. 1 speaking of the day of t their creating. But he sadd in Deut. you read in the (giving of the ten commandments) that in six days God made heaven and earth, and this Heb. word asah that is usually translated "made" can also mean "show." So he said, this means Moses had a vision that lasted 6 days, and in 6 days God showed Moses heaven and earth, and therefore it does not tell anything about how long it wasy, it jsut tells how long Moses had having the vision. Well if he had looked up "show" in Young's Concordance, he would find "show" there is spelt shey in the KJV, and that this Heb. word asah is translated "do" (off hand I'd say 200 times; "make" maybe 150 times) It is translated "sew" 20 times, and these 20 times are all cases where in the light on context it is used with the word shew mercy. Every one of them shew mercy. How do you d shew mercy without giving someone a picture? or is it doing mercy? It is an English idiom. To do mercy, to be merciful. But the KJV translators translated this "do" or "make" as "shew" in that phrase "shew mercy" which I don't think we muse much in the English anymore -- to shew mercy. Maybe we still do, but it certainly is a peculiar idiom in English. But that is what misled this godly man into an interpretation which has no basis at all. So that when you come to a difficult verse or to a place where there is a word that you don't understand how it fits in, you look it up in Young's Concordance if you don't know any

Hebrew, and I find that even if you do know Hebrew this is sometimes quicker than any other method to do it. So lookup the English word in Young's Concordance and see whether it is translated that way by the KJV a lot of times or just one or two. And that immediately gives you an idea if === immediately in any case look at the context a little and if it is translated, but if it means "shew" mercy" always you immediately know it doesn't mean "shew" in our present sense. But if certainly it is only translated two or three times it is perfectly clear. But if it is translated that way 100 times, you are pretty safe in saying that is doubtless what it means. Then always look in the back. Lookup the Heb. and Gk. words in the back, and t see the different ways it is translated, and that way you get an idea of the basic sense of the word. We are supposed to watch lest the day of the Lord come upon us unawares. Some of us may have the idea that means we are to watch the papers everyday and try to see what Bresnev is going to do next or Mao, trying to determine whether the Lord is coming tomorrow or the next day. Constantly be watching for Him. But if you look up the two Greek words that are used --grigoreo(?) and agrupneo(?) you find that both of them are used in the sense in which Paul spoke of himself in being in watchings often, and by that he meant long nights of being on the job. It means to be busy, to be active in the Lord's workm, to be wide awake to be vigilant. It does not mean to be looking to see if itse coming because the Lord has very definitely told us the day and the hour you don't know. The Lord might come today and He might not come for another 1000 years. The Lord has not told us and we have no way to know. I'm ass absolutely sure His return is a day nearer now than it was yesterday, but that's all I'm absolutely sure of. I see many signs which lead me to hope it might be very soon. There have been other times in the history of the world when signs have seemed very

clear. And when it has not been done. The only sign we have today that could not be said to be there before, was the sign of the return of the Jews to Palestine. That is a new and very very important thing. But it is not impossible that it might be the Lord's will they be driven out of Palestine again. There might be another long period and another return. It is not impossible. Personally I would think it unlikely. I would think things are heading up toward the end of the age, but to be dogmatic on it is going beyond the Scriptures which tells us we are not to know

(Question: May I ask you a question question as far as the lexicon or concordances are concerned. Very often they have been written by people who are not as fundamental as we are, and the danger is not present that we could get a word that would be wrong because you say they always give the different meanings even though they say that == they assign a meaning that they so they are scholarly enough to they would not just choose different words

That depends on thebook. BDB was made 60 yrs. ago by three modernists but they were great scholars, and they put maybe 20 yrs. on the job. And they tried to give all the evidence. There are many cases where they will give a modernist interpretation of a passage, but to me the great value of it will be they give all - - - you can see from this whether a word occurs 50 times, or whether it only occurs 2 times with a certain meaning. If they say, for instance, parallel with a certain word, well that's a good argument. This word is used parallel to that, it may prove a lot, it may not prove anything. But if they give you 6 cases of that that means a lot. If they give you one or two cases, you can look up the cases yourself. They give the reference. They always give the reference.

(Question: The word is usually there the meanings even if they don't

I would say, whenever they give considerable amount of evidence their conclusions are probably justified. But when theyg-give only one or two cases, I would say go a bit slow on accepting it, particularly if it differs from what is generally held.

(Question: I still don't

You are speaking of a concordance. There is Young's Concordance. The words there are all a exactly as they are in the kJV. The KJV was made by very godly men. So that there is no real modernist in the KJV though there are misunderstandings at various points. Now if the translators of the kJV thought that the word had a certain meaning that does not prove it did, but they weren't influenced by modernistic attitudes. Very seldom, if ever. Young's will give you the meanings they have.

Now these meanings may often not be clear to us at all. Now if you say "drawn from the breast" today you would think of a person who had drawn something out of the breast for clinical examination or something. You would never think of a person withdrawn from the breast. The word does not have that meaning any more in English today. But so the meanings often you have to check, because the KJ words are different from today. But it Young's gives you all of those words.

Now there is an interesting case in Isaiah where it says, Therefore will he sprinkle many nations. Now all the modernistic translations of Isaiah here in Isa. 52, we will come to it in this course - in Isa. 52 there is a picture of actually the story of the atonement in Isa. 53 should start at Isa. 52:13. This is an erroneous ch. division. It should start at 52:13. And 52:15 says, So shall he sprinkle many nations. Now if you look at any modernistic translation of the Bible you will find it says "so shall he startle many nations." And if you will look at some translations made by evangelicals it

will say so shall he startle many nations! Most recent translations, if they say "so shall he sprinkle many nations", will put "startle" in the footnote. All you have to do is to look at a good concordance to find this word always means "sprinkle" and never means "startle." There is absolutely no basis except modernistic bias for interpreting this word as "startle."

But the evidence of that fact is very easy to get. If you look in BDB you will find they give you all the cases where it means "sprinkle" Now dont have the statistics in front of me right at the moment, but it is used c. 12 or 15 times, I'd say at least 15 times in connection with the sacrifices, where the priest is to sprinkle the altar with the blood or he is to sprinkle water on certain things or persons = = That's the common usage of the word "sprinkle." It is used in two other cases: one where Jezebel is thrown out the window, and she dies there and it says the walls were spattered with her blood. It is used in Isa. 63 where Jesus when he comes to Edomw with garments that are === I forget the word they use = but it is something like spattered with blood. You see, every use of it means exactly what we mean by sprinkle today. Every single use of it! in the Bible except in this case you have, your context is not sufficient to prove what it means.

Now the modernists say this == nobody as far back as Isaiah could predict the death of Christ! could predict that people would be cleansed with His blood. Nobody would have done that in the time of Isaiah. That would be utterly impossible. Therefore they say this must mean something else, and therefore what=what can it mean? Well, then they make an argument from syntax. They say,Here he says, He will sprinkle many nations. Now, they say, the word is always used of the thing that you sprinkle. You sprinkle blood on the altar, sprinkle

water on something. They say, you don't sprinkle nations! So it can't mean that. Well, yes when you have only 20 cases it is pretty hard to prove that make a hard and fast rule like that. In English we sprinkle water on the lawn, and we also sprinkle the lawn. That does not prove the Hebrew, but it shows at least the possibility of the word can have that width of meaning. So the fact that in other cases, it has the object as its of the thing that is sprinkled rather than the thing it is sprinkled upon does not prove that it could not be used as we do in English for sprinkling upon the nations.

But then they say it can't mean that, it would not make sense. So they say in the Hebrew the word is in the causative. It is always used in the causative. So they say, when it means sprinkle it means cause something to jump. So you sprinkle water, you wprinkle blood and you cause it to jump. So they say, to cause it to sprinkle nations means to cause the nations to jump and that would be to startle. So they translate it as startle. But you will find scholarly books written today that say this word here means startle, and that's all the basis there is to that. It's based on nothing but the desire to say that it is impossible for anybody as far back as Isaiah to have predicted Christ. Well now of course for a Christian, all you have to do is look at 1 Peter, and in 1 Pet. you find in the very beginning that he says, (v.2), "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God (these people he is writing to) ----Peter an apostle of Jesus Christ(v.1) to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bythinia, elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinking of the blood of Jesus Christ." Now where did Peter get that idea of "sprinking of the blood of Jesus Christ"? He must have gotten it from Isaiah. He is saying here

when Isaiah says, So shall he sprinkle many nations, that's what came to you through the death of Christ and His blood. You were sprinkled with the blood of Jesus Christ. So very evidently Peter here is saying, What Isaiah says the Servant of the Lord would do, that Christ has done, and these many nations here === the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bythinia are == have been elect to sprinkling of the blood of Jesus ~~Christ~~ Christ. So Peter very clearly interpreted Isaiah as using the word in this case exactly as it is used in every other case in the OT where the word is used. Well, you see you can get that evidence simply from reading Young's Concordance, or from using Young's Concordance, looking at the == getting the 20 cases, in most cases there is enough context that you can immediately tell what the significance of it is. It the cases where there isn't you can easily look in the Bible and get the context and see exactly what it means.

So when you come to something that is difficult or uncertain or a turning point it's good to check exactly and precisely on the meaning of the words.

Now we in this course are dealing with Isa. 40-55, and this is a unified section as most scholars recognize. It is aunified section. At least most evangelical scholars. Now there are those who say, there is a part of it written now and a part of it written 200 yrs. later, and a part of it 300 yrs. earlier, and so on. The liberals argue about ~~whenth~~ whether the servant poems are a separate thing inserted into it or whether they were originally part of it, and all that. F But from our viewpoint that Isaiah wrote it that there is no question that the book of Isaiah has as one definite unite in it chs 40 to approximately ch. 55. I'm not at this point going into the question of exactly where this section ends. But the general ~~interpretation~~ interpretation of this section, any modernistic book you look at will tell you that this was written by

an unknown prophet shortly before the end of the exile, and this unknown prophet shortly before the end of the exile, told the people that they were to be delivered, and that Cyrus who was the king of Persia would ~~~~ was going to deliver them, that they would be able to go back to their homeland, and this is entirely a passage telling how God is going to bei+ bless these Israelites and bring them back to their homeland. That's what it is, that's what it all is. Well now, there are many things that fit exactly with that idea. But when you get to the latter part of the passage, how does Isa. 53 fit with that? How does Isa. 55 fit with it? There are many statements especially at the end and some all through which it is very difficult to see what possible connection they have with that. There are some evangelical interpreters who will call this a picture simply of Christ and of His work, and say it has nothing to do with the exile, or if they don't say it has nothing to do with the exile they will at least in their commentaries e interpret everything to relate to the church and to relate to Christ, and nothing in it to relate to ancient ~~Israel~~Israel. But I don't know of any book that does this that does not at some place say, Here is it is speaking of Cyrus. And I don't know how they are going to get around from that viewpoint the fact that ch. 44 and 45 specifically name Cyrus the king of Persia. What has that got to do with Christ? So you see we have two very different approaches to it, and as I showed you last time, you start in it at the beginning and you'll find a great deal that can fit with the return from the exile. And you'~~ll~~ find certain things that it just seems it is impossible to interpret any other way ~~tha~~ than dealing with the exile! There is a great deal like that particularly in the first part. And you look at the last part of it and there is a great deal that just makes no sence if it is not a predictinn of Christ. So I am very strongly convinced that the passage starts with the exile and that it leads to Christ, and that it is a presentation by Isaiah to the godly

of his day, but intended to be such that it will bring even greater blessingto the peopée at the time of the latter part of the exile, giving them God's mind regarding the exile, and giving them the definite promise of return from exile but also looking forward to Christ and directly, logically leading from the matter of deliverance from exile to the matter of deliverance from sin through Christ. To me that is the great central, vital thing in the study of this passage is to see how from the thought of exile he leads right into the thought of Christ eventually in a logical, reasonable way, and to see that Christ is the answer, not only for the problem of exile, but to all the great problems in human life.

Now when you start at the beginning of ch. 41, it is very obvious that in 41 it is talking about exile, and the next 6 or 7 chapters it is very very clear, exile is the thing in mind.

Now ch 40 you could interpret as dealing entirely with exile. You could easily do that. But you could also take ch. 40 & interpret it as dealing entirely with Christ. I do not believe in double fulfillment I believe that if someone is predicted, he is predicting Cyrus or he is predicting Christ, but he is not predicting both. It is one or the other. I believe it makes utter nonsence out of interpretation to say that a prediction that a great deliverer will come and will do such and such and such, has two different fulfillments. It's one or the other. If it was plural"deliverers" you could coer a dozen, but ch. 40 can be applied all of it to Christ, or it can be applied all of it to exile, And my interpretation of it is that this is like a symphony. We have these themes in it. Ch. 40 is the introduction or prelude to a symphony, or like the overture to an opera. In ch. 40 you have no specific prediction of one specific event, but in ch. 40 you have the great themes introduced. You have the theme of deliverance,

particular

you have the theme of comfort, you have the theme of the folly of idolatry, you have the theme of God's great knowledge. You have these great themes introduced in ch. 40, and then developed from there on.

Well I was hoping we'd get over 41 and into 42 today, but there are quite a number of problems in 41 we will have to spend a bit of time on because they are introducing other later things.

Would you give me before you leave then the papers you have done on 41 as far as you have gone, and next time would you look up in a concordance the word "servant" and see wherever the word servant is used from ch. 40 on through the end of Isaiah., it won't be a great many times, and list all references to the word "servant' and then read the verse and see if you can see who is talked about. For instance ch. 41:8 says, But thou Israel art my servant. Who is the servant? It's Israel. Now if it is clear who the servant is, say so. If it is not clear who the servant is, say it is not clear. Just tell what it is. And bring those papers next time, and leave these for today now please.

(Question after class: So you are saying that for every prediction there is only one literal fulfillment?

If it is a literal singular prediction. Now if somebody says, there will be great armies that will sweep over the land, that could happen many times. But if somebody says a great is going to overwhelm France, well he's talking about Hitler, he's not talking about somebody that's going to come later. Or else he's talking about the later thing that it isn't going to fulfill. But it's one or the other. It isn't two different things. I would say that very positively.

(Question:Was there ever OT a Newr view and a farther view?

Ch, 40 40 presents the feelings (?) rather than any specific prediction here. There is no specific prediction. There is the presentation of the theme. But when he says, Behold a virgin shall conceive, he's talking about

Copy #2

We looked a couple of weeks ago at ch. 40 and we noticed how the different themes which are interlaced and repeated frequently during the next 10 chapters, many of them appear in that chapter. I thought I would just briefly review ch. 40 from this viewpoint as we start today. Mr. Corcoran, would you tell us in ch. 40:1 what is the theme there? (answer: indistinct????0

Yes, and that is one of the big things of course. That is by the book, I mean, ch. 40-55. It is comfort. It is not like the earlier part of Isaiah- rebuke for sin, and declaration of God's punishment and then turning to the godly and giving them assurance for what they had, but it starts right in with comfort.

What about v. 2, Miss Johnston? Do you still find comfort in that? (Answers, Yes). Do you find anything in addition? (Answer: indistinct). I believe you could say deliverance definitely in v. 2 though perhaps not quite as clearly as some later ones. Those are two of our major themes -- comfort and deliverance.

Now we have sin touched upon in v 2 but hardly otherwise in this whole chapter. Sin is not a major thought in ch. 40. Of course sin is the reason for the exile, it is punishment for sin. But the approach here is people who are in great sorrow, people who realize that the exile has come because of sin, and the terrible results are there, it is the sin of their nation; although they are thought of as the godly thathe is addressing specificially, they are implicated in it -- in the sin of their nation. Consequently he does not approach them head on with rebuke for sin. You find much head on rebuke for sin in Jer. and in Ezek., and in the early parts of Isaiah, but here it is mostly of obliquely. Here there is no rebuke for sin in v. 2, but the statement that they are finding solution for the problem of sin, touching

on the matter of sin, but in that way, you see. Solution for the problem is in v. 2. So it's really under deliverance though it is the touch upon the idea of sin.

What would you say about v. 3, Dr. Phillips? (Answer: the beginning of the revelation of God's power and glory) Yes, that certainly is implicit in it. It isn't so much directly expressed in it. Perhaps the idea of deliverance is equally in it, because it is getting ready for the deliverance surely. These two surely would be the themes in it. And in v. 4 also.

Then in v. 5, Mr. Knight? (Answer: not here) Mr. Boheer, what about v. 5? (Answer: the glory is going to be revealed so I think that would be it.) The emphasis on God's power, God's glory. We want to put them under these specific themes as far as we can. Themes that are repeated over and over. Now you can get other ideas in and they are worth nothing to see if they are repeated, but to see the structure of it, it is God's glory or power whichever you want to call it. But do you have any other theme in v. 5? (Answer: there is also the idea of -- it is not very explicit but the mouth of the Lord and what it says). Yes, in other words, God's knowledge. In other words God has said it, God knows it is going to happen. This is the first very slight touch on that theme, so slight we wouldn't even pay attention to it, except it becomes a great thought later on. It becomes greatly stressed as you go on. So we note the first touch on God's knowledge, the truth of God's word, that what God predicts will come to pass because that in these chs. is the great proof of God's power -- his power to predict the future.

Then in v. 6, Mr. Teacham, what is the theme there? (Answer: the weakness of manking -- flesh is as grass and the transience of) That is an idea in v. 6 definitely. It is not one of the ideas that is

stressed a great deal in the passage, so that as a theme I consider v. 6 subordinate, and v. 7 as the theme really being the glory of God. It is God's power contrasted with the weakness of man. Weakness of man could be a great theme that is constantly stressed, but it isn't in these chs. But the glory of God is, and this contributes to that very definitely.

How about v. 8, Mr. Ward? [Answer: all flesh is as grass and all grass withers -- I would say v. 7,8 together God's glory manifested). Yes, God's glory which is one of our great themes. We had it in v. 5 and there was God's glory. By the end of the v., this other theme was brought in -- God's knowledge. "The mouth of the Lord has revealed it." Here you have the same thing. "The word of our God." Not just our God is and what He is is going to stand, but the Word of our God. Here you have the theme of God's knowledge. This again is rather incidental in v. 5 and v. 8 but it is one of the primary themes of the next 10 chs. So we note that here it comes out strongly that the knowledge of God, the Word of our God shall stand forever.

Now the next v. as we noticed, there is a variation in suggested translations of the next v. In order to get it into decent English you have to change the order of the words quite completely. It just would not make English at all if you followed the literal order of the words in the Hebrew. This is v. 9 which in Heb. literally says, "upon the == a high mountain, go up for yourself, the one evangelizing or speaking good tidings Zion." You see how different that is from English! Now to try to make sense out of that, since you do not have case endings like in Latin and probably in very very early Heb. before the Bible was written, you had the case endings to show what is vocative and what is object, etc. You don't have that in the Heb. You have the

possible way of indicating an object, but it is not required. Consequently as it stands "upon a high mountain go up (that's fem. form), go up for yourself (fem. again agreeing with the go up) you who are evangelizing, and then there is Zion. Now who is the fem. form which is here addressed. And as I mentioned last time or time before the fem. in Heb. is not used a great deal and has quite a variety of possible meanings. It could mean a woman. There is no particular woman who is in view in this case. You could personify a city, or it can represent a part of the body for instance. They are always considered fem. in Hebrew, any part of the body, of man or woman. Or it can represent a collective. So this may be the collective body of the prophets -- you group of prophets, any group can be considered as fem. in Heb. "You group who are evangelizing" and then the next word is Zion. Or you can if you want take Zion as the subject, and say "go up, you who are evangelizing, you Zion." So you see the Heb. does not show which of the two it is, whether it is the prophet, the spokesman, those who are proplaming the message are to go up and give this message to Zion or whether it is Zion that is to go up. The two are possibilities so far as the Heb. is concerned. The way the KJV translates it, "O Zion that brings good tidings, , getup into the high mountain. O Jerusalem that brings good tidings, lift up your voice with strength." That is an entirely possible way of translating it. On the other hand since the whole passage is bringing a message of comfort to Zion, and to Jerusalem, and nothing has yet been said about Jerusalem and Zion going out to give the message, it is perhaps ~~likely~~ slightly preferable to think of this as the one who is bringing this glorious message to Jerusalem. We have read in v. 2 "Speak comfortably to Jerusalem." This one who is bringing this message is to go up to the high mountains and spread this message widely. So we cannot be dogmatic as to which of the

two it is at all, but I feel as if it fits the general context a little better and certainly it seems to go with the order of the word, thought a that really does not prove anything in Hebrew, to take "the ones bringing the message" -- the Ones, the collective or the group of spokesmen who represent God in bringing the message to Zion. But here then we have the message of comfort again in v. 9.

Then in v. 10, what theme would you say Mr. VonBaren? (Answer: I think the power of the Lord.) Yes, there certainly is the theme of God's power. The great, powerful God is coming. I think you also have comfort or deliverance. He's going to do something. He's not just showing His power. He's going to do something. You have those two combined there. The same would ve true of v. 11.

Mr. Wilson, what is your theme in v. 13? (Answer? It is the concept of God's understanding, His mind is far greater than anything we can understand). In v. 13? How about v. 12. (Answer: God's power, his creative power). Yes, again the same order we've had before twice, isn't it? Great emphasis on God's creative power. And there is more on God's creative power in these next 10 chs. than in any other perhaps in these other 50 consecqutive chapters of the Bible. That is the great theme of these 10 chs. And so in v. 12 has the great emphasis on the power of God and immediately the stress is right on the knowledge of God. He has this great power but it is not like a great wind that blows wherever it happens to. It is directed. God's wisdom is in it.

What about v. 14, Mr. Brodney(?) (Answer: knowledge the power of God). Well I would incline to think v. 14 is more than knowledge. Of course power is in the background but it is counsel, understanding. I would incline to think it is continuing the theme of knowledge.

What about v. 15, Mr. Corcoran? (Answer: weakness of humanity,

or maybe the futility of idols.) I don't think we have the idols quite in v. 15, perhaps we will get to that before long. Yes, Mr. Wilson. (Answer: Can we look under idols on surround Gentile nations??) You mean as symbolizing the nations? No, I think they are considered as - - - Actually here is a real problem in the interpretation of the OT, is that what we know of these nations is that their leaders, their thinkers at least believed in great cosmic god who exercised in power in many parts of the world. None of them were omnipotent, but they were tremendous forces. They represent these with images. But it was the ignorant people among them who would think the image was the god. Just as there are many Roman Catholics today who actually worship idosl, whereas the RC theologians think of the statue of the virgin Mary as merely representing a spiritual being. But I don't believe these are used as figures for the nations. I think they are representing definitely the worship of the nations, but the interest here is primparily whether the Israelites will be led into worshipping these. Did I misunderstand your question?((Yes, no. In vv 15, for example, ~~that idol says idols~~ not idols, but isles.)) Excuse me, I misunderstood the word. I thought you said idols. Yes, the word isles here in Heb. is often better translated "coast lands": What it means is that as you look out from Palestine to the west, and you think of the lands that are bordering on the Great Sea, it is a very comprehensive term. ((Student: the Gentile nations that surround Palestine) No,not surrounding, because it would not represent anything to the east, or to the south, or to the north. ((Student: Never?)) Well, it's a little slightly MW, maybe, yes. I'm not even sure it would represent that. I'm not sure Tyre and Sidon which are on the coast would be considered under this term. It is further away than that. It is apt to be Asis Minor, Grete, Cyprus, Greece all those areas. Now I May be wrong. I don't recall any case where it is used of Phonecia.

But I'm sure it would not be used of Babylonia or anything like that. No inland area would be called by this term. This term could be applied to a specific island, but it is not so much the thought of a separate piece of land surrounded by water, as it is of these regions off to the west there that are bordering on the water or in the water them. It is very often used to indicate Greece, but sometimes even for Rome. It is all of that country bordering on the Mediterranean Sea. Except Egypt, I dontt think Egypt would be counted. It's a general term that came to be used. These people had not travelled a great deal. # Of course the Bible was written in the language of the people who heard it, and the words are used the way they used it. Just like the silly say that we use the word Indian. Mr. Burraga is an Indian, a person from India is an Indian. But we also use the term Indian for the people out in the western U.S. who have never been within thousands of miles of India! We use it more frequently of them than of the people of India simply because Columbus was mistaken and when he got here he thought he'd gotten to India. So we use the term Indian is this very broad sense. And we use the term American in several -- we use it in a very bread sense or in a very narrow sense.

I had a friend who was a missionary in S. America. When he came with a Chilean one time to the U.S., he they arrived in New York and there was a sign up where you go through to show your passport, seying" Americans here, and others over here. The man from Chile was very irritated that he could not go through the gate that said Americans. He said i"m just as much an American as you are. And of course he was. AA a matter of fact the Chilean is more an American than a person from the U.S. is because Americus Vespucius after whom we named American never was a North American. South America was the only part he ever ev visited. When he got home he wrote a book about his travels, and people named the whole area after his first name.

We use the name == term American properly because it is part of our official title, the United States of America. We use it for the people of this one particular country. But it applies equally to anyone from any part of this continent. And the isles were a long way away from the people there, and Isaiah uses it == the term in a way the that they thought of. But ~~Isaiah~~ they never thought of it as toward the east as far as I know. Almost anywhere in Palestine, you go up on a hill and you can see the Mediterranean out there. And it is the people over there across the sea or up near the sea.

So there any time there is a question on any == one of these words here please raise it, because there are many interesting questions we may hit upon. We don't want to spend a great deal of time on them, because we have a great many main important points to get over but we want to note them anytime anyone has a point like that to raise.

Then v. 16 is again the glory of God, I think. 'The beasts are not sufficient for a burnt offering.' V. 17 certainly is the glory of God. When you get to v. 18 you definitely have idolatry and idolatry is definitely a theme in these early chs. (Question: indistinct?? v.15)

V. 15 would be the glory of God because it means that all the nations and isles together would not be enough to make a real present to God, a real offering to Him. He is certainly not speaking of V. 16 speaks of the offering. V. 15 would be right with v. 16, it is the glory of God. V. 17 also. But v. 18 on speaks of idolatry, and we speak about idolatry through v. 20. Then in v. 21, Mr. Corcoran, what would be ~~your~~ your idea there? (Answer: God's power and glory, and maybe His knowledge.) V. 21 is really introductory to v. 22 isn't === 22 it is as you it? So you'd have it with v. 22, and taken with v.22 say God's glory and power. I'm not sure there is anything about knowledge.

About God's knowledge in v. 22. In v. 21 it is just the same, "How foolish you are not to realize this, but it does not say what you are to realize. You have to get to get to v. 22 tofind out. So it would go under the glory of God, and God's power.

Then of course v. 23 is God's power. Here are these great powerful rulers who have taken the Israelites into exile and made the people walk and hundreds of miles away from their homes and put them there in a strange place where they seem to be surrounded with enemies, these great princes. Now that term "prince" is an interesting term. In present day English I think "prince" is used 9 times out of 10 to mean the son of a king. But I don't remember if it is ever used in that sense in the Bible. "Prince" is simply a leader, or a ruler. But it would include "kings" as used in the Bible, which is still a usage today but not our common usage.

V. 24 again is the glory of God which is so much greater than the princes and judges of the earth. So is v. 25. And v. 26 also. What would you call v. 27, Dr. Ghrist? (Answer: ?? the lowliness of Israel??indistinct Yes, it would be comfort, wouldn't it? Yes, because he is w saying, Why do you feel so bad? When you say that to somebody you usually mean, You ought to feel better. It is sort of indirect, but I think it is the theme of comfort. Why do you say my way is hid from the Lord? Why should you say this? Don't say that. The implicaton is, It isn't true! You're --- it simply is general comfort. He does not say yet anything about deliverance. Gkneral comfort. Then v. 28 is God's power again. And v.28 has that theme of knowledge just touched on like we had before at end of v. 28. Then v.29-31 could fit very well with the people way off in exile wanting to come back, and how are they going to get that great distance? How are they ever going to make the long trip? He gives power

??

to the faint. They that wait on the Lord shall renew their strength. But like everything else in ch. 40 it could equally be an introduction to the work of Christ. Ch. 40 is a prelude; it is an introduction rather than really starting a direct discussion of the problem. It touches on all these main themes.

Now how much did we have about the servant of the Lord in ch. 40? That is a theme that has not yet been touched on at all. There is nothing about the Servant of the Lord. There is very very little about sin. Hardly more than a brief touch and that in connection with the theme of comfort and deliverance.

Then ch.41 is a place where there is a definite break. Sometimes our ch. divisions in the Bible are, you might say, accidental, Sometimes they are erroneous. I heard Campbell Morgan, the great English expositor, once ~~e~~ say he thought that 9 ~~out~~ out of 10 of the ch. divisions in the Bible were in the wrong place. I think that is terribly extreme. I think that many are must the right place/ to make a division and I think this is one. But I believe it is important we realize that a ch. chapter division in the Bible is simply a mark put in by an archbishop in the 13th century, and they did not exist before that time and they can throw us off. I never like to start reading at the beginning of a ch. and read to the end. I like to start two or three verses before and run two or three vv. after, just to make sure whether there is a real division there or whether it connects right on, because so often you miss the real importance of it. I think in the book of Hebrews practically every chapter is summarized in the first ~~f~~ v. of the next chapter.And that next v. could just as well be the end of it, the conclusion. And you miss the thought if you make too much of a sharp break where there isnone . Well, here there is a definite break. We've had the theme touched upon. The themes have been introduced. So

now we start in with the specific action. Now we are dealing directly with exile. If anybody w questions if we are dealing directly with exile we have in v. 2 a very specific reference to something that will happend at the end of the exile. "Who raised up the righteous man from the east and called him from his foot, and gave the nations before him and made him rule over kings? He gave them as dust to his dword and as driven stubble to his bow. He pursued them and passed safely even by the way that he had not gone with his feet." Now in the light of succeding context we have no doubt this is Cyrus whom He is describing. I mean in the light of the next few chs. But if you just read the ch. by itself, you say, Who is he talking about here? Well, you will find a number of commentaters say this is Abraham; this is describing Abraham. It certainly is not a very good summary of Abraham's life! You can find a few incidents in Abraham's life that will fit. Different parts of it. The time in Gen. 14 when he rescued Lot, he overcame the rearguard of these kings. But it's not like what this says: he gave the nations to his foot and made him rule over kings - - We could not be dogmatic on it if it stood alone, but when you look at v. 25 you find it says, I have raised up one from the North and he shall come from the rising of the sun shall he call upon my name and he shall come upon princes as upon mortor, and as a potter treads clay." Well, the first part of that could describe Abraham because he came doubtless from the east, from the rising of the sun, and doubtless came around the desert so he came in from the north. It equally well fits Cyrus who came from the east but who went to Asia Minor first and then came down from the north to attack Babylon. But it fits right with what is before. ' He comes upon princes as upon mortar and he treads and as the potter treads clay" that describes Cyrus' conquests, but it certainly does not describe what Abraham did at all.

Then you look at 44:28 and of course it is very specific there. It says (v.26) God is the one that confirms the word of His counsel and confirms the counsel of His messengers and that says to the deep be dry and that dries up the rivers -- that's a reference to the Mesopotamia. He will remove the power of the rivers of Mesopotamia, the power of the people that came from that area. V. 28, "that says of Cyrus, he is my servant and shall perform all my pleasure even saying to Jerusalem h thou shalt be built and to the temple, thy foundations shall be laid."

I hope that all of you in your papers for today mentioned this verse as one --- Oh, he is my shepherd, it says, not my servant. He is God's shepherd to perform his pleasure. And thus says the Lord to His Anointed to Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden to subdue kings before him. And goes on and tells how God is using Cyrus and you find it again in v. 13: "I have raised him up in righteousness, I will direct all his ways. He shall build my city and shall let go my captives. not for price nor reward says the Lord of hosts." Cyrus simply gave his edict after his conquest of Babylon, that the conquered peoples of Babylon had taken and moved far away from their home land are to be allowed to return.

Then in 46:11 we have another picture of Cyrus in quite different language. "Calling a ravenous bird from the east, the man that executes my counsel from a far country." He speaks of Cyrus before as the one whom God has raised up in righteousness to perform His purpose. Here He calls him a "ravenous bird," and of course Cyrus himself was simply a great conquerer who was trying to take in everything he could, but and God used him and so he became an instrument of God's righteousness. So that ch. 41 starts a direct presentation, and right away you have this idea of Cyrus introduced -- God's instrument to deliver them from exile.

You have in the beginning of ch. 41, it is quite evidence it is a picture of an immaginary debate between God and the idols, God and the God's of the heathen. God says, Keep silence before me O islands. Let the people renew their strength, let's come near together for judgment." Who is responsible for Cyrus' coming. The whole world is upset about this conqueror who is conquering nation after nation. Well God says, You are upset? Well, I want to tell you I am the one who is controlling him. I brought this about, and he has predicted this in the Book of Daniel many years before it happened. Of course Isaiah is now speaking to the godly who are imagining themselves in that situation directly but he is also speaking to the people 150 years later who will be in that situation.

He describes Cyrus (v.2,3). God says, Who has wrought and done it. I the Lord am here He and with the last I am He." There is your glorious God again for your theme. Then in v. 5 on we see the terror of the people of the world as a whole, of that part of the world as they are overwhelmed with fear of Cyrus' coming. "The isles saw it and feared." Before Cyrus attacked Babylon, he went up north of Babylon; he passed up over north of it and went west and then went up north into Asia Minor. There in Asia Minor he conquered this region that could very definitely be called isles to the Hebrew terminology. He conquered all that before he attacked Babylon. "The isles saw him and feared and the ends of the earth were afraid." Then it shows them all building new idols as if that could deliver them. But in contrast to that (v.8). he says, "But thou Israel art my servant, Jacob whom I have chosen. The seed of Abrahm, my friend." All these nations are in terror because of Cyrus coming. But Israel does not need to be in terror because Israel is the descendant of Jacob whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham my friend. They don't need to be in terror because God has raised up Cyrus. God

is going to work His will through Cyrus and so Israel need not fear. But here we have the first use of the word "my servant." And who is the servant here? Mr. Roher, who is the servant? (Answer: Israel). It specifically says Israel is my servant. Why does he say Israel is my servant, here? What is the point of it? Why does He not say you Israel are my pet, the one I love, the sons of Abraham my friend. Why does He say, You are my servant? What reason is there for using that terminology? (Student: Would he be reminding them that they should be?)

Yes, He si telling them that they need not b fear because God has raised them f up for a specific purpose, and until that purpose is fulfilled they knew that God will support them. ~~Israel~~ Israel has been set apart for a purpose. Someone has said, Israel was not God's pet but God's pattern. That's a little bit of fitting words together and is not exactly it, but it means Israel was chosen not simply because God liked them better than others, but becasue God had a work to be done and He selected Israel to do that work. So we have the idea not clearly expressed here, just hinted at but the idea hinted at is that, Israel need not fear that you are going to be swallowed up among these nations, that you are going to be destroyed and disappear because God has called Jacob and Abraham for a specific purpose, and Israel had an obligation to fulfill that purpose and can have the knowledge that God will enable them to do it, and consequently there is a reason for comfort in knowing that Israel is God's servant. Yes?

(Student: Would you go over again v. 3 and v.7?) V.3 is describing Cyrus as pursuing the enemies and not being overcome by them. He passes over safely into areas that the Persians had never even been in before, way up into Asia Minor and coming back down into this east western area. And v. 7 is describing the nation looking for help to their idolatry. Because people say ~~Because people say~~ they are not religious; they are perfectly worldly

and secular, but when they get in trouble you find they are immediately looking to some sort of higher power for help. It's a universal trail. No matter how much people talk about having no belief in any religion once some trouble comes they immediately show that this isn't true in the depths of their hearts. Here these people when they see this trouble immediately the carpenter, and the goldsmith, and person who smooths off with hammer and the person who smites against the anvil they all are busy preparing an idol.

(Student question: Is he also poking fun at them at the end when he says they fasten it with nails, etc.) Yes, he fastens it with nails because otherwise it might disintegrate. Yes, there is a lot of derision of idolatry through here, which is just touched on here but comes out more clearly later on.

So then we have this new note of the servant. We would not know this was a major theme at all if we did not find as we went on it is repeated. Years ago there was one of the ch. of Isaiah -- several of them -- as I studied that seemed to be just a miscellaneous collection of verses. AT first sight I could not seem to get any real flow of though, and I went through them listing all the ideas that I could find in any verse, in one verse and then in the next verse making a mark under wherever an idea was repeated in the previous verse. After going through thew whole chapter in that way then I was able to see a pattern/through it, to see how certain ideasin it were stressed throughout, and then taking them as a key it was easy to see how all the others fell into place. As one student said then, It just seemed like that chapter that seemed like an utter mess, he said, after we got into it we could see how it was a very definite clear line of thought. But it is not brought out in bold relief in Isaiah often, as we tried to in

our writing today. You have to find what the ideas are so that this servant could be a very incidental thing, but when you find as you all have in your papers for today, that the work servant is used repeatedly from here on, you find that it is a new thing that is now just touched upon, just introduced, and is often in the Bible and particularly in Isaiah. You find the theme just touched on and then touched on again, and then touched on a little more and then developed. And then eventually you have full understanding of it, but at first you have just little hints about it. So we learn on that this servant is a vital theme just barely touched upon here.

Mr. Barraga, this word servant, how many times approximately did you find it in the Isaiah from ch. 40 on. (Answer: I read did until ch. 55, I did not go any further. Ch. 40-55.) Who went to the end of the book? Mr. Teacham? (Answer: I found 31 t. from 41:8-66:14) You found 31 uses of the word servant. Andhow many of those were after 55? (Answer: Ten). You found 10. So you found twice as many from ch. 40-55 as you did after. Did you notice whether it said servant or servants? (Answer: The majority of these were servants - 50-55, in fact I believe probably they all were and then after that one plural because (indistinct) and then the other one went on to the other end.) That's one thing I wanted you all to notice that the word servant occurs a very considerable number of times between ch. 41 and 55, and servant, in the plural, hardly at all, between ch. 40 and 55. I'm not sure it ever occurs up to then. ✖ Just once.

And then after ch. 55 you find a few, not a great many, but a few occurances of servants, (plu.) and hardly any of the sin.(servant). That is the Servant of the Lord is a very definite theme between ch. 40 and 55. After that, where you have the word servant, it has a different

significance. Of if you have servants, it differs quite from saying the servant of the Lord. You have the servant of the Lord presented in -- to ch. 55. After that you have His followers, the servants occasionnally referred to. But this is a theme of these particular chs. It is interesting to trace through and see what it means.

F. Delitzsch was a very great scholar of the Bible, a very fine Christian, and in his commentary, he says the Servant of the Lord is an idea like a pyramid. He said you have your pyramid and this is the servant of the Lord, and down here the word is used for all of Israel. Sometimes it is used here for the remnant of Israel, the godly in Israel. Sometimes it is used here for Jesus Christ. That is an interesting picture to get an idea how the word is used, but personally I don't think it makes any sense at all. I don't think that that adds to our understanding in the slightest. I think there must be some other reason for it, than that. I think we can find a very definite reason for the uses of the word servant. But thusfar we have clearly seen it means Israel. There is no question of that in this particular case. Now how can --- when you get to Isa. 53 there is no question but that it means Jesus Christ. Now how can these fit together? That the thing we want to look into and see what the real significance of it is.

So we go on as we see this theme developed, the servant of the Lord. He continues here: Thou whom I have taken from the ends of the earth and said thou art my servant. I have chose thee . . . Not just, you are the one I love, and I'm going to do all this for; you're the one who knows the true God, therefore i'm going to do it. No! You are my servant, I have chosen you. I have chosen you for a task. He called Abraham. He loved Abraham and called him out from Ur of the Chaldees. But he called him out for a specific purpose. Because he had a work to be done through Abram and through Abraham's descendants. "I have chosen you. You are my

servant. I have not cast you away. I'm going to fulfill my purpose for which you have been called."

Then he goes on with comfort and deliverance. I will strengthen you; you will be able to accomplish your purpose, the purpose for which I have called you. Those who were incensed against you will be ashamed and confounded. I the Lord hold your right hand. Fear not thou worm Jacob.

I want to look at the other themes in this chapter verse but as the time is going, I will look forward just a minute to the beginning of ch. 42/ Imagine the Israelites who read in ch. 40 that they are God's servants to produce God's purpose, and then they read the statements in ch. 42: "Behold my servant whom I uphold, mine elect in whom my soul delights. I will put my spirit upon him, and he shall bring forth judgment to the nations. He won't cry nor lift up nor cause his voice to be heard in the streets. A bruised reed shall he not break. Smoking [redacted] shall he not quench. He will bring b forth judgment into truth. He will not fail nor be discouraged until he has set jusdment in the earth, and the isles shall wait for His law." And you think of the ex+ Israelites in exile, or the godly in Isra-l looking forward to exile knowing it is certain to come and you say, They won't fail nor be discouraged until they have set judgment in the earth. The distant isles are going to wait for God's law. How can we do that? Isn't that ridiculous to describe us that way? He will bring forth judgment to the Gentiles. They are under the thumb of the Gentiles! The Northern king has been taken has been taken into exile.The Southern is going to be soon! They are just overcome and humiliated. How are they going to bring forth judgment to the Gentiles? Well, maybe God is going to give them great strength. Maybe He will multiply them, and enable them to get control of great armaments, and go out and bring judgment to the nations; accomplishing these trmmendous things!

But look at v. 2 and 3. They are not going to do this with force and violence. He won't cry nor lift up nor cause His voice to be heard in the street. Here's a bruisdd reed. You lean on it and it breaks. Throw it away. What good is it? No, He won't break it. The smokeing flax flacks that hardly has any life in it, he's not just going to cast it aside. It shows the gentleness, the confidence, the strength of the One who does not need to go with violence and force. He accomplishes God's purpose with ease. It certainly does not describe Israel or the attitude of the Jews as a whole, the attitude of the nation. It does not today. It would not them. They have accomplished tremendous things, but they accomplished them with great force and effort and yelling, and fighting and fussing. Not crying or lifting up their voice in the street -- the gentle mild way here described. Here is a picture of the servant of the Lord that is very hard to equalize with the picture given before that the servant is Israel. I don't think it adds anything to our understanding to say the servant sometimes means the bottom of the pyramid and sometimes the top. I don't see how that adds a thing! When I first heard that and it looked pretty good to me, I looked for a case where it would be in the middle and I did not find one. There may be one, but I did not come across it. But I think there must be a logical interelation much different than that. The conclusion I've come to is that in ch. 41 He says, You Israel are my servant. In other words, I've called you for a purpose. I'm not going to let you be destroyed. You are going to bring forth His purpose. This is going to be accomplished. Now what is the purpose? What does the Servant of the Lord do? Here is the picture of the ideal servant of the Lord. The task that the Servant has before Him and the way it is to be accomplished, pictured in vv.1-4 of ch. 42, and that would bring discouragement to Israel. Because Israel would say, We are God's servant, we have the obligation to perform His work.

to perform His work, to fulfill this task. But here is the desctiption of the way the servant is to work and what he is to accomplish, a tremendosu outreach. It just does not fit our character; it does not fit our strength. How can we ever do that? It would bring complete discouragement if you don't recognize the great power of God and the fact that what God says He will bring to pass.

So this must be fulfilled by Israel. Israel is God's servant. But does this mean that every Israelite is going to participate in this? Certainly not. There were very wicked people among Israel. There were people who repudiated God among Israel. They can't be part of the ideal servant. Israel as a nation as the responsibility to do the work of the servant. But ~~Israel~~ the work of the servant won't be done by every individual in Israel. How large a part of Israel will perform this work which it is Israle's responsibility to do? It must be a group of people or an individual who can truly represent Israel. They come from Israel. They are a part of Israel and do the work of Israel so that Israel is doing the work, but it is not all of Israel that is doing it.

How big a part is it? Is it a sizeable portion? Is it only one out of the nation? It is for the accomplishment of this work that God has preserved Israel, has called Abraham. He is going to do this work.

As we go on we get more light on what the nature of the work is. But up to this point we see here not so much the nature of the work. We see the completeness completion of the work. It brings God's judgment to the very distant islands. It brings the whole world under God's effective control. We see the manner of the task, which is not a manner of going out and fighting and using tremendous effort to make a little strength fo a long way, but with such ==there is such strength that he does not need to do that. He does not cry, nor lift nor cause his ~~get~~ voice to be heard in the streets. He goes forward with calmness, courage, and

confidence and accomplishes the task. There then is the great problem laid before us: how can Israel perform the work? what are further details of the work that must be done? We have here the two aspects -- you might say the opposite extremes presented right here at the beginning of our big passage. Israel is the servant, but the work is one which it is hard to think of as Israel performing and gradually we get these thoughts worked out as we go on through the section.

Give me your papers before you leave. You might start next time with ch. 42 and note which of the themes we have already seen are touched upon in ch. 42 and 43 as far as you get for next time. Leave me yourp papers. (Question: Is that to be written out?) Yes, written out and turned in. Just the main themes that we have noticed. See which of them are in which verse. (Question: 42 and 43?) Yes, 42 adn 43.

****

Question, per Phillips: If this does not picture Israel at all, what does the liberals say, because if these chas.chs. were really written after Cyrus and referring back to what happened, why would the writer picture Israel this way when they were anything but?

I don't know as I have noticed any statement by them. Some, most of them think the servant things are a separate thing that may have been written long after the liberals and inserted. There are many different views among them. Not uniform.

Question: Another thing are you going to comment on the way the LXX renders 52"15? Because they say the nations will be amazed? Yes.

Question: How is this assignment different from the one (indistinct) I went up to chs. Just do again these two chs. and you'll have it in mind perhaps a little better in the light of our discussion. Any question you have about the Heb. be sure to bring it up.

Copy #2

We might look again at Isaiah 41. We have not looked at the last part of that chapter yet. I don't think we'll have to spend much time now on the last part, but I want to get the general sequence of it in mind. We have here this symphony. This overture in ch. 40 touching on the main theme, but not specifically predicting definite events. Then in ch. 41 we start with an imaginary picture of the Lord calling the heathen and their gods before Him to declare their worthlessness. He declares in v. 2 which of them had anything to do with bringing Cyrus? Some commentators have said Abraham but Abraham has no relevance here in the passage. We might perhaps have an argument whether it was Abraham or Cyrus but it takes a little twisting to make it quite fit Abraham. You can fit it, but in view of the many references to Cyrus later, some of them parallel to this I think there is no question that Cyrus is who is meant.

Then we have the theme of idolatry in v. 6ff, and inv.8 we have this declaration of why He is going to take care of Israel. "Thou Israel art my servant." That introduces the new theme of the servant. We have the word servant used of Israel in v. 8 and again in v. 9."Thou art my servant; I have chosen thee and not cast thee away." Israel is in bondage for its sin. Israel is sent into exile. They are in captivity. Other nations go into captivity and completely disappear. They became completely assimilated with the nations aroudd them or they died out. But Israel here, he said, I have not cast thee away; fear not I am with thee." So in v. 10, what would you call the theme of v. 10, Mr. Corcoran?

(Corcoran: I haven't read the verse ???? indistinct??) O I see. Mr. Berraga? (Ans. comfort) Comfort, certainly. Fear not. Be not

dismayed. I think it goes beyond comfort in the last half. The last half would probably come under deliverance because he does not merely say "Be comforted", he says, "I will strengthen thee, I will help thee, I will uphold thee." That is God's power is there to deliver them. "For I am thy God" - perhaps the theme of God's power is in it, but it is not brought out specifically so much in this verse.

What would you say, Mr. Roher, about v. 11?

(Roher: I think it would be the same idea of deliverance only more of an aspect of crushing the other people). It still would be under deliverance. Then v. 12 is a continuation of the same, and vv. 13-16. V. 17 gets back to comfort more doesn't it? "When the poor and needy seek water." Well, you might say it's deliverance to give you something to drink when you are thirsty, but it is not this specific deliverance from enemies we had thus far. V. 18 is still that idea of giving water. V. 19 is deliverance. Perhaps it suggests the eventual deliverance of the creation from the curse. I don't know if we could say that for certain. Yes?

(Student: In v. 16, "Thou shalt say unto them. . . and the wind shall carry them away." Seems to be questioning the process involved. It seems to be that of the winnowing process, the threshing floor.)

There is a suggestion of that, yes. But there is no statement here about the good part being kept. The emphasis seems to be on the destructive aspect.

(Student: But that particular thing has reference to the winnowing process) Oh, yes, undoubtedly. (O.K. now . . .) You also have it in the end of the previous verse. The previous v. speaks of threshing them and beating them small, and making the hills as chaff. It is the winnowing process, yes, but the emphasis is on the destructive

part of the chaff, rather than (indistinct).

(Student: In Orientalism in Bible Lands it discusses that particular process. I always thought just from my own seeing it that there was a large pfan in the actual process of the famming. The large fan, like the wheat would be placed on the floor and then it would be fanned so that the wind would blow it away. They said that that really isn't the process at all; it is a matterof throwing it up in the air with a pitch fork. So what's the word fan?)

The result would be the same as if you used a fan. If you fan somebody, you can take a fan and wave it like this, but you can just turn on a fan, an electric fan, and if you throw it up in the air the wind is the instrument. But if you are putting it in the way of the instrument so you can be said to do it.

This figure of the threshing floor here, thank you for calling attention to it. That question is one I think that is vital, where second causes can be regognized as accomplishing something or the first cause can he mentioned in connection with it. I could say that I mailed a letter this morning if I asked Mr. Koontz to mail it for me. I do it through his instrumentality. He could also say he did it, and there is no contradiction there of course.

That is a very important question that comes up in many connections in Bible study and in theology also. (Open the window)

This same theme is continued through v. 18-19. Do you have anything additonal, Mr. Corcoran, in v. 20?

(Corcoran: God's power) Yes, you have God's power very definitely It's in the background up to there. There is deliverance, but here "that they may know and understand that the hand of the Lord has done this, and the Holy One of Israel has created it." God's creative power is stressed through these chapters. Because when people don't

have visible signs of God's power, they don't have the walls of Jerusalem, they don't have the great temple, they dontt have the sacrifices, they don't have all these physical emblems of His power then He stresses His creative power, His power in nature, these things which are even greater indications of His power.

In v. 21, Mr. Ward, what would you say is the relationof v. 21 to the rest of the chapter? (Ward: God's knowledge as opposed to . .) Yes, God's knowledge is definitely in v. 21. But what's the relation of the verse? How does it fit in with what just preceded? What's its relation to the ch. as a whole? ~~(Ward~~ It's syntactically quite different, isn't it? V.20 "that they may see". V. 19, "I will plan." V.18, "I will open." V.17, "I will not forsake them." But now, v.21 has a different part of speech altogether. How could it come in here? What is the meaning of it? What is its relationship? Yes, Mr. Roher?

(Roher: Isa. continually shows the Lord's power through God's foreknowledge in order ~~that~~ to show that He can so what He says He's going to do.) Yes, that is the theme here, it is His power and His knowledge, definitely. But syntactically is what I was interested in. Why does He change to an imperative here from declarations? Miss JOhnston? (Johnston: He seems to be challenging them to come and see if there is any greater than Him.) And who is He challenging? (??) And How does He come to challenge somebody all the sudden here now? (Johnston: trust in idols (indistinct) Dr. Phillips?(Phillips: to the nations, to the idols? It harks back into the first of the chapter with Cyrus coming and the futility of the idols to save the nations from Cyrus' advance.) Exactly, you see the ch. starts with him speaking, Keep silence before me O islands. Let them come hear let them speak. Let them come near to judgment." Now he goes on and

talks about the situation with Cyrus coming. Israel need not fear. The heathen are making idols, no accomplishment. Now he turns in v. 21 to the same thing he's been doing in v. 1. He is speaking directly to the heathen nations and particularly to their gods, their idols. You might say it is the opposite of v. 1 because v. 1 says, Keep silence, and this says, Produce your cause. But the "keep silence" is more of less rhetorical. What he means is, Here is a confrontation. This is a scene like a debate where God calls them to prove what they amount to. He says (v.2), Who had brought Cyrus? Who has done these things? I am the One. Then He pictures the result of Cyrus coming, and tells Israel not to be concerned because they are His servant and He is going to protect them. Then he reverts to the thing the ch. started with again, Produce your cause. He is talking to (in this imaginary debating scene) the idols. What He says to them as Mr. Ward and Mr. Roher point out is this theme again of the power of God as proved by the knowledge of God. What I was wanting also to bring out was the position in the ch., how he is reverting to his main idea of the ch., of calling on them to produce their causes. To produce evidence. So he says, Produce your cause, bring forth your strong reason. Is Mr. Knight here? Mr. Knight, would you tell us in v. 22 & what is the theme?

(Knight: Again God's knowledge over against the futility of idols. They can't do anything.) Yes. (They can't even declare things to come. They are utterly helpless.) Yes, but the central theme is the knowledge. He is proving by their lack of knowledge that they are powerless. He is directing to the idols to show that they don't amount to anything. He says, If you amount to anything you can tell us what the future is going to be. I have used this for a text very often, when I have spoken on predictinve prophecy. I've said, God callson the gods of

the heathen to show what is going to happen in the future, but they can't do it. We have a right to turn the challenge back to him. They have a right and we have a right to say, You challenged the idols to prove they exist by foretelling the future, let's see if you can foretell the future! That's what He goes on to do here. That is one of the great evidences that God exists with this power to predict the future. Here where Israel is in bondage and there is no visible sign of God's power except what you see in nature, there He points to His ability to predict the future and here you see the very fact that this was written 150 years earlier, that he wrote this for the godly in the day of Isaiah and 150 yrs. later in the time of the exile they see it coming to pass, they see Cyrus coming, they see these things happening, it is visible evidence before their eyes that God has predicted, He has shown the former things and He is showing the things that follow. He's shown what has already happening and now he's showing what is going to happen later on. So the theme of God's knowledge as is proven by His power of prediction is stressed in v. 22. Mr. Von Baren, would you tell us in v. 23 what is stressed? (Von Baren:The same thing, God's knowledge.) The same thing, only stronger isn't it? He says, Show the things that are going to come hereafter that we may know you are God. Then he goes from that to doing anything. "Do good or do evil, that we may be dismayed and behold it together." He says,they carry these idols around and talk about what they are doing, but there is no proof they are doing anything. They have not brought Cyrus. They can't claim that. And of course you say, How can God claim that? Well, he's predicted it 150 yrs. in advance! That's pretty good evidence that he's done it. Yes, Mr. Wilson?

(Wilson: Prediction seems to be an important part of recognizing the work of God whether it be through a writer or through the prophets. In fact, in Deut. 18 and ch. 13 as well, one of the signs of the prophet is whether he can predict the future. But now, what about the powers of evil to predict the future?)

(One in Lev. 18 or in Duet. 13) Look at Deut. 13:1 -"If there arise among you a prophet or a dreamer of dreams and give you a sign or a wonder and the sign or wonder come to pass . . " Here's a man who has given some proof that he is --- he has divine inspiration, he knows what is right, he has predicted something and it comes to pass. But it goes on. And the sign se comes to pass and he says lets go after other gods whom thou hast not known. Let us serve them. Thou h shalt not harken unto the words of that prophet or that dreame of dreams for the Lord your God proves you to know whether you love the God with all your heart and all your soul. Thus a prediction that fufulfilled may come from pure accident, or a good guess or dr from demonic activity. It may come. Now Satan cannot predict the future far ahead, but Satan certainly knows a great many more facts than we know. Satan knows what the weather is in W. Pa. right now. I don't know. And if I make inquiries I only know what it was an hour ago. He can see, if he knows that a big storm has come up in Maryland that no one expected, he can predict that in three hours from now we may have it here. Such things do happen. The forecasters have predicted everything he good because they did not see any sign of it. But the sign then comes up. If they were watching all the time they could do it. Now Satan knows more facts so he can make better guesses than we can about the future. One prediction is not a proof of divine inspiration but a series of predictions, it is a cumulative argument. God can predict the future, and here when he challenges the idols to,

this is one great difference between Christianity and Mohammedanism for instance. Mohammed tells about the great last judgment and how there is a rope stretched, and how those who believe in Allah are able to walk on the rope and those who don't fall off into hell. He has ~~There are~~ various things like that about the very end of the age which are purely guesses of course, but when it comes to the course of history from Mohammeds day on, he makes no guesses about the future. He makes no attempt to predict. Now the Roman and Greek gods did attempt to predict, but their attempts were usually worded in such ambiguous a language that whatever happened you could say it was fulfilled; when it's exact opposite happened you could still say that it was fulfilled.

One prediction does not prove anything, but cumulatively it is a tremendous argument. I read a statement once,-I don't know how true it is, but I read it in an advertisement for a certain observer who told that he said that they had taken the statements given out by financial experts and if you see the ads for these you can easily see how you can get rich very quickly because there are many of these ads that you subscribe for this financial service and they will tell you what stocks to buy, when to buy, and when to sell them and you can easily get rich! But this says that they had taken all of the forecasts made by half a dozen or so of these financial services over a period of time, - not just where they said, Buy this stock which is now 5 and it will go for 30 later, but the other ones that they said to buy at 30 and then they were 5 later. They took all their predictions and put them together and they found that if you followed any one of them you would have lost money over a period of time. Then he said,he took these various stocksand he just flipped a dime -- a dice for each day to see whether he should buy it or sell it and

made a list of recommendations that way just by pure chance, and he said if you had followed those recommendations you would have lost your money too, but you would not have lost it as quickly as if you had followed any one of those financial services.(Laughter)

So it's easy for someone who has made prognostications to point out a few cases where he has hit it right, but=== and I also believe there is a possibility of demonic activity which can make predictions but they cannot be very far ahead; they are based simply on what now is. But you have a series of God's claims. You have these many predictions and cumulatively it makes a tremendous argument. It is particularly when the visible signs of God's power have disappeared, It made a very strong argument -- that Isaiah had written this book 150 yrs. before and here is Cyrus is coming just as Isaiah said, coming from the east and going toward the north and coming back south again, followming the same line he had and he makes various references to various things he had predicted and he says,Which of these idols could predict like this? Yes?

(Student: You were talking about maybe these references were made after the event occurred, but it seems to me unlikely that if someone were to use, to write about events after they occurred and you use this line of proof it seems that this type of prwof of the existence of of the God they are writing about would that be the type of proof they would choose if they were writing later? That is the predictive prophecy would not be as strong line of proof) If it was written later. And that probably is a sizeable part of the reason why God caused that the last book of the OT would be completed c. 400 B.D. and there was a space of 4 centuries between the writing of the OT and the time of Christ,

Now in the OT -- the attitude of the critic is wherever you have

true prediction, they say, This was not written until afterit happened. And we can't prove it. ~~There~~ a There are many cases where we just don't have the proof. But nobody can say the predictions of Christ in the OT were written after He came, because it is thoroughly known that the last book of the OT was finished by at the latest 400 B.C. Now there might be some critics who would put a few parts of the OT as late as the 2nd cent. B.C. I don't think anybody would put it later. So the predictions of Christ, there is a big space between them (and their fulfillment) and there is no question about that.

(Student: One other point, If the critics they say that Daniel was written during the Maccabean age, yet there is a statement there that says there was no prophet during that time, it appears that even at that time a prophet did not appear. What do they mean by that? It seems to me we could say, That shows the books had to be written by that time.) That would be one evidence, yes. (But what do they do with that particular statement? Do they ignore it or do they try to explain it? in some other fashion?)

There are various ways they can try to explain it. I Macc. particularly has a lot of good historical data, but it has some statements we know are incorrect historically. II Macc. is largely mythical. I don't think there is much in it we can trust. Well now they could make some It would be evident that the writer of Maccabees did not believe there were prophets at that time. That is evident. Of course they cannot admit Daniel was written earlier because Daniel predicts some many many events in precise detail more than any other book of the Bible that it just is impossible unless you believe in a God who can preeict the future to believe that Daniel was written prior to the time of the Maccabees. The critics claim that the predictions up to the time of the Maccabees were written by somebody

after they happened and then that what went beyond that were just his guesses quite worthless.

(Student: Doesn't it seem kind of funny though that the writer of Macc. would not be aware of Daniel and yet 30 yrs. later the book is cannonical?)(Because by 130 it's pretty well known what books were in the canon. Am I correct 130 B.C. with the prologue of one of the apocryphal books?)

I doubt if we can prove that they were that that early. There have been critics who have claimed that the canon was not settled till c. 100 A.D. I don't think any critics hold that view any more. I don't think anybody would say that any of the books in the *OT* were written later than 150 B.C. at the very latest, but as to accepting them as cannonical they used to say about 100 A.D., now I don't think any still hold as late as that because there is pretty good evidence it was quite a bit earlier. But there are many things we just cannot prove.

This then is the challenge to the gods, v.21. And he gets stronger and stronger. Look at v. 23. "Show the things to come hereafter that we may know you are God. Do good or do evil and we may be dismayed and behold it together. Behold you are nothing, and you are a work of naught. An abomination is he that chooses you." That's very very strong language, but then in v. 25 he gives proof again of God's power. "I have raised up one from the north and he shall come, from the rising of the sun shall he call upon my name." Now "rising of the sun" means the east, and Cyrus came from the east of Babylon. Coming from the east he went through the territory north of Babylonia and up into Asia Minor and conquered Asia Minor and then comes down from Asia Minor, from the North into Babylonia, and of course Palestine too. So the direction is here stated from which Cyrus is given.

but it is stated as if he is talking to them after it happened even though Isaiah wrote it 150 years earlier. Mr. Wilson?

(Student: What does it mean, He shall call him by name?) That statement is one which there might be some difficulty about, but we do have a statement twice in Ezra of the edict which Cyrus gave saying that the God of Israel is -- that the Great God of Israel, they are to go back and build the temple and that they are to pray for him in the temple. I would think that could satisfy the statement "call upon my name." We do not have evidence of that outside the Bible but we have cuneiform evidence that Cyrus told the Babylonians that Marduk the god of Babylon had brought him to deliver them from the tyrants who had been ruling them and that the idols of the various gods of Babylon that had been taken away - some of them carried away from their cities to other places - they were to go back. So it was Cyrus' policy evidently to call upon the gods of all the people that the former ones had conquered, and to appear as the deliverer of all the conquered people from the Babylonian tyranny. But if you just read this by itself you may think Cyrus became a believer in the true God. He may have, but we have no proof he ever did. This says, he will call upon my Name, therefore Cyrus became a believer in the true God. We may find out some day that that was true, but we have no evidence of it at present. But we do know that to that extent he called on Him.

God declares he has brought Cyrus and he will come on princes as on morta and as a potter treads clay and then again in v. 26, what do you have in v. 26 Mr. Teacham? (Teacham: The omniscience of the power of God - who else is called from the beginning . . .). Yes. the stress is on the omniscience again. God's knowledge. God says, Who can predict these things? He says, None of you can. Then he goes

to v. 27, what theme do you have? (Student:) That would be comfort again, wouldn't it? It might go as far as deliverance, but at least it is comfort. He is going to give to Zion One who brings good tidings. Then in v. 28 he points out the conditions of Israel. There was no man, no counsellor; the same is true of these opponents. None of these could answer a word to God's challenge. Behold they are all vanity. Their works are nothing. Their idols are wind and confusion, but in contrast to them, Behold my servant whom I uphold!

Yes, Mr. Rohere. (Rohrer: major theme for v. 28,29?) I think v. 29 would be clearly idolatry, wouldn't it? There is a little question whether to consider v. 28 as going with v. 29 as showing the failure of these, or putting it with what goes before and say I am bringbringing deliverance, there is no one else that could. There is a little difficulty there. I am inclined to think it goes with v. 29 under the theme of idol worship.

We have noticed that in ch. 41 He has twice spoken of Israel as His servant. Then in ch. 42 -- and these ch. devisions you know are purely late divisions, very convenient for finding places, but not necessarily a sharp division. But there is a definite division between what he has been talking about and the statement of several vs. about one subject. "Behold my servant whom I uphold." Here is the theme of the theme of the servant and the description of the work of the servant. We would not have known when we previously touched the statement "Israel is my servant" so incidentally brought in, we would not have known it was a separate theme. But here you have four vv. Four continuous vv. devoted to it which is pretty good evidence it is a vital theme, the theme of the servant. There are those who say, Well Israel was a servant there, Israel was a servant there, now Christ is

the servant. That's true, but that is a very arbitrary way of saying it. It does not show the logical relationship. It seems to me that the logical relationship is, Israel will not perish; Israel will be delivered. Why? Because Israel is God's servant. That means God has a work Israel ~~ah~~ has a responsibility to do. Now what is the work of the servant? Here it is. So for four verses he describes how the servant is going to fulfill his work. You look at Israel as a whole and you say, How on earth can Israel which is in bondage and slavery and captivity, how can they fulfill these things here to ~~p~~ bring judgment to the Gentiles, and the isles will wait for His law. How can Israel do a thing like that? Then you look at the statements in vv.2-3 about the gentle, determined, slow and steady way He will progress in accomplishing His purpose and you say, That's not like Israel's character at all! This doesn't fit. How can Israel do ~~it~~ this? But God says Israel is His servant and God is going to protect Israel and the work of the servant is going to be done. Well, you say, not all of Israel is the servant certainly. Israel all has responsibility that the servant's work be done. That's what Israel has been preserved for. But not == But Israel includes many who have turned away from, many who have refused to follow Him at all. Surely they are -- they have responsibility that the work of the servant be done, but they certainly are not part of what is going to fulfill the work of the servant. So it is not all of Israel. It can't be. It's a part of them. Now, how big a part is it? Is it going to be done by the greater part of the nation? Is ~~a~~ it a small part of the nation/ Is it one person who represents the nation and does that which it is the nation's responsibility to do? Represents the nation and therefore can do it on behalf of the ~~nti~~ nation, but is one individual? rather than the greater part of the nation? We are not told, but we are told what the servant

is to do, how he is to do it, and it just is staggering when you contrast it with the condition of Israel now. So you say, How is this going to be carried out? That is a question that is not answered till we are nearly at the end of the section we are looking at this semester. The question is raised, repeatedly. Then gradually the answer is brought out.

So there is this description of what the servant is to do in v.4 What would you say is meant in v.4 by the statement "and the isles shall wait for His law"? What isles? Does that mean the Bahammas? What isles does it mean?

(Student: indistinct) Exactly. It is a general term. The Bible is written in human language, the language of the people to whom it is given. This is written to these people in Israel. They as they look west look out at the sea, and beyond the sea and up north and south and further east there are coastlands, there are lands bordering on it whether they be islands or parts of continents or what. This is all more or less included under the term which you can't exactly translate in English because we don't have a term that is quite the equivalent. Yes, Mr. Rohrer? (Rohrer:/ He speaks in absolutes -- he won't be disheartened until he has established in justice throughout the earth. You look at this and say this is the Messiah?) At this point we can say, How can it be anything less? We can say that at this point. Eventually we find out who it is going to be. But here is the ideal. Here is what God has declared the servant is to do and how He is to do it. He is to establish justice throughout the earth. He is to bring forth justice to the Gentiles. This is the tremendous thing He is going to do. As you finish v. 4 you can almost hear the people saying, Well, we are God's servant. We are supposed to do this. How on earth can we possibly do this? How will this be fulfilled? And God answers in v. 5.

He says, Thus says the Lord, God the Lord who created~~who~~ the heavens and stretched them out, who spread forth the earth and that which comes out of it. He gives breath to the people upon it and spirit to the people that walk on it. God says, I am the creative God. I am the One who has created all things and controlls all things. Who are you to say that what I predict will not be fulfilled? You may not see how it can be. It may sound impossible to you, but if God has truly said it you can depend upon it. So the power of God is again stressed in v.5 and it continues to be through these chs. It is so important in this whole presentation. God says, I can do it and in v. 6 ~~y~~ he goes on, You may think the servant cannot fulfill His purpose. How can we ever do this? How can any of us ever do this?

He says, I the Lord have called thee in righteousness. He is talking here to the servant. Israel is the servant, so anyone in Israel thinking how is this to be fulfilled, says, Well God has promised the work will be fulfilled. Can I be part of that which will fulfill it? And of course Israel in beinging the Messiah into the world did a tremendous part in carrying out the work of the servant.

(Student: Can you determine in v. 27 back in ch. 41 who the one is. "I will give one who will bring you good tidings." Is that a direct reference to Cyrus, or Christ?) No I think that is general. The one is not in the Hebrew. The Hebrew is simply a bringer of good tidigings. (Student: look back to the other chapters where good tidings will come?) Yes, that is not a specific prediction of an individual. If he said, I will give to Jerusalem a man who will bring good tidings, or a messenger who will bring good tidings, something like that, that could be taken as a collective or as an individual. But here it is simply a participle."I will give a

bringer of good tidings" which we guite generally in English translate as one who brings.

God is going to enable the servant to accomplish His work. He is going to make the servant for a covenant to the people and a light to the Gentiles. Now the word for people can refer to all people or it can specifically refer to Israel. But since here it is a covenant to the people and a light to the Gentiles, it suggests at least the possibility that the servant has a work for Isreal as well as for the Gentiles. That He is going to carry out God's covenant with for the people and that He is going to bring light to the nations. Here is Israel in subjection to the nations, but God does not say, I am going to deliver you from it and put you where they can't hurt you! He says I'm going to make the servant bring light to the nations. It shows His purpose is not simply to deliver them so they can escape from theqr present suffering, but it is to use His servant for His purposes. That purpose embraces all the Gentiles - to bring light to them. "To open all the brind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the prison and them that sit in darkness out of the prison house." If you had v. 7 just by itself, you would think this is just deliverance . This is just deliverance for Israel. They who are in difficulty,like prisoners, they are going to be brought out. They sitting in darkness will be brought out of the prison house. But when it's ~~talking~~ tied right with "light to the Gentiles, to open the blind eyes and bring out the prisoners", it sounds as if He is going to bring amelioration to all the nations of the world through the work of the servant. That would seem that that would be included in v.7 -- not just for Israel.

Verse 8 again has two themes in it. What would you say, Mr. Von Baren were the two themes of v.8? (Von Baren: God's glory and idolatry(??) Exactly. God's power and in contrast the idols which He will not permit

His glory to be given to. What about v.9, Mr. Corcoran?

(Corcoran: His knowledge) V.9is definitely His knowledge. He says, Here the things I predicted before- the coming of Cyrus - it's fulfilled. They have come to pass. Now, he says , New things I declare. Before they spring forth I'm going to tell you of them. Then the next v. is God's ~~g~~ praise ~~ga~~ again, God's power. Same with v.11 and 12. Verse 13 is deliverance in very vivid language, isn't it?

"The Lord will go forth as a mighty man. He will stirr up jealousy. He will be like a man of war. He will cry, he will prevail over His enemies. Now I will cry like a travailing woman, I will destroy and devour at once." What a contrast between the terminology here and the first 4 vv. of the ch. where he won't quench a smoking flax or quence a break bruised reed. Two aspects of God's work - His great steady accomplishment of His wonderful beneficent purposes, and the great power with which He overthrows all that oppose Him.

(Question: your assignments are going through a good almost evangelical purpose my wife and I did this assigment together over the week end. It was a wonderful time of noticing that even confusing passages apparently have a pattern to them.

who is very confused in reading through passages like this, noted reall clearly that contrast of which you spoke following 13 and one through four bringing it up this morning. He asked why, and I did not have any answers for him. Maybe you don't have for me this morning.) It is an amazing contrast ~~it~~ isn't it. You see verious sides of God's activity. Y.u see God's gentle, steady accomplishments of His will, and His great love and gentlenaes, and then you see the tremendous force of God's activity when He breaks out in His wrath against ungodliness. He will not keep His anger forever, but He may keep it a long time. He may be patient with wickeness

for a long time, but the time will come when He will burst out in his wrath and destroy and devour at once. These are two aspects of God's attitude - God's wonderful mercy, but the certainty of God's justice and the tremendous force with which it will come when it does come. Is that any help? (Yes.)

Then, the thought of vv.13-14 is continued in v.15. He is going to straighten out things. He is going to open up a way we are told in ch.40 and make everything nice. But now here He is going to dry up the pools and He is going to lay waste the mountains and hills. He is going to completely destory those who remain hostile to goodness and justice and right in the end. His judgment may wait a long time but it will not wait forever. It may break forth in an unexpective time and unexpected way.

The contrast between vv.14-15 on the one hand and v.16. Verse 16 is His mercy again toward those who turn to Him. "I will bring the blind by a way they knew not; I will lead them in paths they have not known. I'll make darkness light before them, and crooked things straight. Yes?

(Student: Does this refer back again to the work of the servant? Back the first four verses?) We can't be dogmatic on that. I would say === I would incline to think that here he is speaking in general about what God is going to do rather than quite so specifically on the servant as He was there. I wouldn't be dogmatic. " I will make darkness light before them, and crooked things straight. They will be turned back greatly ashamed.Who? Those who are trusting in idols. Here we have the idolatry theme again in v. 17. That say to their moulten images you are our god. But now look at vv.18 and 19. "Who is the servant in v.19? And how do you put together v.19 and the first four verses?

"Who is blind but my servant? or deaf as my messenger that I send?" The servant is going to bring judgment to the Gentiles. He won't cry or make his voice to th be heard in the street. He will bring forth judgment to truth. But who is blind as my servant, or deaf as my messenger whom I send? Here we have Israel is the servant. Israel has the ideal before it of the work that must be done. How can Israel do it? Well, how can Israel do it? Who is blind but my servant, or deaf as my messenger I sent? The Lord has sent Israel to do a work for Him and instead of getting nearer and nearer to the position where Israel would seem able to do this tremendous work, Israel has fallen into sin and Godhas had to send them into exile. Who is blind as my eervant? It brings out the impossibility of Israel doing this work except as God is going to provide a way in which it can be done. The contrast is very interesting and sharp.

Who is blind as the Lord's servant, seeing many things but thou hearest not, opening e the ears but he hears not. The Lord is well pleased for His righteousneess sake, he will magnify the law and make it honorable. God has the power and intention of carrying our His purposes. He is going to do it, v. 21 says. But the Israel is going to be saved,delivered because it is His servant to accomplish this task described in the beginning of the chapter. But what's Israel's condition? "This is a people robbed and spoiled. They are all of them snared in holes. They are hid in prison houses." How can Israel do this work? How can Israel bring deliverance to the Gentiles when Israel itself is in captivity? How can Israel bring light to the Gentiles when they themselves are blind, many of them falling into idolatry, mah many of them turning away from God, many of them seeking the things of this work. world instead of following Him. "This is a people robbed and spoiled. They are all of them snared in holes. They are hid in prison

houses. None says restore. You can almost imagine in v. 42 that it is Israel answering to God. God says, You have this work to do. You can almost imagine they say, Yes but how can we do it. We are robbed and spoiled. How can we bring judgment to the Gentiles. We are hid in prison houses. We've been taken captive. How can we do it? God answers, (v.24), "Who gave ~~Israel~~Jacob for a spoil and Israel to the robbers? How do you come to be in this condition? Did not the Lord? He against Whom we have sinned. The prophet associates himself with the people as part of the nation that has sinned. For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God.

"For they would not walk in His ways, neither were they obedient unto His laws, therefore He hath poured upon him the fury of His anger and the strength of battle, and has set him on fire round about. Yet he knew not, and it burned him yet he laid it not to heart. The other parts of Isaiah, and Jeremiah, and Exekiel, they start in rebuking people for their sin. Showing their sin and how God will send them into exile and punishment if they don't turn away from it. But this part of Isaiah, from ch. 40-57, he does not do that. He brings comfort. He brings messages of deliverance, and then he points up that the reason they are in the situation that they need to listen where they need to be rescued is because they have sinned. You see it is quite a different approach. The matter of sin is barely touched on in ch.40, and then it gets more emphasis as we go along. But in case after case in these chs. he starts out with deliverance, comfort, what he is going to bring to them, and then he says, Yes, but look at the situation they are in, Why are you here? Because of your sin. Thus he is gradually, tactfully, gently stressing in these chs. the fact that all the suffering they are having is the result of sin and thus is gradually bringing to attention the vital fact that

deliverance from exile is a wonderful thing and God is going to give them deliverance from exile, but if it stops there, what is accomplished? They were sent into exile for their sin. Now if they are delivered and continue in sin, there will be another exile, and another. They need something more than (physical) deliverance. They need deliverance from sin. So through these chapters we gradually get brought into prominence in a very tactful way speaking to people who are in suffering, gradually, tactfully it is brought to their conscience the fact that their greatest need is not deliverance from exile great as that need is. Their greatest need is the solution of this problem of sin.

So you have a thought progress all the way through these chapters.

Now you wrote up chs. 42 and 43 for today. Suppose you do ch.44 and 45 for next time. Leave me your papers before you go.

(copy #2

We have been looking at the first part of this section of Isaiah. I was just asked, What was the standard liberal commentary on it. I don't think you can say there is any standard. I don't think you can say there is any standard conservative commentary either. Most of the commentaries look at isolated verses. I find that true of almost any part of the Scripture. That is one thing I find unsatisfactory about most commentaries. They look at isolated verses; they give you valuable suggestons about the meaning of particular words. In the course of it they may have some discussion of general relationships but the tendency is of the - You see the critical approach which began a century ago, I guess more like a century and a half now, started with the idea, Here is Isa. 1-39, here is one book. Then ch. 40-66 is a second book which got written on the same scroll, and that could easily have happened. We don't believe it did happen because Christ quotes from both parts as the word of Isaiah, and I believe Paul in one passage quotes from both of them as the work of Isaiah.((John does in John 12:38-41)).

That view did not last very long. Before long they began to show that the different arguments that were being advanced to prove that statements in the socalled second Isaiah were late, applied equally well at least to a third of the first part of Isaiah. So they began saying this Ch. in first Isa. is really from second Isa. This ch. from first Isa. is later than second Isa. This ch. from first Isa. is much earlier than Isa. But they did not go by chapters. They sometimes had a verse, sometimes even half a verse. So first Isa. came to be all divided up; the second Isaiah was ch. 40-66. Then the argument was made that the last half of that section was not about exile, it was === it had Palestine again in the center, the forefront of ideas, and

so they said, It was written a century after the Second Isaiah, so there were three Isaiahs. There is hardly a liberal today who would believe in two Isaiahs. They most would believe in three, but they don't believe only in three. One commentary that said specifically the question is not whether something was written by Isaiah or by the first or second or third Isaiah; the question about every v. is when was this v. written; what was the historical circumstances out of which this v. comes. So there are many commentaries that divide it up - a little bit is written this time, a little bit another time, a little bit another time; it's just a patchwork. Well now, there was a prof. at Wheaton College one time who said, Dr. MacRae and I have a very different viewpoint about Isaiah. He said, he thinks of it as a continuous presentation, whereas I think of it as a series of separate poems. Well now, if that was said by a man who was generally conservative, you can imagine what view the radicals take! There are some who will have fairly long passages which they think are a continuous unit. But even in these they will say certain things are interpolations, etc. One of my great feelings regarding Isa., has been that it is one book that came from Isa. in substantially the same form that it has now. By substantial I mean, I do not believe there is any passage of any length that is a later interpolation. I do not deny the possibility of a word being changed in the course of copying. Or even of a few words having been inserted by error in the course of copying, But I think that such changes are very rare. I was much shocked when I was teaching in the first of the three seminaries in which I have taught, I had a student in a class who was a very bright fellow, a very conservative fellow, who later wrote a lot of books on the OT But I assigned to the class the study of a certain section in Jeremiah where there was some important

archaeological evidence, and recommended several books dealing with a discussion of that passage, and asked them to bring in a report from it. He brought in a report that he was convinced on by one of these commentaries which took the whole section of about a chapter of Jeremiah and said it was not genuine at all, it came from a later time. Now I think God has preserved His Word better than that! I believe that the Word is substantially as it came from the author. But I do recognize the possibilty of occasional errors in copying that have not been detetted. And I believe the Lord intentionally left a few occasional errors in copying it in order that we should not think we can take one v. and just squeeze it to death, and say every word in it must be carried to the very utmost interpretation and that the fact that something was not mentioned in it proves that was not true, etc. It is so easy for us to do that. I think the Lord wants us to compare Scripture with Scripture and that anything we find really taught in the Scriptures is going to be taught more than once and it is going to be brought out clearly, all the important matters in the Scripture as a whole.

So that I don't find the liberal com. of much help. Now there are good conservative commentaries on Isaiah. Prof. Alexander of Princeton, a century or more ago, wrote a long commentary in two vols. on Isa. Later it was issued in condensed form. Alexander has a number of points of interpretation that I very definitely disagree with. I think he has a little too much tendency to do what I call spiritualize, what some call spiritualize -- that is to take words as meaning something quite different from what they sound like. But on the whole, he wrote an excellent commentary and he was familiar with the previous commentaries. So Alexander is still a very great guide. There was a Scotchman, Geo. Adam Smith, who wrote extensively

on Isaiah, and he is quite liberal in his view, and twists things around a very considerable amount, but he had a marvellous wonderful imagination and a wonderful skill of thinking of things that others had not noticed. So while a great part of what G.A. Smith says is to be discounted, every now and then I have found a very valuable insight in the course of his writings.

Prof. Delitzsch has written commentaries on many of the books of the OT. His books are very thorough usually and very dependable on the whole in his discussion of the meaning of different passages. Now Delitzsch toward he end of his life, his son a brilliant son became a very radical fellow and his son took up the higher criticism and attacked his father's views and convinced his father of the main things of the higher criticism, so the latter books of Delitzsch have got the higher criticism coming into them in various places, but in his very latest work on Isaiah and the Pentateuch, Delitzsch says that though he has accepted these things he still remains feeling there is considerable possible that they are not right, but that it is true as it stands. Delitzsch did some very fine comments on Isaiah.

In recent years, Prof. Leupold has written some commentaries on some of the books that I think are quite good. He commentary on Isa. that came out comparatively recent is more superficial than I think are some of his other works. It is a bit disappointing. Prof. Young of Westminster has written a three vol. commentary on Isa. about 10 yrs. ago. This commentary by E. J. Young has some very valuable discussions, but it is mostly word by word. He does not see, nor does Leupold, the interrelation of sections in a way that I think is very vital for a correct understanding of the book. During the last 15 or 20 yrs. there have been 5 or 6 different books published by liberal

scholars on the second Isaiah, on the latter part of Isa. Some of them have some very wierd theories, and I'm not sure how much value there is in them. My approach -- I have not really found in any book I have seen that is I feel the important thing is to go to it and take passages and see what is the central idea. I think I have mentioned once before in this class, I have occasionally taken a ch. of Isaiah and looked at the ch. and found in it that it just seemed to have a lot of isolated sentences. I did not see much progress of thought. But I've taken each verse and I have written down all the ideas that seem to be touched upon or stressed in that verse -- just a brief reference to them at the top of a page. I put a list of these and then the number of the verse and then put a check under it. I then have taken the next verse and seen what ideas there were. There might -- I might find four or five possible ideas in that verse, and put a check under those particular ones and also under what might be that was new. Going through the whole ch. that way and then looking back, I have found often that certain ideas are stressed continuously, or are stressed and repeated, gone back to, etc. Thus I have seen the pattern through the chapters. That's what I've done with this section we are taking this year, 40-55. I have come to the conclusion that the section is one continual section in which the prophet starts with a certain situation and from that situation he leads up to changing the attitude of his hearers from feeling that the most important thing in the world is getting deliverance from exile, getting relief from this terrible thing that has come. He leads them to the idea there is something more important than that, and that the cause of exile is actually the sin of the people. Now that has been brought out repeatedly before elsewhere in the Scripture. But that he brings out in a very gentle way, instead of as elsewhere in Isaiah, and as the prophets generally do just tearing into the sin of the people

and rebuking them for it. Here he goines it on the whole in a very gentle way. The people are now suffering, they are inexile. And he does not come to them and say, You sinners you got what you deserved. He comes to them and says, God has still interest in you. God has not forsaken . God is anxious to deliver you. He will deliver you. And you can trust this because after all God -- all signs of God's existence may have disappeared, but nevertheless God still is the great God that controls everything. The proof of this is that He was able in this book of Isa. 150 yrs. ago to predict the coming of Cyrus and even to give His name! The many proofs that God gives that things are working out the way He declared they would and this shows He really exists, He really is powerful. Then he goes on to say, Look at the sky ; look at the universe. See what God has created, how powerful He is. Now the powerful God who could do all this, He can deliver you and He will deliver you. But should He deliver you? So he gradually raises that question, Should He deliver you? The question is, Should He deliver you after all you sin? Well, you say, We are sorry; we have repented. That's fine. But God says, Suppose we deliver you. You say you are sorry and I deliver you, well, there will be sin continuing and there will be another exile and another and another. That's not the end. The sin is the cause of it. What are we going to do about this matter of sin. So gradually this thought is brought to the conscience. While he is doing that there is this other new concept that Israel is being delivered and protected because Israel is God's servant, because God has a purpose for Israel. That's what He is going to say. That's why He is going to deliver them because

He has a purpose for them. Then in ch. 42 we find tz what that wonderful purpose is, and not only what that wonderful purpose is to bring justice to all the nations of the earth, the marvellous purpose to be a light to the Gentiles, but then we are told how He is going to do this. How He is going to go with a steady confident progress. That a bruised reed He will not break, smoking flax he won't quench. He won't come with force raising His voice in the streets, but He will do this with such confidence, such certainty. It's like a big strong force that can move constantly instead of a little force that has to hit, hit, hit, and hope to get some results. As you read the tremendous thing the Servant has got to do, and as you read the way in which -- the confidence with which the Servant is going to do this, you say, How can we do a thing like this?

And at the end of ch. 42 we noticed at the end of the last hour, he says, (v.19),"Who is blind but my servant, or deaf as my messenger that I sent? who is blind as he that is perfect, and blind as the Lord's servant? Seeing many things, but thou observest not; opening the ears, but he heareth not. The Lord is well pleased for his righteousness sake; he will magnify the law, and make it honourable." You see how he touches on the idea of sin here? He does not say, The Lord is well pleased, He is going to deliver His people. He says the Lord is well pleased for His righteousness sake. He will magnify the law! God's law is going to be upheld; God's purposes are going to be accomplished. He is going to deliver you, but He is not going to drop any of His interest in what is right. He is not going to let His law simply be profaned. Then he says,that's what he's going to do, but now Israel is a servant, his instrument. But how is Israel going to do this?

"But this is a people robbed and spoiled; they are for a prey and none delivers"(v.22) Well, he says (v.24) Who gave Jacob for a spoil, and Israel to the robbers? Did not the Lord; He against whom we have sinned? You notice it is "we have sinned" that is, Isaiah includes himself with the rest of the people. The godly among the nation are the ones who feel terrible about the fact that exile is certain. They see the sins of the nation, they know it is bound to come, but they are implicated in the sin. Consequently it is "we who have sinned" not just "they" and that is a very important point.

"For they would not walk in his ways, neither were they obedient to His law, therefore he hath poured upon him the fury of his anger, and the strength of battle; and it hath set him on fire round about, yet he knew not; and it burned him, yet he laid it not to heart." In most of the prophets, the chapters start with rebuke, rebuking people for their sins, and then after the terrible rebuke they comfort the godly with telling them of God's marvellous purposes of blessing beyond the punishemnt, but in this section of Isa. it is reversed. It ends usually with the idea, it's deliverance and all that, and the end is but why are you in this situation. Then a strong word about the sin and the fury of His anger against sin but it's almost as if he is afraid this will discourage the people too much, we've got to immediately comfort them, he goes right on in ch. 43, "But now thus saith the Lord, that created thee, O Jacob, and He that formed thee O Israel, Fear not." So you just have these little touches on sin and on its terrible nature as he comes back immediately to people who have been suffering to give them a note of comfort a note of deliverance. But in the course of it he

always leaves -- leads up again to what has caused this, and that is the primary question for which we must find an answer.

So as we start ch. 43, Mr. Teacham, What is the theme there?

(Teacham: Comfort, consolation; don't fear, I have redeemed you I have called you by thy name. Confidence.) Yes, it is comfort very strongly, but also deliverance. But more comfort than deliverance. Also there is a little stress on the Lord's creative power, isn't there? The Lord is the ONe who created you. Just a little stress on that.

How about v. 2, Mr. Von Baren? (Von Baren: Protection) Yes, v. 2 is again deliverance, in a general way deliverance. It speaks of general situations. Probably rather figurative language, through which he will be delivered. So deliverance, but perhaps it's almost more comfort because it does not speak of specific deliverance,but general. No matter what comes God is going to protect.

What is the theme of v. 3, Mr. Corcoran? (Corcoran: God's glory). Yes, God is the one who is going to do this so you can trust Him. It is going to happen. God's glory, God's power. "I am the Lord your God." And what does this mean on the end: "I gave Egypt for thy ransom, Ethiopia and Seba for thee." What does that mean? There is a statement as you read it in Scripture, there is no explanation by it of what it means. No explanation at all, but something similar to what is later on too. The fact of the matter is that historically we find Cyrus conqueres all of Asia Minor, Palestine, Syria, and Babylonia and then goes east and conquers even to part of India. Then he dies and his son continues his conquest and takes Egypt and Ethiopia and Seba. So Seba was probably part of Ethiopia. So he is saying, You give up. Cyrus is going to let Israel go back. He is going to give you up, you might say, though they are still under

his control. God is going to give him a ransom for you. God is assuring that He will give Cyrus power over Egypt and over Ethippia. That great region down in Africa, He is going to turn over to Cyrus as a ransom for Israel whom Cyrus left go. That is not specifically stated in Scripture. We have to take that as an assumption or guess based on the historical facts. But I know of no other guess that is alfhas good.

Verse 4 seems to fit with the same idea - "therefore will I give men for thee, and people for thy life." That would fit with the same idea. He is going to reqerd reward Cyrus by allowing His son to conquer Egypt and Ethiopia, to reward him for letting Israel ₹ go back to their homeland.

Verse 5 is again comfort but also deliverance. "I will bring thy seed from the east, and gather thee from the west; I will say to the north give up and to the south, Keep not back; bring my sons from far, and my daughters from the ends of the earth". Now the bulk of the Israelites of course were now in the east, but we know from the book of Jer. there were some who had fled to Egypt. So we know some had gone south, and this suggests a rather wide disbussement. This seems to suggest a wider dispersion than had occurred at that time. So one might wonder whether it looks beyond the actual deliverance at the time of Cyrus and means that there is going to come an eventual time when they will be more widely scattered than they were then, and that then God will bring them back. Well, that I think we should be very careful about being dogmatic on. Since it does seem to be a little too extensive for what we know about that exile, one wonders whether it does look forward to a later regathering of Israel.

Verse 7 again touches on God's creative power. What do you think v. 8 is talking about, Mr. Beraga? (Beraga: Both v.8 and 9 seem to have one theme -- God's predictive power.) Yes, and who is He talking to? Who does He mean in v. 8, "Bring forth the blind people that have eyes . . ."(Beraga: the isles (??) Yes, at first sight you would certainly think back to where he said, Who is blind but my servant? And you wonder if he is talking to Israel. Bring forth Israel who has eyes and yet are blind. But then he goes right on "Let the nations come together and who among them can declare and show these things" -- a challenge to the heathen gods to declare what == to declare the future or explain what has happened in the past. As you come on to that I incline to agree with Mr. Beraga that v.8 [illegible] has the same meaning as v.9. Now, of course, I don't feel I can be dogmatic on that because v. 8 might go with v.7 to quiete an extent. It might mean, Here is Godss cervant Israel. You are so blind. You don't really see what has ahppened. Well, let's bring all the nations together and the isles and see if they can do anything comparable to what your God can do? You should not hem so blind as to think you are just hopeless, you're off in exile, there is nothing you can do, because none of the gods of the heathen can predict the future as your God can. So I'm a little uncertain as to which is the best interpretation of v.8 there.

(Question: Does this inordinately large space here have to do with this translation, the NASB? Or because the darker have something to do with the way the original Hebrew set up there might be more of a space there? to separate the ideas.) I believe they print in darker letters what they think are the beginning of a paragraph. (Student: So it's their idea.) It's simply their idea.

Sometimes those ideas are good and sometimes they are bad. Sometimes the thought goes from something very different from something over here -- it moves so smoothly in transition it ishard to tell. We know this is different from this, but the transition is so smooth. If you were going to draw a line people would where the difference would be.

The ch. divisions seem to have been put in by an English Archbishop. They say, he put them in as he rode on horseback. He put them in in his Latin Bible. And as he looked at it he said, Here's a good place for a division. And some of them are very good. Some are very poor. Some places he certainly made very terrible mistakes in where he should put a divison. The Jews saw this Latin Bible with the Archbishop's divisons in it, and they saw what a handy thing it was. They already had v. divisons, but the vv. did not have numbers. And they saw what a handy thing this ch. and v. divisbn was, so they put it into their Bibles, and usually they followed what the Archbishop did, but in maybe one case out of ten they said, Maybe this would be better ten vv. earlier, or two vv. later. Somthing like that. And there are very few vv. where they made thier change very evidently with an antichristian bias. Very few, but there are a few. That makes a bit of confusion when you find finding references to ch. and vv. But it is sometimes very obvious where it ought to be, and other times the thought moves so smoothly that any one of two or three places might be just as good as another place. Even though it is perfectly obvious often that there is a sharp difference, but the difference goes gradually and makes it hard to know. If you are going to put paragraph divisions in you can be sure somebody will differ from you, and you can also

be sure you'll probably make some mistakes in the course of it. You would not be human if you did not.

Now he continues then the challenge to for prediction, the omniscient of God. What is v. 10? (Student: certainly this power. There is a challenge here also. His servants. Challenge based on XXoX power.) We have the theme of the servant very clearly in this. We also have the theme of God's power. Those two things are in it. Now the theme of God's power is what is stressed. The servant has been introduced generally rather incidentally. But its very important since the (theme of) the servant comes back over and over and finally there is this great climax to notes(?) wherever the servant is referred to. Here in contrast with the nations that cannot predict the future, he says, You are my servant whom I have chosen. So since he goes directly to Israel in v.10 I now incline, a little more strongly than before, to think v.8 goes with v.10. He says, You are blind , you don't see that God has the power to dqliver you and that God's predictions are going to be fulfilled' well, just look at the nation. Let them predict the fut. like I can. You are my witnesses says the Lord. I don't want to be dogmatic on it. It can be taken in either of the two ways, but I incline a little more toward this way now. "You are my wittnesses sais the Lord, and my servant whom I have chosen." Again, who is the servant in v.10?

(Answer: Israel). Israel! How esle could you take v. 10? You are my witnesses. That is plural, isn't it? You are my witnesses. He must be talking to Israel on that. Any my servant whom I have chosen. He is talking to Israel. Is He talking to every single individual in Israel? Is he talkingto the very wicked in Israel, people who have completely turned against God? He can't be calling them His servant! So we have to take it --- now Delitzsch's

suggestion of the pyramid, I don't think helps at all. I don't think it adds to our understanding, but we have to take it that he is speaking to Israel but he is not speaking to all of Israel. Or that he is speaking to Israel that Israel is the servant in the sense that Israel has the responsibility to fulfill this work, to bring light to the Gentiles, to estab. justice in the earth. That is Israel's responsibility. But certainly it is the responsibility of every one --every member of Israel, the most wicked still has that responsibility. They can't get away from it.

I've heard the Campus Crusade very strongly critisized on the ground that the first of their four laws is that God has a plan for every human being. I've heard people say, How does God have a plan for the heathen, a plan for people that hate God ? Well there is a sense in which that is a very true criticism. That the only thing the ungodly can do is turn form their sin and reject receive Jesus Christ as Lord. There is a sense in which that is a very true criticism. And yet there is another sense in which I think that is a very unjustified criticism. Because I think we can say God created every person whom he has created in order to carry out His will. If you don't fulfill His plan that does not mean He does not have a plan for you, that He desires your life count for you. He has a plan for you. It seems to me there is much to be said for it as a method of reaching people who are wondering what is life all about any way. Where are we going? Why should w we be here? We get hungry and we eat a lot of stuff and then we are sick. And we say, What was the use of it all. We enjoyed it but what did it amount to? We think we get some pleasure out of drugs and we take them and life seems wonderful and then the results are utterly miserable. And you say, What's it all amount to anyway. As Horace Greely said, Life is a dream; riches have

wings; fame is a vapor and all is vanity", at the end of a very effective and successful life when he failed to get elected President of the U.S. and he wanted it and that was his conclusion on it all! It is the conclusion of the one who is not trying to fulfill God's plan. He sometime must come to the point where he realizes that his life is absolutely aimless but God does not want anybody's life to be aimless. Properly understood, you can certainly say to anyman, God has a plan for your life, but are you fulfilling God's plan. You certainly are not if you're not putting Him first, if you are simply seeking personal pleasure, if you are seeking simply that which appeals to you, you are not fulfilling His plan. The only way you can fulfill His plan is to turn form your sin and be saved through Jesus Christ.

So here he says, You are my servant -- all Israel no matter how wicked is a part of the Servant in the sense that it is his responsibility to see that this task is fulfilled. Cut all Israel is not part of the Servant in the sense that he is going to be part of that which will actually fulfill what is the responsibility of the Servant. This is Israel's responsibility that it be done, but Israel will have to do it through a portion of the nation, because a portion of the nation is not even interested and turns against God.

How big is the portion that will be able to do it? As the godly reads this, the most godly person says, I have sinned. I have fallen short. I'm in captivity. I'm in exile. I'm weak. How could I ever bring light to the Gentiles. How can I fulfill? Well, God says it is your responsibility to fulfill it. So Israel in that situation and in that generation when they could not possibly bring light to the Gentiles, their responsibility is to bring into existence the generation that can fulfill it. And the ultimate responsibility of

Israel is fulfilled in bringing into existence One who is a part of Israel, One who represent Israel, who bears the blood of Israel, and who as representative carries out the work of the Servant. So from the viewpoint of responsibility the Servant is all Israel. But from the viewpoint of carrying out the responsibility the Servant is whatever part of Israel is able to perform this task. As we go on through this chapter we learn more about it.

And so he says in v. 11, "I, even, I am the Lord" - again the glory of God, "and beside me there is no saviour", no other saviour. How easy it is for us in reading the Scripture to take a verse and try to just squeeze every word out. We have to be careful of that. "I have declares, and have saved, and have shewed, where there was no strange god among you: therefore ye are my witnesses, saith the Lord that I am God."(v.12).

What is the theme of v.13? ,Mr. Knight? (Knight: God's power in the directive area of deliverance.) Right, it is God's power, but it applies His power to deliverance. "I will work and who shall let it." There's the Old English "let". They sill use it legally, without let or hindrance. It means the opposite of what let means today. Who will let it, means who will stop it? It does not mean who will permit it? How many words have just completely reversed their meaning. Sometimes when words are just half reversed and we don;t know it, that's where even reading something written a century ago - we can completely misunderstand it. And this is/300 written yrs. ago. We can very easily misunderstand it. If westrike the word "I do you to wit" and we don't have any idea what that means, or deliver me from frowardness and leasing - we don't think it means don't the real estate business. We don't know what it means. And that doesn't do a great deal of harm, we can look it

up and see what it means. But when there's a word which has changed its meaning just a little, we can be greatly misled by a translation 300 yrs. old.

"Thus saith the Lord, your redeemer, the Holy OTe of Israel: Forf your sake I have sent to Babylon, and have brought down all their nobles, and the Chaldeans, whose cry is in the ships.(v.14). You notice the specific ref. to the Babylon and to the Chaldeans. We dontt have references to the Assyrians in this section. In the earlier sections we have many references to them. And again God's power in v. 15.

V.16 is God's power again.(referring to v.17 -"which brings forth the chariot and the horse, the army and the power." He's going to make this power be worthless. "They shall lie down together, they shall not rise: they are extinct." That is any power that opposes Him. It does not say He is going to do away with horses. It does not say He is going to make chariots non existent any longer. Like the people in N. Africa at one time, they used to say that God said to Peter, Put up thy sword. Therefore we won't use swords, so they beat their enemies to death with clubs. Well that's the literal interpretation of Scripture instead of seeing what it really means. He says the sword; we use the sword today, but the gun today is the equivalent. to the sword. And often we have to translate it into our own used/

He goes on here with deliverance. And v. 20 is a very figurative verse. And v. 21, "This people have I formed for myself; they shall shew forth my praise." Here he declares that the work will be accomplished. Israel will shew forth my praise, but look at the the contrast in v. 22. This is a very poingent passage. "But thou hast not called upom me, O Jacob; but thou hast been weary of me, O Israel."

How different from the rebukes of sin that we find so commonly in other sections of the Bible. "Thou hast not brought me the small cattle of they burnt offerings; neither hast thou honoured me with thy sacrifices. I have not caused thee to serve with an offering, nor wearied thee with incense . . . (reading through v.25) I will not remember thy sins. See the note of sins here. Israel had not given God His proper place, and here is regret and pain on His part rather than anger and wrath. "I am He that blots out thy transgressions for mine own sake . . .Put me in remembrance: let us plead together; declare thou, that thou mayest be justified."

Then the rebuke of sin becomes rather strong, just for two verses. "Thy first father hath sinned . . . Israel to the reproaches"(vv.27-8) Just for two vv. - strong rebuke of sin! Just for two verses, then he goes right back (44:1), "Yet now hear, O Jacob my servant . . . I will pour water upon him that is thirsty . . ."(44:1-3). You know how he touches on this theme of sin just touches on it these ways, and gradually brings in to attention the tact of the Holy Spirit. He finds a way to reach people. He goes hammer and tongs after the ones that need that sort ~~XXXXX~~ of approach, and he goes gently and carefully after the one that is in the situation that needs that sort of approach.

Immediately after these two vv. of strong rebuke, He goes right into comfort. "Thus saith the Lord that made thee, and formed thee from the womb . . . Fear not . . .I will pour my Spirit upon thy seed . . . they shall spring up among the grass . . .(44:2-4). Here is a prediction of a great future for Israel. "One shall say I am the LOrds . . .(v.5). In v. 6 again, what is the theme, Mr. Ward?

(Ward: Power). Again His power with a little stress on deliverance.

Again His power mainly. The same is in v. 7. In v.8 again he says, Ye are my witnesses, you notice. Still power but again the witnesses. Again there is a little bit of prediction in v. 8.

Ie v.9, what is the theme, Mr. Campbell? (Campbell: He seems to be showing once again the folly of idolatry.) Yes, in v.9 it is again idolatry. You notice how he goes quickly from one extreme to the other often. Very suddenly often. Here it is idolatry again because that was a constant threat among the Israelites. Idolatry was all around them and it was so easy to slip into it. Yes? Mr. Ward?

(Ward: other passages on idolatry is this the main one in Isaiah?). There is probably as much about idolatry in Isa. 40-55 as any section of Isaiah. It's one of the big themes because the people are over there surrounded by idol worship and it is caressed constantly in this passage here. As much as anywhere else in the Bible that is and prediction is, as much as anywhere else in the Bible. And the greatness of God, the creative power of God is stressed as much here as anywhere in the Bible. Question?

(Student: We had a speaker in missions class this morning who said, The tribes believe in God, a good God but they say they don't have to bother paying any attention to Him because He doesn't torment them. So they pay attention to the demons and idols.] wonder with the Israelites and these idols that surrounded them, was it the same sort of thing? To me, I can't quite understand how they would turn to idols if there is nothing compelling them to do it, unless ? no social pressure.) Well social pressures can be very great. I went once and spoke to a woman who was much attracted by Christian Science, Eddism. She had had a baby who recently died, and she had a friend who followed Mrs. Eddy and her baby did not die and she said, If I followed her my baby would not (die) either. I believe that when there is this social

pressure there also is that, but when there is any trouble and you don't see God, you don't see visible signs of His power, and you are a little group believing in Him, and you have people around it is easy to look at the seeming effectiveness of some of them -- that some of them have. I don't think that would be a universal situation always . . . but it very well may be among certain peoples, that God seems so far off, so distant that what seems nearer seems more an immediate problem. They have these people who claim the demons are injuring them, etc., and they see that troubles come and they think well that's the demon that's done it. Well, ŧtsŧZ8ŧZ of course it is true that a Christian can be bothered by Satan. Christians can be bothered by demons, but we don't find relief from them by propitiating the demons but by seeking the Lord's power.

Idolatry then is in v.9(ch. 44), v. 10 and v.11, 12, 13, 14, 15 And 15 points out the ridiculousness of it. He takes some of this wood and uses it for a fire that makes bread and he takes another part of it and makes a god out of it. He says how ridiculous. He is ridiculing idolatry here. He burns part in the fire, and with part he cooks his meal and with part he warms himself. 41:17, And with the rest he makes a god and falls down before it and says, Deliver me. V.18 has a natural conclusion to that sort of thing. "They have not known nor understood: for he hath shut their eyes,that they cannot see; and their hearts, that they cannot understand. And none considers in his heart" and none considers how ridiculous this is. He is pointing out the idolatry not simply for the people around them, but for some of their own who have gone into it. Yes?

(Student: Sometimes preachers will be preaching on passages that have to do with idolatry. They sort of leave the realm of the religious and they go to the Christian make your TV and all that. What do you

Do you think that is really a valid understanding of those things? To me it seems to indistinct) One can easily do that.

(Student: You can easily say it is wasting time, or something, but I don't have TV and fall down to it and say deliver me and that sort of thing.) No its making an idol out of your own pleasures instead of doing God's purposes. It's putting yourself first instead of God. It's a -- you'll find many things in sermons that are not strictly logical. The unfortunate thing is that most people get their truth from what their parents have said, what they have heard in church, even of most ministers, instead of what does the Bible say.

(Student: I heard a speaker this summer say that sense of human. You had to have some degree of intelligence to have a sense of humor. People with greater intelligence tend to have a more profound sense of humor. The person with all knowledge and intelligence would have the greatest sense of humor. We can probably get a little bit of that. It would be better that he burned both halves of the ipces of wood and have twice as much of bread or something like that...)

Yes, it certainly is true. Yet you find some pretty unintelligent people who are laughing all the time. I'm not quite sure that that is a generalization that's true (Student: sense of humor) Yes, there certainly is a lot in the Bible that is humorous if we look at it rightly, and of course it is sad on the other hand if we look at it from the viewpoint of the folly of people, and wickedness of people. This ch. goes on with stress on idolatry thro v. 20. But in v. 21 again you get the Servant, don't you? The only passage we had that dealt with the servant at any length thus far was the first two verses of ch. 41. But we've had a lot of stresses on it. "Remember these, O Jacob and Israel . . " God says, I've formed you I'm going to protect you, you're mine. No, He says. My servant I've formed you. You are my servant, you will not be forgotten.

Israel can be sure God will deliver them because He brought them into the world for a purpose. What is that purpose? Of course Israel has completely forgotten that during the Middle Ages and today, that is the attitude of the believing Israelite as a whole is (that is the ones of Israel beliving the OT) is We are God's people; God will protect us, we must keep away from the wickedness of the heathen around us. That's good as far as it goes. But God does not say, You are my pet, I'm going to protect you. You believe in me. All these other people around are lost. He says, You are my servant, I have formed you. You are my servant. In other words, You have a purpose. You are to bring light to the Gentiles. You are supposed to reach out.

Evidently they were trying to reach out in the time of Christ because Christ rebuked the Pharisees. He said, You'll turn heaven and earth to make a proselyte. He rebuked them for that, but after that within a few years after the time of Christ Israel ceased in any great extent to try to win people to Judaism, but closed into its shell and simply tried to keep the message for themselves, and the persons of their race were supposed to be true to God and follow the OT, but the others were just all outside. But God made them to be one with something that is to bring light to the Gentiles throughout the world. You are my servants. My servant he stresses here. There is the purpose that you should carry out.

Now of course the great purpose has been carried out in that the OT has been preserved for us. Of course the purpose of bringing Christ into the world was the great purpose. But the OT has been preserved and the existence of Israel and all the other nations of antiquity have disappeared is an evidence of the truth of God's word. So God is using Israel even in unbelief. But the only way Israel can carry out His

purpose fully of course is to become a follower of Christ who is the true Israel, the true servant through whom these were fulfilled. But that, he is laying the foundation for.

I asked you to go over ch. 44 and 45 for today. Please turn those in to me. I think you can look at the next three chs. next time because there is quite a bit that there is not much change in yet? There is quite a bit dealing with just a few subjects. But write up that way ch. 46,47,48 for next time, and leave me your papers, and we'll continue here next time.

Copy #1

We were in the 44th ch. I believe of Isaiah last time, and we looked at the long section on idolatry which ended with v. 20. Then at the end of the hour we looked at v. 21, where again he brought out the theme of the servant. In v. 22 we have deliverance, but we have perhaps more emphasis on deliverance from sin than we have had at any time yet. "I have blotten out as a thick cloud thy transgression, and as a cloud they sins, return unto me for I have redeemed thee." This is a very very strong statement on redeption. It is the strongest that we have had as yet. To the listener at this point it would raise the question, How can He blot out our transgressions which were so bad that they sent us into exile? How can he blot out as a cloud our sins? He says, I have redeemed theee. Just how? It can raise the question. It does not yet give the answer.

Then v. 23, of course, is still a continuance of the theme of deliverance. It is more the thought of being rescued from physical troubles in v. 23. Verse 22 seemed to stress the idea of sin quite strongly, and then in v. 24 we read, "Thus says the Lord, thy redeemer and He that formed thee from the womb, I am the Lord that maketh all things and stretcheth forth the heaven alone." This statement, "he stretches forth the heavens" is a very interesting one. How many of you have a Hebrew Bible here? Mr. Wilson could you tell us what the Hebrew form is here? This is Isa. 44:24, the next to the last clause in the verse which was translated "that stretches forth the heaven alone." While he is doing that, Miss Johnston would you look at Isa. 45:12. There we have the statement, "I have made the earth and created man upon it, I even my hands have stretched out the heaven."

Mr. Wilson, what is the form? (Wilson: "I am the Lord, the one making all, stretching forth shamayim . "Stretching forth" is Qal act. part.

Yes, and Miss Johnston have you found 45:12? What form is it there? (Answer: Qal perf.) It's a perfect, and it is translated quite literally in the KJV in 45:12, "I even my hands have stretched out the heavens." But in 44:24 as Mr. Wilson pointed out it is a different form; it is "that stretches forth" the heavens alone. One is a perfect that suggests something that has been done. We now see the results of it. This suggests a continuous action. This participle is used for continuous action in the past sometimes, for continuous action in the future sometimes, or for continuous action in the present. But the perfect is used of an action that is thought of as completed. Now this saatement that God stretches forth the heavens, occurs 10 times in the prophetic books, and 3 of them are perfect.(45:12; Jer. 10:12; 51:15) "I the Lord have stretched out the heavens." That would very evidently refer to His originalcreative act, or at least it would look at something that has been done in the past of which we see now the results. Yes, Mr. Wilson?

(Wilson: What were the references where it is perfect?) - 45:12; Jer. 10:12; 51:15. The participle though is used seven times. We have 3 times "I have stretched out the heavens." Now of course the word "stretched out" is used many other times, like it is used in Exodus a great deal where it says, "I the Lord have brought you out with a stretched out arm." Showing his arm stretched out to acoomplish His purpose. This word NATAH "to stretch out" is used many times in the Scripture, but in connection with the heavens it is used these times I have mentioned - 3 times in the perfect - "I have stretched out the heavens." This would refer to God's creative act, or to some portion, some great portion of His activities in the past which is now conceived of as we see the results of it. It is something that we think of as completed. But now it is used in the participle, as here in 44:24, seven

times, four of them are in our section of Isaiah between chs. 40 and 51. There are four cases where in this part of Isa. where he speaks of God as the One who is stretching forth the heavens. That's a -- yes?

(Question: What do you take these nuance to mean?) Well, there are two possibilities. One === Let's say there are 4 possibilities: (1) that God has stretched the heavens, therefore it is God who is the One who was stretching the heavens. I think that rather unlikely when we have the two different forms; I would think there was a difference in meaning between them. (2) the future; "I am the God who will be stretching forth the heaven. That I think would be rather unlikely too. I think there would be more evidence in the context if it's a fut. idea. (3) What would seem the most likely possibility when we have this difference, is that He is the One who is now stretching out the heaven. I can well imagine someone in Isaiah's day saying, What is He talking about? We know that God created the heavens. He put the stars in theri their places. He arranged everything in the universe. He has done this. But what do we mean? God is stretchingout the heavens? Are we- taking it as a past event to show how God did this not instantaneously, but over a period of time? Or are we describing God as the One who has the potential of doing this kind of action? It"s -- the most likely interpretation would seem to be that God is the ONe who does this, either continuously all the time, or from time to time. Someone in Isaiah's day might well say, Why use the different tenses? Why use perfect three times, and why use the participle seven times, and why use the participle more times than you do the perfect; more than twice as many? I think people might well puzzle about this, and wonder if there was a significance to it. It would seem as if there might well be. Particularly *if* when you find right in Isaiah the two of them here,one in ch. 44 and one in ch. 45/

It was within the last 30 years, I gather, that astronomers -- it may be a little further than that -- but I understand it, they began to decide from certain changes in color of stars that the stars were actually moving away from us all the time, and moving away from each other. The figure that is sometimes given for it is as if you had a toy baloon on which you had marks on the outside of the baloon. Then you fill it with air, and as you fill it every dot on the outside of the baloon fets further away from every other dot. They are all moving further away from each other. That is the theory, which if I am correctly informed, has been widely accepted among astronomers, as the expanding universe. That theory fits exactly with this usage of the perfect, as God is the One who causes everything to stretch out.

The theory might be given up in a few more years. There might be some other theory to fit the facts. Yes, Miss Johnston? (Student: I was interested to read here in v. 25, he goes on to say "and spreads out the earth." That's another participle from NATAH. But this is the earth, referring either to this planet or to the dry land.) It would again show the constantly changing conditions of the earth in which the oceans are either expanding or contracting all the time. The continents are growing larger or smaller. It's a -- In Wilmington where we lived for a number of years, there was a place I liked to walk (watch) not far from where we lived. When we got there there was a little bit of a rill that came down the side of the hill, and came down the dirt road I used to love to walk up. It wasn't very long before that little rill had become a big deep chasm that completely made the road unuseable. These changes are constantly happening in the earth. It's not a static thing; it's constantly changing.

(Phillips: Some people feel that the force of gravity has been decreasing steadily since the beginning of the universe which would also

cause the earth to expand literally. That is quite speculative whereas the expanding universe (idea) is fairly ~~quitetw+~~ quite well established.)

Just how much the spreading abraod of the earth, how much content there would be in it, it's hard to say. Certainly the earth is changing. from time to time. But this theory which is widely accepted *today* would seem to perhaps be anticipated in this usage in the prophets. Now of course the prophets would not know anything about it, but God led them to use certain terminology which perhaps anticipated a discovery of actual cosmic conditions. I thought that -- when I came across that a few years ago I was quite interested in noticing that, that they use the participle more than two times to every one they use the perfect. Of course they both would be true, but the perfect points back to what happened. God is the great God who created the universe, but God is not merely the One who has created the universe, God is the One ~~is~~ who is still spreading out the universe, he is still causing things to happen He is the one who ~~s~~ is still spreading out the earth and causing all the changes that occur on this earth to occur.

(Snudent: Here's where verbal inspiration is important. It seems like it is only when we have the doctrine of verbal inspiration that you really stress a point like this. You say it is a participle, not ~~an~~ adverb. you put the stress on that you might normally not put if) if it was merely human writing certainly what the man said would merely express the idea that was merely in his head. Now ordinarily the writers do express the ideas that are in their heads. Ordinarily God causes them --- I believe these writers all had erroneous ideas in their heads. Every human being has erroneous ideas, but God by inspiration prevented them from writing down in what He intended to be part of Scripture, any erroneous ideas which were in their heads. Like when the two disciples were on the road to Emmaus, perhaps they were two

men, perhaps it was a man and a woman. We don't know. But if the writer had said "two men" we would know they were two men. But he said "two disciples", and left it open. We do not know which it is. But Luke when he wrote this might not have known, and he might have conceivably used either word but God prevented him from using a word that would give a definite idea there were two men. Of course the word "two disciples" does not show they were a man and a woman, it leaves us not knowing. Verbal inspiration does not mean we can take a verse and we cn squeeze it and get every possible nuance out of it and be true; it doesn't mean that. But it does mean the Lord kept the writers from putting down what would be a ~~true~~ false idea. He kept them from using words that would later be shown to be in error. Of course there is then the possibility that on any particular occasion God might cause the writers to select words which would contain truths that they themselves had not realized. I would hesitate very much about making much of an argument that we had one use of the participle. I'd hesitate very much. But when we have seven uses of the participle in this phrase as against three uses of the perfect, it seems to me that it is enought to make a strong probability that God intentionally gave us the preview of something that would later be discovered.

I would like to look ahead for a minute, Mr. Corcoran, would you look at 45:4. Would you tell us how many sentences there are in that verse. We are thinking now not necessarily of English punctuation. We are thinking of words which were in the Hebrew and have been translated here. On the basis of the words, not paying too much attention to the punctuation, how many sentences would you say are in v.4? (Answer: two). Two sentences; it would seem to me quite definite. "For Jacob my servant's sake, and Israel mine elect" is very definitely not a sentence.

It's an introductory phrase. But for Jacob my servant's sake I have even called thee by thy name -- that would seem to be a sentence. Then he goes on and says, I have surnamed thee though thous hast not known me. Now the way the KJV has punctuated it it sounds as if "for Jacob's my servant's sake" goes with both succedding parts and could thus make one sentence. But it would seem to me the other is at least equally probable. Now how about v. 3? How many sentence would you say there are in v.3. Mr. Von Behren? (Answer: I would say one)

We might say one, or we might say perhaps less than one. If this was all English I would say that three(v.3) is unquestionably part of one because the "and" would connect it up with the previous, and make the the two of them one sentence. Since in Hebrew many sentenees start with "an", I don't think we can say with certainty whether v. 3 is a whole sentence or part of a sentence. It is certainly not more than one sentence.

How about v. 2, Mr. Kanish? (Answer: Two sentences.) V. 2 would seem rather definitely to be two sentences. I will do this and that; I will do this and that. It would seem to be rather definitely two sentences even though the KJV indicates it with a colon.

How about v. 1, Mr. Ward? (Answer: It's got to be less than one. even the colon). Yes that is the punctuation. But as far as the words are concerned, there is nothing in it that requires it to be connected with what follows or precedes, is there? It would certainly seem to be at least one. It's not two. He has the "and" connecting two different clauses, which could be independent. "I will loose the loins of kings " could be a separate sentence but since he has the "and" I think we can

reasonably say one sentence. But it is a complete sentence. It is not a participle.

Mr. Corcoran, how about v.28, the v. just before it? (Answer: Do you think that is four sentences, three sentences, two, one, or part of one? (Answer: Take it as one, I should think) Could you take it as two? The last thing, "thy foundations shall be laid" that could make a sentence, couldn't it? "Thou shalt be built and to the temple"? Could that be a sentence? He is saying to the temple "thy foundations shall be laid." But the "saying" you have to go back earlier. So "to the temple, thy foundations shall be laid" is not a sentence. " "Thy foundations shall be laid" alone is not a sentence. "Thou shalt be built" could be a sentence by itself, but it's part of a sentence because it is even saying to Jerusalem "thou shalt be built." How about from "even" on to the end, could that be a sentence? (Answer: I would think so.) No you have to have a subject for a sentence, don't you? You have to have a subject. If he said, I am the one that is even saying to Jerusalem thou shalt be built", there is a sentence. But he says "even saying to Jerusalem s thou shalt be built" that is hardly a sentence. So you can't have a sentence starting there. How about starting with "he is my shepherd?" Could there be a sentence that and that be a sentence? (Answer: Saying that saith to Cyrus) Would seem to introduce that, yes. Well then, could the whole verse be a sentence? One sentence, complete sentence? (Answer: Well it would connect with v.27). Yes, it would seem that v. 28 here is only a part of a sentence. Mr. Burraga, where does that sentence start? (Answer: With v. 24. The subject is the Lord.). You go way back to v. 24. (Burraga: He continues to speak at v) Would anybody differ with that?

Well now that is quite different from the sentences in the beginning of ch. 45 isn't it? That is really a remarkable sentence! That's the sort of thing you are accustomed to in Paul's *epistles*. He has long involved sentences, but you don't often find that in the Hebrew. In the Hebrew it is usual to have short sentences. Look at the beginning of ch. 44: "Yet now hear, O Jacob my servant; and Israel whom I have chosen." You don't have to have anything more. 44:1 can be a complete sentence.

"Thus saith the Lord . . . " 44:2 is a sentence. But it can be a sentence alone. 44:3, "For I will pour water upon him that is thirsty...." can be a sentence. 44:4 could be part of v. 3 starting with "and" or it could be a complete sentence, as many sentences in Hebrew start with "and". It is usual in Hebrew to have short sentences. It's quite rare in Hebrew to have a sentence that runs through 5 verses. It is very rare. When it happens, it would seem there must be a reason for it.

V. 22, The Lord has said I have blotted out your transgressions. The person in this world says, Yes that's as they said to Christ. You can say, your sins are forgiven. How do we know you can forgiven sins? But you say, Take up your bed and walk. Well, that's different. We can see some evidence as to whether you really have any power or not. And when the man gets up and walk, the Lord's command, "Take up your bed and walk is proven to be true, that He has power. Then when he says to the man, Get up and walk, and he walks. That' gives you strong reason to think that when he says, Your sins are forgiven, he was not just talking. That He really had the right to say what He said. Well now here the Lord has told them to rejoice because the Lord redeemed them. Now we have something of tremendous

importance that is going to start, run through all these sentences, all these verses. "Thus says the Lord." Here we have God's Word for it that Israel is going to be redeemed.

Now the structure of these next verses is very interesting. I'd like to make just a rough diagram of it if I can find chalk. (Writing on blackboard). You notice that next verse starts, Thus says the Lord." I say that is the introduction to the whole thing. Everything that follows is related to that, "Thus says the Lord.' Who is the Lord? He is thy redeemer. We have jst been told in the verses before that He is going to redeem them. Now how do we know He is the redeemer? How do we know He can do this? "Thy redeemer and he that formed thee from the womb." God says, I'm going to redeem you in the future. He says, I created you in the past. I brought you into existence. I did not merely start the world going and then leave it. I formed you personally in the womb. I overlooked every part of your coming into existence. He says, Thus says the Lord, thy Redeemer, and He that formed thee in the womb, I am the Lord." Again stre-sing who He is. Thus says the Lord, that did this and did this, I am the Lord. I am the Lord who? That makes all. The Lord who creates everything, that controls everything. That word "make" I believe it is the word asha asah which often is translated to do. I am the Lord that - He is particularly speaking here of His activity in making, but the word he uses is one which is used of all activity. The Lord who controls all things. The Lord who makes all things; not only that but the One who is responsible for all activities. The Lord that is stretching forth the heavens alone. He says I am giving the power, the force that is doing this, that is stretching forth the heavens. And that is stretching abraod the earth by myself. No one else is participating in this that I am doing.

Then he continues, v.25, "I am the Lord." Here He is talking about His creative power. God's omnipotence. You say, How do we know it? Again v, 25, "I am the Lord that frustrates the tokens of the diviners." Here he refers to the soothsayers, to the predictors, to the false prophets. I am the Lord that frustrates the tokens of the liars, and makes diviners mad. Continuation of the same thought there. "That turns wise men backward, and makes their knowledge foolishness." Paul says, the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God, the God that causes people's anticipations to prove false when He so chooses.

I picked up a copy of LIBERTY magazine in Jan. 1939, and they had an article in it by a famous astrologer that told what was going to happen in 1939. I happened to see the magazine a year later, and out of 10 predictions they had made, 8 were definitely false. He said Hitler would die a violent death during 1939; his violent death came six years later. He said, no war would break out in 1939. But the greatest war in history broke out then. He said that during that year that Roosevelt would announce that he would not seek a third term. He not only sought a third term but a fourth term. I think hte there were 3/4th of his predictions which were proven absolutely false. Most people did not see it a year later like I did. They read it in advance and probably forgot about it. But he frustrates the tokens of the liars and makes the diviners made, turns wise men backward and makes their knowledge foolish. This is the negative aspect of God's knowledge which is the proof of His power.

Then again, That confirms the word of my servant, and performs the counsel of my messenger. Parallel with that. He confirms the word of His servant. I believe this is the only case where the word

"his servant" is used in a different way from the regular way in these chapters 40-55. That is in 40-55 ordinarily the servant is Israel, the one who is to preform the great redemption, and bring light to the Gentiles. But here it would seem to be me simply speaking of the prophet. "That performs the word of His servant, and performs the counsel of his messengers." What is this word "he performs.?" That says to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be inhabited, and to the cities of Judah, ye shall be built and I will raise up the decayed places thereof." Here we are getting back to specifics -- definitely return from exile, deliverance from their condition over there in Babylon. Or actually not in Babylon the bulk of them. Some were in Babylon. Most were further north, but they were in the country under control of the Babylonians far from their home land. He aa says to Jersualem which was now in ruins, Thou shalt be inhabited, and to the cities of Judah, Ye shall be built and I will raise up the decayed places thereof. That says to the deep, be dry, and I will dry up thy rivers. That says of Cyrus, he is my shepherd and he will perform all my pleasure; he'll say to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built, and to the temple, Thy foundation shall be laid." Here we have a long continuous presentation involving the general idea of deliverance, involving God's great power as the proof He can deliver, involving God's omniscience, God's prediction as proof that He has this power; involving specific declaration of return from exile and after all these five verses reaching its great climax that says of Cyrus (and this is the first use of the word Cyrus). And of course the liberals all says it is utterly impossible that Isaiah could write the word Cyrus. How would Isaiah 150 years before Cyrus lived have known his name? How could he use the word Cyrus? and some have

even tried to defend against that by saying that Cyrus was some sort of a general term, not actually some specific name of this specific ruler. But there is no evidence of such a thing whatever. It is a marvel of God's predictive power that He gives the name Cyurs in advance, and Dr. Oswald T. Allis wrote quite an article on this passage here in which he stressed the position of the name Cyrus in it. That all this leads up to, that says of Cyrus. Here is his proof that the word of his servant, the counsel of his messengers given 150 years beforehand, is that there will be cone called Cyrus who will be God's instrument to bring about this rebuilding of Jerusalem, this reestablishment of the temple.

Now there are those who say that the word in Daniel for the building of the city is an edict given by Artaxerxes 100 yrs. after this time. It seems to me that to say that when Daniel speaks of the going forth of the word to rebuild Jerusalem, that that did not happend till Artaxerxes in 522 B.C. or 545 (I forget which of the two () it is neither it is 445 B.C. () when Cyrus 100 yrs. before in 539 B.C. had given the people the edict they could go back to Jerusalem and rebuild the temple. And Isaiah says that God says of Cyrus, He will say to Jerusalem thou shalt be built and to the temple thy foundations shall be laid, then to say that the word for the rebuilding of Jerusalem refers to something 100 years later seems to me to be making Isaiah a false prophet. Because Isaiah predicted Cyrus was the one who would do it. But the emphatic position of Cyrus in this whole proceeding here leading up to that is a -- as Dr. Allis emphasized -- is an emphatic thing that this is not an incidental thing speaking of somebody and you might say the name just incidentally goes in there, people written in the time of Cyrus when people know Cyrus is conquering all around and think

maybe he will come to us, and the author makes a good guess and says yes, Cyrus is going to deliver us. But that it's way ahead. God is the one who confirms the word of His servant, who performs the counsel of His messengers and says of Cyrus, he is my shepherd and shall perform all my pleasure even saying to Jerusalem thou shalt be built and to the temple thy foundation shall be laid. So we have this big stress all through here on deliverance from exile. That is a big stress in ch. 40-55, particularly in the earlier chs. of it. But we are gradually building up to the thought, After all why are they in exile? What caused the exile? It's their sins. If you don't do anything about the sin problem, it will be a wonderful thing to deliver you from exile but you'll have another exile and another and another if something is not done about the sin problem. That's the real vital problem, and of course that has been touched on in v.22, rather positively in v. 22, but not a great deal of stress laid on it. These are people in misery and suffering. Whether they are the people to whom Isaiah wrote who would read this 150 yrs. after he wrote, or whether they are the people, the godly people in his day, who are == know that the exile is certain, have talked with people who have escaped from the exile of the northern kingdom which is what happened during Isaiah's day -- know what exile is and what a terrible thing it is, know that it must come. Kkow that their nation is not turning back to God. Know that the exile is absolutely sure. Know that they as members of the nation are implicated in it. And then to give way to despair and God assures them the exile won't last forever. God is going to bring deliverance from exile. But you constantly get raised in your mind the question (as we go on?) Yes, that's wonderful to be delivered from exile, but after all what about the basic problem that cause the exile. And that's just been touched on, touched on. There is

no direct head on attack on sin in these chs. as such as there is so commonly in the early part of Isaial and in the latter part and in the other prophets which in these circumstances they need the tactful presentation with the little touches on it until it becomes strong in their mind.

There certainly is abundant evidence in Scripture that ordinarily God wants us to use tact in presenting His (orders?) Now there are cases where a direct straight statement God uses in a wonderful way. There are cases of that type. But particularly when people are in a condition like them of real suffering, real problems, there is a tactful approach that wins them instead of driving them away.

Now then having had this tremendous introduction to Cyrus in these verses, then he goes on to speak, to use the name cyrus again. These are the only two times the word Cyrus occurs in the book of Isaiah. 45:1, "Thus says the Lord to His messiah." This word messiach is used maybe 30 or 40 times in the OT. Twice it is translated in the KJV the messiah. Both times are in the prophecy of the 70 weeks in Daniel, where it says, From the going forth of the word to restore Jerusalem unto Messiah the prince shall be 7 weeks. Then two verses further it refers to, speaks of Messiah. Messiah shall be cut off. But those are the only two cases in the OT as in the IJV where the word Messiah occurs. But it's exactly the same word that is here rendered "anointed." Exactly the same word. This word "my anointed," or "his anointed," or "the anointed," is used at least 30 times in the OT. In 3/4th of the cases where it is used it is used of kings. David says, I will not lift up my hand against the Lord's anointed. He refused to kill Saul when he had a chance to do so. It is used 3/4th of the cases of kings. It is used in a

few cases of priests. Some prophets were anointed. To anoint is to set aside for specific service. God sends the Messiah in this way for a specific service. The anointing is only a form representing the fact. God's anointing is not necessarily carried out in a particular form. God told Elijah, he said When you come back, Anoint Elisha prophet in your place. When Elijah saw Elisha he threw his mantle over his head. And Elisha said, Let me go and say good bye to my folks and I'll come with you. Elijah said, What have " got to do with you? That was not our ordinary picture of anointing certainly, but there is no other evidence of anointing. When Elijah was taken up, he said to Elisha you stay here. I have to go over here. Elisha says, I'm not going to leave you. Elisha goes with him. He gets over to one town. He says to Elisha, You stay here, I have to go up to this town. Elisha says As the Lord lives I won't leave you, and he goes with him, and Elisha stays with him. Finally Elijah said to him, I'm going to be taken up from you now. What shall I give you. Elisha says, I'd like an equivalent portion of your spirit. The translation "double" is alright if you think of the double as equivalent. But if you think of double as/I'd like to be twice as great a prophet as you are, it's of course absurd. Some people say, Well it was double. Elijah did 7 miracles and Elisha did 14. I think that's rather silly, but in any case, we can be sure that Elisha wasn't that tactless to tell Elijah, I want to be twice as great as you are. He said, I'd like to have the same kind of spirit you've got. I'd like you have the Lord use me the way He has used you. Elijah said, You've asked for a hard thing. That does not sound as if he anointed him. There was no actual anointing, but God command to anoint him was carried out in his training him, in his calling him, in his setting him apart. God had set him apart to do the work God had for

meaning

Elisha to do.

Now in Dan. 9, that's not what we are talking about now of course at all, but where it says in Dan. 9, "from the going forth of the word to ~~rebuild~~ rebuild Jerusalem to Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks" and then there should be a semi-colon, and it should be "in 62 weeks the city shall be rebuilt in troublous times." But in the KJV they have the semi-colon too far over, so they say "from the going forth of the word shall be seven weeks and sixty-two weeks" as if anybody ever said 7 and 62 when they meant 69. They might say 9 and 60, but they would not say 7 and 62.

Mr. Wilson? (~~Answer~~ Question: So then do you view that messiach in Daniel as Cyrus?) Yes, very definitely. God here says, to His anointed to Cyrus. E. J. Young of Westminster has written a commentary on Daniel in which he says that "to Messiah the Prince" in Daniel must be Christ because no other was both priest and king. But it says there unto Messiah the Prince, and certainly Cyrus was a prince, and certainly Cyrus was anointed. The word anointed as used in the OT is used 2 or 3 times as often of kings as it ever is of priests. So to say that the prince is one who must be both priest and king is reading into the Scriptures something that is not there. It could refer to Christ, yes. Christ certainly was a Messiah the Prince. And we are not dealing with Daniel, and so I do not at this time want to argue whether it is. All I want to say today is that it can be Cyrus. Cyrus is a prince. There is no question. And here Cyrus is called his anointed, very definitely. It says here Cyrus is the one who is going to give the command to rebuild Jerusalem, so to say Artaxerxes is the one is certainly is reading into the text something that is not there. And to say 7 and 72 weeks means 69 weeks is certainly illogical. You could say

9 and 60 mean 69, but if you say 7 and 62 suppose that I said, From the time that I entered college in California till I got my first was 5 years, and 40 years I taught in Penna. and Delaware. Nobody wuld interpret that that from the time I entered college till I got myfirst M.A. it was 5 years and 40 years. The "and 40" clearly goes with what follows, not with what precedes. If that is true of 5 and 40 in that parallel, then this is exactly parallel - 7 and 62 certainly does not mean 69. It means 7. And then the 62 goes with what follows. Then that is absolutely proven by the fact that in Daniel he goes on to say, After the 62 yrs. Messiah will be cut off. He does not say after the 69 years. But then that is getting into Daniel.

(Question asked. indistinct). Yes that was, as I say I don;t feel we should take time in this class going at length Yes, it is Dan.XXXX 9:24-25. "Know therefore and understand fr+ that from the going forth . . . . . unto the Messiah the prince shall be 7 weeks and 62 weeks . . . Then there is a colon in the UJV, and then it says the street shall be built again and the wall even in troublous times." The way it is punctuated in Hebrew is: "Shall be 7 weeks(athnach)...that should be the semi-colon. Then 62 weeks the street shall be built again . . . .." But practically all interpreters of Daniel, that is all evangelical minded interpreters, practically all of them take it as 69 weeks in order to get a precise prediction of the time from Artaxerxes, because from Cyrus it comes to much more. But from Artaxerxes up to Christ and then it runs 10 years too long. So some suggest it is 360 day years instead of 365 days, and there never was such a thing as a 360 day year. But that is quite aside from

our present discussion. The main thing I'm interested in here is we definitely have the teaching here that Cyrus is God's anointed. So Messiah the Prince can refer to Cyrus. That's the vital point here. And that Cyrus is gives a command to rebuilt Jerusalem, so it is not Artaxerxes, the one who gives the command to rebuild Jerusalem. But I think having gone that far I should perhaps say one more word, that in Dan. 9 it says in v.25, "from the going forth of the commandment to restore and rebuild Jerusalem," but the word translated "commandment" here is simply dabar, which means word. A word can be a command, but it does not have to be. It can be a prediction. When Jerusalem fell Jeremiah gave the word that God gave him that the people will yet again buy property and plant fields, etc. in this area. So that can be taken as the "word" to rebuild Jerusalem i.e. God's prediction. I don't say you have to take that, but you can take. The interesting thing is that if you do, that from that to when Cyrus gave the === Cyrus the prince came and allowed the people to go back and rebuild Jerusalem is exactly 49 years. So it would exactly fit with the prediction. But then what we are interested here is that it definitely says here Cyrus is the one who rebuilds Jerusalem and it definitely calls him His anointed. That is the vital thing.

I perhaps should not have gone into Daniel here at all because there are to so many commentary books that say it is 69 weeks from Artaxerxes to Christ. 69 weeks that is of ~~62=and=~~ seven years each(?) So many books. But it does not figure out. It figures at least 10 years too long. Artaxerxes is not the proper place to start

(Question: Do they get by that the use of the prophetic year?) Yes if there ever was such a thing. That's right. Sir Robert Anderson who was a very brilliant detective wrote a book on the Coming Prince.

In it he said, we sometimes, the Bible sometimes speaks of a month as 30 days. So we can say a prophetic year is 12 times 30 = 360. There is no evidence there was such a thing as a prophetic year. I would say it is altogether possible ~~XX~~ if people had an incorrect idea of what a year was that God could in the Scripture use people's incorrect ideas. Or it is possible that He could use what He knew to be the true year. But for God instead of using the true thing to use an imaginary thing that we have no evidence people ever had, I would say is pure imagination. It does not work out. And of course the way Sir Robt. Anderson figured it, he said it came exactly to the triumphal entry from the day of Artaxerxes to the day of the triumphal entry which he put in 32 A.D. There is a recent, very good commentary on Daniel by a man named Wood in which he says practically all scholars today say the crucifixion was 30 A.D. rather than 32, therefore Anderson's theory does not work, so he says let's go back to an earlier command of Artaxerxes, and he says we'll take that as the starting point. But, he says, if scholars should change their mands and put it at 32 A.D. then let's come back to Sir Robt. Anderson's idea because he thinks that would be better than the other. Actually it does not have a solid foundation.

(Question: Do you see then the coming of Jesus in Daniel?) No I don't. I don't see a date for the coming of Jesus. I see in it a prediction that there's a long period yet to wait. That there is 7 weeks unto Cyrus. And this works exactly and that can give you assurance the rest is going to be fulfilled. Then there is going to be a period of 62 weeks in which the city will be rebuilt in troublous times, and after this Messiah will be cut off. Well, you have a period of c. 530 years, and this would be about 420, and so you know it is a good long time, but I don't think that God ordinarily

specifically tells when things are going to happen.

(Question about the trouslous times.) It would be the general situation of Jerusalem during this period, and would not mean necessarily that it was only going to be rebuilt for that long, but it would mean that there would be a long period. And there is a gap in time between the 7 and the 62 and then between the 62 and the one. There are many that say there is a gap between the 62 and the one but they try to make the 7 and the 62 continuous. If you are going to have a gap at all, it is much more reasonable to have a gap between the three sections than between just two of them. E. J. Young in his commentary makes it one period of 69 really, and he says this comes to approximately the time of Jesus, and then he says the final week, the first half of it is 3 and 1/2 years and that is Christ's earthly ministry. What do you do with the last half then? The last half must go from the crucifixion until 40 years later. It just does not work out at all. But the only way I can see you can make sense out of the last week is a gap between, that there is a gap between the second and the third, it is not at all unreasonable that there is(a gap) between the first and second.

It is 5 of, I'd better not take more time on Daniel. We can discuss next time, or I can talk with you privately, so we'd better quit. Don't forget to leave me your papers. Your paper went through ch. 48. For next time look at ch. 49. Look at the first part of ch.49? . Who is he talking about in the first part of ch. 49? Who is talking? Is it the servant? Is it Israel? Is it Christ? I'm not asking you to reach a conclusion, but I'm asking you to write out evidences' in each direction if you find any. If all the evidences is one say so but if you can find evidence Christ is talking, or the servant is talking, or find evidence the servant is not talking, or Israel is talking in these first few vv. Feel free to look in commentaries. Not required.

I've been asked about the relation of the early part of our present section to John the Baptist. Remember that in the NT, ch. 40 is quoted in connection with John the Baptist. In Mat. 3 - let's look at that. We find there that, "In those days came John the Baptist preaching in the wilderness, of Judea, and saying, Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand. For this is he that was spoken of by the Prophet Isaiah, saying, The voice of one crying in the wilderness saying, Prepare ye the way of the Lord. Make His paths straight." That quotation is directly taken from ch. 40, where we read in v.3, "The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord. Make straight in the desert a highway for our God."

As we have been looking at these various themes, we notice that ch. 41 begins a - God calling the nations before Him, particularly calling the heathen gods before Him to show their insufficiency and to show they are absolutely worthless. Then he goes on talking to Israel talking about Israel's sad condition in exile, giving them comfort, promising them deliverance but incidentally pointing out that the reason they are in exile is on account of their sins. And gradually as we go through bringing to our attention the fact that God is going them from exile, but He delivers them from exile nothing permanent will be accomplished, unless the cause of exile is dealt with. Thus gradually it is brought to our attention the vital place of sin, and the necessity of dealing with sin. So we have chs. 41 and following with the great stress on exile which continues right up through ch. 52-- a tremendous stress on exile. But during these chapters we have a gradually increasing stress on sin, as the problem. What is going to be done about it? God is going to deliver, yes, But how did you get this way? How did you get this terrible exile?

On account of sin and all that it means, and so on. Then we have that idea introduced of the servant of the Lord as we gradually see how the servant is the one who is going to deal with this problem of sin.

Now as we do this from ch. 41 on, it reads right continuously. There are no shapr breaks. (Student: I'm still a little puzzled about what you said about Isa. 40's relation to the Baptist). That's what we are leading to. From ch. 41 on we have this continuous development. It starts with ch. 41, with God calling the nations before Him, calling the heathen gods before him, and accusing them of being worthless in the face of the coming of Cyrus, and then talking of this terrible calamity that is coming to the nations, but how to Israel it won't be a calamity, it is a deliverance. And God is going to deliver. But what's the use of delivering if you still have sin. You'll have to have more exiles. So gradually there is brought to attention the importance of this problem of sin, and the necessity of dealing with it.

To show our whole sections which runs from ch. 40 to 55, ends with that great explanation of the solution of the problem of sin. Isa. 53 -- Jesus Christ is going to solve that great problem. We start with exile. We lead up to sin. That is ch. 41 to 55. Now through this we have noticed the principle of the theme, how the thought moves suddenly from one theme to another. God comforts. God delivers. We can ~~note~~ know he'll deliver because he's promised it. He is == his great creative power. We can trust God. There is no other God. More emphasis on that than in any other part of the Scripture. Emphasis on the fact we can know God exists because he will fulfill his word, and he has in the past. The evidence from prophecy - the knowledge of God. These themes - we jump from one to the other.

Now we look back at ch. 40, and we find that ch. 40 has no specific statement about a particular event that is going to happen. The emotional rather than the directly intellectual is dominant through our whole section from 41 through 55. We have much of the intellectual, but the emotional is dominant. But in ch. 40 the emotional is all through it. That is great truths are presented for their effect on people's minds, for their influence, for their certainty. These great truths are presented, but a spedific statement - a King is going to come and going to do something. Someone is going to give His life as a ransom on the cross. Specific predictions like that we do not have in ch. 40. We have the great emotional thought of the whole passage stressed in ch. 40, stressed and emphasized and driven home very, very strong. But no specific predictions that can be recognized immediately as specific predictions in ch. 40.

So ch. 40 is a little different from the rest. I have felt that the solution to it is to condider ch. 40 like the prelude to a great symphony of music, like the overture perhaps to an opera, in which the great themes that are developed afterward, are here presented. Presented and driven hom by themselves apart from definite specific predictions. Consequently, you can take ch. 40 and you can read it only with exile in mind, and you can find as you go through it every thing can have a direct relation to this thought of, What about this problem of exile? God is going to comfort. God is going to deliver. God assures you that He is far superior to the idols. He has power; they are nothing. He will accomplish what He wants. He'll enable you to make that difficult journey back from the Babylonian area. He gives power to the faint and to those who have no might He increases strength. They that wait on the Lord shall renew their strength, they shall mount up with wings as eagles. You think of them starting on the trip from Babylon. Wonderful! We just mount up with eagles. God's going to take us

back. How wonderful! Then as we go on a little bit, we get a little tired; we don't feel like we're mounting up like eagles, but we're still running and not wearing. Then as we go on it's a long, long ways. And we can't be running any more. But we shall walk and not faint. We just keep going, and we shall accomplish His purpose. You can read all of ch. 40 and apply every word of it to exile. On the other hand you can go through from ch. 41 to 55 and get your great picture that starts with exile, and leads on and developes up until it gets to the solution to the whole thing in the coming of Christ to deal with the problem of sin, and you can go back to ch. 40 and you can find that every word in ch. 40 can be interpreted in relation to the wonderful joy over what Christ is going to do. So you do not have a spedific reference to exile, and you don't have a specific reference to Christ in the ch. But you have the great emotional theme connected with the beginning of this great development in ch. 41 and with the end of it in ch. 53-55. Those these themes are presented as the introduction to the whole passage. Consequently you can take the end of it we just looked at, you can say the people in the Babylon, how will they ever get back? How will they ever be delivered from the exile? Verse 28, "Hast thou not known, hast thou not heard. The everlasting God, the Lord, the Creator of the ends of the earth does not faint, nor is weary. There is no searching of His understanding." Not only His power but His understanding. He uses the means that will accomplish His objectives. There is no searching of His understanding He gives power to the faint, and to those who have no might He increases strength. In your own strength you could never get back from exile. Even the youths shall faint and be weary, and the young men shall utterly fall, but they God will give you the strength, He will give you the patience; He will enable you to get back safely.

Or you can interpret the whole passage as the end of our development from ch. 41-55, and you can say, here is God comforting His people, not merely because they are going to be delivered from exile but because the root cause of exile is going to be dealt with. The matter of sin is going to be handled, and they are going to be delivered from it. "Speak to Jerusalem, cry to her that her warfare is accomplished that her iniquity is pardoned, for she has received from the hand of the Lord double for all her sin."

What is going to produce this. You can figure the ones in Babylon. Prepare the way of the Lord. Make straight in the desert a highway for our God." How are they ever going to get a way back there? Every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill made low, and the crooked made straight, and the rough places plain, and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed. God will bring you back and remove all these difficulties. Or you can think of it as the end of the development here from ch. 41-55, "Prepare the way of the Lord." The forerunner comes before Christ preparing the way for Him, going out into the desert and drawing the people to Him there, and preparing in their hearts a highway for our God. Giving the great teachings that open the way and make them ready to listen to Christ. "Every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill made low," which can be applied literally to the return from Babylon. It can be applied in a symbolic sense to the way God is going to clear out the difficulties, to open up the way to accomplish His great purpose in what Christ will do, and also in the spreading of the gospel. This I feel is vital in the interpretation of ch. 40 - to recognize thus that ch. 40 touches emotionally == emotional rather than specific predictive acts. Therefore it is a description of what John the Baptist is going

to do;it also is a description of what Jesus is going to do returning from exile, because it is not a specific prediction but an emphasis upon the vital emotions involved. Now I think this must be thought through very carefully, and one must recognize that there can be a great danger in this approach if it is applied too widely. I apply it to very few passages. After ch. 40 here, I think in the whole structure here from 40 to 66 is very clearly the introduction. It does not have in the whole ch. anywhere any specific action pointing to it. It can be applied to different things. It is emotional rather than intellectual. This is the general situation. These are the emptions applied to it. Now when we get into specific situations like in ch. 41 when it describes Cyrus' coming and people filled with terror, you can say the person who is a country that Hitler is overrunning can read this and say, Why just as God caused those people who did not need to fear from Cyrus, so we don't need to fear if Hitler comes if we are God's people, God is going to work His perfect will in all this situation. But you can't carry it to saying that just as Cyrus is a deliverer, so Hitler is a deliverer! You find analogies, you can apply things to your own situation,but that's not what they are talking about. Ch. 41 is specifically and definitely talking about Cyrus. It's not talking about Christ; it's not talking about John the Baptist; it's not talking about the anti-christ; it is talking specifically about Cyrus. When you have a specific prediction, it talks about one person. It does not talk about two people unless it says, There will be great enemies (something in the plural which would naturally be more than one.) But as long as there is the singular, definite, specific prediction it is predicting one thing. When the virgin birth of Christ is predicted, it is not predicting the birth of a son of king Ahab. It has nothing to do with

any event that took place before the birth of Christ. Specific predictions are fulfilled in a specific way. They may be analogies for other situations, but they are specific predictions.

Now this I'd say here is not a specific prediction of John the Baptist. It does not say, one who lives in the wilderness and eats locust's honey (?) is going to come out and preach, and baptize great number of people and prepare the way for the coming of the Messiah. It does not say that, but it describes the emotions involved that can fit the return from exile, or it can fit John the Baptist. Mr. Rohrer you have a question?

(Question: My questions was how you can know John's message was to the emotions?) John's message by itself would not be very meaningful to us. His message was simply a message of repentance. But in the beginning of Mat., it tells us that John's great message of repentance and of turning away from sin is not an end in itself but he is a forerunner of Christ. He is coming to prepare the way for the coming of the One of whom John said toward the end of his ministry, there comes one after me that was preferred before me for he was before me. It's not the outstanding thing that a person seeing John the Baptist's ministry would immediately have thought of. He would have thought of him as a great preacher of righteousness attacking sin, and calling people to repent - be baptized for the remission of sin. It was rather incidental, his pointing out that his work was preparatory. In fact he even had doubts when he was in prison he sent his desciples to Jesus to ask him are you the one that must come or are we to wait for another? God revealed certain things to him, but a great deal he did not reveal. But Mat. explains John the Baptist's mission as being more than appeared on the surface, as being preparatory for Christ, clearing and straightening out the

paths before him and making it far easier for Christ's preaching to be accepted and received because of the forerunner who went before him.

Mr. Wilson, did you have further question? Mr. Knight, you have further question about this? Well, that was in answer to a question, and I think a very important question, because you notice this passage from 40 to 56 is a very closely knit passage in which the great emphasis is emotion, but there is a definite deveolpment of thought as he leads up in this wonderful way to the great prediction of the atonement of Christ. Mr. Wilson?

(Question: What was the Jew in John's day -- what did he think when he heard "the voice of one crying in the wilderness . . . ."? What would be his reaction to that? What would he be understanding with those words?) How often the ordinary Jew heard those, I don't know. He read the Scriptures, he would come across them. He might ponder over them, but Matthew who sat the ~~feet~~ seat of customs and who in between his tax collecting duties studied the Bible, and studied the OT and saw the picture of the One who was coming, when a group of Galillean peasants came by, and to other people they were just a group of Galillean peasants with a humble looking fellow talking to them, Mat. who had studied the OT so thoroughly saw that here was something more than what appeared on the surface. He was ready so that when Jesus said, Follow me, he left his job and went and followed Jesus, because he saw that Jesus was the fulfillment of the OT predictions. So to Mat. it was clear that here was the fulfillment of what ch. 41-55 develope~~s~~, and that ch. 40 introduces in this way and that John the Baptist who had already the greater part of his career by this time, had not been ~~in~~ an end in itself. His great message of repentance was important, but it was only a forerunner. The thing that was most important was not that we turn away

from sin but that we find salvation through the Redeemer. Matthew saw that and Mat. begins his Gospel with quoting (Isaiah). Now the ordinary person reading this in Isaiah would say, Now what is it talking about? He'd say, Well, God tells Jerusalem her warfare is accomplished; He is going to deliver them. This was a marvellous promise of deliverance from exile that Isaiah gave. What is its message for us? But he would not find that the ch. was a ch. of specific prediction of future events. And when he'd get in ch. 41 and so on, if he was intelligent and ~~education;~~ educated, he would immediately recognize it was a description of Cyrus' coming, a prediction of Cyrus. Not a prediction of anything later than that. If he was not particularly educated, he might read it and he's think it was talking about Abraham rather than about Cyrus which some interpreters have taken those passages. Some of those passages sound a little like Abraham; most of them don't sound a bit like him. Any further question on this or shall we go on to the specific assignment for today? The specific assignment for today was about ch. 49.

In introducing our examination of ch. 49, I asked you to write out a statement of who you thought was speaking in each part of the few verses of ch. 49. I'd like to say a word first about who is speaking. This is a problem that is not always easy to solve in the prophetic books. Who is speaking? The prophet wrote down or some one else heard them and wrote down -- it varries from depending on the prophet --- they wrote down what they said. Their messages were mostly given/first in oral form. But in these messages there are cases where the prophet describes his own situation. He describes his fears, his doubts, his hopes. He gives his prayer to God. These are a small part of the writings of the prophets. Now there is a larger part of the writings of the prophets where the prophet speaks as God's mouthpiece, and what he gives is God speaking to people. Now of course God speaks through

everything the prophet says, but where the v. is directly a divine statement that God is speaking to the people. Then there are a few things in the prophets, like where somebody says that the Bible had errors in it; that the Bible says there is no God! It contradicts the many things in the Bible that tell about God. It says there is no God! Now when you look at the passage in the Psalms, and the fool has said in his heart there is no God. There the one who is speaking is the fool. That's what the fool says, There is no God. We have in the Bible quotations from those who were opposing God or who are stating false things given in order to correct them.

There is one case where Isaiah makes a great talk at a banquet, and suddenly we read, Whom will he teach wisdom, those that are little ones that are not yet barely weaned, etc. who is he going to teach wisdom? Like them? Then it goes on and says, God is going to speak to you like little children, He's going to speak to you in tones you won't understand. That is, these nobles are saying, Look at Isaiah with his old fashioned simple platitudes he is giving us. Let's get rid of this fellow and not bother to listen to him. Isaiah says, If you won't listen to God's direct teaching, God will talk to you in a way everyone can understand, even the smallest, thought people of strange talk, that is through the Assyrian army comes in, and God through the conquering Assyrian army shows the people His condemnation of sin and of what they have done. There we have introduced without anybody else saying it, somebody talking the objection. saying somebody else is talking the objection. We have occasionally objections in the Scripture. They are not always introduced.

Now we have in ch. 49, as we look at the beginning of the ch., we ask the question, Is this Isaiah speaking? Is Isaiah simply speaking as a mouthpiece of God? Is Isaiah quoting what someone other than God either had said, or is saying, or will say?

Now before we look into that further, just one other point we should look at, that is we have through these chapters gradually seen the Servant of the Lord introduced. We have seen how the Servant is introduced, a new idea in these chapters. An idea that is developed only in these chapters, that God is going to deliver Israel, not because He loves Israel particularly and because they are His pets. Not at all! Isarael is His servant to accomplish His purpose. In ch. 40 42 we saw that the Servant is going to bring light to the Gentiles. He is going to bring justice to the nations, and he going to do it in a steady way that shows great power, not in the way of one who is struggling. That's the picture in ch. 42. We noticed how the servant is Israel. Israel is struggling, suffering. How can Israel fulfill this? We have seen that it must be that the responsibility to do the work of the servant is upon Israel, but that the servant is not all of Israel. It may be part of Israel. One even wonders sometimes up to this point whether it could be one individual out of Israel who represents Israel. So that in ch. 49 is a question. If this is not God speaking, or Isaiah speaking, or an objector speaking, is it the servant speaking?

Look at v. 1. Mr. Von Bhern Behren, who would you say is speaking in v.1? (Answer : The Holy One of God). Yes, of course there the teaching about the Messiah is being developed. We don't have a great deal about it yet. So I'd rather at this point speak of the servant. You think it is the servant speaking here? That is, Isaiah might say, Listen Oh isel isles, or coasts to me. Listen all your great western areas to me." Isaiah could say that. It does not seem likely he would. He had no loug speakers, or TV or anything to reach tremendously large audiences. You would not quite expect Isaiah to speak it. You'd think it was more apt to be God than Isaiah at that point but it could be Isaiah.

But then he says, The Lord hath called me. That is not the Lord speaking in the ordinary sense, because he says, The Lord has called me. So this is someone whom the Lord has called. "The Lord has called me from the womb, from the bowels of my mother he has made mention of my name." ~~The=dee==~~ That does not tell you whom he is, because God said to Jeremiah, Before you were born I knew you. Jeremiah could say that the Lord has called me before I was born, he has prepared me for this specific work. So we cannot say with certainty who this is; it could be Isaiah conceivable, that part of it. So that this verse could conceivably be Isaiah. It's not God that is speaking. It's most likely the servant that is speaking. So that the answer that Mr. Von Behren gave, The Messiah, s is the correct answer, but I think that in the development of our thought here it is better to say it as the Servant. It is the Servant who seems to be speaking in v. 1.

Now is it God who is speaking in v. 2 or who? Mr. Kanish. (Answer: I would say also the servant.) You would say the Servant is still speaking in v. 2. V.2 he says, He has made my mouth like a sharp sword." Now that's not God saying, He's made my mouth like a sharp sword. It is clearly not God. He has made me the servant. He has made my mouth like a sharp sword might conceivably be that Isaiah said that about himself. It could be Isaiah in vs. 1,2, possibly. But when you get to v.3, who is talking?

(Answer; I believe it is Messiah. If a person would say the Servant here, he would have a hard time with the Lord being glorified) That might be. But he says, Thou art my Servant, O Israel. Isn't it Israel talking? (Answer: No, . . . that's the Lord.)

(Another student: First glance it would seem to be Israel. He personifies the nation Israel by speaking to it.) Exactly. We have

told that Israel is the Servant. We've been told that 5 or 6 times maybe more in these chapters. Israel will not be destroyed because Israel is my servant. Israel is God's servant. Israel has a task to do. Here he says, Thou art my servant O Israel in whom I will be glorified. He's going to be glorified through Israel. He is going to be glorified through His Servant. Now he is not going to be glorified through Ahab, or through the false prophets, or through the wicked members of Israel certainly! So when he says Israel he is talking to a portion of Israel, not all of Israel. Is he talking to all the godly in Israel, or is he talking to one individual? You cannot tell from v. 3 which he is speaking to, but he seems to be speaking to Israel which he calls His servant. So in the light of the previous discussion of the servant, you can suggest it is the servant who is doing the talking if the servant is Israel. Of you can say it is Israel here talking because he says, Thou art my servant Oh Israel. Yes?

(Johnston: I had the impression when I read it that the same one who is speaking here has been speaking in the previous chapter) We have not looked at the previous chapter yet. That is a good point to have in mind, but I'm taking the chapters in reverse order right now. Yes, Mr. Roher? (Rohrer: Did you then conclude the Messiah is saying this?) I prefer not at this stage in our development to use the word Messiah. That is to say, Isaiah is developing thoughts *with* people who as yet have heard very little about Messiah. The idea of Messiah is going to come out. After we get through and have developed it we may go back and say this is Messiah. But at this point in our development, I'd like to either say, This is Isaiah speaking; this is God speaking, or this is the Servant speaking. If it is the servant speaking, who is the servant that is speaking?

If it is the servant speaking, is it the servant who is Israel? See what I mean? We can come back later and say, We see now that it is Messiah speaking, but we have not had that development yet, in our development of the passage. (Rohrer: In this translation it says,And he said to me, You are my a servant. Would the servant say, You are my servant? Would Israel say, You are my servant, or would God say that or someone else?) Well, he said to me, You are my servant. He said to me. Now if Israel is the servant, Israel could say, God said to me, You are my servant. Because he said it repeatedly in previous chapters. He said, Israel, Don't you fear, you are my servant. He has many times referred to Israel as the servant. So Israel could say God said to me, You are my servant.

Mr. Corcoran, who do you think is speaking in v. 4? (Answer: The servant). He said to me, You are my servant Israel, then I said (the servant said? or Israel said?) Israel is the servant. I have labored in vain, I have spent my strength for nothing, and in vain. Yet surely my judgment is with the Lord and my work with my God. This is certainly not God speaking here. He is talking about what God has done and is going to do for him. Here he says, I'm struggling. I'm not accomplishing. It would seem to be the servant Israel as the servant that is speaking which we've had just in the chapter before. There you have quite a contrast from ch. 42, don't you? In ch. 42 he says, Behold my servant whom I elect. I've put my spirit on him. He's going to bring forth judgment on the nations. He will not cry or lift up or cause his voice to be heard in the streets. He will not fail nor be discouraged till he has set justice in the earth. Do you expect the one who can say in what he does in v. 42, to say I have labored in vain, I have spent my strength for nought? Yet surely God is going to work out His purpose. We have the servant Israel

speaking in v.4 surely. We have the servant speaking, but we are thinking of the servant as the whole of Israel. We are thinking Israel is going to say, How am I going to do this work? God says, You are my servant to bring light to the Gentiles. Israel can say, How can I do this work if I am your servant, this work you are calling on me to do. How can I accomplish it. Well, he says, God says he is going to enable me to do the work. Is this Israel as a whole speaking? Is it the godly portion? With the wicked ones left out? Is it one individual who represents Israel? He is of Israel, he represents Israel. He is the true servant who does the work that Israel has responsibility to do as God's servant. He is part of Israel so he can represent Israel in doing Israel's work.

What about v.5, Mr. Corcoran? (Answer: The servant). V.5, the servant is speaking, you say. Is it Israel the servant who is speaking? V. 5 suggests very strongly that it is not all of Israel who is speaking. Why? (Student: Because it speaks of Jacob and Israel) Well, you could speak about yourself. I mean what does it say about Jacob and Israel.) Answer: As distinguished) That's right, it speaks of them as distinguished from him. Verse 5 then raises a serious question about this being the whole of Israel or even a substantial part of Israel. "Now says the Lord who formed me from the womb to be his servant, to bring Jacob again to Him." Now you dontt say the Lord has sent me to bring myself again to Him. The implication is that it is something else he is going to bring. So in v. 3 we have the servant closely identified with Israel. In v.5 we have the servant distinguished from Israel. That's an interesting thing, right in two verses, right next to each other, one associates, ~~identifieds~~= identifies the servant as Israel. The other distinguishes the servant from Israel. So we have the suggestion that the servant is an Individual rather than the nation.

"Now says the Lord who formed me to bring -- to be his servant. Though Israel be not gathered, yet shall I be glorious in the eyes of the Lord and my God shall be my strenght." That is an indirect quotation, you notice. It is not a direct quotation. If it was: "Now thus says the Lord, though Israel be not gathered, yet you will be glorious in my eyes, and I will be your strength." But it is an indirect quotation: Thus the Lord has said, Even if Israel is not gathered, yet I will be glorious in the eyes of the Lord." It is an indirect quotation, saying what the Lord has said, but sayingit indirectly, using the first person about the one to whom it has been said, "Though Israel be not gathered, yet I will be glorious in the eyes of the Lord, and my God will be my strength." I am going to be able to accomplish the work, and there is here for the first time, we have an explicit distinction between the servant and Israel. Identified in v.2, but distinguished in v. 5, a contradiction, a definite contradiction at first sight. Now often what seems at first sight to be a contradiction, on examination proves to be two different sides of the same truth, which may be verbal contradictions but not actual contradictions. Here we have two sides of the same thing. Verse 3 the servant is Israel; v. 5 the servant is only a part of Israel, and the greater part of Israel is not included in the servant because he says that it may be possible that the whole of Israel will not be gathered even if not, yet the servant will do his work in bringing light to the Gentiles. But then he goes on in v.6, and who is speaking in v. 6? Mr. Tej ?

(Tej. Sounds to me like God speaking). Yes, after the first three words,it is God. The servant who in v. 5 gives the indirect quotation of what God says about the servant, in v. 6 gives a direct quotation, And he said, and then all the rest of v. 6 is very clearly God speaking. God said, It is a small things that you should be my servant to

raise up the tribes of Jacob and restore the preserved of Israel. Here we have the servant very definitely separated from the mass of Israel, because the servant is going to raise up the tribes of Israel. Inc ch. 42 the servant was going to bring light to the Gentiles. Light to the nations. And for all you knew in ch. 42 it might be God's will that the whole of Israel go out and perform this wonderful task, though as you read the description in ch. 42 of his activityit did not sound like what you would expect Israel to do or any mere man to do.

But here we have what the servant is going to do for Israel. So here you have a pretty definite idea ~~of=yhs=====y~~ that the servant is one individual who represents Israel, but who is not only to be a light to the Gentiles as we had before, but he is also to do a great work for Israel. He is going to deliver Israel, and he's going to raise them up and he's also going to be God's salvation to the ends of the earth.

(Mr. Rohrer? What does he mean when he says it is a small thing?) What he means is that is only a small part of what you are going to do. That is, before we were told the servant is going to be a light to the Gentiles. Now we have that idea again. The servant is going to do a great world-wide work. The work he is going to do d for Israel is a small part of this tremendous work he is going to do. The servant is going to do this work for the world, but Israel itself needs a work. Israel itself is gone into exile for its sin. As he said earlier, My === Who is blind like my servant? His servant is deaf, blind, in bondage. He can't do the work. Israel needs a work itself. So this one who represents Israel, this one who is the true Israel, he is going to do a work for Israel, and that is only a small part of His work. It is a work that is going to reach to all the world.

It is a small thing that you should do this for Israel. We have been told how wonderful God is going to do for Israel, but what he is going to do for the world is so much greater, vaster, that the work he is going to do for Israel is small part of it, but in previous verses, in this whole section, we haven't been told of the necessity of doing a work for Israel. It has been suggested in occasional statements about Israel, it has been suggested, but not explicitly stated until now. The servant is going to do a work for Israel, also. So the servant is here definitely distinguished from Israel, but the work he does for Israel is a comparatively small part of the entire task. He must be a light to the nations, and bring God;s salvation to the very ends of the earth.

"Thus says the Lord, the redeemer of Israel . . . to him whom man despiseth, to him whom the nations abhore, to a servant of rulers, kings shall see and arise." Here we have the humiliation of the servant; he is going to be despised, looked down upon. And yet what he does is going to reach to the very leaders throughout the world, and bring light to the whole world. So here we have the concept that is so clear and sharp in ch. 53, Who has believed orur report? This One who seems to be nothing. He is a root out of dry ground. Yet he is the One whom God uses to bring blessing to all the world.

There are many more things I want to look at in ch. 49, but right now I want to look back to ch. 48 a little bit. Look at the end of ch. 48, the last three vv. are very definitely exile, are they not? "Go forth from Babylon, flee from the Chaldeans. With a voice of singing declare, tell this, the Lord has redeemed his servant Jacob." Verses 20-22 of ch. 48, who is speaking? Well that could be Isa. speaking as God's messenger. It could be God speaking directly to the Israelites saying, I am delivering you from Babylon. You will leave your

exile and go back to Jerusalem. Or it could be the servant speaking to them. There is nothing in it to show it is the servant, but it surely is a possibility. Now the previous two vv. just before that are like the occasional verses we've had, vv.18,19, where God has rebuked Israel for its sin, though those are incidental in this section; not stressed like they are in other parts of Isaiah, and of the other prophetical books.

But then look back at v. 16. Who is speaking in v. 16? "Come near unto me hear this." Who speaks this? It could be Isaiah, couldn't it? Come near hear the message I have to give you. It could be God speaking to all the people of the world. It could be the servant,"Come and hear me." Those words don;t tell us who is speaking. But now what's the next statement: "I have not spoken in secret from the beginning." Beginning of what? It could be the beginning of Isaiah's ministry. It could be Isaiah, couldn't it? "But I have not spoken in secret from the beginning, from the time that it was, there am I." Who is speaking there? "From the time anything existed." God is speaking, isn't he? God is speaking. "Come near to me, hear this. I have not spoken in secret from the beginning, from the time that it was, there am I. This must be God speaking. Who else could it be? Look at the rest of theverse? Who is speaking. (The servant.) It must be, because the Lord God has sent me. So if the Lord Godhas sent me, the first part sounds as if it is God speaking, and yet he says God has sent me. So here we have a contradiction! Like the other contradiction, we noticed. It is a verbal contradiction. It == How can it be God speaking, and not be God speaking? Only after you know the secret of the trinity is it possible that it can be both God speaking and not God speaking. It can be Jesus Christ speaking who is God, and yet not the Triune God, not God the Father speaking. Then you go on in

verse: "And now the Lord God and His spirit has sent me." God has sent him. Now, "and his spirit" is translated this way in the AV. In the Revised Version of 1901, it says, "And now the Lord God has sent me and His Spirit." The way it stands in the Heb., either is possible. You don't know whether it is the Lord God and His Spirit who has sent the Servant, or you don't know whether the Lord God has sent the servant and sent his spirit. Both are possible in the verse. There is no way from the verse to say which it is and actually we know both are true.

Here is a verse then where we have One speaking who is God, and yet who distinguishes himself from God. One who performs this work on earth as God's messenger, One whom God has sent. Here we have the Trinity very clearly in the OT. There is no other reasonable way to interpret ch. 48:16, but that you have there the 3 persons of the Godhead: God the Father who has sent the Son; God the Son, the servant who is spoken of in these chapters who is the one speaking here; and God the H.S. who is associated with God the Father in sending Christ. And Christ constantly speaks during his earthly ministry of the work of the Spirit through Him. He lived in the Spirit. The Spirit was constantly with him, and yet he says, I will send you another comforter and He will lead you into all truth. So the Spirit and the Father sent the Son, but the Spirit was sent in a very special way after the resurrection, after the death of Christ to be with His people. So here we have the trinity not explained in such a way that a person simply reading this passage would know what it means. A person would say, Here is a problem, it is a contradiction, I don't understand it. Then when he gets the NT and learns about the Trinity, he learns that there is the explanation of what this verse msst mean. This is the trinity here in v. 15. It is the servant who is the second person of the Godhead referring to God the Father and

referring to the Holy Spirit. (Question: It seems to me this is a good time to bring up something I looked up in a concordance the other similar phraseologies throughout the OT and NT and seeing what those phrases were talking about and how they related back I came to the conclusion, it seemed to me convincing. My wife did the same assignment, and did not look it up in a concordance. She tried to analyze it for herself as you are seeming to do and she came up with an answer that is different from mine but we had some areas of overlaping. The near context does not explain this particular verse, but then thing s like you were explaining from the whole Scripture) The near context leaves it a problem; leaves it something we can't understand. Then when we get the later truth we find it is perfectly clear in the light of later truth.

I always urge first study the passage by itself. Study it to see what it has, hw what it is in the light of context, what it is in the light of things that God revealed earlier and see what one can get from that. Then look at things revealed later and see what further light they draw throw on it. I think it is very useful in any study to look in commentsries and see what different people say about them. But anything you study it is always good to see what you can do first without them (any commentary). See what is obvious in the passage. See what stands out, and you may think something is obvious, and on investigation you find it isn't. But you would not perhaps be aware of the problem if you had not done that first. So it is good first to study in the light of the context the m immediate situation as you figure from that. Then look in commentaries with questions in your mind, and see what they raise add. And then of course they add new questions to it as you go into it.

So we have in ch. 42 the marvellous picture of the servant who is to be a light to the Gentiles; the Servant who is going to in this steady

confident way, not with st sudden struggle, not with lifting His voice in the street and having a hard time to do it, but in the power of the mighty God he is going to accomplish His great work. We have that in chb 42. Then in ch. 49 we find that the servant is not Israel which we could not get from ch. 42. You could infer it, but you could not find it stated because there is no statement in ch. 42 of his doing a work for Israel, just for the world as a whole. But in ch. 49 you find that Israel also needs the work; while he is of Israel, he represents Israel, he is distinct fomm Israel. Then in the light of ch. 49, 48:16 is definitely the teaching about the trinity though you would not fully understand it until you get the NT.

((Johnston: I was thinking that even without the NT trinity, in so many readings of chs. 48 and 49 you realize ch. 48 it is obviously God who is speaking. Then he just keeps right on going into ch. 49. These first few verses seem to make it pretty strong that he is a human Israelite, so you would not understand how he is at the same time God and human Israelite)

You get the problem, the elements clearly before you, you might think of the answers, you might not till you get the NT after all. But when you get the NT you find it fits perfectly with it.

We have yet to speak of parts of ch. 45,46,47. We have yet to look at. And some other parts of ch. 48. Then we'll have ch. 50,51,52. Then when we get to ch. 53 we will probably have to spend two or three hours on 53.

For next time you glance rapidly over ch.49-52, those four chs. Glance over them rapidly and write out any verse which clearly refers to exile or deliverance from exile; which clearly refers to those situations. Any verse in those that clearly looks forward to Christ as the solution to the problem. Christ's redemption. Indicate that. And the great number of verses in them which are not clearly one or the other, indicate if

they perhaps seem to be one or the other. See what I mean. You might say five categories. 1) A verse which is clearly exile. 2) A verse which might perhaps be exile 3) A verse which looks as if it might be pointing to redemption, to Christ's atonement. 4) A verse which is definitely pointing to Christ's atonement. 5) Then those verses which don't seem to have a specific reference in relation to any one of these. Write that out and bring it in next time. And leave the papers for today.

We were looking at this sec. of Isaiah from ch. 40-55, which is the great section of the OT for presentation of the death of Christ and what it means to us. We've noticed how the sec. starts with the emphasis on the deliverance from exile, and then leads up to solution of the cause of exile which is sin and the way that God is sending One who will take care of this tremendous need.

We have not looked in class much at the themes from about 45 on. I want to look rather rapidly starting in ch. 45. In the beginnigg of the ch., what is the theme there, Mr. Warner?

(Answer: God's strength and saving power.) Well, the way we've termed it is deliverance. See we have a few main themes that we find repeated over and over again. One is comfort; this is a general theme which we find a great deal. Then comfort is expressed in === some specific reason for comfort, and thet perhaps is one of the most important is deliverance. That's what we have here in the beginning of ch. 45. We have God promising the Israelites who were under subjection to the Babylonians that they will be delivered. He says, Thus says the Lord to His anointed, to Cyrus." This word "anointed" here is the word which is translated Messiah twice in the OT. This word Messiah occurs in the KJV only twice in the OT. Both times it is a translation of this same word here, "anointed," a word which occurs maybe 40 or 50 times in the OT. It is used of one whom God has set apart for special service. It is used for the priest, it is used for kings. David said, when he had a chance to kill Saul, I will not lift up my hand against the Lord's anointed. It is exactly the same word that is translated Messiah twice in Daniel. He was the one whom God had anointed for a special purpose. Would somebody know whether this word "anointed" is always used of Israelites, or whether it is ever used

of anybody except an Israelite. Dr. Phillips? (It is used of Cyrus). It is used of Cyrus right in this passage isn't it? "To His anointed, to Cyrus." This is the only case I know of where it is used of someone other than an Israelite, or at least where it is clear that it is used of someone other than an Israelite.

Here it is used of this Persian king whom God has called to deliver His people from the Babylonian captivity. So he says to his anointed, to Cyrus whose right hand I have held to subdue nations before him. He says he is going to give Cyrus great victory, and the reason for this, of course, is to deliver God's people. So from vv. 1-3 are telling about Cyrus who is the deliverer God is sending them. Then in v. 4 we read why He sent him. "For Jacob my servant's sake, for Israel mine elect." Here Jacob is definitely called God's servant. Is this a new usage? We have had the term servant used where we were quite sure it was definitely usedof Christ We have had servant used where it was used of Israel. New here we read, For Jacob my servant. Is this a third usage, Mr. Knight, would you think?

(Answer: I'm not sure). Mr. Kanish what would you think? (Answer: I would say it was a third usage.) Yes, well, I think we want to look at this word Jacob a little bit. Jacob is the son of Isaac, a man who was the father of the 12 founders of tribes, the man who went down into Egypt to see his son Joseph. Now is Isaiah saying that for the sake of this man he is going to do this? I think one thing we need to realize is that in Genesis God told Jacob, Your name shall no longer be called Jacob, but Israel. After that quite frequently in Genesis you find Jacob called Israel, but occasionally you still find him called Jacob. And when you go on into the reat of the Bible, the term Israel is used for all of Jacob's descendants, but the term Jacob is occasionally used for it always.

That is the two are interchangeable. Israel is another name for Jacob, and it has to our usage the two have become separated. We think of Israel as a nation and Jacob as aman, but actually Israel was the other name God gave him. From now on your name is not to be Jacob, a supplanter, but Israel a prince of God. Yet we still always refer to him as Jacob, and we refer to the nation as Israel. The OT refers to the nation as Israel most ofthe time, but there are many cases where it refers to it as Jacob.

So that in this caseit is not impossible that it could be saying for the sake of this great ancestor Jacob, but it's much more likely in the usage of the prophets that Jacob and Israel here are used like in regular Hebrew parallelism. You often have the same thing said in different words. Jacob my servant, and Israel my chosen one, and the two mean exactly the same thing. Now it could mean for the sake of your great ancestor Jacob, but it's much morelikely it means for the sake of this nation, the descendants of Jacob which is personified by the name of their ancestors. So then I would say this is the same usage we've had right along that Israel is God's servant. But at first sight one could easily get a different impression if one is not familiar with this use of the term Jacob which is not nearly so common as Israel but yet it occurs a great many times. Just look back to ch. 44:23. The end of v. 23 he says, For the Lord has redeemed Jacob and glorified himself in Israel. Now that could be speaking of their great ancestor, but it seems far more likely that it is speakingof the nation. Look at 44:21, "Remember these O Jacob and Israel for thou art my servant." There he is addressing the nation using both names. So here he says that it is for the sake of the Israelites, this nation that is His servant which has a purpose in God's plan. God wants Israel to be the means by which He will bring

Christ into the world, the means by which He will spread the knowledge of the true God, the means by which will be prepared the way for the coming of the One who will make salvation possible for us through His death on calvary's cross. So Jacob, for the sake of carrying out God's work through His servant, the nation of Israel, - the work which is to be done through the Servant, the One who represents the nation which is Chirst of course - I have even called thee by thy name, I have surnamed thee thou thou hast not known me.

This verse seems to be making a claim that God has done a tremendous thing : He has called Cyrus by name. As you know the Higher Critics, a century ago, began to say that Isaiah 1-39 and ch. 40 on is a second Isaiah. The reason for that is that from ch. 40 on it discusses exile a great deal. Instead of warning people as the first part does, that if you do not mend you ways and turn to God He will send you into exile, this treats them as if exile is already a fact. Instead of talking as the first part of Isaiah does about the Assyrian as the great enemy who took the northern kingdom into exile, this refers to the Babylonians as the people who have taken them into captivity. So they said it is a book written later on, written at the time of the exile to encouage people. Now if that is the case, this verse here is a rather peculiar verse. "I have called you by your name; I have surnamed you though you haven't known me." Why is it such a wonderful thing that God called Cyrus by His name, at the time when Cyrus is already known as a great conqueror who has conquered a great part of the world and who is proceeding to conquer more of it? But if this is written 150 years earlier when God enabled Isaiah to predict Cyrus' coming and even gives hisname in the last verse of the previous chapter, and in the first verse of this chapter -- gives his name 150 years ahead of time -- then this is worth remarking about as v. 4 does. That I have even called you by your name!

I have surnamed you though you have not known me. That is even 150 yrs. before Cyrus came, Isaiah says, God has predicted his very name of the one who will deliver Israel. It does not make much difference to our interpretation whether we believe in a Second Isaiah or a First -- one Isaiah, because it's clear that First Isaiah is comforting the godly in his day and writing that which will be special comfort and help to people 150 yrs. later. So for interpretaion he has the greater period in mind so it doesn't affect our interpretation a great deal. But the NT defers to both parts as the work of Isaiah, and this v. makes it plain == a claim that seems to imply very definitely, this is a wonderful thing Cyrus' name has been predicted 150 years in advance!

In v.5 what is the theme, Mr. Berraga? (Ans. God's glory) Yes, that is the third of the great themes. The first theme is comfort, general comfort; the second is deliverance, the comfort is brought to people in exile because God is going to deliver them. But the third theme is, You know He can deliver you because God is the only true God. God is great & powerful. That is stressed in this section almost more than any other part of the Bible. So He says, "I am the Lord and there is no other God. There is no God beside me. I girded thee though thou hast not known me." Cyrus has not known God, but God says everything Cyrus has been able to do has been because God has made it possible that Cyrus should accomplish what he did. God declares His great power in v. 5 and v. 6, "That they may know from the rising of the sun and from the west." Of course the rising of the sun here clearly means the east. From the rising of the sun and from the west that there is none beside me, I am the Lord and there is none else. I form the light and create darkness. I make peace and create evil; I the Lord do all these things."

The Westminster Confession says, that God is not the author of evil. What do you think? Is the Westminster Confession wrong, or is Isaiah wrong? (Answer: I have another solution. Perhaps it would be better rendered in English by another word.) Exactly. This Heb. word rab is a word which means something bad or destructive. It is physical evil; it is not moral evil. There are other words in the OT for moral evil. This word is used where Jeremiah comes before the people, and the KJV says he holds before them two baskets of figs. One are very good figs, and the other are very naughty figs, so naughty that they cannot be eaten. Of course this is using the word naughty in the old English sense, which means physical evil rather than moral evil. There was nothing wicked about the figs! But the figs were figs which were physically harmful. They were corrupt. Earlier when Pharaoh had a dream and saw 7 fine, fat cows which represented the years of fine harvest they were going to have. Then he saw 7 thin, pale evil cows. They are, this word rab is used of them. It means they were worn, thin, worthless. It does not mean anything was morally wrong with those cows. The word rab means physical evil. Of course if you take this idea of physical evil -- that which tears down instead of building up, if you take this term in the sens of that which is evil in relation to what God *does*, it naturally includes moral evil in such cases. The == If I am trying to rob a bank, and the security guard gets in my way and stops me from my viewpoint that is evil, that is evil physical evil. He is interferring with my plans, you see. But it is morally godd. Now that which interferes with God's plans is physically evil, butit is also morally evil, because whatever God' wills is right and good. So this term can be used to cover moral evil, but the term intrinsically does not mean moral evil, it means physical evil.

It is used many many times in the Bible where the sense of moral evil is not involved. Now there are other Heb. words that definitely cover moral evil. The words wicked, sinful -- there are many such words. But this word which is sometimes translated evil, I suppose in the days of King James the word evil covered physical evil, but today we have restricted it to moral evil, so it would be better if we could take another word. I don't know what word would cover exactly that idea. But if you saw a building being torn down, that is evil in this sense. It is putting an end to something; it is destroying it. But if it is being torn town in order to make way for the ubilding of something much better, it is a good thing to do, but it is physically evil.

So when God says He makes peace and creates evil, he means He tears down as well as builds up. It means that when some misery or catastrophe comes into our lives we == it is evil in this sense; it is bad in this sense. But if we belong to Christ, if we are part of His family, we know that He makes everything work together for our good. Therefore we know that though a thing may be physically evil as far as we are concerned, it is part of His plan and is for our good. So when He says, I form the light and create darkness, I make peace and creat evil, it means that He can do whatever is necessary to carry out His purposes. He advances the cause of those He is blessing, but He brings catastrophe to those who are doing what is wrong and wicked. He is bringing evil to them, but it is not moral evil. It is morally good, the evil that God produces. But all things are in His hands.

The next verse continues this same theme of course, the theme of God's great power. Verse 9, 10 stress that still further. Verse 9 says, "Woe to him that strives with his maker. Shall the clay say

to him that fashions it, What makest thou? Woe to him that says to his father, What begettest thou, or to the woman, What hast thou brought forth?? We are none of us responsible for whether we have a first class brain or a slow working brain; whether we are able to run faster than most of the people in the world, or whether it is difficult for us to walk. We are not responsible for the physical inherritance we receive, but God has given the physical inherritance He desires us to have for His purposes. We are responsible with what we do with it, whether we make the best possible use of it for His glory. So he says we have no right to complain about the lot that God gives us, but we have a duty to do our best to improve that lot and to use it for His glory.

It really is pitiful the way people struggle to get recognition. Children even are struggling to have people think they are a little brighter than the one next to them, or can run a little faster, or can have a little more ability in this regard or that. God judges by what you make of the physical inherritance He has given you, rather than by what you are not responsible for because He creates man unequal. But He creates us to make the best use of what He's given us, and He has His purposes in it all.

So instead of complaining that God hasn't given me the ability to do something as well as the next person, let me try to improve my ability, but let me be sure that what I do is for His glory and be satisfied with what He's given to me.

So in v. 12 he's against letting === again stressing His great power, and He is declaring that He is the One great Creator. Therefore Israel need not fear. God can and will deliver them. When we are caught in the toils of sin and see no way of escape, we know that if we trust God and look to Him He will prove a way of escape.

Now what do you think v. 13 is dealing with? Mr. Ward, do you have a question? (Ward: I have a question about v. 11....The ending of v. 11, I think we kind of) You are reading a different version than what I have. What does it say? (Ward: "And you shall commit to me the works of my hand. Thus says the Lord the Holy One of Israel, and His maker.) You shall commit to me the works of my hand. In other words that version considers it as meaning, Trust the Lord for the works of Hishands. Don't blame Him for it but it but trust Him for what he has provided, for what He isdoing. The KJV is a little hard to understand. It says, Concerning the works of my hands command ye me, which doubtless means commit or trust or ask Him, rather than give orders to God. I think the translation is unfortunate in the KJV, but I think that makes pretty good sense -- commit to Him the work of His hands. Trust Him for what He has done and will do.

Miss Johnston you had a question? (Question: It is interesting that the Heb. word there is) What is the form? Since I did not require Hebrew for this course, I == most of you have had Hebrew but some have not, we'll look at the v. in Hebrew. Isa. 45:11. Tssalwone(??). What form would you think that is, Miss Johnston? (Answer: I think it is [illegible] Piel.) Yes, Tsawa is always Piel; it is always used in the Piel. It is a rather forceful thing command it always occurs in the Piel. But what form otherwise? (Answer:) Is it present, imperfect? (Answer: It is imperf. used in the sense of command.) It is imperfect, but as to sense, that is a matter of interpretaion. But as to the form it is an imperfect in the second plural, "You shall command me." It is parallel with the word before it, == the form before it is, "You have asked me." Isn't it. It is

"ask me", the English has which is an imperative, but this is not and imperative. "Thus says the Lord, the Holy One of Israel. You can ask me of things, and you can command me concerning the works of my hands sons." It could mean to give an order, but it certainly must be interpreted in the sense, You are permitted to make inquiries. It must be the sense of it. I think the "commit" is a little bit free in the NASB. I think "command" is a little nearer, but "command" does not quite give it in English. Perhaps "you may require of me an answer." It's a little unusual. The KJV is very literal, but it is not easy to get a precise sense in English. But it means, I have have done this, I have done this in accordance with my Holy will and you can trust me in it is what it really means.

Now v. 13, we still, I still have not gotten an answer. Mr. Rohrer maybe you can tell us what v. 13 is about. (Answer: Foreknowledge.) Foreknowledge of what? (Answer: It would have to be the children of Israel being freed from exile.) That they will go free from exile. You build that on 3 words of it, don't you? What about the rest of the verse? (Answer: They are going to rebuild Jerusalem.) They are? (Answer; No, he will rebuild my city.) Who is the "he"? (Answer : TD must be Cyrus.) Yes. This v. 13 again deals with the one spoken of at the beginning of the ch. "I have raised him up in righteousness, " i.e. in accordance with my righteous purpose, I have raised him up." Cyrus could never have come into his position of tremendous prominence if God had not permitted it. God says he did not merely permit it; he planned it for His purpose. To free the Israelites from the Babylonians. " I have raised him up in accoradance with my righteous purpose. I will direct all His ways. And he will build my city." Did Cyrus build Jerusalem? He did not build it but he gave the Israelites permission to go back and build it.

So it is quite in line with present day usage. You say an officer has done something which he has done by giving orders to others to do. So Cyrus is the active human cause of the rebuilding of Jerusalem. He will build my city. The way he did it was to give the Israelites certain money, certain assistance, letters to his representatives, freedom for all those who wished to leave the Babylonian territory to go back to Israel to do so. He permitted that -- to build the city. It was understood they would not go back there just to live in tents. They would go back there and build the city and so he says, He will build my city.

Cyrus is going to build his city. When people say Artaxerxes is the one who gave the decree to build Jerusalem, it certainly contradicts this v. in Isaiah which says that Cyrus is the one who is going to rebuild Jerusalem. Artaxerxes permitted the walls to be improved around it, but Artaxerxes certainly is not the one who gave the decree for the rebuilding of Jerusalem. It was Cyrus that God predicts here. "And he will let my captives go, not for price nor for reward." In other words Cyrus did not require them to pay a ransom or anything like that. He even gave them help toward going back to their land. Of course this was part of Cyrus' policy. He did it not merely toward the Israelites. He did it for certain other nations. The policy of the Assyrians and Babylonains was when they conquered the nation was to take all the most able people and transport them away to some other area where they would be strangers among the mass of people, people they did not know and who looked on them as queer foreigners. And the result would be they would not be in a position where they could foment opposition. So the Assyrians and Babylonians transported many peoples away from their homelands to other parts of the territory they controlled.

When Cyrus conquered Babylon he reversed the policy and he allowed these peoples to return to their homelands. Thus enabling them to look on him as a deliverer from the Babylonians and the Assyrians though they were still under his cominion and control as much as they had been under the previous, but not under as harsh a control. They were treated much better under Cyrus than they had been under the others.

The remarkable thing about the government Cyrus established -- for 200 yrs. the Persians held the territory that was maybe 3 times as large as what the Babylonians had held. And at the end of that time when Alex. the Grt. succeeded in a couple of great battles in defeating the Persian kings and taking over the territory, Alexander died and his generals fought back and forth 40 years as to which would control the territory, there was practically no uprisings anywhere in it. The mass of the people remained quite and did not interfere much with it. Life went on despite these constant fightings and changing from one general to another, and that could never have happened unless the Persian government had been a very well administered government and a government which on the whole the people were very well satisfied with, so that life continued despite these upheavals for the next 40 years with the mass of the people taking very little part and the Greek soldiers fighting for one general or another until finally the situation settled down to a situation that lasted for another century and a half until the Romans to it over. But Cyrus conconquered this tremendous area and established,he and Darius between them, established a very effective organization.

I don't want to take a lot of time on the rest of the ch. There is more emphasis in it on God's power, God's control. There is some

emphasis on His predictive power. Teh wonderful declarations at the end of it -- v. 23: "I have sworn by myself that unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear, everyone shall say in the Lord have I righteousness and strength. Even to him shall men come." A prediction that is not yet fulfilled, but that God will fufill we can be sure upon this earth.

Ch. 46 continues right on with this theme of deliverance from Babylonian control, and it starts with an interesting sentence. "Bel bows down, Nebo stoops." Now I don't recall seeing this Bel anywhere else in the OT. If it does occur, it is very very seldom. Does somebody know of a similar word that has a rather similar meaning that occurs a good many times? Mr. Ward. (Ans., Baal). Baal, yes and Bel. The two are quite similar particularly when you realize you are dealing with a Semetic language in which the vowels are quite generally express tense, mood, and time, and relationship; and the meaning is largely conveyed by the consonants. The two are originally the same word. But Baal, really Baal with an ayin in the middle - Baal - is is west Semetic word for master. The word Baal(without the ayin_- ((I take it)) was used of any god in the early days, and it is even applied to the true God. But as time went on the term Baal was applied to the local gods of the communities and villages in Palestine and Syria. When Jezebel brought Melkart, the god of Tyre down and introduced him into Israel, they == she referred to him as Baal or Master. So we have the struggle between Jehovah and Baal in Kings in the time of Elijah and Elisha and Baal there simply means master, but it was used commonly at that time for this one outstanding one among the many gods the heathen were worshipping in that area, as the god of Tyre whom Jezebel introduced.

Now the == a similar word of the same meaning is used among the Babylonians, but the gutturals which are retained in the Hebrew are pretty largely lost in Babylonian except that the ayin sometimes expresses itself in the letter E which otherwise is hardly == exists in Babylonian. Consequently in Babylon where Marduk was the great god, the chief god of Babylon, they often call him Master but instead of saying Baal they say Bel. They had a regular ceremony of of taking the hands of Bel which the king of Babylon for maybe a 1000 yrs. the king of Babylon on the New Year's Day always had to take the hands of Bel and receive from him the right to rule in Babylon for the next year. So Bel was the common way of referring to the god Marduk of Babylon.

So here he says,"Bel bows down, Nebo stoops." Now Nabu as they pronounce it was the god of wisdom, the second god of the Babylonian pantheon. Here he refers specifically to the two leading Babylonian gods -- Marduk and Nabu called Bel, and Nebu here. Bel would be the common way of referring to Marduk in those days. They bow down and stoop. Their idols are on the beasts. These idols amount to nothing. They were supreme over that great part of the world when Judah was taken captive, but Isaiah predicts Cyrus is going to conquer and these will be taken over and Bel and Nabu will lose their position of importance, and of course that happened historically. In 540 B.C. Bel and Nabu seemed to be the two most powerful gods in the Near East. By 538 they were minor gods in a small area because of Cyrus' conquet of Babylon.

So he says, They stoop, they bow down. They could not deliver the burden, but themselves are gone into captivity. This is a prophecy: they will be gone. He's looking forward to the situation. They go into captivity, but he says, You Israel, God is going to protect you

and then he conpares himself to the idols. We've had several sections on idolatry before. Here we have quite a section in ch. 46 here. But in v. 8 he sayd, Remember this and show yourselves men. Bring it again to mind O ye transgressors.

In the early part of Isaiah it is common to have a long passage of denunciation like the first ch. of Isaiah. A long passage of rebuke for sin, and declaration God will send the people into exile for their sin followed by a brief passage in which he looks beyond the exile and shows the blessings that God has for his true people beyond it. But in this sec. ch. 40-55, he is thinking of the people as already in exile and he is bringing primarily comfort and just incidentally introduces the rebuke for sin. An incidental word or verse here or there reminds them of the fact that the reason they are in this situation is because of their sin, and that something must be done about the sin question or that any deliverance from exile will not be permanent.

So he says, Bring it to mind you transgressors. Remember the former things. I am God. There is no other. I am God. There is none like me, declaring the end from the beginning. What is the theme in v. 10? Mr. Corcoran? (Answer: God's knowledge) Yes, that is the fourth of the great themes of these chs. More stresson God's fore-knowledge, God's predictive power as proof of His existence and power than anywhere else in the whole Bible, in chs.40-55. Here again it is stressed. "Declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done." You see how the stress is upon this for people inthis time near the end of the exile reading what Isaiah wrote 150 yrs. earlier. Remember the former things. He says, I warned you you would go into exile. Now you see how it has been fulfilled. "Remember those things. I declare the end from the beginning, and also declare those things that are notyet done."

Namely, the deliverance by Cyrus. "My counsel will stand. I will do all my pleasure." What is v. 11 talking about? Mr. Knight? (Answer: power). Yes. But displayed in what way? (Answer: Again it is by His) What about the first half of v. 11? What is He going to do? (Answer: Call upon Cyrus to accomplish His task power?) Yes, it is again Cyrus. God's deliverance by means of Cyrus. He's called Cyrus, His Anointed, the one who will fulfill His purpose. Now He calls him a ravenous bird! So we have the different sides of the same situation. We have Cyrus as the one who is executing God's will, who is Gods instrument. But we have Cyrus who as far as he himself is concerned, he is simply a ravenous bird. He simply is one who wants to take in all he can, and conquer all he can and get it under his control. Of course he came from Persia, far to the east of Babylon. God calls this ravenous bird from the east. This is one of the many references to Cyrus again. "The man that executes my counsel from a far country." He says, I have spoken it; I will bring it to pass. I have purposed it; I will also do it." And then a little touch of rebuke again. Here are these great commands God has given these wonderful promises and you have not trusted in Him. You have sought your own will, your own purposes. "Harken to me you stout hearted that are far from righteousness!: Just a little touch again on rebuke which is so greatly stressed in other parts of Isaiah, but here just incidently brought in to remind the people that you are in exile for your sins. I am going to deliver you from exile but we've got to do something about the sin question or deliverance from exile won't accomplish anything. So we start in in ch. 41 with a great emphasis on deliverance from exile. We end up in ch. 53 with the solution for the sinquestion. But there is a logical development from the one to the other.

So he says, I bring my righteousness. It will not be far off. My salvation will not tarry. I will place salvation in Zion for Israel my glory." And ch. 47 starts just as ch. 46 starts with the declaration that Babylon is to be overcome. "Come and sit in the dust O virgin daughter of Babylon. Sit on the ground. You are not to have a throne, daughter of Chaldeans. You will no longer be called tender and delicate. Take the millstones and grind meal." The Babylonians, who were the rulers are now subject to Cyrus! They who held the Israelites in subjection are themselves to be in subjection. Verse 5, the same thing again: "Sit silent . . . darkness, O daughter of the Chaldeans. Thou shalt no more be called the lady of kingdoms. I was wroth for my people; I polluted my inheritance nd gave them to your hand. But you showed them no mercy. You said I will be a lady forever." Now hear this, he says, (v.9) "In one day will come upon you these terrible miseries because you trusted in your wickedness. You said, No one sees me. Your wisdom, your knowledge perverted you." The Babylonians were God's instrument to punish His people, but that did not mean that they were far more guilty than the Israelites and they received far greater punishemnt of course. The Israelites were sent into exile and chaztened == to chasten them and to purify them and bring them back to serve God and bring Christ into the world. While the Babylonians disappeared from history, and died out as a people completely as did all the other ancient people except the Israelites. The Egyptians of today have little in common with the great powerful Egyptians of ancient times. The Egyptians today are largely Arabs. They even speak Arabic instead of Egyptian. They are people under Mohammed"s teaching who came from Arabia. into Egypt and took over that land.

(Question: in v. 9 one day, just one day) This was the day when Cyrus conquered Babylon. The Babylonians lost their control. They became widows. (Question: Was it an actual day it happened? It doesn't mean a period of time?) Well, it was a short period of time in which the armies were approaching. The actual conquest of the city was one day of course, yes. I would not press the word "one day" as necessarily meaning one 24 hr. period but the actual conquest was in one day. So he is continuing with telling and v. 13 == 12, and 13 are insteresting as reflections of the Babylonian attitude. "Stand now with your enchantments and the multitudes of your sourceries. . . Thou are wearied in the multitude of thy counselors. Let now the astrologers the star gazers, the monthly prognosticators, stand up and save thee from these things that are come upon thee.

There are thousands of clay tablets that have been excavated in Babylon that give pictures of the stars, that is of the arrangement of the stars showing the situation as they claimed to try to foretell from the stars whether the king of Babylon couldn't make an attack without seeing whether the stars were right, whether it was a good day or a bad day for the attack. Then there are hundreds of tablets giving pictures of livers, animal livers. Because before any great decision of the Babylonians the priest had to kill an animal and examine his liver, and you would find that the liver had a certain queer formation of an animal that was sacrificed before a certain great catastrophe and if you ever found another liver like that you would fear another great catastrophe. They worked out a great science of interpreting the future by the appearance of the liver. I gave === I spoke an the inauguration of the president of a college one time and the speaker before me told about a queer experience he had had

when he preached a sermon "Looking at the River." He said they had made a typographical error and it said looking at the Liver. So I immediately when I began to speak turned to the passage in Jeremiah where it tells about a king of Babylon who was going to attack and he looked at the Liver. And he se examined the Liver to see whether it was a propitious time to attack. Though it was a typographical error it was not as bad as a mistake as it sounded. Because this was a great science among the Babylonians though it did not do them any good at all. Of course today it is amazing how you will find in our day the papers for sale telling you from the stars what stocks you should buy, or how the crops are going to be, or what is going to happen. It s is a common thing on a TV for somebody to ask, What sign of the Sodiac were you born under? As if that has anything to do with our accomplishments or character at all! But it starts as far back as the Babylonians who had a very extensive science in it, but it did not do them any good any more than the people today who put trust in it.

In ch. 48 he goes on again remeiding the Israelites he is going to deliver them, but look how He ends v. 1. "Hear this O house of Jacob who are called by the name of Israel." Again you notice the synonymous use of Jacob and Israel. "House of Jacob who are called by the name of Israel who are come forth out of of the waters of Judah who swear by the name of the Lord and make mention of the God of Israel, but not in truth nor in righteousness." The little touch of rebuke for sin as we find a number of here as he reminds them of the fact that God is going to deliver them yes, but they should remember why they are in exile. It is for their sin. Because of their lack of truth and righteousness, and if something is not done about that there still has to be other exiles. So that is the big problem.

He says, For they call themselves the holy city and stay themselves on the God of Israel. I have declared the former things from the beginning. I showed them. Idid them suddenly. They came to pass. Because I knew that thou are obstinate; they neck is an iron sinew, they brow brass. I have even from the beginning declared it to thee. Before it came to pass, I showed it thee lest thou shouldst say mine idol hath done them and my graven image and my moulten image has commanded them."

In 1940 or 41 the German army broke through into Belgium and the great British armythat had gone over to help the French was cut off and they managed to make their way to Dunkirk, and the Germans announced over the radio that within two days they would have these thousands of British troops behind barbed wire. There seemed to be absolutely no way of escape for them. But British churches were thronged as everybody went to chruch and prayed that God would rescue their armies from certain annihilation. There was an cloud cover over Dunkirk and over the channel such as is comparatively rare so that the Geramn planes could not bomb them. They did not have radar yet at that time. They could not find them exactly to bomb them. The English channel was one of the roughest stretches of water in the world them, very disagreeable to cross. It was calm very calm for three days. Anybody that had even a little fishing boat left England and rushed over to France, all the boats they could get and thousands of them(the soldiers) were gotten into them and resuced. They praised God who had miraculously enabled them to save a large part of their army. Of course all their supplies were lost. If was not very many years after when they were telling about how it was the wonderful work of the RAF, and the wonderful activity of their soldiers that had enabled them to save them. As he says

here, You would say, My idol has done it, my graven image. It is my great skill that did it. That's what everybody said afterwards, but when you get into trouble everybody looks to God for help. And in that case had it not been for the very unusual circumstances all those troops would have been taken by the Germans, unquestionably. So here he says, I have declared it in advance, because I know your character. God knows the nature of our hearts.

Now you have turned in a statement of the themes through ch. 48. Today you have a statement about whether it is dealing with === from ch. 48-52, what there is of exile, what there is of Christ? But you have not specifically looked at the themes in this area. So please for next time bring in ch. 49. You have already done ch. 48, I believe. Ch. 49 through 52. Don't just make an outline. Don;t just say what the content is; put it specifically on one of these themes if you can. Of course if you can't say so. But if it is comfort, if it is deliverance, if it is the glory of God, if it is the prophetic == God's knowledge. If if is the importance of the problem of sin, if it is Cyrus coming, or if it is the Servant. These are the great themes we've had repeated over and over. Put it under one of these if you can. If you don't see how it goes under one of those, don't make up a new title for it, just indicate it does not seem to go under any of them. Bring that in for next time. Leave me the papers now, please.

We looked at the various themes last time and we got just at the beginning of ch. 48, I believe, where we noticed in the first verse it starts so very favorably - "you who swear by the Name of the Lord and make mention of the God of Israel" but then it says "but not in truth nor in righteousness." There is no such statement as this in the earlier part of our section. Ch. 40-55 is a definite section of the book, a definite unit. There is no such statement in the earlier part. In the earlier section the thought of sin, of guilt on the part of the people is brought in only very incidentally. The idea is to bring comfort to the people, to reach people who are hard to reach, they are in such sorrow, such misery. In the future 150 yrs. after Isaiah when they read this book because they are in the midst of the exile, in the time of Isaiah because they are the godly people who know Isaiah's predictions are true, they come from God, the exile is sure they have seen exile in the northern kingdom. They have talked with refugees from the northern kingdom, they know what a terrible thing it is. So to these people in sorrow he does not rebuke, but he incidentally brings in references to their sin as the thing that produced the exile. Now by this time he has reached the point where he gets a little stronger, more emphatic. We have noticed the end of one or two of the chs. some rather emphatic rebuke, but nothing like this first verse here: "but not in truth nor in right-eousness." That is a pretty hard criticism. He goes on: "They call themselves the holy city and stay themselves on the God of Israel. I have declared the former things from the beginning." He gives his eclarations of God's knowledge tremendous he says, but he says, Why did I do this? Simply to give a proof? Well because I knew thou are art obstinate and thy neck an iron sinew and+they thy brow bronze. Ihave

declared it from the beginning lest thou shouldst say, My idol has done it." He points out the frailty of human nature. I gave an illustration last time of Dunkirk. About how people were so ready to praise the Lord when he gave them a marvelous deliverance, but in a short time it was the great strength and valor of the RAF that did it! In a short time people forget God and turn away from Him. So in this wicked world God keeps reminding us, but in certain situations He uses particular tact in His approach. There are other occasions when a direct, strait on confrontation is needful, but it is good to know what the situations are. God gives us tact, He gives us wisdom in dealing with people. You find many illustrations of it in the book of Isaiah. Some you notice in this book here; some we will touch on in chapel later on.

He goes on in v. 6 to stress this thought of the prediction -- in vv. 6 and v. 7. You see these things now. They were created now, not from the beginning. These things predicted 150 yrs. before, you see them now before you. But in v. 8 he again reverts to the theme of rebuke."You did not hear; you did not know. I knew you would deal very treacherously. You were a transgressor from the womb. For my name's sake will I defer mine anger, for my praise will I refrain from thee that I cut thee not off." We start on in ch. 40 and go on, and it is comfort, it is deliverance. And gradually these little touches on the theme of deliverance; I mean the theme of sin, the theme of the cause of the exile. Now it gets stronger. Now the people have been brought to the point where they have more confidence in delivery, more confidence in God's greatness and power to predict the future and He stresses more the fact that the fact they are in the exile is not just due to bad luck, andit is not just due to God;s having taken an arbitrary notion to injure them, but it is due to their sin. That is stressed more, so they realize more this is the problem that needs an

answer. The exile is an temporary problem, it seems terrible as all temporary problems do. It seems terrible. Something's got to be done about this. He deals with the thing that something has to be done about but he brings the attention around to that which is more vital, more fundamental -- the sin of the people which is the thing that needs to be taken care of or else this exile will be just one of many. And there will be another exile and another exile and another. As they had in the books of Judges. There they did not have exiles; but they had captivity. You know there is a difference between exile and captivity. Exiles are driven out of their land. Captivity -- they may be in the land, they may be out of it. But captivity is when they are under control and oppression of some other people. In Judges we have it over and over. The people sinned against God. God sold them into the hands of the Ammonites, the Moabites, or some other people. The people oppressed them for 40 yrs., the people turned to God, called for help, repented of their sin. God delivered them. Xhey followed him for a brief period. Then they again turned away. That's the history of all mankind. Not just of the Israelites. But bringing out here the fact - that this sin that produces all the troubles of life, that this sin is the vital question. He is stressing that constantly.

He says it is not because Israel deserves anything, but v. 9 says "for my name's sake will I defer mine anger, and for my praise will I refrain from thee." It is for God's purposes. It is not because we deserve anything good from Him, but it is because God has created us for His purposes and He is going to accomplish those purposes through us or in spite of us. He is going to accomplish His marvellous will. So He says, For His sake He will do it. He says, Behold I have refined thee but not with silver. I have chosen theee in the furnace of th affliction. So he says to them, You have your suffering, your trouble;

it is too bad, yes. But it is a part of My training for you. When we have trouble in life. A dentist once said to me, there is a spiritualist girl who comes to me for dental work and he said, I love to work on her, because if I hurt her tooth she just says, Oh don't you worry; it's some sin I've committed. The pain comes from sin I've committed; that's what's making the trouble." Of course it is true, all the suffering and misery is due to sin. But our direct suffering is not necessarily due to our direct sin. It may be in many cases, but in many cases it is not. But the sin and weakness in the world -- the suffering and weakness in the world all go back to sin. It is all due to sin, but not necessarily the sin of the particular individual who is having the suffering. So we may have a suffering that comes into our lives because God is punishing us for some sin; more likely if we are Christians we have a suffering that comes because God in his mercy is chastising us and giving us some warning to bring us back to Himself. Very often the suffering that comes into our lives is His refinement; it is because He has a purpose in it for us. He will make us a better servant of His; it will make us more useful in His work. He will prepare us for the glories that will be ours through eternity and part of that preparation may be suffering He wants us to go through. So the Christian should always be cheerful in whatever suffering comes, because we know that it is all part of God's will, whatever it is. If it is our direct fault, we should repent and look to Him, but if it is not our direct fault He would not permit it to come to us if it were not He has a purpose for us.

"I have refined thee but not with silver. I have chosen thee in the furnace of affliction." Mr. Wilson, you had a question? (Wilson: I wonder why He says, For my name's sake I will mine anger. Why does He lay emphasis on His Name's sake?) Because His purpose -- of course the term Name is a difficult one. The Name's sake is His glory. It's His purposes. God's great purposes are accomplished through us.

(Student:There is something He is trying to show the nations that He can redeem Israel.) That may be part of it, yes. But that's not the whole thing right now. (Question: Why does He want to show what amounts to a bunch of ciphers that He can redeem Israel?)

Francis Schaeffer has just published a book called, No Little People. I think it is worth reading. There are no little people in God's sight. One may get the impression from some parts of the OT that the Israelites are God's pets and everybody else is just a cipher. But actually when Schaeffer was in a church in St. Louis he did a lot of work with Children for Christ. And they had a song they used to sing: Black and yellow, red and white all are precious in His sight. There are no ciphers in God's sight. He would not have brought them into the world except that He has a purpose for them. Now how much ofthis was for His sake, in showing what would be shown to the people then living, and how much for the people in the future living we are -- cannot say. But they all are His creation. He created them for His purpose and it is His will that they should know His goodnes and grace. It is His purpose we should reach out to the ends of the earth to reach everyone possible for God and who knows what His purpose may be. I would say there are no ciphers in His sight. They may seem like ciphers to us, but they certian certainly are an not any more than we are. When it comes to actual goodness the differences is == If our goodness is like this thing here (rapping the wood) that the chalk goes on, compared to the floor, and one that we we think of as much inferior or worse is like the baseboard down there, compared to God's standard we are all pretty far from it. Of course we are justified in His sight tree through Christ we are just as if we had not sinned, but we have a long long ways to go, all of us. And it is for His Name's sake. God did not have to create any of us. But He created us all for

His good purpose. For His Name's sake. To us the idea of name's sake is I want everybody to know my name and think how wonderful I am, and with all the historical study I've done, I've seen such tremendous figures that everybody's forgotten about today! See how unimportant human things are. But that's not what God means. We don't fully understand what He means. But it means for the carrying out of His great purposes which are good purposes, purposes of love to all His creation. I'm glad you asked the question; it is a very vital one.. A very vital one for us to look into. You asked it in a rather bald way but I think it's best to make things come out in strong . . . I think that is much the best way to do, to bring it out in clear relief. So please any of you, any question that occurs to any of you, don't hesitate to mention it. I may not interrupt what I'm dealing with immediately but I will come to you soon if you have a question.

In v. 12 what is the theme that he stresses, Dr. Schultz. (His power.) Yes, he reverts again to His power. He says, For my sake I will do it. How should my name be polluted. I will not give my glory to another. Then he gets right back to the theme of God's power and glory. There is much talk as if the Christian world is divided between Calvanists and Arminians. I don't think it is a proper division. Ifeel there are those who call themselves Calvanists who make -- who are really fatalists, and who make it out as if God planned everything and there is nothing you can do about it. We dan't help it. Those He has damed, He's damned and there is nothing we can do about it. That's not Calvanism at all. Calvanism stresses the sovereighty of God,the goodness, the power, the glory of God. We should stress it. And it is very vital in scripture. But we must not stress it in such a way as not to make man responsible for his sin, because God is not responsible for our sin, and if we reject Christ it is we who are doing it and we are responsible for it, and we who deserve punishment for it.

So it is a reaction against the extremes of a false Calvanism, a parody of Calvanism that some have so reacted against and produced what we call Arminianism which in the hands of some people becomes an attitude that after all if I'm good enough to understand and see that I should accept the Lord why I deserve His good pleasure. I don't know how many people there are who take that attitude. But I know some people represent all Arminians as being. Between the extreme of either, the extreme of either is utterly wrong. Prof. Sell of Boston U. wrote a life of John Wesley in which he called it the rediscovery of John Wesley and he tried to show John Wesley stood about half-way between Calvanism and A minianism and a little bit on the Calvanist side, in reality. And I think that John Wesley reacted a bit against some people who took a fatalist position rather than a true Calvanistic position. But I'm sure J. Wesley recognized that God is supreme and that God has a purpose in everything. I think it is vital that we do. Why did God ever create the world? Why should people be born into a difficult situation? Why should we have misery in the world?God has a good purpose in it all. But the evil that comes is due to our sin, and the greatest sin is the rejection of Christ. We cannot reconcile these truths, but we can't understand how they fit together, but it is very important that we don't loose either of them.

We had a day of prayer once in which the speaker who was pastor of a Presbyterian church told about somebody preaching, and he told about the sovereignty of God, what God had done, and how no one can be saved unless Jesus draws them. And he said, all the Calvanists smiled and were happy. And the Arminians looked sad. Then he said, he talked about man's duty to accept Christ and how if man is lost it's his own fault, and he said, all the Arminians looked happy and the Calvanists looked sad. But actually he said the Calvanists should have been happy at both because true Ccalvanism includes both.

True Calvanism is not an extreme position on this point. But I think that the emphasis upon the sovereignty of God is something that if we don't have we find ourselves in an impossible position. The world seems utterly unfair if we don't realize that God has a good purpose in all that He accomplishes. He says, I am the first, I am the last. My hand has laid the foundation of the world. God has His purpose in everything that happens. He will work it out in accordance with His will. So we need to work and strive to accomplish His purposes but we don't need to feel too bad when everything seems to go the wrong way because it may be part of His good purpose for us, that is should work out that way.

(Student: I don't know if we should pursue this) Maybe you would have an idea that would be worth mentioning at least. (Student: In relation to what you were saying, a preacher said, Christ died for all of our sins except unbelief. That's the sin that sends us to hell.) That is an oversimplification, definitely. We are lost because of our sins and there is no greater sin than rejecting Christ, but certainly other sins are(not)attoned for and that not. No. Infact we all have shown unbelief at times. No, I would say that may be an oversimplification. Perhaps in the context it would be perfectly all right. But taken out of context and quoted the way you did I would say it was definitely wrong.

We don't want to stop in by-lanes very long, but I'm glad to stop and glance at them anytime any of you want to raise them. There is tremendous truth inthese chs. of Isaiah. We don't want to just skim the surface.

(Student: In v. 13, continuing the thought about sovereignty. He lays emphasis as he does over and over again on His creative power. What weight would that carry in our society? with alternative explanations as

to origins?) I think the important thing would be to make clear that alleged explanations to origin are merely the explanations of the changing from one form to another. I have never heard of any explanations of origins other than creation. That is to say there are those who say everything was at one time just a mass of jelly like substance with a carbon dioxide atmosphere and then through certain changes there developed what is now. But where did that come from? I do not know any theory of origins other than that God created it, or to just assume it has always been there. When you say that, I don't think the human mind is capable of conceiving that the universe has always been here and always == and all these elements have always been here. God has created us in such a way we feel there must have been an origin. I believe most when pressed, who may have beautiful theories of how the elements gradually developed and out of an undifferentiating universe there developed all these elements and all that, you ask them where did the universe start with, and they say, We just don't know. I don't think there are alternative theories of origins. There are alternative theories of development. The Bible does not say an awful lot about development. I'm afraid we often have a tendency to take two or three verses and build perhaps more on them/then they are capable of building. One thing I think is very unfortunate, that many good Christians are making a tremendous effort to prove that the world is only a few thousand years old. And the Bible does not say. There is absolutely nothing in the Bible to say that the universe is 6000 years old any more than to say it is 6 billion years old. There is absolutely no Biblical evidence. It's purely reading into the Bible. Certainly it is just as possible for God to have done it 6 billion yrs. ago as 6,000 yrs. ago. Humanly speaking nobody

can prove the universe was not created yesterday! There is absolutely no way of proving that we were not created yeaterday with certain little furrows in our brain to give us the feeling of the impression of past history and of past experiences in our lives. Nobody can prove that did not happen. Actually that is no more bizzare to think than to think there was a universe created in which there was only one kind of matter but principles by which that one kind of matter could develop into hundreds of matter kinds. In principle it is no different. We know that the world is at least 6000 years old because there is that much history given in the Bible. ±But as to how much longer the Bible says nothing and I believe it is the devil's device. I think too of the most unfortunate devices of Satan today to waste the effort of good Christians are (1) trying to prove that the world -- I don't know anybody today who says it's only 6000 years old. But some will say it can't be over 30,000, and they will spend tremendous effort trying to prove it can't be over 30,000. That and also the attempt to prove that the Hebrew and Greek back of the KJV must be the actual original Scripture. God could have done that. He could have kept the original Scripture absolutely unchanged just like the Bureau of Standards in Washington has a foot rule of a certain length within a room of a certain temperature and kept exactly so so that it will not be a thousands of an inch different in the exact foot rule. God could have kept the exact Heb. and Greek, but with the Human words so changeable as they are in their meanings that you have to take passages together to be sure of the real meaning of anything, there would not have been much point in it. God could have done it but if he had, I think he would have told us in Scripture, and there is no such claim anywhere in Scripture. But many good Christians today are just spending an awful lot of energy just proving that the Textus

Receptus --- a word that was an advertizing blurp for one particular edition of the Grek NT -- is the original Scripture as it came from God. I don't like to enter into controversy with good Christian people who are trying to spread the Word of God. But I think they are doing harm by diverting attention to something that is very minor and is not true.

(Question: Should that not release at least some effort into showing there is an alternative for people who might be sitting on the sidelines just wondering?) Absolutely. Idid not say we should not. I said, I don't like to I do not like to come into opposition with people I know to be good Christians. I hate to, but I believe a certain amount has to be done. I think we have to. I have very good friends who I think are absolutely wrong in their ideas about the tribution and the last days. I am glad to discuss it impassionately if I can, but as to entering into any opposition with them over it, I say, when the time comes we'll know. I don't like to enter into what seems like an attack against people who seem really interested in the Word. of God. I never have. But I don't think we have to clarify it and I've been working on an account of the Book of Daniel and the sad thing is I just about find it impossible to avoid severe strictures on every commentary on Daniel I've ever seen. I hate to run a risk of arousing antagonism with real Christians over what are not the primary essentials. But I think we have to clarify the truth. Absolutely! And I can't help but feel that when young children are trained up in the idea that the world is only a few thousand years old and that the Heb. and Gk. in back of the KJV must be absolutely as it came from the hand of God; then they get into school and find a few evidences that look very strongly against it, their faith has a tremendous battle to survive and the great bulk of them don't. I think great harm is being done, and something ought

to be done about it. Very definitely. I just do not want to be the one to do it myself. I'd rather give the ammunition to someone else.

(Question: Is fear one of the primary reasons that drives people to make the world no more than 10 or 30 thousand years old?) Yes, perhaps a misunderstanding. Yes. People faced with tremendous opposition by men who are bitterly anti-Christian tend naturally to oppose anything that such people say rather than to examine them and see how much truth there may be mixed in with some terrible error. It is a natural human tendency. We all tend -- to that which we are against we tend to oppose everything that such a one presents.

That is a factor. We all have to recognize it. When we detest somebody or their attitudes or viewpoint which are utterly bad, it is very easy for our detestation to pass over into something that they have said that is not in itself bad. I think perhaps a good illustration might be William Henry Huxley. Huxley hated the church. As a young man he was forced to go into long services in the church of England where long sermons that seemed to him terribly tiresome were given, and he listen to them. He detested the church, and he detested it so much that when he was studying anatomy he could not remember which side the micro valve was on. He said, I realized that a Bishop has a mitre and a Bishop could never be right, so the micro valve must be on the left side. That way he learned to remember. which side the micro valve was on. He became acquainted with a good friend, Charles Darwin, an older man. And Darwin said to Huxley: "You know I think species developed the one into another." Huxley said, What nonsense. Every species is immutable, you cannot move from one to another. And time and again he met with Darwin and they were both very interested in natural science and enjoyed each others company but Darwin was very tactful about mentioning that idea because he knew

how much Huxley hated it. Huxley had the feeling that this was ridiculous that one species would change into another. Huxley wrote a book on the origin of species and asked Huxley to look over the manuscripts. Huxley looked it over and said, It sounds like a lot of nonsense to me. Then the book of was published and all the church leaders began to attack it. They said it was anti-Christian. Then the leading newspaper in Britain asked Huxley to review it. Huxley said that now when he read == reread the book in printed form, he immediately saw it was right. Huxley == Darwin called Huxley my general agent. Huxley was Darwin's bull dog. Huxley went all over England calling everybody an utter fool that did not accept Darwin's book. And it is clearly evident in the lives of Huxley and Darwin that this was a fact, that this change was made that quickly and that Huxley had that attitude toward the church. I'm not saying the man was an utter hypocrite, or anything like that, but his prejudiced to quite an extent perhaps unconsciously affected his attitude. Huxley was fighting the church when he was going out fighting against (?) Darwin's book, and then in turn many Christian people discussed it == disgusted with Huxley's attitude, attacked individual things in Darwin's book that may have been harmless in themselves. Because of their irritation at Huxley's attitude and the attitude of others like that.

There is a story that Darwin in his latter days recanted and gave up this theory and regretted the harm it had done, but I think that's an erroneous story. He was a very gentle srot of individual. He never went around spreading his ideas. It was Huxley who did that. I think it is an erroneous idea. But Darwin was such a gentle soul that anybody that came to him with any belief he would say, Oh but that's wonderful! He would not hurt anybody's feelings for the world. But in Darwim's autobiography it is filled with blasphemous statements. But his wife went through it all before it was published. Everytime he wrote

a book she said, Oh I feel so bad Charlie is writing another book. God always seems further away when he gets a book out." She went through it and crossed out all these statements, so they did not appear in his autobiography of it. But a new printing of it more recently includes them all.

People unconsciously take attitudes, and I believe that the question of development - there was an awful lot of Christian prejudice roused against it by the attitude of men like Huxley, etc. which on some points was unfortunate. I think perhaps we have made more of it than we should. It never claims to say how the world came into origin. It is acclaimed that it developed from one aspect to another. The question still remains where did it start?

A Harvard professor spoke in the Accademy of Natural Science and two of our faculty were present. He talked on evolution. He said, I don't know what makes my car go. But he said, if somebody wants to say there is a little imp under the hood of the car that makes it go, I can't prove he is wrong. But he says, I know enough about the explosive power of gasoline and about the power of electricity to make a spark to understand a little bit about how the explosion of gasoline makes the car go, so I don't see any need for any theory that says there is a little imp inside the car that makes it go." And everybody laughed, and he went on and spoke about evolution and they all felt he'd proved evolution. Well, he simply proved *that we* know something about the forces that make the car go but that did not prove the car came into existence by accident, and that by natural forces you got an automobile built. There were human minds that planned the details of it and gathered the materials from many different places and put it together and formed a car. But people did not think of that. They all laughed and thought that was wonderful evidence fo evolution. None of us think as deeply as we ought to.

So it was necessary that God in bringing out these truths should speak in a way not to arouse people's animosity. Sometimes He gives head-on attacks in certain situations. But in this particular situation He is very tactful in bringing to their attention the vital cause of the exile and leading them to see this is the important problem, is not exile, but sin and some answer to this problem is needed.

So he continues here with the great stress on divine power in vv.13 and 14 he declares he will do His pleasure on Babylon. His arm will be on the Chaldeans. Very definitely the exile right here.

What does he mean in v. 15? (Student: Power and knowledge). His power and knowledge enter into it. But is there anything else. What does He mean, I have called him, I have brought him. Did he call Abraham? Where did he bring him? What does this mean?

(Answer: indistinguishable) Abraham? Who is the him? Cyrus, right. Here is Cyrus. We have had nothing about Cyrus for many vv. What right do we have to think Cyrus is mentioned in v. 15? How can you drag Cyrus in here? Yes, v. 14 enters right directly immediately into the question of exile. God is going to do His pleasure on Babylon, His arm is going to be on the Chaldeans. How? He has brought Cyrus to conquer Babylon. You take v. 15 alone, you might ask, Who is the he? Who is He going to make prosper? Suppose it was you. I've spoken; Ihave called you, I have brought you, I will make your way prosperous. That might be God's promise to any one of us. But it's not the second person, it's the third person. He's talking about somebody and we would not know who except wehave the vv. immediately before it that show he is talking about the exile. We have many passages before in which he has said He is going to deliver them from exile through the hand of Cyrus. So here's this great conqueror who is conquering all these nations round about and God says, I brought him. I gave him the power. I'm going to deliver you by his means.

He's going to conquer Babylon and deliver you. So here He goes right to the theme of exile and deliverance in v. 15. Then, in v. 16 we have already looked at v. 16. Who did we say was speaking in v. 16? The Lord. The Lord God has sent me. Why does He say the Lord has sent Me?? Why does the Lord say the Lord has sent Me?

(Answer:This is the way we understand thou in terms of the trinity) Yes v. 16 is just incomprehensible appart from the fact of the trinity. Come near to me and hear this. That could be God speaking. That could be Isaiah speaking. Any messenger could speak that. But I have not spoken from the beginning, from the time that was there am I. That is not Isaiah speaking. That's God speaking. Then he says the Lord has sent me. How does God say the Lord has sent me? It just does not make sense, until you understand the truth that is not fully revealed in the OT but is suggested in a number of places in the OT of the Trinity. God has sent == God, the trinue God has sent the Second Person of the Trinity and has sent ME. We notice the KJV says the Lord God and His Spirit have sent me, and the Revised Version says the Lord God has sent me and His Spirit. That's the ASV. I don't know whether any of you have other translations before you. It's always a value to look at various translations and see what they do.

You have the NASB there. What does it say? (Answer: Now the Lord God has sent me and his Spirit.) It puts the "and His Spirit" last. You cannot prove in the Heb. whether the Lord and His Spirit have sent me, or the Lord has sent me and His Spirit. The order in which it is given puts "and His Spirit" last, but that does not prove that it isn't another subject. Either another subject or another object.

(Question: Do you know how Jewish people today handle this verse?) No I don't. It would be very interesting. But the Talmud of the Middle Ages has the queerest of interpretations. I was at a class in the University

of Pennsylvania, and there was a young fellow there from one of the Jewish schools in NY. Evidently abright fellow and he had graduated from a Jewish college and was taking seminary work in a Jewish school. But he took this course from Prof. Montgomery in the U. of Pa., and he said, You know, I don't think you folks are paying enought attention to Jewish exegesis, Jewish interpretation; there's so much of it in the Talmud and other places." And Dr. Montgomery very graciously said, Yes we are greatly interested in getting light from every source. Well, this man said, Now here is a case where it says, And it was in the days of (I forget what the instance was) It starts out "and it was in the days of" and it went on. Then he says the Book of Ruth says, And it was in the days of the judging of the judges, and then there is the famine. So he says, when you find "and it was in the days of" that means there is trouble for Israel ahead.

There's good material in some of the Jewish interpretation of the Middle Ages, but it is mixed in with just thousands of interpretations of that type. You find a combination of two or three words and then it is followed by a certain situation. Then they did a lot of counting letters. They did a marvellous thing XXXXXX that we are grateful for in preserving the text accurately even where they did not agree with what seemed to be clear teaching,they preserved the sacred text and we are eternallygrateful to them for that. But in their interpretation of it, they have some of the craziest things you ever heard of. Of course there is some beautiful stuff mixed in with it, and some real insights, but they are in the great minority. I have never seen what they have done with this particular verse, but my guess is that it would be rather wild. Because there is no way to get a sensible interpreation out of this verse, taking it as a unit as it stands, then to take it as presenting the Trinity.

But whether it is that the Spirit has sent Christ, or that Christ has sent the Spirit, the fact is that both are true. The fact is that Christ in his earthly ministry was sent by the Triune God which includes the Holy Spirit. And the ministry of the Spirit in Christ's earthly ministry was a very real thing. He lived in the Spirit. He worked in the Spirit. The Holy Spirit worked through Him. But it also is true that when Christ went to Heaven he sent the Holy Spirit to be our comforted . So He was sent by the Spirit and He also sent the Spirit. So both are true in this case.

Here we have the rebuke again. Thus saith the Lord thy Redeemer, th- Holy One of Israel who teaches you to profit. O that you have had hearkened to my commands; then had thy peace been like the river and thy righteousness like the waves of the sea. He says, If only you had listened to my commandments. The very tactful rebuke of sin, in showing that the evil that had come is the result of turning away from God's Word. Yes?

(Question: How do Jehovah's Witnesses handle v. 16?) I don't know that either. Mr. Harding might know, but I don't. I'm no expert on JW's. I certainly admire their zeal though; the way they go here and there to spead their doctrines puts the average Christian to shame. But they have some very wierd ideas. What they do with this I don't know.

What do you think about v. 20? What is it dealing with? Mr. Corcoran? (Corcoran: In what respect?) What's the theme in v. 20? (Answer: Deliverance) Very definitely! We still have the exile here as a very promi-ent idea - Go forth from Babylon; flee from the Chaldeans. Declare this from the end of the earth, The Lord has redeemed His servant Jacob. Now in ch. 42 we heard about the great work the Servant must do in bringing the light to the nations.

But here we have the servant being redeemed! So Israel which is the Servant has to be redeemed. But the work of the Servant is to bring light to the Gentiles. How can Israel do this work when Israel itself needs redemption? Mr. VonBehren?

(VonBehren: This might sound weird but Cyrus Could there be any relationship between Cyrus and Moses ? ? Each person was kind of the chief person in deliverance) No I don't think there is any connection. It is an interesting comparrison, but Moses led the people and brought them God's Word, while Cyrus was a heathen conqueror who delivered them. (Could there be an relationship in the fact that they are opposites?) They are opposite in some ways, they are similar in being the means God used in bringing deliverance. But they are opposites in that Cyrus was the one who conquered Babylon and thereby released Israel.

(Student: indistinct) Cyrus was a heathen that freed them from Babylonian bondage, yes. There is a and God uses many different types of characters to accomplish His purpose. And I think that's another thing that is important for us in Christian work. We someone else that we don't like greatly used of God, because God uses them to do things we could not do. He may use us to do things they could not do. God uses many types of people, but He uses primarily those who believe in Christ and follow Him. Mr. Ward?

(Ward: go forth from Babylon why does it say flee because they are released from captivity? It involved a hurry up life but a rather purposeful) It was there was no rushing. It was an escape. Elsewhere it says you shall not go with flight; rushing. It's escape really. Another instance of how our words have a very broad variation. If you just take things verbally you can find - - somebody says, there is no contradiction in the Bible. YOe can

find many if you take things just verbally. But if you read the word in the light of context, a word has quite an area often of meaning. You have to decide which part of the area from the context. In this case, it is quite evident from the context that flee here must mean escape, rather than run for fear they will catch you. They fled out of Egypt and Pharaoh pursued after them, but in this case they had the king's permission to come, they had his help.

So the word flee is used in a some what unusual sense here.

(Question: This is all a little bit back in dealing with Moses and Cyrus but when you like Hitler you certainly would be difficult to say that God used him, rather that God allowed him to do what he did to people because if He had not wanted to allow he certainly could have removed him.) If you were in the position of the average German today you would say, Wasn't that fellow Hitler a wicked fellow that killed thousands of people and brought tremendous hardship and all of these armies lost in war and all that. You would say, Wasn't he a wicked person! Yet if you were a German today and you looked back at German history and you looked at Germany in the years after the Kaiser was driven out of Germany, the Allies just treated the German people as if they were dirt, and shut them in a little area and they had no resourses. I was there and studied at that time. And a tenth of the people had practically nothing to live on. People were just wandering from place to place and the republican government pled with the allies to Instead of that they demanded tremendous reparations for what the Kaiser had done. The Kaiser was living oppulence in exile, but for what he had the allies demanded these tremendous reparations that Germany could notpossibly pay and there was no future for anybody in Germany except

semi-starvation. Intheyears from 1918 to 1932 and then this crazy upstart who had a tremendous mind and was a wonderful organizer came up and said to the people, You've appealed to all these people for help and they won't give you any help; you've got to just step out and take things for yourself. The people rose up and grabbed the Rhine land the Allies had taken from them and the nations that had sworn to protect the Rhineland did nothing about it. They grabbed other things, and they did nothing about it. And the people said, the only way we can succeed is by grabbing land. Because when they asked the allies said No, but when they grabbed the Allies did nothing. And Hitler had everybody in Germany employed; he raised the standards --- of course he was doing it all in preparation for war, but they did not know it. Then he brought on this war and then he got into this terrible wickedness and they == the allied forces went through and there was starvation and misery for two or three years, but after that the people got to work and they worked hard. And today they are on top of the world. Today, next to the U.SA. Germany is == West Germany. Of course E. Germany is under Communist's heel. But 2/3 of Germany is today in better condition than they have ever been. They are tremendously prosperous. A person could say, If it wan't for Hitler we'd be like we were back in 1930 starving, with nobody paying any attention! So that from the viewpoint of some German who wonders, he thinks how terrible Hitler was and he wishes he'd never been; and yet if he thinks of where he is today and where he would have been if it was not for Hitler, he might say, well after all Hitler produced some mighty good things for us. So that in most things that happen God brings good and He brings evil out of it. The British thought they were doing a wonderful thing in protecting Poland from Hitler so

they made war against Hitler, and the end of it is then to put Poland under a worse tyranny than Hitler ever had, and England hereself has lost all her colonies, and she has got a country that has built up its population tremendously because it was dependant on commerce with her colonies and they have lost all their colonies. So humanly speaking there is nothing but misery ahead for England. You just can't understand these things but you know that God is controlling them and is going to work out His will through it all.

We have onlyone minutes left, and I was hoping to get into ch. 53 today. But it does not look as if we will. We have already looked at the beginning of ch. 49 and we've seen how the servant of the Lord is here shown and how he --- how the Servant of the Lord who is to bring light to the Gentiles, also is to raise up the tribes of Jacob. Therefore while the servant is Israel the servant is distinguished from Israel. I call this section the individualization of the Servant. (Question: What is the picture depicted by the polished shaft hidden in the quiver?) The polished shaft hidden in the quiver is that which the man has prepared in order to accomplish a great purpose which is already for him to shoot out and accomplish that purpose. Very good question. Miss JOhnston? (Question: section you called the individualization of the servant?) Just the beginning, the first half of ch. 49. In fact the whole of ch. 49. It tells how His word is going to go out to all the nations and you get to v. 12: Behold these shall come from far, these from the north, these from the west, and these from the land of Chinnim." Today the modernist writers say that must be some little town in Egypt. You've got them notth, the west, so this must be south. But I attended a seminar in oriental languages at the U. of Penna.. The people in it were not particularly Christian

in their attitudes but the prof. of Chinese was there and he said there was a section in far western China which was called Shin. This section, he said, was the section which the traders from the west came to first. So though it was a comparativelysmall section of China people in the time of Isaiah -- he referred to this passage - - referred to China as this which was the first thing they discovered when they went to China. And he said after this time this little section got a great conqueror in it who conquered all of China and established the first great kingdom of all China which only lasted c. 40 or 50 yrs. But his name came to be the western name for China, and today the westerners call China China. We don't. But the name which was given before this conqueror came up in the book of Isaiah, Shinim, is the same. as China and refers to China. This is only the word of this rather heathen professor who is a scholar in Chinese studies and who made the statement about Isaiah. But it is interesting that he says "these will come from far, these will come from the north, and these from the west, and these from the land of Shinim." God's people are going to be delivered through Christ from all over the world from every section. X China is under communist tyranny today but God has his own and he is going to spread His word there yet though we cannot see at present how.'

For next time look at start at 42:12 and look on to 53:8. Look at these vv. and study the content and meaning of these vv. About 15 vv. and particularly look at the pronouns, and make a list of the pronouns and tell me who the pronoun refers to. Does it say we? he? I? Who does it mean in each case. From 52:13 to 53:7 say. Hand me in a list of all the pronouns and who is the pronoun refer to?

We've been going a little more slowly than I thought we'd go through this material and I'm anxious to have abundant time for Isaiah 53. A couple of years ago I took a whole semester on Isa. 53 We were studying it closely in the Hebrew then but we don't have a semester this year on that. We are covering a much larger area. We don't want to have to rush through that ch. too much.

At the end of the last hour we were lookigg at ch. 47 and 48. Ch. 47 is all about God's rebuke upon Babylon. I'd call your attention to v. 13. "Thou art weary of the multitude of thy counsellors. Let now the star gazers, the monthly prognosticators stand up and save you from these things that come upon thee." We might developments in our own country in recent years. The QQQQ whole ch. is devoted to that. Then ch. 48, I believe we looked at the first part where he tells how he was told these things in advance so they will not attribute them to their idols. Then sometime ago I know we looked at ch. 49 and saw in it how the servant is individualized. We noticed in 48:15 there is doubtless a mention of the Trinity.

IN 49:8 on he tells of His blessings to Israel. We noticed v.12 he speaks of believers coming from the land of China. The blessings on Israel and on the followers of the servant of the Lord continued through ch. 49. Ch. 50 starts in with: "Where is the bill of your mother's divorcement . . . ." What does that v. mean, Mr. Wilson?

(Wilson: The Lord is making reference to the fact that where they might say God has forsaken me, in reality He has not forsaken them at all. They have forsaken Him because of their sins.) Yes, it is a rhetorical question as Mr. Wilson points out. One has to realize in reading Scripture, while the bulk of it is straight, continuous language, and while the bulk of it is in literal language, there are figures of speech that have to be interpreted, and there are rhetorical

questions and there are statements in which you have to assume a certain tone of voice. Here he is not asked, Where is the bill? Show it to me? No. He is saying, You have a foolish idea that I have rejected Israel.

"To which of my creditors have I sold you?"It's a rhetorical question. I have not rejected Israel. For your iniquities you have sold yourselves. For your transgressions is your mother put away. It is again laying stress on that fact that exile has not come because God could not protect His people; it has not come because God abbitrarily chose not to; it has not come because He got some benefit to himself by letting them go into exile. It has come because of their sin. "Behold for your iniquities have you sold yourselves." This is theme that is gradually developed through all these chapters. Here we find it clearly expressed.

(VonBhren: Does the term mother represent Israel?) Yes, it represents Israel as a nation who is though of as God has taken her into a nuptial relation as if she were His wife - a figure of speech - He says I have not cast her off; it's on account of your sins. It's not my arbitrary action. It is your sins that has produced your situation. But I still have not divorced Israel. Israel is still my servant and must accomplish my purposes. Not that everyone in Israel has a share in accomplishing His purpose, but that Israel is responsible for the accomplishing of His purpose and God is going to insure that the purpose be accomplished. So he continues, and if we had an hour or two more than we have this semester, I think we could have an interesting time looking at ch. 50 and seeing whether we would be justified in saying that part of it is the servant speaking. I believe we would be in view of later developments if we just had it by itself you would find it difficult to know exactly what it means. But in view of later developments I think we could easily prove that to be the case.

But you get to v. 10: "Who is he among you that feareth the Lord, that obeys the voice of His servant, that walks in darkness and has no light, let him trust in the Name of the Lord and stay upon His God." If you truly are obeying the Lord and obeying the voice of His servant, you don't need to think you are walking in darkness and have no light. Again a rhetorical question. If you are truly following the Lord, trust in the name of the Lord and even though you are in a dark tunnel, even though everything seems gloomy around you, even though you see no hope of the future, trust in the Name of the Lord and He will take you through. Hewants all His people to learn that lesson.

Then he reverts to the hypocrits. "Behold all ye that kindle a fire, that compass yourselves with sparks," you that are building your own methods to getting light, that have you own ideas as to how you are to succeed, he says, "Waslk in the light of your fire, and the sparks you have kindled. This you will have of my hands. You will lie down in sorrow. You are working out your very clever schemes. Some poor people desiring to follow the Lord came across the ocean, long difficult trip over to this country in order that they might find a place where they might worship God as they understood the Bible. God has blessed and prospered them through the years. Though it often looked dark and gloomy and almost impossible God has given them great success. Now when they are affluent -- talk about [illegible] troubles in this country, the troubles anywhere else in the world are about 2 or 3 times as bad. Where was it I was reading - this country in Africa where they had this big fight a couple of weeks ago and the country spent $12 [illegible] million for it and realized $7 million back, but they got a reputation, why they say the average income of the people there is $100 a year. Inflation is bad here, 10 or 12 % but in most countries of Europe it goes to 25% a yr. We are far better off than any other country but we are building our

fire. We are walking in the light of our fire, the sparks we have kindled. We are planning how we are going to improve everything. God said, This shall ye have of my hand, ye shall lie down in sorrow! So this is applicable to the hyppcrites in Israel but it's equally applicable to people in our day. Then in ch. 51 he continues with his rebuke upon sin. His promise of deliverance.

51:14, "The captive exile hastens that he may be loosed." V.13 the stress again on God's tremendous power that we have had more in this section than anywhere else in Scripture. The wonderful promise, v.22, "Thus says the Lord, "Behold I have taken the cup out of thy hand, the cup of trembling, even the dregs of the cup of my fury. Thou shalt no more drink it again, but I shall put it in the hand of them that afflict thee."

Ch. 52 I want to start looking at a bit more in detail today. "Awake, awake, put on thy strength O Zion." I asked you to look at all the pronouns from 52:12 on, but we will take a running start in getting to them. So v. 1, what is the first pronoun in v. 1, Mr. Ward?

(Ward: indistinct - -) You have your where the KJV has thy which is good.. The KJV has the great advantage. Where the Heb. has four forms the KJV has two - thou for singular, you for plural. In English we hve one for all four ideas in Hebrew. If we could translate in such a way that our translation would show which of the four is in the Heb. our translation would be much more accurate. But there is absolutely no way we can translate, so we show the four. The KJV has the advantage in that it shows the two to people living 300 yrs. ago. But to people who live today they have the foolish notion that thy means God, when thy simply means singular. Some people think it is more reverent to use the term thou or thy when they speak to God. I was at a baptism the other day and said to the little baby, I baptise thee, and I wondered

whether I was showing reverence to the baby! Then I turned to Mat. 16 and I read where the Lord said to Peter, Get thee behind me Satan. I wondered whether the Lord was showing reverence to Satan or reverence to Peter. The fact is that it is a very foolish present idea, that thou or thee shows reverence. Thou or thee is singular. In German they have done a foolish thing. The you for plural, in order to get more polite they call them they! They use the word they if they want the plural, though the same German word means they or you.

My second day in Berlin a fellow was guiding me where I wanted to go and as we came to a corner where there was more traffic than usual I said, Oh they are going fast. He immediately slowed right down. Because he thought I meant you are going fast! The Germans are worse off than we are. But in German they still have the singular but they have restricted the singular to members of the family, little children, animals and dogs. To them they restrict the singular. To anyone that is not a close friend they say, they. But in English the thou or thee has dropped out completely, except in prayers and I rarely hear anybody make a prayer in which he does not get you and thou all mixed up. He uses them both, and I wish he'd stick to one or the other.
I used to think when I began teaching Hebrew that where he had to translate words and I'd give them English into Hebrew, that if I'd read thou or thee, they would know it is one of the singular forms.
I'd have two forms to use as against the Hebrew four, instead of only one the way we have it. But I soon found the students were translating thou or thee as plural because people today have no idea what thou or thee means. I have not struck one person in 500 that knows the difference between thou and thee, or between you and ye which is kept absolutely perfectly regularly throughout the Scripture -- if you use you or ye there is a difference in meaning. But there is not one reader in 1000 who knows what the difference is!

I think that for people to understand today we have to use our own present language. When Mr. Ward says your, he is quoting what is probably the best translation for today even though it still leaves you not knowing which of the four Hebrew forms it is, instead of not knowing which of two it is like the KJV. In the translation, the you or thy, who does it refer to? It refers to Israel. Israel is refered to by the 2nd sing. pronoun.

What's the next pronoun, Mr. Corcoran? (Answer: indistinct) Yes, Israel again is referred to. Thought of by their principle city Jerusalem. Who is the next pronoun, Miss Johnston? Yes, you again. Who does that refer to? (Jerusalem) Yes, and here the verse is declaring God's deliverance to Israel. And v. 2 we have a further continuation of God's deliverance to Israel thought of as its principal city, Jerusalem. What is the first pronoun there, Mr. Wilson? Who does that refer to? Yes, Jerusalem. What's the next pronoun, Mr. Rohrer? (Thyself again, and refers to Israel) Yes, refers to Israel again. Then we go to v. 3,and Mr. Von Bhren, what is the first pronoun there? (You). Yes, and that refers to who? To Israel, yes. What is the next one in v. 3, Dr. Ghrist? (Ye again) Israel yes. And v. 4 Mr. Phillips? (My and refers to God) Yes. The next, Mr T. (I have been ..... and the Assyrian oppressed them. Them is Israel). And v. 5, Mr. Knight? (First pro. is I, and refers to Lord.) Next, Mr. Kanish? (My refers to God.) Next? (They refers to the oppressors, the Babylonians) Yes, because they make them howl. That's old English. We think of animals howling now. Make them yell, cry out in fear. (Question: What does v. 4 mean?) V.4 Thus saith the Lord, my people went down voluntarily to Egypt to sojourn there, but the Assyrians oppresssed them. The Assyrians came in by force and took them away. Not a cause of their decision to go to Assyria but they were force to go to Assyria. (Question: Go down to Egypt and reside there. Is that before Moses or ?) Yes before Moses.

He is referring to the two long periods in which the Israelites had been away from the land of Palestine. He says, when they went to Egypt there they got terribly oppressed, but they had gone down there voluntarily. They had put their head in the lion's mouth, you might say. They had gone down there trusting in the promises of the king, then when the king died and a new dyasty came in they oppressed them. But in the case of the Assyrians, they did not go there voluntarily. The Assyrains came and took them as prisoners. A very good question. And v. 5, what is the first pronoun, Mr. Berrogah? (Answer: I. . .the L'rd.) The next pronoun? (Answer: I...and again God.) The next one? (Answer: They) Yes, that's probably the Assyrians. And the next one? (Answer: Them . . .)Yes. As you see we have no difficulty with the pronouns thus far in telling who they are about. So he is saying, these people are in bondage, not that they volunatrily went there. They were forced to go there. But that God is going to deliver them We've had the theme of deliverance, and we've had a touch on the reason why they were there. Verse 6 promises they are going to recognize Gods power when He is going to deliver them.

Verse 7, the Lord declares the fact they are going to be delivered. You can say while the immediate thought is deliverance from bondage, he has been stressing the fact that bondage is the result of sin, and therefore v7 can show, how beautiful are the feet of those that bring bood tidings of deliverance from exile, or deliverance from the cause of exile -- sin. In both cases they are something grand, those who can bring this assurance that God reigns and God can give deliverance both from the results of sin and from sin itself. V. 9 he calls on them to rejoice because of deliverance. The theme is perhaps more comfort than deliverance here. You notice,ye waste places of Israel == of Jerusalem implies exiles already there. We believe Isaiah wrote this 100 yrs. before the Southern Kingdom went into exile. But already

know
they/of the waste in the Northern (Kingdom), they know of the == they know it is definitely coming to the south. He is comforting the people of God by telling them how God is going to deliver them. He's looking forward & putting himself in that ~~pois~~ position of the situation after they are in exile. So he speaks of the waste places of Jerusalem.

Verse 10 again speaks of God's power and how all the world will see the salvation of our God. Mr. Corcoran, what do you think the idea of v. 11 is? (Corcoran: indistinct) Yes, but it's deliverance from exile isn't it? Depart ye, depart ye, go out from there. He says go back from the exile, but don't go back and take all your sin with you. Don't go back in wickedness. Don't go back simply rejoicing that God delivers you . Touch no unclean thing. Be clean, you that bear the vessels of the Lord. This touches again on the fact that sin is what brought you into exile. You got to find some way to get out of it, or nice as it is today to be released from exile; it is not permanent. You're got to have something that gets to the root of the matter. So v. 12 again he declares that it is God who is to be == reading the Old English some might say == your ? rereward, but of course it would be better for modern English to translate it as your rear guard. We don't spell rear rere any more, and the word "ward", we talk of putting someone in ward, but we don't think so much of guard as of isolation which is pretty much the idea of ward today. But of course in English 300 yrs. ago ward and guard were
meaning
identical, in . Even today the word warder is used the same as the word guard is used. It would be much better modern English to say, YOur read guard. God is before you and behind you. You are surrounded by the blessings of God. Then v. 13 makes a rather sudden shift, but then it's not so sudden because he's been speaking about the fact that Israel is going to be delivered because God's Servant must succeed in

in his work. We know that it can't be all Israel that is going to do this. Wicked Israel cannot be part of His Servant. We know that Israel has responsibility. It must be an Israelite or a group of Israelites. It must be someone who can represent Israel, and yet in ch. 49 we saw it must be someone who can not only help the rest of the world but help Israel too because Israel needs deliverance from sin even as the Gentiles do. So he is to be a light to the Gentiles, but also to light up the tribes of Israel. Here we are told you can go forth, you are going to be delivered from Babylon. My servant is going to succeed. The servant is not going to fail. He is not going to be destroyed in Babylon. He's going to succeed. So we have the exhaltation of the servant in v. 13. The marvellous exhaltation of the Servant of God. He will succeed, he will accomplish His work, he will be exalted, extolled and be very high. All three of these are Heb. words that express being lifted up. They all three of them be figurative, or be used literally. Raised up to an eminence physically, or raised up figuratively for being praised. Raised up in people's minds and attitudes. He will be exalted. You can be exalted up to the top of a building. You can be exalted in your reputation. Extoled, we use in modern English to mean praise, but in the Heb. it can mean either praise or be lifted up physically and be very high, the result of course of this lifting up. The Servant is to be exalted. His work will succeed. Having been told of the exaltation of the Servant it is strange immediately to learn of His humiliation. We read of His humiliation now: As many were astonied at thee (the old English). Astonied. Some have the idea that astonied in old English means astonished. It might be used for astonished, but that is not properly what astonied means. It means astounded. It means shocked! It means filled with dismay at seeing a terrible thing. Of course you can be astonished at a terrible thing, or you can be astonished at a good thing. Here's the 747 that for four years has flown without a single

---

at you. my people.) As you, my people? I don't know where they get the "my people." Do they have that in italics?(No.).

great catastrophe. People began to think it was the accident free airplane. Then this morning or last night in Nirobi a plan landed (crashed) and over 100 people killed and another 50 or 60 badly injured because of the bad crash that the 747 had. People who thought that the 747 was free from danger were astonished. But I think astounded is nearer to what they meant. We usually think of astonished as being astonished at some good thing. We might marvel at something pleasant rather than at something unpleasant. This word astonied astounded and that is specifically the Hebrew has the note of being filled with misery or with the bad impressions rather than the good ones. They were surprised, they were astonished and what's the next pronoun, Mr. VonBehren?

What's the first pronoun in v. 13? ( ) The second is thee; the first is my. As many were astounded at thee. Who is the thee? The servant? What's the next after that, Dr. Ghrist? (His . . . refers to the Servant). Why should you call the servant "thee" and "his"? Does anybody have the RSV? (Student; I would say that is referring to the servant Israel, and then "his visage" refers to the servant, God's Son.) On what basis? (Student: I think a parallelism is being drawn.) What == How has the 2nd person pronoun been used previously in this chapter? (Student:) In this chapter it has been Jerusalem or Israel which is the same thing really, in practically every case the ch. has been adressing Israel. That does not mean He has to continue addressing Israel. He could turn His attention in a different direction, but it certainly ought to raise a serious probability that He still is continuing to address the one He has continued to all through. Now the RSV and the NEB and I think some others say, "As many were astonished at him." (Student: The NASB says "astonished at you. my people.) As you, my people? I don't know where they get the "my people." Do they have that in italics?(No.).

I'm surprised at that, but I'm pleased at it. It is not a literal translation, it isa little more like a paraphrase. But it does make the meaning clear. Most don't have that. The RSV, NEB, and most other translations have "as many were astonished at him. . . " There is really not much reason for the difference between - as you read it in the KJV - the "his visage was so marred" and I felt when I first discussed this some years ago in class and reached the conclusion that the "thee" was Israel, I felt I'd made something of a step forward in understanding. I'm glad the translators of the NASB have also made that same step, and have made it clear to the reader by inserting the words "my people" though they are definitely not in the original, as far as not in any MSS, nor as far as I know in any early translation. The RSV simply says "as many were astonished at him" and then they have a footnote Heb. "you." Of course the Heb. is the Bible. If you are going to translate the Bible you ought to translate the Hebrew. The Heb. is you. As many were astonished at you. There is a comparrison there. Just as many were astonished at you so is His visage marred. Actually in the Heb. the "so" occurs before "his visage." In the KJV it is a little obscure: "as many were astonished at thee, his visage was so marred . . ." It's a little difficult to get the exact idea, but the Hebrew "as many were astounded at you, so was His visage marred . . ." כן or so מרה marred was his visage. There is a definite comparrison there. So is His visage marred, more than any man and his form more than the sons of men. This word "more", does somebody know what the Heb.is that is here trans. "more."? It is <u>min.</u> The Heb. preposition min. Ordinarily what does min mean, Dr. Phillips? From. Min which means from is very often used, I would say maybe a fourth of the cases -- of course the word occurs hundreds of times in the Bible -- and the usual is from. But from has a lot of meanings. We go from this place to that. They looked from here to there. It can be the place from which

you observe something. It can be the place from which you went. It has quite a variety of meanings, but in the Heb. a very common usage is for comparrison. I would say not over a third of the cases, perhaps not over a fourth, but that is a very sizeable number. This is more than that. Most translators have thought that more than was the best way to take the min there, as it is very often in Scripture. But there is another possibility, to take it in the more common meaning of from. His visage was marred from the sons of men. His visage was marred from any man and his form from the sons of men. That is to say He was more marred, more battered up than somebody that a tank ran over does not make sense. He was == his appearance was changed more than any person's ever has been -- there certainly have been people who have been run over by big things, or somebody in war who has had 100 spears thrown into him from different angels! -- who was certainly more marred in appearance than Christ was. But He was marred from a man. In other words, he was so marred that he did not even appear to be human. He went through such terrible suffering, such terrible agony such terrible marring of his physical body that He hardly appeared to be a human being.

(Student: You have visage, and I have another word . . .I always though visage meant face but it has appearance here. Is that wrong?) I would think that it is the appearance of the face. Appearance is all-right. He is speaking of the appearance of the whole man. (Student: The Heb. would not just mean face?) The second word is here translated appearance == form. What's the first there? Yes, it's again appearance. Appearance would be more literal. His appearance. But we usually think of a person's appearance, first of their face and then of their body. Appearance is slighty more literal. I don't think that visage is a paraphrase because we usually think of the

appearance of a person as the first place the face. But perhaps it's slightly more literal to say appearance. His appearance, and his form, the way he looked was == did not hardly seem to be human. This is what has happenedto Israel. Israel has gone through terrible sufferings. But not more sufferings than other nations. Other nations were taken off into exile and completely disappeared; never regarined their national identity. Israel was taken away into exile, mixed up among the other nations; it hardly seemed to be a nation any more. It was so marred it hardly seemed to be a nation. It was a part of the Babylonian areas where they were scattered. So was he marred that he hardly seemed to be human. In the Heb. there is this word chen which means so. So as you were . . . so was his visage.

What word does v. 15 start with, Miss Johnston? (Answer: chen). It starts with chen again. In the KJV we also have so. We have two sos. As. . . so was he marred . . . so shall he sprinkle many nations. The RSV says "so shall he startel many nations" , and has a footnote:

What do you have in the NASB? He will sprinkle many nations. No footnote. Most modern translators make it "so shall he startle". Because they see no sense to sprinkling nations. What could that mean? (Mr. Wilson:ceremonial sprinkling). That is exactly what the Hebrew word is. The Heb. word is a word which is used about 20 times in the OT, and 15 or 16 or them refer to the ceremonial sprinkling of the vessels in the tabernacle as a sign of cleansing sanctification and purification. The other 2 or 3 are like when Jezebel was thrown out of the window and the wall was sprinkled with her blood. Or where it says, Who is this that comes his his garments spattered with blood. Same word. It is used in the literal sense of sprinkling something 2 or 3 times. But in most cases it is used of ceremonial sprinkling of things in the tabernacle or temple as a sign of ceremonial cleansing.

What the interpreters who insist on startle say is that the word sprinkle == that you sprinkle water on something. You sprinkle oil on something. You don't sprinkle the thing. You sprinkle water on the lawn; you don't sprinkle the lawn. How could you take a lawn and sprinkle it? So they say in all the 20 locations where it is used it is "her blood was sprinkled on the wall" or the "wall was sprinkled with her blood" --italways is used of the thing that is sprinkled, not the thing upon which is sprinkled, and they say it cannot mean upon unless you have the word upon here. Of course the illustration I just gave who shows how in our English we use the word loosely. We sprinkle the lawn as well as sprinkle stuff (water) on the lawn. We use it in the two references (uses) i.e. the thing that is sprinkled, and the thing on which it is sprinkled. We still use the word. So we have no proof that it is thus used in Hebrew. We have no such proof but when you have only about 20 cases, that is hardly enough to make a negative (?) So one cannot say that it must be used of the thing that is sprinkled. Onecan't say it must be. But one can say here we make an assumption that it is possible that it is used in this way.

The NT gives us proof that this assumption is verified. According to the modernists it makes no sense. How could you sprinkle nations? According to them that makes no sense whatever. But according to the NT it does. Does somebody know of a NT reference that proves it? 1 Peter 1 == in that reference there can be no doubt Peter was referring to this very passage. So we have an inspired interpretatinn of the passage. H esays: Peter an Apostle of Jesus Christ, to the strangers scattered throughout . . . . .(that's many nations, isn't it?) And to these many nations he says, You are the elect according to the fore-knowledge of God the Father through sanctification of the Spirit unto obedience and SPRINKING OF THE BLOOD OF JESUS CHRIST. He says, You people

have been sprinkled with the blood of Jesus Christ. In other words the figure here given for being justified, for being saved through Christ, is being sprinkled with His blood! So Peter says, What Isaiah meant was that many nations will be sprinkled with the blood of Jesus Christ. So he says as a result of this humiliation which he's gone through, as a result of this being put into a situation comparable in a way to the sufferings which Israel has gone through, but gone into not like them on account of His own sin, but because of His standing as a sacrifice in their stead. On account of this He is bringing sprinkling unto many nations. He is causing individuals of many nations to be sprinkled with the blood of Chirst, and thus cleansed from sin and enabled to enter into the Kingdom of God.

So we have three elements here. RLally the verse should end at that point. "So shall He sprinkle many nations" should be part of the previous verse because we have here a continuous movement. "As many were astounded at thee . . . so marred is his visage more than any man . . . .like you seem not to be a nation at all, He seems not even to be human because of the terrible sufferings He goes through. But it is not as in your case for His sin but it is something to produce a result i.e. to bring sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ unto many nations, not merely to Israel. To be a light to the Gentiles, He is to bring them the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ which means is salvation and sanctification to those to whom it comes. So this is a continuing progression and summary of the whole chapter that follows; a summary of his exaltation,then of his humiliation, and then his results of his humiliation -- his accomplishments. The accomplishment for which He is exalted, He will sprinkle many nations. The LXX translators unfortunately c. 200 B.C. did not have 1 Peter before them, to give them an inspired interpretation of this verse, and they just could not make sense.

So they made a translation into the Greek, into the LXX, that is somewhat like astonished," so shall he cause to marvel many nations" or something like that. They just could not see how it could be sensible -- how the Servant being humiliated would sprinkle nations. So they thought we just don't know what it means and they gave it sort of a general term of astonishment (or something like that) which fits in with the way the modernists all translate it today - so shall he startle. Well, how do they ever get the meaning startle out of this? They say "to sprinkle" means to cause the water, or oil, or blood to jump. Sp theysay, he will sprinkle the nations, means he will cause the nations to jump. In other words he startles them. Of course that fits with the idea of their being astonished rather than astounded. He causes XXXXX them to jump, and they say you go right on, "kings will shut their mouths at him." See how astonished they'll be! See how it fits with the idea? He will startle them, they will shut their mouths at him! But if you are startled and astonished youdon't shut your mouth you open your mouth. It does not fit at all. To shut their mouths has an entirely different meaning from the result of being startled or surprised! It means you are put in a position where you just can't give an answer. You shut your mouth. Kings will find it impossible to answer this fact. Strange thing, talking about Israel an oppressed people subject to this impression from the Babylonians, talking about one who is to be humiliated and rejected of men, to say that kings are going to shut their mouths at him is already a big suggestion of the fact that the news of this is going to go out throughout the world. Not merely reaching to poor and the humble and the ordinary people, but reaching the king, the ruler of the land. Not merely reaching one king but reaching many kings. The outstanding ones of the earth in a future day -- many of them are going to find no answer, no way of denying the fact that here is the only way of salvation!

Here is the only way of salvation through Him who was so humiliated in order that He might bring salvation to all who put their trust in Him. So kings will shut their mouths at him for that which had not been told them shall they see and that which they had not heard shall they consider; Who has believed our report and to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed?

The sad thing is that most commentaries take each chapter as a unit when the ch. divisions were not even put in the Bible till the 13th cent. A.D. They are very convenient for finding places, but they are not in any way inspired and do not necessarily indicate division point. And if there is a division point the division point should come at the end of v. 12, because while there is a very close relation between v. 12 and v. 13 yet you start the subject of v. 13 it runs clear to the end of the next ch. But the archbishop must have stumbled at the point where he was making his marks in his Latin Bible, where he thought ch. divisions would be good, and as a result of that or some other accident or perhaps a slip of the mind on his part he made the new ch. division come at this particular point, and the result is that commentator after commentator begins discussion of Isa. 53 with the discussion of Who has believed our report? Who is talking? Well this is the great voice of the prophet. The great sum (?) of the prophets are asking Who has believed our report? or some such guess they make. But if you read it in context, it is perfectly obvious who is talking. Who is talking, Mr. Knight?(I believe it is the servant . . . Isaiah is writing, but I believe it is God speaking, says Mr. Knight.)

Well, I had never heard that particular suggestion. (Student: God has revealed it hasn't he?) Yes. (So it is). Now that is -- I never heard it, but it is not an impossible suggestion. I don't mean to cast it aside; it's not an impossible suggestion, it is an

entirely new one! to me. But is worthy of consideration. I think there is a more obvious suggestion, Mr. Wilson. (Indistinct) Who is talking, who is the our? Who says "who"? The sentence is rhetorical, a very good point. A rehetorical question, but who is the "our"? Mr. Kanish?

(Student: The prophets in general) That's what most the commentators say, but I'm very skeptical of it. Miss Johnston? (Answer: Is it the people who seeing Christ's humiliation they are telling the kings in the previous verse.) Well, you haven't looked at the Heb. when you say that. That's a good suggestion from the viewpoint of the English, but not of the Hebrew. Reading it in context, the kings are going to shut their mouths, they have heard something they have never thought of before. It seems to me that in the context that the most obvious suggestions is that it is the kings who are talking. That this is the people who are filled with surprise at this great fact that is brought to them that there is salvation possible through Him, through one who was humiliated like this, mistreated like this and all? Well who would have believed such a thing? I don't think it is saying that people arn't going to believe it, as a rhetorical question, Who has believed our report, it might be nobody is listening to us. I don't think that is what it means at all. I think it is, Who would have believed such a thing? Who would think that salvation would come in such a way as this? Of course the one minor point is that the word report in modern English is not a good rendering. It might have been a good rendering 300 yrs. ago, I don't know. Mr. Rhorers? (Question: Who does the out refer to?) The our is whoever is talking. (Question: Who is that?) That's the question I've been asking. My suggestion is it is the king. It is the people immediately before this who shut their mouths and say this is something we have never seen nor heard before. (Question: Are you referring to the "who" or to the "our"?) To the "our".

(Question: Could you apply that same thing to ? ? ?)
It uses its Well now, we want to look exactly at the context there, if we have. time. In fact we only have a minute or two, let's bring that up next time. Will you please at the beginning of the next hour? We'll look at that next time, but the time is a little bit short so that might take more time than we have left. But I want to note this that the term "our report" is a very loose rendering. It may have been perfectly alright 300 yrs. ago, but it is not the way most people use the word report today. It is my impression the ASV of 1901, if I recall correctly, made a more literal translation of this.

Miss J.hnston, you have a word from the Heb. there? (Student:The thing that we have heard.) Yes. The Heb. is the past participle of the word to hear. It means the thing that has been heard. Who would have believed the thing that we have heard. Now "our report" can be the report that has come to us. But in present day usage "our report" is more apt to be the report that we're giving out. Of course that's why the people who start reading the ch. at this v. instead of realizing the ch. begins 3 vv. earlier, say this much be the prophets who are giving out this story. The strange thing is that even people who know the Heb. thoroughly make such statements in their commentaries as if this is the voice of the prophets talking, "Who has believed the report we've given?" But this isn't. This is, Who have believed' the thing we've heard, the report we've heard, the message we've gotten. Who would ever believe that salvation would come this way, not a great king marching in with a big army and saying to all the wicked, You quit your wicked practices, we're going to force you to change. But a poor peasant dying aon a cross, suffering for the sin of all who would believe on His Name. Who ever would have believed this would be what would happen if Gdd had not revealed it? So it is not only the kings, but

I would say it is the people to whom the message comes who have been referred to ~~t~~ just above with emphasis on the fact that not only the poor of the world,~~=but~~ are going to receive it, but even some of the outstanding of the wise, of the rich, of the rulers are going to believe. Kings are going to be included among those who are going to believe on Him, on His Name, and who will say Well this is a wonderful thing, who ever would have believed God would have done it this way.

We will have to continue with it there next week.

AFTER CLASS

Who would have believed. (How does that go with the next statement?) Who would have believed what we've heard? This did not come from one of the great wealthy people of the world. It did not come from Rome or Athens, it came from an obscure place, a root out of dry ground. (What about "to whom has the arm of the Lord been revealed". Would the kings say this?) Yes, they would say of the people who come and bring them the message, Who would think God would reveal himself to this poor man Paul and these others who would bring us this message? Who would think we'd hear it this way? Wouldn't it have been one of our great philosophers. (Do the kings go on speaking in v. 2...is this the king's impression.) It could be. It's the impression of all who received the story who find it is not through a great wise ruler or philosopher, but it's thro a poor man.

We've been discussing this passage that runs from ch. 40 to 56. As you are aware the book of Isaiah simply as a new thing that a person had never seen before if he wanted to divide the book of Isaiah into natural sections and know nothing about the book whatever, I think anybody immediately with a little bit of observation would divide it into three parts. Because chs. 1-35 are discourses, they are prophecies, they are exhortation, prediction, they are a certain type of literature that we think of as prophetic literature. I think anybody would easily recognize a great similarity in the general material from ch. 1-35.

But then when you come to ch. 36, parts of it you would believe you were back in the book of Kings or Chronicles. That is ch. 36 is primarily a historical ch. rather than a prophetic. It is not strictly historical, because it contains long addresses, long talks and a long message from the Lord. But it is given in a historical sort of presentation. That is true in the book of Jonah also. Jonah is a book of prophecy, but it is given telling of certain events and what happened and what the prophet said and what the Lord said. We have incidental passages of this type in almost any prophetic book, not everyone but in most of them. But here we have four chs. which tells about events with which Isaiah was concerned, and the messages that God gave Isaiah and the connections Isaiah had with different people, you would immediately say chs. 36-39 are chs. which are historical in nature, though they are definitely prophetic chs. as compared with the prophetic material for the first 35 chs. When you get to ch. 40 immediately you are in what you would naturally think of as prophetic material. So you have a historical section inserted in the middle of the book of Isaiah. It is part of [redacted]ophecy, it deals with the

prophet but it is different in the general type of literature. So that that naturally divides the book into these three sections. So there can be no question we have a new section beginning at the beginning of ch. 40. The question is how far does that section go? There are many commentaries which if you look into them, you will find they say that the first part of this section begins with ch. 40 and when you get to the end of ch. 48 you find the words, "There is no peace saith my God to the wicked." They they will say when you get to the end of ch. 57 you will again find the words, "There is no peace saith my God to the wicked." Then when you get to the end of ch. 66 you again find it says, "They sahll go forth and look upon the carcases of the men that have transgressed against me, and their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched, and they shall be an abhoring unto all flesh." So you have this is more or less parallel to those other two verses. So many commentaries will say, Isa. 40-66 is divided into 3 sections: 40-48; 49-57; and 58-66 because of this similar ending of each of three chs. If you look in the book of Micah you find it has a definite beginning at the first ch., "Hear all ye people." And ch. 3, "And I said, Hear I pray you O heads of Jacob." And ch. 6 says, Hear ye now what the Lord says." And Micah naturally divides into three sections which are indicated by starting with a similar phrase. But in this part of Isaiah, to say that because you have these three similarities proves that is the division is utter nonsence! Though you find it I believe in most commentaries on Isaiah. That is to say an author may use a sign like this to show a division, but he may not. He does not have to. And the fact of a similarity does not prove a division. When you get into the contents of ch. 40-66, the natural point of division is not at the end of ch. 48, and it is not at the end of ch. 57. That is utter nonsence! The way to tell is by content, and

teaching not by a particular little indication. Now an indication may be put there by the author to show but it does not have to be. In this case what looks like what may be an indication proves on examination not to be a vital change. But we started with ch. 40 and we discussed exile and we gradually got from -exile into the cause of exile -- sin, and then into the cure for sin -- the Servant of the Lord and His work. And we found a great climax in ch. 53, and we have this great praise of what WNW wonderful things God is going to do in ch. 53, and then we have in ch. 54, "Sing O barren, thou that didst not bear, "Cry aloud." And the end of it, v.17, "No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper; this is the heritage of the servants of the Lord." The wonderful results of the atonement in Isa. 53 are presented in a general way in ch. 54, and then in a specific way in ch. 55 with the greatest gospel call anywhere in the OT: "Ho everyone that thirsteth, Come ye to the waters . . ."

So immediately you say, Does this section end with the end of ch. 55? Certainly if you look at ch. 56, you are in a different area. "Cry aloud, spare not; lift up thy voice like a trumpet and show my people their transgression and th house of Jacob their sin.' It's more like the early part of Isaiah. Denunciation, rebuke. Eventually some blessing passage is introduced, but starting with rebuke. The same with ch. 57 -- "The righteous perish and no man lays it to heart." "The merciful men are taken away, none consider him that the righteous is taken away from the evil to come." Rebuke! So we have ch. 57 and from 57 to 66 makes a section. And from ch. 40-55 makes a section. But what about ch. 56? I asked you to consider this matter for today; to say where the division should come. How many of you think that 56 as a whole belongs to ch. 40-55? Would you raise your hand? Nobody!

How many think it belongs with ch. 57? Raise you r hands. We-l now we got no votes for it belonging to ch. 55, which I think is rather unfortuante because you will find tremendoussimilarity between this and ch. 55. How many votes do we get that it belongs to ch. 57? I'm asking now for the ch. as a whole. How many think it belongs partly with one and partly with the other? A number think so. If you vote partly with one and partly with the other, Mr. Wilson, what part would you put with ch. 40-55?

(Answer: Well ch. 56 seems to be the result that should be in the life of one who has responded to the call. Yet it almost sets up a contrast to the following chs. It's talking about the wicked, so it seems like a transition into that.) There is a sharp transition in ch. 56. A sharp transition. Ch. 55 ends with a wonderful promise. "Instead of the thorne shall come up the fir tree." Ch. 56 is in the Scofield Bible called ethical instructions which I don't think is a very good heading. I hope it was improved in the NSRB but I have the old edition in front of mehere and don't remember.) (

(Student: Rewards for . . . .) Well, that's much better! That's one improvement we made in NSRB. But it starts in blessed is the man that does this, the son of man that lays hold on him, And v. 3: Neither let the son of the stranger who is joined to his people feel frustrated that he does not belong. For thus says the Lord to those who seem to be outside the pale, even them (v.5) says will I give him my house within my walls . . . and a name better than sons and daughters." I'll give them an everlasting name. It still is the blessing that comes as a result of ch. 53. The blessing to those who are true to the Lord is contained in these early vv. of the ch. Nowhow far does the blessing continue and where does a brand new section start? Mr. Ward?

(Student: It starts at the end of v. 8 and continues to the end

of v. 8. Verse 9 is indefinite and v. 10 is something else.) Yes, v. 10 following following is certainly a part of ch. 57. It goes right with ch. 57. The Archbishops horse must have stumbled very very badly when he put in a ch. division at the beginning of ch. 57. It was not a bad stumbling to put a ch. division at the beginning of 56 because there is a definite paragraph change between ch. 55 and 56. But between ch 56 and 57 there is no change whatever. There is simply continued with the same rebuke and denunciation of sin. You have this denunciation of sin in v. 12. You have it in v. 11 -- They are greedy dogs that can never have enough, shepherds that cannot understand. You have it in v. 10 -- his watchmen are all blind, they are all ignorant. They are all dumb dogs, they cannot bark, sleeping, lying down loving to slumber. That's not the style of ch. 40-55 at all. It is starting another section that is similar to the early part of Isaiah. But as Mr. Ward pointed out an argument can be made for putting v. 9 with what precedes or with what follows. But certainly somewhere between the end of v.8 and the beginning of verse 10 there is one of the major divisions of the book. Between those two. It's either before v.9 or before v. 10. That I don't think we need to argue about. "All ye beasts of the field come to . . . . yea all beasts of the forest devour as . . . " If you are saying The Lord gathers the outcasts to him, these who seem to be outside. All you beasts of the field, come and east eat; all you come and be field. An argument can be made for putting it with what precedes. Like, Ho everyone that thirsts, come ye to the waters. But I think a much better argument can be made for putting it with what follows, a part of the denunciation. But here is our primary division, and = = either I would think at the beginning of v. 9, butcertainly not later than the beginning of v.10.

(Student: Why would you put a - - - How would you interpret v. 9 then if you were going to put place it with ch. 57?)

If I would put it with ch. 57 it would be a declaration that the wickedness of the people that he addresses whether we take it as the people of his own day or as looking forward to people after the returnfrom exile at a time when they are beganning to lose their zeal and become more selfish, whether he is saying, calling on the beasts of the field to come and destroy these people because their watchmen are blind, they are dumb dogs, they won't protect them from them, they are just greedy dogs taking care of their own selfish things, the righteous perishes and no one takes it to heart. A rhetorical, it would be a common typp of rhetorical introduction to a section of denunciation. But it is not obviously so. It does not obviously go with either one. But the fact they translate "devour" rather than "eat" or "be filled up" suggests that the KJV translators thought it went with what followed rather than what prededed. But the archbishop's divisions are very unfortunate!

Now I dont want to take much time on this because we have very important things to cover this hour, but I think it's important to see just as a matter of methodology, that we look for the content to see where the divisions are. The ch. divisions are helpful to find places, but they don't necessarily prove anything. But this is a major division of the book.

Now going backward for a minute. Ch. 55, we noticeX is the great godpel call. It comes after ch. 53; it is meaninglyss without ch. 53. It is easy believism as some people say. It's just come and take it, it's yours! Freely! There is taht sort -- there are some people who are very much against what they call easy believism, and I myself have been very much upset at times in the past when somebody has gone to a group of people who knew nothing about Christianity at all and have said, Here's $1.00. Will you take it? And of course most people

think what are you talking about, and most people won't touch it! They think there is some quirk in it. Until somebody finally comes and takes it, and he says, It's yours. And he says, You want salvation? Take it. Now that's a wonderful thing when a person has a realization of sin, a realization of the wonders of God's offer. It is just impossible for the ordinary person when they realize what it's all about to come to realize that it is absolutely free. There is nothing we can do about it.

Campbell Morgan told about a time he was holding an evangelistic campaign in his early days, and he was talking with a miner, and he tried to get the thought across and the miner did not seem to get it and finally the miner said, O I see. I'm down in the mine, and there is the car that comes up thousands of feet to pull me up out of the mind. He said, I don't have to make that car move. All I have to do is to go and sit in it. I sit in it and it brings me up. But, he says, it costs the company an awful lot of money to put that car in and to run it. It costs God an awful lot to provide our salvation. And ch. 53 tells what God did to provide it. Once you realize what God has done in ch. 53 then there comes the problem of realizing that there is nothing we can do to earn it, but simply receive it as a free gift. So ch. 55 alone would give an utterly false impression; but ch. 55 combined with ch. 53 gives us a true understanding of the gospel, of the wonders of God's grace. It's a marvellous offer in ch. 55. Everyone that thirsts! Come without money, without price. There is nothing you can do to earn it. It's God's marvellous gift. Of cousse this allrests back on ch. 53. We have looked at 53, and as we noticed ch. 53 should start with 52:13, and we have looked at it more or less in detail up to v. 8. Verse 8 starts: He was taken from prison and from judgment, and there is much undertainty as to exactly what that

means. There are several interpretations differing radically from one another. I think the most probable one is that prison and judgment here reppesent a proper legal trial, a proper decision. A judgment which is related to prison that is made by proper authorities in a proper way and this means that He was given a judicial murder. In other words He was innocently killed! He was taken away from prison and from judgment without proper judgment.

(Student: The first word I have there is oppression in the NASB) Yes that maybe fits in better, the wordx simply means being held in which may refer to a specific prison. Some take it as meaning he died, he got away from prison. Of course that doesn't make much sense. Others take it as a deliverance. That doesn't make much sense. I believe the interpretation some commentators make of it, a judicial murder is the best. (Student: That would fit with the concept of a man?of separation.) Yes. The men from prison, from judgment can mean without, apart from. It can mean more than that or it can mean leaving a place. There are the three possibilities and this one I think is the best one here. Thank you for calling attention to that.

He was taken away without proper == without any proof that he deserved to he killed, he was taken and killed, because he was not punished for anything he had done, but gave himself voluntarily in our stead. I believe that is a great scriptural truth that is taught in that phrase but I don't believe it is clearly enough taught that we can draw it from it. I think we fit it in, with what is taught elsewhere.

But the next phrase is mery important -- Who shall declare His generation! for he was cut off from the land of the living. Who can say that anything worth while is going to come out of this! Young man, early 30's'; preached for three years. People said, We thought it was

to redeem He that was to redeem Israel, and He is cut off. He is taken away. Maybe if he had lived 50 yrs. and kept on preaching he could have built up a movement. Maybe he could have gotten people together that could have freed the land from the Romans. Maybe he would have trained enough people to have done something worthwhile. But it seemed as if he was just off. We thought it was He would would have redeemed Israel, but He was cut off from the land of the living. Who shall declare His generation? Just the thought of the peple on the road to Emmaus.

(Student: Does that mean He had not children?) That would be the physical specific sense -- the generation would be the posterity and that could enter into it. He won't have any posterity. But I think it is larger than that. Any spiritual posterity, any continuing following, any permanent effect. It's specifically children I would think. Now some take it, Who out of His generation would say that He was cut off out of the land of the living? I don't see how that makes an awful lot of sense. (Student: In view of the fact that Isaiah is speaking with reference to the surrounding nations and it means that the gospel call is going to the Gentiles, couldn't it mean he is referring to the attitude of the whole world on the Palestinian scene as far as we are concerned too?) Yes, that is to say, I think it probably refers most directly to those who were there to see it, but it also does include I would think, as you point out, the people in the beginning of the ch, the people off in the distance that say, What's ever going to come of this that's worthwhile? Here he was young man, crucified on a fake charge; He was not deserving of death, yet; but what did He accomplish? He's gone. His life is ended. Can any good thing come out of Nazareth? Will anything out of that land of Palestine come that is worth while? We don't think so, but if it should, how will it come from one who was cut off at an early age when He had only three years to preach? It can represent the attitude of the peoplefar and near as merely

knowing about the crucifixion without knowing why it was or what it means. Of course the answer that is given in the rest of the ch., it starts in the rest of the phrase: It was for the transgression of my people that He was stricken. He was not actually cut off out of the land of the living, taken away and could not help himself, could not accomplish anything. It was for the transgression of my people He was stricken. He gave Himself voluntarily as a ransom for sin. The Jews try to make out that this ch. describes Israel. Well, you might say Israel for its own sin has been stricken. Yes. But it does not seem to have much point to put it in here.

"He made his grave with the wicked and with the rich in His death. I believe I mentoned at the end of the last hour how this word "in His death" some think is His tomb, with the rich His tomb. We cannot say this is necessarily correct, but at least the argument can be made for it as is shown by the fact that a Jew preparing the Jewish version of the Scriptures put it in that way. One who had no puppose in trying to make it fit with Christ and actually who would does not believe it fits with Christ, yethe felt it was a more accurate translation of the word to translate it as "his tomb" instead of In His Death. Now to us in his death means in == what happened in connection with His death. It means his burial was with a rich man. But we ask ourselves what's a rich man got to do with it? So many commentators will say there is a mistake in the text rx here. It should be He made His grave with the wicked and with the sinners in his death. Let's get rid of the word rich and put in some word for sinner or wicked so as to make a parallel. What have the rich got to do with it? Is this His exaltation to be buried with a rich man? That's no great exaltation. Is it humiliation to be buried in a rich man's tomb? That's no humiliation. Is this the accomplishment of His work?

Does He make better atonement for us because he was buried in a rich man's tomb? No,it's not an organic prophecy It's a little incidental note that points to the fact that this great unusual thing that One crucified as a malefactor should nevertheless be buried in a rich man's tomb; it's a little incidental thing pointing this is the One that is here predicted. Nobody in Isaiah's day could really have seen much point in that statement, but when the thing happened the point was obvious and the Jews who did not believe Christ was Messiah preserved these words right through the centuries exactly.

(Student: Do you know what the Talmud says on this verse?) Well the Talmud is the presentation of the views of various rabbis, and the- have all kinds of opinions. (Student: Do any of them take this as a prediction of the place Messiah would be ?) I don't know about that. The talmud does not contain a running commentary. There are several splendid commentaries by rabbis of the Middle Ages, but the Talmud is the discussion mostly on points of law, and conduct and habit and manner by different rabbis and on all sorts of customs and there is all sorts of varities. But the Jewish views through the ages have varied, some believing that there was to be a Messiah a son of David who was to be king, and also a son of Joseph who would suffer. And this this refers to the Messiah. There have been Jews who have held that view. There have been others who have interpreted it as referring to Israel. But there is no unified view among them.

(Student: He wasn't buried with a rich man was he, it was a rich man's tomb? That bothered me.) The his tomb fits a little better from our viewpoint, but in connection with His death he was placed ina place that was set up for a rich man. It is more accurate from our viewpoint if you say he tomb. But I think you can bet the idea from the other, though it is a little bit involved. With the rich in his death. Now I feel there should be a breat there. I don't like that

semicolon. inNtheKJV there. I don't think "because he has done no violence, neither is there any deceit in His mouth has anything to do with his making his grave with the wicked or his being buried with the rich. I think this should start a new sentence, and should say instead of because, it could just as well be translated "although." In Hebrew it is just in relation to. It can be either because or although. I feel that "although" here going with the next phrase is what's meant here. "Although he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in His mouth yet it pleased the Lord to bruise Him." I think it goes definitely with the next rather than with what precedes, for the v. division was made here in the wrong place. "Although he had done no violence, nor was any deceit in His mouth, yet it pleased the Lord to bruise Him. He has put Him to grief. It is not the men that killed him, it is the Lord's action in producing the atonement. God gave His only begotten Son.

When thou shalt make His soul an offering for sin -- the Hebrew can be either "when thou shalt" or "she shall" and what sense would she shall make there? (Student:) The Hebrew is 2nd mas. of 3rd fem. singular. So what sense would it make to say "she shall." Who would the "she" be? (Student: I imagine it could be his mother!) That's good imagination but it's not in the text. (Mr. Berraga:) Well that again is imagination. Is there anything in the verse? It is normal in Hebrew to put the verb first. In English we start with the subject, but in Heb. the verb normally comes first. So when a verb is 3 mas. sing., we don't alwasy say "he". We may say "he" if there is no subject following, but if there is a subject following we take that as the subject. The same would apply to the 3 f. s. Mr. Berraga do you have a suggestion as to who the she would be ? Mr. VonBehren?

Soul is feminine. Of course. All souls are feminine, don't you know that? All parts of the body in Heb. are feminine. All souls are fem. You read in Genesis where the man came to see Jacob to get his daughter to become the wife of his son Hamor, and he said, My son, His soul she cleaves to thy daughter Dinah. Soul is fem. in Hebrew. The matter of gender varies from language to language. In Hebrew souls are fem. So many say this should be translation "when his soul shall make an offering for sin." Actually it does not affect the sense either way. When he shall make his soul an offering for sin, or when His soul shall make an offering for sin, in either case it is he does it. He gives his life as an offering for sin, or else his soul makes an offering for sin, an offering of himself. So it does not really matter which way you take it here, but it is either his soul shall make it or he shall make. That's a good rule in Hebrew. When you find a Heb. sentence, you look at the verb, and then se e if there is a subject somewhere in the next 5 or 6 words that can be the subject to go with that particular form of the verb. Now if there does it does not necessarily prove that it is, it might be he will make his house a strong place of fortification. It could be he, or th it could be the house shall make a strong place of fortification. You have to decide by the context. But when you have nothing in the context to suggest a she, but there is a she right in the verse. So his soul makes, or he makes his soul. In either case when that happens he will prolongue days. He is cut off. Who will declare his generation? There is no result. He's gone. No, he is going to prolongue days. There is going to be the resurrection. There is going to be continuing effectiveness. There is going to be accomplishment through the ages, because he performs a great atonement and so His work does not end but he continues to prolongue his days. He is resurrected!

(Student: although he had done no violence) Although he had not done any violence, nor was any deceit in His mouth, yet it pleased the Lord to bruise Him. (Student: That's exactly the way the NASB translates it.) Neither or nor well in English, you have to see the context to see which will fit, in English.

(Studnet: In v. 11 how do you take in his knowledge . . .) We have not come to that yet. We will and must. "He will see his seed and prolongue his days" so there is going to be. You say, Who will declare his generation? Nothing is going to come! That would be true if he was an ordinary malefactor, yes. Look at these men Jesus tells about who led a group of men out into the wilderness in order to start a rebellion against Rome. They were going to turn everything upside down. Then they were captured by the Romans and killed. Nothing came of it. And people say, what's going to come of His death. He looked very promising. He thought he was going to build a . Here he is cut off. But the fact is that he will see seed. He will have a posterity. Those who come to God thorough Him. Great numbers of those who can be considered as His children in the sense that they receive atonement through Him. He will see his seed. He will prolongue his days. He was dead but he is raised from the dead. He continues to be with his people all through the ages. And the pleasure of the Lord will prosper at his hand.

Then you have the same thought again: He shall see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied. He went through this terrible suffering but it was not simply a tragedy that this wonderful man was killed and nothing accomplished! He'll be satisfied because a great deal was accomplished by it. By it there willcome justification. By the knowledge of Himshall my righteous servant justify many. Through people coming to know about him and to know Him he will justify many. This "his knowledge" in Old English can be deceptive to us today, because the word "his"

means of him. "Of him" can be taken three ways: It can be possessive; it can be subjective; or it can be objective. That is my knowledge can be what I know. My knowledge can can be the knowledge I possess. My knowledge can be what I know, or my knowledge can be what is known about me. In modern English we have developed a rather queer habit that with many words the genitive will naturally seem to us to be possessive; with other words it will seem to be subjective, and with other words it will seem to be objective. It will seem strange to us to take it in the opposite way. Actually our English genitive can be taken in any one of the three ways and we can easily find illustrations of all three ways. If you say the knowledge of him, people know him. Die is intransitive, but a transitive verb the his can be the object of it or the subject of it. In this case it would be clearer to us today to say by the knowledge of him. By the knowledge of Him, he will justify many. It is not that he knows so much he is able to do it, but it is that when they come to know what he has done, what he offers, they can be justified.

"For he will bear their iniquities." Through this knowledge being carried by his followers throughout the earth, the knolwedge of what he's done, there can be brought to people everywhere the means of salvation. But it is a little unfortuante that in our present day English when we say his knowledge, we think what he knows rather than while with many other words we would think of it as what is known about him. we think of the building of the ship. The ship's building consumed a great deal of time. And so on. That is an objective genitive. The building of the ship. They built the ship. But the man who built the ship, yo could say you this company's building consumed too much time. No, you say, the building's construction. You don't mean that the building did the construction! You mean the building was constructed.

That's a good instance of an objective genitive. There are many. But we get the habit in present English of thinking of certain connections as objective, certain as subjective, certain as possessive and we don't realize the fact that there are the other possibilities. But they all three are found used in regular English today.

(Student: In v. 11 he will see it is in italics and be satisfied. Over here it says another reading is "light". He will see light and be satisfied. Is there any reason for that?) I never heard of that before. (Student: That's something discovered in the Dead Sea scrolls) Yes, I see, a suggestion from another text in the DDS. Noe the only book of the OT that is found complete in the DDS is Isaiah. Most of the DDS have little fragments consist of that will have half a dozen words in them. Some of them have quite a bit longer and there are some commentaries that quote them and have a discussion. But one of the first DDS to be discovered was a complete copy of the book of Isaiah. This copy is a very early copy but it is a poor copy. It has a great many tiny errors that are easily recognized, as errors. The -- It is of great interest to note that the book of Isaiah substantially as we have it today with our earliest Heb. MSS coming from the 10th cent. A.D. that back there at the time of Christ there was a copy made within the century there was a copy made of the book of Isaiah that is substantially the same as the copy -- copies made 1000 yrs. later and it shows how wonderfully it has been copied. -But- preserved through those years. But it itself has a great many tiny errors which are obviously errors. In making the sSV there were about 20 places where they thought that the DDS of Isaiah gave a different text that perhaps was the correct text being 1000 yrs. earlier. They put this in in about 20 cases in h the original RSV, and then the Committee decided that about 15 of them were only errors in copying and left them out. And they had about 5 as it was published, and in later

editions their committee had serious questions whether these five should be left in. So it is a wonderful evidence to the general correctness of the text, but when it comes to individual changes of the text in line with the DDS it is not a sufficiently carefully copied text to be of much value for that purpose.

The same is true of Manuscript B, MSS Vaticanus which is our earliest great complete copy of just about the whole Bible. It's in the Vatican. It is a very fine ancient text and preserves what is perhaps the best text. But it is a very poor copy of that text. It has a great many very tiny errors which are clearly scribal errors.

(Student: The critics would come down on that and say that LIGHT should belong in that text. Because the Qumran scrolls of that is 1000 yrs. older and it is probably an error of omission of omission in the Masoretic text.) Yes, but you also have your LXX that is made before the time of Christ. I don't remember exactly what the LXX has but that would have to be brought into comparison to it. That would be a matter of text that if we had another hour we could spend a alf hour on it with great interest. We have more to cover now. I doubt if there is enough evidence for it to really make it a serious point. But it would be interesting to look into.

It continues, He will see of the travil of his soul and be satisfied. For he shall bear their iniquities. There is your atonement very very definitely. For he shall bear their iniquities.

Verse 12: Therefore will I divide Him a portion with the great. "A portion" is in italics in the KJV but the "dividing" means I will allocate to him with the great. I will enable him to take a part, to divide a spoil with the strong. That which Satan and his angels seem to have seized of God's creation, that which they have filled with Satanic ideas, and that which is headed for eternal destruction -- a portion of it he will rescue from them.

He will devide a portion with the great, a portion with the strong ones. How did He do it? By His atonement. Because he poured out his soul unto death and was numbered with the transgressors and bare the sins of many and made intercession for the transgressors. Who has the Hebrew before you? Dr. Phillips would you read us that last -- you can keep your English before you if you want, but read it very carefully in the Hebrew starting with "and he was numbered with the transgressors." Noting the tenses very carefully in exact form. I'm not worried about whether you know the meaning of particular words but get the forms right.

(Phillips: "For as perfect rather sins of many) Start a little earlier. He shall divide the spoil with the strong, because he poured out his soul unto death. What tense is that? (Student: Perfect) Yes. Perfect. He has poured out his soul unto death. Then, he was numbered with the transgressors. What tense is numbered? (Student: Perfect.) Yes. Then "he bare the sin of many." What tense? (Student: Perfect.) Yes. Then what continues. (Studnet: Imperfect) Then it is an imperfect, and so your natural translation would be "shall intercede" for transgressors. That is what the Hebrew says. He will divide the spoil with the strong because He poured out his soul unto death; he was numbered with the transgressors and bare the sin of many. These are all in the perfect. These are things he has done. But then it gives an imperfect that/can express the beginning fo something in the past but which very commonly expresses something for the future. The most natural way to translate it would be "and he will make intercession for the transgressors." So why make it simply a repetition of what you have already been told.-- that he is going to perform the atonement, that he is going to bare the sin of many, that he is going to pour out his soul unto death but an imperfect -- he will make

intercession for the transgressors. It seems to me that there is a difference of tense there which corresponds very clearly to what happens when Christ poured out his soul unto death, was numbered with the transgressors, bare the sin of many, and thus divided spoil with the strong, and rescued many people who were in Satan's hands.

But that does not end it. He ever liveth to make intercession for us. He is at the right hand of God making intercession for us as we transgress, as we fall we know not merely a dead Christ but we have a living Christ, One who is at the right hand of God making intercession for us and He will continue to do this all through the present age.

(Student: How do you fit that in with the great ones, he will divide the plunder?) Yes, I take that as being the great strong one Satan, and his hosts who are misleading the souls of people, leading them toward predition.

(Student: That's a distinct difference then . . . The picture that it seems to give to my mind is that of a warrior who just conquer everything and have it to himself. Who are the great ones then? He will divide it with the great.) He will take part of it. He will divide it. It means that the spoil that they have, he will sieze part of it, and the way He seizes it is by His atonement. He destroys, custs the power of Satan to holdthis world in subjection. Satan is the Prince of this world. Satan and his powerful ones are in control of this present evil age. But Jesus rescued a portion of ~~XXXX~~ that which Satan has bound, thro His atonement. There is no universalism here. It does not teach as some say that Jesus by his atonement saved everyone., and so the whole world is saved. I heard a sermon one time in which the man said, Everybody is saved through what Christ did. All we need to do is like the prodigal son, to recognize what ~~===~~that God is our father and come back to him! That is not what the

Scripture teaches. There is necessary repentance; there is necessary personal acceptance of Christ in order that the atonement may be applied to us. It applies to all those who believe on His Name. But He divides the spoil, he seizes a portion of it.

(Student: Souls or material goods?) Souls, those whom Satan has taken and misled.

(Student: Couldn't it be this is only a figure and not to be taken literally?) It is a figure. (Student: But not to be taken literally. All its' saying is that he's going to win the battle.) No, this does not say He is going to win the battle. This says He is going to seize a portion of that. He will divide the spoil with the strong. He will take away from the strong one a portion of the spoil which he has already taken. It is a figure of course, of a battle, and of one coming in and seizing a portion of the spoil that the other has already taken.

(Student: Isn't it kind of unusual to call sols booty?) It is unusual. (Any parallel?) O I think so. I don't think of one off hand, but it is a very natural figure. Souls as booty which Satan seized. (Student: the word for great is rab.) Yes, it can be interpreted as many or as strong ones. Either way, both are possible. That which is big, or that which isnumerous. Both are possibilities. You cannot say which it is.

We have only c. 4 more min. So I must rush on. I took a whole sem. on Isa. 53 a couple of yrs. ago. We went into Heb. then.

Ch. 55 is this wonderful gospel call. It is fairly obvious -- the teaching of ch. 55. Ch. 54 is less obvious. In v. 2, Enlarge the place of thy tent. Let them stretch forth the curtains of thy habitation. Spare not, lengthen thy cords, strengthen thy stakes. Wm. Carey gave hisgreat sermon urging the church to send him to India and preach the gospel there, and he used this text.

Somebody might say, Look he just takes a couple of words from Scripture that have nothing to do with foreign missions. Strengthen thy stakes! Lengthen thy cords! What's that got to do with foreign missions? That is a great danger taking words out of context in Scripture, and getting something out of them that is not there. But here in the context that is exactly what is here. " Sing O barren, thou that didst not bear." The Gentiles that seemed outside the family of God and seemed to be headed for destruction and the ~~~ and only among the Jews was the knowledge of how to be saved through the sacrifices to come and be saved through Christ, but the barren one that did not bear is to break forth into singing, for more are the children of the desolate than the children of the married one. Of course the modernists all say that this means more are the children of Israel when she has been redeemed but was formerly desolate than before she was redeemed when she was thought of as a married wife. That is a very involved interpretation. It's much more simple to take it the way Paul takes it in Gal. that the barren is the one outside who seemed to be producing nothing spiritually valuable, the Gentile, but to them the knowledge has been brought to them of the atonement and there is even more from this than from Israel that are being brought intothe kingdom. So he says, Lengethen your cords, strengthen your steaks, and you will break forth on the right hand and left and your seed will inherit the Gentiles. It is an expression of the outgoing of the gospel. So we have the general expression of the outgoing of the Gospel and the reaching of souls all through the world for the Lord in this chapter. We won't go into the question here of just how much of this chapter is talking about the ch., and how much is speaking about Israel. It is my impression that the early part of it is very definitely speaking about the followers of the Servant of the Lord whether Jew or Gentile. That is the first part of the

chapter and later on it speaks more specifically of Israel and it would take us considerable discussion to see exactly where the transition occurs and we w&XN won't have time for that now. It being only one or two minutes left . . .

Ch. 55. The Gospel call comes for nothing, you can receive this wonderful thing. Let your soul delight itself in fatness. I'll make an everlasting covenant with you even the sure mercies of David. Of course Jesus is the son of David the king, but the blessings that were given to David, the one who fell into such terrible sin but whom God redeemed and with whom God made His personal covenant, these blessings are available for everyone who is thirsty and comes to the water. It is a marvellous gospel call.

In v. 5, You will call a nation you don't know. Nations that know not thee shall run unto thee. Verse 6, Seek the Lord while He may be found. Call upon Him while He is near. Let the wicked forsake his way. God will abundantly pardon.

Verse 8 For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither=are your ays my ways. God is not like a vengeful man that has got to have his pound of flesh. But God has received the atonement, the penalty is paid, and so He can have mercy without charge or cost.

Verse 10, the promise that the Gospel message will not return void. The Word will not return void. God is going, v.10-11 say, to accomplish His purpose and His word will accomplish the purpose to which He sent it. You will go forth with joy. Be led forth with peace. The mountains and hills will break forth into singing. This of course is figurative language. Anybody who says he takes everything in the Bible literally is talking utter nonsence. It is figurative language but it does represent that all nature is going to partitipate. All nature is going going to participate in the joy.

Instead of the thorne will come up the fir tree; instead of the briar will come up the myrtle tree. This looks forward to the millennium in my opinion, to the day when the thornes and thistles that are here as a result of man's sins are erradicated. Then, x Ch. 56 goes on, Nobody is left out.

The son of the stranger, the eunuch who says there is no place for me. I can't enter the house of God. X&X The Lord says, even to them willX I give in my house a place and a name better even than sons and daughters. I will give them an everlastingname. Even them will I bring to my Holy Mountain, and it will be called a place of prayer for all nations.

So 40-56:8 forms a unit. Ch. 41 really. Ch. 40 is a summary of the whole. But ch. 41, starting with exile, leading to the cause of exile which is sin. Shoving that God will deliver from exile, but the deliverance fmow sin is necessary, vital, more important then even from deliverance from exile, and it comes from what Christ will do on the cross. I think we have to stop there.

It is only a 1 hr. course so the exam will not be long, but will deal with matters we have all discussed in class. Bring an unmarked Bible.

The Allan Alexander MacRae Memorial Library

INDEX TO ISAIAH 40-56

CLASS LECTURES

1974

000642 Isaiah Class Lectures 1974
Isaiah 40-56

J

Lecture 1 9/11/74

1 Introduction to course
2 Greatness of Isaiah's poetry
Translatability of the Bible unique
3 Koran not translated
Isa. 40-55
4 Transitions Isa.29:1 KJV misses the thought. Sennacherib's attack
5 29:5 KJV "moreover"/ but, while. Shows transition. Waw.
6 40-55 logical progress of thought
7 Date of Isa. 1:1 Micah, Uzziah
8 Assyria's conquest of northern kgdm.
In Isaiah's time. Judah conquered 150 years later
9 Higher criticism and Isaiah
10 Second and third Isaiah
12 Exile certain
13 Basic problems
14 Isa.56-66. Assignment
"
15 Babylonian gods
17 Analogy of the symphony
18 Themes
19 Deliverance, God's glory, power, uniquéness.
20 Question about relation to John the Baptist

Lecture 2 This lecture was evidently not recorded

Lecture 3 9/25/74

1 Comments regarding the Hebrew language. Difference from Greek
2 Usefulness linked to knowing Greek and Hebrew
3 Use of gender: in English, in German
4 "Snake" fem in German; mas. in Egyptian
5 Gender little stressed in Hebrew.
Gesenius-Kautzsch Grammar. Only 5 pp. on signif. of gender.
6 Higher critical interpretation re gender
8 "My son, his soul cleaves to your daughter" where soul is fem.
and cleaves is fem. to agree with it rather than son.
Gender does not tell us a great deal in Hebrew
Two reasons why Hebrew is most important: syntax and meaning of words
10 Heb. meanings are more uniform than English
K-B and BDB lexicons
11 Use of Young's Concordance (Meanings of "draw")
12 Same word means "ancient" 4t. and "draw" once.
British military leader who knew nothing about Hebrew or how to use Young's concordance
13 Hebrew word "day". "Shew", "made" asah. "In 6 days God shewed Moses a vision of heaven and earth."
14 Meaning of "watching"== be on the job, not looking to see
15 Value of BDB even tho written by modernists
16 Isa. 52 "sprinkle many nations"
19 Isa. 40-55 a unified section
20 Logically leads from matter of deliverance from exile to the matter of deliverance from sin thru Christ
21 No double fulfillment

pages 249 250 251 252 253 254 255 256

About IBRI:

The Interdisciplinary Biblical Research Institute is a group of Christians who see a desperate need for men and women convinced of the complete reliability of the Bible who will:

(1) get training both in Biblical studies and in some other academic discipline, and

(2) use this training to help other Christians deal with the many areas where non-Christian teaching is so dominant today.

We believe that such trained people can be effective in removing many stumbling blocks that keep others from the Gospel.

Our Objectives	Our Programs	Our Beliefs	Membership

You can contact IBRI by e-mail at: webmaster@ibri.org

This Web Site has been selected as a "Links^{2}Go" Key Resource for Theological Studies

Links^{2}Go
Theological Studies

000642 **Isaiah Class Lectures 1974**
Isaiah 40-56

J

Lecture 1 9/11/74

1 Introduction to course
2 Greatness of Isaiah's poetry
Translatability of the Bible unique
3 Koran not translated
Isa. 40-55
4 Transitions Isa.29:1 KJV misses the thought. Sennacherib's attack
5 29:5 KJV "moreover"/ but, while. Shows transition. Waw.
6 40-55 logical progress of thought
7 Date of Isa. 1:1 Micah, Uzziah
8 Assyria's conquest of northern kgdm.
In Isaiah's time. Judah conquered 150 years later
9 Higher criticism and Isaiah
10 Second and third Isaiah
12 Exile certain
13 Basic problems
14 Isa.56-66. Assignment
"
15 Babylonian gods
17 Analogy of the symphony
18 Themes
19 Deliverance, God's glory, power, uniquéness.
20 Question about relation to John the Baptist

Lecture 2 This lecture was evidently not recorded

Lecture 3 9/25/74

1 Comments regarding the Hebrew language. Difference from Greek
2 Usefulness linked to knowing Greek and Hebrew
3 Use of gender: in English, in German
4 "Snake" fem in German; mas. in Egyptian
5 Gender little stressed in Hebrew.
Gesenius-Kautzsch Grammar. Only 5 pp. on signif. of gender.
6 Higher critical interpretation re gender
8 "My son, his soul cleaves to your daughter" where soul is fem. and cleaves is fem. to agree with it rather than son.
Gender does not tell us a great deal in Hebrew.
Two reasons why Hebrew is most important: syntax and meaning of words
10 Heb. meanings are more uniform than English
K-B and BDB lexicons
11 Use of Young's Concordance (Meanings of "draw")
12 Same word means "ancient" 4t. and "draw" once.
British military leader who knew nothing about Hebrew or how to use Young's concordance
13 Hebrew word "day". "Shew", "made" asah. "In 6 days God shewed Moses a vision of heaven and earth."
14 Meaning of "watching"== be on the job, not looking to see
15 Value of BDB even tho written by modernists
16 Isa. 52 "sprinkle many nations"
19 Isa. 40-55 a unified section
20 Logically leads from matter of deliverance from exile to the matter of deliverance from sin thru Christ
21 No double fulfillment

000642 Isaiah Class Lectures 1974
Isaiah 40-56

J

Lecture 1 9/11/74

1 Introduction to course
2 Greatness of Isaiah's poetry
Translatability of the Bible unique
3 Koran not translated
Isa. 40-55
4 Transitions Isa.29:1 KJV misses the thought. Sennacherib's attack
5 29:5 KJV "moreover"/ but, while. Shows transition. Waw.
6 40-55 logical progress of thought
7 Date of Isa. 1:1 Micah, Uzziah
8 Assyria's conquest of northern kgdm.
In Isaiah's time. Judah conquered 150 years later
9 Higher criticism and Isaiah
10 Second and third Isaiah
12 Exile certain
13 Basic problems
14 Isa.56-66. Assignment
"
15 Babylonian gods
17 Analogy of the symphony
18 Themes
19 Deliverance, God's glory, power, uniquéness.
20 Question about relation to John the Baptist

Lecture 2 This lecture was evidently not recorded

Lecture 3 9/25/74

1 Comments regarding the Hebrew language. Difference from Greek
2 Usefulness linked to knowing Greek and Hebrew
3 Use of gender: in English, in German
4 "Snake" fem in German; mas. in Egyptian
5 Gender little stressed in Hebrew.
Gesenius-Kautzsch Grammar. Only 5 pp. on signif. of gender.
6 Higher critical interpretation re gender
8 "My son, his soul cleaves to your daughter" where soul is fem.
and cleaves is fem. to agree with it rather than son.
Gender does not tell us a great deal in Hebrew
Two reasons why Hebrew is most important: syntax and meaning of words
10 Heb. meanings are more uniform than English
K-B and BDB lexicons
11 Use of Young's Concordance (Meanings of "draw")
12 Same word means "ancient" 4t. and "draw" once.
British military leader who knew nothing about Hebrew or how to use Young's concordance
13 Hebrew word "day". "Shew", "made" asah. "In 6 days God shewed Moses a vision of heaven and earth."
14 Meaning of "watching"== be on the job, not looking to see
15 Value of BDB even tho written by modernists
16 Isa. 52 "sprinkle many nations"
19 Isa. 40-55 a unified section
20 Logically leads from matter of deliverance from exile to the matter of deliverance from sin thru Christ
21 No double fulfillment

Isaiah Class Lectures 1974

Isaiah 40-56

Lecture 4 10/2/74

1 Different themes. 40:1-2
2 40:3-6
3 40:7-9
4 Zion go up; or go up to Zion
5 40:10-15
6 "coastlands"
7 cf. use of word "Indian", and "American"
8 40:15ff
9 40:21ff
10 chapter divisions 41
11 Cyrus
13 41:2-3
14 my servant
15 Derision of idolatry
New note of the servant. Methodology in study of Isaiah
16 The servant theme
From 40-55;and after 55 a diff. significance
17 F. Delitzsch on the servant of the Lord
19 Servant in ch. 42
20 How to be realized

Lecture 5 10/9/74

1 Cyrus ch. 41
Servant theme
2 41:12ff
3 Winnowimg process
Doing things through an instrumentality
4 41:21
5 Futility of idols
6 God;s ability to predict the future
7 On the powers of evil to predict the future. Deut. 31
Satan knows more facts so can make better guesses about future
8 On difference between Christianity and Islam
Statement by a financial expert on predicting future of stocks
9 Reason why Malachi completed c. 400 BC and a space for 4 cent B C
10 Daniel written during time of Maccabeas say critics. Why?
11 Close of the OT canon
41:21-25
12 Was Cyrus a believer in the true God? "Call upon my name"
13 chapter division ch. 42
14 how the servant will fulfill his work 42:1-4
15 The "coastlands"
42:4
16 42:5-6 41:27
17 42:6-8
18 42:9-13
19 42:13-15,16-19
20 42:19-22
21 42:24 rebuke for sin

Isaiah Class Lectures 1974
Isa. 40-56

Lecture 6 10/16/74

1 Critical approach. Unity of Isaiah
2 Wheaton prof thinks Isa. a series of separate poems rather than a continuous presentation.
On interpolations
3 Westminster student thought a ch. in Jer. not genuine
Commentaries: liberal and conservati e
G. A. Smith, Leupold, Delitzsch, Young
5 Finding themes, method of
From theme of exile to the cause of it
6 Way the theme is presented. Gradually brings in rebuke
7 ch 42 The servant theme
42:19
8 42:22-24; 43:1
9 43:1-3 themes
10 43:4-5
11 43:7-8 NASB
12 Chapter divisions and the archbishop
13 43:10 witnesses servant
14 Criticism of 4 laws of Campus Crusade
God's plan for your life includes turning from sin
15 How bring light to the Gentiles? 42:6 if entire nation Israel
16 43:11-13 Old English "let"
17 43:14-22
18 43:24-44:6
19 43:9
Social pressure and idolatry. Christian science woman whose baby died did not die influence woman whose baby did die
20 Fear of demons. Relief not by trying to please them but by seeking God's power against them.
44:9-18
21 Idolatry and making idols(TV) out of your pleasures
On intelligent people having the most humor,questioned
Things in Bible that are humerous
22 God not call Israel his pet to be protected but his servant to bring light to Gentiles

Lecture 7 10/23/74

1 Isa.44:22 theme of redemption. Raises question but gives no answer
44:24; 45:12 Stretched out the heavens
2 Participle--continuous
Occurs 10 t. in prophetic books; 3 are perfects
3 Four possible meanings
4 Theory of the expanding universe
Constantly changing conditions of the earth surface
5 Force of verbal inspiration
6 What verbal inspiration does not mean and what it does mean
Isa. 45:4 has how many sentences in it?
7 45:3 is not more than one sentence
45:2 is two sentences
45:1 is at least one sentence
8 44:28 is only part of a sentence which begins with 44:24
9 Usually Hebrew has short sentences; rarely run thru 5 vv.
10 Isa.44:24 God's creative power
11 44:25 God's omniscience. LIBERTY MAGAZINE's predictions 1/39
12 44:26-28 Cyrus named-
13 Decree (word) to rebuild the city
14 CAuse of their exile--sin. Touched on in 44:22
15 Isa.45:1 Only 2 cases in OT where "Messiah" occurs in KJV.
16 The double portion of Elijah's spirit. Means equivalent
17 Daniel 9:25 punctuation
The Messiah in Daniel 9 is Cyrus. Messiah the Prince (Cyrus)
To say 7 and 72 weeks means 69 weeks is illogical
18 Illustration from college entrance till get M.A.
Dan. 9:24ff No such thing as 360 day year
19 Cyrus is God's anointed who gives command to rebuild Jerusalem.
"Word" can be a prediction also. Not start with Artaxerxes
20 Sir Robt. Anderson's figures
See no date for Christ's first coming in Daniel.
21 See gap between three sections rather than just between two of them

Lecture 8 10/30/74

1 Themes. Stress on exile chs. 41-52 with increasing stress on sin
2 Other themes: God's creative power, knowledge
3 Isa.40 Emotional overtones rather than specific prediction
6 Isa.41 gives specific prediction about Cyrus. Single prediction
7 John's message emotional
8 Jew's reaction to John's message to repent
9 Isa. 49 Who is speaking?
11-12 49:1 The Servant is speaking
14 The Servant is speaking. Servant = Israel as a whole
15 49:5 the servant is distinguished from Israel whereas in v.3 he is closely identified with Israel. Servant an individual, not a nation.
17 49:6 The work He will do for Israel is but a small part of world-wide work
18 49:7; 48:20-22 who is speaking?
19 48:16 Who is speaking? Remarkable v. on the trinity in OT
20 Servant a light to Gentiles (ch.42. Represents Israel, yet distinct from Israel

Lecture 9 11/6/74

2	Isa.45:4	the term Jacob used interchangeably with Israel
4	45:5	Higher Critical idea re second Isaiah
5		Cyrus was predicted 150 yrs. in advance
		Themes: comfort, deliverance, God's glory
6	45:7	"evil" is physical, not poral (rab) tho can include it also
7		Today "evil" is restricted to moral evil. God may send us some physical evil that is for our moral good.
8	45:9-10	Not responsible for physical inheritance we've received but are responsible for what we do with it
		Pitiful to see way some people strive for recognition
	45:12	
9	45:13	v.11 in KJV unfortunate. "Command" in piel imperf. used [illegible] in sense of "I have done this in accordance with my will and you can trust me."
	45:13	Foreknowledge re Cyrus
11		Could not be Artaxerxes
12		Cyrus and the Persian government
13	45:23	Prediction yet unfulfilled
	46:1	Bel=Baal(Master) Marduk of Babylon.
		Nebo=Nabu, the second god of the Babylonian pantheon
15	46:10	Stress on God's foreknowledge
16	46:11	God's power. Cyrus executes God's will as His instrument, yet in himself he is a ravenous bird wanting all he can get under
17	47:1-9	his control
		Babylonians died out and disappeared from history. Egypt same.
	47:9	Babylonians lost control--became widows in short time
		Clay tablets showing their enchantments
19		"Looking at the River" changed to "Liver" in type error.
		Considered a science by the Babylonians
	48:1	
20		In 1940 Battle of Dunkirk, British churches thronged. Deliverance forgotten with credit given the wonderful RAF

Lecture 10 11/13/74

1	48:1	stronger criticism
2	48:2	frailty of human nature Illustration from Dunkirk
	48:6,7	thought of prediction
	48:8	reverts to rebuke
3		difference between exile and captivity
	48:9	God's undeserved mercy
4		God's purpose in suffering
5		F Schaeffer's 'No Little People' No ciphers in God's sight
6	48:12	Misunderstanding of Calvinism
7		Extreme views on Calvinism and Arminianism
		John's Wesley's position
		Story of what speaker said re sovereignty of God and man's duty to accept Christ
8		Did Christ die for every sin except unbelief?
	48:13	Question asked about origins and creation

Lecture 10 (cont'd)

9		Alternate theories of origins and development Age of universe not given in Bible
10		No way of proving the universe was not created yesterday God not keep originals in room at certain temperature
11		On correcting incorrect ideas of others
12		Tendency to oppose everything a person presents if we reject them on certain things Example of Wm Huxley and C Darwin
13		Questions whether Darwin recanted in later life
14		Story of Harvard Professor who spoke of 'little imp' under car hood that made it go
15	Isa 48:15	Cyrus again
16	48:16	Difference between KJV and NASBs Trinity in view
17		Student at U: of PA who thought Montgomery should pay more attention to the Talmud 'As it was in the days of' meant trouble ahead
18	48:20	Theme of deliverance
19		Answering questions re Cyrus and Moses
20		Conditions in Germany before Hitler came to power Attitude of the Allies toward Germany What Hitler did for Germany
22	49:2,12	Land of Sinim (China)

Lecture 11 11/20/74

1	Isa 47:13 50:1	
3	50:10,11 ,	Inflation in U:S: compared with other nations
4	51:14	Noticing the pronouns Pronouns 'thee' and 'thou' do not show reverence
5		Usage of 'they' in German for anyone who is not a close friend Most people don't know the difference between 'thou' and 'thee', 'you' and 'ye'
6	52:1-5	Identification of pronouns antecedents
7	52:6,7	Deliverance
8	52:10-12	'rearward' < rearguard
9	52:13	Exhaltation of the servant ASTOUNDED 747 airplane crash astonished people Relates to misery rather than something pleasant
10	52:13,14	thee' refers to Israel
12	min	His visage was marred from the sons of men
13	52:15	Sprinkle many nations
16		Kings shall shut their mouths at him
17	52:12-13	Chapter division
20	53:1	'Our report'

Lecture 12 11/27/74

1 Development of thought. Exile only a symptom
Climax reached in 52:13
2 Infra- and supralapsarianism.
Start with the purpose, the ultimate exaltation of the Servant
My servant shall deal prudently i.e. wisely (yaschil)
4 Isa.52:15 "so" "Kings shut their mouths?
5 LXX translators couldn't make sense of "sprinkle"
Isa.53:1
6 53:2 unattractive looking?
7 53:3 sickness
Tendency either to despise less fortunate or to reverse it and look down on more fortunate
8 People's attitude toward king of England
German steel worker surprised AAM would walk with him
9 Cornell student who took coach because thought he would be looked down on by other students if took a sleeper
xxxx 53:2
10 Isa.53 quoted often in NT Rom. 10:16
NT use of OT
11 53:1 "our report"
12 53:3-4 and 1 Pet. 2:24
13 How bear our sicknesses?
14 53:5
15 53:6-7 Sheep dumb before sheares
16 53:8 Taken from prison and from judgment
Who shall declare his generation
18 53:8 For the transgression of my people to whom the stroke was due
19 Best source of attitude of people in Christ's day is the NT. Second best source is Josephus
Mishna and Talmud
20 53:9 grave with the wicked
22 modernists delet "with the wicked"

Lecture 13 12/4/84

Isa 1-35 prophetic chs 36-39 historical
re ch division
40-55 make a section 57-66 make a section
To which section ch 56 belongs A sharp transition

Isa 56
Decision on what to place ch 56

Isa 55 The great gospel call Easy believism
Story of the miner and what it cost the company
to bring him up out of the mine
Ch 55 rests on ch 53

Isa 53:8 Who shall declare his generation?
53:9 Made his grave with the wicked
Not an organic prophecy
53:9 Because he had done no violence
When thou shalt see/ or she shall see
Soul--fem Declare his generation
53:10 See his seed prolongue his days
53:11 By his knowledge 'Of him' can be taken 3 ways
Building a ship The ship's building Obj gen

'He will see the light' DSS
Bk of Isa substantially as we have it today
same as Heb MSS from the 10th century

Discussion on DSS rending of 'light'
53:12 Divide him a portion
Make intercession for the transgressors
54:1-2 Wm Carrey's sermon
55:5-10
55:13-56:1