

The course this year covers portions of Isaiah different from what we covered last year yet there is necessarily a certain amount of overlapping, so those of you who had the course last year will pardon the fact that . . . introducing the book as a whole. We are on a whole different part of Is. with a whole different subject matter from that we dealt with last year.

This is the first time I have ever used an overhead projector. . . . I'd like to have a list of everyone present. Once we have assigned seats. . . who is not hear. Pass the check list along so we'll know who was present today.

I'll start with an outline of what we want to cover in Isaiah. The first point is Introductory. You'll notice I said, Part I. We are this year dealing with two separate and rather unrelated sections of Isaiah, the first part and the last part. They are unrelated but each of them is tremendously important and interesting. So I'm going to call it Part I, as long as we are dealing with the first part, and under that Roman numeral I is Introductory. Under that I've listed as A. The Supreme Excellence of the Book.

All literary scholars agree that one of the great masterpieces of the world's literature is the book of Isaiah. To the Christian it is of even greater importance that this book contains more pictures of Christ than any other part of the OT. Many different aspects of Christ's life, preeminently, of course, the story of His death, and His resurrection, His future activity are carefully described in Isaiah. Naturally there are those who have different opinions as to how much of this Isaiah understood. Peter tells us that the prophets were searching what and what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify when He testified beforehand of the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow. So we have it on the authority of the Apostle Peter that the prophets looked forward to the activities of Christ. They probably understood a good deal about these activities, but there is probably a good deal they did not understand. But the Holy Spirit so led them in what they wrote that it could be later read and understood in the light of our former knowledge of Christ, and we would see how very very wonderful it is that the important facts about Christ and the meaning of these facts is already contained in the book of Isaiah. The book of Isaiah is quoted in the NT probably more than any other section of the OT. There are a great many times when the NT quotes Isaiah by name; there are many other times it quotes verses from it simply saying that the Scripture says. So for a real understanding of the NT we need to know the book of Isaiah.

The book of Isa. has a Heb. style, that is it is perhaps the finest that ever was written. It has a great deal of alliteration. It has many significant literary features. We will not deal with these in this class except insofar as they pass over into English. But the remarkable thing about Heb. is that so much of it can be translated into other languages. The Mohammedans boast that the Koran is such a great literary masterpiece that cannot possibly be translated; you must read it only in the Arabic! All translations give only a feeble idea of it. The great thing about the Bible is that

while no translation exactly represents it, a tremendous part of its literary excellence can be passed over into another language. One reason for this is the nature of Hebrew poetry. Isaiah's poetry is not so much a matter of particular length of syllables, or of rhyme, though these do enter in to some extent, but it is a matter of parallelism of thought. It is a matter of arrangement of thoughts in a certain order. It is a matter of using the metaphores, and similies and interrogations. Practically every rhetorical figure you will ever find is to be found somewhere in Isaiah. So it is one of the great literary masterpieces in the world, and one of the most important books in the Bible. Yet, unfortunately, it is comparatively little known and understood by Christians.

Most Christians are familiar with a number of isolated verses in Isaiah. They may have memorized the 53rd ch. of Isaiah and some of the great verses earlier in the book that we use at Christmas, but of the great flow of thought in the book, the interrelation of its parts, the sections that do not immediately bear on the life of Christ, most Christians have little idea of.

I have here a book in which a statement is made about the first ch. of Isaiah. It says: "The first ch. is a marvellous condensation. It is a complete manual of religion setting forth the relation of God to His people; the duties growing out of that relation; the errors to be avoided as a result of obedience and of disobedience to the divine will, and this not in the dry abstract terms of a theological system, but in concrete pictures which the simplest soul can understand and appreciate."

But how many have much realization of what there is in Isa. 1. We will not spend a great deal of time on the first ch., because we have many other matters that are intrinsically more important to move on to. But this statement gives an idea of the greatness of the book, and of the amount that can be gained from a careful study of even that one chapter!

#### B. The Importance of the OT.

This, I believe, needs emphasizing among Christians. It's all too often forgotten. I've occasionally passed a church on which I've seen the sign: "No Creed but the NT." That is not a Christian statement! To the Christian the source of his knowledge is not the NT, it is the Bible. And the Bible is One. The NT constantly refers to the OT, constantly quotes the OT. The Apostles and NT writers over and over build their arguments upon quotations from the OT. To the Christian the OT is of tremendous importance. When you think of the fact that in one particular Bible I looked into, the NT covered 396 pages, the OT 1333 pages. In other words, more than 3 times as long. More than 3/4 of the Bible is the OT! The NT brings out the great Christian truths very very clearly and is tremendously important. The study of the OT at the neglect of the NT would be utterly wrong. I've often said it's far better to know Greek thoroughly than to have a slight knowledge of Greek and Hebrew. But even a slight knowledge of Hebrew is of great value in enabling us to read commentaries, and to understand discussions. But, of course, a good thorough knowledge is better, but above all

get a good thorough knowledge and ability to interpret the statements of the NT in the original.

#### C. The Importance of the Prophetic Books.

In the OT the average person who attended S.S. and was familiar with some of the stories in Gen. and Ex., Josh, Kings, and perhaps a very few stories from the prophetic books. But the average Christian never gets into the inside of these books to look at and learn to really understand them. There are principles that you have to have in mind in order to understand them. This Bible I spoke of that has 396 pp. in the N.T. devotes 378 pp. to the books of Isa. through Malachi, to those 17 books of the OT. Almost as long are they as the whole NT! I must confess that in my 2nd yr. of teaching in a theological seminary, I started at the beginning of Isa. and every day read a ch. or two until I got to the end of Malachi, and when I got through I had practically no recollection of anything I had read. It was just words. I did not then understand the principles of interpretation, to have it really meaningful to me. Since then I have devoted thousands of hours to studying it and they are absolutely endless in the amount of vital truth that they contain that is very important for the Christian.

The importance of the prophetic books is something that cannot be overemphasized, but

#### D. The Difficulty of the Prophetic Books

I noticed the difficulties very vividly as I said back when I read them through continuously without any understanding and I was then already teaching my second year in seminary. In my seminary course that I had taken there had been much discussion of minute points of the prophetic books, but to really get into them and understand their meaning and their relation together, and how to go at them I had never really gotten until I got busy studying them, comparing them and finding principles which opened them up and made them living and vital. I'm going to mention 3 difficulties:

1. The Poetic language. The prophetic books are very largely composed of poetic language. Until one recognizes this fact and learns a little about the major appeal to poetry he is not apt to get into the beauty of them or have any real understanding of their meaning. Of course these poetic features are carried over into English. Unfortunately many of the translators have failed to recognize and understand some of these principles, and as a result have made translations, which while may be quite accurate, do not give a proper idea of the interrelation of the parts. One big reason for that is that in Heb. you have one common conjunction, the letter waw. It is the common conjunction which means "and" but it is much broader than our English "and" though our English "and" is much broader than most of us realize. We say: I looked for him and he was not there. You might say that. It would be more accurate to say: I looked for him but he was not there. Our "and" sometimes carries the meaning of "but". In Heb., the waw, which in half the cases at least, is translated by "and" in many many cases is represented by "but" or "yet", "moreover", "then." I came across one verse in Daniel where waw is translated four different ways, in the course of one verse in the KJV!

It simply is a broader word than our English "and" but the English "and" is a broader word than the average English speaker recognizes even though he does use it in the broader way which is part of the language. So the poetic language is one cause of difficulty.

2. The local situation (is a second difficulty). The prophets were not men who sat in an ivory tower somewhere and looked up at the sky and wrote down visions that they saw! Occasionally they did have visions like this, but as a rule they were out among the people dealing with situations. God was giving them messages relating to these situations. Out of the many many messages that God gave his people that had twice the relation to the situation of their time, God selected certain ones to be written down in a book that was to have great meaning for all people in subsequent times. But all of these messages have certain relationships to the local situations. These local situations are explained in the books of Kings and Chronicles. Then some of them later in Ezra and Nehemiah. The local background is often referred to and implied without being fully explained in the prophetic books. Until we find what it is, sometimes we fail to get the full meaning.

3. Their partial glimpses of the future. No prophet, so far as I know, ever sat down to write a full history of the situations that would be ahead. He was not writing a history book for the future. Sometimes people say prophecy is history written in advance! There is a sense in which this true. But we don't understand what history is. We think by that we mean events just one after the other. Now if you take history of the last 50 yrs. and in that history you tell what happened on January 1, 1926 in San Francisco and in Siam and in Hong Kong, and what happened the next day in Paris and in Britain and in Dayton, Ohio, and on, you would never call that a history. It would just be a list of events. A history books gives something of an idea of the interrelation of events. When you do that you've got to take one of those reasons and trace it through. Then take another. You don't go back and forth all the time. You can't. That' would not be a book of history. So the prophets when they wrote of the future they wrote of the particular ideas == they looked with particular ideas in mind and God had them see what related to these ideas. So a prophet might rebuke the people for their sins, and then he might look forward to God's judgment that is coming; then he might comfort the bodily with the blessings God has for them and then he'd look forward to a different area to a particular blessing ahead for them. Thus the glimpses of the future are not any of them complete. Of course they could not see all the future, all the past anyway. But they are particular vistas at particular ==different times, and we have to see interrelationships

So these three specific difficulties are of importance in understanding this book.

#### E. The purposes of Prophecy and Their Relations to Predictions.

There are many purposes of prophecy. The word "prophet" has come to mean simply someone who forthtells the future, but that's not what it means in the Bible. It means a man who speaks on behalf of someone else. The prophet is one who represents God and gives God's

MESSAGE. So that is truly what prophecy is. Some will say that and stress it in such a way as to make you think that they never predicted the future! Actually prophecy is full of predictions of the future, because it is very definitely related to the specific purposes of prophecy. I list these for the moment very briefly under three main heads:

1. To Call Men to Repentance. The prophet is there to call people to repent of their sin and turn to God. He is also there to call God's people, the true believer, to turn away from sin that so easily besets them and to turn back to a fuller obedience to God. So this does not cover simply the unsaved, the ungodly. It covers all those to whom the prophet speaks. The need to call men to repent, and probably 2/3 of ~~the~~ what the prophet wrote was for this specific purpose: to call people to turn away from their sin and to look to the Lord's provision and be saved, and to call people who are already believers to turn away from the sin that so easily leads them astray and to devote themselves more fully to doing the Lord's will. Now prediction has a great deal to do with this because the prophet tells what the future is of those who fail to follow the Lord. He tells of the suffering and misery that is ahead for them, he tells them what God is going to bring upon His own nation in the comparatively near future -- 10 yrs, 100 years. He tells the future in this life and in later times in relation to this call to repentance.

2. The second great purpose of prophecy can be summarized in the words: To Comfort and Reassure Believers. To comfort believers and give them assurance. When a prophet speaks of the terrible things God is going to do as a punishment of his people's sins -- when he stresses this and some of them stress this a tremendous amount of times, and these are not passages we should pass over lightly in our study. We'll have to pass over many of them quickly in this class because we want to get to some of those that are most immediately relevant to us, but I would urge that you study these passages yourselves in coming years for their effect on your life and heart, and on your activity for Christ. But as they did this and stressed the way God was going to deal with those who turned against his holy law, and as He did that the true believers were apt to give way to despair. They knew they were part of the nation. As such they were implicated in its sins. They knew the terrible things the prophets said were definitely going to come; they knew they were ahead for them, and therefore they might tend to become terribly disturbed. So while perhaps 2/3 of the prophetic books are devoted to the purpose of leading men to repentance, leading unconverted men to turn to God, and leading believers to clean up their lives and follow Him more closely, yet perhaps 1/3 of the contents of the prophetic books is devoted to the purpose of comforting and reassuring those who truly believe. Also, it does not say, I've quit talking to these people, now I'm going to talk to these. It does not introduce a sharp indication of a change. In cold print as it stands it just goes straight on and you have to recognize that either the prophet turns his head away from one group to another; he thinks of individuals scattered among the group rather than the whole group; he makes a change in

HIS MANNER PERHAPS WHICH IS NOT INDICATED TO THE WRITING. So as you read it often there is a very sharp & sudden transition from the purpose of calling men to repentance to the purpose of comforting and reassuring believers.

3. The third purpose does not affect us today so directly. That is the purpose of giving specific guidance. That was a great purpose of prophets in ancient times. Isa. said when Sennacherib came with his army and threatened the people of Jerusalem and demanded they surrender and told of the terrible things he would do to them if they didn't and gave them promises that he would be good to them if they would surrender, Isaiah said, Don't surrender, don't give in to him. God is going to protect you. God is going to deliver you.. He said just as birds flying God is going to protect Jerusalem,

But 100 yrs. later Jeremiah was told by the people, O if we just fight and stand here; this is God's city. God will protect it and save it. Jeremiah said, God is going to turn this city over to Babylon. They are going to come in and destroy everything. He said, Surrender to the Babylonians; that is God's will. Of course there were those then who called Jeremiah a false prophet. It was not always easy for people to decide who was the true prophet and who was the false. In that case God gave the people specific evidence. Jeremiah turned to the false prophet who said within a year we are going to be delivered from the Babylonians, and Jeremiah said, Within a year you will be dead. And within a year he was ~~de~~ dead! There was evidence God gave that Jeremiah was the one he was speaking through.

Now this purpose is very important in OT times. It is not of particular importance in the parts of Isaiah we are studying this semester. It just does not happen to enter into them as in other portions. But the sections, wherein this is of importance and a purpose, while not directly as important for us today, are nevertheless of great value to us in showing the manner of God's dealing and the principles we can apply in situations that confront us in the present time. So this matter of giving specific guidance in your general study of the prophets is of great importance, but not so much in your study of this particular semester. But this is vital to recognize that God gave that specific guidance then before His whole Word was available, and now we have the whole Scripture and He wants us to study it and get our principles of guidance from it. So while he may choose at certain times and in certain ways to give us definite personal guidance, His great desire is that we learn to understand His word so we can apply its principles. As He says in the Psalm, He can guide us with His eye, not having to give us direct words but leading us to know that our steps are ordered of Him and that He is working in our lives as we take these principles and apply them.

#### F. The Perspective of Prophecy

We have the glimpses of the future, but how are we going to relate them to each other? Does it proceed right through chronological order? How are they arranged?

1. It is not simply history written in advance. I've already referred to that fact and will not go into it further right now.

2. The order is often logical rather than chronological. The prophet is dealing with God's punishment for sin. Then he tells what God is going to do. Then he is dealing with God's blessing to his people. He looks forward to a particular occasion of blessing that has relevance to the particular matter he is dealing with. Thus the order is often logical rather than chronological. We are doing wrong in assuming that there must be a chronological relationship.

I'm going to give an illustration of this from history books, an illustration that brings out in a very definite and interesting way the fact that the order is often logical rather than chronological. Turn to a passage in the history book, what at first sight you would not say was prediction. In fact, I have even had theological professors say to me, That's not prediction; those are commands. But on a little examination it is obvious they are not commands. This is the story of Elijah, in 1 Kings 19, where the Lord spoke to Elijah and he was so terrified with Jezebel's vain threats that he fled clear down to Sinai and there God showed Himself in power to Elijah in order to comfort, strengthen, and encourage him. Then the Lord said (v.15) "Go and return on your way to the wilderness of Hamascus and when you have arrived you shall anoint Hazael king over Syria!" Now if this was a command, Elijah was a disobedient prophet. He never anointed Hazael king over Syria. But to take it as a command would be utter nonsense because how could Elijah this Israelite prophet who was hated by the King of Israel, how could he go into another country that was larger than and more powerful than Israel even, the country of Syria, and take a man there who was in a subordinate position, unrelated to the King, and anoint him to be king of Syria? It sounds rather preposterous unless God were to work a miracle, and he did not.

When the Lord gave this command to Elijah what he was really doing is giving him a prediction. He is saying, Elijah, you're afraid of you life of King Ahab and Queen Jezebel, but I'm going to make a change in the control of this land of Syria a country much larger and more powerful than the region of Israel where you're so afraid of the rulers. In this greater kingdom, I'm going to make a change there and I'm going to cause a man to become king there who has no relation to the royal family at all, a man who calls himself a son of a nobody. So He gives it in the form of a command, You anoint k him king over Syria. Actually many yrs. later Elijah's successor, Elisha, went over to Syria, and there he met this man, Hazael, and Elisha began to weep and Hazael said, Why are you weeping? And Elisha said, I'm weeping because I'm thinking of the terrible way you're going to treat the people of Israel as you attack and destroy it, etc. And Hazael said, Why, who am I; I'm just the son of a nobody. I'm just like a dog, I'm the servant of the king. How could I do anything like this? If I did I would merely be carrying out the king's orders! And Elisha looked at him and said, The Lord has shown me that you are going to be king of Syria. Then Hazael went back to the king's palace, and the king was

ill and Hazael took a wet cloth and put it over his face and killed him, and Hazael made himself king. The Syrian records refer to him as Hazael the son of a nobody seized the throne. Elijah never anointed him, but God predicted this was going to happen.

Jeho the son of

The next v. continues, "And/Nimshi you shall anoint king over Israel." Here was another man who was not related to the royal family. In this case there was a real anointing, but it wasn't done by Elijah. It was some years after Elijah's death that Elisha sent someone else -- Elisha didn't anoint him --- but Elisha sent one of the prophets with him, and he went out to where they were fighting against the Syrians and he went in there and poured oil on Jehu's head, and thus Jehu was anointed and Jehu immediately made rebellion against the son of Ahab and made himself king. God is not here giving a command but a prediction that Jehu will become king over the complete kingdom and dynasty of Israel. Before he gave == After he said this in v.16, he continued and ~~Elisha~~ Elisha. . . . you shall anoint a prophet in your place.

Elijah could not pick up a man and anoint him to be prophet in his place! As far as the Scripture goes, he never anointed Elisha. In fact, when ~~Elijah~~ Elijah was taken up to heaven, he asked Elisha, the one who poured water on his hands and washed him, his menial servant, and he tried to get away from him, and Elisha stayed with him. Finally he said, What would you like me to do for you when I'm taken up from you? Elisha said, I'd like to have a double portion of your spirit. That means a duplicate portion, or more perhaps the portion of the elder son, the double portion of the older son of a man's inheritance. ' I'd like to be your successor," in other words. Well, Elijah did not say, "I'm ready to anoint you to be prophet in my place." Elijah said, That's a hard request. He said, Only if you see me when I'm taken up will you know that you will be my successor.

So these were not commands, these in 1 Kings 19:15-18, but the verses I put up there -- 2 Kings 8:8-15 tells how Hazael became king of Syria; 2 Ki.9:1-13 tells how Jehu became king of Israel; and 1 Ki.19:19-21 tells how Elijah threw his mantle over Elisha when Elisha was plowing, and when Elisha said, Wait a bit till I say good-bye to my family and I'll follow you, Elijah said, "What have I to do with you?" That's pretty far from anointing him to be his successor! They are predictions of who the successors will be and the changes God is going to make. But you notice the order of them? Elisha was called to be his successor before either of the other two was fulfilled. The order is logical rather than chronological. It starts with the great kingdom of Syria -- God is going to make a change there. Then it goes to the kingdom of which Elijah was so terrified -- God is going to make a change there, and then he said Elijah, "you've done a great work and deserve great credit, but now you've gotten frightened because of this wicked woman and fled into the wilderness, you're through. Your work has got to be carried on by someone else. You are not able to go ahead and do the great work that's needed to follow up the wonderful things you've done. We have to train an entirely new



man to do that and that man will be Elisha. But that one was fulfilled long before either of the other two! The order is not 1,2,3; it is 2,3,1. The order of prophecy is often that way. It is logical rather than chronological.

An illustration that often occurs to me is the illustration of a mountain range. If you look at the range . . . you see the near hills and it will be higher in some places and lower in others, and then behind that there may be another range, and another range.. Maybe three or four ranges. As you look at the nearer one you can't tell often whether the one you see back of it is right back of it or there is a big space in between. You'll look at one range and you'll see behind a certain part of it a third range. The second does not show. Then you look a bit and still further along you'll see the first and the second. Then you look a little further on and you'll see the first and the third and the fourth. It varies. You might say, It's logical; it's the particular place where you look. And the chronology is what you see back of it. You look at one and then the other. So the order is logical rather than chronological.

Now instead of giving the next point right now, I'm going to do something now that I should do at the end of class and usually forget to do, so I'm going to do it now instead. That is to assign the lesson for next week, Sept. 20 . . . (Remarks referring to the overhead projector . . . )

Assignment: 1. Note all correspondences as to thought between the early verse of Isa. 2 and those in Micah 4. This I'll say some more about, but for the moment just get it in mind. (I hope the first part of the assignment will be to review today's lecture because it's far easier to review it now than before exams. If you'll review it now it won't take a fourth of the time as if you reviewed it before exams. Please review sometime in the near future what we've ~~gone~~ gone over this hour.) Then note the correspondences -- write out.

2. Note any important connections between each of these two groups of verses and the later verses of the preceding chapter. As you look at 2 look back at the last vv. of Is. 1 and see the connection. As you look at Mic. 4 look back at Mic. 3 and see if there is a close connection. The ch. divisions in the Bible were put in by an English Archbishop in the 13th century. It is amazing in the book of Hebrews how often the first verse in each ch. is a summary of the previous ch. It might just as well be the last verse of the previous ch. Many times the ch. divisions are quite wrong. G. Campbell Morgan, the noted English expositor said once in my hearing, that in 9 cases out of 10 the ch. divisions were wrong! I think he was quite extreme. I think often they were very well put. But they are badly placed on enough occasions that it is always well to look back to the connection. Write out any important connection; not trivial things.

3. Explain the purpose of Is. 2:1. What do you

think its purpose is? Please answer each of these questions from your own study without using helps. This is what you find. I find one can get far more from the Bible than from most helps of others. If you need help you find you get far more help from the helps if first you try to do it yourself. This is to be done direct from the Bible and I don't care what version you use. Use any Bible version you wish. In fact if we have variety within the class so much the better, but I'd like you to state on your paper what version you are using.

After you have done this yourself you may look in one or more commentaries and state their answer to question 3. I'm not asking you necessarily to do this but if you're interested in seeing what commentaries say about the purpose of Is.2:1, it will be interesting to see what they say, and I fear most of them will say something that does not add much understanding to it.

(Question: Will this be a standard procedure that we should usually do our own studying and then consult something else?)

Exactly it is not my purpose that you look at a lot of books and compare their statements. It is much better to look at the Scripture and see what you get from it. Then look at other things if you want to.

(Question: Do you have a recommended translation? I just picked up the NIV.)

The KJV has some very bad ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ slip ups in it, but on the whole it is an excellent translation, probably ~~shes~~ as good ~~aw~~ translation as has ever been made. But it's in the language of 300 yrs. ago and many words give a different impression than what they did to the writers 300 yrs. ago. I got used to it through most of my life and ~~a~~ am still using it mainly. The NASB is a on the whole a good accurate, literal translation. Very useful. The NIV has some fine renderings, but some terrible ones too. I think it was done too hastily. I think they wanted to get something out quickly to arouse interest in the OT, which I hope will be an excellent production, but it has some very fine renderings. You may use any of those or you may use the Jerusalem Bible, the RSV, the NEB, or any other for this particular class. . . . Time and again the translations fail to see the interrelation, and consequently give a good verse translation, but in point after point where either of two meanings could fit just as well as far as the immediate literal translation, one will show the relationship to what precedes or what follows, and the other won't. In all three cases there are important things that were just overlooked by the translations who put their attention on the meaning of the particular sentence, rather than on the meaning of the particular sentence in relation to its ? ? So I don't care which translation you use.

Turn in your paper to the seminary office not later than noon of next Friday, so I can look them over before our next class.

Now the first of these questions: Note these correspondences. I'd like to give you an idea of how I'd like that done. (Overhead projector display of Isaiah 2:2. I put a 1 by v.2 meaning this v. is very similar to Mic.4:1.....The two verses are almost identical. So I put a 2 Micah to show that is very close to the first verse of Isa. 2. A 1l to show it's like that v. in Micah.)

Look at the first 5 vv. of these chs. You'll find little difference not related to our present purposes. ~~XXX~~ For our present purposes we will call these two vv. identical even though they are not exact . . . If you find the idea of 3/4 of the verse . . .? ? ? Indicate which verses in each are related in thought to the others, not to fit in identical words. Actually among the prophetic books you will rarely find two passages so similar as these. It is very interesting that we do have this similarity.

For this particular thing it would be better not to use the NIV because we don't have the NIV of Micah. In any other translation you will be able to see the verbal similarities much more closely, than in comparing just Isaiah(NIV) with one of the others.

We go on to the divisions of the book of Isaiah. When you look at Isaiah you'll find ch.36-39 are different from the rest. Isa. is what we call a book of prophecy. He is exhorting, looking forward to the future. He is comparing things. ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~. It is a series of messages. That is very different from Kings of Chronicles. But in the book of Isa. which has comparatively few statements of events, historical statements, aside from ch. 36-39, you have there 4 chs. which describe a series of events. In the course of them Isa. gives some messages. But you have somebody came and said something. Somebody answered. Certain things happened. It is a historical section. So Isaiah naturally divides into 3 parts:

ch. 1-27 is separated from chs. 40 to 66 by this historical section.

There are those who call chs. 1-39 one Isaiah, and call ch.40-66 dual Isaiah, and say it was written 150 yrs. later! I don't believe that at all. It is interesting to note that just as the Bible has 39 books in the OT, and 27 in the new. The first Is. had 39 chs. and the rest of the book is 27. Purely coincidental but a help in remembering the division.

This historical section is in the middle. Up to there the ch. divisions are quite well made. Ch.1-6 is the section we are going to study as Part I of this course. Then ch.7-12 is the Book of Immanuel. Chs. 13-23 is largely about other nations. Ch.24-27 is called the Isaiah Apocalypse -- consumation of the ages following the statements largely about other nations. Ch.28-35 Immanuel continues. Last yr. we studied ch.7-12 and 28-35 which makes one unit closely related. These divisions could all be made according to chs. But when you go on after ch.36, the ch. divisions are very poorly made. There are two main divisions after that: chs.40:1-56:8

which I used to call the Gospel of Isaiah. I've now changed it to Isaiah Sees the Saviour. Because this is the section which tells about the atonement. It leads up to it, explains it, stresses it. I gave a course in this section 2 yrs. ago. It ends abruptly at 56:8. Abruptly, I should say, the Archbishop didn't notice it there, because the next three vv. of ch. 56 belong with the main part of the book. We are going to in this course to take those as Part II -- that last half. That is a section of Isa. which is comparatively little known, but one of the most thrilling sections of the whole book.

#### H. The Structure of Isaiah 1-6 and the Comparison to Mic. 1-4.

Isaiah and Micah prophesied at about the same time. Many books refer to Micah as Isaiah's younger (contemporary) -- as a man who was younger than Isaiah, but I know of no evidence for that. We don't know which was younger; which was older. But the first 6 chs. of Isaiah and the 7 (?) chs. of Micah start in with rebuke for sins and then go on to deal with God's blessing, then another passage of rebuke for sin, then another passage of blessing for the future. This section of Micah corresponds with the first one in Isaiah. Then you again have a passage of rebuke for sin, then the last ch. of this section of Is. and the last ch. of Micah is either a prayer to God or a vision of God. So there is a remarkable similarity of structure between them.

For next time I would like you to make this comparison between the beginning of Micah 4 and the beginning of Is. 2, noting the relationship of each to the last few verses of the preceding chapters. Please get those papers to me by Friday Noon!

I meant to show you the ( . . . indistinct . . . ) That I'll show you next time.

Commentaries often have helpful ideas, and sometimes have very misleading ideas. But for this class, I am anxious that before you do anything with the commentaries, you study the Scripture text yourself. We are not requiring any language for this course; it is possible to take this as a first year student. I'm not requiring for this class, unless specifically so stated, any study in commentaries, but any you want to do will I think be valuable to you. But I'd like you to study it first yourself.

About 20 years ago, I had two students who had graduated, who had had my work for 3 yrs., and then they went to another seminary which at that time was quite a conservative seminary, and they worked there for a Th.D. I talked with them after they had been there about 2 yrs, and they said, We have a tremendous advantage over the students in this seminary who had their undergraduate work here. They said, these students here are accustomed on every question to look up commentaries and say, These commentaries say this, and these commentaries say that, and lay they off one against another and see what the different opinions are. But they said, None of them are able as we are to go right to the Scriptures and see what it says; and it's amazing how many things that are quite obvious in the Scripture are overlooked by most of the commentaries. Commentaries have the habit of copying from one another. Sometimes when some very great student who has written a commentary that has a lot of excellent material in it, will get careless about some passages he's not so interested in as others, and make some rather foolish mistakes on those passages. It's amazing how many later commentaries will copy his mistakes! So my great interest in this course is that you learn to go direct to the Scripture yourself and see what is there, and then after that if you want to do some study in commentaries, that's all to the good, of course.

Today I gave you an assignment which involved a comparison of Micah 4 and Isaiah 2. In this comparison, I was interested to see what you could get. On the overhead projector you cannot see all that is on this paper, but I'm interested in your seeing the part assigned. I believe all that is visible. As you compare the verses, as a rough comparison at first, you see that in Is.2:2 is almost identical with Mic.4:1 In Is.2:3 is almost identical with the second verse of Micah. The 4th verse in Is. 2 is almost identical with the 3rd verse in Micah. But then the 4th v. in Micah, the first part of it, has nothing corresponding to it in Isaiah. Yet as you look at that 4th v. the first portion of the verse, you see that actually they are a development of what has already in the previous verse. So by not having those verses in Isaiah, you don't have it expressed quite as clearly and fully as you do in Micah, but you might say it is inferred in what Isaiah had in the previous verse. "They will not learn war any more." There will be no violence! No external danger. Now Micah makes this more specific. I don't think he adds to it, but makes it more specific in that 4th v. There he says, "They shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree, and none shall make them afraid." He has in mind the time when the Assyrian Army is spread all over the land of Judah, and the people are safe behind the great walls of Jerusalem, and they do not dare go out. They are protected from the army as long as those walls stand.

They don't dare go out where the roving bands can come by and injure them. Even within our present generation, a condition somewhat similar in Palestine. In 1929 I travelled through a considerable part of back country of Pal. on horseback. There was four of these ~~fx~~ born in four different continents! We had some Arabs with us to take care of the stuff; we had a number of mules to carry our stuff. We camped at night. I don't know as you can do that in that area now. At that time it was very interesting. Conditions were much more like they had been for a couple thousand of years, than they are today.

Dr. Albright who was leading the party spoke Arabic very fluently and had been in Palestine many years, was very familiar with the customs and circumstances. Every time we were in the back country when night approached, we'd find an Arab village and we'd come to that village and the leader of the village would come out. Dr. Albright would greet him; he would welcome him to the village, and we were under their ~~pro~~protection. We could camp on the edge of the village. We would hire someone from the village to sit out in front of our tent at night to watch for sneak thieves and that sort of thing, but as far as any real danger was concerned, we were perfectly safe because we were under the protection of that village.

We heard how just a year before, a young couple from Czechoslovakia had begun to make a walking trip carrying their provisions, and they had gone from Czechoslovakian westward through Europe down through ~~Spain~~ Spain and had crossed Gibraltar and had come along the northern section of ~~Africa~~ Africa and had come to Palestine, and had had no injuries or difficulties until they got into Palestine....There they were not aware of the customs of the country. At night they camped in a place where the nearest village was a mile and a half away. There were 3 villages in 3 different directions. So they weren't under the protection of any one of them. You might say they were out in the open, out under their vine and under their fig tree! During the night, the son of one of the heads of the villages and two of his friends came down and began to seize their property, and ~~when~~ they objected they were both killed. Later on the British Govt. which then held the mandate for Palestine, discovered who the criminals were and hanged them. But it illustrated ~~the~~ the fact that even within the present generation it was not safe in Palestine out in the open to camp over night. In the protection of the town you were safe. The hospitality, they felt, was a sacred duty. But out there under your vine and fig tree there was constant danger someone would come along of whom you had every reason to be afraid..

So Micah adds this and this is not really an addition; it merely makes it more specific. They shall not make war any more, they will not even learn how to make war any more, previous verse . . . So Micah does not add anything. He simply makes more specific what's already been said., in the greater part of his fourth verse. But the last verse, the last line of the 4th verse, adds another idea. He says, For the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it. Here is something so tremendous, so important to the people living in that area at almost any time in its history, it is so tremendous. So a few years ago that would have seemed very strange to us in America. We are getting now so that it is more

like here as it used to be there. But it seemed very strange to them at that time, I'm very sure. That there would be none to make them afraid. In order to give us assurance that this is true, he gives us the words "for the mouth of the Lord has spoken it." This then is a distinct idea in this fourth verse.

Does this idea have any parallel in the corresponding passage in Isaiah? That's an interesting question.

Now we look at the next verse. I asked you to compare vv.1-5. You notice that v. 5 has considerable general similarities. In v.5, in both they are speaking about walking, about walking in the name of the Lord, or-about walking in the light of the Lord. There is considerable similarity, and I believe these verses go together.

Now the Bible from which I copied this, in Is.2 you notice they put a heading separating v.4 from v.5. I think that's a mistake. I think it goes with what precedes. It is parallel with the same verse in Micah. There is much similarity between the two. I think you can consider them as parallel, and the way the next v. starts does not make much sense in relation to it. "Let us walk in the light of the Lord. Therefore thou hast forsaken thy people" You have to assume a lot. There is a break there, after v.5. The break certainly should not come after v.4.

Now we speak a little more about the relation between these two passages when we take them up as we go through the book. I'm just speaking in relation to the assignment now. The second part of the assignment: I asked you to compare each section in Is. and Mic. with the immediate preceding context. Most everybody said there was quite a similarity or relationship between these and what preceding. That's true of most anything in the prophetic books. The greater part of the prophetic books is made up of rebuke for sin; the next greatest part is blessing for God's people, and promise of the wonderful things God is going to do in the future. These are related. These themes are so closely related you will always find some relation between almost anything in the prophetic books and anything almost anywhere else in the prophetic books.

But in one case here it seems to me there is a very specific relationship, a very close relationship. (Looking at the overhead projector: Notice I have underlined different words. The words I've underlined in green: Zion, Jerusalem, and the mountain of the house. Now you look on to the next verse, the first v. of the next ch., the way it has later on been divided into chs., and you find that in those next 2 vv. those very same ~~2~~ two places are spoken of again! These same three places. The previous statement: "Therefore shall Zion for your sakes be plowed as a field. Terrible punishments to come upon Zion, the place where David's palace was. And Jerusalem will become heaps -- piles of refuse. Terrible punishment God is going to bring to Jerusalem. 'And the mountain of the house' which perhaps is more literally translated 'the temple hill' -- it is the Heb. word that means mountain; often it means almost any hill. It may mean a great mt. It may mean a medium sized hill. The mountain of the house, or the temple will will become just like a high place in a forest. It has nothing particular to stand out as different from the surrounding area. This wonderful temple is going to disappear.

It is going to be just like a place in the wilderness. But these three specific statements of the terrible things God is going to allow to Jerusalem are made in Micah, and there is no parallel for them in the corresponding passage in Isaiah.

When you go on to the next verse in Micah, he immediately says, It will come to pass that the mountain of the house of the Lord, or temple hill, will be established in the top of the mt. The previous v. says the mountain will be like a high place in a forest. Now he says it will be established in the top of the mt. The next v. says that the law will go forth from Zion. V.12 said, Zion will be plowed as a field. It says, The word of the Lord will go forth from Jerusalem. The last v. of the previous ch. said, Jerusalem will become heaps.

There is a relationship then between the last v. of Mic.3, and the first 2 vv. of the fourth ch. There is a close relationship. There is a relationship between almost any passage in the prophetic books, and the preceding or following passage. But here is a very close relationship. Three specific words used to indicate important places in or about Jerusalem that will be utterly destroyed, and then says they are to become great world centers! Now that is a relationship! between the previous ch. and the following in Micah that is far & far closer than the relationship between the previous ch. and the following one in Isaiah.

Then, of course, in addition to that Micah writes smoothly forward. God is going to bring this terrible overthrow, but God is going to bring tremendous blessing to these very places. It reads right straight on in a continuous discourse. Whereas in Isaiah he has one ch., mostly of rebuke for sin ending and then he says, The word that Isaiah saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem. It sounds like a heading. It seems like a natural place to make a ch. division. In Micah it doesn't seem like a natural place to make a ch. division; it is just a direct continuation. So I was interested in seeing how many of you would notice that close relationship between the previous ch. and the following ch. in Micah a relationship much closer than it is in Isaiah.

I've underlined in 3 places in green. Can you all read that from where you are sitting? Big enough?

Now, the question about 2:1 is a very interesting question. How many ch. in Isaiah have the heading: This is the vision Isaiah saw? This is the word God gave to Isaiah? Out of 66 ch. you'll find very very few cases. Most of the cases where there are headings come in connection with the visions mostly about foreign nations --between chs. 13 and 23. There are a few there: the burden of this country, the burden of Egypt, etc. That you'll occasionally find. Ordinarily you don't find separate headings in Isaiah. You just go straight on and you have to figure out where the g break comes. Now you might think that Isaiah would put a heading at the beginning of his book and another heading at the middle of his book, perhaps putting the things that he wrote in the latter part of his life separate from the first part. But you have no ref. to Isaiah in the last 27 ch. of the book. His name does not occur there at all. There are very few such headings in the book. Now what a strange thing to have a heading which seems to describe the whole book in Is.1:1 and then to have another heading in Is.2 which might just as well describe the whole book as the heading in ch. 1! How strange to have it there.



You don't have it in ch.3; or in ch.4; or in ch.5. You have it very seldom. You might think somewhere in the middle to have such a heading, but to put it right at the beginning of the ch.2. Very strange! I have not come across any commentary -- there may be some, but I've not come across any -- that give what I consider to be the natural explanation of the reason why this particular heading is here. I believe the clue is found in that last part of the fourth verse of Micah. He says: "For the mouth of the Lord of hosts has spoken it." Isa.2:1 says, The word that Isaiah the son of Amos saw, concerning Judah and Jerusalem."

The word "saw" there is not the ordinary word for saw. It is the word used primarily for the vision the prophets had. Certainly the meaning is clear. This is something Isaiah received as a revelation from God about the fut. of Judah and Jerusalem. I do not believe that is a heading for chs.2-4 as some commentaries say. Some say 2-12; one said 2-4. Some may say the second chapter. I don't think it is ~~as~~ all. I think it is a heading to the first five verses of the second ch. I believe here Isaiah is saying, Where I'm going to give you now is such a wonderful thing --- complete end of violence! complete end of danger! of war! Jerusalem becoming the very center from which God's Word goes out to a-1 the world! It's such a tremendous thing that I want to assure you that this is a message I have received from God. So I believe this is paramount to the latter part of that 4th verse in Micah where he said, "For the mouth of the Lord hath spoke it." Isaiah said, "The word that Isaiah ~~saw~~ saw regarding Judah and Jerusalem.

The two, I think, are parallel in ideas. But Isa. adds one thing Micah did not have. Micah simply goes right on with what he had been giving. Isaiah said, The word that Isaiah saw about Judah and Jerusalem. It is my feeling that in both cases the Lord gave them a vision not in which they saw words passing along like they sometimes have in front of a big building up in New York, or perhaps in other places where you see the big new that has come from such a country is that such a thing has happened. Not words passing in front of him like that! But he saw a picture, a wonderful picture, and he describes it. The Holy "pirit by inspiration kept the writer from error and prevented him from saying anything in the picture vision God had given him that was not correct.

So we have a statemnt that is inspired by God and that is free from error, but the statement is not necessarily the Words God gave the prophet, it is a true picture of what God caused the prophet to state but stated perhaps in the prophet's own words, but these words kept from error as we believe all Scripture is kept from error. Now there are some commentaries that speak of Micah as Isaiah's younger contemporary. Well, ~~of~~ if they had said, his smaller contemporary, or his contemporary who wrote a smaller book, that would be true because Micah wrote only 7 chs. while Isaiah wrote 66! But as to which of them was older, I know of no evidence anywhere that tells which was older. ~~Eabh~~ Each of them names the kings under whom he wrote and they mean(name) the same thing(ones). We have no way of knowing which was older and which was younger. It is my personal guess and I think a very good one, that Isaiah read the words of Micah and said those words describe the vision that I had too. God has given me the same vision! So when he says, The word that Isaiah saw, he's not saying Micah didn't see(say) it He is saying, I have also received this vision from God. This thing someone may have

This thing that someone may have read in Micah, the words that he gave describe pretty well what I saw. There is no reason I should make up new words to describe it; I can use pretty generally the same words he did. He did not use exactly the same, but they are 19 words out of 20 are identical with the words Micah used.

There is one interesting difference. In the very first v. of this, Micah says, Nations shall flow unto it. No Micah is on the left up there, he says, People shall flow unto it. Isaiah says, All nations shall flow unto it. He stresses its universality a little more than Micah did. There is a place further on where Micah stresses its universality a little more than Isaiah did. But to my mind that is a satisfactory explanation of the reason why we have a new heading at the beginning of ch.2 I don't think it is a heading for the whole ch., but just for the first five verses as a heading to say: I put my authority back of this thing too. God gave me this same vision. It doesn't fit in with what I just said, like it does with Micah. It is a part of Micah's continued presentation. But it is a vision I saw which can logically come at this point, and I Isaiah am certifying that God has caused me to have it.

(Question: How can you tell whether Is. got his from Micah or Micah got his from Isaiah?)

You can't tell which got it from the other, but the fact that Micah's words fit in right with his previous verses that flows straight along, while in Isaiah there is a new start seems to me to be a strong argument in the direction of it being originally a part of Micah rather than a part of Isaiah. If that's the case the fact Isaiah puts his name to it, it seems to me, gives a reason for it. He says, Yes, You've read this in Micah. I'm not just copying something Micah said. I'm telling you something I also saw, a vision God gave me.

So much then for a summary of the assignment I gave you for today. I'm not so interesting in your knowing what I think, or in what any commentary says; I'm interested in your learning how to get into the book and see what's there. That takes practice, time and effort, and I hope you will not merely learn what certain chs. of Isaiah mean, but get , learn methods of getting into the Scripture that will enable you in studying any part of the OT or NT to go further in your understanding than you would otherwise.

In our outline we had reached H at the end of the last hour, under Roman Numeral I . I had spoken about the fact that the Book of Micah naturally divides into six divisions though there are seven chs. In Micah the whole of ch. 1 and all but the last 2 vss. of the 2nd ch. is rebuke to the people for their sins. Then there are 2 vv. of marvellous blessing. In Micah ch. 3 is rebuke for sin, but ch. 4, the whole ch., is various aspects of fut. blessing God is going to give His people. Then ch. 5 again is largely rebuke for sin. Though toward the end of it there is some blessing, and then the last part of Micah is dealing more with Micah's relationship with God and God's blessing to him. We're not so interested in Micah now. I'm interested in pointing out the similarity of organization between the 7 chs. of Mic. and the first 6 chs. of Isaiah which are a definite unite separate from chs. 7-12, which we call

the Book of Immanuel because they deal with a very specific situation and some very wonderful promises.

But these first 6 chs. of Isa. are similar to Micah, in that the first ch. is very largely rebuke, and then you have 5 vv. of fut. blessing. There you have the rest of ch. 2 == Then you have the rest of ch. 2 and ch.3 mostly rebuke for sin, and declaration of God's punishment that is coming. Then ch.4 of Isaiah is mostly future blessing. Ch. 2 of Isa. we noticed being almost identical to ch. 4 of Micah.. Then in Isaiah you have rebuke for sin again through ch. 5, and then you have Isaiah's personal experience of coming to know God more intimately in ch.6.

The greater part of the prophetic books is thus made up of declarations of rebuke and punishment for sin on the one hand, and of promises of blessing God is going to bring in the near or distant time.

I have a rather short assignment for you which I would like you to turn in by Friday noon again at the office. For next time I would like to have you jump over to Isaiah 56 and 57. Look at those two chs. and indicate which sections of them are rebuke, which are blessing. Which sections deal particularly with the people's sin or with God's punishment of sin; which parts deal with God's promised blessings ~~xxx~~ for His people. Look for that purposes in ch.56-57. Then you might make just a brief summary of their contents. Viz: vv.1-7 deal with; vv.8-- deal with Just where the natural breaks occur in those two chs.

I thought this was the logical place to give the assignment after going into H which I barely touched on in the end of the last hour. The similarities between the first 6 chs. of Isaiah and the seven chs. of the book of Micah.

Now we go on to Roman Numeral II, which is the first ch. of Isaian This ch.(ch.1)(put on overhead projector) . . . Under this,

A. Verse 1. "The vision of Isa. son of Amos . . . (notice that up to there it is almost identical with 2:1), but he goes on and tells when";" In the days of ~~XXXXXX~~ Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah.

I have looked up what I wrote in the ZPEB as the dates for these kings, and I'll dictate them to you just for your records. I don't ask you to memorize them. Uzziah reigned from 791 to 740. The Script. says he reigned 52 yrs. There is only 51 between these but as you count each of them it's 52. Of course we have no reason to think he died on the same day of the yr. in which ~~he~~ he became king.

Jotham probably reigned from 750 to 732. Notice it overlaps. You read in ~~II~~ I Kings how Uzziah sinned against the Lord, and God made him a ~~12345~~ leper. So during the latter yrs. of his reign, he lived apart. Though he was still king, Jotham was also king. So there were two kings at that time.

Ahaz, 736-716. According to this figuring Ahaz was king 4 yrs. while his father was also king. Uzziah reigned so long, it is probable Jotham was along in years when his father died, and he having been co-king with his father so long, it would be quote natural for

him to follow the practice and make his son king while he was still living. It was good practice for a king anyway to make his successor king while he is still there; it prevents an upheaval after his death.

Whether this actually was the case we don't know. We have certain dates we can fix by parallels to the history of the Assyrian king. Then between them you have to try to fit them in. But a Prof. Thiele, who spent many yrs. studying the chronology, has suggested these dates, and they seem to work pretty well with the evidence we have.

Hezekiah, 716-687, he reigned.

B. Verses 2-6. THE LORD'S COMPLAINT. The division between ch. 1 and ch. 2 is a very definite division. The division between ch. 2:5 and 2:6 is a very definite division. These divisions within ch. one are less definite. Someone might suggest a place at a different place. But I think this is a fairly logical ~~isd~~ division. "Hear O ~~Heavens~~, and give ear O earth. I have nourished and brought up children and they have rebelled against Me." A terrible denunciation. When you think of all that God did for Israel ~~xxx~~ bringing them up out of Egypt, caring for them in the wilderness, protecting them as he did. "I have nourished and brought up children and they have rebelled against me." It is something that is repeated over and over in human history. It is good for parents to realize that it is something that often repeats itself. Often I have had people say to me, I don't know what to do with that son 19 yrs. of age, 18 yrs. of age. He just won't pay attention to anything I say. Everything he does is different from what I think he ought to do. I don't waly say what I think, but what I think is, You had your chance. You had him during his formative years. A child before~~x~~ he reaches 14 is tremendously influenced by his parents, but when he gets in his later teens he doesn't like to be pushed. You can push him a lot in earlier years, as long as you don't overdo it, you can push him a lot in earlier years, but when he reaches the age of adolescence, what you've done before has a tremendous effect on him, but what you do then will not have so much effect. The main thing you can do for him then, is to pray for him and show him forbearance.

Think of the heart of God! You think of how a parent feels, and think of how God felt after all He had done for Israel. He had nourished and brought up children and they had rebelled against Him. "The ox knows his owner and the ass his master's cribb, but Israel does not know, my people do not consider. O sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a seed of evil-doers, children that are corrupted, they have forsaken the Lord, they have provoked the Holy One of Israel to anger. They are gone away backward. Why should you be stricked any more. You will revolt more and more. The whole head is sick; the whole heart sick, from the soul of the foot even to the head there is no soundness in it. But wounds, bruises and. . . they have not been . . . bound up . . . with ointment." The Lord's complaint which begins the Book of Isaiah.

That 5th verse: Why should ye be stricked any more? You will revolt more and more." The Heb. there is an imperfect, and the imperf. is quite commonly trans. future as the KJV has done here. But the imperf. very often expresses a frequentative idea, an action that

occurs and is repeated rather than something in the present or in the past. It is used in the past in =en. 2 where it says that a mist would come up and water the earth. It uses the imperfect although it is talking about things way back in the Garden of Eden. It is referring to something that occurs and occurs and occurs again. So I think it might express the idea a little better here if we said: Why should you be stricken any more; you revolt, more and more. The whole head is sick. . . . Translate it thus as ~~afrequentative~~ rather than as future.

### C. Verses 7-9. THE DESOLATION OF THE LAND.

I don't know which would be more useful to you right now. To have the verses before you. You all have Bibles where you can look at the verses, or to have this outline, before you.

These verses are quite different from what preceded them. Your country is desolate, your cities are burned with fire. Your land strangers devour it in your presence, and it is desolate as overthrown by strangers . . . left as a besieged city . . . like unto Gomorrah." These verses seem to describe a condition that is actually in existence as he writes. Some take this as a prophetic perfect. They take it as a description of something God is going to bring. But I have looked at 5 of the more most recent translations of the Bible, two by evangelicals, two by other scholars, and in all five I find they take it just as the KJV does, as a present event, present situation. That can exactly fit if Isaiah wrote these words while Hezekiah was king, when Sennacherib came as king of Assyria and overran the whole land in 701 B.C. At that time the whole land was overcome. Lachish the second largest city in Judah was taken prisoner, the city was overcome, demolished, and thousands were carried off into captivity by Sennacherib.

And Jerusalem was left alone. We read the history of that period in Is. 36-37, and also in Kings and Chronicles. A time when for nearly 3 yrs. they expected at any time the A-syrian army would come an attack Jerusalem, and that it also would be demolished. But Isa. said to them in later chs. of the book Jerusalem is not going to be taken; God is going to protect His city as birds flying He will protect Jerusalem. It won't be by your strength, or power. It will be by His action. Then we read in Kings, Chron, and in Isaiah how the Lord destroyed great numbers of the Assyrian army. Probably it was by a great plague He sent and Sennacherib could do nothing but return across the desert to his home in Mesopotamia. This exactly describes this situation. The country was desolate; strangers were devouring it; the people from the walls of Jerusalem could see the foreign troops as they were destroying village after village . . . a besieged city. He said, Except the Lord of host had left unto us a very small remnant we should have been like Sodom and Gomorrah."

So we have here certain verses that were doubtless written at that particular time. I incline to think these first 6 chs. were gathered together as an introduction to the whole book. They represent material he had given at various times during his long life as God's prophet, but making a good introduction to the whole book, chs. 1-6/

But this particular situation reflects the situation at that particular time.

By the way this 9th v. is quoted in Rom.9:29, but in the context in Rom. there is not much specific reference to this situation in Isaiah but simply to the fact that it was only due to God's mercy that any people were left. So it fits well in the context in Romans, but it does not draw on the whole situation here, just on this general aspect of it.

#### D. Verses 10-15 THE FUTILITY OF EMPTY CEREMONIES.

These are verses that can be very applicable in our own day. We have to transpose some of the words in them to fit our own day, because we don't have the same type of religious observance they had then. But they are just as applicable when this transposition is made.

"Hear the word of the Lord ye rulers of Sodom . . . To what purposes is the multitude of your sacrifices . . . I am full of burnt offerings and rams . . . I delight not in the blood of bullocks or of lambs or of he-goats." There is a large school of OT interpretation that thinks of the prophets as being against the temple services, and the priests in supporting them, and there being a conflict between the two, and they quote such passages as these. But it is entirely a misunderstanding. Isaiah is not against the sacrificial system. In fact, he promises elsewhere in the book, that everything the sacrificial system stands for will continue. He's not against anything that is taught or prescribed in "cripture, but he is against putting our faith in such matters.

He says, For what purpose are these things? When you come to appear before me, who has required this of your hands to tread my courts? Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination to me. The new moons and sabbaths, I cannot away with. It's iniquity even the solemn meeting." That's a strange statement: I cannot away with. You take the four words as they stand in the KJV. If you make a break in them like I did, I think it makes more sense. "I cannot. Away with!" I think a better interpretation is perhaps the way some modern translations take it. They say: I cannot bear your new moons, your sabbaths, you calling of assemblies. Away with the iniquity, even your solemn feasts"! I'm not sure that is better, but the idea is the same in either case. There is no punctuation in the Hebrew. The punctuation in Heb. was put in many years after the Bible was originally written. The ch. divisions were not put in until the 13th cent. A.D. In the 10th cent. the Massorets, a group of Heb. scribes put in certain accent marks which show where they think there should be stress, and where they think there should be division. But this simply indicates the tradition handed down by word of mouth. It's pretty hard to hand down such things as that.

Now the ~~XXXX~~ vowel points also represent tradition handed down by word of mouth, but it is much easier to preserve that as you read it, as it is read over and over through the ages. It is much easier to preserve the vowels than to preserve these accents. So some scholars say, forget the vowels, just the consonants are what is inspired. Most scholars say, The vowels represent a very well preserved tradition, but not quite as well preserved tradition as the ~~xxx~~ consonants. But the accents most of us don't pay much attention to. Some of them we

don't know for sure what they mean, anyway. But in your Heb. Bible there are a great many of these little accent marks, which most Christian scholars simply disregard. Except once in a while someone has a big argument he wants to base upon one of them. When he does I think he should be consistent and try to interpret them all, and I don't know any Protestant scholar who does that!

This is a very vital idea in our own day. "Your new moons and appointed feasts my soul hates. They are a trouble to me. I am weary to bear them . . . I'll hide my eyes from you. . . You hadds are full of blood." A criticism of hypocrisy, and a criticism of putting your trust in observances, or forms, or ceremonies, or regularities.

I know a man who used to teach here in the seminary, whose father was a very pious Jew. He could quote from memory all the services which included great parts of the OT in Hebrew, but he did not have any idea what a word of it meant. He did not know a word of Hebrew so as to understand its meaning, but he said these words, forms. And some of our Protestant churches are almost as bad. Certainly a lot of the RC churches are that way. They repeat Latin words which the bulk of the people have no idea what they are talking about. Empty forms and ceremonies. They may have much meaning when you understand them, when you put your trust in what they stand for. But it is what they stand for that is vital. The futility of empty ceremonies.

We don't have time to look at E, F, and G today. That won't take such a long time. Please review the material on Isaiah on the next ch. for next time a little bit too because we will spend much more time on the next ch. than on the rest of this ch.

Please get the assignments in my Friday noon to the office!

The assignment for Oct. 4 is to study Isa. 4 entirely from your own study. You can study any translation you desire to, or you can study the original Hebrew if you want to. Only 6 verses. Write out answers to three questions entirely from your own studies, not using commentaries or annotated Bibles.

1. What is the primary theme in each verse/
2. Designate each verse that predicts a complete removal of all external danger. After today's lecture it will be a little clearer what that means.
3. Discuss vv. 1-2 in more detail.

I would like you to review the less on each week. This written assignment should not take you over an hour. . . . If you care to look in a commentary or annotated Bible, that will be extra work which may be of interest. It is not part of the assignment. If you do it, I wish you would state on paper whatever is of interest or value that you may find, and specifically mention what source you looked into. I'd rather you'd not use any source except the Bible text until you have written out the answers to these three questions. Later on you can see whether others agree or disagree with you.

We have not finished our discussion of ch. 1. I'll put the outline back on the chart.

II Isaiah One. On that we had looked at

B. The Futility of Empty Ceremonies.

C. An Offer of Forgiveness, vv. 16-20 of ch. 1.

There is quite a marked change between vv. 15 and 16. V.15 is "when you stretch forth your hands I will hide my eyes saith the Lord and when you make many prayers I will not hear. Your hands are full of blood." But v.16 though it connects right up with it has an entirely different theme. "Wash you and make you clean, put away the evil of your doings from before my eyes. Cease to do evil, learn to do well; keep judgment, relieve the oppressed . . . . plead for the widow, Come now and let us reason together saith the Lord, though your sins . . . . they shall be as wool." If you be willing and obedient you shall eat the good of the land, but if you refuse and rebel you shall be devoured, . . . ."

Here is a prophecy that if they will do right, God will treat them well; if they refuse they will be punished. These are fused together in this one brief passage, and the one v. that is better known than any of the others is v.18 which we usually take completely out of context. Taken completely out of context it is a ~~xxx~~ wonderful prediction of what the Gospel will do for us, of how wonderfully God can cleanse us through the Gospel, It's an absolutely wonderful description of that! But in the context, does it fully mean that? There is no Gospel introduction to it; there's no real Gospel continuation from it. Some have taken it as a question: "Come now, and let us reason together says the Lord. If your sins are like scarlet, shall they be white as snow? If they be red like crimson, shall they be as wool?" I notice that none of the recent translations take it that way. Some translations made 40 or 50 yrs. ago took it that way. It would be entirely possible to take it as a question. If the whole context was one of rebuke for sin, I would think that it was right to take it that way. There are no question marks



in Hebrew; it is possible to take it that way. But none of the recent translations take it that way. Not only do the NASB and NIV not take it that way, neither do the RSV or NEB. They take it as a declaration. In spite of context it is right to do so.

God gives a marvellous promise to those who were faithful to Him, obedient to Him. So I do not think it is at all wrong to say it looks forward to the great fulfillment in the complete redemption as a result of what Christ will do on the cross. At first sight it looks as if it were taken quite out of context when you take it alone, yet in the light of context I do not think that is the case. I think it does look forward to its wonderful fulfillment in Christ. That gives vv. 16-20, An Offer of Forgiveness.

#### F. The Sin of Jerusalem, vv. 21-23.

Here he speaks specifically of the city. He has been addressing the people, in general up to this point. Now "How is the faithful city become a harlot. . . now murderers. Her city has become dross . . . everyone loves bribes (KJV "gifts" undoubtedly means bribes; probably the term "gifts" was used to cover "bribes" in the days of KJV more than now). Everyone takes bribes and follows after rewards They judge not the fatherless, neither does the cause of the widow come before them.

G. Punishment and Renewed Blessing, vv. 24-31. Here there is a beautiful passage; lovely poetry in the course of which the threats of punishment as they continue in sin are continued. The last v. has a note of punishment: "The strong shall be like tow, and the maker of it like a spark, and they shall both burn together, and none shall quench it." There is also the hope of deliverance from the wickedness of the land right in the first verse: I will . . . purge away your dross, I will take away your tin, and I will restore your judges as at the first and your counsellors as in the beginning. There is a specific promise, but it is not a promise of the establishment of complete righteousness. Because he says, "like at the beginning as they were before." In the early days evidently according to Isaiah, their standards of morality were much higher than they were in his day, but this is not a declaration of a golden age. This is a declaration of a renewal, like they had been before. Back to the situation from which they had fallen. "I will restore your judges as at the first and your counsellors as at the beginning. Afterward you will be called the city of righteousness, the city --the faithful city. Zion will be redeemed with judgment and her converts with righteousness, and the destruction of the transgressors and sinners shall be together. They that forsake the Lord shall be consumed."

Thus we have the two notes mixed together. The prophet's vision looks forward here mightily(?) but not necessarily to the complete establishment of righteousness. It is to be made like it was at the beginning. So shall we go on to Roman Number III.

III Chapter 2:1-5 The Glorious Promises. Actually these five verses make a chapter by themselves. The Archbishop made a break at the end of ch. 4 that had only 6 vv. in it. Here, he could very well have made one at the end of v.5 because there's a complete break between vv. 5 and 6.

Some have suggested that the Archbishop's horse stumbled as he was riding on his pastoral calls and making these chs. divisions in his Bible. Certainly he did right at the end of ch. 4, but he did quite wrong here, because vv.1-5 here are a unit. There's a sharp break between that and v.6

A. The General Relation to Micah 4. (I want you to see that title and also the two passages next to each other - need two overhead projectors for that). Put back the text of the two chs.

This is the assignment you did for last time, and consequently I trust you were all familiar with this. The General Similarity between these two chs. Mic.4:1 is almost identical with Isa.2:2.

Mic.4:2 is almost identical with Isa.2:3.

4:3 " " " " " 2:4

So we have a very remarkable general similarity between these two passages!

Context

B. The Relation of Is. 2 and Mic.4 to the Preceding ~~XXXXXX~~ of Each. We spoke of this last week in connection with the assignment. We noticed then that ch. 2 of Is. begins with a new heading -- that seems to make a break from what precedes. Many commentators say that is the title for chs. 2, 3, and 4 and that ch. 1 was written later. That is entirely a guess. I would not pay any great attention to such suggestions, as this of the way the book may be put together. But it is of importance in pointing out the fact that there is a rather marked break there in the opinion of most interpreters. You do find points in common between this passage and the last few vv. of Isaiah, but not a great deal more than you would find with almost any section of the prophetic books.

But we have a very different situation in Micah. In Micah we have no such introductory statement as in Isa. It continues right along. In fact it continues so steadily along that if you did not have a ch. mark there it would read right straight along as if there was no real break. The previous paragraph leads right into this. "Hear . . . you princes of the house of Israel, that abhor judgment and pervert all iniquity. (v.11) The heads thereof judge for reward and the priests thereof teach for hire and the prophets thereof divine for money. Yet will they lean upon the Lord and say, Is not the Lord among us? None evil shall come upon us.! Therefore shall Zion for your sakes become a plowed field, and Jerusalem shall become heaps and the mountain of the high places become a forest." This tells the terrible destruction he predicts for Jerusalem, ~~and~~ as a result of the people's sin. Zion the place where David's capitol was, that section of Jerusalem would be just like a plowed field. Jerusalem would become just heaps of ruins. The temple hill, the mountain of the house, would become just like a high place in a forest. He continues right on and refers to these same three places. He says the mt. of the house will become the high place of the forest, he goes right on, But in the last days it shall come to pass that the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established at the head of the mountain. In v.12 he says, therefore shall Zion for your sakes be plowed as a field. We read in v.2 that the law will go forth out of Zion. He said Jerusalem shall become heaps(v.12); he says(v.2) and the Word of the Lord from Jerusalem. So we have these three specific places mentioned as having a terrible destruction, and the result of the sin. Then he refers to the very same places again in these words:

"they are going to be established with such glory and such importance as they never had before. A tight connection in Micah here. In Isaiah you could just as well connect with any one of many other chapters, in Isaiah, either before or after. In Isaiah there is that separate head.

So it seems to me this is a very strong reason to think that this passage of Micah was written first. Now we go on to the next point

### C. The Meaning of the Vision

#### 1. Is.2:2 and Mic.4:1

##### a. The Use of Figures of Speech.

This word translated "the top of the mountains" some recent translations prefer to render it as "the chief of the mountains." The Heb. word is the common word for "head". It will be established as the head of the mountains. But when it goes to speak of their being exalted above all the hills, that sounds as if it were a literal raising up. As if the temple hill in Jerusalem, that small hill we would call it, was raised up so it was higher than Mt. Aarat. It gives you that impression.

But then it says that nations will flow, stream to it. That's a figure of speech. You don't stream to something high. You flow to something low. So these two figures of speech: it will become the head, it will be exalted; but they will flow to it. They are figures of speech here. But it is very plain it contains the opposite of what was contained just before in Micah. It will be destroyed, made like a high place in a forest, just a waste. But it will be exalted and become a center to which peoples will flow, Micah says. Isaiah changes it to "all nations" will flow to it, showing its universality.

##### b. The Supremacy of God's House

#### 2. Is. 2:3 and Mic.4:2.

" . . . and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." This is not a figurative statement. Quite literal here. This is what people are going to say all over the world. We will find out what God's law is by going to Jerusalem. This is the center from which it will come.

##### a. People seeking God.

##### b. Order going out from Zion.

Says specifically where this is going to start, but also shows a desire on the people's part to come up there and learn God's law. Just what does this passage mean? There are two possibilities. There is the possibility this means that there is going to be established a king in Zion. A king who will represent the Lord, and He will give God's Word, God's law and people all over the world will say, Let us look to Zion to find what the Lord's will is. Let us go up to Zion. Let us hear God's message. That is one possibility.

Another possibility is that a wonderful message, the Word of the Lord, is going to go out of Jerusalem, and the Apostles carried the message from Jerusalem to Samaria and to the rest of the Near East and over into Europe, and crossed the ocean in both directions, and the the Word of God will spread all over the world starting at Jerusalem. Up to this point there are these two possibilities. We find some who interpret it one way, and some the other way.

(Student: When I would see a couple different translations -- their quotation marks switched around. Is that clear that...)

No, there is no quotation mark in Heb., but where he says, Come let us go up and He will teach us of his way, and we will walk in His paths, clearly they are speaking there. But then when we say, Out of the shall go forth the law, it could just as well be translated, The law is going forth. If he did that it could be in quotation marks. The KJV translators evidently did not take it that way. They took it as a statement of the reason why . . .

(Student: In other words, the standards ? ? are different)  
Yes, and that's rather inconsistent. They probably had different committees that translated each of those two portions.

Now we go on to the next verse.

3. Isaiah 2:4 and Mic.4:3.

This next v. continues and adds a thought. 'He shall judge among nations, and rebuke many peoples.' This certainly fits with the idea of a ruler in Jerusalem sending out orders. He shall judge among peoples. He shall rebuke many peoples. It certainly gives that idea. It is not impossible to interpret it as meaning that in the light of the Gospel that goes out, nations will settle all their differences. And this law that comes of the Gospel will cause nations to settle their differences, and do away with their errors. That is possible up to this point.

But then it continues 'they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks.' Hosea(?)--Micah earlier had given the opposite of this prophecy. He said, They shall beat their plowshares into swords and their pruninghooks into spears, predicting great battles and wars that were to come. Now there is a prediction of a time of peace, a time when people will do away with armaments. A Time It reminds me very vividly of the time back in 1945-46 when U.N. had been established; Hitler had been destroyed; the war had been won. Now there was to be universal peace and harmony, and the UN was to settle all disputes. In this country they immediately started putting all their battleships into mothballs, and doing away with most of the plants. I remember hearing of a man out in Texas who read about some kind of machinery available as surplus for \$1 apiece, and he sent the order to Washington saying I might as well get 300 and when they came he found they were great big machines. They filled up a couple acres of his land with these big machines. Three years later the Government found that they started to reverse the process, and instead of doing away altogether with ammunitions, they found it was desirable again to establish some military power, and they needed these machines, and I think they paid \$300 apiece in order to buy them back! I can't vouch for the accuracy of the story which I read, but I can ~~XXXX~~ vouch ~~wfx~~ for the fact that it does exactly represent the change in attitude of the Govt. between the time when the UN was established, and the situation a year or two later when it became evident that Russia had taken over half of Europe and established a military tyranny which threatened to conquer the ~~WXX~~ whole world. And the Communists in China were taking over more and more ground and establishing their absolute control. So the process began to be reversed.

(Student: What was the \_\_\_\_\_ that people will beat their swords into plowshares.)

I don't recall the exact reference. Yes, Hos. 2:18. A similar one in Joel.

This v. has as its specific idea not that people will say, Why should we bother to expend ourselves? That is what the Chinese said during many centuries; I don't know how many, but for quite a long period. For a long time the attitude in China was that the military were the very lowest category. The scholars were on top, and the philosophers and administrators, and why bother with an army? As long as they had a strong central govt. which ~~wasn't~~ wasn't interfering much with the different parts of the land, that seemed to work for quite a while. Then military coups rose up in different parts of the country and people had no means of protecting themselves. Then eventually the communists came in and took over by military force and killed millions and established an absolute despotism.

So this is not a prediction, though the words could be taken as such, that people are just going to do away with their armies and say, Why bother to defend ourselves? What do we need police for? As long as we show kindness to others we know everybody else will show kindness to us. There is no need for police, or for military!

This describes a situation in which there is no NEED for these things. A situation in which the external danger has been entirely removed. Of course the last part of the v., which is found in both Micah and in Isaiah fits with this idea: "Neither shall they learn war among more? Why? Because it will not be necessary. There will be a complete removal of external dangers. That's clearly taught in this verse. That seems to show that the previous verse should be interpreted in that way of the two possibilities.

It is interesting to look at various commentators which start in and predict the verse is strictly a picture of the gospel going forth changing people's characters, making them love the will of God, and a gradual diffusion of Christian principles throughout the world, and then they come to this verse and they say, because there is a strong power which removes all external danger. At that point Isaiah's prediction ends, but Micah's goes right on. Micah, in the next verse, in the next 3/4 of the next v. continues the thought of this verse. He says, "They shall sit everyone under his vine and under his fig tree and no one shall make them afraid.

One of the early ch. fathers, Methodius, who lived at about 300 A.D. refers to this verse in these words. He says, The vine and that not in a few places, refers to the Lord Himself, and the fig tree to the H.S. as the Lord makes glad hearts of men, and the Spirit heals them. Micah says, They shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree and none shall make him afraid.' Now it is certain that those who have taken refuge and rested under the shadow of the Spirit and of the Word shall not be alarmed or troubled by those who trouble the hearts of men." Certainly what Methodius said was true, that those who rest under the Spirit and under the shadow of God's Word should not be frightened by human things because they know that their God is far greater, and that His will is best in all things. But I don't think that is what Micah means here. "They will sit ....fig tree...and no one shall make them afraid." I don't think it is possible to say that what Micah means

is they will be protected by their vine and fig tree. It is a picture given to the people in Jerusalem, possibly at the very time when the army of the Assyrians was flooding through the country outside. And it was impossible to go out of Jerusalem except for a very short distance.

And Isaiah said, This will be the sign to you, This year you'll only be able to eat what grows of itself. In other words, you could rush out to the gates when there were not any Assyrians standing near and pick some fruit or vegetables that had grown, and rush back in before you saw any of these roving bands of Assyrians going through the area. And also next year you will get what grows itself, but he says, in the third year, You'll be able to plant and harvest. There was that period when they were shut in and they had their property outside, and out there they had their vines and fig trees. Then they could sit out in the open country with nothing to fear. That was to them the picture of a glorious future! Micah says that this is not going to be that the people in Jerusalem will be able to do that for a time & till the next war comes, not merely they, but that is going to be a universal situation. That men can sit in the open with no need of bars, gates, or that kind of protection because there is a complete removal of external danger.

So in the previous verse and in the first three parts of this verse of Micah we have stress the idea that there is no external danger. There is no need for defense. There is nothing to fear That is what is promised here.

#### B. The Fulfillment of the Vision.

Here I've put in red what I think is important to stress -- The Importance of avoiding the danger of Circular Reasoning.

It is so easy for us to go to a passage of Scripture with a preconceived idea and try to fit it into that idea. The great stress we make at BST is that we should find our ideas in the Bible and build our ideas from it, rather than go to it and fasten a system over it. There is no complete human system that is dependable. God could have given us a list of 10 or 12 points stated very clearly and definitely that are the major things. But He did not. There is much in this Word which is absolutely clear. There is much in the Word that may be difficult to understand today, but perhaps a century from now may be very easy to understand. There is much in the Word which was perhaps very unique to understand 1000 yrs. ago because it exactly fits the situation, and we have to study hard to find out what exactly the situation was then. So we feel we should go To Scripture and ask each passage, what is this passage talking about? Here in this passage in Isa. and in Micah the great stress is on the removal of external danger. It is true the Word of God goes forth from Jerusalem with the spread of the Gospel from Jerusalem (in the first century), and you might interpret it in a figurative way if the Gospel so spread through the world that everywhere everybody was in peace, nobody would think of injuring others, all were converted to the world. You might think that that way there would be established such a situation as is described here - a complete removal of external danger. There is however, the other possibility that there is a force in Jerusalem which perhaps does not have to be exerted often because everyone knows it is sufficient, powerful, and it settles

all problems and questions. The word of the Lord goes out from Jerusalem and he judges among the nations. He settles their problems rightly. They know He will. There is a complete removal of external danger.

Now it is interesting to see the way this passage was interpreted by some of the early Christian fathers. Because they lived in a very unusual situation. In the early days of the Xn church there was such peace as the world had never before seen. That peace was established because the Roman army had gone out and had conquered nation after nation. Those who resisted them they had cruelly destroyed. But they had established a system in which the people all over Southern and Central Europe, the Near East and N. Africa, were so sure of the power of the Roman army that it was only very rarely that people in those areas had to think of the possibility of war injuring them in any way. So from about 20 B.C. Augustus established the Roman Empire, and established this situation in which there were no wars except small skirmishes on the border of the empire. There were occasionally in the years after that uprisings and rebellions, but compared to the state of almost constant war that had existed throughout most of the previous 2000 years of the world, it was a very marked change.

So in the 3rd and 4th centuries A.D. there were many of these Christian apologists who were saying, See the results of the Gospel. Just as predicted in Micah and Isaiah, they said, we have peace throughout the world. There is a complete cessation of war, and many a Christian apologist declared this as a wonderful proof of the truth of God's Word. One writer is quoted by Pusey in his commentary on the Minor Prophets in his discussion on Micah, he says: All things are made ~~new~~ new in Christ. As the inward disquiet of evil men makes them restless, and vents itself toward others in envy, maliciousness, and wrong, so the inward peace of which He says, My peace I give you --wherever it reaches, spread out abroad and has brought to all nations, unity, peace and concord. He says, All are in harmony now one with another. And he says, the outworking of Christ's Gospel spread not only forward but backward, and thus universal peace was established 20 yrs before Christ was born, and the birth of Christ brought this universal peace into the world."

Now it was a fact that the pagans could not deny that all nations had been at war in war after war in constant strife in Europe and in the Middle East during most of the years up to about 20 B.C. And during the next three centuries, except for skirmishes on the edges of the empire, there was widespread peace. So they said, Look what Christ has accomplished! There is this universal peace. They did not have to learn war any more. The Romans were taking the Barbarians into their army, and by the end of that time hardly any of the local people were even thinking of learning war any more!

2. Disappointing Events. A change came just about the time when the greater part of the Roman empire had become Christian, the barbarians began flooding into the empire. During the previous centuries the Romans had been taking them in a few at a time, putting them in their armies, training them, and then when they would retire from the army would make them Roman citizens and they would settle down and be given a little farm, and their children would be Roman citizens. But now they were pushing in thousands-at a time, faster than they could be assimilated and within the next two centuries these floods of

==these groups of Germanic invaders flooded across Europe, and they all but practically == every country in Europe, the people of Roman background were completely submerged by it. They would march back and forth fighting each other and this continued for several centuries.

So naturally the pagans could turn the argument back on them. They could say, This is your sacred book which predicts this, and you say Christ brought this about, but look we have the very opposite. We have more wars than we ever had before. That proves it is entirely wrong!" Well, it does prove their interpretation was wrong! This is not a picture of what happened in the first few centuries after the Gospel was preached.

Now is this a picture of what the Gospel will produce? as it goes out into the world? Well, nearly 2000 yrs. have passed and we certainly don't see today that millions are not learning war any more. Russia is putting about one fourth of its total production to the building of armaments, and the training of men for war. In many parts of the world there is constant preparation for war, and we have had one war after another during all the years since 400 A.D. There have been very few times when there has been peace for any long pe-iod. This certainly is a picture of something still future. It has hardly been fulfilled yet! So it seems

4. This is a prediction of the same thing that is promised in Isaiah 11. There we have a picture of the coming of the Rod out of the Stem of Jesse, of whom we are told that His kingdom will be such that the wolf will dwell with the lamb, and the leopard will lie down with the kid. This does not mean the wolf will dwell with the lamb because the lamb will be inside of the wolf, it means the lamb will not need to fear the wolf any more. It says a little child will lead them . . . lion shall eat straw like the ox . . . The tiny child who is just able to toddle is usually not afraid of the serpents today. They are apt to run right up and begin to pet them, but the serpent is apt to bit the child and make it loose its life.

This is not saying that a child may do that, it is saying that the time will come when there will be no harm . . . It is predicting the removal of all external danger.

5. The Manner of Fulfillment is Not Entirely Specified Here. The most natural reason for that is that there is a force at Jerusalem that establishes peace throughout the world so you don't have external danger. But it does not require a twisting of the Isa. passage and Micah passage to say this might be brought about by the preaching of Gospel. If that were to happen at the rate at which it has penetrated the world in the last 2000 years, we would look to another 5 or 6000 years at least before we could look for the fulfillment of this promise. Of course we are told in the NT that Christ is coming back to this earth and He is going to put down all its evil, so it seems most reasonable to think this is a picture of a situation that Christ comes to establish when He comes again. But it is a picture of something to happen on this very earth. It is the same place, Micah says, where the destruciton was that there is going to be the glory. The mountain of the house that was destroyed is going to be rebuilt and exalted and the Law will go forth from Zion.



After class last week I was asked two or three very intelligent questions, and I know that there are things I say that may raise questions in your minds or there are places where I may mispeak myself, or something I don't make clear. So I appreciate it if you have questions you would write them out, give them to me, then I could see whether they are matters we should discuss for the whole class, or whether they are matters that are personal problems. So if you would do that it would be helpful. It's always hard to know whether one has made himself clear or not. Some can get what is stated briefly in one sentence; some you can say it in ten sentences and they don't have it. You have to strike some where in between. I try to make it seven or eight sentences, hoping that will reach about everyone. But it is good to know just how successful I am in getting across the things I want to get across.

One question last week was about Is. 1:18. I said a bit about that. Evidently the one who asked about it, it was not made clear to him. That is not of great importance in the progress of our discussion and consequently I'm not going to take time on it at this time. From the viewpoint of the principles of interpretation involved it might be of importance. From that viewpoint we might take more time on it later on. But I would be interested to know how much I got across about what I tried to say about 1:18. So one of these days when we have a test I might ask a question about 1:18. If I do so that particular question will not be in any sense a way of judging you, but a way of finding out for myself how much I have succeeded or failed in making clear the particular remarks I made about that verse.

Some of you are taking this course for graduate credit. There may be a few taking it for 2 hrs. credit, though I prefer most take it for one hour credit. Anybody who is not taking it as an undergraduate course for one hour's credit, in order to keep my records straight, I would appreciate it if at the end of the hour you would give me a little slip stating your exact situation. Anyone I don't get such a slip from today, I will assume that he is taking it simply as a regular undergraduate one hour course. The list I have from the office simply lists everyone with no particular statement otherwise. . . . Please be sure to get that to me today.

There is one slip I have from a man who asked for his first two assignments back. I can give them back to him. If anybody else would like any particular assignment back, or even if you'd like all your assignments back, please give me a note to that effect, and I'll do the best I can to oblige. I hope everybody won't ask for them all, because it is a bit of extra bother arranging them and dividing them. I'll be glad to do that if you should really want them. I will not give back any assignments unless . . . a note (requesting), and I'd appreciate such a note at the end of the hour.

For Oct. 11, the assignment is rather brief: Read over Is. 5 and make a general outline putting together those verses that make up a section, somewhat delimited from what precedes or follows. Give a brief title to each section you make. Also, if as you read you notice something that seems to you to be specifically related to something we've already looked at in Isa. 1-4 or 56-57 (which were included in the assignment I gave you) or to some other part of the Bible if this relationship

occurs to you please mention that). I'd like to have the assignment done without looking at any commentary or at any marginal notes in any annotated Bible you have. That is I'd be interested in knowing what you see from your own recollection, knowledge, or observation because that's my primary purpose . . . is not to see what somebody else has seen or found but to train you in methods of finding out for yourself what the Bible says. After you have done that, then if you want to look up marginal notes, footnotes, or commentaries that is extra. . . I'd be glad to have you do that if you feel like it. If you do please mention that you've done so on your paper and mention what you've used. You might mention what version you are using at the beginning of your paper.

Our purpose is to learn how to find what is in the Bible. Some people have a very magical idea of the Bible. They pick out three or four words and "here is God's truth." They remind me of the Episcopalian rector who once gave a sermon on the text "Hear the Church." That, of course is in the text, "And if he will not hear the church then count him as an unbeliever." See the man alone, then with witnesses, and then before the church, and if he will not hear the church . . . The Bishop was present and afterwards the Rector was expecting a compliment on his sermon, and the Bishop simply turned to him and said, "I have another verse for you you might prepare a sermon on. This verse is 'Hange all the law and the prophets.' You know Jesus said, Upon this hang all the law and the prophets."

Unfortunately, many people's idea of the Bible is the sort of attitude formed by taking three or four words that way out of context. Some words are tremendously important. Some words are simply transitional words. Some words are absolutely clear and definite. Some words can possibly be translated in two or three different ways. There are people who are making a tremendous fuss about the fact that the ancient MSS don't have every word in them that is contained in some of the later MSS. When they find that a later MS repeats words from one section in another, and they are not in the early MSS and the translation is made from early MSS, they say, O this translation does not believe in the deity of Christ because it leaves out this statement about him. Well, if it includes the statement elsewhere where it occurs in the early MSS such an attitude is I think like this attitude of the person who would preach on "Hang All the Law and the Prophets"! In other words it is taking these as magical words instead of as an attempt in the very difficult and weak instrument that human language is, of using that instrument to present the truth of God.

So when we say the Bible is inspired and free from error, we don't mean you can take 3 words out of context and get God's ~~XXXX~~ truth. We mean that in the Bible carefully studied, you cannot find anything clearly stated that is not part of God's truth. You can draw ~~lots of~~ a lot of false inferences, but what you find clearly taught there you can stand on. That's what we mean by the Bible is verbally inspired. That these words do not contain false ideas if correctly interpreted. That is my great stress in this course. We do not want ~~ot~~ to read into the Bible, but to find what is there. Now this is particularly the case when we come to matters on which consecrated Christians differ. One such matter is the matter of the millennium. If a person is thoroughly convinced that there is to be a millennium, as I am, then such a person can go to the Bible and find anything that he thinks will throw light

on that concept, and he may find that new new evidence that nobody ever yet realized before was related to the millennium. There is value in that approach. But I believe as long as there are people who do not think that this is what is taught in the Bible, I believe it is particularly valuable on all such matters, and say not merely, Can I fit this in to the teaching of the millennium, but does this prove there is a millennium? See the difference?

There are these two approaches and there is value in both. But I believe this second approach is absolutely necessary that upon all that upon which we are going to stand strongly and which we are going to insist upon as the word of God, we be able to say, These passages prove it. Not, I think this passage must relate to it!

Now I was asked a question at the beginning of the last hour as to whether the last part of ch. 1 relates to the millennium. In the last part of ch. 1 == I can't get this on one sheet . . . See Is. 1:25 which reads: I will turn my hand upon thee and purely purge away thy dross, and take away all thy sin, and I will restore thy judges as at the first and thy counsellors as at the beginning. Afterwards thou shalt be called the city of righteousness, the faithful city. Zion shall be redeemed with judgment and her converts with righteousness. And the destruction of the transgressors and of the sinners shall be together, and they that forsake the Lord shall be consumed.' Now this 28th verse, I read it for context, but it really is not part of this section about which the question might be raised: Does it relate to the millennium.

Now as we look at those words, I will turn my hand upon thee and purely purge away thy dross and take away thy tin.. Well, that might be said of those who are to be in the millennium! God does this to them. But it might also be a prediction of God's taking the people off into captivity! The Israelites were tending to fall into idolatry during all their history up to the time of the exile. During all that period we find constant attacks on idolatry by the prophets. But we do not find Christ criticizing the Israelites of his day for worshipping idols! In the exile those, at least who returned from the exile to Jerusalem, were thoroughly weaned away from idolatry, and from that phase of heathenism. Therefore one can say that in a sense, in that regard and in certain other regards, at least, this statement that I will purely purge away thy dross and take away thy tin could be a prediction of what is going to happen in connection with the millennium.

Now if some one wants to say, No, it is pointing to what is going to happen in the Great Tribulation, well, something similar may happen in the Great Tribulation but you can't prove it from this verse. If I tell you I'm going to go to Phila. and there buy a new suit, and if I do that next week, you can't quote my words six months from now and say, that I am still going to do it. I may do it next week and again six months from now, but if I make the statement and fulfill the statement, the statement has been fulfilled. If I say, I'm going to go to Philadelphia frequently and buy new suits, then when I go once it would not fulfill the statement. But when a prediction is made and can be conceived of as having been fulfilled, we may say that similar things to it may take place later, but we have no right to say it is a prediction of an event that is going to happen later.

The passage continues: "I will restore thy judges as at the first and thy counsellors as at the beginning." How were Israel's judges are the first? How were their counsellors at the beginning? We read of great judges in the history of Israel. We read of Samuel. Of Gideon. Of many other judges, and counsellors whom God marvellously used. But we do not find that their condition was a perfect condition in any of those periods. If you want to say there is a similarity between this and something God is going to do in the millennium; there's going to be some similar sort of organization in the millennium with what there was then, that you can prove from this passage if you prove the passage is about the millennium. But you can't prove the passage is about the millennium from this statement. This statement can just as well be taken as saying, After return from exile there will be men like Ezra, like Nehemiah; men like the Maccabees who gave their lives for their loyalty to their God. Men who are worthy to stand in every regard as the equal of the men who were judges and counsellors in earlier days.

And the statement: Afterwards thou shalt be called the city of righteousness, the faithful city == well certainly there were centuries after the time of the exile when despite their sin, wickedness and their failure the Jews nevertheless did become noble as an area, as a group many of whom were willing to give their lives for their belief in the one true God. It would be pretty hard to prove this would not be a prediction of that period.

The statement that follows: Zion shall be redeemed with judgment and her converts with righteousness . . . In this statement there is an unfortunate translation. The word rendered "converts" is simply the participle of the Heb. word "to return." So literally it is "those who return." That could certainly be a precise reference to those who returned from exile. Now it does not have to be. The idea of returning is used not only in a material sense, it is also used in a figurative sense. So it is quite proper to translate: "those who return" to the Lord, or those who become converted! But the translation "converts" while not an incorrect translation is a translation which takes only a small part of the meaning of the word. I believe it would be better to translate it literally as "those who return" and then allow the possibility that it is a spiritual return rather than a physical one.

It is interesting to notice that this statement which in KJV is "her converts" makes into "her repenting ones" in the NASB, and "her repenting ones" is slightly nearer the (?) than "her converts" because it is a definite act of returning. But the NIV has gone one step further and is definitely wrong, and says not her repenting ones but "her penitent ones." Now "her penitent ones" simply describes a state of mind. The Heb. shab does not describe a state of mind! It describes a change. In most cases a physical change. It may refer to a spiritual change, but certainly not a state like penitence. I don't know whether this is important enough for me to write the Chairman of the committee about. I have a lot of other matters I'm going to write him about that I think are far more important. But I may include a reference to it when I write. He has specifically asked me for suggestions, so I certainly shall make some that are important and I may make this one. It is certainly not a correct translation at that point.

This is something I think we should have covered when we first came on it a little more fully, My greatest interest is in the method

of approach, the method of translation. As you see if you want to say Here is a picture that describes what will happen in the millennium. Perhaps what will happen in the millennium will be exactly like this. I do not wish to fight with someone who says this is a picture of the millennium. But I do say, You can't prove the millennium from this because it very well can be a picture of the fact God is going to bring the Israelites back from exile, and going to give very great blessings at that time.

Now we can go on with our regular outlines. I have condensed the first part I will put up so as not to repeat matters we have discussed. We are discussing Roman Numeral III

II The Glory of the Promise Is.2:1-5. In our discussion of this you noticed that this is a passage that describes a period when there is no external danger, a period when there is no need of defense and a period when there is nothing to fear. I read to you the exposition by one of the church fathers (c. 300 yrs. after the time of Christ), something over 300 yrs. ago we might think of as a long time ago. But we speak of them as the early fathers and seem to think they have special importance. They certainly have very definite importance, but he says that the vine and the fig tree here show God's protection. That the vine and fig tree represent the protection God will give. That == Well now the vine and fig tree were hardly a protection! The vine and fig tree are simply given as a picture of the possibility of going outside the city, out in the open field, and there sitting down under your vine and fig tree with no fear whatever. It shows a time when there is no external danger, no need of defense, nothing to fear.

Now I just mentioned at the end of the hour

B(?) The Fulfillment of the Vision. Under this I looked at four subjects, and I mentioned #5 -- The Manner of Fulfillment is Not Entirely Specified Here. It begins here telling how the law will go forth from Jerusalem, and the Word of God from Zion. But whether this is necessarily the beginning of what is here described, or whether it is a statement of what will occur at the time and . . . . is not specifically stated. The early Christians took it as the manner of fulfillment. They said, Christ was born in Bethlehem, He preached in Jerusalem; from Jerusalem the word of God began and went out into the world, and after the end of the first and second or second century they said, This word is going to conquer the world and thus all the world will have a time of absolute peace.

Then some said, Yes, We've had peace for 300 years. The world enjoyed not complete peace but such peace as the world had never known before because Roman arms were preventing people from fighting. This began about 20 yrs. before Christ was born so they said the kingdom of Christ exerts its influence back before He was born which is a beautiful but rather irrational idea. Certainly Christ's birth in Bethlehem had nothing to do with Augustus' conquering Egypt and establishing a division of peace such as the world has not seen before! When after 3 or 4 centuries the Roman peace completely broke down and all the area of the Roman empire became a section in which roving tribes were fighting one another, = and in which literacy which may have been 90 or 95% decreased to % or 10% at the very lowest, and the terrible Dark Ages began, then the heathen could turn against the Christians and say, You say Christianity is true by this period of absolute peace, well it came to an end!

Christianity is false!" Of course the fact is this is not a prediction; that is something yet to come in the future. But how is this going to be fulfilled? It would be entirely possible as far as this passage is concerned to say, The Word of God going out from Jerusalem is going to reach all people to the extent where they will all say, Let's turn to the right, let's go to Jerusalem; let's go to Christ who is in the heavenly Jerusalem, let us find from Him how He wants us to live and thus there will be established a condition of absolute peace throughout the world.

It looked a lot more like that would happen 50 yrs. ago than it does today! Let's say 80 yrs. ago, it looked far more as if it might happen today. During this century there have been about as many wars as any century in history. It does not appear at present as if there is much likelihood of it stopping. I understand Russia is spending about 25% of its total production on preparation for war. We are spending about 5% of ours. There are those who are making a protest against that! Just why Russia is putting all this into that when there are people == their people are many of them half starved and would like to have part of that at least so as to have more to eat, is something they have not explained. But that a condition of peace is going to continue for a long time is certainly something that appears extremely unlikely.

So when someone says the Gospel is going to go on and conquer more and more and more nations, more and more people until we have absolute freedom from war all over the world and this is going to last for a long, long time == well, if the Bible definitely predicted that I would certainly say that though everything looks contrary I would believe God can fulfill what He has promised. But the passage does not specifically say that is what is going to happen. In fact, it sounds a bit different, because it says that He will reprove strong nations. . . and he will judge among the nations. It sounds as if a strong force is going to establish peace. So just as the Roman force over that area of Europe and N. Africa and part of the Middle East established (peace), so the Lord Himself is going to establish power on this earth and no one will think of making war because there will be no opportunity to, and no one will need to prepare for war because there is nobody else who would dare make war. The condition at least of external peace and safety will be brought about when in one of these two ways.

On the basis of this passage and Micah 4 and Is. 11, I believe we can dogmatically say there is going to be such a long period == the N.T. six times says 1000 years, and yet I'm not going to fight with those who say the 1000 is simply a round number! But I'm not going to think it can be a round number for ten seconds, or ten minutes. It would seem to me as if it would have to be a long period of time. Therefore, it seems to me the Bible clearly teaches there is going to be a millennium reign of Christ upon this earth, but I don't think we should try to prove this by these last verses in ch. 1. I believe ch. 2 very definitely shows a period in which there will be complete external freedom == freedom from external danger.

6. Note Micah 4:4 c. We have noticed how in Mic.4:1-3 we have almost exactly parallels to Is. 2;2-4. But Mic.4 the first 3/4 of the

verse has no exact parallel in Isaiah, but it simply stresses and drives home that fact that was rather clearly taught in the previous verse. Very clearly taught I would say when there is to be a time when no external danger, no deed of defense, nothing to fear. But the last part of Mic.4 says "For the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it". In other words Micah says, This prediction of a world free from war, a world free from external danger is such a tremendous thing that in order to believe it, you must know that the Word of the Lord --- the mouth of the Lord has said it. God has given this vision to me.

Is there any parallel to these words in Isaiah 2? Personally I believe there is. I believe that is why Isaiah put in v. 1 of ch. 2. I believe he put that v. in "the word that Isa. the son of Amoz saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem" -- as the equivalent of what Micah said: "For the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it". It looks rather silly to the average person approaching the book of Isaiah, certainly it did to me, before I studied into it, to have the book start with verse 1 telling you that these are the vision Isaiah said. An excellent introduction to the whole book. And then in the very next ch. to repeat another (?) heading. It would not be silly if he did it on every chapter, or even on every tenth chapter. But there are not more than 7 or 8 pages where the word "Isaiah" even occurs in the book! We have it in 1:1; 2:1; --- we don't have it again until Is. 7:3 where he's telling of his meeting with Ahaz, and it says, Then said the Lord unto Isaiah. Then in 13:1 we have the burden of Babylon which Isaiah did see, which begins not merely one chapter but a period of about a dozen chapters dealing with other nations and showing what God says is going to happen to them.

In ch. 20:2 it says "the Lord spoke to Isaiah" and in v.3 it says Isa. walked naked and barefoot for a year. Then in 37 to 39 where you have a historical account of Isaiah's relation to Hezekiah you find the word "Isaiah" 10 times, and never again in the whole book!

So aside from 13:1 where it introduces a long passage of about a dozen chs. of a type different from most of the rest of the book, such a title occurs only in the beginning of ch. 1 and in the beg. of ch. 2. That seems rather not a very sensible arrangement as a heading for a group of chs. Why have your heading and then give it all again? Most of it again just one ch. later unless you're going to keep on doing it all the way through? I believe 2:1 is a heading for these 5 verses.

Isaiah realized he is going such a tremendous prediction, such a prediction that it is almost impossible for one to believe and would be particularly difficult for those Israelites to believe with the Egyptians to the south of them and the Assyrians north east of them clashing and fighting each other. And the Assyrians coming and overrunning Israel to the north that was twice as large as Judah, and overrunning most of Judah, taking Lachish the second largest city in Judah, taking her captive. That in those conditions nobody dared to go out and sit under his vine and fig tree. Isaiah is saying, You may find it difficult to believe. You may say, Micah has said it and that's wonderful, but how do we know Micah is a true prophet of God? Well, God gave me the same vision! Here is a vision that Isaiah has seen. God has enabled me to give my word to what Micah has ~~seen~~ given that this wonderful thing is actually going to take place!

That this world is going to become so free from wars that there will be complete freedom from external danger! That will be entirely removed.

So we have this parallel here, I believe. And then we have one more parallel, I'll call that

ground  
 E. Mic. 4:5 and Is.2:5. Since we have a lot of ~~ground~~ to cover this semester I won't spend much time on it practically as the real problem is in Micah rather than in Isaiah. Most Bibles like the one I have copied from == the reason I used it was because it had the largest type of any Bible I could get to make it lie flat enough to make a transparency == Notice the heading? "The Lord's judgment on the proud". "O house of Jacob, come ye and let us walk in the light of the Lord, therefore thou hast forsaken thy people the house of Jacob." What sense does that make? Putting v. 5 and v. 6 together like that in my opinion makes absolutely no sense. That is not a reason why God has forsaken his people because they want to walk in the way of the Lord. That is Isaiah's conclusion to the wonderful picture. God is able to promise this tremendous thing you could not believe -less Isaiah said, God has revealed it to me, and He revealed it to Micah. We can know it's going to come to pass! ~~Therefore~~ Therefore, O house of Jacob come and let us walk in the light of the Lord! That is his conclusion to his marvellous statement of how it is not enough that we think of this marvellous thing that's going to happen way off in the distant future. That's wonderful God is going to do that. But what does it mean to us?

We who believe in a God who could do this wonderful thing, we should walk in the light of the Lord. We should follow where He leads. We should make our lives count for Him. I cannot think of Isaiah as ==== I think it is utterly wasteful when a man takes a Biblical teaching no matter how wonderful it is and simply presents it to a congregation as "Here's something interesting for you to know; God is going to do this or this is going to happen." It is good to know, but we should draw it to our purpose. In view of what God is going to do, let us walk in the light of the Lord. That's what Isa. does here. I think it is very sad that many Bibles put in a division at that point where there certainly is == where it certainly does not belong,

Notice the passage in Mic. 4:5 ends "for the people will walk every one in the name of his God and we will walk every one in the name of our God forever and ever." That used to puzzle me greatly because it sounds as if all the heathen are going to keep on worshipping their heathen gods forever and ever. The trouble is that the Heb. imperfect can just as well be translated as a frequentative, or it can be translated as an exhortation. Not in all cases, but in many. In any case it can be translated as a frequentative, and most of the modern translations render it that way == "for the people walk every one in the name of his God." This is a fact that if you will go to almost any part of the world where people are worshipping false Gods, you will find that they have no shame about doing so. I was on a train in Egypt, and it came the time for evening prayers. The men dozens of them got out in the aisles and bowed down toward Mecca. Nobody thought of being ashamed of it. The only religion I've ever heard of that people feel any shame about is Christianity. People are ashamed often to say grace in a public place lest someone will think they are pious!



Or they will not make a testimony for the Lord when there is a most wonderful opportunity because they are afraid people will look down on them. Muslims don't feel that way. They are proud of their belief in Allah. The worshippers of Buddha, the followers of Confucius, the Brahmins, etc. The difference of course is that Christianity requires a standard of life that most of us find it hard to live up to. Consequently those who don't want to follow this standard have managed to in many ~~xxx~~ Christian areas to get an attitude in which people cover up the fact that they believe in Christ instead of being proud of the fact.

Isaiah says, These heathen people who believe in the heathen gods who can do nothing they direct their lives in accordance with the teachings of the gods they worship. They worship publicly and think nothing of it. Shall not we who have a God who can make such a prediction as this, shall not we who have a god who can do these wonderful things shall not we ~~walk~~ in His name forever and ever.  
walk

I believe we have covered most that is necessary at this point about Is. # 2:1-5. We can go on to ch. 4. I don't want to show you the whole thing because I don't want you copying it till we get to it. Pay attention to what we are saying. But ch. # 2:6 to 4:1 is made up of Rebuke for Israel's Sins.

This is one of the characteristics of the prophets that I find most useful in studying is to note what is the purpose of the passage. Is it a rebuke passage? dealing with sin? Or is it a blessing passage comforting those who wish to be true to the Lord? Most passages in the prophets can be put under one of these two headings. I find it a very useful first step in interpretation to ask that question about every passage. Certainly that is true about the rest of ch. 2, certainly at v. 6 a new ch. should have begun. If ch. 4 can be made up of 5 verses there is certainly no reason why ch. 2 could not be made up of 5 verses. Because we have a complete change of thought. I don't know why they translated into the next verse: Therefore thou hast forsaken thy people.

The Heb. word there is a word that is ordinarily translated "for". I guess it seemed ridiculous to the translators of the KJV to say, Let us follow the Lord for thou hast forsaken thy people, and they thought it ~~xxxxx~~ sounded a little less ridiculous to say Therefore thou hast forsaken ~~they~~ thy people. But there are a few cases where there is no question that the "for" of this word refers to what follows rather than what precedes. And a few places where it seems to be an assertion of the certainty of what has been said. So I would say either omit it or say "surely" thou hast forsaken thy people, or "indeed thou hast forsaken thy people." If it is "for" it goes with what follows rather than what precedes "because thou hast forsaken thy people therefore thou art going to send punishment." At any rate it is definitely a new section. We have had this wonderful section of rebuke, most of ch. 1, with this marvellous section of picture of blessing and comfort for God's people, a little at the end of ch. 1, this marvellous picture at the beginning of ch. 2.

Now we start a new part of the book and this part begins with

A. Idolatry and Heathenism 2:6-9

In this section he rebukes them for turning to the gods of the east, and for looking to these that claim to predict the future by their false methods. That is just as appropriate today as it ever was with the way that people today are turning to the gods of the east.

My wife and I less than a week ago were standing in front of the Lincoln Memorial and a man came up to us and began to talk to us in a very attractive manner. In fact my wife thought he was connected with some Christian movement for a time, and then when we pinned him down we found he was trying to get people to give money to advance the work of Krishna, the Hindu god. The religions of the east are coming in like a flood into our country now. Astrology is being widely followed and all these cults, isms and false ideas, and God rebukes the Israelites in vv.6-9 for the way they allow these things to come in. The way the time is going I won't read these verses or even the verses in B. which is a much larger section from 2:10-3:9. One whole ch. which is interrupted by a ch. division which should not have been placed in it. It should have been placed at the end of v.5, of ch.2. But there's no reason for one at the beginning of ch. 3. There is hardly a paragraph division there.

The certainty of punishment into which he goes rather in detail and there are verses there that would be well worth our time but we will move on, and look at

A

C./Conditional Prediction 3:10-11. I'm going to take a second on that because there is something there you find quite frequently in the prophetic books. At various books == places you find something like this, Say ye to the righteous it shall be well with them for they shall eat the fruit of their doings. Woe unto the wicked for it shall be ill with him for the reward of his hands shall be given him. In **otah** other words we have here two conditional predictions. It does not say either of these things is going to happen: that it's going to be well with people or that they are going to suffer terrible punishment. It says the result depends on the decision they make.

And I believe thoroughly in the sovereignty of God that He controls all things, that everything is in line with His plan. But I believe that people can easily take that wonderful doctrine and make it ~~x~~ into something that gives them an idea of life as if it were a moving picture that you look at it and see it running before you, and people look at it and are surprised, terrified, they weep, they laugh. And yet you know what is going to happen right in the next scene(?). It's all there. It's purely play acting and no reality to it. But Life Is Real and what we do matters! Over and over in Scripture God says that what we do matters. We cannot understand exactly how these two fit together that God controls all things, and yet that what we do, what we think, what we say really decide matters. So at many places in the prophetic books we have these conditional predictions. God knows what is going to happen. God knows what His wonderful plan is going to work out. Yet what we decide and do matters.

## D. Judgment on Unworthy Leaders 3:12-15.

Deals with the unworthy leader and tells how God is going to enter into judgment with them, and rebuke them for their sin.

## E. Rebuke to Vain and Worldly Women 3:16-4:1

Here he turns to those daughters of Zion who were haughty and walked with stretched forth necks and wanton eyes, and put all their interest in the adornment and beautiful things they had. He describes it in detail and says that all this beauty is going to be turned to ashes. He does not criticize them for wanting to look attractive. He does not criticize them for giving reasonable attention to making the world a more pleasant place to live by dressing themselves attractively and pleasantly but he rebukes them for making this their end in life and a thing from which they get their joy and pleasure. He rebukes them for it and tells them how they are going to be punished for it.

They are going to have instead of a girdle a rent, instead of well-set hair, baldness; instead of a stomacher a girdle of sackcloth. Burning instead of beauty. They men shall fall by the sword and thy mighty in the war, and thy maidens shall lament and mourn and she being desolate shall sit on the ground. In that day shall seven women take hold of one man, saying we will eat our own bread, wear our own apparel and let us be called by thy name to take away our reproach.

I was in Germany in the years after WW I and I felt great sympathy for a whole generation of young women. They were women in their 30's and 40's who were left with there being say 3 women to one man of that particular age group most everywhere. Now of course the older people were still living of both sexes, and the young children were living of both sexes. But of that particular age group there was that disproportion which introduced all sorts of evils into the society. It predicts here to the Israelites that there will come war and difficulties in which the men will far in the war and this disproportion will be introduced. Now if the Women's Libbers succeed in their ideal of making women and men absolutely indistinguishable we will not have that particular evil in the next war because there will be just as many women as men in combat and killed. But whether they will succeed or not nobody can tell at this time.

But v. 1 very clearly belongs with the preceding verse. Yet the ch. division breaks it up, because people looking for one verse for a sermon take it out of context, and have often taken this one verse and said these seven women represent the seven churches of Asia and these 7 churches have shown their love to the Lord, and say we will depart from all others, only let us be called by your name! That sort of metaphore can prove anything. In this v. it is clearly false. But it became so strong that the Archbishop put the ch. division in clearly the wrong place. I was hoping to get over ch.4 today, so we are behind but next week I hope to finish that and the rest of ch. 5. You have your assignments; please get them to me by Noon Friday.

There will not be any assignment for next week. Instead of that we are going to have a half hour test so that you will know about it and have plenty of time for review. The first half hour of the next class we will have a written lesson on what we've had thus far. The questions will not be of equal importance. Some of them will be to see whether you've gotten things I'm sure I've explained very clearly; others will be to see if I succeeded in getting across things I'm not sure I explained so clearly. So don't worry too much if there are some parts you don't know just what to say in it. There will be other parts I hope you will all know what to say in it. It will be a mid-semester test on everything we've covered to the end of today's lecture,

If I misspeak myself and say Amos when I ought to say Micah, or say A.D. when I mean to say B.C. and it is not perfectly obvious I wish you'd call my attention to it so I can correct it. If there is a question in your mind, something you think it would be helpful to have further explanation on, I'd appreciate it if you'd give me a paper with a written statement on it and I'd consider whether it was something to take up in class or devote attention to you personally.

At the end of the last class I got a very thoughtful question. "Dr. MacRae, I've had a question with the last phrase in Is.2:1 and "in that day" in 4:2. Is there any special significance to ~~xxx~~ this?"

Now that is a very good question not so much in relation to this section of Isaiah as to the OT in general. The first thing I'd like to mention is that almost any phrase, any word can come to be used as a technical term. Take for instance the word "millennium." What does the word mean? Millennium means a thousand year period. I used to find that when I would be teaching archaeology in the seminary and I would say something happened in the 2nd millennium B.C. the students would laugh. Now there is no reason to laugh because you referred to the second thousand year period before the coming of Christ. But the reason they laughed was because they had only or generally heard the term as referring to one specific thousand year period. So the term millennium has come to be used as a technical term among Christians, to be that period of absolute freedom from external danger the Lord has promised to establish upon this earth at some time in the future. It has become a technical term. That does not mean it cannot be used as an ordinary term as is done regularly in books of archaeology where they speak of the 2nd millennium B.C. or the 4th millennium B.C. It's not done so much in History because we're more apt to go by centuries there instead of by thousand year periods. But any phrase like "in the last days" or "in that day" may be an ordinary term, or become a technical term. But there is a rather common error among a great many students of the Bible wherever possible to insist that some word is a technical term.

When someone suggests that something is a technical term we must examine it carefully and see. There are many terms used as technical terms. But there are many cases where it is said it is used as a technical term where it is not. I remember one man who had a very definite theory of the N.T. He was a very prominent professor, and had a very definite theory which would do away with any faith in a future millennium. He was very insistent. One of his arguments was based on the use of the word "end." He said where ever it speaks of the "end" it speaks of the

end of the age and leaves no room for the millennium. Then somebody pointed out to him that "end" is very often used for the end of the day, end of the century, etc. He said, Yes, but in those cases it is not used absolutely, as a phrase after it such as "my end", "his end", "their end." He said when it is used absolutely it is a technical term. Then we found a case where it referred == he admitted it did not refer absolutely to the end of the world as we know it. Well, there he said the technical word is used non-technically!

I thought it was a very good illustration of the great danger of jumping to the conclusion that something is a technical term. We want in each case to see what is the evidence that something is or is not. Something may become that . Like the word "branch of the Lord." It is tsemach. In the context that could very easily be interpreted as a non-technical word, and refer simply to vegetation. But we find several places later in the OT where it is very obvious that that word is used to refer to the coming of Messiah. Therefore when we find it later used as a technical term we have a right to ask in this case is it simply a non-technical term which later came to be used as a technical term? Or does it already refer to Messiah in this case?

Now the term "last days" (acherith hayamim) I had not intended to discuss in this course because it only occurs once in the section of Isaiah we are dealing with now. But I will say a word about it. I'm quite sure it is not a technical term for the final end of the age. I believe it means really just "after a while." Now "after a while" may point to the very end of the age and there may be a case where it does. But there are a number of cases where it definitely does not and I would simply mention three of them: Gen. 49:1 (if you try to take Gen. 49 as referring to the last days you will find great difficulty with parts of it. I believe it simply means 'after a while' after the Israelites move into Canaan), and Deut. 4:30 and 31:29 refer to how God is going to punish His people for their sins, and then He says in the last days when you turn to God He will again give you mercies. He's not there saying that if you sin you'll ~~be~~ be punished now, but if 3000 years later you turn to God He will give you mercy. He's saying He is going to punish you for your sins, but after you have endured the punishment for a while, if you turn to God He will give you mercy. If we had more instances of it in this section, I would go into the Hebrew words for it which I think are very interesting in that connection. But I'm not going to do that in this class use for it in the material we are going to cover, this semester.

Now the other phrase "in that day" occurs 8 times in the section of Isaiah we have had up to this point, including today's assignment. It occurs 8 times in that, and it in most of them means the day we've just been talking about. That is very clear in most of them. It occurs in 2:11; 17:20; 3:7,18; 4:1,2; 5:30. In most of them it clearly means the day we've just been talking about. That's what the phrase "in that day" would ordinarily mean in English. So there are 7, I believe, of the 8 where it is definitely not a technical term. So we would need pretty good evidence to say it is a technical term for the ? ? ?

I believe that looking at it in other cases, we find the term occurs in other parts of Isaiah a great many times. It occurs in Micah quite a few times, and it occurs a great many times in Zechariah. Looking at them we find it often refers to the day we've just been talking about, but in many cases it means "the day we're going to talk about." We don't use it that way in English, but that Hebrew phrase is so often used introducing something, and I would think the best way to say it in English would be to say "there will be a day when." "In that day something will happen."

#### section

Now that I think is true in the ~~VVVVVVVV~~ we are going to look at today in the beginning of ch. 4. "In that day seven women shall take hold . . ." That is the same day just spoken of. He is speaking of the men falling in war, and the depopulation. It is at that particular time and the next sentence is: "In that day shall the branch of the Lord be beautiful and glorious." You have your choice here. You could say the first verse is looking on to the same time as the second and there is a big space between v. 26 and 4:1. Or you could say these verses refer to the immediate situation of ch. 3 and between v. 1 and 2 there is a period of time which might conceivably be a long period. So in either case, one of these two must be the day we are now going to speak of. I know some Bible teachers say, Whenever you see the phrase "In that day" it is pointing to the Day of the Lord. I think that is a guess based on insufficient evidence. I have here listed all the cases where the term occurs in the OT, and some of them refer to that period but the great bulk of them do not. So I believe the day we are about to speak of is what it means which may mean the day we have just been speaking of. That may be the Day of the Lord but does not have to be.

Now as I say any time you have a question you think is === that comes into your mind as we speak and you'd like to have clarification, I wish you'd turn it in to me. This one I intended to write a letter to the one who gave the question instead of taking it up in class. Then I decided that after all it would be worth the attention of the whole class to go into this particular question. While it is not of such great importance for this section of Isaiah, it is important for a number of sections of the OT; also the principle is important, the difference between technical terms and terms that are not technical terms.

At our last class we had already begun to look at ch. 4. The outline is Ch.4

#### V Chapter 4

The Branch of the Lord. We were still looking at E. under IV. Rebuke to Vain and Worldly Women. We have all this long description of the vain habits of the Israelite women, many of them, at the time of Isaiah and then we have the terrible description at the end of ch. 3 of the way God is going to punish these, and it is quite obvious that 4:1 is simply concluding with the statement that there will be such great depopulation that the number of women will be far greater than the number of men in the land. The fact that the Archbishop made the division here shows clearly that he understood it as some interpreters have as meaning that the seven women were some group of Christians and the man on whom they take hold is the Lord Jesus Christ. That is an allegorical interpretation of the verse. There are verses in Scripture that can be taken allegorically; there is much in them that can and should be taken figuratively, but in this verse it is quite clear that that is not the case!

## V The Branch of the Lord, Is. 4:2-6

Verse 2. I don't know whether most of you have or it would be better to put the Scripture in front of you. . . . . This vv.2-6 are here before you, and I've entitled them The Branch of the Lord. "In that day the Branch of the Lord shall be glorious and the fruit of the earth shall be excellent . . . ."

1. Relation to the Preceding Passage. The relation is quite obvious. Ch.4:1 is clearly a part of the passage that precedes. Verse 2 is clearly related to it, but it might conceivably refer to something that might happen after depopulation, after the death of so many in war, and that is the great impoverishment of these people. However it can equally well mean: There's going to be a latter day, much different than this; there's going to be a day when the women and those who should be God's people will find their adornment and joy not in the bonnets, and the ornaments, and the head bands, and the tabrets, etc. --- it will not be in these objects which most of them are not bad except as they become matters of primary interest for them, but instead they will find their satisfaction in the Branch of the Lord which will be beautiful and glorious and the fruit of the earth will be . . . to those that are escaped of Israel.

Instead of these women being interested in all this physical adornment, all that sort of thing, they will be interested in growing big crops and having plenty for everybody to eat and getting back to a ? life. That is a very natural way to interpret the verse in relation to the preceding. It is not however the only way. It may be that instead of saying, They'll turn their attention from these superficial things to the solid things of agriculture, it may be their love and devotion will be turned away from these vain and worldly things to something higher and finer ~~and~~ that the Lord will make available i.e. the Branch of the Lord!

Now there's 17 words in the KJV translated "branch", and that makes it quite obvious it is not technically and specifically a branch of a tree. It is a larger term than that. It means a progeny, that ~~ix~~ which is produced by something that grows out of the ground. Here ~~is~~ it is called the Branch of the Lord. It does not mean the peace of the Lord. Like we say, A branch of the Railroad. It does not mean that! It means that which is produced, which comes from the Lord. After you've ~~gone~~ gone through a period of famine and starvation --- back in 1927 I took a walking trip through Germany, and there I talked to a man who told me how after WWI ended the section of Germany in which he was living everything was broken down. There was no transportation. There was no food available. He said turnips was the only thing they could get to eat and for 6 weeks they had nothing to eat but turnips. And then after 6 weeks an American Red Cross cart came through the area, and distributed little cans of lard. He said when they ate some ~~f~~ of that lard, it tasted like the finest ice cream you ever tasted in your life! They had had nothing but turnips for the previous 6 weeks! They had been sort of half starved during most of WWI anyway. (My landlady in BUrlin told me she lost 50 lbs. during the course of that war.) He said, when they ate it they just swallowed up the lard, it seemed so good. But their stomachs had become so frozen up, so closed up from having so little to eat

that when they put this in they all felt cramps and miserable for a time and I know in 1928 and 1929 how I never saw such joy (people had) in whipped cream and things like that anywhere in my life as I did in Berlin by these people who had already 5 or 6 years after the experience of the war. Some said Americans felt terrible when they could not get butter, and thought they were suffering greatly. But we have never experienced what so many nations have experienced in times of war, and famine.

So it would be quite natural to say when the ground began to produce and the trees begin to give fruit to say, The Lord has provided and isn't this wonderful? That is not an impossible interpretation of this verse. But the fact that this particular word for branch, tsemach, is used in Jer. 23:5; 33:15; and Zech. 3:18 and 6:12, the fact that it is used there as a term for the Lord== for the Messiah == would suggest strongly that those writers understood this passage in Isa. as referring to the One whom the Lord would provide, the great Messiah, who would come to deliver from war and trouble, rather than simply to the fact that famine would be at an end and they would have plenty to eat.

2. Note the Descriptive Term. When you notice these terms in this verse: "the branch of the Lord will be beautiful and glorious." You don't ordinarily speak of a tree as beautiful and glorious. "And the fruit of the earth will be excellent and comely." These four Heb. words used here, I looked up a couple of days ago to see how they are used elsewhere in Scripture. To see whether the KJV translators had given them a grandeur, you might say, that simply isn't in the word! I found that they are uniformly used of that which is glorious, that which is beautiful, that which is excellent, that which is absolutely transcendent. You will hardly ordinarily use such a term for food or for agriculture. So these descriptive terms, these so very strong ? suggest very strongly that God led Isaiah to predict, not the end of famine, not the women turning their attention away from worldly adornment and turning it to agriculture, but the sending of something that would have direct relation to the cause of the famine and the depopulation of the war, direct relation to the sin of the people, that God would send the One who send relief from all this , the one who would work out God's own purposes and that He is the branch of the Lord.

3. Vegetation ~~of~~ Something Greater? Is it vegetation or is it something greater? The fact that this very same word for branch out of 17 words for branch used in the OT, this very same one is used in all four of those passages, suggests very strongly that they understood that the branch of the Lord was being ? ?

So much for #3 whether it is vegetation of the Messiah. Somebody in Isaiah's day might have had difficulty. But Peter said, as you recall, that the prophets searched and inquired what or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify. . . when he prophesied of the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow. So we have it clearly taught in the NT that God gave the prophets understanding, or at least words that could be understood, as describing important matters about Christ even though the prophets did not understand them themselves. Therefore we certainly are justified in saying that the Branch of the Lord is the Messiah here.



The verse goes on: The branch of the Lord will be beautiful and glorious and the fruit of the trees will be excellent and comely. So here are these women who formerly gave all their attention to personal adornment, and vanity, who now are finding their joy in the coming of Messiah and the fruits that grow out of the earth. They are looking forward to Christ with the agriculture which is again to be established. Seems rather incongruous in one verse that way! to combine the two in that way. You can take them both as referring to agriculture but the adjectives used seem to go far beyond what would seem to be reasonable in applying to agriculture.

If we take the first one as referring to Messiah, is it reasonable to take the second one also as referring to Messiah? The branch of the Lord and the fruit of the earth. This word "fruit" is not to be taken in the narrow sense in which we take apples and pears. The word fruit is used of the fruit of a man's body; it may speak of the fruit of that == the fruit is that which is produced in Scripture. Often for ordinary fruit as we have it, but any kind of something that is produced by the land, by a person. Anything like that is this Heb. word that is used in the OT. Here then is it possible that Messiah is the Branch that comes from the Lord, and is also the fruit that comes from the earth. The adjectives used in connection with the second part of it as just as strong as the adjectives used in connection with the first part of it.

We find that whether Isa. understood this or not he suggests the same thing in ch.9 where in 9:6 "unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given. That is a good case of Heb. parallelism, but the fact you have the two ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ terms used: one is born, one is given. Exactly parallels this here. The branch of the Lord and the fruit of the earth. It is certainly reasonable to consider them as suggesting the twofold nature of Christ. He is the Second Person of the Trinity. He is God Incarnate in human flesh. He is the Branch of the Lord, but He also is Man. He has the human heritage, a human background. He is the fruit of the earth as well as being the branch of the Lord. It seems to me it is altogether reasonable to think we have the two aspects of Christ here, predicted by Isaiah.

I mention here Rom. 1:3-4 because Paul brought out those two aspects so clearly: "Concerning His Son Jesus Christ our Lord who was made of the seed of David according to the flesh and declared to be the Son of God with power according to the spirit of holiness." There we have the two aspects of the two persons of Christ. I believe we are justified in saying we have them both here in this verse.

B. The Divine Provision for Holiness. Certainly that is what is unquestionably contained in vv.3,4. At this point I might switch back to the passage." It shall come to pass that he that is left in Zion and he that remains in Jerusalem shall be called holy. Even every one that is written among the living in Jerusalem. When the Lord shall have washed away the filth of the daughters of Zion. (Notice the Daughters of Zion connects up with what precedes, but does not necessarily ~~xx~~ mean it is the same person involved. There is a ~~conflict~~ contrast between those who are punished for their sins and those who are purged by the Lord and cleansed from their sins, and this cleansing is coming right here with their finding their joy and satisfaction in the Branch of the Lord and in the fruit of the earth. "He that is left

in Zion and remains in Jerusalem shall be called holy, even every one that is written among the living in Jerusalem, when the Lord shall have washed away the filth of the daughters of Zion, and shall have purged the blood of Jerusalem from the midst thereof by the spirit of judgment and by the spirit of burning."

One could take this as simply meaning that through the attacks and great catastrophes they are going to go through they are going to be purged, cleansed, and will find their joy in the Branch of the Lord and the fruit of the earth. One can equally say it is looking forward toward a later period contrasted with this earlier period, contrasted with the sin of Isaiah's day. There is to be a time when Messiah, the One who is both God and Man, will be the One who is wonderful and glorious and that will be a time when the Lord will have washed away the filth . . . and cleansed Jerusalem by the spirit of judgment and of burning.. It does not explicitly and clearly refer to Christ's atonement, but it certainly can be considered as referring to that. Certainly there is no real cleansing at any time except in some relation to that.

So we have in this verses the Divine Provision for Holiness.

C. Divine Protection and Leadership for God's ~~EMIXIXEM~~ Pilgrims. There's quite a bit put into that title, and there are some things very definitely left out of it. We look at vv. 5-6. "The Lord will create upon every dwelling place of mount Zion, and upon her assemblies a cloud and smoke by day, and the shining of a flaming fire . . . ."

a word

This word "assemblies" is ~~something~~ that does not imply something that is continuing, but something that is temporary. People coming together. "A cloud and smoke by day and a shining of a flaming fire by night." Anyone in Isaiah's day, or in fact anyone with a Bible ever since reading those phrases ~~XXXX~~ will immediately think of the pilgrim journey of the Israelites as they came from Egypt after being delivered from Egypt and going through the experience of the Passover, as they were coming toward the Promised Land, how God put over them a cloud of smoke by day and a flaming fire by night to guide them and to protect them. You remember when they came to the Red Sea that the Lord caused it should give them light, but that it should hide them from the Egyptian forces that were following them and intending to destroy them. So it ~~g~~ gave them both leadership and protection.

So here we have reference ~~XXXX~~ back to the Exodus and to the pilgrimage journey of the Israelites when God led and protected them and it is stated there will be a similar protection ~~YYY ZZZZZ~~ for them. A similar leading for them. "And above all the glory there shall be a ~~z~~ defence" -- I ~~xx~~ don't know why ~~CCCCCSEBCCC~~ the KJV used this word "defense" here. The word is only translated defence once in the KJV. It is translated "chamber" once and "closet" once. It is derived from a verb that would seem to mean that which closes something in and protects it. It is translated "canopy: in the NASB and is a word that suggests a temporary kind of protection and that idea is still further brought out in the next verse.

"And there shall be a tabernacle . . ." This word TABERNACLE in the Bible doesn't mean something put up to hold evangelistic services.

This word tabernacle does not have in itself necessarily a religious significance. But it does have a significance of something temporary. Very often in the OT the KJV used the word tabernacle to translated the word ohel which means a tent. But in this case it is not that but it is the word succoth which means a booth. It is used where Jonah put up a temporary structure to protect himself from the sun. It is used - the Feast of Booths, also called the Feast of Tabernacles, is a time when among Orthodox Jews they often in their back yard put up a little temporary thing of branches and leaves, to remind them of the wilderness and the way God protected them on that journey. It is a temporary thing, not a permanent place.

"There shall be a booth for a shadow in the daytime from the heat, and for a place of refuge, and for a ~~XXXX~~ covert from storm and from rain." Here is divine leadership and divine protection. People thought of as pilgrims but people who have been cleansed through the One who is both God and Man. Here these people are protected from the dangers that are around about them. They are protected from the storm and from the rain and heat of the sun. It is quite different from ch. 2.

I had you in the assignment for last time to note what verses in this ch. indicate the removal of external danger. In this ch. I do not find any removal of external danger. That is the clear emphasis in ch. 2. There is to be a period of complete removal of external danger. God has promised that. We can look for it, we can know it is going to come. But in this case we have something quite different. We have dangers round about. We have the dangers. We do not have a permanent dwelling. We have temporary dwellings, but we have God's protection and God's leadership. We have been cleansed by the spirit of burning and by the spirit of judgment.

So it would seem to me that one must say that 4:2-6 must look forward to == let's say vv.3-6 cannot look forward to the millennium but must look forward to a time when God's people are being particularly protected by Him, a time when these people have been cleansed by the spirit of burning and the spirit of judgment. If we had only vv. 3-6 we might very well say this is God's protection of Israel at some time during its history subsequent to the time of Isaiah. In view of the fact it is so closely connected with v.2 which predicts the glory of the One who both the Branch of the Lord and the fruit of the earth, it would seem to me that it would be still more reasonable to say it looks forward to those who find in Him their glory and satisfaction. It looks forward to them as they carry on their earthly journey amidst danger, persecution, difficulty and trouble, and that God will give them guidance, leadership, and protection whatever comes just as the Did for the Israelites as they went through the wilderness.

Now as between these two interpretations I would not wish to be dogmatic. If we did not == if we only had vv. 3-6, I would say that I could not decide between the two. I would not know wish it might be. In view of v. 2 it seems to me it is pretty hard to escape the conclusion that as Peter said they are looking forward to ~~the~~ Christ and to the glory that should follow.

It is looking forward here not to the consummating glory of the millennium or to the period following the millennium, but it is looking forward to the time of the pilgrim journey. I think at this point we can go on to ch. 5.

The most important thing as we approach ch. 5 is to note that there is an important division in the ch. While there is the general subject of the whole ch. is rebuke for sin and declaration of coming punishment -- while that is the theme of the ch. as a whole -- nevertheless it is true that the first 7 verses deal with one specific picture and this picture is not referred to again in the ch. There is no further reference to the Lord's vineyard or to the Lord's treatment of it. So while the whole ch. is dealing with God's condemnation of sin of His people, vv.1-7 form a definite unit by itself. I was disappointed to find some who in the assignment would make one part, two parts, maybe three parts of vv.1-7 and then go one 4,5,6,7 and so on. Because there is such an important division there it seems to me it should have a Roman numeral I with subpoints under it rather than to have subdivisions of it parallel with subdivisions of what follows. We made a division definitely.

Now from v. 8 on. The directions I have suggested to you in looking at all the prophetic books is, Is he dealing with rebuke? Is he dealing with blessing for God's people? I think that the greater parts of the prophetic books falls under one or the other of these two headings. All of this falls under the head of rebuke. But under the subject of rebuke we have material that deals particularly with pointing to the sin and God's unhappiness with this and His urging people to turn away from this sin, and we have passages in which He specifically predicts punishment.

In this ch. the last part is definitely dealing with punishment, vv.24-30. We have in these verses, 24-20, it is entirely dealing with punishment for sin. The fact that v.25 ends with a phrase that that is used as the end of several stanzas of a poem used later in the book of Isaiah leads people to think there is an important break after v.25. But actually the subject matter of v.25 and of the verses that follow is very closely related. From v.24 on through he is telling how God is going to cause there there will be great misery come to the land when a fierce people, wildly aggressive people attack with tremendous roaring like a lion, and like the roaring of the sea and look to the land and behold darkness, etc.

So from v.24 on is punishment. But in the part from v.8-23 you have largely rebuke for sin but you also have certain verses that deal with punishment. Verses 9-10 for instance after telling in v. 8 about covetousness and selfishness and trying to build up tremendous estates he then goes on to say many houses will become desolate without inhabitant and the land will produce very very little. That is definitely punishment. Then he goes on with various types of sins, rebukes, and in vv.13-17 again you have punishment for sins. "Therefore my people are gone into captivity . . ." Does this describe what happened in Isaiah's day when many people were taken by Sennacherib into captivity?

Or does it look forward to the future day when the whole nation will go? This we cannot say. Of course in English we would translate it a little differently depending on which way we take it. It doubtless includes both. Just as the final verses of the ch. may look forward to the Assyrian conquest, but may also view other greater conquests and attacks.

One thing that makes some think the latter part does not refer to the Assyrian conquest is the use of the phrase "many nations". But the Assyrians had conquered many nations and had forces made up with people made up of many nations. So it could conceivably refer to the Assyrians conquest. It could refer to the Babylonian conquest. It could refer to the Persian conquest later, or to the coming of the Hellenistic empire, or to the great Roman forces that were made up of people from many nations under their control. So there is no conclusive proof that one would be wrong if he said that the last verses of the ch. are pointing forward to a terrible catastrophe for Israel toward the end of the age. That is not impossible, but there is nothing in the passage that requires it. It could point forward to matters that have already happened.

Some of the woes in this ch. against particular sins are I think very appropriate to our day. Look at v. 20. "Woe to them that call evil good and good evil, that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter!" What a picture of the relativity of the present day, when people use words to mean the exact opposite to the way they are usually taken.

This first parable of the Lord's vineyard is the exact form of a parable our Lord gave in the NT which is found in Mat, Mark, and Luke and therefore is of special interest for us in connection with this passage.

The next time the first half hour we'll have a little test on what we've had thus far, and then go ? ?

You may use your Bibles in the test, but please use an unmarked Bible.

Thus far we have noticed that most of the material is under one or two headings == one of two headings: either rebuke for ~~is~~in and declaration of punishment or else it is comfort for the godly with promises of future blessing. Most everything thus far can be put under rebuke or blessing.

sixth

Now this ~~XXXXXX~~chapter is hard to put under either heading. Because it involves great blessing for Isaiah but it involves great rebuke for the people as a whole. It really goes under a different category. There is much discussion as to whether this is Isaiah's original call for service or whether it is a rebuke given later in his ministry. It is a rather silly thing spending time arguing about. There is absolutely no way to decide it. If it was given in the first chapter of Isaiah, as we have Jeremiah's call in his first chapter, and Ezekiel's call ~~on~~ his first ch., nobody would question that this is Isaiah's original call for service. As you read it it certainly sounds like an original call for service. I think myself that it is a good guess that it is. One cannot rule out the possibility that after Isaiah had been serving the Lord for some time he had a new call which is described in this (6th)chapter.

(renewed)

These first 6 chs. which we call part one (Part I) of this particular course, are actually part one (Part I) of the Book of Isaiah. There is a sharp division at the beginning of ch. 6 and at the beginning of ch. 7. Chs. 7-12 form a very definite unit separate from these first six chs. I think a good argument can be made for these first 6 chs. being a sort of summary of the great part of Isaiah's ministry. Possibly written during his ministry or at the end of it but placed at the beginning as a proper introduction to the whole of his book.

The last ch. in this section which I'm calling Roman Numeral VII Isaiah's Call For Service is one which I'm not going to divide up by means of an outline. The divisions are quite obvious. It is a definite account of a series of events and we will look at these events and notice certain features about them. It is one of the finest chs. in the Book of Isaiah from the viewpoint of Christians.

One time in Seminary we arranged to have this ch. be the subject of maybe a dozen continuous chapel messages looking at the various aspects of it. It is full of spiritual meaning. A tremendously vital ch. for every Christians, but a great part of the lessons of it are quite obvious. There are comparatively few problems in it that we need to go into. I think we should take time to emphasize its great value on the Scripture and its great importance in your preaching and studying.

On the screen . . . I don't care what version of the Scripture you use in this class. Any version at all in any language, but if you use something other than the three that are most used among conservatives today --- the KJV, NASB and NIV which exists in the OT only for Isaiah --- if you use another one or even if you use one of these and any particular problem arises in your mind between it and another version I wish you would call our attention to it.

It might be that you if you are using some far out version that you wrote out your question and . . . after class . . . take time in class(?) But it adds to the value of the class if some are on the (?)

It begins with a strange statement - "in the year that King Uzziah died I saw the Lord." Why doesn't he say, "In 732 B.C. I saw the Lord"? That would be much more reasonable wouldn't it? But it is a strange thing that this system we have of calling years by numbers only originated about 400 years after the time of Christ. Before that time there was one nation that got into the habit of using it. That was the nation of Syria where Seleucus, one of Alexander's great generals, had secured the largest portion of Alexander's empire after his death, and Seleucus had been in control in Babylon for a brief time and the governor had been driven out and took service with Ptolemy the King of Egypt and then he came back with Ptolemy's help two battles (?) and reestablished himself there.. He did this in 312 B.C. For some reason they started number in that region in the year that Seleucus came back to Syria. That's the oldest known system of continuous numbering. That system was continued so long that in Heb. MSS of the OT written sayin 1000A.D. you will have the year often given as such and such a year of the Seleucus era, that is so many years after 312 B.C. when Seleucus went to Babylon(?). The worst of it is that it often it makes those MSS one hundred years from so long that people did not bother to put do-n the century! They would just say written in the year 54, and you don't know whether it was the year 1454 or 1354 or 1254 after Seleucus went to Babylon(?).

That is the first time numbers were used that way. In Egypt they would often be numbered by the reigning king and also by as in the OT they would say in such a such a year of such a king. When you had a king like Uzziah who was strickedn with leprosy and had to ~~turn~~ turn over everything to his son and we don't know ~~what~~ what year of his reign that happened, somebody might say it was in the 30th yr. of Uzziah who reigned 52 years. Somebody might say it was in the 6th year of Jotham and it might be part of the same year. It might be one of the other two.

In Assyria they named the years after the year of a particular missions. The first year was the year of the king; the second year would be the year of his leading minister, etc. And if he reigned say 40 years it gets down to fairly unimportant officers. It gives you a different year for the man for the year.

In Rome they named them after the consuls and as you see this becomes very complicated. So that the Seleucid era perhaps gave the idea, and then a Christian monk named Dionysis some time in the 5th century estimated when Christ was born and said this is the date 467 years after Christ was born, and from then on he used those numbers, but he was somewhere between four and six years off in his calculation. So our years are off a few years. But it gave us a wonderfully convenient system.

So Isaiah said that "in the year that King Uzziah died...." But when he mentions it this way, most interpreters think that he is not merely calling our attention to the time when this happened

and incidentally the time when this happened does not tell us whether this was the beginning of Isaiah's ministry or not, because he ministered in the reigns of Uzziah, Jothan, Ahaz, and Hezekiah. If the call came the year King Uzziah died that could be enough just by putting the name Uzziah to it, but when you put all four kings it is a very long period of time.

But that does not prove whether this was his original call or a later call, but most interpreters think that his mentioning this is not merely a means of saying when this vision came. That it also points to the background of the general situation. Uzziah had begun as a very godly king, a man who desired to do the will of God, a man whom God blessed. But as he succeeded in reigning as a very good and successful king after a time the situation went to his head as it so often does when the person is in a position of authority or real power and he began to consider himself of greater importance than he was, and decided to take over control of the religious aspects of the nation.

Theoretically that is true even today. Today the Queen of England is according to her official title the head of the church of England and theoretically nobody can assume any position in the church of England today except as the Queen appoints them. Actually the church makes most of its decisions, but the Prime Minister may change them and put in whoever he wants in positions in the church. The Prime Minister merely controls what is done in the Name of the Queen. That was forbidden in the OT. The rulers were civil rulers. They were supposed to protect the religious authority but they were not themselves to assume leadership or make determinations in religious matters. That was a distinctly separate thing. And we believe Church and State should be separate. That was one of Calvin's great stands, that Church and State must be separate.

Even though the leaders in the church in Geneva in Calvin's time were appointed from the councils that were elected by the people as the political elections. Thus the state had great authority over it and Calvin did not like that but there was nothing he could do about it, yet Calvin insisted that the ministers along with these men who were leaders in control of the church that they should not be interfered with by the civil authority. He risked his life several times because he insisted on it.

Luther took the opposite attitude. Luther said, What do we care who runs the church. Let the Bishops keep on running the church just so they preach the Gospel. Trouble was the Bishops in his time were not preaching the Gospel, and there was one way of making them. So in ~~Denmark~~ Denmark appointed new ones, while in Sweden the King appointed new ones, and eventually situations changed, but it remained in the Lutheran countries that the State controlled the church. To some extent it remains that way today, in Germany and in Scandinavian countries.

But this was forbidden in the OT. And so King Uzziah when he went beyond his authority as king and decided he would take over the religious and went right to the temple and began to offer incense which only the priests were supposed to do. We read in the books of Kings and Chronicles how the priests came in and rebuked him for it and then



He looked at him and Uzziah's ~~face~~ face had broken out with leprosy and he hastened out. God had punished him in this way for having destroyed the basis that God intended to be the basis of the Israelites' control, that the king controlled political things and the religious leaders controlled the religious aspects and his face broke out with leprosy and we read that he lived in his own house alone for the rest of his life. How long that was, whether 40 yrs. or 10 years or what we don't know.

But it would seem likely that Isaiah would pass by ~~and~~ the house where Uzziah lived alone. Nobody dared go near him for fear of catching leprosy. They would pass the food in and he would get a hold of it and they would wash very very carefully and be careful not to touch so afraid were they of catching his scourge and as Isaiah would pass by and perhaps see Uzziah's face at the window it ~~was~~ would suggest to Isaiah the wonderful start that this man made and how he seemed to be such a wonderful man, so truly followed the Lord, and then the way in which he departed from the Lord and the terrible way in which the Lord punished him.

So it is thought by most interpreters that Isaiah says this not merely to tell us when this vision of God came to him, but to show something of the background in Isaiah's mind when it happened. There would be the tragic feeling that it would have. To think how one started out so wonderful and yet failed so miserably!

When you look back as I can on a good many years of training Christian workers one cannot avoid somethings having similar feelings and to think of individuals who have started out well in ~~the~~ the Lord's service and then have fallen by the wayside. It is really amazing the number of truly wonderful Christian leaders who fall into sin of one sort or another and fall away. It is often very shocking when we hear of individuals.

So Isaiah's mind was in a situation in which he was very conscious of the tragedy that was so common in human life when he thought of King Uzziah. Whether this vision came after King Uzziah died or shortly before we don't know. But at least Uzziah was very much in Isaiah's mind.

He said he saw the Lord sitting upon a throne high and lifted up and his train filled the temple. Where was Isaiah when he had this vision? Immediately it is suggested that he was in the temple. And he saw this in the temple. Certainly the temple is called God's house. God speaks of the temple as the place where he will dwell. But he dwelt above the mercy seat and the mercy seat was in the Holy of Holies where the people could not reach it. Only the High Priest went in there once a year. Consequently we are not at all sure that he is here referring to the earthly temple. Some think that Isaiah like Paul later on was taken up to heaven for a few days. Paul said he saw things which were not lawful for a man to utter. He does not tell us whether the experience was during those days. But Paul had a marvellous experience and he doubtless learned much that enters into his epistles and his work for God. Here we have Isaiah giving this account of this experience.

We often find a prophet having a great vision of God. Did this vision happen in the temple? Or in the vision did he see a temple and imagine himself in it? If so was it the earthly temple, or was it the ~~the~~ temple it stood for? Was he lifted up to heaven or did he see heaven, see God in of course an imaginary form because God does not have a human form. No man has seen God. But Isaiah saw that which represented God humanly(?) There is no mention of a face, or of arms or of other human features here. It is the train of His robe that is apparent. It is the manifestation of His glory that fills the temple where Isaiah was or which Isaiah saw whichever it was.

Above this stood the seraphim. This word seraph occurs only in this chapter, nowhere else in the Bible. It is a word that would seem to be related to a verb that means to burn. Sometimes people translate it the burning ones. Evidently they would be messengers of God. Perhaps you could call them angels. At least they would be individuals who would be so bright they would seem to be burning. They were God's emissaries in this vision. We do not have this word seraphim anywhere else but in this chapter.

We have the word cherubim(plu.), cherub and by the most peculiar develop cherub has come to mean a little child. And you see pictures of cute little children. You hear people of someone having a cherubic countenance. Actually the cherub seems to have been like an ox rather than like a child. The ~~cherubim~~ cherubim is mentioned much more than the seraphim in Scripture. But these two are mentioned, simply as a reminder to us that in the spiritual world there is much we do not know about.

The material world today is known to have all sorts of things in it that people never dreamed of 100 yrs. ago. There are forces in the material world that scientists have discovered that 100 yrs. ago were absolutely undreamed of and unknown but today are referred to in common ways. Features of great importance. Take electricity that is so important in the life of all of us today. 300 years ago nobody ever dreamed of such a thing. The idea that you can pick up a telephone and dial a person and it rings a bell thousands of miles away --- nobody could have imagined these things in the material world that are so far beyond what we could imagine. Think of the spiritual world what there must be. God has revealed certain things about it in the Scripture but there's an awful lot we don't know anything about.

This is all we know about the seraphim that they were evidently the They represent here, but because they might not have been physically visible -- just as God gave this vision -- they were messengers of God, instruments to do His will, and He gives this peculiar description. Each one had six wings. With two he covered his face, with two he covered his feet, and with two he did fly. He only needed two wings to fly, but he had six! God provides plenteously for the needs of His instruments. He gives far more than we need to accomplish His will. They covered their faces before the majesty of God. Sometimes we hear Christian workers speaking very lightly of God and of Christ. Of course we have an intimacy with God. We can know Jesus as we know our best friend. Yet we must always remember that He is so great and so wonderful beyond anything

we can imagine that we should show true reverence. Here even the seraphim covered their faces in the presence of the Lord!

One cried to another and said, Holy, Holy, Holy is the Lord of hosts. The whole earth is full of His glory. This statement "is fully of His glory" is not an exact translation. The Hebrew word "full" is male and this is glo(?). It is the same root but it is

a noun rather than an adjective. Literally it is "the fulness of the whole earth is His glory." Everyone of the various sources I have looked at translate it this way: "this whole earth is full of His glory." But I can't escape the feeling that it might more literally be "the fullness of the whole earth is His glory." In other words all the wonderful things we know of in the world and all the wonderful things in the universe we don't know anything about, they are all part of God's glory. Now as I say, I have not found anybody else who has that thought, but it does seem to ~~hx~~ me that that would be a more literal translation of the Heb. and that . . . there are plenty of places in the Bible that speak of the earth as being full of God's glory; I can't help but think that here perhaps he is speaking of the fact that all this marvellous universe is just part of the wonderful glory of God who created it all.

And the posts of the door, more lit. the "foundations of the walls" moved at ~~ZZZZ~~ the voice of Him that cried. When the seraphim cried the whole place shook. We read in Acts how when God spoke to the people that the building shook. Whether actually or whether the feeling was, the feeling of Isaiah was that the tremendous force ~~fn~~ of God. It was like the feeling people have in the midst of an earthquake when the world seems to be shaking and we feel how puny, how small is humanity and and its in comparison with the tremendous forces of nature. And God of course is far greater than any of these.

I think we'd better look further into this ch. next week. I did not make any assignment. You've already looked at chs. 56 and 57, and noted in them what parts were rebuke and what parts blessing. All I ask you to do is to look over chs. 58 and 59 and divide them that way. What is there in them that is rebuke? What is in them that is blessing? What is there in them that you don't think really belongs under either category? And you would suggest another category. The is a quite brief assignment.

(Remarks on grading of the last quiz. . . It will count about one fourth of the semester's mark. The assignments will count about one fourth, and the final exam will count about one half . . .)

Assignment for next time. . . There are a number of verses to look at but in most cases I think you can make a quick judgment from the verse alone or from the context in relation to the particular question I have asked . . . I think you can do it in an hour quite easily . . .

We were still discussing Roman Numeral VII which was Isaiah's Call to Service which I did not go into detail in the outline. We had come to the point in it of the seraph coming to Isaiah and touching his lips with a coal from off the altar. Very interesting point. What would it mean to someone in those days? Jesus Christ called the ones on the road to Emaus "fools and slow of heart to believe all the prophets have spoke. Ought not Christ to have suffered these things and to have entered into His glory?" In other words they should have understood from the OT accoutn. How much Isa. understood we don't know. Peter says, the prophets were trying to find out what and what manner of time the spirt which was in them did signify when he told of the sufferings of Christ . . . The fact is that in Isaiah's vision it was the coal from off the altar that touched his lips, and when that happened he was then made fit for service. It certainly is a representation of the fact that the sacrifices were necessary that a man could be cleansed from his sin and made fit to serve the Lord. As Paul said, The blood of bulls and goats cannot take away sin! The aacrifices represented the death of Christ on the cross. It was only through that that any one ever has been saved or ever can be saved. This is very clearly suggested in this vision of Isaiah.

After Isaiah was cleansed by this Seraph bringing the coal from off the altar and touching his lips, then he heard the Lord saying Who shall I send and who wil l go for us? Isaiah said, Here am I, send me. He was ready for service now; he == weare not ready for service until we have been cleansed through the blood of the Lord Jesus Christ. Then what a disappointment it must have been to Isaiah to hear the Lord's words: "God and tell this people, Hear but don't understand; see but don't perceive, make their hearts fat and their ears heavy and shut their eyes. What a terrible thing to tell a man who just thinks he is going to go out and lead the ~~wor~~ world into a great successful movement for God. God and h~~ard~~arden their hearts, close their eyes." Of course there's a background to people ~~ux~~ turning away from the Lord. Isaiah had given much rebuke to the people in previous chs. for the way they had turned from the Lord. The mass of the people have reached the point where they have already gone so far in that direction that the presentation will simply harden them. That does not mean Isaiah's work has no effect in helping people. It does not mean that at all. It means that that was an important part of his work and that the Lord was showing him the worshipping cherub(?) so he would not feel too bad that when he found he had many loyal followers, they were only a minority in the nation.

It is interesting how the Lord in giving the call sometimes emphasized sometimes the side you might say was less prominent but was psychologically needed. You find in Jer. 1 where God tells Jeremiah I'm going to set him over the nations to tear down, . . . to plant and build up. He talks as though Jeremiah is going to have a tremendously important function as indeed he did. But Jeremiah served in a much worse time than Isaiah and saw the nations go into exile, and into misery. But the Lord gave him this happy command whereas in Isaiah the Lord gives him these sad words as he begins his ministry.

So the Lord said, Do this. And Isaiah said (v.11). How Long? Lord how long? We hope we won't have more than a day or two like this! We hope there won't be at least more than two or three years! The Lord said Until the cities be wasted without inhabitant and the houses without man and the land be utterly desolate and the Lord has removed men far away and there is a great forsaking in the midst of the land. The people had reached the point in their apostasy where God was going to bring a calamity and send them off into exile.

But yet v.13 which is not very well translated in the KJV (I think most of you looking at v.13 at first glance would not get much sense out of it) --yet a tenth of it shall return and shall be eaten. The NASB expresses it much better: "(I think the KJV probably would be clear to someone in that time but we use our words differently now). The NASB says: Yet there will be a tenth portion in it. You noticed the KJV said, Yet in it shall be a tenth. But then the NASB "and it will again be subject to burning" The NIV "and it will again be destroyed." This cleansing the Lord is going to give will have to be repeated. There will be a remnant that will follow Isaiah's standard and yet in this remnant there will be those who will turn away. There will be a tenth that will remain true but yet out of them there will be those who will again bring judgment. Yet it is not to be a complete destruction.

The KJV says: As a tuel tree and as a oak whose substance is in them so the holy seed shall be the substance thereof." That word substance does not carry it to us. In modern English 'stump' would be much better and most recent translations render it 'stump.' It will be like a terebinth orsan oak whose stump remains when it is felled, the holy seed is its stump. In other words there will be these repeated purges and cleansings among God's people. But there will still always be a remnant in the earth. The holy seed is the stump which still remains no matter how often it is cut down, it may be destroyed, it may be purged.

So Isaiah is given this general vision to encourage him to go on and see that though things are bad they are not nearly as bad as he fears after God calls. Because God's call stresses mostly one side, and yet he did say in this final word that there would be a remnant of grace after all.

Now I thought when I started this course that I was going to divide it into two parts: first speak of Is. 1-6 and then go on to Part II which would be the last 10 chs. of the book. But I think it is best to touch on certain matters in between, because in looking into 1-6 we have already referred to chs. 9-11, and in going into the latter chs. we need something of the background. So I'm not going to make it two parts, but make it all one part.

And just have Roman Numerals, so the next will be VIII

### A Glance At the Predictions in Isaiah 9 - 11.

A. Isaiah 9. If you will look at ch. 9 to which we have already made reference in connection with ch.4, you find that the relation to what precedes is very important. Ch. 8 ends with a picture of calamity. The people are being punished for their sin. Verse 22, they look unto the earth and behold trouble and darkness, dimness and anguish and they shall be driven to darkness. And in the context he is predicting the attack by the Assyrian army which came during the time of Isaiah's ministry. These Assyrian armies came marching in from the North East, and as they arched there and attacked the land they brought terrible darkness and misery to the people there.

Now the first v. of ch. 9 in KJV: "Nevertheless the dimness shall not be such as was in her vexation when at the first . . . and afterwards did more grievously afflict here by way of the sea beyond Jordan . . . the people that walked in darkness have seen a great light." That's a strange connection. The Jewish copies of the Scripture when they took over the ch. divisions from the Latin Bible they did not put it where the Archbishop put it, but put it one verse later. Just looking casually at it it looks like you have a brand new start in verse 2, and that the break should be where you find it in the Hebrew Bible and the Jewish copies of the Scripture.

But Matthew quotes the two verses together, and it is clear as you examine them together and particular in the light of Matthew it is

clear that what he is saying is that there is going to be this terrible darkness as the Assyrian army comes marching into the north eastern corner through the land of Zebulon, the land of Naphtali, Galilee of the nations. But that this very region in which the darkness first comes as the enemies come rolling over the land, this very area is to be where the great light will first come. In other words where Jesus christ will begin his ministry. A definite prediction of the coming of christ. Now if we only had v. 2 we might hesitate about thinking it is specifically looking forward to Christ. But in v. 6 it is very clear. The reason for the light is that "unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given and the government shall be upon his shoulder." It is a prediction of the coming of Christ. So we have

2. The Quotation in Mat. 4:14-16. There Mat. quotes this passage. After telling how Jesus began his preaching up in that region of Zebulon and Naphtali he says, "That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Isaiah the prophet saying, . . . Galilee of the Gentiles" - the region where the great darkness first came, from the Assyrian invasion, there the people who sat in darkness have seen a great light and to them which sat in the region and shadow of death, light has sprung up" and from that time began Jesus to preach saying, Repent for the kingdom of heaven is at hand" So we have this quotation from Mat. and in v. 5

3. The promised end of war (9:5) This v. is not always immediately understandable to us but if we look closely at it is quite clear what it means. "Every battle of the warrior is with confused noise and . . . but this shall be for fuel of fire, for unto us a child is born. . ." These implements of war are to be destroyed. War is to come to an end because the prince of peace is coming.

#### 4. The two-natured redeemer (vv.6-7)

We looked at this in connection with ch. 4 where he was called "the branch of the Lord" and "the fruit of the earth". Here he is called "a child is born" and "a son is given." God gave his only-begotten son, God caused His Son to be born there of the Virgin Mary. Here we have the two natures of the Redeemer and the tremendous name given to him showing His deity. He is the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the prince of peace.

Now in the course I gave last year we looked at ch. 9 rather at length. Here I merely want to point to it for its relation to ch. 4, and go on to Is. 11.

#### B. Isaiah 11

1. Relation to what precedes. The end of ch. 10 shows the downfall of the Assyrian empire. The great Assyrian empire that attacked Israel as God's instrument for that purpose did not do it in order to please God. He used these wicked men for His purpose, and then He punished them for their wickedness. So we read a description of their downfall in vv. 33-34 of ch.10, and it is given under the figure of a forest. "He shall cut down the thicket of the forest . . . Lebanon shall fall by a mighty one", but in contrast to that "the stem of Jesse" which seemed also to have been cut down - a rod shall come out of the stem of Jesse and a branch will grow out of his roots. So here as in ch. 9 it is closely related to what precedes.

#### 2. The Branch.

(Question regarding what empire) Assyria army. We always must distinguish between Assyria and Syria. Utterly distinct. Syria was really Arab, but it was conquered by the Assyrians and became part of the Assyrian empire, and later the Greeks called it Syria from the name Assyria. But the Assyrian empire was the great empire with its headquarters at Ninevah which conquered the northern kgdm. and overran most of the southern kgdm.

The word "branch" we had in ch. 4. There the Heb. word was Semach. There are 17 Heb. words that are translated branch in KJV. At that time I gave you in connection with that word Tsemach two or three references where it is clearly used in a Messianic sense later on. That was the word Tsemach. Now in this particular case that word is not used but a different word is used -- the word Netzer which is another word for Branch which is not used so much in a Messianic sense as the word Tsemach is, yet which is important in connection with the NT. Because there is a ~~word~~ reference to this passage, I am quite convinced, in Mat. 2:23. I say quite convinced because there are some who advance a different interpretation of Mat. 2:23, but one which does not have much to be said in its favor. But this, I am quite convinced is what Mat. has in mind when he said

#### 3. Quotation in Mat. 2:23

"He came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth" which is derived from this root Netzer, meaning this type of vegetation. A town called Nazareth that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet He shall be called a Nazarene." Now we must never confuse a Nazarene with a Nazarite. The OT tells about the particular arrangements that can be made for a Nazarite who was one who never cut his hair or touched anything that came from grapes, not even rasins. Never touched wine, strong drink, or even rasins. Anything from the vine was - one of the men in Judges was a Nazarite from birth. Ordinarily it was a vow he took.

(Question: How do you spell that in English). You really can't spell it in English. It's ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ --- Nun Tsade Resh. The Tsade in many concordances is written ts.

Which is certainly not the best way to write it. The best way is to write it usually is an s with a dot - N long e s with a dot under it, short e r. So it is from this root naser that the word Nazarene comes, not the word Nazarite. Matthew connects that up with his living in Nazareth. He will be called a Nazarite. He is the Branch of the Lord referred to just once under this title at this point in Is. 11.

4. His Character 11:2-3,5. Very briefly glance at it because it is not the section we are dealing with . . . but for its relation with the other material we looked at in ch. 4. "The spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might . . . He shall not judge after the sight of his eyes neither reprove after the hearing of his ears." You remember that it says of Christ that He knew what was in man. Nobody needed to tell him. He understood in a way nobody else ever had. When he met Nathaniel he said, Behold an Israelite in whom is no guile." Nathaniel said, How do you come to know me? Jesus knew all things. He was of quick understanding, thorough comprehension. V. 5 "righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins and faithfulness the girdle of his reins." I put these 3 verses together in order to mention v.4 separately.

5. His victory over antichrist (v.4) cf. 2 Thess.2:8; Rev. 19:15,21. "But with righteousness shall he judge the poor and reprove with equity . . . and he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked." That word antichrist has come to be used for the great enemy of God's people at the end of the age. The NT says there are many antichrists, so it really would be better to use a different word for that one particular antichrist. But since it has become rather widespread to refer to that one great opponent of God as the antichrist, or Antichrist(capital A), I'm using that designation here, referring to that one great individual at the end of the age. Reading the last part of v. 4 again. . . . There we cf. 2 Thess. 2:8 and Rev. 19:15,21.

Look at 2 Thess. 2:8 and see how the Apostle Paul interprets this passage. Then shall that wicked one be revealed whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth . . . That wicked one. Which wicked one? The one referred to in Is.11:4. There is nothing else in the OT to which to connect it. He will be destroyed by the Lord by the spirit of his mouth. This word trans. spirit could also be trans. breath. Same word could be trans. either way both in the Greek and in the Hebrew. So Paul says this which was predicted about Christ was not something Christ did at his first coming, but something that is yet to come, because the wicked one whom he will destroy in that way has not yet been revealed. He will be revealed at the end of the age. And the Lord will destroy him with the breath of his mouth and with the brightness of his coming . . .

Then in Rev. 19:15,21 we find what is doubtless another reference to this too. In v.15 after describing the coming of the One on the white horse whose name is called the Word of God we read, Out of his mouth goes a sharp sword that with it he should smite the nations and he shall rule them with a rod of iron." Out of his mouth goes a sharp sword . . . King of Kings . . . Another ref. to the same thing is found in v. 21, "The remnant were slain with the sword of him that sat upon the horse which sword proceeded out of his mouth." There is a figure of speech here. Exactly what is represented it may be hard to say. But it represents a destruction. It represents an overthrow of antichrist and his hosts as described here in Isaiah. Paul says it is still to come at the end of the age. Rev. 19 uses this figure too. One commentary on Rev. says that this ref. to the sword coming out of his mouth refers to the preaching of the gospel. When it says it will destroy the whole host of them what it means is that everyone on earth will be converted by the gospel. That is taking it in a very figurative way.



If you had only Revelation alone a considerable argument might be made ..... for taking it that way. I don't think it could be proved. But a considerable argument could be made. But when you have Paul's specific statement that this is looking forward to one not yet revealed who shall be destroyed by the spirit of his mouth and the brightness of his coming, that makes it perfectly clear that is not what Rev. means.

6. His Millennial Reign. In Rev. 20 right after ch. 19 we have a description of a period which is six times referred to as a thousand yrs. A period in which Satan is bound so that he shall not deceive the nations any more. Some say when it says Satan is bound so he cannot deceive the nations, it means that Satan is unable to injure the saved after they go to heaven. That is extremely figurative interp., not worthy of much consideration. What it clearly says here is that Satan is unable to deceive the nations during this period of 1000 yrs. during which Christ reigns on earth. We have that described in Is. 11 in the account of the condition on earth during that period (vv.6-9) The conditions during that time when there will be a complete end of external violence. The wolf will dwell with the lamb, not that the lamb will be inside of the wolf or that the lamb does not need to fear the wolf. Neither of them will injure the other. It is stated in figurative lang. (vv.6-8). Then v.9 makes it literal lang. "They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain . . ."

7. The Obedience of the Nations (v.10) In that day there shall be a root of Jesse . . . to it shall the Gentiles seek and his rest shall be glorious." This word rest is not such a good translation. The word can mean to rest like when we go to bed and try to be refreshed. But it can mean to rest just like this glass case rests on the table. It is the place where he is, the place where He stands, not the place where he relaxes. The Heb. word is used in both ways. There are places where you can take it the place of his rest and say it refers to the place of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem. But most Protestants do not take it that way. But the main thing of the verse is that through Him He will be an ensign to the people and to Him shall the Gentiles seek. That's exactly what we had in Is. 2 where it said all nations would come and say. Let us go to the mt. of the Lord to the house of the God of Jacob, He will teach us of his ways and we will walk in his paths, for out of Zion shall go forth the law . . ."

There is a book written recently by a man who insists this 11th ch. must be exactly in chronological order, and therefore since v.11 speaks of regathering of the Israelites, he says that cannot come till after the millennium. Therefore, he says, the present state of Israel is not the regathering promised in Scripture. Of course we cannot be dogmatic that the present State of Israel is the regathering of Israel, but it certainly looks very much that way. It is possible that the State of Israel might be destroyed, the Jews again dispersed and the regathering again before the coming of Christ is yet to come. It is possible. We cannot be dogmatic. But there is to be a regathering of Israel which most interpreters take to come before the millennium. And to say that because lx v. 11 comes after the account of the millennium therefore it is afterward, is I think reading into Scripture. The obedience of the nations is in v.10 which we had in Is.2:3 and in Mic.4:2.

8. The Time Perspective (v.11) We have the account in vv.1-9, then v.10 does it refer to what happens at the beginning of the millennium or does it give a description of what is all through the millennium? Does v. 11 refer to what happens before the beginning of the millennium or is it with what happens after the millennium? The prophetic perspective is not always made clear in Scripture. If he said after that ~~WOULD HAPPEN~~ this would happen, that would make it clear. If he said before this this will happen that would make it clear.

If I were to tell you I had visited Rome and Jerusalem, that statement would not tell you which I went to first. The perspective would not necessarily be involved in it. In reading the Scripture we can make guesses as to the order in which things happen, but if we are to be dogmatic we must have a specific statement either in the passage or in some parallel passage.

We will not spend more time on that now because after all that is not the section of Is. we are specifically studying in this course, but it was related very definitely to what we have already covered. We will go on now to a passage that also is not in the part we are dealing with but which is vital background to the part that we will deal with most of the rest of the course.

#### IX The Servant of the Lord.

Up to thus far in Isaiah we have had no reference to what you might call the Servant of the Lord.

A. Isaiah's use of the word Servant. We have had the word used occasionally in this early part of Is. There are a few general uses in the early part of the book. It speaks of a servant of the king. It speaks of the king of Assyria sending his servant to do something. It uses the plural in a general way that way in the early part of Isaiah occasionally, The singular word servant is once used of Isaiah (XXXII:3 "Like as my servant Isaiah has walked naked and barefoot . . .") It refers to Isaiah as God's servant in this passage. That's the only passage the first part of Is. that refers to Isaiah as God's servant. There is one place in the latter part of the book which may refer to Isaiah but may not. You may notice them as you go through this assignment for next time.

All uses of the sing. for "servant" after Is. 37 are of a special type. All uses with one possible exception. There is at most one exception. This word servant used in a general sense in the early part of Isaiah is used a great deal in the latter part as you see from these sheets I gave you for your assignment for next time. The word is used a great deal of my servant, the Lord's servant, etc. and they are of a special type, these uses here. They don't refer to an ordinary person or situation. There is one possible exception where it might refer to Isaiah but not necessarily. So we have this special usage of this term the term the servant of the Lord.

We will look at the first three occurrences of this type. They are in Is. 41: 8 and 9. "But Thou Israel art my servant, Jacob whom I have chosen . . ." "Thou whom I have taken from the ends of the earth and called thee from the chief men . . . and said thou art my servant, I have chosen thee and not cast thee away." Thus is the servant here is called Israel? I don't think that any of you would have any question about v. 8. "Thou Israel art my servant". He is calling Israel his servant and he is speaking of the nation Israel. Then in v. 9 he refers to them too. Verse 8 specifically calls the servant Israel. Verse 9 in the light of context must refer to ? ? So here we have in these first two cases the use of the word servant - it is clearly Israel that is designated by name and by who is clearly indicated by context in the second one.

But when we turn to the next one, ch. 42:1 "Behold my servant whom I uphold, mine elect in whom my soul delights." Could that be Israel? in view of all the rebuke of Israel before for their sin, the terrible punishment that is described, it seems a bit strong to speak of Israel as the servant in whom His soul delights. But the verse goes on "I have put my spirit upon him; he shall bring forth justice to the

Gentiles. Well Israel was a small nation. The word Gentiles can equally well be translated nations. The same in the NT - the word Gentiles and nations is identical and you have to guess from context which translation, and often it is very difficult to know which. You might think the two ideas are involved as a rule, though there are a few cases where the word is used for true Israel, though usually it refers to the nations outside Israel.

But he says His servant is going to bring justice to the Gentiles, and how is he going to do it. Well, Israel is a small nation. Assyria has ten times the power Israel had. Persia a century later had perhaps 15 times the power that Israel ever had. How is Israel going to bring justice to the nations? Is Israel going to be able to build a large enough army, a strong enough force to establish justice throughout the world? How is it going to be done? "He will not cry nor lift up nor cause his voice to be heard in the streets." It is not going to be done as through a great military power. There is some other method involved here. "A bruised reed he will not break and smoking flax he will not quench, but he will bring forth justice unto truth." Does that sound like the nation Israel? It is a gentle progress here described. Those who are giving a little light and doing a rather poor job of it, but yet sincerely trying. He is not going to simply cast them out of the way as unfit for His purposes. He is not going to quench them. There is a gentleness. There is a confidence. He shall not fail nor be discouraged till he has set judgment in the earth and the isles (the distant lands) shall wait for his law.

These first 7 verses (of Is. 41) describe my servant, the Lord's servant in a way that would be very very difficult to apply to Israel. We have other cases later on that are similar, that are very difficult to apply to Israel.

So we have here a very interesting problem. The Servant of the Lord is specifically called Israel. Not only in one case but in a number of others as we will see. The Servant of the Lord in the context is clearly referring to Israel. Not only in 41:9 but in a number of other cases. But the servant of the Lord cannot be the nation of Israel in ch. 42. It just does not fit Israel. It is entirely different from what Israel could possibly do. When you get to ch. 49, you find that the Servant of the Lord is distinguished from Israel. In v.6 he says, "It is a light thing that thou shouldst be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob and to restore the preserved of Israel. I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles." Clearly he is distinguished from Israel in ch. 49. When you get to ch. 53 (and ch. 53 should start 3 vv. earlier,) "Behold my servant shall be exalted and estolled and be very high . . . Then the great description of the sufferings of Christ in ch. 53, and the word servant used again in 53:11 - by His knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many" - and the word servant is never again used in the sing. in the whole book of Isaiah.

So we have all these uses of the word servant some of which clearly refer to Israel. Some could not possibly refer to Israel, but are simply spoken of as my servant, or the servant of the Lord. The word is never again used in the singular, but we have this tremendous work that is to be done by the Servant of the Lord and after this we have the servants of the Lord spoken of. Never again the Servant. In 54:17 "This is the heritage of the servants of the Lord and their righteousness is from me." The servants of the Lord - those who are the followers of the Servant of the Lord. It is always used in the plural after this, never again in the sing. in Isaiah. So the examination of these passages will make clear the nature of the problem. How can the servant be Israel and also be Christ? Is the word used in two entirely diff. ways or is there one way it is used which covers all the uses. I won't go into that today I'd rather you'd look these over first & have an idea of it & think a little about the problem. We will close now for today and continue with that for next week.

copy 1

Our assignment for this class is very different from that of the test. The assignment is to give you a chance to look into the passage and answer questions that prepare you for dealing with understanding better the material that we discuss in class.

The next assignment jumps a little bit ahead. I think we'll reach it next week, but we may not. I'd like to have you do it . . . this assignment for next week . . . hand out sheets.

You notice on this I have a passage from Isaiah on the left and a passage on the right. Look at the passage on the left, look at v.16 at line a. "And he saw that there was no man and wondered that there was no intercessor." Now if you look over on the right hand side over toward the bottom, you will see v.5, and there it is (a) "And I looked and there was none to help, and I wondered that there was none to uphold." You see the close parallel between these? Noticing that, under each of the verses on the left that I referred to, you take the number of the one on the right . . . On the right it says "I looked and there was none to help . . ." (5a), "and I wondered that there was none to uphold" (5b). So where it says "he saw there was no man and wondered that there was no intercessor", under each of those you could put 5a-b, and on the other hand on the right you could put 15ab under each of those two. If you find there is a slight similarity you just put the number down. If you think there is a considerable correspondence of meaning you draw a line . . . If the reference is extremely close, circle the reference on each side . . . I don't expect you to do a lot of work on this. I want you to find the great similarities there are, and whatever lesser similarities there are . . . fit in. Some interesting relationships.

The assignment will be due next Friday noon.

We were speaking at the end of the last hour about  
IX The Servant of the LORD

We announced in the catalog this class was to cover Is. 1-6, and 56-60. I thought at first of dividing this into two parts, separately. As I thought about it, I thought that to properly understand the latter part it is necessary to understand certain things in the part in between. So we are seeing certain outstanding ~~xx~~ things between these two main parts. I'm not going to call it Part I and Part II. I'm just going to go straight along.

We noticed last week

■ A. Isaiah's Use of the word Servant. That there are a few general uses in the early part of the book where he just speaks of the servant of the king, or something like that. Isa. uses it of himself in Is. 23. Then as we pointed out all uses of the sing. after Is. 37 are of a special type. (Two exceptions at most). I had one and changed it to two at most. I don't think there are any exceptions, but I say at most there are two. We're not so interested in the exceptions as we are in the question. Since Isa. uses this term so many many times in this part of the book, and never uses ~~x~~ it again after ch. 53, but right in this section uses it so many times, is there a very special reason why he uses it so many times? Does it have a special use? I believe you can say it does, every time he uses it.

Now there are two cases where someone might say it's referring to Isaiah. I don't think they could prove that, but if you want to believe that, it is not particularly important in the whole matter. There are many cases where (with the possible exception of those ~~two~~ two) it is used in a very specific manner. We want to find out what that specific sense is.

#### B. The First Three Occurrences of this type.

These first three are very different, as you doubtless know if you prepared this assignment to turn in last time. They are very different from one another, that is the first two are identical but the third is very different from them.

##### 1.

So look at the first. The word is specifically applied to Israel nine times of which 41:8-9 are as clear as any. There can be no question in 41:8-9 what he's talking about. I hope you have your Bibles open. It would have taken me two or three hours to copy all these verses on to the . . . to put up on the screen in front of you, or else I'd have had to cut the Bible into pieces . . . So if you will look at your own Bible, and I don't care what version you use. Look at those two verses, 8-9.

There is no question that in these two verses he is talking to Israel/Jacob -- the two terms are used indiscriminately. We tend to think of Jacob as a man who was son of Isaac; and Israel as a nation. But Jacob's name was changed to Israel in the latter part of his life, and the nation Israel is often referred to as the prophets(?) of Jacob, . . . So there is no question that in these two cases he is speaking to Israel and about Israel. The whole point of it is

2. Israel need not fear for God has called her in order that a task be performed. This 41st ch. begins with the coming of the great conqueror, Cyrus, the ~~XXXXXX~~ Persian, who comes and the nations are filled with terror. Different nations are rushing to make new idols, seeking for their protection from this terrible aggressor who is coming against them. But God says to Israel, You don't need to fear because you are my servant. Twice in these two verses he brings out that provision. Israel is his servant. You might expect Him to say, You are my chosen one. He doesn't. You are my chosen one; you are the one I have called. You are the one I have great blessings for. You are the one I have great interest in. We find such statements in many parts of the Bible.

But here he says, You are my servant. He says it twice in these two verses. I believe that points to a very important matter. God did not call Israel simply because He chose to pick out a certain group of people and give them certain blessings. God called Israel in order that a certain task be performed. He called Israel to be his servant and to perform certain things. Of course the most immediate is to keep alive the name of the Lord. We know that when the world had turned away from God, and tried to put Him out of their memory, God called Abraham out to separate himself from the ungodly world and to raise up a nation which would keep alive

the memory of the name of God, was a great part of Israel's task. It is keeping alive the knowledge of God. It is the instrument through which God would give His revelation to the world. God used Israel in a very definite way. God loved Israel and He blesses Israel. But His great reason in calling Israel is in order that a task be performed. This task has certain obvious elements we have just referred to and which we might have enlarged upon. But here in Isaiah we think of a very special aspect of the task. That's why he uses the word servant so many times - to stress the fact that there is a great task that is to be performed and He has called Israel for that purpose and so Israel need not fear. God has called her in order that a task be performed.

Now we turn over to ch. 42 and we find a tremendous difference. There we find the word servant again.

That would be a tremendous thing, wouldn't it, to tell this little nation of Israel there? Surrounded by great empires, many times as strong as they were. You are to bring justice to all the nations of the world. Tremendous, isn't it? Is that Israel's task? To bring justice to the Gentiles?

It seemed like shadowy distant great areas to the people of Israel.

Here's a tremendous picture of the task that is to be performed. A description of the servant of God who is to perform this very great task. So Is. 42:1-7 presents this task that must be performed.

Now certain ideas are clearly presented in these verses.

a. The task involves bringing light and justice to all the nations. That we have noticed in v.1 which said "he will bring forth judgment to the gentiles (or the nations)." You find it again in v.4: "He will not be discouraged till he has set justice in the earth; and the coasts will wait for his law." You find it again in v.6: "I will make you a covenant of the people, a light of the nations." So you find this idea stressed here that here is a tremendous task for the whole world, and God has called Israel in order that this task shall be fulfilled.

<sup>a</sup>  
b/ God Guarantees Fulfillment of this task. It is not merely a hope. Someone might say to Hezekiah

might say to Hezekiah, God wants you to establish justice throughout the world. Hezekiah would say, That's wonderful; just give me the strength David had. David conquered a big area around him. Yes, but the Assyrian empire is ~~x~~ five times as big as the area David conquered. Well, give me great forces, great armies, and I'll go out and establish justice throughout the world. For Hezekiah to say that would be about as silly as the ~~xx~~ nation Israel today to say, We're going to establish justice in the world. America and Russia you do what we tell you. People would just laugh. It would be ridiculous.

It would be just the same way for them to undertake to do such a thing then. But this is not merely a hope: Wouldn't it be nice if you could do this? This is God's statement that He is guaranteeing that this task is going to be performed. He guarantees fulfillment of the task. It is not merely a hope. We find that brought out in vv. 1,3,4 and 6. He says, I have put my spirit upon him and he will do this. In v. 3, He will not fail nor be discouraged till he has done this. In v.4 (that was v.4 instead of v.3) Verse 5 God says, You think this is impossible? Well, God who created the heavens; God who controls all things; God says this is going to be done. So v.5 is a guarantee of the fulfillment of this. Verse 6 says, I the Lord have called you in righteousness, and will hold your hand and will keep you, and give you for a covenant of the peoples. We find next

c. The task will be done without uncertainty nor discouragement,<sup>4</sup> "He shall not fail nor be discouraged, till he has set judgment in the earth and the coasts shall wait for his law.

d. It will not be done with violent effort, but with gentleness and consideration, vv.2-3. Hezekiah might have said, Give me a new army. Give me half of the --- three fourths of the forces of the Assyrians. Let me step out and bring justice to the world; let me bring light to all the nations. They don't want to listen to the message about God. Let me force them to. Let me send messengers everywhere with this message and carry God's truth to them. He might say it, he might send a force out to forcibly do this. But this is not the picture of the Servant. "He will not cry nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street." It is done with gentleness. A bruised reed he won't break, and smoking flax he won't quench. In other words, here is someone who is trying to serve the Lord. And he's not succeeding; he's not accomplishing much. Push him out of the way; put someone in there who can do the task. No. That's not the true servant of the Lord, is it? The true servant of the Lord is going to be kind, helpful. Those who are sincerely trying to follow and do God's will, He is going to help them, and not push them out of the way. He won't quench the smoking flax that is just about to go out. Instead of that He will give it life. Give to it opportunity of accomplishment.

These were four aspects of the task. Now

4. It is hard to think of 42:1-7 as describing Israel. As we already mentioned

a. Israel lacks the tremendous power needed. How could Israel do this tremendous thing? Tremendous power is involved. God has never given this power to Israel.

v

b. Israel is human and subject to discouragement. Israel has fallen into sin repeatedly and God has had to punish them for this. A great part of ~~XXXXX~~ Isaiah is prediction of punishment to come for their sin. Yet he has called Israel to be his servant in order that this work might be accomplished and here is the work that is to be done, and the Servant is to accomplish this, not to be discouraged and not to fail till he has done this tremendous task.

c. Israel hardly fills the characteristics described in vv.3-4. A bruised reed he won't break; smoking flax he won't quench. One must admire the Israelites for their accomplishments in the world. Persecuted, oppressed, kicked around, they have nevertheless risen up and been active and worked and gotten ahead and their influence upon the world has been far out of proportion to their numbers. But they have not done it by being quiet and not lifting up their voices and being gentle and kindly. They have done it with force, energy, often with violence. This is a picture that hardly seems to fit Israel either in that day or as Israel as a whole has been since.

5. Yet Isa.41:8-9 and also many later passages clearly show that Israel has responsibility for the Servant's task. Now we look at a few of these verses that bring this out so clearly. Here is the beginning of ch.42 telling us about the Servant's task: what he must do and how he must accomplish it. But look at v.19.

One would mean he that is in a covenant of peace. The other one would mean "he that should be perfect." Now either of these would fit with Israel Israel was in a covenant of peace with God. Israel had a duty to carry out God's law, to show forth his perfect justice. That is what Israel should be, but he says Israel is blind and deaf. Israel is the Lord's servant and yet Israel is blind and deaf, is falling into sin, is turning to idolatry and to wickedness. And he goes right on in v.22

Here is Israel in sin. How can Israel fulfill this purpose? Yet this is the task of the servant. Israel has been called in order that this task may be fulfilled. In ch. 43:10

Israel is God's servant to perform some great tasks. We know that Israel preserved the Word of God. We know that Israel preserved the knowledge of God through all those years when all the world tried to put him out of their minds. But there is far more in this picture in vv.1-7. How is this going to be fulfilled?



## ISAIAH

Definitely designated as God's servant. Again in v. 2

And in v. 21, he says

Clearly Israel is God's servant . Yet how can Israel fulfill the task? The task described in the first seven vv. of ch. 42?

I have called  
Cyrus by his name and brought Cyrus to deliver them from  
the Babylonian captivity)

Ch. 48:20

So there is no question the term servant is used of Israel, but there is no question that the picture in ch. 42 that the work the servant must do is a picture of something that is very ~~xxx~~ hard to think of Israel as fulfilling? What is the answer to this problem?

Delitzsch in his excellent commentary which has many fine things has one thing I think is quite mistaken. He says the concept of the servant of the Lord is to be thought of like a pyramid and sometimes the prophet looks at the base of the pyramid which is all of Israel; sometimes he looks at the top of the pyramid which is Christ; sometimes he looks at the middle which is the believing remnant.

Now I know of no case where the word servant is used of the believing remnant. I know of no such case. So there are only the two ways it is used, with the possible exception of the two cases where it might refer to Isaiah, though it does not have to. With those possible exceptions in this whole section the word servant can either refer to the whole nation of Israel or it would refer perhaps to Christ. What is the relation then? How can the word be used in such different ways?

6. There is a difference between responsibility and accomplishment. That's a point I don't think Delitzsch thought of, but that I think is quite important. . . Though all Israel bears responsibility for the task, all Israel cannot be involved in accomplishing it. Now that is an obvious ? ? but it may not appear at first sight. Suppose I say that the members of this class have responsibility to see to it to see that this table is put here for me before the beginning of the class. Could everyone in this class do it? It would be impossible. We might give responsibility to the whole class, but the actual accomplishment of that particular responsibility would have to be carried out by a part of the class. Now Israel contained many people who did not take part in the major other part of the work of the Servant, who did not make

the true God known, who went and worshipped idols, who disobeyed God's law. They certainly could not be thought of as part of those who were accomplishing the task. But they certainly bear responsibility along with the rest for the task God has given. The whole nation has the responsibility. But the task cannot be fulfilled by all of them. Certainly some are unworthy. Some have turned their backs upon it. It must be a portion of the nation. Now how large a portion of the nation will it be? that will fulfill this vital part of the work of the servant?

Will justice be brought to all the world. Will light be brought to all the world? to all the nations? to two thirds of it? Will there be half of Israel. Will there be through a fourth of it, or is it possible that One individual out of Israel, representing Israel, acting == actually an Israelite can fulfill the task for which all Israel has responsibility?

You see the question then. There is a difference between responsibility and accomplishment. Now we move on to

C. The Individualization of the Servant. When we get to ch.49 we find evidence that this great task of the Servant of the Lord that Isa. stresses so much, is to be fulfilled not by the whole nation, not by 2/3 of the nation, or half of the nation, but by one individual who is Israel because he is fulfilling Israel's responsibility and because He is an Israelite and belongs to the nation of Israel, but one individual who can represent Israel in carrying out the great task God has for Israel. It is a task that will end up in bringing light to all the nations, light to all the Gentiles, the task that will end up in bringing justice throughout the whole world. So the individualization of the servant in ch. 49.

1. The Servant is called Israel in v.3. In ch. 49 the Servant speaks and he says:

So he represents Israel in carrying out the work that Israel had responsibility for. He is to accomplish this work. We would not know of course from v. 3 that he may be taking to the whole nation but as we read through this whole ch. we certainly get the impression an individual is being spoken of.

2. Like ch. 42 this ch. shows that the Servant who is here called Israel must do a work for the entire world. Verse 1,  
-- that was the word they used for the distant lands.  
All the distant lands that were far off were referred to as the isles.

It is a world wide work that the Servant must do. Verse 4 brings it out again:

Now all scholars practically a century and a half ago were convinced that the land of Sinim meant the land of China. In recent years the modernists are determined it could not possibly be China. I saw a statement recently by a man who was teaching at a conservative school and claiming to be a conservative Bible scholar, but who got his advanced training ~~at~~ from liberals in which he says China was only one of various possibilities, and actually he says the world of the OT does not reach as far as China. Well I think the world God knew reached as far as the furthest Galilee (?) and certainly reached as far as China. From times earlier than Isaiah we have objects found in Egypt and Mesopotamia that were brought from China. We know there between those nations at that time. Today a student of student of China, of Chinese history, etc. is called a Sinologist. ~~That~~ That is our common term for a student of Chinese things. Sinology. We use this very word, Sin.

Now he says this is only one of various theories. I know of only one other. There is one other that is widely taught today that this is a little town in Southern Egypt of very slight importance. Since it says they will come from the North and the West then the other direction must be South, and so it must be this little town in southern Egypt which town is represented in a different way, a similar but different way from this word Sinim. The im is the plural ending. But I believe that is a ~~rather~~ rather ridiculous suggestion. We should either say we don't know what it means or, recognize it means China. That of course is not the way the Chinese speak of China by this name, Sinim. But it is a way China is spoken of outside of China, and as I say it is commonly used of China today by scholars of China.

Now it is not our big purpose today to argue about that verse, but if you take that verse in the sense which I believe is certainly the correct sense of it, it fits with the previous verse that the servant is to do a world wide work. But v. 3 has a new idea we did not have in ch. 42 at all. The ch. shows that the Servant must do a work for Israel as well as for other nations, vv.5-6.

That's not the whole nation he's going to bring again to him; this is clearly an individual who is to bring Jacob again to him

He must do a work for Israel as well as for the other nations. So here we have clear evidence that the Servant of the Lord is separated from Israel as a whole. I call it the individualization of the Servant. The ch. in which that great about the servant, which might have been guessed at in ch.42(?) is now made clear.

I might just take one second to refer to the fact that where it says in v. 4 "though Israel be not gathered" many, most recent ~~translations~~ translations will say "in order that Israel be gathered."

but nevertheless a fact that the difference between those two translations is one letter in Hebrew, the difference of one letter in Hebrew. And some MSS have one, some have the other. Which either way you take it it still is definitely taught that the Servant has a responsibility toward Israel as well as toward the whole world.

4. Thus the ch. distinguishes the Servant from Israel. That's a summary of what we have already brought out.

5. The ch. shows that the servant like Israel must suffer humiliation. This is suggested in v. 7 -

To him whom the nation, not the nations abhor. The nation. What nation? The word nation is usually used of the Gentiles, usually used in the plural. But there are cases where it is used of Israel, though this may mean one who is going to be despised by a considerable portion of Israel. Certainly the suggestion is here that the ~~XXXXXX~~ Servant must suffer humiliation like Israel does and this thought is further developed in ch. 50:4-11 which we will not take time now to look at. There are points there that require consideration, and detail and that's not really the purpose for this semester but it is good to have in your notes a reference to it.

D. Fulfillment of the Servant's Work. The Servant's work has been pictured, the ideal, that which God says must be done, will be done in ch. 42. In == It is clearly brought out that Israel has responsibility for this. Israel has responsibility. Ch. 49 brings out that the one who accomplishes this can be distinguished from Israel as a whole. He has work to do for Israel as well as for the rest of the world. Israel also needs it. Now we get further details on it and about the servant's work and assurance that it will be fulfilled in ch. ~~XXXXXX~~ 52:13-53:12.

Now that is one of the great chs. of the Scripture, so we should start at 52:13. It is a great ch. that gives the description of the work of Christ, that which is so important and it brings light to the nations. That which is the very foundation of it, that which is the foundation upon which the justice is to be brought to the whole world. That is described in this ch. beginning with v.13

That is a Heb. word which you cannot translate exactly into English. It means to act wisely. It also means to be successful. It usually means to be successful because you do that which will bring success. I don't know of any one English word that conveys those two ideas. So in the OT sometimes you'll see it translated one way, it's often translated "my people prospered." It's often translated he will act wisely. The emphasis can be on one or the other aspect, but both aspects are involved always. This shows what the servant is going to accomplish. We do not have time to go into the details of it. In this class it really goes outside the section I'm dealing with. I'm looking at it as background for what follows, but the

essential outstanding element in this chapter is vicarious atonement, and we find that already in v. 15. "So shall he sprinkle many nations."

The OT tells how in the Temple they must sprinkle blood, oil or water upon the altar, upon the furnishings, etc. in the temple. It is the purification usually produced as the result of sacrifice. Now no modernist can understand how this can make any sense whatever in Is. 52. So if you take up the RSV you'll find it says, So shall he startle many nations. And there is a footnote which says, Heb. obscure. Well, there is nothing obscure about the Heb. It is a word that occurs 22 or 23 times times in the OT. In every case except this and one other the RSV translates it "to sprinkle" in at least 20 cases. And in the one case beside this == aside from this place, ~~XXXXXX~~ where the RSV does not ~~xxx~~ translate it sprinkle, it translates it spat, which is really the same thing. So in say 22 out of 23 cases they translate it sprinkle or spatter, and in this one they say Heb.obscure.

It's obscure because they do not believe in expiatory sacrifices. They can't understand this, but Peter could. He had no difficulty with the word. Look at 1 Pet. 1:1 "Peter an apostle of Jesus Christ to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, and Bythinia, (we writes to many nations, and what does he say about these many nations?). He says,  
That they are

Peter never certainly would have said such a thing if he did nothave this verse in mind. He is saying, Here is the fulfillment of what Isaiah predicted that through the Servant of the Lord many nations will be sprinkled. Well that is what the modernists of course cannot believe in, so they want to get rid of it == rid of this verse, but they can't get rid of ch. 53. Beaus==== Because in v. 5 it is expressed four times.

times vicarious atonenemt is expressed in that one verse.  
It is again in v. 6

It's expressed again in v. 10

It is expressed in v. 11

And it is expressed again in v. 12. So the fulfillment of the Servant's work which is brought out so clearly in these vv. has a great stress of the atonement which is the foundation by means of which light is brought to all nations, and by means of which the foundation will be laid that eventually He will establish justice throughout the earth.

Now this word ~~XXXXX~~ servant is never again used in the singular in Isaiah. Not once more in the remaining over 10 ch. of the book is the term servant ever used. But the word servants is used, === used twice in the next couple of chapters, and then toward the end of the book it is used quite a number of times. And it seems a reasonable interpretation that the servants means those who are the followers of the Servant, those who are the recipients of His work, those who are saved through what He did upon the cross, and those who are his representatives in carrying that message. They are the servants of the Lord.

So in ch. 54, he says at the end of the last verse

They are righteous not because they have worked hard to try to do good works, but because God imputes righteousness to them because of what Jesus did on the cross. Then in ch. 55 we have as wonderful a gospel call as is found anywhere in Scripture:

You go on throughout ch. 55 and it is stressing that which is to come through David's greater Son, the marvellous blessings that are simply to be taken by faith. You don't have to pay for them because Christ has paid it all for them.

This section of Isaiah continues with ch. 56:4-8 which show the word going out through all the world, so that v. 7 that he will bring them to his house of prayer.

Verse 8 ends that major section of the book and the section we are now going to deal with starts with v. 9, and I've already had you divide that into sections of blessing and of rebuke. We had no such sections to speak of in this section just before which was the great section about the Servant. But now it becomes more like the first part of and we'll go on from there. Please get the assignments in by Friday Noon.

I had a very intelligent question that was given to me at the end of the last hour. It relates to the section of the book that I ran over rapidly because it is not what we have for our main emphasis at this time, so I don't want to take long at this time, but I think it is well worth looking at. The question is, Could you comment on what is the smoking flax and broken reed in Is.42:3?

Is.42:3 taken by itself, or the first 2/3 of it, you would not have any idea what it means. "A bruised reed shall he not break and smoking flax shall he not quench." That could mean any one of a hundred different things when you just take that alone. When you read the rest of the verse, "he shall bring forth judgment unto truth" you see he is speaking about One who is doing a task, one who is going forward to accomplish something. And when you look at the preceding and following verses that is quite clear that is what it is. That someone is undertaking a great task and looking forward to fulfilling that task and in the course of it He will not break a bruised reed nor quench a smoking flax. So you have the picture of One who is headed for a task, a very vital task, and whatever gets in his way he is just apt to throw out of his way and be done with it, and He's not going to do that.

What is it He's not going to break? A broken reed. What would a reed be? Like a cane, something you would lean on, or something you use for some purpose. Here you take hold of something and it just does not accomplish the work. You saw throw it away and get a new one. No, he's not going to do that. A bruised reed he is not ~~going~~ going to break.

flax

And smoking ~~flax~~. This refers to a ~~flax~~ of course in our day we just turn the button and the electricity comes on, but in those days they did not have electricity or kerosene lamps. So they had a little wick, and here is a little wick that gives light. It may be that the oil is under the wick and comes up through the wick and gives you the light, and some wicks don't work very well, and instead of giving light, all it gives is smoke. Throw away the wick. Get us a new wick.

But the picture here is of those who are trying to serve the Lord, sincerely trying to the best of their ability to understand what the Lord's will and to accomplish it, and as they try to do it they do not have the abilities they need, or perhaps they have made some bad mistakes and have fallen back in their, and injured themselves and failed to do what the Lord wanted, but they have repented, come to Him, sought His forgiveness, He has granted it through the blood of Christ. They are cleansed from their sin, but they still are a broken reed or smoking flax. "The bird with a broken wing (pinion) never flies as high again." Under those circumstances it is very easy to give way to despair. But the true servant of the Lord has the great task of bringing light to all the nations, the one who is interested in every one of us. On account of our failures and our weaknesses, he is not just going to toss us out of the way. If we sincerely look to him and sincerely try to do His will, bring our faults and sins before Him for His cleansing - He does not promise He will make us great evangelists, great accomplishers necessarily.

He will use us in proportion to our abilities and in proportion to His particular desires for us in His plan, but He won't toss us out of the way and say, Oh that one's no good, get one that's better. So in light of context that is undoubtedly what the meaning is of the phrase. It shows the gentleness of the Servant and His confidence He is not one who is struggling to get results and he has to throw out of His way.

When you are in ordinary circumstances you are very careful not to break things, and you would feel very badly if you upset the table and broke the glasses. But if there was a fire started there and you had a chance to rush over and crush out the fire before your hose burned down, you would not worry about how much china or how many glasses you broke. Anything that got in your way would be very secondary..

When I hear of someone who has been in a very bad auto accident and they have come through it without much injury. The car perhaps is ruined but you say, Isn't it wonderful you weren't hurt. You don't feel so bad about the car, you feel happy that the person was not injured. Well, that's not the way He's going to have to work. He does not have to struggle to accomplish His work. He goes forward with confidence and certainty to accomplish the task he has set out to do. I believe you would find that is the meaning of this verse all commentaries would agree. I don't think it is a questionable thing at all, but it is something that is not terribly clear when you first look at it.

(Question: Mat. 12. . . .He cares about the small people.) Yes, and Francis Schaeffer in his book NO LITTLE PEOPLE, that's just the mane of the first series of talks. God says there are no little people. We had a student once who I would say was right at the top of the lowest third of the class in just about every regard, academically, personally and about every other way. But he got a letter from his mother who said, What does Billy Graham have that you don't have? Why can't you accomplish everything that Billy Graham did; get busy and work. " Well, that's no way to help a fellow. If he did the best he could with the ability he had, I'm sure God would use him and bless him. But to make one of us think that we have got to have particular abilities that only a few people perhaps have is not helpful. On the other hand every one of us probably can accomplish much more than we do if we would really try the best we can with what we have.

This is showing that after all the work is Christ. He's the One who does it and He will use us, but He does not want us to become discouraged or think that because of our failures He's going to throw us out of the way. If we are sincerely trusting and resting in Him we can depend upon Him for His accomplishing. There's many a person who has worked hard and has had great effect for a time and then things have come along over which they have had no control and they look back over their life and think it was a waste and a ruin, when actually it was not at all. He did not cast aside the broken reed.

I gave you an assignment for last time and as you went over those verses - they ~~w~~ are a little ahead of where we are now - we'll discuss it later, but as you went over those verses I'm sure you noticed ~~XXX~~ I included a few verses at beginning and end, I believe both sides, that did not have any parallel with the other.



But there was a large section, the greater section of what I have you that had very close parallels in the other section 3 or 4 chs. further on. I imagine most of you were struck by the fact that a few of the verses toward the end of one of them, had close parallels with the beginning of the other, but that the larger part of the two of them had very close parallels. We will discuss that more later. I had taken the vv. from ch. 59 that have the closest parallels, that's not the whole section that has parallels, but it's about 4/5 of it, and I have typed them out starting at the left hand side of the page, and then I have indented after each verse or section of verse, I have given the verses from the others that are close parallels and that makes it a little easier to see just how close the parallels of thought are between these two although they are arranged in somewhat different order. I have left out the smaller section of parallels. This is one rather unified section, and so I ran off copies of this and occasionally there's a slight comment. First the vv. from one side in order, on the other side parallels are written. Sometimes the same verse occurs more than once on the right hand side. At the end of the hour you may take a copy if you wish to refresh your memories on it, or if you still remember it well enough just don't bother, but it might be helpful as we look forward to the next lesson.

By the next lesson I hope to be discussing the section after the first part ch.59 going on into the latter part of ch. 59, and 60 and 1, 2, and 3. There's four chs. or 3 and a fraction chs. that I'd like you just to look over in the English (or in Heb. if you prefer) but look it over rapidly to see the main divisions and the main subdivisions. Don't take any division you find in a Bible or commentary of any kind. I don't object your looking at these, but first do it yourself and this I am not asking more than a superficial subdivision of it. What are the main subjects? What are the points of its divisions?

(Question: ? ?) How far did what we had go in 59? Let's say from 59:20 -- just the last part of 59. Take from there on and run through 63. You don't need to look at 63 more than just to note the subjects and where the important divisions occurs. You would not divide any of these books(?) (chapters) for this purpose into more than 3 divisions at the most.

(Question: ?????) Yes.

Now I believe we are ready to continue with our discussion, and so I will go on to

X The Relation of the Later Part of Isaiah to its Earlier Part.

We are now going to start this last section, but here I'm speaking for the moment ~~xxx~~ of the part from ch. 40 on.

A. The "Higher Criticism" of Isaiah. You note I put the term higher criticism in quotes. Forty years ago there was widespread discussion, Is the Higher Criticism Right? Among Christians the term HC came to mean the attitude of those who would divide the Bible books up into all sorts of sections and say they were written by different authors than they seemed to be and at different times. The term HC came to mean to most Christians as destructive criticism. But in most classes 40 yrs. ago even if they were classes taught by thoroughly orthodox men, they would say the term HC should not be thought of as having a bad connotation. HC simply is a term for investigation, they would say. Of who is the author?

When was it written? What is its unity? They would say that term is used with all literature and there's nothing wrong with HC, it is just Lower Criticism is trying to get the exact text, and study the meaning of particular words; HC is studying authorship, unity, questions like that. So that's what they told you 40 yrs. ago in any ~~xxx~~ class in OT study.

Today I fear many orthodox teachers in orthodox schools will say the same thing. In fact, it wasn't long ago I thought it was true. Then I got out of the public library all the books I could get on literary criticism, books which were not particularly concerned with the Bible but with literature in general, and I looked up the term HC in their indexes and I found that practically all of them did not give the term at all, never referred to it in their books. It is not a term used in literary study today outside the Bible. I found in the few books of that type that did use the term, they used it only in relation to the Bible. The term has now been given up in literary criticism. Not only the term, but the thing it stood for. Forty and fifty years ago literary critics would take almost any work of literature and divide it up into all kinds of sections written by different authors at different times. Today that idea is almost entirely given up for all literature except the Bible. But Bible students are many of them way behind the times in this regard. Most any University that you would take a course in Religion, and in almost any theological seminary that's over 40 yrs. old you will find that they are dividing up the Bible according to these theories, and so we still ~~use~~ use the term HC because it has come to be a term for that sort of division.

seminary

I met a man teaching in a ~~university~~ in this city not long ago who told me he was meeting with others from other seminaries and he was discussing the boundaries of Q -- just what parts of Mat., Mk., and Lk., are from the Q source, and what parts are from other sources. They are tremendously interested in dividing it -- this half v. goes here and this half v. goes here, etc. They don't do that today with other literature. Hardly anybody does, but it still is taught in all of the older schools as established fact.

Now we are interested here in the HC of Isaiah, and we are not going to take much time on that.

(Question: screen not clear)

1. There is no evidence that anyone questions Isaiah's authorship of any part of the book until the 18th century.

There were people in ancient times who said Daniel did not write the book of Daniel. There was the beginning of denial of biblical books in ancient times, but we have no evidence before the 18th cent. that the book of Isaiah was one continuous unit written by one man. The book says his name was Isaiah.

## 2. The Two-Isaiah Theory.

About 200 yrs. ago one of the Higher Critics advanced a very simple theory. ~~xxx~~ You look at Is. 1-39 and you find many mentions of Isaiah -- not over 10, but quite a number. You look at Is. 40-66 and the name Isaiah never occurs. You look at Is. 1-39 and you have occasional mentions of particular Israelite kings particular in chs. 36-39. You have no Israelite king mentioned by name after that, after ch. 40. In ch. 1-39 you have many statements that the land is going to be taken into exile if the people do not repent of their sins. In chs.

40 on it presupposes the exile is already here. In the first part there are many references to the background of situations in Palestine; in the section from 40 on you get the feeling he's talking to people way across the desert in Babylonia. So its a very simple theory = here's Isaiah's book, chs. 1-39. ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ Somebody, they say the Great Unknown, a greater Isaiah, they call him Deutero-Isaiah, he wrote a book more or less in the spirit of Isaiah but it was 150 yrs. later and somebody since it was so similar it got written on the same scroll. It did not have any title so people forgot Isaiah was the writer. You might say, What's the great difference? God inspired it all, whether the first book Isaiah wrote or the other by a Great Unknown 150 yrs. later. You might say that at this point. It is an apparently simple theory.

a. The theory is an apparently simple Theory

b. But hardly any scholar holds that view today. That was advanced, and today among conservatives sometimes you will find that view argued. People who are conservative on other points will argue about two Isaiahs. But modernist scholars, hardly anybody, I doubt if there is one that holds to any two Isaiah theory today.

### 3. More Recent Higher Critical Attitudes

It was not long after this theory was advanced that people began to look at Isaiah 40 on and look back at chs. 1-39 and find parts of it they said that were similar. So they said the evidences that show us that much of 40 on was not written by Isaiah also shows many sections of chs. 1-39 that were not by Isaiah. So they split chs. 1-39 all up into little sections, and then

a. Extension of idea of disunity to Is. 1-39

b. Trito-Isaiah. It was noticed in the great argument and discussion that was carried on between those who said the book has a Palestinian background, it was written by Isaiah in the time of Hezekiah, and those who said, No, the last part from chs. 40-66 have a background of Babylonian when the exile is already in progress, it was noticed that those who said the background was Babylonian were presenting most of their evidence from chs. 40-55 and those who said the background is Palestine were presenting most of their evidence from the last 10 chs. So they said, No there is a Third Isaiah. Trito-Isaiah. So they said the last 10 chs. of so (they differed as to where the division should be made) they were written 100 yrs. after the Second Isaiah. So you have three Isaiahs and if there are any today of any critical scholars who hold to two Isaiahs you will probably find six for every one of them who will hold that there are three Isaiahs. But they don't hold merely to three different books written by three different authors. You pick up almost any critical commentary today and they will say, The question is not, is this by Isaiah or not; the question is examine these verses here and decide what is the time at which they probably were written. So they will say here are 6 and 1/2 vv. that were written probably 100 yrs. before Isaiah; here are 100 or so vv. that were probably written 300 yrs. after Isaiah. Then here are 6 vv. written maybe by the Second Isaiah. Then here are 10 vv. written by an Unknown Author. So the book came to be completely fragmented.

c. Complete Fragmentation by Most Critics. That was the practice of critics say 20 yrs. ago There's a little tendency to see the absurdity of going to such extremes today and there is not quite as

much fragmentation. But you will find books entitled THE SECOND ISAIAH. And you will find most of the books, some written even by fairly conservative authors will adopt part of this theory.

#### 4. A Glance at the Arguments

Historical argument. Historical background is a very strong argument. From chs. 40 on passage after passage talks as if the exile was already in progress. This is a very strong argument. As I see it, Isaiah talks in great parts of chs. 1-39 to the nation as a whole and he told them if you do not turn from your sin, God is going to send you into exile. You are having these terrible problems with Sennacherib and his Assyrian army, but worse things are ahead for you if you do not turn from your sin. Even at the end of ch. 39 he specifically predicted they would be taken into exile, not into Assyria but into Babylonia which seemed to them at that time a rather insignificant force subject to Assyria.

But from ch. 40 on -- Comfortye, comfortye my people . . . tell Jerusalem that her iniquity is pardoned, that her warfare is ended . . . you have a different picture. I explain it by saying in ch. 40 Isaiah turns his attention away from the ungodly mass of his nation to the very sizeable group of believing people who knowing what he said was true and exile was imminent, and certain to come, and he was giving them comfort. They were already familiar with that the northern kingdom had already been taken into exile, and they knew what it meant. They knew the sin of their nation was just as Isaiah said it was and exile was sure to come and they would ~~xxx~~ tend to give way to despair. Isaiah said, No God is not through with Israel, God has a great work yet for Israel to do, there is a work of the Servant of the Lord that must be accomplished and so from ch. 40 on sometimes it is called the Book of Consolation. He is speaking to the godly remnant and comforting them. From 40 to 66 that is his principle emphasis. So the argument from historical background, if you do not believe in a God who could enable his prophets to predict the future, it would be absolutely unanswerable argument.

That ~~xxx~~ is to those who do not believe in such a God, it is clear that Is. could not have written chs. 40 and following.

There are two other main arguments advanced. They say  
There are differences in style and  
The Theology is Different.

For instance chs. 1-39 God is majestic; in 40-66 God is universal. They make all kinds of terms like that, and they do not contradict each other. They show a difference of emphasis. From ch. 1-39 he is speaking to the nation Israel with occasional glimpses of the outreach into the whole world of the message of salvation. But from 40-66 ~~he~~ he is looking at the world and at the salvation God is going to bring through the Servant of the Lord. So the style naturally varies a little bit with the subject matter. You write on two different subjects and your style is going to be somewhat different. And your emphasis in theology will naturally be different in two different situations, but there is no contradiction between the theology of ch. 1-39 and chs. 40-66. And as far as the style is concerned some of the critics say It is amazing that Deutero-Isaiah is so much like Isaiah in style that you would think it was Isaiah risen from the dead. You can find differences of style with differences of subject matter; but the

similarity of style is so great, I am ready to say let almost anybody here three chs. picked at random from Isaiah, and then read them a ch. from almost anywhere in the Bible and they will be able to tell you whether it is from Isaiah or not, and they will be able to tell you because Isaiah has a very distinctive style. All through his book he uses a far larger vocabulary than any other part of the OT. He has a poetic flavor and approach that is found throughout the book and that is different from any other book. The only other book that is fairly near it is Micah and there are great differences between Micah though not near as great as with any other part of the OT.

So there is one argument that really matters and that is the argument from historical background. The other two can be looked at in detail and fairly easily answered. But unless you believe in a God who can predict the future and not only predict the future but enable his prophets to be actually carried along that he actually imagines himself to be in the future, and in that situation he talks to people who know that exile is coming and who are tending to give way to despair and imagine themselves in that situation. Unless you believe in that kind of a God you cannot believe in the unity of Isaiah.

To me the thing that matters is the NT attitude.

5. The NT attitude. The NT quotes from Isa. more than from any other book in the OT unless it be the book of Psalms which has 150 chs. as against only 66 in Isaiah. But the NT quotes many times from various passages of Isaiah. But c. 13 times it quotes from it as the work of Isaiah; 6 of these are from one to ch. 39 the first 39 chs., and 7 of them are from the last 27 chs. The cases where it says Isaiah says.

To me one of the most interesting things is to look at the book of Romans and see what language God led the Apostle Paul to use in quoting from Isaiah. We find there that in Rom. 9:27 Paul says, Isaiah, the KJV says Esaias following the Greek sounds instead of the Hebrew but the two of course are identical in meaning, Isaiah also cries concerning Israel

quoted from Is. 10:22. The is

Then we find that two vv. further he says,

That is a quotation from the first ch. of Isaiah (1:9). So here are two quotations he makes from the first part of Isaiah.

Then in ch. 10:16 he says

Here he quotes from the second part of Isaiah. He does not say, As we read in the book of Isaiah, Lord who has believed our report. You can say the book of Isaiah even if Isaiah only wrote the first ch. Even if that's only the name of the book. But that's not what he says. Under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit he says, As Isaiah says, Lord who has believed our report. So here he quotes from the second part of Isaiah using the same terminology that he used in quoting from the first part.

Then four vv. on in 10:20 he says,

Here he quotes from Is. 65:1 which is from the so called Third Isaiah. So here within two chs. Paul quotes from the First Isaiah, the Second Isaiah, and the Third Isaiah introducing them all with the words Isaiah says, Isaiah is very bold and says. It is very plain he is not saying the book says, he is saying the man says.

Paul did not have to enter into questions of criticism. He did not have to tell us whether there was one Isaiah or two or three. He could have side stepped the question. He could have simply have said, It is written in the book, or as the prophet says, or in the book of Isaiah, or something like that. But the fact he is so specifically refers to all three parts as the work of Isaiah to my ~~mind~~ mind as a Christian settles the matter that the book of Isaiah was one book, written by one man, even though it is a difficult thing humanly speaking to believe that a man in the time of Hezekiah could look forward so specifically to events that would 150 years later.

#### B. The Important Change in Isaiah 40.

1. Relation to the exile. We did not for purposes of this class make reference to specific passages, but there are a good many that say that God is going to deliver Israel. He will take you home from Babylon. In the first part in ch. 30 he said they would go to Babylon, but there it was a prediction. Here he assumes they are already there.

2. The Servant of the Lord. We took our last hour in seeing how that concept was developed. Israel cannot perish because Israel has responsibility for this great work that must be done. So Israel is the servant of the Lord. But in the fullest sense the servant of the Lord is one who is from Israel and who can represent Israel but who is an individual who does a work not merely for the whole world but for Israel also as well as the nations outside. So we looked at that last week. The development of this concept of the Servant of the Lord.

#### 3. The Possibility of Prediction.

When the RSV of the NT came out I found many excellent translations. I found good flowing English and on the whole I was well pleased with it. The OT of the RSV did not come out until about 5 yrs. later. I said, the RSV-NT strikes me as a wonderful translation, but when the OT comes out we are going to have a very harmful book. Because I said, it is possible for a group of men who do not believe in a miracle working God, who do not believe in the necessity of salvation through Christ, who think of these as foolish outworn ideas, nevertheless to be first-class Greek scholars and go to the Greek and see what those apostles believed, and say that here is what those apostles believed. So they presented objectively on the whole a good translation of the NT. But when they combined it with the translation of the OT it is impossible for men with that viewpoint to think that men in OT times could look forward 500 or 1000 yrs. and ~~see~~ see Christ and predict it, and predict specific things about His work and life, about His death and His resurrection. Therefore, these men though they can objectively give a pretty decent translation of most of the NT, when it comes to the OT they simply cannot believe that such things can happen.

Therefore they are bound to translate them in ridiculous ways. When you looked up the Messianic passages in the OT-RSV I found that where it said "kiss the Son" lest He be angry, they translated it (if I recall correctly) "Kiss His Feet", then they had a footnote, Heb. is obscure. But the very same word they translated in another place "son". It's not a common word for son but in the other place they translate it "son."

Where Peter says Jesus' resurrection fulfilled the ~~XXXX~~ Psalms statement "thou wilt not suffer thine Holy One to see corruption" the RSV translated it "he will not see the pit." In the NT they translate it "corruption." They have a footnote referring to the OT passage and in the OT passage they translate it "pit."

Where it says "his goings forth are from of old from everlasting" they say "his genealogy is from way back". They get away from the Messianic interpretation because naturally not believing in the supernatural God they can't believe that people back then could predict the wonderful things about Christ. They can't believe that so they have to twist it some way. But in just about every case I found that the twisting they did was not in line with the actual study of the Hebrew. There was abundance of evidence that the Messianic translation was one which had plentiful evidence philologically.

That such a thing should occur, to my mind the two clearest passages on it are 1 Pet. 1:10-12 in which the Apostle explicitly says, speaking about Christ,

Peter says the OT prophets did predict things they did not fully understand; they predicted the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow.

Now that does not mean we should do like some do - find Christ on every page of the OT, twist everything in the OT to fit Christ - not at all. There's a great deal in the OT about Messiah, but there are specific passages in almost every book of the OT in which the prophet looks forward to the coming of the Saviour. How much he understood of it, we don't know. But there are these passages.

Then Lk. 24:25 when Jesus talked with the disciples on the road to Emaus he said,

Thus he showed very clearly that God through the Holy Spirit enabled the OT writers to see things they did not fully understand and to predict the future. If this can be true about the coming of Christ there is no reason it can't be true about the exile too. There is no reason God could not enable Isaiah to put himself in the situation of those in exile just as God was going to bring them back and speak to people who were themselves in imagination in that situation.

### C. The Change at Isa. 56:9

It's very interesting, I've noticed once, I've never heard it said but I've happened to notice just as there are 39 books in the OT and 27 in the NT, there are 39 chs. in what the critics call the first Isaiah and 27 in what they call the second. That's one of many coincidences in life, but it makes it easier to remember the fact. But this is an important change at ch. 40 but now at ch. 56:9 there comes a change not as important as that but let us say second in importance to that in ch. 40.

So I consider 40:1 to 56:8 as one section which I have written a book called ISAIAH SEES THE SAVIOUR discussing that section ending at that particular point because that forms a definite unit. The Archbishop got so confused that he made his ch. division in such a way that one of the most important divisions in the book would be made right in the middle of a chapter. So we have this important change at 56:9.

1. There is a great similarity to earlier portions hereafter than before. There is also a difference between what follows and the early part of Isaiah, but in some ways from 56 on is more like the first 35 chs. of Isaiah than it is ~~like~~ like chs. 40 to 56. Chs. 40-56 form a very definite unit. This is somewhat like the earlier sections. What is most important is the alteration of sections in the many earlier portions of Isaiah of rebuke for sin, followed by blessing to those true to God. That is very common in many prophetic books, and it is common in the early part of Isaiah. It is common from here on but practically not found at all from 40 to 56.

2. The Likelihood that the Future Emphasis Continues at least to some extent. In other words what do we find from 56:9 on? Does Is. find that after looking forward to deliverance from exile looking forward to the coming of the Servant of the Lord, then come back to his own time and deal entirely with his own time? Or does he to some extent come back to his own time, but ~~still~~ still look forward to the days after the exile? So to my mind there ~~may~~ may be a good deal of truth not to the idea of there being a third Isaiah but to the idea that in this part of the book Isaiah does look forward to some extent to the situation of the Israelites after they have returned from exile. But as many think they are equally applicable to the Israelites before they went into exile. So I don't wish to be dogmatic on that, but I do think it is very important to keep it in mind. There is at least one person that is hard to imagine having lived before the exile, in this last part, unless you believe God led Isaiah to put himself in that future time and write it in the first instance for people in his own day who put themselves into that time because they knew his predictions were bound to be fulfilled, but also in a way that would be even more helpful to people at the later date than they were in Isaiah's day as was certainly true of Is. 40-56.

Now we stand then with looking at this last part.

XI There is a Succession of Passages of Rebuke and Blessing, which comes after this break. Just as we had at many points in the first part of Isaiah. We have practically nothing like that except for very small instances from 40 to 56. But now we have a succession of the next group of chapters are specifically a section of a



succession of passages of rebuke and blessing. I gave you an assignment earlier in the semester to look at chs. 56 and 57 and I believe all of you between 56: 8 and 9 did some very sharp breaking.

But then for 56:9 on for quite a distance it is all rebuke of sin, and then there is a section that is all to God's people. So those sections begin with

A. Rebuke Against the Watchmen and Leaders of the People 56:9-57:13a. Three times (under XI) we have this alternation. We have the rebuke the blessing, the rebuke the blessing, and the rebuke and the looking forward to the wonderful things God is going to do. We have a long section that is made up of this triple alternate.

So the first part of it is this rebuke against the watchmen and leaders of the people 56:9 to 57:13a, and in my notes here I have indicated a number of comments on individual verses there which I think could be helpful and edifying but are perhaps not as important to us as some of the things we will strike later on,

I will call your attention to a few of the things in this section. You notice it starts v.8 ends the previous section. The

That ends that section the previous verse

Now probably the Archbishop was misled by the fact that after saying they were going to be gathered the next verse says

There is a gathering and then there is a coming. But actually there is such a complete break between these two -- the preceding and following verses that I think there should be a complete new start there. Then he goes on, Why are the beasts of the field called to devour? Why is God calling for vengeance on the people? Because the watchmen are blind, they are ignorant, they are all dumb dogs, they cannot bark, sleeping, lying down, loving to slumber. Somebody once said that the D.D.. often means "bumb dog", and of course that is true in areas where you have modernism coming in and where a man who really believes the Bible keeps quite for fear of not getting the D.D. by some college. In such a case it should mean dumb dogs. Actually D.D. is an honorary degree which colleges used to give to somebody who had in his congregation somebody who gave a good sum to the college, or to whom they really thought deserved it. Many who received the honorary degree fully deserved it, and I was glad to see many get it. But there were many other cases where they got it for wrong reasons.

But his watchmen he says they are not calling people's attention to their sin. I read a book a couple of days ago by a great Christian leader who died a couple of years ago. In this book he speaks in most glowing terms of his years in a Christian college 40 -50 years ago. He tells of his wonderful times there, how much this college meant to him and all that. It is by a man who has written books showing the terrible modernism of our day, but he does not give even a suggestion in his book of the fact that that college which was then a good Christian college within 20 yrs. after he graduated from it became a place which tore down people's faith

I ~~was~~ met a young fellow who went to it thoroughly believing in the Bible ~~XXXXXX~~ wishing to make his life count for Christ and when he graduated from that so called Christian college his mind was full of doubts and he was very much upset and did not know what he believed, and then he went to a seminary that was quite modernistic and when he came out of that he believed == he did not believe in any Christian doctrine. He was completely changed by that college. This man does not put a single word in about the danger of it. And people who love that man's wonderful preaching and some of his great stands for the Lord, read that book and say, That's where I want my children to go to college. And I'd far rather they went to an athiestic school than to an a college that has all the forms of pietism and all the terminology and yet it is turning out people == it is tearing down people's faith.

I would say to that extent he is one described here -- the watchmen are blind, ignorant, they are dumb dogs, they ~~do~~ cannot bark, sleeping, lying down, loving to slumber. So the watchmen are called slothful, lying down, loving to slumber, they are called selfish, greedy dogs, that never have enough. They are called sensuous, v.12.

Their selfishness is stressed again in the next two verses(57:1-2) and vv. 3-4 again stress their sensuousness and idolatry, etc. We'd better not today glance at these

B. Blessings of the Men of Faith 57:13b-19.

I believe I've already given the assignment so we'd better close.

So long as you include at least five verses of the previous chapter I don't care whether you go further back or not, but I want you to answer three questions.

#1 What is the purpose of the prayers? What is the petition being made for?

#2 On what grounds is this petition being made? What are the reasons? You ask your father to give you an auto for Christmas, you say reason number one: You are my father and you owe it to me. Number two, I've been a good boy all year. Number three, I promise not to get into any accidents. What are the reasons for the petitions that are made?

#3 What evidence is there in the prayer of sincere repentance? and determination to turn away from sin?

You might conceivably spend several hours on this, but there is noneed to. Try to answer the first one in one sentence. I would like you to spend an hour reviewing the material we covered in class so I do not intend the assignments necessarily to take more than an hour. Spend an hour on it I will be satisfied. . . . Read it for yourself and get answers to these questions. If you want to consult a commentary I have no objections.

It is quite obvious as you look at the latter part of ch.64 that there is a prayer being given. This prayer starts at least five vv. before the beginning of ch. 64. You may think it starts further back than that. I don't care if you think so or not. . . . It at least includes all of ch. 64 and the five verses immediately preceding. What are they asking for? On what ground are they asking for it? What are the evidences of sincere repentance and determination to turn away from sin? and to be faithful to the Lord in the future?

I had a question turned in to me last time at the end of the hour: Just what is meant by the watchmen in

A. Under XI

Rebuke against the Watchmen and the Leaders of the People  
56:9-57:13a

(B. The Important Change at Isa. 40

1. Relation to Exile
2. The Servant of the Lord
3. The Possibility of Prediction

C. The Change at Isa. 56:9

1. The Great Similarity to Earlier Portions
2. The Likelihood that the Future Emphasis Continues, at least to some extent

XX A Succession of Passages of Rebuke and Blessing

- A. Rebuke against the Watchmen and the Leaders of the People (56:9-57:13)

The term watchmen as used here in the context means those who have responsibility not only for themselves but also for others. Naturally, the leaders of the people - the priests, the prophets, the kings, they were watchmen in a special sense because they were appointed to watch over the well-being of the nation. So they are the ~~w~~ones here that are called the watchmen.

The message has equal importance for us today because we trust that all will someday be in the position where you are expected to watch over the well fare of people in your congregation or the group to whom you minister. You will be a watchman for them to show them how to avoid evil and to guide them away from that which will destroy their lives and the lead them toward the Lord.

But there is a sense in which every Christian is a watchman, because God has not given the oversight of Christians only to those who are set apart . . . but each of us has a duty regardless of how he earns his living. The true Christian has a duty to try to lead others into the fold of Christ and a duty to help others. So this rebuke against the watchmen and the leaders of the people which runs from 56:9 to 57:13a deals particularly with the leaders but has a relevancy for all.

XI A Succession of Passages of Rebuke and Blessing. You find such succession of moving from rebuke to blessing in most of the prophecies. You find it in the earlier parts of Isaiah but not in the section after ch. 40 until you get to here. You find it very little in that section where he is comforting his people and promising He will bring them safely back to the land of Israel and showing how the cure for exile must be more than just bringing them back - they must have the sin problem dealt with and the Servant of the Lord is to be sent to bear on the cross the sins of all who believe on His Name.

So we have a difference now after the beginning of this section, 56:9 quite apart from what immediately preceded it. As I mentioned last time this has a greater similarity to earlier portions yet there is a likelihood to be noticed (as I have No.2 on the board) that future emphasis continues at least to some extent. That is Isaiah is speaking to his own people but not exclusively to them. It may be that God particularly has in mind these people after the exile when they return to their land and when there is a tendency after a time to become careless and selfish. So he speaks here about the watchmen. He reproves them for being slothful. In vv.1-2 of ch. 57 he reproves them for being selfish. In vv.3-4 he reproves them for being sensuous. In vv.4-9 he points to the terrible danger of idolatry again, of falling into putting other things ahead of the Lord. In v.10 he speaks of the fact of their failure as watchmen results in their becoming weary, becoming unhappy, and they are and yet they are not turning to the Lord for the help He is willing to give them. He stresses how they are turning to human resources instead of to God.

Our tendency is to put all our emphasis on the wonderful blessings through Christ that are available to us. Certainly that should be our main emphasis but there also is to be an emphasis on the nature of sin, that is needed and these OT passages have great relevancy although even though addressed originally to the people of Israel. There's much in this section we could look at at length but there is other matters later on that I must get to in Isaiah this semester, so I'm going to hurry through this section and call your attention to the fact that

the transition from this section to the next starts in the middle of a verse. It is in v. 13:

That is an important part of the rebuke. Their own resources will be insufficient for their protection, but the last half of the verse says:

And from there on for a section he is dealing with blessing for those who are true to him. So v.13 might seem to flow smoothly part of the same idea but there is a change that runs for several verses and these changes, thus, in this section seem quite gradual and yet actually they are rather sudden even though often they come in the middle of a verse. Several verses before are rebuke, and several verses after that are blessing.

Now there are various ways one may attempt to divide up Scripture. We have to see what ways will work out in particular passages, and I have found in the prophetic scriptures that in many cases this division into passages of rebuke and passages of blessing is, I have found, very helpful in seeing the changes in the general approach, that the prophet takes. Here he turns his attention away. His attention has been for about 20 vv. on the watchmen and the leaders that were unfaithful to God. Now he turns it to

B. Blessings to the Men of Faith 57:13b-19. Here is speaks in contrast to the situation of those who do not truly follow the Lord. These who do follow the Lord are described in the beginning of it as the ones who put their trust in Him and who say  
 Now this word cast up ~~now~~ does not make much sense to us today. We would say build up. It was the usual way in making a road to take dirt and rocks and put them down and smooth them off and so build the road up higher than what was around. The road is apt to be higher than what is around anyway because otherwise the water would be going into it and will soon wreck it. So this term is evidently used in old English - Cast up. In casting up the material to build the road. Used of building roads, highways. These are preparing the way for the people to go in accordance with God's desires and taking stumblingblock out of the way. So the Lord gives them these wonderful promises. He says

Verse 16

He recognizes that these who are faithful are not perfect by any means. They are those who are trying to serve Him, trying to seek His way, trying to find the true meaning of what Isaiah is giving about the Servant of the Lord and how He will give himself a ransom for many. And he says the spirit would fail before me if

you were to try to find salvation by your works of righteousness which is impossible. But those who are contrite and humble and who try to follow the Lord and put their faith in the redemption He provides, He says that He will revive them and that He will help them.

Verse 17 points back to their sin but back to it not as rebuke but to show them how He has brought them out of it.

Good old English word "frowardly" - I'm not quite sure what it does mean in modern English, but it's one of these words that has disappeared from our language. I don't think it does a fraction of the hard that words do that have changed their meaning. You strike a word frowardly, or words of that ~~xx~~ type and you know what it means, it's just a blank. But when you strike a word we use today like "Take no thought for tomorrow", of course that's absurd - take no thought for tomorrow. The Lord wants us to take thought, but what He means is Take no anxious thought; don't be upset; He certainly wants us to plan. So it's these words that have changed a little in their meanings that are the main reason we need the Bible in our own language today, more than the words that have disappeared and become a blank. Like "I do you to wit" - nobody in the world would have any idea what that means today if they did not go on and read the context.

But this section goes through v.18, and I wish the archbishop had made the end of the ch. at v. 18

This is our first alternation in this passage. Then we go on to the next one

C. Rebuke Against wickedness and especially against insincere formalism 57:20-58:5

Again we have a connection between the last word of this section and the first of the next. This is telling how God brings peace to those ~~x~~ who are distant and to those who are near, but who put their trust in the Servant of the Lord and look to him for redemption. "I will heal him", but in contrast

This word "there is no peace . . . to the wicked" occurs at the end of two different chapters, the way the archbishop divided this. Some people think the last part of Isaiah should be divided ??? between three parts, because two chs. end with this particular verse and the book as a whole ends with God's punishment upon the wicked. That is not the way to divide a literary work and see what its natural divisions are. We must go by the thought; not simply by the repetition of words.

We must go by the thought and not merely by the repetition of words. Very often a writer will use repetition of words to show a division like, Micah starts each of his main three divisions with the words "Hear ye" and he puts that in to call attention to the division. But one might conceivably as has been suggested put a verse at the end of each of these sections that were similar to show that this was the end. You might, but I don't think it is near so likely as at the beginning. But in either case it is the content(context) not a superficial designation like that that we should use. If the content shows a proper division then it is interesting to see if the writer has put an indication. In this case he has not but he goes right on from speaking of the peace God gives to the righteous, and then he turns to the wicked and starts the second of these alternations.

So this runs through the fifth verse of the next chapter. Immediately we find here, as I noted in the title, insincere formalism. The people, he says, (v.2) seek me daily, they delight to know my ways - he doesn't mean they really delight to follow the Lord. It is obvious from context it means they are using all the forms of being His people.

q

Like a nation that has no God, they say, we will not forsake our idols.

They go through all the forms of religion and they say (v.3)

Why don't you pay attention? And His answer is

So here they are fasting in order to observe the ordinances the Lord gives. They are as Christ said about the Pharisees, praying on the street corners. They are showing how pious they are, but actually in their lives they are not, at all. Jesus said, When ye fast go into your chambers and when you pray do it secretly and God who sees in secret will reward you openly. Here he says

So His rebuke against wickedness, especially against insincere formalism now turns to His blessing on sincere believers.

D. Blessing on Sincere Believers, 58:6-59:1  
Again the ch. divisions were not so well put in, and again the transition is very definite so you hardly notice it unless you have in mind this alternation. I would not say this alternation was a vital factor, if it were only a matter of verses. But you notice there are sections fairly long in each part. Rebuke and then blessing and now his blessing on sincere believers (58:6-59:1). Here he shows how true devotion to God requires honesty and compassion (vv.6-7)

Here is the kind of fast He desires, a fast that shows itself in true humanitarian and Christian activity. He continues:

This word "health" is a good example of what I was speaking of - a slight change. Today when we say health, we mean the condition you are in. But in the old days health would include the idea of the change from poor health to good health. So for modern English "healing" is a more accurate translation, and your healing will spring forth speedily and your righteousness will go before you; (not your reward, and not your rereward, but your rear guard.) This Old English word is very puzzling to the average reader of Scripture. Because we spell rear r-e-a-r which is no more sensible than the Old English rere, but it does make it look like rereaward.

If you turn away from these various wicked things He mentions

Wonderful blessings are given to those who sincerely try to follow the Lord. Blessings offered the people in Isaiah's day, blessings that would be very very appropriate for the people after they returned from the exile, and blessings that any believer in the Lord has the right to appropriate for himself. And we know God will bring these wonderful things into his life.

God made us in such a way that we need one day's rest in seven, and there's many a minister who breaks the sabbath by working harder on Sunday than on any other day and then working equally hard through six days of the week. A minister cannot take his rest on Sunday, it is his busiest day but he should take another day as his day of rest. Some ministers take Monday, except for matters of emergency, to get completely away from their regular work. If they do they live longer and accomplish more in the end. God has made us this way that we need one day's rest in seven. Of course He wants all our lives to be a sabbath in the sense that all of our life is devoted to Him, but it is good to take certain special times and devote them particularly to His ~~service~~ ~~XXXX~~ Service. There are at least two features of the sabbath: there is that of rest which everyone needs==== two features: there is that, and there is the rest that everyone needs and God intends us to have.

So he says, You honor him not doing your own way, nor finding your own pleasure, nor speaking you own words, then you will delight yourself in the Lord and



This section of blessing includes the first verse of ch. 59. But again the transition of all these verses of blessing to the next section of rebuke here comes gradually === not gradually, you can make a sharp point, but there is a definite relation between last statement and the one and the first of the other. Just as ~~zzozzz~~ we had the false fast and then the contrast with the true fast, here we have the Lord's hand is not shortened so that he cannot hear, but your iniquities have separated you and your God. So we have the start of this next picture of rebuke which I have called

E. A Picture of Transgressors 59:2-15a (because it is not so much directly rebuking as it is describing what the impact of === but the impact of it is just the same.)

It divides naturally into two parts

1. Iniquity described 59:2-8c. That is the greater part of verse 8 along with v. 2 ff.

Up to this point we have been describing the iniquity of those who turn away from the Lord but then the last fourth of this eighth verse begins to speak of

2. Its results 59:8d-15a

Whoever goes in these crooked paths the wicked make shall not know peace.

Here he describes the results largely in the first person. Results of their transgressions from 8d-15a

The first half of v. 15 is definitely in this picture of transgression -- the results of transgression. As to whether the division should be made in the middle of v. 15 or at the end of the verse, there might be an argument. I don't think it is tremendously important. I made it here at the beginning. We go on to

F. A Long Picture of Future Divine Activity 59:15b-63:6

We have had rebuke (about 20 verses), then blessing (about 15 verses), then rebuke (10 or 15 vv.), then blessing (quite a few vv.), and then rebuke (about 15 vv.). Now we have a section which can be considered as the sixth of these but which runs much longer than any of the others. Someone might argue for starting (the section) a half a verse later, we won't fight over that but running from 15b I believe to 63:6.

A long picture of future divine activity, completing this triple cycle of alternation. So this picture of future divine activity, being as long as that, though I've mentioned it here under F. I thought it wise to give it a section to itself. So I'm making

## XII The Long Picture of Future Divine Activity 59:15b-63:6

### A. God's Sovereign Interposition to Overthrow His Adversaries

I gave you an assignment a couple of weeks ago in which I gave you a sheet of paper with a passage from Is. 59 on one side of the page and a passage from Is. 62-63 on the other side, and asked you to note the parallels. I believe you all noticed that the last two verses of what I had on one side of the page was very close to two verses that were very near the beginning on the other side. But that there was a large group of statements which were say in the last half, or maybe in the center of the last half on the one side, which corresponded to the first part of the other. That is, the two sections were reversed, one having about only two verses in it, the other having a larger number. I believe all the papers noticed that. Many noticed many similarities, some noticed few. Well, I took the passage from 59:15b-19a and I wrote those verses in order on the left side of the page and after these I ===and after each I put the parallel verses from the other, including all the verses from both of them, except that from 59:15b might be considered introduction to it, and that's why I say if you want to consider that as part of the b? I certainly have no objection.

But I don't know anywhere in Scripture where you have right within a few chapters two passages that are quite as similar as these are. So I gave you that assignment so that you might see the very remarkable similarity between two passages that are quite extraordinary passages. There is very little that is quite identical with either of these anywhere in Scripture, but they are very very close to one another. Last week I mention in class that I had typed these up and had them copied, and that they were here on my desk and you could take copies at the end of the hour. Did anybody take one? Quite a few . . . How many don't have it? Still quite a few. . . . (Distributed the papers )

I want to look at these with you now. Look at these two passages that have this remarkable similarity. I think that the content can be pretty well summarized in the title I gave it -- God's Sovereign Interposition to Overthrow His Adversaries.

Now 15c it seems to me (15c,d) is an introduction to the whole though you might find parallels to it in some of the other verses. But I put it alone at the top:

Then in 16a we have this statement:

And in 63:3a,b

Certainly a striking similarity.

Then 5a

Then going right on in ch. 59 which I have starting on the left side of the page, 16c

And in ch. 63 the big difference is that this is in the first person instead of the third.

There he says,  
 But that is even closer to 5c  
 That is almost identical with the statement in 59

The next part of that v. in 59:16d  
 parallels 63:1c

Then 59:17

This  
 emphasis on clothing is paralleled very closely. It is paralleled  
 with the beginning of ch. 63(v.1)

The garments of vengeance. And  
 also v.3

In 59:18 we read:

The parallel:(63:3):

Further parallel(v.60),

Then 59:19a

perhaps paralleled by 63:1a

Which as I say is

Because Edom and Bozrah, the city  
 of Edom is to the east of Israel where the sun comes up.  
 Biblica

So we have this passage where the Encyclopedia/describes this  
 63:1-6 as a very beautiful but esthetically disgusting(or something  
 like that) passage -- this modernistic Bible Encyclopedia calls  
 this. But it is a very striking passage. Here in ch. 59 he declares  
 how the Lord is going to come in vengeance. In ch. 63 it pictures  
 him as saying how he is coming and the ideas being so closely  
 parallel. That being the case it seemed to me ~~xxx~~ that it was a  
 strong evidence for considering that these form one passage ---  
 A Picture of === The Long Picture of Divine Activity beginning  
 and ending with this almost identical picture. We have one passage  
 in the first person === Except one case in the third person and  
 one in the first == of God's sovereign interposition to overthrow  
 His adversaries.

Well then, it is very interesting to note that in ch. 59  
 this is immediately followed by the declaration that

B. A Redeemer Comes to Zion. And ch. 63 is immediately pre-  
 ceeded by the statement that a Redeemer comes to Zion. So you have  
 thus the beginning and ending of this long passage being identical.

Then you have just before one and just after the other the statement of two verses that is almost identical - not quite as identical as the previous perhaps, but very close. A redeemer comes to Zion.

In ch. 59, I'm starting it with 19b, now there might be an argument as to whether it should start with v.20 or with v.19b. I'll start with v. 20 right now

And in ch. 62 the two verses just before that picture of judgment you have in v. 11

(Question: Meaning of "daughter of Zion.") Yes, the term daughter is used in Scripture quite frequently as a personification of people. The daughter of Zion. Just like we say, France is not happy, she feels that she should be better treated. We use feminine pronouns often for nations. The Bible often speaks of the daughter of Zion, the daughter of Jacob, etc., the daughter of Babylon. It means the people as a whole. A personification.

So you have here the redeemer comes to Zion, and in each case the next verse is very close. In 59:21 it is

While the corresponding verse at the end of ch. 62 is (v.12)

These two verses are very dissimilar in wording but very close in meaning - a continuing covenant that God will have for His people - the Redeemer comes to Zion and God will never go back on the promises He has made.

Now the passage at the end of ch. 62 (v.10) was

That can be put right together with v.11 as introducing the coming of the Redeemer who comes to Zion. Whether 59:19b is a parallel to that, there may be a question raised particularly if you are using some modern version. In the KJV it is

There we have a standard lifted up and a standard lifted up in 62:10. Lift up a standard for the people.

I originally entitled this A Banner is raised and a Redeemer Comes to Zion. I shortened the title, left out the banner because there are those who object to KJV of ch. 59:19. I cannot complain about their objecting to it, but I will say that I believe it can be as well defended as any translation that has been substituted == that has been subsequently made. I'll read the NIV of this:

Now if you have a KJV in front of you you wonder how anyone could translate it so utterly different as that. I think if I recall correctly the NASB takes a position about half-way in between the two. It translates it:

It has a  
footnote opposite rushing: lit. narrow. Like a narrow stream which the wind of the Lord drives. If you want to take either of these modern translations, there is not the same parallel as there is if you take the KJV.

When you see such a tremendous difference, a person naturally asks. How can there be such a tremendous difference in the translation.? The answer is that in every language there are words that are ambiguous. In English you look at the word light and you don't know whether it is the opposite of dark, or the opposite of heavy. You have to guess it from context. English is worse than most any language I know of for having words that are ambiguous, and you have to guess the ~~xxx~~ translation from the context. Usually we have no difficulty guessing, but there are cases where you get two or three words together like that in a verse and then you are up against it, if you have no larger context to make it clear.

In this particular verse, we have a succession of words. For instance, the  
Heb. word sar is a word that is used a good many times for enemy, but there is another word that looks exactly the same which can mean narrow. So it is either  
an enemy, or narrow which can be an adjective describing the river. Adjectives usually follow the noun in Hebrew. So  
or

Then the words

spirit i.e. the spirit of the Lord will life up a banner against him or as a rushing wind == which the wind of the Lord drives. Now the word Spirit is used before the word Lord in the NT over and over constantly. In the OT a good many times. It seems to me more reasonable to take this as the spirit of the Lord than the wind of the Lord. I think the RSV and some of the modern translations have it "a mighty wind" ie. as the wind of the Lord a mighty wind. I don't quite see how a wind of the Lord has a great deal of relevance in this particular passage. It is unfortunate that this same word in Heb. can be either spirit or wind, or breath. It is used a good many times with each of these ~~two~~ meanings. Either as wind or as spirit. It is translated ~~as~~ spirit 230 t. in the OT, breath 38 t., and wind 9 t. That leaves you with a difficult choice. One place in the OT where it says the Lord will destroy antichrist with the breath of His mouth, in the NT the KJV says the Lord will destory him with the spirit of His mouth. You would think that breath would make more sense there, but in the NT the corresponding word pneuma is generally trans. spirit. But there is one case where it is trans. life, one case where it is trans. wind. It would seem to me that the breath of his mouth would make more sense than the spirit of His mouth. But we have this same ambiguity in this word in the Heb., and in the Greek. But I incline to think it is the spirit of the Lord rather than a mighty wind.

Since there is this ambiguity here -- Oh yes, we have one other ambiguity in the verse. The word @ "lift up a banner" is a word that occurs only once in the OT. The word banner, nes, נֶס is very common and to make a ~~WXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ verb from it would not be at all unusual in Hebrew. So it could well mean "to lift up a banner." But there is another word nus that means to flee. So where it says they are taking this word which means to flee, which is used in the causative here i.e. which the wind of the Lord makes to flee. Usually you speak of people fleeing, you don't speak of waters fleeing. When the water comes down, a stream which the Lord makes to flee == so it does not seem to me to be possible to take it from nus, but it seems more likely to be from nes. It is a word which occurs only once in the OT.

Then when you notice this parallel with the other (the passage in ch. 62) it seems to me an added argument for thinking that the KJV is right in this case. But in either case you have God's sovereign interposition to overthrow His adversaries, beginning this long picture and ending. And at the beginning followed by the declaration of a Redeemer who comes to Zion; and at the end of the passage preceded by the account of a Redeemer coming to Zion ~~WXXXX~~ there is a banner raised.

whether

We will have to stop and continue there next week. I have given you the assignment, please turn it in by Friday noon. I am not asking anyone to spend over an hour on it, but if you want to spend more there is no objection.

We were speaking at the end of the hour about this section: A Redeemer Comes to Zion. I had thought of giving it the title A Banner is Raised and a Redeemer Comes to Zion. But then I shortened it because the greater part of it is dealing with a Redeemer coming to Zion and also because in ch. 59 that half of a verse, which the KJV translates with such a beautiful statement: "Wh

I've heard that preached on. It is a beautiful statement. But all the recent translations translate it differently. But here is a case where I believe the KJV is better than any of the recent translations. I don't say it is enough better that the recent translations are wrong. Just as I mentioned last time. This is one of those cases you will find in any language. You will find it in English statements at times where you have several ambiguous words in one verse. Here in this verse you have a word which is used rather commonly for enemy, but which could be considered to be from a root which means to be narrow, and therefore can be translated as an adjective modifying river rather than as the noun, the enemy. Also you have in this verse the word spirit. Now the Spirit of the Lord seems a lot more reasonable than the breath of the Lord or == I think Spirit is more natural to use with L<sub>o</sub>rd. The word is often translated breath. Wind is the way most recent ones translate it. Let me turn to NASB and read it there:

Now it is hard to get much further away than that from

get much further away. But in that the word rushing, they say in the margin, literally means "narrow", but the Heb. word is practically never used to mean narrow. It is used more often to mean enemy. So that is one of the ambiguities in it. This word they translate drives which the KJV translates "raise a banner" is a word which occurs nowhere else, in the Scripture. So we have to decide what the word means by analogy. We have no other evidence. Most recent interpreters take it from a term that means to flee. Since it is in the causative they say it means He causes to flee. Well, that might fit with the idea of the Spirit of the Lord causing the enemy to flee. That's quite all right. But to say that He comes == His glory comes in like a rushing stream which the wind of the Lord drives --- the word "to cause to flee" which not naturally mean to "drive." It could be thought of that way but it's not a natural interpretation.

Now it is not of great importance, nothing hangs on it-which of the translations you take, but another interesting thing in connection with this verse is that word Spirit that in the Heb. can mean spirit or breath. And the corresponding Greek word pneuma is also translated wind or breath, and often also translated spirit. So that makes an ambiguity in the NT. I was very much puzzled years ago with the third ch. of John where we read in v.8,

I was talking with Dr. Buswell once and I said, It seems to me that this must be an incorrect translation because it simply is not true --that the wind blows where it chooses and you don't know where it comes from and where it is going. Why in the earliest days people knew in what direction the wind came from. They could see the wind blowing in the trees off in the distance, blowing the branches, and it was easy to get an idea where the wind came from and where it goes. Certainly in our day with out weather stations we can predict what the winds are out in the State of Washington and how they are apt to reach us a week later. We don't know exactly yet but we certainly can give a pretty good general idea of where the wind comes from and where it goes to. So the statement simply is not true as the statement stands in the KJV.

The very same word which is translated in v.8 "the wind blows" is the same word that is translated so is everyone that is born "of the Spirit." Why don't you say, Everyone that is born of wind? If you are going to translate it "spirit" in the last, why not in the first? So I said to Dr. Buswell who knows far more about the NT than I do, I said, Why don't you say, "The Spirit blows where He chooses"? And you hear the sound of it, you see the results, the acts of the Spirit, but you can't tell where He comes from or where He goes, so is everyone born of the Spirit. And his rather contemptuous answer --after all who am I to speak on NT interpretation which He had done far more work on that I had --led me to think I had better keep out of the book of John as far as new ideas were concerned.

About 15 or 20 years after I had made that suggestion to Dr. Buswell, I happened to be looking at this Zondervan Pictorial Bible Dictionary in which ---for which I wrote the article on "Creation". I noticed the article on "Spirit" which is signed by J. Oliver Buswell. In this article on Spirit he says "The same Hebrew and Greek words translated spirit can also mean wind or breath. In at least one passage, John 3:8, this interpretation is doubtful. But the verse would much better be translated "The Spirit breathes where He chooses". So I was glad to see the result of my skepticism worked over by a NT man and finding expression here.

I fear that none of the new translations have read much of Buswell's article and incorporated it. As far as I know they all still say wind. But I think it is a good example of the fact that when we find a scientific error in Scripture, one of two things is probably true: 1) It is probably either a mistranslation or 2) deals with something that science has not yet fully understood and may contradict with a theory of today that will be given up or may represent something that will be discovered later on by somebody.

That is not directly related to our matter here but I thought it was very interesting in connection with it. This word that many render "cause to flee" is only so rendered, no they render it "drives" -- I don't think that's right for "cause to flee". I don't think it is a proper rendering of it, and this form is not used ordinarily with the word flee. It could be derived from the word "banner" and being the causative of banner, lift a banner is a guess like the KJV has. But I would not be dogmatic between



the two. We can be absolutely certain of this in Is. 59:19b-21 and 62:10-12 deals with the subject a Redeemer comes to Zion. Whether it also has in it the raising of the banner by the Spirit.

Then as we go on from that passage, from Is. 59, or as we come back to the passage in Is. 62, we come to a section, rather two sections, one in each part, which for want of a better title I have entitled

#### Millennial Blessings.

Now these are two fairly long passages == Is. 60:1-20 and Is. 61:4-62:9. These two passages are not passages on which we can build the doctrine of the millennium. These two long sections deal entirely with blessing. They are pictures of ways God is going to bless His people Israel. Neither of them is a ~~passage~~ passage upon which we can ground our ~~belief~~ belief that there is to be a millennium upon this earth. I believe is securely grounded in Mic. 4, Is. 2, and Is. 11. Those three passages teach absolutely plainly that there is to be a sizeable period upon this very earth when there will be freedom from external danger. Having, I believe, proved it from those passages and information as to when it is to come, and a certain amount of detail from Rev. 20, having done so we are justified in asking the question, Do these ~~se~~ two passages deal with that period?

When we look at these two passages we find a few verses in this that very possibly fit in with that idea. I don't say they prove it but they very positively fit in with it. One of them in 60:18 where we read "

This has the theme of freedom from external danger. That was brought to this country in one way when the Pilgrims arrived here. After they introduced a Christian civilization in this country and when Chas. Dickens came here in about 1845-50, though he detested the U.S. on his first visit, and contemptuously refused the invitation of the President of the U.S. to have dinner in the White House, and wrote a book which caused great anger in the U.S. in which he criticized so much about this country after he returned to England, yet Chas. Dickens said that ~~at~~ a woman could walk in any part of the U.S. at any time of day or night without any danger of molestation. That's a tremendous statement. I ~~could~~ would not make that about any of our cities today. Some of them I would not even make it about in the day time. But it was the result of the Christian background and teaching which the Pilgrims and others brought to this country. But, of course, you can't ~~say~~ say there was no violence here because they had Indians around who every now and then would raid their cities and scalp many of their people.

But places having a Christian environment have had a tremendous decrease in violence. But never for a period for as much as two or three centuries has this been fulfilled in any country in the world. Now this of course just says "thy land". Those passages in Is. 11, for instance, speak of the whole earth being full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea. The universality of this condition would be hard to prove from this passage. These two passages have a certain emphasis on the long continuance of the situation. Their great emphasis is on the promises of Jerusalem during the

period of which it speaks, on the freedom from incursion from other lands, about the great honor that would be given to it, and the general blessings of the Lord. So if you are already convinced of a millennium from other sources you can get added information about it perhaps from these two passages.

I would not bother about being too dogmatic even about that because there is no great stress in the passage about the universality of it, nor on the permanence of this condition. I think we want to remember that as the prophet looks forward to the future he often sees things rather unintelligible (?) you might say. I've often used the figure of a person looking at a range of hills. You see something on a near hill and then you see next to it maybe something that is the fourth range back, and the second and third may be hit by the one next to you. Often it is hard to distinguish. So the prophet may be here looking forward to various periods of the Lord's blessings in the future with only a certain emphasis on the millennium. It would be interesting to go into these two passages in detail, but the semester comes to a close earlier than it used to, and so we'll have to forego that because we have some very interesting things ahead.

(Question: What criteria do you feel are important for a passage to be specifically teaching the millennium? . . . )  
I would say that Is. 2 and Micah 4 definitely show it is an earthly kingdom, an earthly period ~~XX~~ which is to be, a period in which there will be complete freedom from external violence. And a period which will last for a long time. Now those three I would say are a criteria which have given to our language the word "millennium." The word "millennium" as used in secular writings refers to that kind of period, a period of complete peace and general well-being. The word itself, of course, means 1000 yrs and that is taken from the fact that 6 times in Rev. 20 the phrase "thousand years" is used, of a time when Satan will be bound.

(Question: Would you have universality too?)  
Well universality is very clear in Is. 11, Is. 2 and Mic. 4. Yes, universality is a vital element of it.

So these are not among the clearest passages dealing with a millennium, and I would not be dogmatic as to just how large a part of it does deal with the millennium. But every bit of these two passages deal with great blessings that God is going to give in the future. So I think millennial blessing is not erroneous for a title for it.

Then we have the Messiah Speaks, Isaiah 61:1-3. It's only three verses but it is quite distinct in nature from what precedes and follows. It is in the first person, and it is very similar to the previous statement about the Servant of the Lord. Is. 11:2; 42:1; 49:8; and ~~XX~~: 50:4,5. You have those passages that are very similar to the beginning of this passage. This passage, you remember, was read by our Lord as described in Lk. 4. It was read in the Synagogue in Nazareth. "

And in these other passages we find much reference to the Spirit of God resting upon him.

You notice it does not say there "to bring good tidings to meek." To bring a time of happiness. It says to preach good tidings.

This statement out Lord ~~ZZZZ~~ read the first half of (at least the first half as it is described there) in Luke. Then He closed the book and said Today you see this fulfilled. He did not say, Today all captives are being given liberty. He did not say today all the broken hearted are being bound up. He did not say that. He said the Lord has anointed me to preach these things. This was the beginning of his preaching ministry.

The statement is sometimes made that the fact that the Lord suspended the reading of this passage in the middle of v. 2 and did not go on to the day of vengeance, shows that the passage up to there deals with his first coming and from there on deals with the second coming. I think that is a guess that is without foundation. I would not say that was impossible that it might be the case. But I would say it is a guess. For one thing, we do not know that this is all that the Lord read. Very often we have a verse or two read as pointing to a passage that might be read. But perhaps the Lord read more than that.

More important than that, the passage does not say that He is now bringing these things. It says He preached, proclaimed them. And in His earthly ministry He proclaimed not only God's favor; He also proclaimed vengeance then. And He did much then to comfort those that mourn in his first coming. If the division was made there it would only apply to His second coming. I would say that the passage as a whole describes the preaching of Christ and He pointed forward to what He was going to do through His atoning death in His first coming which laid the foundation for all the blessings we have from the Lord, and through His second coming when He will bring all these things to fruition and when all who mourn will really be comforted and all the captives released.

I think it is a guess that He stopped right at that point and divides between His first and second coming which does not work out. There have been many clever guesses made, and some of them have worked out. I think it's good to make guesses, but I think we should check them very carefully before we are dogmatic about them.

At this point you've seen how these passages parallel each other. I think that it would be helpful though to have them go up instead of down. Notice we started at the top with A and went down which is quite natural. The other side goes up but I think it is more appropriate to have them go like that. I have titled them slightly differently here. We start with A

here on the left: God's Violent Interposition to Overthrow Evil. I didn't use the word "violent" in the heading I gave you before but I'm wondering if I shouldn't because it is the marked thing about that, about the passage in ch. 59 and also the passage in ch. 63. The Lord comes and His garments are spattered with blood and there is a picture which one modernist writer says ~~X~~ it is beautiful but ethically repulsive. Well from the viewpoint of the general modernist attitude it is repulsive, but from the viewpoint of Scripture teaching it ~~is~~ represents a fact that God does interfere violently in the affairs of the world. Here we have this passage beginning and ending with two passages that are remarkably parallel as we saw. How wonderfully they fit together. It is clearly the same thing because of the beginning and end of it. They remind us that life is real, and a struggle between good and evil is real. Satan is a real force, even though he can go no further than God permits. God has promised that He will with violence put an end to the work of Satan, this evil in the world.

q So we start with that and work up to the climax, the Messiah Speaks. Then we come down to through the same again.

Then after that we have the Redeemer comes to Zion, and then the millennial blessing. Then I think the top of it should be Messiah speaks as I did before it is ~~is~~ inevitably at the bottom. I think it belongs at the top. That is it is the climax, He is the One through whom all this comes to pass. We have here the acceptable year, the period of wonderful blessing in the millenium and we have the Day of Vengeance with His violent interposition. Both before and after the millennium to overthrow evil.

So I thought I would put it up this way as the more natural way, but the other was necessary in the progress of our discussion.

Now on this passage which is the climax of it the Messiah Speaks. It has parallels where the Servant of the Lord speaks in Is. 49 and elsewhere in Scripture, and ~~is~~ as I mentioned there are these many similarities of which I put four of them on the board.

At this point we can go on to our next section:

XIII A Long Prayer. This is what you turned in to me today. As I mentioned, ch. 64 is undoubtedly a prayer, the whole thing. It begins in ch. 63. There is no real reason for a division of chs. at that particular point. How far back into ch. 63 does it go? Well, it is clearly a prayer when you start in 63:15 - Look down from heaven. Before v.15 there is nothing to identify it as a prayer, but it would seem quite reasonably to be an introduction to the prayer. Vv.7-14

I had thought in preparing for this hour about the problem of that verse, they are children that will not lie, so He was their Saviour. Revelation says, All liars shall have their place in the lake of fire. But I don't imagine there is anyone who ever lived who did not sometime or other tell a lie. This is certainly not why He became their Saviour == because they were children that would not lie. Children that ought not to lie. Children that perhaps after they had received regeneration would not lie, or at least after they had been completely sanctified they would not lie.

t You notice they don't say us; they say them. They are looking back at earlier stages in their history.

Then after they say that you read in Leviticus that the Lord says if you turn against the Lord and rebell and vex Him, that He will make you subject to your enemies; and you will have all kinds of misery and trouble. Then if you remember the Lord and turn to Him and ~~so~~ in complete repentance, then he will turn back to you and will deliver you. But this does not say after saying they have rebelled, it does not say they will remember and turn to the Lord and sought forgiveness. It says "then HE remembered the days of old Moses and his people." They said Where is He that brought them out of the sea, where is he that put His Holy Spirit within them and did all these wonderful things when Moses was there? Notice there is not a suggestion of repentance there, at that point. It sort of gives you the impression that God punishes them for their rebellion and then God says, After all we did all these wonderful things for them in the past, we'd better deliver them. I don't say you have to draw that out of the passage, but I do point out that the other is not here as it is in Leviticus.

So this passage from vv.7-14 certainly can properly be called A Remembrance of God's Past Blessings, including the book of Judges where He repeatedly gave the people deliverance when they turned away from Him.

(Question: In v.11 it says something about His putting His Holy Spirit within him.) Yes, where is the One who put His Holy Spirit within Moses to lead the people? Why doesn't He put His Holy Spirit in somebody today to lead us the same way He led them?

(Question: Would that give an indication regarding the indwelling of the Spirit in the OT?) Oh yes, the Holy Spirit certainly indwelt all the leaders of Israel. There is no question about that. That's clearly believed by all classes of interpreters, that the Holy Spirit directed the leaders of Israel and of course Moses the prophet He inspired them to lead them=== and worked through Moses and the prophets and inspired them to lead them. No question of that.

Of course if no body was saved in OT times then we can say that the Holy Spirit did not enter into anybody in the OT times like He does now in regeneration (if they are all going to hell). But if as Hebrews says, We are surrounded by so great a cloud of witnesses, that they without us should not be made perfect, that would seem to imply rather clearly that the Holy Spirit regenerates then as now. There is one method of salvation at all times. The only method of salvation that the Bible teaches anywhere is the Holy Spirit regenerating people through that which they looked forward to through the sacrifice, or that which they look back to (Christ)

But here he is not speaking of that. Only the Holy Spirit's activity in leadership, including Moses.

This introduction though it speaks of their rebellion there is no statement of repentance in this; it is a statement of how despite the fact they rebelled God stays with them (vv.7-14)

(Question: In the NASB in v.11 it has "then his people remembered". Is there some significance to the fact that they put "his people" instead of "he"?) I was not on that particular committee. I gave some help with the NIV, but I did not have any part in the NASB and I know that three men who made the NASB of Isaiah -- I could ask them when I see them. I would not know what was in their minds. You mean as to whether the Hebrew warrants it, "he remembers" ~~xxx~~ and "one remembers", well we do often speak of people in the singular as well as in the plural. The Bible often speaks of Israel as singular, meaning the whole nation. So it's not an impossible translation, but it is reading into the text. The "he" would seem in context more natural to me, to be godly members of his people when they said, Where is he that brought them out . . ." But it's true the KJV says, Then he remembered saying, now the saying is in ~~x~~ italics. They inserted that. They are a little inconsistent there because if he remembered his saying it, it would not sound as if it was God. So the ~~NASB~~ NASB may be going on quite logically from the guess the KJV has. But it is an insertion. It is not in the original. And people are more apt to ~~xxxxx~~ refer to nation as fem. than mas. We say France fought for her glory, we don't say his glory. It's one thing you can't be dogmatic on.

After the introduction - I'm not going to look by sections at what follows but to raise the question: What is the object of the prayer? That certainly is a legitimate thing with a long prayer like this. As you start. What is it about? It is always good to look at the prayer and see if it assumes any particular situation. You pray for God's mercy and blessing. Are you praying in a specific situation? Is there a great illness? Is there a tremendous danger? Is your country at war? Is there any indication in the prayer of the situation under which it is given? Well, here we have three rather clear indications: In ~~ch. 63:18~~ ch. 63:18 we read:

The people have thought of your holiness (which in modern English would be

So this would seem to be a time when Jerusalem itself came into the hands of the enemy. It would seem to suggest that rather strongly. It is much clearer when you get to ch. 64:10:

Now that not simply the land being overrun by Sennacherib as it was in the days of ~~Z~~ Hezekiah. That is the time when Jerusalem itself had been taken. So we must at this point either go with the higher critics and say this part of Isaiah is not by Isaiah but written at a much later period. Or we must say, God caused Isaiah prophetically to describe a situation. I believe God often did that with His prophets. In ~~xi~~ view of the NT that all three parts of ~~Isaiah~~ are not merely from the book of Isaiah but are as Paul says, ~~xi~~ What Isaiah said, I believe we should take the latter and say that Isaiah prophetically looked forward to the future and gives us a prayer that will express the general sentiments that will be held by some group of people at a time in the future and which might represent the ideas and thoughts of some in his own day as they looked forward to the coming exile and desolation of the land.

As we think of that we must realize that among the people at that day there were three categories: There were those who scoffed and said, ~~Isaiah~~ is an old fool with these ideas. Our land has stood for centuries and it will continue. We will never go into exile like the northern kingdoms did, like in their life time. But there was a smaller group (of People) which can be divided into ~~XXXXXX~~ two parts -- making three divisions. That would be those who said, Yes Isaiah is right; this destruction is going to come. Some of them might say, We can see the international situation; we can see the tremendous force of Assyria that has tremendous powers. They have taken the northern kingdom. They have taken the kingdom of Arabs(?) with its headquarters at Damascus. It is only reasonable to think what ~~Isaiah~~ says is correct, and we can expect such a thing but without much true repentance as true believers. But we can also say there were the true followers of God who took Isaiah as a true prophet and who said, This is right, this is what is coming and they tended to give way to despair and Isaiah gives them God's message of comfort.

This prayer then could be any of these groups as we look forward to the future. I think the group that scoffed at Isaiah can perhaps be laid aside for the moment. But it could possibly refer to one of the other two groups.

You notice how the next v.(12) says,

, after the introduction you look back to v. 15

That should be from your holy habitation.





right at that point to notice after they say, Give us your blessing, we are your people, we are the ones you blessed in the past, you are our father, you never bore rule over those other people; they were never called by your name. Then it's interesting to look at 65:1 which says:

They say, These others were never called by your name. He says, I say, Behold me to a nation that was not called by my name. You will find commentaries that say (even sound evangelical commentaries) that Paul twisted this into a quotation and got something out of it that was not in it at all. I do not believe so. I believe Paul was inspired interpreter of Scripture, and when he interprets it he may not take the whole meaning. He may draw something that's actually there, but and not put his stress on some things that are there too, but whatever he says the OT teaches I think we should say it does teach. And Paul very definitely quotes 65:1.

We are not ready to look at ch. 65 yet. We are looking at 64. And D. IS THERE EVIDENCE OF TRUE REPENTANCE?

The Prophet Daniel was one of the godliest men in all Israel's history and he understood by books that 70 yrs. was past and the time was come when the nation would be delivered. He did not say, O God now your promised it, now bring it to us. He, though one of the godliest people in all Israel's history, he had a great prayer of contrition and repentance for the sins of his people in Dan. 9. Evidently the Lord did not think Daniel was representing the attitude of all the people because Daniel says the 70 yrs. are finished, we have been wicked, now we are repenting. The angel came to him and said: Not only are 70 yrs. finished, but 70 weeks are determined upon your people. There's a long time ahead, because you Daniel, do not represent all the people by any means, in your true repentance.

Stop there and continue next time.

Last session I read for you that long statement of divine activity in this order. I gave it to you first in this order starting at the top and going down but I think that's a more reasonable order the way we have it there. Though you could hardly do it that way if y u were going through it.

Then we began to look at the long prayer that runs from 63:7 to 64:12, and we noted 8 vv. of introduction

### XIII A Long Prayer 63:7-64:12

#### A. The Introduction vv.7-14

In which God's blessings were recalled. This is ==someone can take this as a separate thing if they want, but it seems altogether reasonable to think it is a part of the prayer since the prayer is calling on God beseeching Him to treat them as He has in the past, and that He continue the previous blessings.

#### B. The Object of the Prayer.

##### 1. The situation assumed 63:18b; 64:10-11(cf.12)

It assumes that Jerusalem is a ruin. It assumes the temple has been destroyed, and it calls on God to reestablish them. Isaiah may be speaking to the people in his day. They know he is a prophet of God and speaks truly, and yet perhaps to some of them who while they believe what he says, yet desires to follow in their own ways and own works rather than to follow God. They can easily imagine the situation as having occurred and they are remembering God's past blessings. However, even if that is the first occasion of its being written, certainly the Lord had particularly in mind people toward the end of the exile, or after the exile when they had come back and were finding difficulty getting reestablished. And they are calling on God for His blessing, so that is the situation.

##### 2. The Specific Request 63:15.;7b; 64:1,9

We looked at them last ~~XXXX~~ time. Then,

#### C. The Reasons Advanced. The principal stress is on

##### 1. The Past blessings vv.7-14(esp.11-12),15

##### 2. A Claimed Relationship 63:16,17,18;64:8-9

They maintained that God is their Father, they belong to Him, therefore He should bless them. This comes out to a clear expression in vv.16,17, and 18 of ch. 63 where they said, "O Lord, thou art our Father . . .(quoting) and 64:8-9 . . .(quoting). So the claimed relationship is the basis. God has promised, God has blessed them in the past; it is up to Him to continue. We noticed the contrast with the non-Israelites in 63:19(cf.65:11) . . . .

It's interesting to notice how this verse(63:19) has been translated in the two most recent evangelical translations. KJV says, "We are thine, thou never bearest rule over them." NASB says, "We have become like those over whom thou hast never borne rule." NIV has, "We are yours from of old, you have not ruled over them." At first sight there seems to be quite a difference, between these. Particularly between the NASB and the others. I've underline the word thine in KJV because it is not in Hebrew. It is an insertion

that seemed to the writers of KJV to belong there. We are. . . thou never barest rule over them." It seemed to them "we are" means "we are yours." But they put it in italics to show it is an insertion to bring out the sense.

Similarly NASB puts the word "like" in italics. Actually it still has the contrast so it does not make a great deal of difference. NIV gets around it by taking the word KJV translates "never"(thou never barest rule over them), and putting it with the first "we are", making it "we are yours from of old, you have not ruled over them." It is an interesting little illustration of the various possibilities of translation. But whichever you take it seems to me there is still the contrast, that the argument that they have belonged to God and that it is not right that they should now become like those over whom He has not ruled before.

Now I put down English renderings of the Heb. to make this a little clearer:

KJV: We are thine: they never bare rule over them

NASB: We have become like those over whom thou hast . . .

NIV: We are yours from of old; you have not ruled.

The reason for the NASB making that change I think is the fact that the Heb. word translated "we are"(KJV) usually does not occur in Heb. in this sense, at least not until very late Heb. Usually if you say something is something else in Heb. you just put the two nouns or the noun and adjective next to each other. They do not have a verb. This verb means really "to become", or it might perhaps be used that something has been in the past. Consequently if it is "we have become", they felt that to put anything alike would give a reason for that.

So I don't say we can say the NASB is necessarily wrong here. There is a good argument can be made for it though. Also, however the fact that the like is not there may be a reason for preferring the KJV. In either case it stresses a contrast. That's the point. Why should these people be able to burn our temple, when they are not called by God's Name. They are not God's people; we are. Therefore He should bless us.

You notice I did not put up there "from of old". I put up there from 'olam. I transliterated the Heb. word. Some of you may not be aware that that little mark I put just before the "o" which is like the beginning of a single quotation mark, that mark is regularly used in transliteration to indicate an ayin. So this indicates the Heb. letter ayin - 'olam. This word 'olam is many times translated "ever" in the Bible. We say this will endure for 'olam, forever. But when you look at this at the back, in this case with the negative, it is easy to say never. They were not since all eternity. When they say, These are the men of 'olam that means the men who were way back. So from this single word you cannot get the idea of ~~xxx~~ endlessness. You get the idea of a long long stretch, as far as you can see. They missed a contrast here=== they make the contrast here, and we have in addition to that in this same verse, we have the last verse "we were not called by thy name," and that ties right up with the next ch. the the first verse, which says, "Behold me behold me unto a nation which was not called by my name." I think the tie up is rather important here.

The very phrase where they use that there is no question about the validity of the translation, that very phrase is used in the very first sentence of the answer given to them.

(Question: what verses involved? At the end of what ch.?)  
At the end of 65:1 is "I said, Behold me behold me to a nation that is not called by my name." The beginning to the answer to this prayer reiterates this same statement. "called by thy name."

(Question: "the nation which did not call upon my name")  
Well, that's easy to get. All you have to do is change the Hebrew and you get that. That is an unfortunate thing at that point that they did that. Now it is not a change of consonants; it is a change of consonants. There are many who say, The vowels were passed on by word of mouth until the 10th cent. A.D., and therefore we can put much more dependance upon the transmission of the consonants than the vowels. The translators of the RSV took the attitude that we can change the vowels any way we feel like. But the translators of the recent Jewish version of the first five books ~~XX~~ took the attitude, We must translate the vowels as they stand unless we have very strong evidence for a change. I believe the NASB translators would have said, That is our intention too. Is there not a side note that says "or"?

(Answer: No.) I'm surprised at that; there certainly ought to be. "For" as it stands is definitely they were not called by thy name. But we'll still look at that a little bit later.

We go on here. Maybe right at this point would be a good point to interrupt this to read a question that I intended to read right at the beginning of the hour. I was given this at the end of the last hour. Question: In speaking about the millennium, do you purposely use the word "freed m from external danger"? Why do you use external danger? Does that imply that there will be other kindsof danger?

That is a very good question; I'm veryy glad it was raised. I have frequently used this statement, that this is a picture of external danger. I am not using that to say at the time when these events are fulfilled there will be other types of danger. I am using it to say, You cannot interpret this passage as simply referring to something else than external danger. There are those who take pictures of the time when everyone can sit under his own vine and under his own fig tree and none shall make them afraid because the knowledge of the Lord will cover the land as the waters cover the sea, and take it as a picture of a man whose mind is so stayed on God that he has no fear of anything. So it pictures, they one whose heart is at peace. But that is not what is pictured. It pictures a time when he need not fear, when there is no external danger. So I appreciate the question. I have stressed that word external because these particular passages look forward to the time when there is no external danger. They do not merely look forward to a time when there is an inner change. I did not mean to say that there would be any other kind of danger in the future. Taat does not enter into these particular passages.

#### D. Is there Evidence of True Repentance?

Here we must say that if evidence of true repentance is lacking then we know God will not hear prayer. This is brought out in Isaiah and in many other places. In Is. 1:15 he says, "When you spread forth your hands I will hide my eyes from you; yes, when

you make many prayers, I will not hear. Your hands are full of blood." There are many such statements in the Scripture. There is a time when people pray and God will not hear. Of course, he does hear. He knows everything that happens. What it means is He will not pay attention. He will not answer your prayers.

So if true repentance is lacking we cannot expect a favorable answer to our prayer. Right here we should note

1. When this is lacking God will not hear prayer cf. Is. 1:15

2. God's Relation to Israel

I'd like to call your attention to the fact it is very clearly brought out in Scripture that

a. Rebellion on the part of Israel is to be terribly punished. Perhaps more terribly than of most other nations because they had greater blessings and greater opportunities to know the Lord. Lev. 26:14-29 gives a most terrible statement of the awful misery that will come upon the people if they turn away from the Lord. In Deut. 28:15-68 we have an even longer passage of similar nature. This is greatly stressed in the OT - rebellion is to be terribly punished. But,

b. It is also stressed that God blesses all those who turn to Him with all their heart (not as much stressed but just as clearly given). Right after this long passage in Lev. 26 vv.40-41 read,

Deut. 28 has a long passage of telling what the results of rebellion are to be, and Deut. 30:1-2 says

So if they turn to Him with their whole heart he promises that then he will bless them again. And in 2 Chron 6:37-39 in Solomon's dedication prayer he reiterates this same idea.

C. However, it is brought out in Lev. 26 that God has made an everlasting covenant with Israel, Lev. 26:44-45; Is. 66:22 This enters into the great problem of understanding God's Word - a problem that no human being can really grasp. God has His plans and those plans will be fulfilled. But what man does is tremendously important. If man sins and turns away from God, God will punish him. If man turns to God with a full heart, God will bless him but God has promised that certain blessings will be given to Israel. These people will be given these blessings, and this is given as an unconditional promise. He has made an everlasting covenant with Israel. This is brought out in Lev. 26:44-45 . . . and in Is. 66:22, at the very end of our present book this promise is reiterated. (quoting v. 22)

He promises everlasting blessing to Israel, and yet he says that each individual if they are to receive the blessing must turn to Him with their whole heart.

(Question: It is my understanding of some positions of covenant theology today that God is finished with Israel today, and the Church is the new Israel. What do they do with a passage like this?)

Certainly the NT teaches that we are the we are the Israel of God. That is clearly stated. We are the Israel of God. It is God's purpose throughout all ages that all those who believe in Christ should form the Israel of God. Yet it also true that God has special blessings for this particular nation He called out. That is very true, and when Is.66:22 says

then to my opinion anyone who says that God is through with Israel at Pentecost is simply talking out of the air. I know of no Scriptural reference for it, and I don't think it is fair to say Covenant theology holds that because I believe there are very few people who hold that and I believe there are a great many who believe in God's covenants who certainly do not believe that.

God has made this everlasting covenant. I don't think we can == I don't think this can be disproven. That is the clear teaching of Scripture. But now our present problem we are looking at, does it contain evidence of true repentance.

3. Compare Daniel's Prayer in Dan. 9. Daniel says he read in the books the word of the Lord that came to Jeremiah the prophet that he would accomplish 70 yrs. in the desolation of Jerusalem. Dan. had gone to Babylon, probably in 604. He is not about 65 yrs. after Daniel went. When Daniel was taken much of the land was laid desolate. Did Daniel say, The land was laid desolate at that time; God said it would be desolate about 70 yrs., now the 70 years is nearly over, O God remember your promise and ~~xxxx~~ restore it, we are your people."

Well, that's all true. God is going to remember His promise and they are His people. But as you read this prayer of which the greater part of Daniel is made up, you find Daniel over and over beseeching the Lord according to all his righteousness to turn away his anger and fury because for our sins and iniquities of our people; we have become a reproach to all that are about us' incline your ear, we present our supplications. He prayed wholeheartedly, confessing the sins and praying God will fulfill the promise He has given and bring them Back. And God does fulfill his promise and permit them to come back. But his answer to Daniel's prayer recognizes that the prayer represents the heart of ~~xxxxxx~~ Daniel, no necessarily of the whole people. I'm sure Daniel must have felt very disturbed when he got the answer to that prayer. Because the answer is, Yes, God is going to bless you now, and you are going to get everything back you had before. The answer is the 70 yrs. are over, yes, but 70 weeks are determined on your people. There is a lot of misery ahead. So Daniel makes a real prayer of repentance on behalf of the ~~by~~ people but the question is how many of them does he represent?

But it is quite a different tone from this prayer here in Isaiah.

#### 4. Compare David's Prayer in Ps. 51.

David had sin. He said, I acknowledge my transgression; my sin is ever before me. Against thee thee only have I sinned and done this evil in thy sight. . . Purge me with hyssop and I shall be clean . . . wash me and I shall be whiter than snow . . . Hide not thy face from my sins and blot out all my transgressions Create in me a clean heart, O God and renew a right spirit within me. There is an altogether different tone in David's prayer, of repentance, than you find in this prayer in Isaiah.

5. This Prayer does recognize the fact of sin. That is recognized in 63:10 and 17 (reading text) You don't find any evidence of repentance in this. Simply a statement of a fact. . . . Sounds as if they are blaming God for it. It does not say, O God we have sinned, we are very sorry, do change us, do help us, we promise to do our best. Nothing like that.

And in 64:5-7 recognizes the fact of sin. . . You'd expect them to say, O do remedy our iniquity, cleanse us and purge us. No, they say,

return to you

with our whole heart, restore us. No. But

We can't help ourselves. This is what you've put us into. Here we are. We have sinned yes, but you have promised us, we are your people that you are going to bless us. It recognizes the fact of sin, but

6. It seems to lay on God the blame for sin. We just noticed in 63:17 and 64:8,9.

7. The prayer contains no plea for a chastened heart and no promise to seek to obey God in the future. Those are facts about the prayer. That's negative, so I can't refer you to verses on it.

#### E. Whose Prayer is This?

As I read the prayer, I am reminded of the attitude of the Pharisee described in the NT, and referred to in 65:5 where it says,

We compare Mat. 3:8-9 We are Abraham's children, it is up to you to bless us. John the Baptist said, Bring forth therefore fruits for repentance and think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father, for I say unto you that God is able to raise up children of these stones unto Abraham. And we notice what Christ said in John 8:33, 39:

Simply expecting blessings because of past blessings or relationships is thus condemned. Whose prayer is this? It seems to me it is a reasonable suggestion that this prayer represents an attitude of a part of the people who believe in God's power, believe in God's control, believe that He has sent them into exile for their sins but who are claiming His

his blessing simply on the basis as the Pharisees did of carrying out particular external observances, or of having a particular birth, a particular family, a particular relationship. That seems to me to be the answer to this question, Whose prayer is this?

F. Since the Speaker is not named, one must avoid all dogmatism. As I study this passage, I have reached the conclusion I have just given. But I do not wish to be dogmatic about it. I do not know whether anyone else has reached the same conclusion. I rather doubt they have. But it impresses me to be a conclusion the evidence calls for. Now F. Delitzsch was one of the great German commentators of the last century. He wrote four editions of his commentary on Isaiah. Everyone of them contains some material that is not in the others. But the second of these four is contained in this set Keil and Delitzsch which is a very excellent set for a commentary for those who know some Hebrew on the interpretation of the OT. A very excellent set. The fourth edition of Delitzsch, in it, he found himself unable to answer the critical arguments, and he made concessions to it, which for us makes his fourth ~~and~~ edition of much less value than his earlier editions.

He takes this prayer, as I think anyone would when they first approach it if they don't study into it, and so he begins the next chapter (ch. 65:1), he makes what seems to me to be a very peculiar statement, but one which is necessary if you accept the view that this is a true prayer of those who are truly serving the Lord. Delitzsch says (p. 474) "After the people have poured out their heart before Jehovah, He announces what they may expect of Him. But instead of commencing with a promise, as we might anticipate after the foregoing prayer, he begins with reproach and threatening."

It seems to me that is a pretty good clue that instead of saying O this is wonderful, you have come back to me, I'm going to bless you. He charges with reproach and threatening. He uses the very phrase they use. They say, Those people were not called by your name. Here he says (65:1), I am saying, Behold me, behold me to a nation that was not called by my name. The very same word is used in both cases. Very same phrase, same expression. That is the way Apostle Paul took it in Rom. 10. He quotes it as showing that God had predicted already through Isaiah His answer to the attitude which Paul found among so many of the people of his day, the answer in causing that more Gentiles would come in to the family of God than were coming in through the Jewish race. Although there have been Jews who have come in every generation, from that time to this. There have been in every generation, not only Jews converted, but in every generation there have been Jews who have become great Christian leaders. But the great mass of the nation has followed these attitudes described in this prayer.

Before looking at 65:1, I want to raise the

G. Question of Inerrancy. If we believe the Bible is free from error what right do we have to take a long prayer like this and say that it represents a wrong attitude? That is an approach which is taken by some at various points in the NT. For instances, I've seen some good commentaries make the statement that Paul when he



spoke to the Athenians he tried to give them an argument about the altar to the Unknown God, etc., but when he got to Corinth he saw the error of what he had done in Athens, and said, I resolved among you to know only Jesus Christ and Him crucified. I believe that is an erroneous approach. I believe Paul was the Apostle of the Lord, that Paul was led of the Lord in what he did. I think Paul made mistakes; I think Peter made mistakes; I think they all made mistakes. But I think that the great leaders that God wants us to follow made mistakes, that He will either not tell us about those mistakes, or He will label them as mistakes. He will make it clear and unmistakable the fact that they made a mistake.

So when it gives the preaching (teaching) ~~X~~ of the Apostles, I believe we can take that teaching as a sample of the sort of thing we should do, rather than as something we should avoid. I have heard it said, Paul made a terrible mistake in making a vow and going to the temple as he did. Now, I think if that were true it would be labeled, and Scripture would tell us. I do think we can take what is told us of the Apostles as being true to the Lord, as truly following the Lord. But here we have a long ~~pp~~ passage which is not labeled, which is clearly a prayer but which is met at the end not with statements of How wonderful this is, your prayer of repentance, how happy I am you are coming back, I am going to give you all the blessings you ask, but with terrible condemnation going through these next 10 or so verses. Under those circumstances it seems to me that we are justified in the hypothesis which I believe is a correct one, that it is simply presenting to us a wrong attitude in order to go on and show what the relationship of God is to that attitude.

The question of inerrancy comes up and there are three considerations we should note.

1. Every statement in the ~~prayer~~ is true. They talk about what God did for them in the past, and everything they say is entirely true. God did do all the things they say He has. They say why they were sent into captivity for their sin. That is entirely true. There is no statement in the prayer that is not itself a fact. God has made a covenant promise to Abraham and to his seed forever. They point to these promises. Every statement in the prayer is true.

2. They claim they make in the prayer are true, though lacking a vital element (repentance.) God has promised eternal blessings to Israel, and He will fulfill His promises. They call attention to these promises. There is nothing false in the prayer as far as facts are concerned, though the vital element of repentance for sin and the expression of a heart felt desire to follow the Lord with their whole heart is lacking from the prayer.

3. Only the attitude is wrong. The statements are true, it is inerrant, factual, but the attitude is wrong. There I say what could be more important than the attitude? From the viewpoint of inerrancy it is entirely true. But the attitude is wrong, and that is clearly brought out in the next chapter.

## XIV The Divine Rebuke and Promise (65:1-6)

## A. The Contrast, vv.1-2.

1. Note Rom. 10:20-21 where Paul discusses this matter, and he says, Isaiah

That's v. 1 here, the end of the two clauses turned around. But it is essentially identical with v. 1 here. Then he says, ~~But so~~ and then he quotes v. 2,

So we have the Apostle Paul saying that this is a prediction of what happened in his day.

2. I'd like to read how the RSV renders this. RSV a version made by some highly trained scholars, tho most of them holding a very different viewpoint from what we do.

As you see they have completely changed this so it makes Paul completely wrong in his interpretation. I was rather shocked to find that a man who truly desires to follow the Lord, I believe -- H. C. Leopold, and who in his commentaries makes an attitude of believing in the great Scriptural doctrines, that he follows this translation. He says,

You notice he follows the same RSV translation except that he at the end keeps the Heb. "was called by my name" instead of changing as they do to "they did not call on my name." He says, It is obvious according to our translation and interpretation that we regard v. 1 as describing Israel's attitude toward God, just as v. 2 clearly refers to Israel. Isaiah is making it clear that even Israel's prayers had to be rejected == why even Israel's prayer had to be rejected. Strangely Paul in Rom. 10 quotes these two vv. applying v. 1 to the Gentiles and v. 2 to Israel. According to the text and context Paul does not abide by the letter of the passage. It would appear that according to the Greek translation the words lend themselves to a fresh application of the words used. Paul is not employing strict scientific exegesis, but with great freedom is readapting the original to reflect his statement of his case."

I don't think we can say that Paul was simply taking the OT passage and readapting it to mean something entirely different from what it actually meant. So I feel that, in addition to that that this translation, I was ready to be sought by those who did not ask for me -- it is a simply Niphat. The KJV translated it exactly as it stands, "I have been sought, or I was sought." Of course prophetic perfect looking forward to a time when He will save us. But the RSV you might suggest that they say, I was going to be sought by those who did not ask for me. Certainly if God was not willing it could not happen to them. But I was ready to be sought by those who did

not ask for me." There is absolutely no exegetical warrant for that translation. However, that idea was worked out by unbelieving scholars at least a century ago. As a result they developed what they called the Niphal tolerativum. To many people, if you give a good Latin name to something it means it is true. It's a very common thing, apply a name to it and that establishes it.

Well, you'll find this in many commentaries that say, Of course this is Niphal tolerativum. Well it is Niphal.. and the Niphal hundreds of times in the OT is translated as a simple past, hundreds of times. Now this so-called Niphal tolerativum -- most of your commentators will say "It is the Niphal tolerativum as in . . ." and then they will refer you to a few other references. But there are only a very few they ever refer you to. They only refer ==deal with two words, this word seek and this word find found here. I have found no reference to an alleged niphal tolerativum dealing with any other word except these two words. And I have looked up every reference which they say is a Niphal tolerativum and every one of them has God as the subject. "I was found", "I was sought" Well naturally God cannot be found unless He permits you to find Him. But the tolerativum, the permissive aspect of it, is because God is the subject, not because of this niphal == or because it is niphal.

If they want to taanslated this as " I have let myself be sought by those who did not ask for me", "I have let myself be found by those who did not seek me", it would not change the thought of it at all. But when they put in this "I was ready to" they are adding another thought that goes even beyond the Niphal tolerativum which despite the beautiful Latin terminology, I don't think represents any actuality whatever in Hebrew grammar. You will find it mentioned in most Hebrew grammars, and I want to say here that one of the important things in Bible study is that we learn that grammars, dictionaries, all such ~~words~~ works are purely human productions. The best dictionary for Heb. is Brown, Driver, and Briggs by far. But the reason for that is not because the three modernists who made it knew what Heb. words mean. It is because they give you the evidence fully for the interpretation. And they take a word and they analyse it, the possible meanings and the parallels, everything they find so that they put it down in lengthy analytical form, and when you find they have a great deal of evidence for an idea, it is pretty ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ reasonable unless something tremendous hangs on it that you don't have to look at all those. Their opinion is probably correct.

But when they give two or three references, you have the right and perhaps the duty at this point to look up those references and see if it really supports what they say it does. The same thing is true of grammars, in any language. You need, and of course in Heb. all the Heb. we have is what is contained in our OT. So all the evidence we have is what is there, and BDB lays out the evidence and you can examine it and see how much there is and see where there is only a little whether it is really valid or not.

There is a more recent dictionary, they are now publishing a third edition which some -- two German scholars Koehler and

Baumgartner got out the first ~~xxx~~ edition, then Koehler died and Baumgartner got ~~xxxxxxx~~ some revision which is called the second edition, and then he died and now they have some other men who are getting out the third edition of K-B which is coming out a little bit at a time. Scholars all over America are looking forward impatiently to the arrival of the K-B to see how they will define these words. But K-B only says a word means so and so and gives a reference; it does not analyze it like BDB does. It does not give the evidence fully like BDB does. It only gives their opinion. So I would say ~~x~~ BDB is far more useful dictionary.

The great disadvantage of BDB is that they followed a theory that was universally held a century ago, and is to some extent being given up now that every Heb. word is derived from a three letter root. Therefore they arranged their words according to the roots. It would not be so bad if they just put their roots at the top of the page, but at the top of the page they put the words that occur on the page so often you are not sure under what root BDB will put the word. That means sometimes there are three possibilities and you are not sure which of them they will guess it belongs under. If you find the one they put it under they will give the evidence, and you can survey the evidence and possibly find it should have been under one of the other three, but you can waste a lot of time looking for words in BDB.

The Moody Press has just published an index to BDB, an index which lists all the words according to the verses straight through and tells you on what page of BDB they have a discussion. With that index BDB should be many times easier to use. I've often spent a long time finding where the place is that BDB discusses a certain word. So K-B arranges the words alphabetically and you can find it quickly. But I hope that advantage won't overcome the disadvantages of it to lead it to replace BDB which I think is a far better dictionary.

You notice ~~x~~ that the end of this, "Those who did not call on my Name" is used in some translations. But there is no question of the tradition that what has been preserved in both these places is "was called" or "my name was called upon them". That is the tradition. I'm sorry that somebody in the NASB Committee had ~~en~~ enough influence at this point to get them to follow this same translation there as the RSV. But you notice Leupold did not follow that, and neither did the NIV.

B. The Contrast Between Unfaithful People and God's Chosen Servants.

If you can glance over again ch. 65-66, I'd appreciate it, but I'm not assigning anything to turn in for next week.

## XIV The Divine Rebuke and Promise Is. 65-66

I am going to put the last two chs. under that head. As I gave it to you the last time it only had the first two verses. But I think it will be better to study them together ~~and~~ as a unit, as God's answer to the prayer that came in the previous ch. and a half.

We noticed last time vv.1-2 of ch. 65, and we noticed in Rom. 10:20-21 how Paul said that first of these verses described the fact God was going to call into his kingdom those who had not been known by His name, that this was predicted by Isaiah.

Of course it would be altogether reasonable instead of saying to say because after all any that is done to God, is only done to Him because He permits it to be done. But as we noticed that's hardly reason enough to make up a new grammatical form and say that this is a niphath tolerativum. Any form that is passive relating to God must imply God's permission. This is never used of anything that any human being does. But God predicts He will allow to bring the Gentiles into a relationship with Himself even though they have not been called by His name, and even though they have not sought Him in the past.

Paul goes on and says (v.21)

Thus Paul quotes from these first two verses here as being fulfilled in what was happening in his day. This brings up a vital question. Does the OT tell us about Christ, or is the OT prophet only interested in the events of his own day? Are they only interested in the Jews and what will happen to the Jews or are the OT prophets looking forward and seeing that which will reach far beyond the Jews?

As we study the NT with even a slight amount of care, we see the OT teaches very definitely about Christ. We must not take every verse in the OT and try to find Christ in it in some way and twist it if necessary to put it in, but we must not be surprised if we find many things in the OT that look forward to Christ. Jesus Himself said (John 5:39) (He means the OT of course, for that was all the Scripture that was written when He said this)

He said the OT testified of Him.

(Question: And did not one of the reformers, Luther or Calvin, say he found Christ on every page?) It depends on how big the pages are. . . I think that's a little broad statement but I think it is true that everything the Lord says has some relation to His Son, no question of that. There are many verses that point explicitly to Christ. Then there are chs. which do not necessarily have relation to Christ. We don't want to go to one extreme or to the other. . . I'd have to see the exact quotation he made. The Reformers were quite a varried group and were all fallible human beings. Every one of them made some erroneous statements, just as everyone living does today. But that would sound to me to be an hyperbole.

An hyperbole that most people utter at one time or another. I would say a man reading every page of the Bible should be looking to find something that may be there that refers explicitly to Christ or merely teaches that which draws him closer to the Lord. But we should read every page of the Bible in relation to our God and of course Jesus Christ is God.

In Lk. 24:25 when Jesus was talking to the men on the road to Emaus he said, "O fools and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken . . . Ought not Christ to have suffered these things and to have entered into his glory." He there rebukes those who do not find Christ in the OT. I don't quite like that English translation, "O fools". The Heb. = = = Greek word anoethes is only this one time rendered "fools." Four times it is rendered foolish, and once thoughtless. He was not calling them fools but was saying you are foolish in this particular. It is foolish, not to see that the OT as a whole points to Christ and there are many verses that explicitly point to Him.

Those who do not accept Christianity naturally cannot believe this about the OT. When the RSV-NT came out, I was greatly pleased with many things in it. Even though it was a group of modernists that translated it, I could see that these men who were expert Greek scholars, and who had studied the Bible all their lives even though there was a darkness over them as far as the great truth of salvation is concerned, nevertheless they could look at the NT and read those words and say, Those people 2000 yrs. ago, had some very crazy, foolish ideas; but here's what the ideas are. They could translate what they found. But when these same men went into the OT they could not believe that a man 700 yrs. before Christ could possibly say something about Christ. That would go beyond the possibility for them, unless the man 700 yrs. before Christ was completely out of his mind, which none of them believed.

The prophets were greatly interested in their own people and their own situation. The RSV has many excellent translations of passages in the OT dealing with temporary situations, and dealing with the things that were before the prophets as they spoke. But whenever the prophet said something which the NT said is fulfilled in Christ, they could not believe that. So they worked out various theories of the meaning of words. Various approaches. This was done a century ago by various unbelieving scholars in Europe. And they wrote up these ideas like this Niphal tolerativum. They wrote up these theories, and today those who want to study the Bible in a scholarly way have to take what these say as established fact, and the fact is that a great deal of study is being done on the Hebrew language and there is much misunderstanding and much misinterpretation of it.

I wrote a little booklet once on the RSV, largely on the OT. Some thousands of it were distributed at that time. In it I pointed out 15 or 20 statements where it specifically pointed to Christ like where it said that he was the one from of old, the one whose goings forth were from of old, from everlasting which describes Christ's preexistence and His appearing in OT times. They change it to one whose genealogy goes way back to ancient times.

Where Peter says the grave could not keep Christ because David was born to him(?) and said He would not see corruption. They translate it correctly in the NT, and the NT has a reference back to the verse in Ps. 16. They say He would not see the pit. The same word could mean corruption or pit. There are two different words which in this particular form are identical but in the majority of cases in the OT that word is translated corruption.

I could give many instances, but his has affected the study of the Heb. in many places and it needs further careful study. How about this verse we are looking at: the calling of the Gentiles? Would this be contained in the OT? Would God in OT times be only interested in the Jews? Would He say anything about the Greeks or other people than the Jews except by way of condemnation?

Peter, who at one time was a very bigotten Jew, when he went to Cornelius being led by the Spirit of God, we read in Acts 10:34

Peter does not say, I see God is now making a change. Up to now everybody except a Jew was headed for hell, and there was nothing they could do about it, but now God has introduced a new method in which people other than Jews could also be saved, and so there is a change now. That's not what he said. Peter said,

One of the great books in the OT is Job. This book has no mention in it of Israel, no mention of the Law, etc., no mention of those specific matters. These were people who were not Israelites but people whom God dealt in a definite way. God called Israel in order that He might prepare the way for the coming of Christ, and in order that the word of Christ might go out through the whole world. He did not cause it to go out through the world until after Christ had come and had laid down His life on the cross. During his earthly ministry He said God only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. But after the actual crucifixion then He said Go into all the world and preach the Gospel. But this was foretold in the OT. In Is. 42 it is three times stated, about Christ, that He shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles. He will set judgment in the earth and the distant isles will wait for His law. I will give Him for a light to the Gentiles. In ch. 42, in 49, in 52 and in 56

So it is not a strange thing that the OT would predict many events in connection with the coming of Christ, and it was particularly predicted that the Word of God would not be limited to the Jews, but that it would go out just as much to the Jew as to the Gentiles. In fact, that the church would come to include more Gentiles even though in every single generation since that time there have been Jews brought into the Church, and many of them have become leaders, Christian leaders.

How were people saved before Christ came? Look at Heb. 10:4.

There we do not find that the inspired writer says, In past time people were saved because they made sacrifices, but now they are going to be saved through Christ. He says,

These sacrifices simply look forward to Christ. But God is interested in our salvation through Christ; He also is interested in our earthly life. IN OT times He took a particular interest in the earthly life of the people of Israel. There is a great deal related to their earthly life in the OT.

There are those who go to the extreme of saying that Israel's whole purpose was to bring Christ into the world, and once that was done God was through with Israel. But there are comparatively few who hold such a view. The most important thing in the OT was not whether the Israelites defeated the Philistines. It was not whether a man lived 100 years instead of living 80 or 80 instead of 50 on this earth. It was whether they were saved for eternity or whether they were lost. There were the saved and the lost at every period as there are today. God is interested in our salvation, in our eternal life, but He is also interested in our life on this earth. He set aside Israel for a very special purpose. He still has a purpose in Israel. It is His purpose eventually that all Israel shall be saved.

So we have these two things and the prophet looked forward to our own day and beyond. We have the marvelous way they looked forward to the going out of the gospel, both to Israel and to other nations to believe in Christ. We also have wonderful promises relating to earthly Israel. It is a great mistake to go to one extreme or the other, and to take one side of the truth and neglect, overlook or deny the other.

Now we have been looking at these first two verses and what I have been saying relates not merely to the interpretation of them but to the interpretation of the whole of these two chs. I should remind you of the fact that as the prophet looks forward he does not necessarily understand everything he sees any more than as you see a great range of mountains in the distance, you can tell what is the first range, what is the second, the third, the fourth, and you certainly cannot see what is between them. So the prophet's vision of the future includes both. It includes God's will for all those who are to be saved in Christ; it also includes God's distinct will for His people Israel. Sometimes we can be sure He is talking about one; sometimes we can be sure He is talking about the other; sometimes we cannot be sure which it is. We will be sure when the time. I'm sure that at the time of the Apostles many were amazed when they saw what Jesus brought out in the OT. They said, We never saw this before. He calls them foolish and slow of heart not to see it. But there are very few of us who are wise and quick enough to have seen all these things. None of the disciples saw it until Christ explained it to them. So we don't expect to understand everything in these two chs., but there is a great deal we can understand.



A. The Contrast ~~w~~ in vv.1 and 2 of ch~~x~~/65.

B. The Contrast between the unfaithful people and God's Chosen servants 65:3-15.

I'm going to have to run a bit hastily through this and only touch on a few outstanding features. As we do this we'll note in vv.3-4 he is ~~xxx~~ speaking about hypocrisy. People who while claiming to follow the Lord, are doing that which is an abomination to Him. In v.5 he speaks about pride and this is just as applicable today as it was then:

God wants us to realize that we deserve nothing good at His hands; it is only because of His wonderful goodness He causes His word of salvation to be brought unto us.

(Question: In v. 5 of the NASB it says Come not near me . . . and the Me is capitalized) I don't know how it could be for the verse reads:

Who are the ones? He is talking about the rebellious people.

(They have it capitalized) Well, that's a mistake. . . it does not make sense. (Mine is not capitalized) Oh, yours does not have it? Well, that's probably an earlier printing of the NASB, and they caught it. You cannot print a book as long as the Bible without some mistakes in it. But you want to keep watching. You can't copy MSS without making mistakes, but we want to find means to get rid of them. But they will come in. That's why it's so silly the way some people seem to think that some late MS is going to be the exact true original, or that the KJV --- I got a letter from Florida saying the KJV is the true Bible. I'm not ready to say if it was good enough for the Apostle Paul it is good enough for us. It is a wonderful translation, but no translation is absolutely accurate, and no printing is absolutely accurate. There's not a Bible that does not have some mistakes in printing in it, but the Bible probably has less than any other because they spent more time checking and checking and getting rid of them.

Well, this describes an attitude very characteristic of the Pharisees in Christ's day, but alas characteristic of many Christians today. God does not want us to say, Look how wonderful I am; aren't those people terrible. He wants us to say, Isn't it wonderful what God has done in saving me; I should bring this message to others so they also can receive the marvellous gift of salvation. So we have this pride in v. 5

In vv.8-10 we have a stress on the true remnant.

The true remnant in Israel. The true remnant in our Christian church. The true remnant in humanity whom the Lord is going to bless. We see the wickedness of nations that were founded by people who loved the Lord, you wonder how =why the Lord does not just kick them out of His way and be done with them. But in His wonderful mercy He preserves a remnant.

V.15 is a striking verse. It is not translated quite accurately in the KJV, but it is a beautiful translation but unfortunately not exactly accurate:

Now the inaccuracies are rather minor, but that word "curse" is never translated curse anywhere else in the OT. There are six words translated "curse" in the OT. The word curse occurs in the KJV OT 52 times; this is the only case where this word is trans. curse. This word is trans. "oath" 28 times. "You shall leave your name for an oath unto my chosen." His people will say, Oh that God may bless us as He blessed Israel of old. This word *shivuah* is used for an oath of loyalty, of fidelity, of blessing, that sort of thing just as much as for a word of execration. And "curse" is an unfortunate translation.

"You shall leave your name for an oath to my chosen(elect)."  
Then it says, "for the Lord God shall slay thee." The Heb. -- in modern English I don't know if you use "slay" very much any more. I have not heard ~~no~~ of soldiers going out and slaying the enemy. We don't use it much today. It's become a slang word today. But the word slay suggests to us violence, and the Heb. has ~~not~~ violence. The Heb. is simply "shall cause thee to die." It can be taken that He will remove you from the center of his blessings during that period; he will cause many of your members of your race to die. He will cause that you will not be the center of His revelation during the period that follows the coming of Christ.

That of course is what happened, 700 yrs. after when the center of God's blessing passed to those who followed Christ specifically and they were called Christians rather than Israelites.

So as the v. stands, it is inaccurate, but yet it has a very definite truth in it. The changing of the name of the followers of God He is blessing for a time. Right there there should be a break, I believe. Most people put the break a v. later. I'm quite sure the KJV translators did because they started the next verse:

Just as if

We don't use "that" in that sense exactly today. Today this suggests it means "so that He who blesses . . ." But the Heb. is simply *asher*, the relative pronoun which means "that one," "the one who". So it can just as well be the start of a new paragraph, which I believe it is here. I believe it starts a new paragraph here which I call,

#### C. Millennial Blessing Described 65:16-25.

It starts not, In order that. . . I went through a considerable portion of Is. looking at all the occurrences of the word "that" to see which might be purposes like this. And in every one where the KJV had translated it as a purpose, I found that in the Heb. it uses a *maan*(in order that), or it uses *le*, of if it was negative it used *min* - away from the . . . This word *asher* is rarely, if ever, and I am inclined to question that it is ever used for purpose, to show purpose. So that should not be translated "that he who blesses himself" but start a new section here.

(the word could be taken either way)

The word "truly" in the OT is usually emeth. This word is related to it. This word is never translated "truth" anywhere except in this one verse. Perhaps "faithfulness" would be better. I don't know. Inevitably it reminds us of the passage in 1 Cor. 1 or maybe I should say the one in 1 Cor. 1 should remind us of this passage. 2 Cor. 1:20

Surely the prophet there is thinking of this passage where the God of the Amen, the God who is dependable and faithful.

(that's fem.) a

that's mas.)

(fem.)

It means the former troubles, not the former heavens and earth. The former troubles will not be remembered. It uses the same fem. form of "former", exactly the same word as used in the previous verse.

To look at this passage (vv. 16-25) and really understand it, we look at the last v. first. V. 25

As you read this you are immediately reminded of Is. 11 which uses this same figure, and uses this same picture of a time when there is complete freedom from external danger, a time when even the animals are no longer destructive, and the serpent that led Eve into temptation and brought about her fall, the serpent will not longer be able to injure because Satan will be bound at that time. So I think that the connection of this with the millennium is clear. You would not prove the millennium from this passage. Is. 2, 11, Mic. 4 definitely prove the coming of a millennium/ This passage describes something about the millennium, but that that is what is being described is proved by comparing this with the other passage.

This passage then looks forward to the millennium and gives us further light on it, that was not given in those passages. If we had time we could spend three or four hours on it. All we will do now is call your attention to a few points. If you start this with v. 17 (Behold, I create new heavens and new earth) you can easily get the idea this is looking way beyond the millennium. But when you go on to the next few verses, it is clear he is not looking beyond the millennium, he is looking at the millennium. So it seems the word "I create" is a participle here - "I am creating." It seems it is quite clear that here he is describing a change, a renewed heaven and earth. A heaven and earth from which the curse is being removed. He is looking here at the millennium, not at something beyond the millennium.

Then as he looks at the millennium, we find (v.19) it will be a time when there will be no more weeping, no more crying. A time of universal joy. V. 20 shows the great longevity of the time. There will not be an infant of days nor an old man that has not filled his years, for the child shall die an hundred ~~years~~ years old (when someone dies at age 100 they will say, Poor fellow he did not live out half his time.) It is a time of greatly increased longevity. It is not a time of immortality. There will still be death at that time. The end of the v. shows there will still be sinners at that time, though it will not be possible for sinners to work violence or destruction. There will be no external violence. Sinners will be in a great minority, that is those who have refused to believe in the Lord will be in a great minority. ~~xxxx~~

So this is a time which is not a time of absolute perfection but a time of complete removal of external danger, and a time of a renewed earth, like the earth in the days of the Garden of Eden.

In v.22 the longevity is further brought out. You see a tree that has stood there for 150, 200, 300 years, so will be life at that time.

#### D. Further Rebuke to Insincere Formalism 66:1-4

The great prayer was, Our beautiful temple has been destroyed. Help us to rebuild our temple. That was the great prayer that just preceded this section.

The place of my rest is what it means, but it means to rest like the book rests on the table - not as if God had to rest. But it is the place where He takes His station, takes His stand. He is saying, The temple has a great place in God's economy and continues to have, but the temple in itself is nothing. He wants them to go back and rebuild the temple, yes. But the important thing is that the temple reminds them of the truths He has given them, and that in the temple they performed the sacrifices to bring to their hearts the sin that needed atonement and the realization of the fact that a perfect sacrifice must be provided, that the Lamb of God must come to take away their sin. The temple is a figure, it is a picture. It is of value, but when you make it primary, then it is of no value. What is the temple to God? What are these earthly things? They are wonderful as pictures, but they are nothing in reality. In reality He builds all the universe.

So here He rebukes them. He says, What ~~xxx~~ good are your sacrifices. He that kills an ox is as if he slew an ass; he that sacrifices a lamb as if he cut off a dog's neck. In other words He takes the animals they thought of as unclean and says you bring a beautiful clean lamb, a perfect animal and sacrifice it, well if your heart is not right before God it does absolutely no good, at all. You might just as well have brought a dog or a pig as a lamb if your heart is wrong. These things are merely pictures of what Christ is going to do. So these 4 vv. are important for those people then; they are important for us today, because we can take the same attitude toward formal things as the unfaithful ones did then.

## E. A Nation Born in a Day 66:5-11

This is an interesting section, but one about which we do not know exactly how what part of the future the prophet saw. We do not know exactly wholly what it meant.

This does not describe anything that has happened to this time. So it would seem most reasonable to think this is a picture of the conversion of the Jewish nation as a whole. Many individuals have come to know Christ, but this is the turning to Him whom they had pierced, the great turning of Israel to God that is predicted in the OT which will be so sudden and so tremendous that it will be like a nation being born in a day. I would not be dogmatic on that; but that seems to me to be by far the most reasonable suggestion for the passage.

There are some who have tried to make it the beginning of the Christian church, but certainly it was not in this sudden way the beginning of the Christian church. The beginning of the Christian church was with 12 disciples and they went out and God brought 3000 in and they went a little further and a little further and it took three centuries to have maybe a fifth of the Roman empire. It took three centuries. It was a tremendous thing but I don't think it was what is described here.

## F. The Indestructible Glory 66:12-24.

Here in these last vv. of the ch. of the book, the Lord gives a wonderful picture of future glory which Is. saw as he looked far beyond the immediate situation.

Is he looking way forward here? or is he looking to their return from exile? or is he including both in these statements? When

The picture here looks forward to great blessings in the future including many different things. Isaiah's book while it is more than any other book in the OT in the way that it look to Christ and the amount it tells about Christ, yet it was a book written for his contemporaries and in these last words he has them very much in mind, as well as his looking forward to the distant glory God is going to bring in. We find in vv.22 on the permanence of the blessings he will have on his people.

Here is a marvellous picture of

the permanence of God's blessings on his people, His blessings on Israel and His blessings on all who are saved through the promise He gives.

Just as the new heavens and new earth will remain before Him so will your seed and your name remain. Frederick the Great of Prussia was one of perhaps the greatest doers in the world's history - he took a little region which was quite weak and built it up into a strong force, and he did it with his brilliance and his ruthlessness. He was a great admirer of Voltaire the French atheist. He invited Voltaire to his court and he spent some time with him in his court. Frederick liked to think he could write Fr. poetry, and Voltaire flattered him by saying his poetry was worth something, but it probably wasn't worth much. Frederick wouldn't even bother to speak German except to his underlings, he thought Fr. much superior. Eventually he and Voltaire got into a big fight and Voltaire left him. But Frederick was ruling in a land where the teachings of Luther were widespread and the church was supported by the State, and where there were many faithful pastors. Frederick had a Chaplain in his palace and he had the forms of religion and doubtless many of the people in his court were truly Christians. But he scoffed at it and ridiculed it. One day he turned to his Chaplain and said, Give me in one word some proof that Christianity is true. And the Chaplain replied, The Jews. And for giving in one word proof of Christianity that was marvellous quick thinking. Because all the great nations of antiquity have disappeared. Egypt was overrun by the Arabs. The present day Egyptians are Arabs. Mesopotamia has become very minor in any power for the last centuries. Rome is largely a pile of ruins. Greece has some beautiful ruins but is not much of a power. Those lands were overrun by what they considered barbarians coming from the north, and overrunning them, taking control and mixing them with their people.

Only the Jew has preserved an identity through all these years, and God has kept them as an identity that has been preserved, scattered throughout the world, persecuted, mistreated but God has enabled them to preserve their existence and identity all this time. It is a wonderful proof the Bible is true. It predicts exactly what would happen, that their seed would remain before him forever, but that for rebellion and disobedience they would suffer persecution and misery. In this passage about the indestructible glory we also have interspersed little references to God's vengeance upon His enemies, to his punishment of those who do not accept his salvation.

So we notice in v. 14

Then it continues through v. 17,

Christ said, I come not to bring peace but a sword. We are not going to get any millennium by human effort, by wonderful plans with the UN, or governments taking care of everyone from birth to death, or by even the preaching of the gospel. It is going to result in calling out a people for His name, in leading many individuals to salvation. But God has never promised that by any human means the victory will be

won, but by His coming in supreme power. So we find that even with the great blessings, the great glory of these passages, we find at the end (v.24) that very strange verse:

With all his wonderful promises and pictures of glory, evil still remains a fact in the universe, a fact that God must deal with. He does not want us to get so wrapped up ~~x~~ in thoughts of blessing that he's bringing, in thoughts of the glory, that we overlook the fact of wickedness, and sin in the world.

(Question: How much of this last section can you say definitely refers to the eternal state, or can you ?) Well, personally I'm very skeptical about the whole phrase "eternal state". I think that is a statement which began from a philosophical concept of God being eternal in the sense that he has no past, no future, everything is just a static present. That's just a philosophical attitude which I don't think has any basis either in Greece or in the Bible. The millennium will endure for 1000 and then Satan will be loosed for a little season. Now, what happens after that? Does the condition continue much as it did before? on this earth? Do the righteous continue to live here? Does God move us to another place? Do we go to another galaxy? I don't think we know. But I don't think we have any reason to say that time has stopped. There is a verse in Revelation where it says, Time will be no more. It means there will be no more time before these things happen. It does not mean that time won't exist.

So I'm very skeptical of that phrase "eternal state" altogether. That does not mean I dogmatically say there isn't such a thing. I just say I don't see any proof of such a thing. So as Isaiah looks forward he saw these things, and what we can definitely tie up like "He will call His servants by another Name", and there will be a time of wonderful blessing on this earth, and yet there will still be a certain amount of sin. These things we have predicted. But the exact fitting of them together, I . . . think it's a human tendency to try to explain everything. That's why we have these systems all worked out, with every little detail. Then you get another system over here with every detail, and each of them may be 60% right, and may agree 40% but they make guesses. To my mind the thing we must do is to take what is clear in Scripture and say this is true, we know we can stand on it, and there are other things in Scripture that when the time ~~x~~ comes we will understand. We can try to understand now, but until you have the whole situation . . .

Suppose a man had said 100 yrs. ago, that a man would have breakfast in London, lunch in NY and supper in San Francisco. People would have said, What a silly nonsense. It takes two months to cross the ocean in a fast boat. And to go clear across this continent and do all that in one day, how utterly ridiculous. Today it is commonplace. The Lord looks forward, and gives us glimpses of many things of which there will be factors of which we don't have any data to understand now.

(Question: Do you recall from v. 22 whether ~~x~~ the phrase "which I make" is also a participle). I'd have to look it up, (It is a participle) Yes, "which I am making"

But a participle can be past, present, or future. So you cannot tell simply from a participle what the time is. It may mean "which I will be making" in the future. But it does not sound like an instantaneous act; it sounds more like a thing that continues over a space of time. But whether it is already in process, or in process of taking place later on we do not know.

(Comment briefly on the exam). I will plan questions I think you should be able to answer in about an hour. But I will permit anyone to take an hour and a half if they desire to. I don't want you to rush.



Lecture #1 9/13/76

- 1 Masterpiece of literature. Hebrew style the finest.
- 2 Greatness of the book  
The Importance of the OT
- 3 The Importance of the Prophetic Books  
The Difficulty of the Prophetic Books  
The Poetic language
- 4 The local situation  
Their partial glimpses of the future  
The purposes of prophecy and their relations to predictions
- 5 To call men to repentance  
To comfort and reassure believers
- 6 To give specific guidance  
The perspective of prophecy
- 7 Not simply history written in advance  
Order often logical rather than chronological  
Story of Elijah (1 Ki. 19)
- 9 Illustration of the mountain range  
Assignment
- 10 Recommended translations
- 11 Divisions of Isaiah
- 12 Structure of Is 1-6 and comparison to Mic 1-4

Lecture #2 9/20/76

- 1 Advantage of students who studied at FTS of going directly to Scripture  
Is 2 and Mic 4
- 2 Albright and the Arabs  
Unsafe conditions in Palestine -- Czechoslovakina couple murdered  
Micah's addition
- 4 Headings in Is 1:1 and 2:1
- 5 Clue found in Mic 4:4  
Isaiah's addition  
True picture of what God gave stated in the prophet's own words kept from error
- 6 Is stresses its universality a little more than Mic did  
Micah's prophecy came first  
Divisions of Micah's prophecy
- 7 Next assignment  
Vision of Isaiah son of Amos. Dates of Judah's kings
- 8 The Lord's complaint 1:2-6 Frequentive imperfect
- 9 Desolation of the Land 1:7-9
- 10 Futility of Empty Ceremonies 1:10-15

Lecture #3 9/27/76

- 1 Isaiah 1 Futility of Empty Ceremonies 1:10-15  
An Offer of Forgiveness 1:16-20
- 2 The Sin of Jerusalem 1:21-23  
Punishment and Renewed Blessing 1:24-31
- 3 The Glorious Promises 2:1-5
- 3 The General Relation to Micah 4  
Relation of Is. 2 and Mic 4 to the preceding Context of Each
- 4 The Meaning of the Vision  
Is. 2:2 and Mic. 4:1 Use of figures of speech.  
Supremacy of God's House  
Is. 2:3 and Mic 4:2 The People Seeking God  
Order going out from Zion

Lecture #3 (cont'd)

- 5 Is. 2:4 and Mic 4:3  
Situation in China before communists took over
- 6 Folly of pacifism today  
Comment of Methodius 300 A.D. misinterprets the passage
- 7 Fulfillment of the Vision. Importance of avoiding circular reasoning.
- 8 Faulty interpretation of early church fathers  
Disappointing events -- barbarian invaders
- 9 Same thing predicted as promised in Is 11  
Manner of fulfillment not entirely specified

Lecture #4 10/4/76

- 2 View of the Bible's words being magical. Episcopalian rector's sermon  
on "Hear the church" and his Bishop's "Hang all the law . . ."  
Not to take words out of context
- 3 Does a passage relate to the millennium, and does it prove the millennium?  
Statements that are fulfilled and statements that are unfulfilled
- 4 Is 1:26-27 "her converts" i.e. lit. "those who return" which could be  
a physical return or a spiritual return. NIV wrong
- 5 Can't prove the millennium from this verse  
The Glory of the Promise 2:1-5  
The manner of fulfillment not entirely specified here
- 6 Bible doesn't predict the Gospel preached will produce freedom from war
- 7 Title in 1:1 and 2:1
- 8 Mic 4:5 and Is 2:5  
Heb. imperf. can just as well be trans. as a frequentive
- 9 Note the purpose of a passage. Is it rebuke? or blessing? or comfort?
- 10 Idolatry and heathenism 2:6-9  
Eastern religions becoming aggressive in West  
Conditional prediction 3:10-11
- 11 Judgment on Unworthy leaders 3:12-15  
Rebuke to vain and worldly women 3:16-4:1

Lecture # 5 10/11/76

- 1 Any special significance to the phrase "in that day"? Technical term?
- 2 Term "in the last days" and "in that day"
- 3 Is 4 The Branch of the Lord 4:2-6
- 4 Is 4:2 Relation to the preceding passage  
Branch == that which is produced or comes from the Lord  
Results of experiencing famine and starvation
- 5 Note the descriptive terms  
Vegetation or something greater?
- 6 Branch of the Lord and fruit of the earth  
The Divine Provision for Holiness 4:3-4
- 7 Divine Protection and Leadership for God's Pilgrims 4:5-6  
Meaning of "assemblies", "defense", "tabernacle"
- 9 Us/ 5 Important division 5:1-7 a definite unit by itself

Lecture #6 10/18/76

- 1 Is 6 blessing for Isa, rebuke for the people  
Isaiah's Call for Service
- 2 Present system of dating originated c. 400 A.D.  
System used in Egypt, Assyria, Rome
- 3 Calvin's difference with Luther over separation of Church and State  
King Uzziah went beyond his authority as king
- 4 King Uzziah started out well yet failed miserably
- 5 Isaiah's vision
- 6 "The fulness of the whole earth is His glory.

Lecture #7 10/25/76

- 1 Isaiah's Call to Service  
His cleansing and commission
- 2 Is 6:11-13  
Plan for course altered
- 3 Glance at Predictions in Is 9-11  
Isaiah 9:1-2 cf. Mat. 4:14-16 Promised end of was 9:5
- 4 The two-natured redeemer 9:6-7  
Is 11 Relation to what precedes The Branch Quotation in Mat. 2:23
- 5 His character His victory over antichrist, v. 4 cf. 2 Thess. 2:8; Rev. 19
- 6 His millennial reign REv. 20  
The obedience of the nations 9:10  
The Time perspective 9:11
- 7 The Servant of the Lord  
Isaiah's use of the word Servant (before ch. 37 and after ch. 37)

Lecture #8 11/1/76

- 1 The Servant of the Lord Is 41  
Isaiah's use of the word servant
- 2 The First three occurrences of this type  
The word is specifically applied to Israel cf. 41:8-9  
Israel need not fear for God has called her to perform a task
- 3 Isa 42:1-7  
Task involves bringing light and justice to all nations  
God guarantees fulfillment of this task
- 4 The task will be done without uncertainty or discouragement  
It will not be done with violent effort but with gentleness  
Hard to think of 42:1-7 as describing Israel  
Israel lacks power needed
- 5 Israel is human and subject to discouragement  
Israel hardly fills the characteristics described in vv.3-4  
Israel has responsibility for the Servant's task 41:8-9
- 6 Is 48:20  
A Difference between responsibility and accomplishment
- 7 The Individualization of the Servant ch. 49  
Servant is called Israel, v. 3  
Lk. ch. 42 the Servant here called Israel must do a work for entire world  
Sinim= China 49:12
- 8 49:5-6
- 9 Ch. distinguishes the servant from Israel  
Ch. shows the servant like Israel must suffer humiliation 49:7  
Fulfillment of the Servant's Word 52:13-53:12
- 10 52:15 cf. 1 Pet. 1:1

Lecture #9 11/8/76

- 1 Is 42:3 Picture of One headed for a task  
Picture of those who are trying to serve God sincerely
- 2 His care about the small people. No little people.  
Not to become discouraged because of our failures
- 3 Relation of Later Part of Isa to its Earlier Part  
The Higher Criticism of Isaiah
- 4 Use of term HC in literary studies today  
No evidence anyone questioned Isa's authorship until 18th century  
The two-Isaiah theory  
Only a theory scarcely held today
- 5 More recent attitudes  
Extension of idea of disunity to Is 1-39  
Tri~~to~~ Isaiah  
Complete fragmentation by most critics
- 6 A Glance at the Arguments  
Historical argument. Differences in Style. Differences in Theology
- 7 Only argument that matters is one from historical background  
NT Attitude Paul quoting Is 1:22, 1:9, 10:16 in Rom. 9:27
- 8 Important Change in Is 40  
Relation to Exile  
Servant of the Lord  
Possibility of Prediction
- 10 Change at Is 56:9  
40:1=56:8 all one section  
Great similarity to earlier portions hereafter than before  
Likelihood that Future Emphasis Continues to some extent  
A Succession of passages of rebuke and blessing come after the break at 56:9
- 11 Rebuke against the watchmen and leaders of the people 56:9-57:13a

Lecture #10 11/15/76

- 1 Rebuke against the Watchmen and leaders of the people 56:9-57:13a  
Message has equal importance for us today  
A Succession of passages of Rebuke and Blessing
- 3 59:13  
Blessings to the men of faith 57:13b-19
- 4 57:17-18  
Rebuke against wickedness and especially against insincere formalism 57:20-58:5
- 5 57:19-58:1  
Blessings on sincere believers 58:6-59:1  
Need for one day's rest in seven
- 7 A Picture of Transgressors 59:2-15a  
Iniquity described 59:2-8c  
Its results 59:8d-15a  
A Long Picture of future divine activity 59:15b-63:6
- 8 The Long Picture of Future Divine Activity  
A Sovereign God's Interposition to Overthrow His adversaries  
Note parallels between Is 59 and Is 62-63
- 9 A Redeemer Comes to Zion 59:19 and KJV
- 11 59:19 discussed

Lecture #11 11/12/76

- 1 Is 59:19 KJV better here  
John 3:8 and Dr. Buswell
- 3 Millennial blessings 60:1-20; 61:4-62:9  
Is 60:18 never fulfilled yet
- 4 Is 61:1-3
- 5 Lk 4:18 and Jesus' action in suspending his reading
- 6 God's Violent Interposition to Overthrow Evil  
A Long Prayer Is 64 is a prayer that begins in ch. 63  
Introduction to the prayer 63:7-14 Remembrance of past blessings
- 7 63:9
- 8 63:11
- 9 Object of the prayer and types of people who would pray it  
63:12
- 10 63:15 Is this a question?  
Specific requests
- 11 65:1  
Is. 64 Is there true evidence of repentance?

Lecture #12 11/29/76

- 1 A Long Prayer 63:7-64:12  
Object of the prayer  
The specific request 63:15, 7b; 64:1-9  
The reasons advanced: past blessings (vv.7-14)  
a claimed relationship 63:16,17,18; 64:8-9
- 2 Possibilities of translating 63:19
- 3 Meaning of "freedom from external danger"  
Is there evidence of true repentance?
- 4 When this is lacking God will not hear our prayer  
God's relation to Israel  
Israel's rebellion will be punished  
God blesses those who turn to Him will all their heart  
God has made an Everlasting covenant with Israel Is 66:22 cf. Lev. 26:44-45
- 5 NT teaches we are the Israel of God  
Compare Daniel's prayer in Ch. 9 of Daniel
- 6 Compare David's prayer in Ps. 51  
This prayer recognizes the fact of sin Is 63:10, 17; 64:5-7  
Seems to put blame on God for sin  
Has no plea for chastened heart  
Whose prayer is this? 65:5 reminds of Mat. 3:8-9; Jn 8:33, 39
- 7 Since speaker not named we must avoid all dogmatism that this is the  
prayer of the pharisee type. Cf. statement of Delitzsch  
The Question of ~~Inerrancy~~ Inerrancy  
What right have we to say this prayer represents a wrong attitude?
- 8 Every statement in the prayer is true  
The claims they make in the prayer are true  
Only the attitude is wrong
- 9 Divine Rebuke and promise 65:1-6 cf. Rom. 10:20-21. Check RSV trans.
- 10 Niphal tolerativum of some commentators
- 11 The K-B dictionary vs BDB  
Contrast between unfaithful people and God's chosen servants

Lecture #13 12/6/76

- 1 The Divine Rebuke and promise Is. 65-66  
65:1-2 with Rom. 10:20,21  
On finding Christ in every verse of the OT
- 2 Using hyperbole  
Weakness of RBV translation
- 3 Did God have anything for Gantiles in the OT?  
Peter's argument Acts 10:34  
The Book of Job  
How were people saved before Christ came? Hebrews 10:4
- 5 The contrast in vv. 1 and 2 of Is 65  
The congrast between the unfaithful people and God's chosen servants vv.3-15  
Is 65:5 and sinful pride  
65:8-10 the true remnant
- 6 65:15  
Millennial blessings described 65:16-25
- 8 Not a time of absolute perfection but a time of complete removal of  
external danger, a time of renewed earth  
65:22 longevity  
Further rebuke to insincere formalism 66:1-4
- 9 A Nation is born in a day 66:5-11  
Not describe the beginning of the Christian church as some say  
The Indestructible glory 66:12-24
- 10 Frederick the Great of Pressis and the Jews  
66:14-17
- 11 Use of the phrase "external state"  
66:22 "which I am making" (participle) does not tell what the time is.
- 12 Could be "which I will be making" in the future