

(Instructions about assigned seats)

In this course we are covering two sections of the book of Isaiah. We are going to deal with chs. 7-12. (First these sheets I've handed out have a number of names I'm going to refer to today and rather than have to spell them for you I've mimeographed this sheet. It does not give an outline; it merely gives you particular names and dates. . . )

We are going to deal with these two sections of Isaiah-- chs. 7-12 is a section that contains as much of Messianic prophecy as perhaps any section in the OT. There are probably more chs. that have references to Christ between chs. 7-12 of Isa. than just about any other section of the OT, that is of consecutive chs.

However, everyone of these predictions is one which is not obvious when you first see it, and there are various problems that have been raised about them. So we'll want to look at the Messianic prophecies in ch. 7-12 to see how they relate to the passage around them, to see exactly whether and how the NT writer was justified in quoting them in connection with Christ.

We also want to note the other passages between 7-12, some of which have very important lessons for us. That will take us maybe half the semester because this is an extremely important section of Isaiah.

Then the other part of the semester we are going to take chs. 28-35/ If Isa. 7-12 is one of the best known sections of the OT, chs. 28-35 is probably one of the least known. There are many individual vv. there that have passed into our ~~in common~~ language as quotes of individual vv. or parts of vv., but very few people know much about chs. 28-35/ The reason for this is simple to see. If you will start reading at the beginning of ch. 28, almost anyone reading ch. 28 will get through and have no idea of what he's read. Ch. 29 is almost as bad.

At first sight they do not convey any continuous idea of something definite. But I have found that if you take the principles and facts that are brought out in connection with ch. 7-12 and have them in mind as you approach chs. 28-35, it opens right up. It's like taking a light into a dark room. Consequently after chs. 7-12 we will be quite easily be able to see the main purpose of ch. 28-35. Once we see those main purposes, we will note many other details that I think are of great interest.

Chs. 28-35 while as not an outstanding section of the book as chs. 7-12, is a very interesting section and has some very important teachings in it, but I think it will be much easier to understand after we've made a careful examination of chs. 7-12.

I picked up a book at the U. of Pa. library called Isaiah and the Assyrian crisis by a professor at Yale Divinity School, professor Childs. He takes up certain sections of Isa. that we'll take up later and he says we have to recognize this particular section is made up of two different sources! You have three vv. from this one, and one from that one, and two from that. The question is which of the two sources is correct?

Their whole approach is that we can take this ancient document and we can determine when it was written and why it was written-- some parts very early, some very late, and we can see just how much truth there is in it. That's what is called the higher criticism. We are dealing in this course with the higher criticism. But we have to say a few words about it at the beginning.

If you pick up almost any book on Bible Introduction, you are apt to find this statement: the term higher criticism does not involve in it anything harmful. They say, higher criticism is simply the regular practice of examining a document to see what its sources are, what its unity is, etc. You will read that statement in almost any book on Biblical Introduction but if you want to want to read a book on literature on the study of any other literature than the Bible, you won't find any such statement. At least not in a book that was written in the last 50 years.

It is a strange thing how often religious students hold back from a theory and oppose it as bad and stick to what they are used to have. Then they come to accept a theory and they take over a view from secular studies, and then the secular studies abandon it, and the religious studies keep on using it. After it is quite out of date.

Here is the Journal of the ETS. I noticed an article in it about a NT problem. He begins by saying we compare the statements quoted by Jesus in Mat., in Mk., and in Lk., and we notice differences, and we must try to decide what did Jesus actually say. How must was the interpretation of the writer? That is the first problem.

He says, Mark is the first Gospel, so Mk. is probably right, and Mat. and Lk. probably out of their own ideas added certain things. That is another application of the so-called higher criticism.

I read a statement recently that it is strange that the great bulk of evangelical scholars today strongly repudiate the higher criticism of the Pentateuch because it has been a central focus of attack on Scripture. All liberals believe thoroughly in the higher criticism of the Pentateuch. It is taught in most of the large denominations as an established fact that the books of the Pentateuch are made up of various documents fitted together. We have to see which of them may contain an element of truth!

That has been a focal point of attack, and most evangelical scholars repudiate that. Yet many of these same evangelical scholars accept that same approach in dealing with the gospels. They say Mat., Mk, and Luke that Mark was doubtless the first and the others used Mark as a source. Then they had another source they called Q. They fit together these sources and so we want to try to get back to the source.

In this particular article in the Journal of ETS, the man is one who believes in the Bible and his conclusion at the end is in line with acceptance of Scripture, but in reaching that he takes the method of comparing these gospels to see which ones are nearer the truth and which are simply ideas of the later writer. He talks about the *sitzin leben* of each passage -- a German phrase which is much used by theological scholars. I think if they would simply say the background (it would be an English word) that would give exactly the same idea and easier for most people to understand.

It is something you have to meet in reading and in studying about most parts of the Bible. I think very few evangelical scholars realize it. The fact which I discovered to my great surprise a few years ago when I decided to look into the application of the principles of higher criticism to secular living.

I found that this term higher criticism began in the 1700 and by 1800 there was a widespread attitude that any ancient document is legendary or imaginary unless you can find supporting proof of it. Shortly after 1800 a custom began which continued until early in this century of taking any ancient document and even some that were fairly recent, and think that we can take the document and decide how much came from one source, how much from a second source, and how much from a third, etc. But today the -- in literary study aside from the Bible, that method has been just about completely abandoned.

There is a book by a professor in Bennington College -- a book on general literature. I've looked in the Index to see what he said about the higher criticism. I found that in the whole book of -- on literary criticism there was only one reference to higher criticism and that was the statement that referred to the almost miraculous way in which students of the Bible have been able to separate out sources -- almost miraculously he said. Because he recognized as I believe practically all students of general literature recognize that in the first place no great classic has ever been written by a lot of sources coming together.

A man may have sources for knowledge, but if it is a great work it must have a great author. The author puts it through his mind and thinking, and he writes it. They recognize that that most great works were not made up of sources; and they recognize still more importantly that if they were we are not able to figure them out. I read a statement about the Mahabhrata -- one of the great religious works of India, of the Hindus, and they said there is no question that this great extensive work began with a

small part and it had many accretions from many sources, but that scholars of it agree that it is impossible to distinguish what they were. Yet even today people are writing about the book of Isaiah and saying these 5 words came from Isaiah, and these next 20 words were written 100 years before Isaiah and the next 3 verses were written 300 years after Isaiah and think they can figure out sources like that!

Personally I don't think there is any point in our trying to take up their arguments in detail and answering them. I think it is good for us to recognize that it is a method that has been proven false in general study and is not used in other studies and that it is a claim to something that is out of date the way it is used by all liberal Biblical scholars today.

Our attitude in this course is that the book of Isaiah and all the rest of the Bible is what God wants us to have. If it says Jesus said something in Matthew, and if it says he said something different in Mark, I believe we can say that they both represent the thought that Jesus was giving, but that when it comes to the exact words I don't believe one of them is what Jesus said. In fact I don't believe He said a single English word in His whole life.

So I don't believe that any of our translations represent exactly what He said. He may have spoken Greek but we can't prove He did. We know that most of what he said was doubtless in Aramaic. So two translations of Greek, of Aramaic into Greek, may both be a good representation of part of what he said. You don't have to quote everything a man says when you refer to something about him. You quote particular parts. They may both be correct representations of what he said as near as you can get in a translation.

So you may have to compare them in order to get a closer idea of exactly what his original thought was. Any sentence in any language we have to look at it and study it in relation to other statements elsewhere to find out what the thought is. Because no statement in any language can stand absolutely by itself. So we are interested in determining what these words mean, and we may have differences of opinion as to what they mean. But what we find in the MSS that God has caused to be passed down to us, we can depend upon as the inerrant Word of God though not in any translation a precise statement of God's inerrant teaching.

It is good to have that in mind as our approach, but we do not expect to go into arguments about the first, second, and third Isaiah or that sort of thing. Most of the material we will look at in this course the critics assign to the first Isaiah, although many parts of it they assign to any one of the other 35 or 40 writers that they say have participated in the production of this book.

The 7th ch. of Isaiah with which we begin is probably best known to Christians because of the prediction of the virgin birth.

I haven't heard a great deal of argument in recent years about the virgin birth. I don't know just why it is because when I was a student in college it was a topic of big discussion. Was Jesus virgin born? Some who claimed to be subject to biblical teachings about Jesus did not believe in the virgin birth! That was a big point of argument. I don't hear much about it now. I think to the liberals it is an absurd idea, and most evangelicals it is what the Scripture says and we accept it as true.

We did have a bit of argument in relation to it when the RSV came out. The RSV in Isa. 7 says, Behold, a youngwoman will give birth . . ." Nothing miraculous or strange about that. That's the way they translated it. An argument can be made about the meaning of the word, whether it means virgin or not. I think it definitely does mean birgin, but we need to look at it. Look at the evidence. An argument can be made for young woman, but the thing that makes it really bad in my opinion is that the RSV in Mat. quotes Isa. as saying a virgin shall conceive and bring forth a son . . .and call hisname Immanuel. And then it has a footnote: that points you back to Isaiah and in Isaiah they translate it a young woman.

That's why I said when the RSV came out that I thought the version had a lie right on its cover because it says Holy Bible on cover, and a holy Bible would not have such a sharp contradiction as for one book to say this was a fulfillment of the OT and then for the OT to say something entirely different from the quotation, contained in NT. The RSV did that in most of the Messianic passages. When you get away from the Messianic passages it is a very good translation. They were excellent scholars who made it and as long as there is no doctrinal issue involved you can trust it.

But they have a complete distaste for the idea that the OT ever predicted Christ and they even where the word is absolutely clear in the OT they may change it around in NT. Then the worst thing is that in the NT they refer back to the OT so that anybody reading the NT and seeing in 15 or 20 cases where the NT writer said this fulfills that in the OT and then you find it utterly different in the OT, how can a holy Bible have such contradictions in it?

I'd like to call your attention to Mat. 1:22. I believe there is an unfortunate thing in all the recent translations of this. That word "recent" needs to be slightly modified because there was a translation that appeared in England in 1881 and in the U. S in 1901 and was widely acclaimed and much used between that time and the time the RSV came out. In England it was called a Revised Version and in America it was called the ASV. It differed in this verse from all the recent translations that I have seen. I don't know whether the translators of the NASB and of the NIV failed to give consideration to the reading of that in the ASV, or whether they rejected it. I don't know which was the case. But I call your attention to Mat. 1 where we read about the birth of Christ. Reading from the NIV beginning with verse 18 . . .

(reading text of Mat. 1:18-20 in NIV) ...."appeared to him in a dream and said, " and then there is a quotation mark. The most recent translations all have quotation marks at this point. KJV has no quotation marks. ASV of 1901 has no quotation marks nor does the original Greek. So you might say this is a paraphrase-- an attempt to give in your language what is in the original even though there is no indication of it there.

The Living Bible is a paraphrase; it looks into the original and those men say that which they think the original means and then they put that into English. Many people find it is much easier to get what the Bible is teaching thru reading that paraphrase. But when it comes to exact study of verses they do not exactly correspond with the original because it's a paraphrase.

No translation exactly corresponds with the original. If it exactly corresponded it wouldn't make sense because no two languages are similar enough that you can make an absolute word-for-word translation. But in a translation (instead of a paraphrase) you try to where the original is a little ambiguous to maintain that ambiguity. Because most sentences in any language have some ambiguity. We try to maintain that rather than make a decision.

If we make a decision which is very close to one of two possibilities, we can call it a translation. But if we change our working quite a bit introducing something there to make clear what we think is in the original, there is an element of paraphrase. There's an element of that in every translation. If one were writing something for our modern time, it is a good thing to put in quotation marks. But remember that represents only the judgment of the translator.

There is no question that if you're going to use quotation marks this is where they come after "said." "Joseph son of David, do not be afraid . . . because he will save his people from their sins." Then there is another quotation. For that quotation mark represents the judgment of those who prepared the most of the recent translations. But it differs from the judgment of those who made the NASB ASVs of 1901 and the ERV in 1881. They would not put the end of the quotation there.

The next verse says without a quotation: All this took place to fulfill what the Lord had said through the prophet: (Then you have a quotation from Matt. again as quoting from the OT: The virgin will be with child . . . Immanuel, God with us.

When Joseph woke up, he did what the angel of the Lord had commanded him. So he accepted this--this unbelievable thing that this child was virgin born, that Mary was not simply a loose woman. Before the last war there were those in Germany as they

as they were trying to raise the Nazi teaching & who tried to praise Jesus and to hate all Jews! Who said that he was the son of a German soldier in Palestine at the time. Anti-Christians sometimes made such statements. Well, what would Joseph think when this woman with whom he had not yet had relations was pregnant? What would he think?

If you find your wife in that situation when you first marry her and you dreamed that an angel said to you, Don't you worry, this is the Holy Spirit who did this. I think most of us would say, Well, I wonder what I ate for supper last night! An idea in my head!

To me the nub of the whole thing is that angel's talk to Joseph did not stop with the words "call his name Jesus because he will save his people from their sins." But the next verse is part of what Joseph said (you mean the angel said), and the NASB?(ASV--- ) read, Now all this is come to pass that it might be fulfilled . . ."

And to say to Joseph to say, This is a queer thing, you can't believe such a thing, how do you know but that this is some demon talking to you? The Bible warns against dreams we're not sure come from the Lord. Joseph wasn't a prophet. God had not given him messages. How could he trust a dream in which he saw an angel? But the angel gives him proof. He says, This is what God had predicted. The angel ~~ix~~ says this is come to pass that it might be fulfilled through the prophet. And your quotation should be ~~xxx~~ afterwards.

To me another proof of this is that if this was Matt.'s idea as is thought by most present-day interpreters, I think Mat. would have put it after Joseph woke up. In view of what the angel has said he took Mary to him and had no union with her until she gave birth to a son and gave him the name of Jesus.

After that it would have said, Now this happened in order for this to be fulfilled. I can't quite think Mat. would have put it right in the middle of the incident instead of at the end. The big argument is that it is the solid basis for convincing Matthew that this was indeed a virgin birth (you mean Joseph?).

As you read it in the NIV it says "All this took place... And the Angel would not say "all this took place." He would say, All this has taken place . . . But this is a distinction you have in English that you would hardly have in the Greek. The Greek perfect represents something that has already occurred and has results reaching into the present. And either translation fits with that.

I reached this conclusion some years ago, but it has only been in the last week that I learned that Irenaeus had the same idea. Irenaeus presented it back in the 2nd or 3rd cent. A.D.

There have been great students like Theodore Zahn whom Harnack said was one of the greatest minds of the 19th century who wrote many commentaries on the Bible and he presents this view as isconclusion.

It's not the generally accepted view of these verses. But whether this is what the angel said; whether it is what Matthew said, it certainly is what is taught in this chapter. That the virgin birth was a fulfillment of these words in Isa. So it's important we see whether the angel, or Mat., or whoever was completely wrong in thus interpreting as many feel. We want to see, Do you reasonably take it to be this. Some say this was Isa. speaking through Ahaz at a great crisis, and in this crisis he is giving Ahaz comfort.

How could it be any comfort to Ahaz to know that Jesus would be born 700 years later? How would that bring comfort to him? Then there is the problem of the relation of v.14 to the next verse. It is not ~~xxx~~ one of the simplest matters in Scripture, but it is a very important matter.

To understand Isa.7-12 you have to have the sitz in leben in mind. You have to have the background in mind. The ~~x~~ historical background is important here. It isobviously important because there are so many references to it in the ch. So before we go on with careful examination of the contents of this ch., we want to look at a few important things about the historical background. That is why I gave you this sheet. I mentioned at the top the two passages we're dealing with. Isa.7-12 and 28-35.

I referred to the higher ~~sxxxx~~ criticism and inerrancy and then I refer to Mat. 1:22-23 and pointed out the possibilities "has occurred" or as ASV says " is come to pass." "These things occurred" -- I don't think if the angel had been talking he would have said that. He might well have said, This has occurred. These things have occurred in order to fulfill what is in the OT, and that would be just as good a translation of the Greek.

After the historic === Now as to the historic background I want to mention 4 nations because these nations are very importat in connection with the whole passage. I'll principally mention matters relating to the history of these. Many of you may be familiar with these because they are vital to the background of all OT studies, but I want to take a few minutes to make sure they are quite clear.

At the top I mention the kingdom of Judah. Right below it, it says Israel. The kgdm. of Israel was estab. by Saul, was ruled over by David, by Solomon, and then was broken into two parts. The southern kingdom took the name of the kingdom of Judah, until the other one(which kept the name Israel) disappeared and then it was often called Israel because they all considered themselves Israel. But the smaller kgdm. took the name Judah after the one trib of which it was made up with a few fragments of other tribes, while the 10 tribes (the northern kgdm.) included the



the territory to the north and also most of the territory across the Jordan, reaching clear south of most of Judah.

I said Judah about 975-587. Just a word there, about the date. I said about 975 because we do not know exactly when Solomon died. There is no statement in Scripture anywhere that Solomon died in 975 B.C. No such statement. Somebody said once that an archaeologist had found a coin that had the date on it. 975 B.C. But I don't quite believe that story.

The system of dating from the birth of Christ, only began in the 5th cent A.D. so all dates before that are in numbers represent an attempt to figure them out. We have no documents of any such dates prior to the 5th cent. A.D. There are no dates specifically in the Bible, that is no dates in our system of figuring. When it comes to knowing when Solomon died, dates that far back, we do not have sufficient evidence in most cases more than to make a guess on it. Some get quite close and others not so close.

When you get to the end of the kgdm. of Judah--587 B.C., Judah was conquered by a nation which left them rather full records of events. We have sufficient records from Babylonia and from Assyria, where we have contact with them, we can establish a date rather closely. With one exception. You notice I said 587 there, and you will sometimes hear that Jerusalem was destroyed in 586. The idea of when you are going to start the year is purely an arbitrary matter.

We start the year on Jan. 1, but during the middle ages the papal(Roman) authorities always started their year at Christmas time! You'll find that reading a record from Rome that gives you a date say 1122, and if it's in the last 5 days of December you don't know ~~when~~ whether it is from some ~~old~~ pagan who began the year at January who therefore considered it would be ~~the~~ 1122 or what we now call 1122, or whether he was a man who said, The year of course should begin with the birth of Christ, so 1122 would be the start of a ~~new~~ new year instead of an old one and be in the last 5 days of December.

It is an arbitrary matter when you're going to start the year. Actually we call some of our months -- September(the Latin word for seventh month) but it is the ninth month of our year because the Romans originally started their year in March. September(seventh month) but when you write it down, you don't write a 7, you write a 9! We say October which means eighth month in Latin, and we call it the tenth month! And December means tenth month, but it's the twelfth month of our calendar!

So 587 B.C. -- we don't know what month Jerusalem was conquered. Nobody will ever say it was 588 I don't believe, and nobody will ever say it was 585. But whether it was 587 or 586 there's no way of proving. We don't know the exact date and anyway we don't know exactly at what time of the year they started their calendar. So in any OT ~~date~~ date there's always the possibility of it being one year off but we're usually pretty clear in which direction.

When we get back to the time of Solomon we're not nearly so sure and there are certain other things we're not so sure of the date.

This kgdm. of Judah lasted till until 587. After the northern kgdm. was destroyed they called it the kingdom of Israel. So I mention Israel on the next line, and on the same line I have written Ephraim and Samaria. Just as Judah was the largest tribe in the southern kingdom, in fact most of the southern kingdom, the largest tribe in the northern kingdom was the tribe of Ephraim. Often they referred to the northern kgdm. not as Israel, but as Ephraim.

Sometimes they refer to it by mentioning its capital city--Samaria. Just as the capital city of the southern kgdm. was Jerusalem. That should say again about 975 when Solomon's kingdom was divided in two, up to 722 or 721. Nobody says 723, nobody says 720. Some say 722 and some say 721.

Under that I've written the name of one of their kings. Pekaḥ, son of Remaliah. He is mentioned in this chapter. So I want to mention him here.

After him, the king who followed is Hoshea who reigned from 731 - 722, or 721. Hoshea killed Pekaḥ. He was not his son, not his legitimate successor. This date 722-21, we know from the Assyrian records of the conquest of Samaria and Hoshea, the Bible tells us, reigned 9 years. So we can be sure in his case.

Below that there is a name which most readers of KJV would find utterly strange -- the name Aram. Because in KJV it always says Syria, rather than Aram. But the ancient kgdm. of Aram-- in fact the people were called Arameans, and there were a number of various kingdoms, but the most important of them, the one with which we are now concerned, had its capital at Damascus.

That kgdm. which was N.E. of the kgdm. of Israel, with its capital at Damascus, called itself Aram. It is called in the Heb. Bible, Aram. Later on the Assyrians conquered it. Still ~~at~~ later when people from the West came into this region that is the first part of the old Assyrian empire they entered. So they called it Assyria, and then shortened the name to Syria. To say Syria today for that region is a complete anachronism. The word didn't even exist then. It's a shortening of the word Assyria, but it's used in KJV consistently to refer to what they themselves called Aram. I believe NIV and most recent translations take the word right from Heb, instead of changing it into what that area later came to be called.

So Aram (Syria) was a power which generally was stronger than the kgdm. of Israel. During most of the history of the kgdm. of Israel there were periods when they had war with the people of Aram (with headquarters in Damascus).

Below that I mentioned the last king Rezin, who reigned from 740-732.

Rezin is mentioned in our ch., Isa.7. So I mention him here. The kgdm. of Israel and the kgdm. of Aram were conquered by the empire of Assyria which had its capital at Ninevah. Ninevah was destroyed in 612. I put two dates: 612 and 605 because Ninevah was destroyed in 612, but the Assyrians fought on and finally were completely ended as a kingdom in 605 B.C. That's beyond the date we are concerned with in our present history.

We want to have those dates in mind. Now let us quickly look at the facts of Isa.7. There is a historical background I've listed below. Most of the historical background is mentioned in 7:1 and 7:5-6. It is more fully given in 2 Kings 16. If you look at 2 Kings 16:1-4 -- they tell you about King Ahaz, king of Judah. He seems to have been a thoroughly disagreeable and ungodly man, as you read about him there. In vv.5-6 you read that then Rezin king of Aram and Pekah...king of Israel marched up to fight against Israel and besieged Ahaz but they could not overpower him. At that time Rezin king of Aram recovered Elah for Aram by driving out the men of Judah. Elah is clear down south at the head of the Red Sea. It's nearer the territory of Israel ~~XXX~~ rather than Judah ~~XXX~~ even though it is further south than Judah.

Then in v. 7 you read a thing that is one of the most important things in our ch. 7 of Isaiah. In 2 K. 16:7 we read Ahaz sent messengers to say to Tiglath-pilezer king of Assyria I am your servant and vassal, come up and save me out of the hand of the king of Aram and of the king of Israel who are attacking me. Ahaz took the silver and gold found in the temple of the Lord and in the treasures of the royal palace, and sent it as a gift to the king of Assyria. The king of Assyria complied by attacking Damascus and capturing it and forcing its inhabitants to and put Rezin to death.

That is the background of Isa.7. In Is.7 we read at the beginning, "When Ahaz son of Jotham . . . was king of Judah, king Rezin of Aram and Pekah son of Remaliah king of Israel marched up to fight against Jerusalem but they could not overpower them. That's what we read in 2 Kings. They made an attempt to conquer. Then they withdrew.

We read in 7:2, The House of David was told, Aram has allied itself with Ephraim. So the hearts of Ahaz and his people were shaken as the trees of the forest are shaken by the wind. They were very upset because they understood that it wasn't only the king of Israel that was attacking them which was much larger than the kingdom of Judah and had maybe 3 times as much territory, and it had maybe twice as many people, it wasn't only that but ~~the~~ kingdom of Aram beyond Israel which was larger than Israel was joining with them to attack them! What could they do? How could they ever think they could resist such an attack?

So the heart of Ahaz and his people were shaken as the trees of the forest are shaken by the wind. What could they do ~~x~~ in this case?

We noticed in 2 Ki. that Ahaz thought of a clever way to get around it. He thought I must get my people to fight hard to resist the attack of those people but in the meantime I will secretly send ~~x~~ for the king of Assyria way over across the desert beyond us. I will send him way over there a great amount of gold and tell him I'm ready to be subject to him and ask him to come and deliver me from them.

The King of Assyria was always ready to do that. For years they had been conquering nation after nation around them. But Isaiah goes to Ahaz and warns him. Isa. says, Trust the Lord. The Lord can protect you. The Lord did protect them and Judah lasted for another nearly 150 years. Although~~x~~ Israel was destroyed by Assyria within 10 years. Isaiah warned him not to use human insufficient methods to gain protection for his people.

He said, You do away with these powers between you and you'll have Assyria right next to you, and you'll be in far greater danger than you are now. Trust the Lord! That's Isaiah's message to Ahaz.

I would like you to turn in the assignment by Friday noon at the office upstairs. I will post the assignment by noon tomorrow.

(Opening comments about the assignments from last class.)

One thing I wanted to mention because many seem confused about it is the difference between Syria and Assyria. In the time of the Bible there was no such place as Syria. There was a great empire a long distance from Israel called Assyria. It is named after a god Assur (Asshur). This empire became very aggressive and conquered many other nations, and eventually conquered Israel. Just before it conquered Israel, it conquered a country called Aram. The word Aram occurs a great deal in the OT. Aram was an important competitor of Israel. After Assyria conquered Aram and held it for a long time, finally what had been the Assyrian empire and became the Persian empire was conquered by Alexander the Great. The first part of the Assyrian empire they entered was old Aram. ~~Today~~ They called it Syria.

Ever since 300 B.C. the region North of Palestine and extending east of there with its headquarters at Damascus, has been called Syria as it is called today. The KJV substituted our modern name Syria. The modern translations (most of them) put the Hebrew as it is Aram. I wanted to be sure that was clear to all of you. I think it was to most.

I asked you what was the crisis that came at the beginning of Ahaz' reign. One sentence would have been quite sufficient. The crisis was when Israel and Aram united to try to ~~remove him~~ try to remove him and to put in a puppet king as we find here at the beginning of Isaiah <sup>the son of</sup> Tabael in his place. Most of you did not mention the son of Tabael. The attempt to put in the puppet's name, but practically everybody had the crisis correct, and a good many went on to tell what he did in what followed, which was o.k. but not as far as what I had asked for.

The important thing to us is what his response was. That was very important.

Now today, I have three things in particular with which I wish to deal. The first of these is to look at the historical event behind Isa. 7 and Isaiah's response. We already looked at this to some extent last time. I want to look a little further at it now. We are dealing with the seventh ch. of Isaiah, a ch. which is tremendously important for Christians because it contains that wonderful promise of the virgin birth.

The ch. begins: "~~When Ahaz son of Jotham, son of Uzziah, was king of Judah, King Rezin of Aram and Pekah, son of Remaliah king of Israel marched up to fight against Jerusalem but could not overpower it. Now the house of David was told, Aram as allied itself with Ephraim.. They knew that an attack from Israel was a tremendous danger. But here Israel has Aram also united with it. "So the hearts of Ahaz and his people were shaken, as the trees of the forest are shaken by the wind."~~

Isaiah does not go on to tell what Ahaz did then. I believe that what Ahaz did he did secretly. We are told about it in 2 Ki. 16. I believe he did it in such a way that only his leading nobles would realize what he had done. We read there (2 Ki. 16:7), "And King Ahaz sent messengers to say to Tiglath-Pileser king of Assyria, I am your servant and vassal. Come up and save me out of the hand of the king of Aram and of the king of Israel, who are attacking me. And Ahaz took the silver and gold found in the temple of the Lord" -- that was his treasure, of course -- "and in the treasuries of the royal palace and sent it as a gift to the king of Assyria."

Here we have Jerusalem having been attacked and the attack repulsed. Then they hear that the ~~x~~ attack which was made hastily

which was not well-prepared and did not succeed, but which had come from two nations both of which were larger and stronger than Judah. So no wonder that their hearts were shaken like the trees of the forest were shaken by the wind.

In that situation Ahaz has sent this great sum of money across the desert way over to Assyria, to the king of Assyria to come and deliver him from these two nations that are attacking him. In that situation Isaiah goes to him with a message which is God is able to protect you. God has promised He will protect His own if they will be true to Him. You can trust God to protect you. But if you follow this clever human scheme of yours of bringing in this wicked king of Assyria in order to protect you from this, you will remove the bumper state in between and be right next to Assyria and be in far greater ~~danger~~ danger than you are now. That is the message Isaiah sent to him.

I used to find this passage very very ~~an~~ appropriate back in the days when the U.S.A. was considering uniting with Russia in order to defeat central Europe. I felt then that if we united with Russia instead of simply preventing Russia from being overrun the result would be that we would be faced by Russia just the way that Judah was faced by Assyria. I think history has proven in that case I was not a false prophet.

But certainly Isaiah was not (a false prophet). That's what we are interested in. So I want to look at the ch. simply from this viewpoint, not thinking of the prophecy of the virgin birth now but getting the understanding of the ch. from the viewpoint of the immediate message in relation to the historical situation. We've already noted the character King Ahaz. The king Ahaz, although descended from David the man was after God's own

heart. The man who wrote so many of the Psalms, the one to whom God gave the promise that he would always have a son to sit on the throne. This descendant of his (~~XXXX~~) was this wicked man Ahaz. Now Ahaz' father Jotham seems from the record to have been a fairly good man. Ahaz' son Hezekiah, was perhaps the best of all the kings of Judah. But in between you have this wicked king. Why do you have this change? Why do you have a fairly good king, then a wicked king, and then the best king perhaps.

I think there is a warning for all of us. It is my observation that the character of the child is more determined by the mother than by the father. The Scripture hasn't told us much about the mother, but my guess is that it is due quite an extent to the woman whom Jotham married, and to the woman who was the mother of Hezekiah. That they were men of such different character. Of course that does not always determine but it is a most important factor.

It amuses me how we trace our genealogies in tracing back our names. If we meet someone who has the same name we have we think it is so interesting, and that we may be related when as a matter of fact we probably were much more affected in our character and attitudes by our mothers instead of by our fathers. So if you want to trace back the genealogies to see the influences that have been the most important on you, you ought to get your mother's name, and her mother's name, etc. I'm afraid most of us could not go more than four or five generations, if that far.

At any rate Ahaz was a very wicked man. He was a descendant of David. He was the one who was sitting on the throne. Isaiah did not go into the royal palace and say, I want to speak to you, as he would in the reign of his son Hezekiah. In fact he would not have to. Hezekiah, we find, would go right to the prophet Isaiah and ask him what the Lord's will was in a certain situation. But Ahaz did not want



to be bothered. So we read in v.3, "The Lord said to Isaiah, "Go out, you and your son Shear-Jashub -- a word which means "a remnant shall return"-- it is an unusual name. It is a name which had a meaning which would carry much more meaning to them than most of our names today, which merely are what are fathers or grandfathers had, or something we thought of that sounds pleasant. In those days most of the names had meaning and this one means "a remnant shall return." In other words, there is misery ahead, but God's mercy is still with us. There will be a remnant. Why would there be a remnant unless there were going to be some pretty bad things ahead.

Anybody who knew Ahaz and his principal characters would know there were difficult days ahead. But he said, God out to meet Ahaz at the end of the aqueduct of the Upper Pool, on the road to the Washerman's Field." Why does it so explicitly tell us where it is? Just where he's to meet him? Perhaps we'll come across something later on in our study which will give some hint as to why it should be specifically named. But at this point we merely notice that he is going out of the city. He's not going to the royal palace. He is going out to where to the outer limit of the defences where Ahaz is on his defense inspection, and is trying to encourage his people to build up strong defences and to fight valiantly against the expected attack from Israel and from Aram.

Of course Ahaz knows that if the people will fight strongly enough to resist the attack he expects from these two, they won't have to keep fighting a long time, because the Assyrian army is going to come. He sent all his money to Tiglath-Pileser and Tiglath-Pileser would be glad for an excuse to attack anybody without the money! So he's quite sure Tiglath-Pileser will come and deliver him from them. He's willing to give up his freedom and surrender

to them in order to exist. After all it's better to be red than dead, isn't it? It's better to be a slave to Tiglath-Pileser than to be defeated and killed! So he is figuring that the immediate danger is not tremendous. He wants the people to fight and to work to protect him from the immediate danger, and if only they will do that it won't be long before the king of Assyria will be there with his great army.

Isaiah cannot get his attention by going into the palace and saying, I'd like to see the king. The representative of Hezekiah when he was king would say, Come right in. If Hezekiah was terribly busy he'd tell the other people to wait a few minutes and see Isaiah right away. But with Ahaz he'd doubtless say, It would be nice to talk with you; come back in 3 months and we'll see if we can find some time for a visit! But he goes out there where Ahaz simply cannot get rid of him. Ahaz is there. Ahaz is anxious that the people shall fight valiantly and that they shall work hard on building the fortifications. He knows most of the people think this man is a prophet of God. He knows that this old superstition is still held by a great number of the people, and he if he mistreats Isaiah or is too scornful of him too obviously the people will perhaps not work as hard in establishing the preparations to protect him. So Ahaz is in a rather difficult situation. The Lord says, Keep careful, keep calm, son't be afraid. Don't loose heart because of these two smoldering stubs of firewood, because of the fierce anger of Rezin and of Aram and of the Son of Remaliah. Aram, Ephraim and Remalliah's son have plotted your ruin, saying, Let us invade Judah; let us tear it apart and divide it among ourselves, and make the son of Tabeel king over it. Yet this is what the Sovereign Lord says:

"It will not take place, it will not happen, for the head of Aram is Damascus, and the head of Damascus is only Rezin . . . If you do not stand firm in your faith, you will not stand at all."

Ahaz says, He's delayed all the people. They are looking at him to see what he has to say. I wish he would go away and let them get on with the work. He can give his line of talk and the people are apt to get lazy and disregard the things that really matter. What we need is to protect ourselves from the immediate danger. As far as ultimate danger is concerned, Isaiah says, Within 65 years Ephraim will be too shattered to be a people. Well, if Tiglath-Pileser comes we won't have to wait 65 years! for them to be shattered. Tiglath-Pileser and his tremendous force will free us from them, and then we'll have safety. If we have to be paying tribute to Assyria we can do that; we won't worry about that. But I just want to get rid of Isaiah! So he hopes Isaiah is going to leave.

Then we read (v.10), Again the Lord spoke to Ahaz. So here Isaiah had gone and given the message. How did Isaiah know what message to give? Did God speak to Isaiah in an audible voice that the people could have ~~had~~ heard if they were there. Did he speak in an internal voice so that Isaiah heard and knew what God said? but so that someone else there would not have heard it? We don't know. Isaiah was probably alone when he got his original message. We don't know how God gave it to him. In those days there were cases when God spoke directly to his prophets. Now that we have the entire Word of God in the Bible we get our guidance from the principles we find in Scripture. So it is rarely ever that God speaks directly in these days to human being. But the Bible he spoke on important

occasions as he did to Isaiah. But however the Lord spoke to Isa. there in 7:3, we are now in a different situation. Verse 10 says, "Again the Lord spoke to Ahaz." Here Isaiah is right in front of Ahaz, and we can understand that when it says the Lord spoke to Ahaz that it means the Lord gave Isa. a message right on the spot. to give to Ahaz. Did God speak through Isaiah? Did God put the words into Isaiah's mind and Isaiah speaks it as what the Lord has given is his message? We don't know the precise method the Lord used, but we know the Lord spoke to Isaiah giving him a further message to Ahaz. The message is: Ask the Lord God for a sign, whether in the deepest depths or in the highest heights."

Ahaz says, What foolishness are we getting now? He says, He comes and he's given his drivel and the people have quit their work to listen to him. They think now if we trust the Lord we'll be safe. He says, I'd rather trust the king of Assyria than I know I'll be saved from ~~xxxxxx~~ Aram and from Israel. I'd rather trust human things I can see. But these people I want to have them keep on with the work, and he's disturbing them. I'd wish he'd go, but instead of that he says, Ask for a sign whether in the deepest depths or in the highest heights. How can I get rid of him as soon as possible and get the people who believe he's a prophet of God back to work? So Ahaz says, I will not ask; I will not put the Lord to the test. Isn't that a lovely attitude?

Remember when Thomas said, I will not believe except I put my fingers into the holes in his hands and in his feet and into the hole in his side, I will not believe, that he is really raised from the dead. That was such a tremendous thing that Jesus was raised from the dead. A tremendous miracle, the greatest miracle in all history.

We cannot blame Thomas for demanding evidence. We should insist on evidence of things with which we are not familiar. But to those who know God, what we find in His word we can trust. We can depend upon. We don't need to look for further evidence. Because we already have many evidences of the truth of Scripture, and we already have evidence in our own hearts if we have believed in Christ and been saved thru his blood.

But in this case it would sound like a beautiful, pious statement. "I will not ask; I will not put the Lord to the test." We'll just trust the Lord. Don't worry Isaiah. We know it's right. Of course it's the king of Assyria we're trusting, not your God that you're talking about! Well it sounds like a beautiful statement but I think we must assume there must have been something Ahaz could not help or keep from creeping into his voice, into his manner or his facial expression was rather obvious that he was just trying to get rid of Isaiah and he did not mean it in a serious way at all. Because you don't find Isaiah saying, Oh I'm so glad Ahaz you are trusting in the Lord. You are believing God's wonderful promise that within 65 years Israel will not longer be a menace to you. Isaiah doesn't say, That's fine Ahaz.

We read in v.13, "Then Isaiah said, Hear now, you house of David! Is it not enough to try the patience of men? Will you try the patience of my God also?" That would be a very strange answer to Ahaz' pious sounding words if it were not for the fact that it was perfectly obvious that \_\_\_\_\_. So he gives this rebuke to him. For the moment we're going to skip over the sign he says the Lord is going to give. We're going to skip to v. 16. "Before the boy knows enough to reject the wrong and choose the right the land of the two kings you dread will be laid waste."

There is a better promise isn't it? The promise before was within 65 years Israel will be gone. Who worries what will happen in 65 years when long before that Aaram and Israel will destroy \_\_\_\_\_.  
not even yet  
But now he says before a little boy is born will reach the age when he can make simple choices and reach for a cup of milk instead of the hot stove. Before he is able to make simple choices, the two kings you dread will be laid waste.

He goes on: The Lord will bring on you and on your people and on the house of your father a time unlike any since Ephraim broke away from Judah-- he will bring the king of Assyria." When he says that, he can see Ahaz start. What does he know about the king of Assyria? The king of Assyria is way over there across the desert. What's he talking about the king of Assyria for? I sent this message to the king of Assyria. I sent him all this pay for him to come and deliver me. Has somebody told Isaiah what I've planned? Isn't this terrible that he knows! At least the rest of the people don't know it, and notice it. Let's hope they won't catch what Isaiah says here.

Isaiah goes on: In that day the Lord will whistle for flies from the distant streams of Egypt and for bees from the land of Assyria." We're not worried Isaiah says about these people if Israel and Aaram you are so worried about. We're thinking of the people way beyond them. We're thinking of what's going to happen when they come into your land. He says, They will all come and settle in the steep ravines and in the crivices in the rocks, and on all the torn-bushes and at all the water holes. In that day the Lord will use a razor hired from beyond the river. . . . Isaiah is here revealing the divine knowledge of the fact that Ahaz is heiring the king of Assyria to come to deliver him from Aram and from Israel. But Isaiah says he is going to do this to shave your head and the hair of your

legs and to take off your beards also. You're going to be in trouble, looking to this wicked realm of Assyria for your protection. "In that day a man will keep alive a young cow and two goats, and because of the abundance of the milk they give he will have curds to eat. All who remain in the land will eat curds and honey." What does that mean? It means that there is going to be a great depopulation. In you land, Ahaz, many people are going to be killed. Some will be carried out into captivity. There will be so much land that there will not be enough people to cultivate it and to grow crops. There will be plenty of land for pasture, so there will be plenty of what you can get from the animals that pasture there. There will be curds and honey for everybody.

"In that day in the place where there were a thousand vines worth a thousand silver shekles, there will be only briers and thornes. Men will go there with bow and arrows for the land will be covered with briers and thorns." They could hardly get through. Such a great depopulation as a result of Ahaz' clever scheme. As for the hills once cultivated . . . you will no longer go there for fear of the briers and thorns. They will become places for cattle to be turned loose and for sheep to run.

So the historical situation is that Isaiah goes to rebuke King Ahaz for his clever human scheme for making alliance with ungodliness in order to save his land. He says, God can protect and he will protect your land. But there is misery ahead first. Misery that has been caused by your act of bringing in the king of Assyria.

So much then for our present look at the historical events and historical situation. At this time it would be well for me to pause for a moment to mention the assignment for next week. This assignment I will post, so don't worry about getting the details.

It deals with Isa.36-37 which show the ultimate result of what Ahaz did. 30 years later in the reign of his son, Hezekiah, another king of Assyria will come and will overrun all the land of Judah, and will even threaten to conquer Jerusalem. This king Sennacherib you will find mentioned in ch.36 and 37. He will come to Judah but God will deliver because God has promised to deliver them though they will have a miserable time as a result of Ahaz scheme which does away with the border states and puts them right close to Assyria.

This assignment will have 3 parts. The 2nd and 3rd parts will be rather brief. If you do not get to the 2nd and 3rd part ~~xxx~~ don't worry about it. They are more tests of your observation than anything else. I don't want you to look into books or commentaries. I want to see if you noticed them, in ch. 36-37. I will be interested to see who does notice them. After you've written out your paper and you say I don't know parts 2 and 3 it will be perfectly alright. You can turn it into me. If you should feel desires of looking into books or commentaries to see if they give ideas on this point I am not assigning this, but if you should do so, please mention this at the end of your paper. I'd like you to do the paper simply from what you get from the text. Use any Eng. version you want. Preferably 2 of them so at any point of uncertainty you could compare them. If you want to go directly to the Hebrew I will have no objection to that. The first part of the assignment is much longer than the 2nd and 3rd put together. It is to list all proper names contained in these two chs. and briefly state what you know about each. If so and



sois a scribe you can put down his name and say an official of the king of Assyria or the king of Aram whichever it is, if it is obvious from the ch. I'm not asking you to look up anything that you can gather from the ch. If you find the name of a place or person unfamiliar to you and not identified in context, you might look it up in a good Bible dictionary and mention your source. In most cases that won't be necessary. I will post this. It will take about the same amount of time as the assignment for today. Maybe a tiny bit longer.

Now we wish to go on to the second part of our present discussion. That is suggested by the fact that in 7:2 we read: "Now the house of David was told, Aram has allied itself with Israel." Why does he say the House of David? And then when you get down to verse 10, Isa. says, Hear now you House of David. Why say that? That is extremely important for the understanding of the first section of Isa. that we are discussing today. The sec. that runs from ch.7-12. David's throne. We find in 2 Sam. 7 the account of how David wanted to build a great temple. God said, I don't want you to build a temple. You are a man of war. You have greatly enlarged the borders of Israel. I don't want you to build the temple. I want your son to build it, but I am greatly interested in your building a house for me. I'm going to build a house for you. In vv.11-16, we have the promise the prophet gave to David. "The Lord declares to you that the Lord Himself will establish a house for you. When your days are over and you rest with your fathers, I will raise up your offspring to succeed you who will come from your own body, and I will establish his kingdom. He is the one who will build up a house for my name. . . .

Isaiah                      Lecture # 2                      9-17-79                      page 14

and I will establish him upon his kingdom forever. I will be his father and he will be my son. When he does wrong I will punish him . . . but my                      will never be taken away from him as I took it away from Saul whom I have removed from before you. Your house and your kingdom will endure forever . . ." Remember Jesus was born in Bethlehem the city of David. We rejoice that the promised king came. A descendant of David, a leader of the house of David. This promise was given to David in 2 Sam. In 2 Chron. <sup>17</sup> we have a repetition of it, the same incident told again. But in Ps. 8 ~~xxxxxx~~<sup>89</sup> which was written after Judah had come into very difficult times we find again a mention of the wonderful promises given to David. Verses 3-4 the Psalmist addresses God (reading text). Then in v. 20 (reading text). And in vv. 28-37 (reading text). So there is this wonderful promise made to David.

In Is. 40-56, I have written a book The Gospel of Isa. because that is the section telling of the wonderful Saviour God has promised. The sec. we are looking at this semester (ch. 7-12) is about the king God has promised. The coming head of the house of David. In ch. 7 we find references to the house of David. In v. 11 "Hear now house of David, is it not enough for you to try the patience of men, will you try the patience of my God also?" God is not content with having the house of David represented long by such an unworthy representative as Ahaz. God is going to provide a leader for the house of David who will be what God wants him to be. It will be the Lord Jesus. So in this sec. he is looking forward to the coming of Immanuel, the great king.

As you look at the history of Israel and Judah, in the northern kingdom (Israel), Jeroboam reigned and then his son reigned

for a short time, and he was assassinated and Baasha took over. He was succeeded by his son Elah who was assassinated. Then Omri took over, and there were 4 kings of his line, and the last of them was killed and a new dynasty took over, the dynasty of Jehu (who had 5 kings), and then there were 3 or 4 more kings during the years up to 722. All this variety in the Northern Kingdom.

But in the Southern kingdom during all this the house of David continued. From the 10th cent. B.C. up to 722 when the northern kingdom went into captivity and on for nearly another ~~100 years~~ 150 years, up until 587 when Jerusalem was taken and destroyed and it looked as if the house of David had come to an end but it had not, the people looked for the fulfillment of God's promise, the continuance of the house of David. Out of Bethlehem was to come one who was to be the ruler over my people Israel.

When Jesus was born wise men brought him gifts fitting for a coming king. In this sec. we find the promise of Jesus' birth in v.14. "The Lord himself will give you a sign . . ." And in ch. 8 we have again two references to Immanuel. Then in ch. 9:6 we find those wonderful statements(reading text). The house of David looks forward to a continuing line. More than that it continued to the one descendant of David, the One who is to be the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace.

When you get to ch. 11 --"A shoot will come up from the stem of Jesse(David's father), from a root a branch will bear fruit. The Spirit of the Lord will rest upon him . . . He will not judge by what he sees with his eyes, or decide by what he hears with his ears, but the last part of v. 4 tells us He will strike the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips he will slay the wicked. The wonderful promises of the coming of Immanuel.

In ch. 7 we have a threat that the line of David would be misplaced(displaced, destroyed). They were going to put in the son of Tabeal to be king. They were going to do away with the house of David. God would not permit that to happen. God promises he would bring his own Immanuel. This is Immanuel's land. This is the great theme of the Book of Immanuel -- the coming of the Son of David.

Question: Who stands for the son of Tabeal?

We don't know who he was. The important thing is they were going to do away with the kings descended from David, and put in some others. It doesn't really matter who he was to us. The important thing is they were going to bring an end to the house of David. God says that cannot happen. The house of David is leading up to the coming of the great Saviour of all who put their trust in him. It is leading up to the coming of Immanuel. These kings are not merely trying to overthrow the land. They are trying to change the leadership, and put in the son of Tabeal. He says, That will not happen. God is going to put in his own king. God is going to bring one and this is the way you will know who He is--He will be virgin born.

Question: (Indistinct) When was this ??

He says "within 65 years." Actually it happened about 12 yrs. later. Within 2 or 3 yrs. after this the Assyrian army overran Aram. And made Aram part of Assyria. Took the people of Aram captive because the Assyrians had a very clever system. They would conquer and take its leading people, its educated people to another part of their empire. They'd take the people from that area and move them to another area. The result was that the people who were taken into an area where they would be looked on as outsiders by the people there, they would be ready to join them in revolting against the Assyrians so they took them off into captivity-- all the leading people, and brought people from other countries to there. That was the Assyrian method all over, in order to establish the strength of their empire.

The result of that was that within 65 years Ephraim was so shattered, it wasn't a people any more. The people who talk about the lost tribes.! Actually there were no 10 lost tribes. But there were various -- many individuals who just disappeared into the various peoples among whom they went, but the people who came back after the exile included people from all the 12 tribes. There were no 10 tribes --no lost 10 tribes. There was a big British Israel movement(used to be)--I haven't heard much of it lately, but the idea was ~~xxx~~ England is the true Israel, and they are the 10 lost tribes. Well, Britain was the greatest land in the world 50 years ago, and they said the sun never sets on the British empire. Today it is a comparatively inferior country. So I would think British Israelism would disappear with it. But I have heard of people(not recently) who were strong British Israelites. There is no basis in Scripture for it. The people who came back were from all the tribes, and the Son of David, Jesus Christ, is the one to be the head over all the tribes.

There are modernists who write commentaries on Isa., what comfort would it be to Ahaz to tell him that Jesus would come 700 yrs. later! How would that comfort Ahaz? Well, who wants to comfort Ahaz? There's no thought of comforting Ahaz. He/s rebuking Ahaz. He says, Is it not enough to try the patience of men, that you try the patience of my God also. There's no comfort to Ahaz there. But there is comfort to the true people of God. The house of David will not come to an end. But the One who is the climax of it will come, the one ~~w~~ through whom we can receive salvation, even Jesus Christ who is the true son of David.

So here is your sign. God is not going to put up with such a head of the house of David as this man Ahaz forever. No. He is going to provide his virgin born son, Jesus Christ, and I believe that's what the angel told Joseph. I don't believe that's simply Mat's words. I believe Irenaeus was right when he said this. I believe the ERV of 1881, the ASV of 1901 were right when they translated it that way. I believe the great German

scholar <sup>John</sup> Zahn, and the great British scholar Plummer were true when they interpreted it that way. Though I must confess I reached that conclusion before I was aware than any of these others held that conclusion. But they may be wrong, and I may be wrong. It may be that it is Matthew. But if it is it is still the Word of God. God's Word is true and dependable, and the Word of God says that here the virgin birth of Jesus was predicted.

The RSV quotes the verse, whether it's Matthew as they take it, or whether it is the angel who quotes the verse and they have a footnote referring to Is.7:13. You look back to Is.7:14 and it says "behold a young woman . . ." or "virgin." The word is not a specific word for virgin, but it is a word which is always used of a virgin. It is a young woman, one of whose characteristics is that she is a virgin. The LXX translated it 200 yrs. before Christ by the specific word for virgin in the Greek (parthenos).

The house of David is a very important aspect of this ch. I've already spoken of (though I've not specified it) of the third point I wanted to bring out -- God's attitude toward Ahaz. Not comfort but one of rebuke but comfort to the godly as they looked forward to the coming of the true son of David.

There is a problem in relating this to the next 2 verses. I don't think it is an insuperable problem, but it is a problem. I don't think I'd better enter into it today. I may deal with it next week.

Question: Do you think v. 11 Ahaz could have asked for a sign in the heavens, or do you think Isaiah knew he would not ask for it anyhow?

Anybody who knew character would know. . . . If Ahaz had been converted that instant - -

Question: Apparently Ahaz had sent to the king of Assyria before Isa. came to him?

Yes.

Question: Then when Isa. said that he knew he could not change his mind and tell the king of Assyria not to come?? It was really too late for him to do anything about it anyhow.

He's rebuking him for what he's done which most of the people don't know about yet.

I'd like to see those who are taking this course for graduate credit for a minute now.

This is rather difficult material to handle for a large class because there are in it a number of simple yet important matters. A person taking it for undergraduate credit should be able to get fairly easily to get a passing grade. But there are also a lot of involved matters here that I'd like to at least touch on, and I don't want to confuse those who don't want to spend that much time on it. Yet I want to take enough time on it for those of you who want to go into it quite a distance.

The assignment I gave for today, the first part was to identify the proper names in the chs. 26 and 37. I wasn't as much interested in your saying Shebna was a scribe as finding out whether he was a scribe for the king of Judah or for the King of Assyria. That was important to understand the relation of the different individuals to the whole situation. Most of the papers were in on time and most did a good job. Two or three were rather skimpy.

The last 2 questions were simply to see whether you would notice certain facts. They were not particularly important as far as my judgment the kind of work you were doing, but they helped me to judge how far we need to go into the particular problems.

One of those questions was, Did you notice any particular phrase in chs. 36 and 37 that reminded you of Is. 7. Someone mentioned it speaks of the virgin daughter of Zion, in those latter chs., and also in ch. 7. That uses the word virgin, but I don't think there is really much relation between the two.

There was one other similarity that was noticed (not particularly important). I think most of you noticed what I had in mind which was that in the beginning of Is. 7 we read that the Lord told Isaiah to go to meet Ahaz at a certain place and he specifically identified where he was to go. A person reading this might wonder, Why does he give the precise detail as to the place where he should meet him? In NIV it says to meet him at the end of the aqueduct at the upper pool on the road to the washerman's field. KJV calls it the fuller's field. And calls it a pool instead of an aqueduct. ~~XX~~ Whatever you call it there is a rather detailed statement of exactly where Isaiah is to meet him. I thought that was an interesting fact.

Why should he bother to tell us exactly where God --why should God tell him exactly where to meet him? You might say it was because that was where Ahaz was going to be at that time. Or it might be because Ahaz at that time would be with a great number of people working on the defences and it would be a situation where he could not brush Isaiah off and say, I haven't time to bother with him. It would injure his standing with the people if he did that way, so he had to let Isaiah speak for at least a while.

But when you get to ch. 36 and you find exactly the same place named with the same detail as the place where the representatives of the king of Assyria come, and tell them that they had better surrender because their god cannot protect them, and

that he will carry them off into exile and they would be better off that way than staying there and being killed by the forces. When you read that they came to the very same spot, it seems to me that is good probability that is why Isaiah was told to meet Ahaz at that precise spot.

In other words it's a foretaste of what's ahead. Still more important it's a reminder of what happened at that spot. It was here Isaiah warned Ahaz that his supposedly clever scheme to get the king of Assyria to come and protect them from these neighboring countries actually would not protect them at all but it would remove the bumper == buffer state and Assyria would be right next to them and they would be in far worse trouble from Assyria than they had ever been from Israel, and Syria.

And when we find these terrible things being said by the representatives of the king of Assyria at that very spot, \* it ties the two together in an interesting way. Now don't feel too badly if you didn't notice that, but I think most of you (at least 2/3 of you) did, and I was happy to see that.

The other question I asked was a little more involved, but I was glad to see that a number noticed it. If you turn to ch. 37:30 you find that "this will be the sign for you Hezekiah, this year you will eat what grows by itself." Why would they eat what grows by itself? Why on earth would they do that? Only one reason and that is because they had not been able for a considerable amount of time to go outside the strong walls of the city and plant. So there was nothing available that they had planted.

So it must have been some months before that the king of Assyria's forces were in that general area. It was dangerous to outside the city walls very long. They were closely shut up in the city, not knowing at what time the great Assyrian army would attack. Severe danger that would possibly destroy their city of Jerusalem. So they had not been able that year to plant. Naturally any fields that had been planted and produced crops the year before would have a certain amount that grew by itself. So they were able to rush out to their fields and on days when there was no sign of Assyrian forces near, and gather enough of what grew by itself to keep them alive.

He says, This year you will eat what grows by itself. The serious danger must have been -- in fact we don't know what time of year this was -- but it must have been at least a month or two and perhaps nearly a year that Jerusalem had been in very serious danger, from Assyrian forces. And he says "and the second year what springs from that." Next year would be just as bad as this year. But in the third year he says, Sow and reap, plant vineyards and eat your food." Here we have a wonderful promise that God is going to deliver them from the Assyrians. They are not going to be able to conquer Jerusalem. They are not going to be able to take them captives. Humanly speaking you can't see how that could happen because the forces of the Assyrian power was just as much greater than theirs as the power of Russia today is greater than say Spain. If Spain were right next to Russia there would be no protection if -Russia took a notion to take them over.

That was the situation Judah had come from except that there was quite a long distance in between which was under the control of the Assyrians but which the Assyrian army would have to traverse before they could get at them. So it was only once in a few years the Assyrians would make a great campaign in that direction.

It was a wonderful promise of God that in the 3rd year they would be able to sow and reap and plant vineyards and eat their fruit. That gives a pretty good indication that the crisis in which Jerusalem was threatened with destruction lasted at least 2 yrs., perhaps for 3 yrs. This was one of the great crises in Israel's history.

So we are interested in two particular problems we noticed in Isaiah 7. We are interested in the problem of the survival of the people, the survival of their land. That is a problem Ahaz would be interested in. Not only Ahaz but all the people. But God is even more interested in the son of David. The preparation for the coming of the true son of David, the One who was going to fulfill all the wonderful promises of the O.T. and who had been promised when God told David that he was always to have a son to sit upon his throne.

We are interested in those two facts. I want to spend more time on the matter of the security of the nation before we spend quite a bit on the other, the more important one, the matter of the line of David.

The assignment was in ch. 36 and 37 to look particularly at the proper names, but I did ask that you carefully examine the chapters. There is a rather important point to notice here-- the arrangement of the chs.

There are no ch. divisions in the Bible as written. Nor were there verse divisions in the ch. as written. The vs. divisions were put in at a very early time. I don't know who made the vs. divisions but some of them are == impress us as rather stupid. There is a v. in the NT that has two words in it; and there are vv. in the Bible that have as much as 3 sentences in them. Some vv. are very long, some very short.

You know where the ch. divisions came from = There was an English Archbishop who took his Latin Bible and as he rode on his horse as he was making pastoral calls, he looked over his Bible and he marked in it places for ch. division. They are written in Latin Bible, and later on taken over into the Hebrew Bible. There were a number of places, one of which occurs in the section studied this year, where he changed it. In that case they changed only one verse.

Sometimes you'll find when you have an English verse== a verse in your Eng. Bible that you want to look up the exact Hebrew, and you turn to the place in Hebrew and start reading and it sounds entirely different because sometimes there are as much as 10 or 15 vv. difference. But in the overwhelming mass of cases, the Hebrew simply took over the divisions the Archbishop had made in the Latin Bible. I've often wished the Archbishop had sat down in his study and gone through carefully and given some real thought to the divisions instead of marking it where it seemed natural to him as he sat on his horse.



Student: What year was that?

I don't have the exact year in mind. In fact it is a tradition this is the way he did it. We don't have a record of it, but it is quite universal agreed that was the way it was done. It would be easy to get his date. Just off hand I would say about the 13th century. There === It is many many centuries after the Bible was written.

It can mislead us very gravely-- the ch. divisions can. Unless we remember they are purely artificial divisions. They are very handy because you can find a reference to a certain place. I would not want us to be confused by anyone trying to make a better one. It's good to have something we all agree on which enables us to find a particular v. immediately and to agree on the designation of the place where it is.

But they are often not very logically made. In this material you looked over in ch. 36-37 it begins by describing what the Assyrian king did. You find that in v. 1 -- Sennacherib attacked all the fortified cities of Judah and captured them. This is nearly 30 yrs. after what we had in the 7th ch. of Isaiah.

Isaiah warned about his submitting to the Assyrian king and submitting to him and paying him a great sum to come and deliver them from the forces of Israel and of Damascus. Isa. warned him against it. Now we find that c. 30 yrs. later that the Assyrian king has come. There are no buffer states in between. He attacked all the fortified cities of Judah and captured them. You would not do that in a couple of days.

When Samaria had been taken 20 yrs. before (it took a 3 yr. siege to conquer the city). When Jerusalem was finally destroyed it took a 3 yr. siege to capture the city. Those walls were pretty strong. Not merely on Jerusalem, but on many other cities.

When it says he attacked all the fortified cities of Judah and captured them, you know that the Assyrian king's armies were there for a considerable length of time attacking those other cities. Then we read that the king of Assyria sent his field commander (KJV transliterates that Rabshaka. It transliterates. We know it is the title of an office. Literally it means "the chief of the cupbearer." A title of honor. It is quite obvious from the context that it was a title given to the commander.

He calls him here his field commander, the NIV. He sent him from Lachish. Lachish was the 2nd ~~xxx~~ strongest and largest city of Judah. Evidently that had already been captured. He came from there and gave his terrible exhortation to the people of Jerusalem to surrender and save him the bother of attacking them.

So the ch. begins with the statement of the situation in v. 1. And then it gives the message the Assyrians sent. The giving of the message takes all the rest of ch. 36. Here we have two things. The first is just one verse. The second occupies 22 verses. Then after you finish that there is a ch. division, ch. 37. Why should there be a ch. division there? "When King Hezekiah heard this he tore his clothes and put on sackcloth, and went into the temple of the Lord."

You see it is very tightly combined with what preceded it. If you were making an outline of it, you might put just one line to separate it because it is the same situation, the same crisis being described. But it is a third -- the third part of it is Hezekiah seeks help. Here Hezekiah goes into the temple of the Lord. Hezekiah sends his people to Isaiah to ask Isaiah to pray for him. That is 37:1-4.

After v.4, there is a division just as important as the division at the beginning of the chapter. Because here we get Isaiah's answer. In v. 5 Isaiah said to them: Tell your master, and then he gives the message to give back. That takes up vv. 5-7.

So we have 4 divisions here. Then at v.7 -- v.8 is what the field commander did, what happened afterwards. Then you would need to make 3 lines if you were going to make an outline, because here you have a new situation.. Really the ch. division, if you are going to have a ch. division, should be at the beginning of v.9. Sennacherib received a report. When did he receive this report? Was it when the field commander came back? Was it the next day? Was it six months later? We don't know. We are not told. But we have a new series of events which exactly parallels the series of events we just looked at.

It begins with a statement of what the Assyrians did. The Assyrians received a report that Tirhaka, the Ethiopian king of Egypt, was marching out to fight them. There are some who say this must be a conflict == a conflate account with two different passages in it because they say Tirhaka wasn't king of Egypt until later than this time. But if Tirhaka was commander of the force and later became king of Egypt, he could easily be called king of Egypt in the account. Or it could just be put in the margin to identify him. He's the man who later became king of Egypt.

There were many a few years ago who insisted that there were two different Assyrian attacks, and that the Scripture has combined the two into one account. Most scholars agree today there is no necessity of such a conclusion. We have Sennacherib's own annals. They make no mention of more than one account(?)= attack(?). The only problem is this name Tirhaka.

He was not yet king of Egypt then. But there is no reason he may not have been a commander of the force that came. But here we have the situation paralleling the beginning of ch. 36. Here is what happened: Sennacherib heard this. When he heard it he sent messengers to Hezekiah. He said, I'm going to have to meet this Egyptian force. It will be better to meet them with Jerusalem having already surrendered to him. So he sends a messenger to talk the same way he did before: What has your God done to protect you? The gods of the other countries have not protected them.

So we have vv. 9-13 which are Sennacherib's message paralleling the coming of the messengers with the message that took almost all of ch. 36/

Then paralleling the third matter which began ch. 37 we have Hezekiah receiving the letter, reads it and goes to the temple of the Lord and spreads it out before the Lord and prays to the Lord. That runs from vv.14-20.

Then at v. 21 we begin a parallel to the next section of the earlier instances. Again you would have a line drawn if you were making an outline, and Isa. sends the message and this message runs to v. 35, and ends with the words " I will defend this city and save it for my sake and for the sake of David my servant." Just before that it said in v. 33, The king of Assyria will not enter his city nor shoot an arrow there; he will not . . . with shield nor build a seige ramp against it . . . he will return and not enter this city." That sounds utterly miraculous. It was. No one could expect it would happen that way.

The next v. tells what happened after God gave this message. We read in v.36 and 37 how the angel of the Lord killed a great number of the Assyrian army; Sennacherib had to give up and go back home, without having taken the city. Yes, Mr. Grossman?

Grossman: In my Bible, ch. 37:9 Tirkakah is called king of Cush. . . .?

Read me the whole verse.

Grossman: "When he heard them say concerning Tirhakah king of Cush, He has come out to fight against you . . ."

Yes. The NIV says Tirhakah the Cushite, king of Egypt. There was at this time Cush was another name for Ethiopia. At this time the Ethiopian kings were also kings of Egypt. I believe Tirhakah's uncle was king of Egypt preceeding him. So the NIV interpreted it perhaps a little more than the other did, but there's no conflict. Yes?

Martin: The NIV, "king of Egypt" or it says "of Egypt", is that in brackets in footnotes?

Yes, I hadn't noticed that. Very good. In other words that is an explanatory comment inserted in NIV. Any translation is to some extent an interpretation. Any translation contains some things that are not in the original, and leaves out some things that are in the original. You can't help it. You try to go as close as you can to what is in the original, but of course their knowledge of the whole situation inevitably is . . .

Student: Ethippia is placed ( ? ).

Is that so? He was king of Ethiopia and king of Egypt. But whether he was king of either one at this time he certainly was an Ethiopian, and it would seem he was commander of the army. But it does not even say he came, you notice. It says Sennacherib received a report he was (hired?) We would not get from the Scripture details on what happened there.

But there is an Egyptian story which Herodotus repeats that at this time a great Egyptian army met a far greater Assyrian army in S. Palestine, and according to that Egyptian story, the two armies faced each other and the Egyptians expected that the Assyrians would probably be beaten because they were so much stronger and greater army, and according to this story that is on record from a much later period, but the record says it happened at the time of Sennacherib, there were a lot of field mice and they came at night and ate up the ropes in connection with the arrows, with the bows and the equipment of the Assyrians and made them helpless so they had to go back.

Of course Scripture says the Lord send his angels and killed a great number of the Assyrians. We can believe what Scripture says, but the fact there was this rumour in Egypt which was repeated and which was told to Herodotus who visited there 100 yrs. later (or 200 yrs.), the fact of this rumour is a further corroboration of the fact that there was a great catastrophe that happened to Sennacherib's army at this time, and not a catastrophe that came from being defeated in battle.

What I particularly want you to see here now is how we have a parallel. We have the situation of the King of Assyria, the message he sends to Hezekiah, Hezekiah's prayer, and God's answer. Then we have the full crisis repeated--we don't know whether it's a month later, six months later or even a year later. We don't know. But we have the whole same progress repeated, so that it would certainly be much more reasonable to have the chapter division come after v.7.

One reason I'm going into this division in so much detail is because the assignment for next time which I don't expect to post, is glande over Isa. 8-12. We have more we have to look at in ch. 7, but we've already looked at quite a bit in ch. 7. I want you for next time to look over chs. 8-12 but make an outline for chs. 7-12. I'd like you to (give) not an extremely detailed outline but I would like you to note which sections naturally belong together, and where there are definite breaks, and then you can see how good or how bad a job you think the archbishop did here in this particular section in this h. division.

At the end of ch. 7-- let's turn back to ch. 7 now. At the end of ch. 7 we have what Isaiah said to Ahaz about the terrible results that were going to come to the nation of Judah as a result of Ahaz' clever plan. In ch. 7 you would make a small division between vv.17 and v.18 probably, or you might even make it after v.16. There may be some question as to exactly where you would make it. It is a small division because it separates the account of Ahaz=== of Isaiah's confrontation with Ahaz from the continuance of the message of what God is going to do about this attack, this plan of Ahaz toward the security of the land.

God says the plan is wrong; it is wicked; the plan is going to put you in worse state than you were before, but God says I am going to deliver the land. There will be a remnant. Of course that is the very name of Shear-jashub, a remnant will return.

Ch. 8 begins with a statement that continues to speak about the downfall of these nations to the north. So there is a minor division at the end of ch.7. But you're still talking very definitely about the same thing. Look at v.4: "Before the boy knows how to say, My father or my mother, the wealth of Damascus and the plunder of Samaria will be carried off by the king of Assyria. So you have the same subject, but another division. You would make a small division there.

I don't think it will be too difficult for you to skim over chs. 8-12, and notice what sections definitely go together, and where there are some definite breaks of thought. I would suggest that you say ch.9:7-12 and there is a minor break--make a line, then say vv.13-15 or 13-56 whatever, and if there is a more important break make two lines; if there is an extremely important break make 3 lines. Make an outline like that. That will be the assignment next time. Get it in by Friday.

Student: Do you just want ch. divisions, or do you want phrases and sentences for each one?

Just the divisions ? for this particular assignment. Put 3 lines if there is quite an important break in prophecy. If there is a definite change in situation but still pretty much in the same subject like there is between ch.7 and 8, (use) two lines or even just one line. See where are the important breaks in this section. That should not be too hard to notice. What the main subjects are without your having to study many of the verses in detail. That is the assignment for next time. I hope everybody understands it because I don't expect to post it.

Question: Starts in ch. 7?

We've already ch.7. Include it in the outline but I don't think it will take much time. Yes, the outline should cover chs. 7-12. But the actual work begins with ch.8.

Ahaz' clever plan put them in greater danger than they had ever been before. It was only through the miraculous intervention of God that they were delivered. A great part of the OT we have no evidence from other sources about a great deal of it except what is contained in the Bible. But there are many places where we have contact with evidence from other sources. This is one of them.

The Kings of Assyria at this time issued what they called their annals. These annals were really propaganda. They were accounts of how great the kings were, and what great success they had in their expeditions. Now Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, later on did not issue such annals. Nebuchadnezzar simply said, I am the great king, the great conqueror led my army over great mountains, and we crossed mighty rivers, and I conquered. He summed it altogether. Then he tells you about the great buildings he built and describes every little detail of the buildings! Nebuchadnezzar was very proud.

But in the case of the Assyrian kings, they don't tell you much about their buildings. We have found remains of some very

great buildings they built, but they don't tell you about them. But they tell about their military campaigns. Sennacherib describes one campaign after another in these annals. Several copies of parts of the annals have been found. They were distributed throughout his land in order to show people what a great king he was and this is done by a number of the other Assyrian kings. In all the cases their principle emphasis was on their great achievements in a military way.

In this section you read in ch.37 Sennacherib says where are the gods of these places; where are the kings of this place, what did they do? What can you god do? How can your king protect you? They tell us about these various places and what they did. We have very little evidence from any of these places. One of these days they may excavate some place in the near east and find the annals of one of these particular places if they bother to keep them.

Nowadays when everything is written up in papers and magazines it seems strange -- Why don't we know what happened in these particular years? But if one of you described something you did within the last 10 years, and I asked you, Just when did you do that? You might have a hard time to tell within the space of 3 or 4 yrs. I often find it hard to tell within 10 yrs. when I had some particular experience or did something. Unless you bother to write it down and make a record of it.

The people outside Egypt did not have paper to write on. They had to use other sorts of things. Even paper 300 yrs. from now a good bit of paper in the country--will have utterly disappeared. When you take events that far back it is very good for our knowledge of history that the Assyrian kings wrote these annals. They give us a lot of knowledge about events then, and we can fit them with the Bible and what we get from other sources.

Sennacherib tells about his conquering this nation and that nation, in his various expeditions. In the account of one of his expeditions he tells how he came against king Hezekiah who was supposed to be subject to him because his father Ahaz had promised to be subject to the king of Assyria, you remember, in order to get them to come and protect him, (he tells that) Hezekiah turned against him. He says, I led my armies out against him. He said, I shut him up in his city of Jerusalem like a bird in a cage.

He goes on to tell about his other conquests. He never says of any other city that he shut the king up like a bird in a cage. He tells how he conquered this city and led the people out as prisoners, carried them off hundreds of miles and killed hundreds of them, etc. But of Hezekiah and Jerusalem he says I shut him up like a bird in a cage. It's pretty good evidence that he could not conquer Jerusalem. He wouldn't admit it, but he ~~g~~ boast of having shut him up like a bird in a cage! Evidently he shut him up for these 3 years.

That is a very interesting corroboration of the Scripture account. But there is another corroboration that I think is just as interesting, though not as often referred to. That is this: In the great palace Sennacherib built at Ninevah hundreds of miles

from here. He put up a great bar relief that showed the conquest of a city. He showed the great walls of the city. He showed his armies all around it. He showed the battering rams attacking the city. It looks in a way like a series of cartoons, because he shows one of them appearing after another until they broke through the walls and the walls cave in and he shows the people of the city going out and being taken prisoners by the Assyrians.

Underneath it he tells how he attacked the city of Lachish and broke through its walls, and conquered the city, and he carried the people off. I don't know of any other case where he boasts about a city other than a capital city. But here ~~he~~ he just says of Jerusalem he shut him up like a bird in a cage, and he boasts about Lachish. So I call that Sennacherib's consolation prize (that great picture in his palace).

You read ch. 36. It's from Lachish he sent. Lachish was the greatest city of Judah next to Jerusalem but not to be compared to Jerusalem in size ~~or~~ or in strength.

Klug: I just wanted to mention that in the latest issue of The Bible and Spade there is an ~~article~~ article on Lachish and there is a picture of all these scenes. Very interesting article.

Very interesting. I read in the U. of Berlin in the Babylonian inscriptions I read the account of Sennacherib's conquest. In the Bible it tells in 2 Kings how in trying to keep him -- I Kings it is -- I King 18-19 it tells of the same events that we have in Isa. 36-37. It tells here how Hezekiah in trying to keep Sennacherib from coming and attacking him, we read in I Ki. 18:14 that the king of Assyria exactly from Hezekiah king of Judah 300 talents of silver and 30 talents of gold. We read in Sennacherib's inscription that he said that Hezekiah gave him 800 talents of silver and 30 talents of gold.

I was interested to hear this professor in the class in Berlin in which we were reading this inscription in the original in the Assyrian say, What do you think of the difference, or where it says 300 in the Bible and it says 800 in the Assyrian king inscription? Well, he said, The Assyrian king just lied in order to make it look good. I thought that was interesting that that would be his attitude toward the discrepancies. Because there is that one discrepancy as to the amount but otherwise the two exactly fit together.

So we have here as far as the security of Israel is concerned God telling Ahaz, Trust the Lord the Lord can deliver you. We have Ahaz making this ungodly scheme to bring in the Assyrian force to protect them; we have God rebuking them for that; we have the results of that becoming clearly evident when the Assyrian force then overran the land to quite an extent. And when 30 yrs. later Sennacherib came and it looked as if Jerusalem would be destroyed as so many other cities were, but God miraculously protected them and the city lasted for another nearly 150 years! before it finally was conquered not by the Assyrians but by the Babylonians.

Just one other point about the history which maybe most of you don't need to bother a great deal about, but some of you may have a question. That is if you try to figure the chronology you look at chs. 38 and 39. Does ch. 38 says "After Hezekiah became ill?" It says, "In those days Hezekiah became ill." What were those days? Was that right after? Was it during? Was it earlier? Sometime in Hezekiah's life.

Then in ch. 39 we read, "At that time Merodach-baladan son of Baladan, king of Babylon, sent letters and a present to Hezekiah... What time? It is quite clear in ch. 9 that it comes after ch. 38. Because in ch. 39 the king of Babylon sent to congratulate Hezekiah upon his recovery. So we know he came after ch. 38. But it is quite generally believed that chs. 38 and 39 chronologically precede chs. 36 and 37. It is quite generally believed that it was this embassy from king of Babylon that led Hezekiah to break off with Sennacherib and to put his life in jeopardy and that it came earlier.

Chs. 37-38 is one continuous story with two main incidents. In it each of which has 4 parts. Four parts which are exactly parallel to each other. Chs. 38 and 39 are quite distinct from that. I'm not going to go into chs. 38 and 39 in this course. But I wanted to bring that out for any who might be interested in it from the viewpoint of chronology.

Our primary interest is in chs. 7-12. I'm not asking you for this assignment to try to solve the problems in this section or to understand all the things you read in it, but notice what the divisions are. What evidences are there for what are the main divisions, or where there are subordinate divisions. Where there is a ch. division that is an excellent division, or if there are any that are quite evidently not very good. divisions.

Now that's our first of these subjects we're looking at-- the security of the land and God's wonderful deliverance. A big theme in chs. 7-12. It's a big theme in chs. 28-35. The theme of the continuance of the House of David, and the replacement of Ahaz by a better one. Well he was replaced. When he died Hezekiah, who was as godly a king as the land ever had. But Hezekiah only pre-figures a far better one who was to come later. Because Manasseh his son was perhaps a worse than Ahaz if such a case was possible.

We will continue there next week. Please get those (assignments) into the office by noon (Friday).



It is very difficult in a course like this to make a reasonable mark simply on the basis of an examination, so I would like to give two short tests during this semester which will be a real help toward that purpose. So for next week there will be no assignment but please thoroughly review everything thus far. . . We will have a 20 min. text at the beginning of the hour next week. . .

We have been laying groundwork largely thus far. There are many things that fit together and we're looking at different aspects of them as we try to fit them together.

Regarding the assignment for today, there is much variety in the answers, as would be expected. Most of these assignments are not a test of how well you can do a thing, but to get you into the problem and get you to try to see what you can do on it and to get the problems in mind. Then we can discuss them intelligently.

One thing we can all agree on is that chs. 7-12 is one unit. We don't have time in this class to look at what precedes and what follows the evidence for that. But it is definitely one unit. In the scale we were using you may need four lines before and after ch. 7-12.

Within that period there are many short sections some of which belong rather closely together. There are many places where we could make a small division, but to know where the large divisions should be made is not easy. I think the Archbishop did one of the worst jobs he did anywhere in the Bible in this section from ch. 7-12, because there is only one of his ch. divisions which seems to me to be reasonably placed.

Briefly glance at that. You notice in ch. 7 we are reading about the attack being made by the people from Samaria and from Damascus, and how God would ~~do~~ protect them from them, but Ahaz has gotten the king of Assyria to come and deliver them from them. Isaiah said in ch. 7:16, "Before the boy knows enough to reject the wrong and choose the right, the land of the two kings you dread will be laid waste."

Then in 8:4 "before the boy knows how to say, My father or my mother, the wealth of Damascus and plunder of Samaria will be carried off by the king of Assyria" So we have the first part of ch. 8 and ch. 7 very tightly bound together, and there is certainly a minor division between ch. 7 and ch. 8, but I'm not certain it is any more important than any other divisions within ch. 7. I hope to be able to go into ch. 8 in detail before the end of the hour.

Now I want to look at the beginning of ch. 9. At the end of v. 18 and beginning of v. 19 of ch. 8, you have a break that is far more important than the break between chs. 8 and 9. Temporarily we have left Damascus, Samaria, and Assyria.

behind, and we are moving toward a different area in v. 19---  
 "When men tell you to consult mediums and spiritists, who  
 whisper and mutter, should not a people inquire of their God?  
 Why consult the dead on behalf of the living?"

Then you have an account of the punishment God is bringing to his erring people. "Distressed and hungry, they will roam through the land; when they are famished . . . they look toward the earth and see only distress and darkness and fearful gloom . . . In the past he humbled the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali . . . but people walking in darkness are going to see a great light!"

So at v.19 there is a very important break, but at the beginning of ch. 9 there is a very slight break. If you look up any of the verses of ch. 9 in a Hebrew Bible you will find the numbers are different than those in your English versions because the people who transferred the verse divisions from the Latin Bible to the Heb. Bible felt that where it says in v.2 "the people walking in darkness have seen a great light" --that that was the place to start ch. 9, not after the verse before which speaks about gloom and distress. So the Heb. Bible --in it-- ch. 9 starts a verse later.

Actually it shouldn't start at either of the two places! It should start a few vv. earlier because we're right in the middle of a transition. There's a much more important break earlier, and a far more important break at the end of v.7 in ch. 9. I think almost everybody saw that there is no substantial break at the beginning of b. 10. There the Archbishop certainly was asleep when he made that break! Because as most of you noticed, there is a series of 4 stanzas making one poem. A poem of four stanzas each of which ends with a refrain. One begins in 9:8 and in v. 12 it says "yet for all this his anger is not turned away, his hand is still upraised."

Then you have another stanza ~~xxxxxxx~~ which v. 17 ends "yet for all this his anger is not turned away, his hand is still upraised."

Then another stanza which ends with v. 21, "Yet for all this, his anger is not turned away, his hand is still upraised."

Then another which ends in 10:4 (the same way). It is very obvious that you have there a section of 4 stanzas together, and he made a ch. division just in the beginning of the third (you mean the fourth).

A new subject begins in v.5 of ch. 10 "Woe to the Assyrians, the rod of my anger . . ." That continues on, and when you come to the end of the ch., you have the Lord destroying the Assyrian empire. "He will cut down the forest thickets with an ax; Lebanon will fall before the Mighty One." The forest of Lebanon standing for the mighty Assyrian empire that is going to perish, but the next verse(11:1) says that in contrast with

this great Assyrian empire which perishes forever, "a shoot will come up from the stump of Jesse; from his roots a branch will ~~xxxx~~ bear fruit." So you have a sharp contrast between the last verse of ch. 10 and the first verse of ch. 11. There certainly is a minor break there because you have a contrast between the destruction and failure of Assyria and the fact that from little Israel, ~~xxx~~ from out of that is going to come the One who is going to change the condition of the whole world.

While the first verse of ch. 9 and ch. 11 are so very important that it is rather nice for us to have them at the beginning of the ch., yet if we don't realize that it is not a major division, we lose the progress of thought and the close relation with what precedes.

Of course at the beginning of v. 12( you mean ch. 12) we have a prayer of praise, so the Archbishop did a good job at that particular place. So much for a summary of the divisions -- a thing I wanted to get across is that in studying any part of the Bible, the verse and ch. divisions can be a very great convenience to find a place quickly. They are extremely valuable for that. But if you are reading any ch., OT or NT, you are wise to look a little bit at the ch. before and a little bit at the ch. after.

In Hebrew, for instance, practically every chapter begins "therefore", and you could consider the first verse in every chapter in Hebrew(s) (?) as a conclusion to the ch. preceding or as beginning what follows. But if you divide it into separate units you lose a great deal of the meaning of each.

Question: I was wondering about 8:18. How do you explain that.

8:18 says, "We are signs and symbols in Isaael from the Lord Almighty, who dwells on Mt. Zion." "When men tell you to consult mediums and spirits, who whisper . . ."

It seems to me, particularly in view of the context before and after that if v. 19 was thought of as "Don't consult mediums and spirits; come to us" -- from that viewpoint, it could be thought of as continuous. I hope we'll get to that today and look at it in a little more detail.

I want to mention this that at the end of the semester with the two brief tests and the final exam, in practically every case it is not difficult to tell what sort of mark I should give. But sometimes a person is right on the line between the two. Therefore, I like to keep all the papers you turn in, so that in such a case I can look at them then in order to see on which side of the line you should go. That's why I keep record of them each week -- a general record of whether the work is well done or not. But I like to be able to glance over them all again at the end. So unless anyone has a

special reason to want a paperback sooner, I would rather not give any of the papers back until the end of the semester. If any of you would like to have the paper back at the end of the semester, I wish you would give me a little note on a separate piece of paper with the request that your paper be returned to you. I'll keep them all together and at the end of the semester put them in your box, all those who would like to have them.

We have been noticing in ch. 7, two major emphases. The emphasis on the security of the people. And the emphasis on the promise to David, the promise of a righteous king. A promise which seems to have failed when there was such a king as Ahaz, but a promise which He assures them will be carried out.

The emphasis on security, whether to make it a separate subject or a part of that -- we mentioned there are two aspects to that: there is God's determination to punish and chastize those who do not follow Him, but also the promise that God's mercy will not depart, that God is going to give deliverance; he is going to give ultimate complete establishment of righteousness. Those who follow Him truly are going to find that everything turns out well in the end.

We have both of these things brought out in the section we looked at in ch. 36 and 37 where we have the land subjected to the terrible attack from the Assyrians with all the large cities except Jerusalem captured. Jerusalem was never besieged at this time. Jerusalem knew that the other cities were taken, that the Assyrian armies were moving back and forth through the land. No one dared go very far outside the walls, for a period of perhaps 3 years.

They could go out to their fields long enough to quickly get whatever they could that had grown of itself while keeping a lookout lest Assyrian soldiers be seen approaching. It was after constantly expecting that the great force which had broken down the walls of all their other cities, would come and attack Jerusalem, and then God miraculously delivered them. So we have that marvelous deliverance to which we are looking forward in this section, though it's not so specifically mentioned in ch. 7-12 as it is in the later sections we will look at.

We have then constantly rebuke for iniquity, with the promise though that God is going to protect His people. God is going to work out His righteousness in the end. He's going to give His marvelous deliverance to Jerusalem. So Jerusalem lasts for nearly a century longer than Samaria did, before it was finally captured, and then not by Assyria but by the Babylonians.

We have looked at everything in ch. 7 except three verses (?). If there is anything I don't make clear or if I mispeak myself . . . I wish you would interrupt me so no one will be misled.

Question: ? in ch. 7?

They are found throughout the section. The two main emphases we found particularly in ch. 7 were the security of the people, and the promise about the righteous king. Those are the two. And then the first of them, you might say, has two aspects: the punishment of his people when they go astray, but the ultimate victory which He promises to them.

They are emphasized in ch. 7, but in ch. 7 these three verses: vv.14-15 -- we have not looked at closely. I was a little disappointed that there was only paper turned in to me that raised the question about these three verses, because they present a very serious problem. An extremely serious problem, and I am pleased when you note these problems enough to raise a problem about them in your paper. I would rather have you raise them on your paper than in ~~xxxx~~ class because I can see where I want to fit it in later. Whether I'm going to cover it anyway, whether it is of general interest, whether it is something I should speak to you about personally.

The great problem with these three verses is that the first verse clearly is a prediction of the virgin birth of Christ. Yet vv.15-16 so very definitely refer to the immediate situation. Those who insist that there is no prophecy of Christ here say, What comfort would it be for ~~xxxx~~ Ahaz to have this sign come of the virgin birth. Of course, God is not choosing to comfort Ahaz; he is rebuking Ahaz.

But he is comforting the people by giving them the assurance that the house of David will not always be represented by such an unworthy representative as ~~W~~ Ahaz, but that God's own chosen Immanuel, the Son of David is coming and coming in a miraculous way. But in ~~xxxx~~ in the ~~W~~ immediate situation, v. 15 seems to have a very definite relationship. It says, He will eat curds and honey when he knows enough to reject the wrong and choose the right, but before the boy knows enough to reject the wrong and choose the right the land of the two kings you dread will be laid waste.

If it says that before Christ reaches the age where he has intelligence enough to reach for the warm milk instead of for the hot stove, that before he reaches that time these two kings will have disappeared! Well, they disappeared 700 years before the time of Christ. It doesn't seem to have much relevance in that relation. There have been commentators who have said the statement "he will eat curds and honey" is a picture of the simple life of our Lord. We have nothing in the NT to suggest that that is what it refers to, and when we look

further on in the chapter, we find that in v. 22 "all who remain in the land will eat curds and honey." There will be plenty of pastoral products, because the land will be open for the cows and the bees and the trees to grow, and comparatively few people to do much cultivation. A condition of depopulation and devastation which came as a result of the Assyrian invasion.

So vv.15-~~16~~ 16 come right back to the immediate situation. We have a problem, a very definite problem. Now somebody tries to get around it by what they call "double fulfillment." I do not believe there is such a thing as double fulfillment. If we are to say, There will be great invasions(plural) -- there may be 2, 3, or 6. We don't know how many. We are giving a plural prediction.

But when we say that David became king, we are giving a specific event. There is no double fulfillment. When we say that God picked Saul or that Samuel told Saul he would become king, it refers to one specific event. When we make a prediction that is not a general prediction, but is a prediction of a single event, it describes that one thing. And if you are going to say, It has 2 or 3 fulfillments, it leaves you without much solid ~~xxx~~ ground on which to stand.

We have to make a sharp distinction. A principle can be fulfilled. That is different, but a specific prediction such as the virgin birth has but one fulfillment. Some have tried to say, This is a prediction of the birth of Hezekiah! The evidence is strong that Hezekiah was already at least 5 yrs. old at this time, when Isaiah spoke with his father Ahaz. It is definitely not a prediction of the birth of Hezekiah.

We have no evidence of a virgin birth at that time. We have no evidence of anyone at that time to which this could refer. Neither do we have any way in vv.15-16 can refer to Christ. V.14 refers to Christ. Vv.15-16 refer to the immediate situation. How do you make the transition?

If you say this is a double fulfillment -- it refers both to Christ and to that time -- vv.15-16 certainly don't refer to the time of Christ. By the time he reached the age of being able to make simple choices, the land of the two kings you dread will be made waste. There is a transition. How is it to be understood?

Personally, I feel, and a number of commentators do, that what happens he speaks of the coming one whom God is going to send without giving any indication of when he is coming. We know he is going to come. Then he takes his life as an imaginary measuring stick. In other words, we don't know when this virgin birth will occur, but if it were to occur during the present, then before that time, these things would happen. It is using it simply as a measuring stick. I incline personally very strongly toward that interpretation of the relationship of these two vv. with v.14.

There is one other suggestion I would not say is wrong. It seems a possibility, though I like this (first) one better. It is that when he says, He will eat curds and honey -- in English that word "he" is a separate word. But in Heb. it is a part of the verb. There is no emphasis on the "he" at all. It could certainly be he is told to take his son with him whose name means "a remnant will return", whose name suggests there is going to be devastation so that there will be only a remnant. And he points toward the boy beside him and says, He will eat curds and honey when he reaches a certain age.

He says "before the boy . . ." and points to the boy, his son who is with him there and the son who is with him is the measurement that it changes from Christ to the son who is there and you might say he points in that direction.

That is a possibility. Personally I like the other better, --that he thinks of Christ that if He were born now it would give you a period of time.

Question: Would 8:4 have a bearing on this?

8:4 is referring to another boy. Maher-shala-hashbaz, and there we have a short period of time. A shorter period of time.

Question: You don't feel that that could be the boy?

No. This boy at that time would be older, if (that was he one).

Question: I still don't fully understand your interpretation. Would you explain it.

It is not easy by any means. It is a difficult problem. I think we should recognize that it is a problem. But I do not see any escape as Isa. 7 stands from taking v.14 as a prediction of the virgin birth of Christ, and the quotation by the angel in the book of Mat. (or even if it was simply Matthew's quotation), I think that would have to be certain. Verse 14 refers to Christ.

Now if you take vv.15-16 in the light of the rest of the ch., I don't see any way to escape from their referring, not to Christ but to the immediate situation. So my preference is it means, We don't know when Christ (Immanuel) will come, but if He were to come now, before He would reach this age, these things will happen. That he takes him as the imaginary life -- we don't know when it will be and uses it as a measuring stick to show what's going to happen in the very near future.

That is the interpretation I prefer, though the other is not impossible that he says before he, before Shear-jashub-- why did he bring Shear-jashub along? Was it just for his name?

Or is there a little more purpose? I prefer the first though I don't think the second is impossible.

Question: Do you mean Isaiah felt that ?

I would think that as far as Isaiah was concerned the Lord had not revealed it to him. He would have known. Now maybe at this moment, ~~xxxxxxx~~ (he didn't) --- and the Lord may have revealed other things to him later and he realized

But at this point he probably only knew what the Lord had revealed to him.

Question: According to your interpretation that was Isaiah's son ?

That was Isaiah's son mentioned in v. 1 where the Lord told him to take Shear-jashub his son. In v.3 he is mentioned. He says, Take you son who has this name -- a remnant will return.

Question: Is there a meaning in the Hebrew . . . that he will know enough to reject the wrong and choose the right. Is there anything of the hypothetical sense in that in the verb?

Yes. He will or he would. There is no distinction between "will" and "would" in the Hebrew, like there is in English. There are comparatively few places where it is translated "would", but there are places where all agree that is the idea.

Question: Are vv.14-15 a general statement that depopulation will take place within a few years?

Yes. Anything else?

Question: According to your view v. 16 would be saying, If this (birth) did take place very soon, then these two kings would be laid waste ?

Then it would give us a measuring stick before he reaches a certain age, that in a very few years both of these kings will be gone.

Question: Would this be a sign of x for Ahaz?

No. It is a sign to God's people that they don't have to think that the House of David will have to put up with such as Ahaz forever, and it's a sign that Ahaz' clever scheme to deliver the land is going to bring in trouble rather than deliverance.

Question: In Mat. 1, the angel prophecies that this is the fulfillment of v. 14, but he doesn't say anything about vv. 15-16. That would support the fact that there is a separation here. A number of times in other places in the NT that the NT will pick and choose out of a whole passage of what . . .



Yes. The angel did not quote vv.15-16, just v. 14.

Question: Jesus stops in the middle of a passage, or verse.

Yes, but we want to be very careful about arguments from silence. The fact that a verse is quoted and it stops there means we don't have any NT guarantee that the next verse also applies to that time, but it doesn't prove it does! In that case where Jesus stops in a quotation you don't say that is the first coming, and the second coming from there on. But I think if you read it closely that is one question (?) but that's another area. I'd better not get into.

I think then we have covered the principle matters in ch. 7 and these matters continue for a few vv. into ch. 8. "The Lord said to me." I would guess that 8:1 comes very very soon after what precedes it in ch. 7. We are not told that it did, but it would seem to be from the situation that it did.

Very soon after the Lord said to me, "Take . . ." This word which NIV translates "a large scroll" is a word which occurs very seldom in Hebrew. We're not sure exactly what it means. Some think of it as being like a stone monument. Just exactly what it was we don't know, but somewhere where it could easily be seen, Isaiah was to write on it in plain letters the word Maher-Shalal-Hash-Baz which is the Heb. for "hasten the booty, hurry the spoil." He puts this sign up. Ahaz is telling his hables secretly the Assyrians will come soon; we'll be perfectly safe. We've nothing to worry about.

But Isaiah asks Uriah the priest and Zechariah son of Jeberekiah -- not the author of the Biblical book of Zechariah but another Zechariah -- he asks them to note the fact that at this time I have put on this sign that there is trouble and difficulty ahead. A remnant will return, but in the meantime hasten the booty, hurry to the spoil..

"Then I went to the prophetess . . . The Lord said to me, Name him . . . Before the boy knows how to say abi and imi -- the two first sounds a child is apt to learn to make, Daddy and Mummie. They come earlier. This is an earlier boy than the other boy. The other boy reaches the ability to make simple choices. Before that happens there is going to be an end to the menace from Damascus and Samaria. But before this boy is able just to make the simplest sounds a baby learns to make -- before that time, of course by the time the boy is able to do that it's a couple of years later than the previous situation.

Before that the wealth of Damascus and the plunder of Samaria will be carried off by the king of Assyria.

Then we have a small break at the end of 8:4, of course. Here the Lord speaks to him and gives a rebuke for the people of the land mingled with assurance of God's continued blessing.

Rebuke for turning away from God but assurance of continued blessing for God's people.

8:6 "Because this people has rejected the gently flowing waters of Shiloah -- in the NT there is no sh sound so it makes it Siloam. The pool of Siloam, it has nothing to do with the OT city of Shiloah, of course. It is the waters of Siloam. Because this people have rejected the gently flowing waters of Shiloah -- a figure of God's messages through his prophets to the people, "and rejoices over Rezin ~~aha~~ and the son of Remaliah."

Who are the people who are rejoicing over Rezin and Remaliah? Most commentators think these are the people of the northern kingdom that he is speaking of and how God is punishing them. Some think he refers to people in the southern kingdom who were turning against Ahaz and thinking they should support Rezin. I think the first (explanation) is the more likely of the two, but probably he has the whole people of Israel to some extent in view. That the people of both northern and southern kingdoms instead of listening to the quite voice of God and looking to him for protection that instead they are using these various human expediences to get protection.

"Therefore the Lord is about to bring against them the mighty flood waters of the River --" This term "the River" is a term often used to mean the greatest river in that part of the world, the river Euphrates. It is used here as a figure of the great power and force of the king of Assyria. The king of Assyria with all his pomp. It will overflow all its channels, and run over all its banks and sweep over on into Judah, swirling over it . . . its outspread wings will cover the breadth breadth of -- it doesn't say of the land -- it says of your land. Then the next word says "God with us -- Immanuel."

Most translators insert an "O" because he says "your land" and then he says "God with us", and we've already been told about the birth of Immanuel so it is quite a reasonable conjecture that here Isaiah turns to Immanuel and recognizes that though Ahaz is ruling over the land, he is a very degenerate representative of the House of David. It ~~is~~ really is Immanuel who is truly the Ruler, and this is Immanuel's land. Even though God permits the Assyrians to overrun the land and bring this punishment for the sins of the people, yet it is Immanuel's land!

So you see another reason why this ch. is tightly bound with the previous ch. We read there of the birth of Immanuel. But here we see that Immanuel is One who is already in existence. He is the true son of David. This is His land! Even though the Assyrian runs over it, there cannot be permanent lasting destruction because it's Immanuel's.

Then he ~~turns~~ turns and speaks ironically to the nations under the control of the Assyrians as they ~~make~~ make their eventual attack in ch. 36-37 which they think will result in the destruction of Jerusalem. ((Must mean vv.9-10 instead of chs.36-37)).

"Raise the war cry, you nations and be shattered, Listen, all you distant lands, prepare for battle, and be shattered! Prepare for battle, and be shattered. Devise your strategy . . . but it will not stand, for Immanuel." NIV translates it, "for God is with us." In both cases you can translate it "God is with us" or you can transliterate it "Immanuel." Both are true. God is with them; this is Immanuel's land. Since it is Immanuel's land, God is protecting and watching over it.

Even Sennacherib's mighty power will not be able to take Jerusalem, because God will miraculously intervene.

As it continues he is still speaking to the people so many of whom have turned away from God. "Do not call conspiracy everything these people call conspiracy; so not fear what they fear, do not dread it. The Lord Almighty is the one you are to regard as holy, he is one you are to fear . . . and he will be sanctuary." You don't need to try to get the Assyrians to come and protect you; you don't need to look to these human means, God has promised to protect you and he will do it.

If you do not trust in him you will not be established. But he will be a sanctuary -- it is understood to all those who put their trust in Him. He goes on, "But ~~be~~ for both houses of Israel" -- there is good reason above to think he is referring to both the northern and the southern kingdoms. But for both houses of Israel he will be a stone that causes men to stumble, and a rock that makes them fall. And for the people of Jerusalem he will be a trap and a snare. Many of them will stumble; they will fall and be broken, they will be snared and captured."

At the end of v. 15 there is a minor break, not a major one. Up to that point he had been speaking about the way God was going to bring misery upon those who are not following the Lord, on those who are not seeking to do His will, on those who are seeking these human expedients instead of trusting the Lord. As he sees the dark days coming under Ahaz, he says, Bind up the testimony and seal up the law among my disciples. I will wait for the Lord who is hiding his face . . . I will put my trust in him."

Who is speaking in vv.16-17? Does Isaiah speak there or does Immanuel speak there, who has been referred to twice already in the chapter? Immanuel ~~is~~ is certainly already the Lord of the land. Immanuel is God's own king. This is Immanuel's land. That's why the Assyrians cannot completely destroy it. This is Immanuel's land. Is He speaking? Or is it Isaiah as Immanuel's representative? He is speaking on Immanuel's behalf.

V.18, "Here am I, and the children the Lord has given me. We are signs, and symbols in Israel . . ." Here we see Immanuel is speaking through Isaiah. He is giving a principle which was true ~~there~~ there. Isaiah and his followers were keeping alive the true message of God even though so much of the land was turning away from God. They are God's representatives. He and the followers that God has given him. But it is Immanuel working through Isaiah.

So we find in Heb. 2:13 that these words of Immanuel are quoted. It says there, so Jesus is not ashamed to call them brothers. He says, I will declare my name to my brothers in the presence of the congregation I will sing your praise. That is quoted from Ps.22 --that marvellous prediction of Jesus' crucifixion, ~~xxx~~ and of the glory that should follow. again

And ~~xxx~~: "I will put my trust in Him" which is exactly the last part of v. 17.

And again he said, Here am I and the children God has given me. So the author of the book of Hebrews is justified in quoting these statements as statements by Christ, by Immanuel the pre-existent Christ who was working in Isaiah and was in them expressing the principle which was exemplified in Isaiah and his little band of followers who kept alive the knowledge of God in a nation that was turning away from him. And it was exemplified as the followers of Christ who went out into all the world to carry the message of salvation in the midst of a wicked world.

God has never promised that by the gospel we are going to conquer the whole world. But he has promised that through the gospel we can bring a message of salvation that will reach many and be used to save many out of this wicked world.

So Immanuel can say it through each one of us. He said it through Isaiah. If we can put our trust in the Lord and look to God to give us those who will join with us in standing for God.

At the end of v. 18 I feel there is a rather important break because in what follows we do not have direct reference to these previous situations but we have a warning first against spiritism. A warning against a practice which was certainly widespread then and is wide-spread in our day, of consulting mediums and spirits in order to try to find out what is going to happen in the future.

"Should not a people inquire of their God? Why consult the dead on behalf of the living? To the law and to the testimony! If they do not speak according to this word, they have no light of dawn." Then from there the next two vv. show a condition of distress and of misery, a condition of suffering of hunger. They roam through the land. They become famished and enraged, and looking up they curse their king and their god.

Some take "look up" that they cease what is wrong and look up. Others take it that no matter what direction you look you see nothing but misery. When you get to 9:1, you find that there are differences of translation as to whether he will glorify Galilee of the Gentiles or whether he will greatly distress Galilee of the Gentiles. Of course both of them are true. Because he describes here the area in the land of Zebulun and of Naphtali, Galilee of the Gentiles, the area in northern kingdom

into which the Assyrian army first came. That area into which darkness of the Assyrian attack first came of its attack and conquest, in that very area the people walking in darkness are going to see a great light.

The NT says that great light was what came first in that area because that was where Jesus began his preaching. Matthew points to this passage as fulfilled in Christ. In the very area where the darkness from the Assyrian attack first came in that very area Jesus began his preaching, his wonderful message of life and light.

I will stop here for today and please review everything up to this point and try to be here on time because I'd not like to take any more ~~kn~~-time than I have to for it because it is a short test, about 20 minutes.

We were looking last time at ch. 8 of Isaiah. We noticed that the beginning of ch. 8 is very closely tied with the previous ch. dealing with the same situation at least thru v.10 and very possibly thru v. 18.

In v.19 we start a new section. There we have the prophet's warning against trying to get guidance from wegie boards, mediums and other such means, astrology, etc. We should consult the Lord for our guidance and not go to these esoteric sources. "To the law and to the testimony, if they don't speak according to this word, they have no light of dawn." Then he goes on to show the fate of those people in Israel who would not look to the Lord for His guidance and not follow the Lord when His will was made clear to them. He shows the terrible fate they must go through, and of course he's specifically speaking of the people of Israel, but the principle applies to all people at all times.

It is pretty hard between v. 20 and the seven verses of the next ch., it is pretty hard to know where to make a break because the division is so gradual. You have a picture of the darkness, and then the coming of the light. The rabbis felt the archbishop made a mistake in making the division where he did, so in the Heb. Bible you find it starting with what is v.2 in your English Bible.

It is true that if you are going to make a break between ch. 8 and ch. 9, then the logical place to make it would be after v. 1. But v. 1 does lead very naturally into v.2, altho not nearly so naturally as it follows v.22 of the previous ch. It leads rather naturally into it, so we are justified in saying that there is one continuous picture here of darkness, and gloom. This gloom reaches a climax with the coming of the Assyrian army who first entered the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali, as the section of Galilee which was neighboring the other countries and which was spoken of as ~~Galiilee~~ Galiilee of the nations.-(gentiles)

That was where the darkness first began to be most bad. Right there in that section where the darkness was first so great there, he says, light is going to start to come. The people walking in darkness will see a great light.

We are justified in interpreting it that way. We would not be justified perhaps in dogmatically saying that it must be that way. It would be possible that at the end of v.1 of ch. 9 a section ended, and that v.2 began a new section. That would be possible and be just as the OT. But in the NT we have the two verses quoted continuously. Consequently they give us the inspired interpretation, that between the last part of ch. 8 and the first part of ch.9 there is no break but there is continuous progress to it.

Question: 9:1 is a reference to Christ because of the NT. I was wondering if on the exam question that was taken as with ch. 8 than with the Heb. Bible(???)

I see, whether this would come to the references to Christ in chapter 8. That's a very good question. Whether you were using the English Bible or the Hebrew Bible. If you were using the English Bible we will count it correct. If you were using the Heb. Bible we will count it incorrect. Very good.

Question: Verse 19 of ch. 8 Does God countenance mediums or spirits, and is it possible to get an answer from spirits?

No. The meaning of v. 19 is that we should not look to mediums or spirits. It is not at all impossible that a medium or spirit might tell us something that is true that we did not know. But it is equally possible that a lying spirit will speak through them, and mislead us and give us something false.

I had an uncle who was quite ill. Visiting us in California he was very ill. His wife was in Montana and she was not a believer. She went to a spiritist, who did not know her, did not know anything about her as far as we know. She went there looking for counsel. As soon as she came in to the room, the medium said, Oh, there's pain, and pointed to the very spot where her husband had this cancer. Pointing to the very spot she displayed knowledge that a human being could not have known by ordinary means. She said, Terrible pain, but I don't see any death! And 3 mo. later he was dead from cancer. In other words there was the possibility thru the spirit who was speaking thru the medium, or by psychological transfer of some sort which we do not know, there was the possibility of knowing present facts. But no possibility of predicting the future, with certainty.

We are not told that these means may not give you truth. But we are warned that the Christian should not use them. They might give truth, they might give error. There might be a lying spirit speaking through them. Just like dreams. God spoke to the prophets in dreams in the OT. When we have a dream it may convey some meaning to us, or it may be the result of something we ate yesterday. Or it may be a demon trying to mislead us. We should get our guidance from Scripture. That is the teaching of these two verses.

Question: In ch.8:20 it starts talking about "they". Who is the "they"? If they do not speak according to . . .

In the English "they" -- the problem would be as someone mentioned before in an English sentence. In the verses about Immanuel and the virgin birth where it is a "he". We would think it was referring to something before, but there it is a good thing to note about the Hebrew. That in Hebrew the verb is 3rd m. s. or 3rd f.s. or 3rd common plu. That is merely a verb. They may use a pronoun, and if they use a pronoun to emphasize it in the Hebrew, there must be some reason for that pronoun. But when they simply use the verb, it is the action that is spoken of. It would be most usual that the one referred to would be the one previously spoken of, but not necessarily. "If they should speak" could just as well be translated "speaking should be done" in a certain way. That is, it can be impersonal.

It can be a definite reference to that which was just spoken of. It's merely a verb. There is no actual "they." See the point?

I think it is very important to realize that in Hebrew and Greek there are a great many matters that are important in our understanding of Scripture which we don't emphasize in class. We simply learn the principles of the language, but we get it into our system. Then when we read something in Hebrew or Greek we automatically know these things, and thus the value is not the ability to figure out some very involved difficult question. That is a value, but the greater value is that there are so many common things about a language that are different from ours that are obvious to anybody who knows very much about it.

I've often heard people say, Why should I spend time learning Hebrew and Greek. I can't expect to make a better translation than these great scholars, who have translated the Bible. We don't expect you to make as good a translation or one as half as good, as the great scholars who have made most of the translations we have. But if you know the language you immediately see that there are some things that are very definite in the original that are extremely hard to make definite in English. There are certain things that are indefinite in the original where we have to take a definite statement in English.

So this "they" -- I would think it would be people in general. "If people do not speak according to this word, they have no light of dawn." He is talking specifically, but the general principle applies to all. If we don't speak according to the word --

I read a book I happened to pick up once in a modernist book store. It was called, How to Become a Bishop Without Being Religious. It was written by a Methodist minister. I opened the book at random, and I read: If you want your people to like you, very often in your sermon make the statement, The Bible says. Then after you've said it, they will all nod and thank that's wonderful, and then you can go on to say anything you want after that because they won't know anything about what the Bible says. Alas that's the case in most modernist churches.

People have a feeling the Bible is right, but they've never been taught the Bible. They haven't studied it themselves, and they will take just about anything somebody says and they will take it more readily because the Bible says it.

But this says, If they do not speak according to God's Word, they have no light of dawn. They are false leaders, leading people astray if they are not according to the word.



The Word makes many things very very clear, and there are many points at which there may be differences of opinion. God wants us to stress those matters that are clear.

Question: You said the NT quoted v.22 and 9:1 together. Where is that verse?

Of the Hebrew. It quotes 8:23 of the Hebrew and 9:1 of the Hebrew which in the English are 9:1, and 2. The Archbishop probably had in his mind that quotation in Matthew 4:15,16. This NIV has many good features, but one thing I don't like about it is that wherever the NT quotes the OT, they have a footnote referring back to the OT, but they don't put a footnote in the OT at that place referring to the NT. (I think there was no reference either way in the KJV. I think it's good to put it in where they do but I think they ought to do it both ways.)

Mat. 4 -- in connection with the sermon on the mount. That was the beginning of our Lord's preaching. He brought the light first in the very area where the darkness of the Assyrian invasion first came. So Isaiah says, Where the darkness begins to descend with the terrible thing of the coming of these warriors, with garments rolled in blood and the warrior's boot used in battle and all that, the first great approach of the darkness was the result humanly speaking from Ahaz' clever scheme, in that region that was where the light begins, and upon them the light will burst.

Question: The darkness then is the Assyrian nation, and not spiritual blindness.

Well, the spiritual blindness was already there, and that was all through the land. But this is mentioning the specific place where darkness came from the Assyrians invasion. Physical darkness which was the result of the spiritual darkness which was God's punishment for the spiritual darkness. that was already there. So it mentions that where the Assyrian invasion began. The land of ~~the~~ Zebulon and the land of Naphtali.

And Galilee of the Gentiles. If I ever mispeak myself -- I should not say ever, because I guess everybody does, I know I do -- if I say Jeremiah when I mean Isaiah I hope you will speak up and call my attention to it so I can correct it. If there is something I don't make clear, I wish you would raise your hand. If there is a side point you'd like to lite on which isn't really germane, I wish you would write it out and turn it in to me. It may be something I am intending to deal with. I had a question on one of the papers a little back asking how I related 7:15 and 16 to 7:14. An excellent question, but one which I was intending to take up later after I'd laid the background. I took care of that in the regular lecture. A question you ask may suggest something I had not thought of including in the regular lecture. In that case I'll take care of it. Or it may be something I don't want to spend class time on.

In that case I'll see you personally, or drop you a note.

There was a paper turned in last week. It said, I have a question: In Isa. 9:1, Isaiah makes reference to Galilee of the Gentiles. My question is whether there was a section of land called Galilee in Isaiah's day. It also seems there would be no reason to call it Galilee of the Gentiles in his day either. So it seemsto me that this is a very remarkable prophecy that the area of Zebulun and Naphtali will someday be called Galilee, andpopulated by Gentiles. Will you comment on this?

I would say,if we had no reference in the early times to Galilee, the OT might use a later term, and it might be a wonderful prediction of it. Trouble is it might be very hard to prove because our information is very slight about a great many things.

You go right up here back of this elementary school, and you walk into the woods right back of the school. Pretty soon you come to a long paved area, with some side paved areas and the reamins of some buildings. What are they from? Wasthere an air strip there 50 years ago or something? Wasthere a building there? I don't know whether you can find out, or whether there is anybody around that knows. Things get forgotten. Very impor- that things are forgotten. History records only a comparatively small amount.

And so even if the name Galilee was not known before; if it was not known until NT times,it might be a wonderful predic tion, but I would not be dogmatic about it, because it is so easy for such things to be forgotten when we don't have a lot of records, especially when we write on paper and it all disappears sometimes.

I'veheard that every book in existence today, unless special means are taken to preserve it, will disappear within 100 years because the paper will disintegrate. I know some are very concerned about this and trying to find methods to preserve it. They saw that something written in 1800 will last much longer than something written in 1900.= the paper was of much more durable quality then than now. Up until about 1840 a new method was introduced that made perhaps better paper for immediate use, but less lasting.

Of course in those(OT) days they did not have paper. They had to get expensive papyrus from Egypt, or use potsherds or clay tablets, in which case they had to write in Syrian because they had no method of writing in their way rather common then.

But in this case, if a person would look in a concor- dance (of course you could look ina Bible dictionary) you would find "Galilee" mentioned six times in the OT. It is mentioned in the conquest of the land by Joshua. Kedesh in Galilee is mentioned twice. That Solomon gave Tyre 20 cities in the ~~land~~

==== That Solomon gave Hiram 20 cities in the land of Galilee, and in the passage we're looking at in connection with the background of this passage, in 2 Kings 15, we have a reference to Galilee. So we have evidence that that name was common in that early time. I had not realized that myself until I got the question and looked up Galilee in the concordance. So I appreciate the question.

We have then this statement: "In the past he humbled the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali, but in the future he will honor Galilee of the Gentiles . . ." evidently the same area, simply another term for it.

In KJV that verse is translated a bit differently: "Nevertheless the dimness shall not be such as was in her vexation when at the first he lightly afflicted the land of Zebulun, and the land of Naphtali, and afterward did more grievously afflict by the way of the sea beyond Jordan in Galilee of the Gentiles." You see what a difference. All the recent versions instead of translating it "more grievously afflict" by "he will glorify." The Hebrew word can be used in either way. It's simply "to make heavy", and it can be to make heavy with misery, or make heavy with glory.

Since what follows is "glory", all recent translators feel it is reasonable to think that there is means glory. It is very often used for vexation and difficulty and so the KJV translators thought they were more literally translating it that way. Just one illustration of many, that when we say we believe in inerrancy of Scripture we do not mean the inerrancy of any particular translation. We mean the inerrancy of that which can be properly deduced from the study of Scripture. And in it as in any language ~~xxxx~~ there are many places where you cannot be sure exactly what it means.

But we can be sure that here is a picture of darkness, of gloom, of misery that comes with the coming in of the Assyrian army, and then we are told that in v. 2 it is very clear it is speaking of light, and joy and in that very area God is going to bring light. The light dawns in that very area where the great darkness was. As we go on we find the reason for it is given in v.6: "For to us a child is born, to us a son is given . . . and he will be called Wonderful Counsellor . . . of the increase of his government and peace there will be no end."

So while the exact point of the division of the picture of darkness and the picture of joy is not clear, the fact is absolutely clear that he is looking at the misery that comes from unbelief, the misery that comes from failure to follow the clear word of God, and it looks on to God, and it looks on to God's answer in the sending of His Son to bring joy and happiness and understanding as He gives us the wonderful understanding that comes from His preaching of the sermon on the mount, and the still greater joy that comes from the salvation that He brings.

The tests have all been marked, but I'd like to look some of them over a little more. It's rather hard to indicate on the test how it is, and particularly it's hard to give a fair mark with the small time that the test took. I'd like to give the papers back because it will give you an idea of how you are getting it so far. Most of the papers were very good. There were a few that I was quite disappointed in.

In this section we are looking at-- chs. 7-12, and <sup>28</sup>22-35, there is a very close inter-relation of thought. You may think it rather strange, the way I've been jumping from one ch. to another in the discussion, but it is so inter-related, that I feel you can work into it better if you see certain emphases and the way they are developed rather than to just go straight ahead when you have to anticipate a little bit. So that's the reason I'm going the way I am now.

I found the 29th ch. one of the most thrilling chs. in the whole section, but one which really did not give me much of an idea of what it really meant when I first read it. I think that when one has an understanding of the great principles involved in this section and of the chs. that immediately follow it as well as those that precede it, that one is in a better condition ~~to understand~~ understand what the 29th ch. is dealing with. I don't expect to get to that until the week after next. For the next week the assignment is ch. 28, and leads into it.

I'd like to review again just a word about the prophet's purpose. I may express it a little differently than I had before. The purpose of the OT prophets--the purpose that involves more of their writing than anything else, is the purpose of rebuking people for their sin. That is the purpose that we find over and over. In probably at least 3/4th of the chs. of the prophetic books, there is at least a little bit that is devoted to this purpose.

It is easy for us to think we can skip over this material because after all he is telling it to those wicked people back there about God's attitude toward them; we want to find out what God's plan is for the future. But if that is all there was to it we can be sure that God would not have preserved more than 1/5 of the material that is included in that. Everything in Scripture is meant for God's people, and there are very vital lessons for us in those sections. We will not go into those sections as fully as you might wish to in class because we have a lot of material to cover, and there is perhaps more similarity than in some of the others. It is also easier to understand than some of the others. But it is vital for us and God has real blessings for us in it.

So that is the purpose of the prophet's work, which consumes more space than anything else in the prophetic books, and I believe God wants it to consume a great deal of space in our own lives because we all tend to sink back into sin, even though

we are justified through Christ, and our sins are completely laid upon him if we have sincerely from the heart turned to Him as Saviour, nevertheless we constantly need to be warned about the sins into which we so easily slip, and to turn to Him to help us gain victory over it and to do better next time.

So those sections -- I hope you will read a good bit and that you will study them and get the meaning for your heart that you should have for them.

The second purpose that involves a great deal of the prophetic writing is to encourage God's people, to encourage those who are sincerely trying to follow him by assuring them that God has blessing ahead for those who are truly his. It is to give constant renewed assurance. That is the purpose of most of the future prophets. Some of the future prophecy are definitely connected with rebuke for sin telling how God is going to punish. Terrible events are going to come.

But another large part of the future predictions are definitely connected with this matter of comforting God's people, and giving them assurance. The Bible is not written simply to satisfy our curiosity. You can get a crowd together and tell them about what God's word says Russia is going to do in the next 5 years, and what will happen to the Arab states, and what the future of the U.S. is, and if you are a dynamic speaker you will arouse great interest by it. If in the course of doing so you really stress the gospel and the importance of being true to the Lord, I say you have done some good, even if some of what you say is a lot of imagination.

I do not believe Scripture was written in order to satisfy our curiosity about the future. But the Lord does give us many glimpses about definite aspects of the future, and he gives it for the direct purpose of leading us to have greater confidence in Him and to live more as He wants us to live.

There is a comparatively small part of the prophetic books that is devoted to telling God's people just what they should do in a particular situation. That, of course, has immediate relation to their situation. The people of Jerusalem are told by Isaiah, Don't worry about the Assyrians: they are not going to destroy Jerusalem. God will protect you. People 150 yrs. later are told by Jeremiah, God is going to bring Nebuchadnezzar to destroy Jerusalem and these people who say God is going to protect Jerusalem are false prophets. His message was precisely the opposite as far as the immediate situation.

It was important for people of Isaiah's day to trust God and know that He was going to protect them. It was important for people in Jeremiah's day to realize that God was now sending a punishment for their sins, and they were going to go into exile and they should not hold on to false hopes. So the immediate situation was quite different. Rarely, if ever, does God give as specific directions as that, today.

But all that He gave his people in OT and NT gives us examples of how He works, how he deals with his people. It gives us principles that can have great application to us as we decide what to do in our own lives. But I think we all realize how ~~xxxx~~ foolish it is to think you can open your Bible and take a verse and that will give you God's guidance. That's not the purpose of the Bible. I believe God does lead His people very definitely at certain crucial points in their lives. I think that at most points in our lives He wants us to make our own decisions in the light of the principles taught in His Word. He will guide us and lead us but, but He rarely simply says Go this way or go that way. He wants us to learn how to follow Him.

So those are the three great purposes of prophecy. Then as we read the prophets we must always realize that the prophet immediately spoke to his own people. He did not sit down in a private place somewhere and have a vision for the distant future. The nearest you come to that is in Isaiah 40 to 56 where Isaiah tells how God is going to deliver his people from exile 150 yrs. later, but even in that case I'm quite sure he was speaking directly to the godly in his own day giving them assurance that though the exile was certain to come, God was going to deliver them eventually from it. And God was going to send His own Son to deal with the question of sin, that caused the exile.

I believe that is the nearest we have of something that has relevance more largely to the distant/<sup>future</sup> than even to those in the immediate time then, though even there, I believe His immediate purpose was for his faithful followers of Isa. then.

To truly understand the prophetic books you have to understand the relation of the prophet to his own people, and that is a relation you have to learn & through a study of the historic books and through the incidental references in the prophetic books which gives us clues as to exactly how the prophet is dealing with a particular situation.

Personally I think the prophets said a great deal more than what is included in the Bible, but God causes that that should be written in the Bible and preserved which had meaning not only for his own day but for his followers in future days. not necessarily for all his followers; not necessarily for all his followers in any one time. There may be things in the Bible that were tremendously meaningful for people 50 years ago that it is hard for us to see the relevance to today. And there may be matters in the Bible if the Lord carries that will exactly fit our needs 100 yrs. from now that it is hard for us to see the relevance to today, and there may be passages in the Bible which exactly fit our needs today which would have been very difficult for them to see then.

We can't rule any section out. God can open up matters that we didn't realize were there and may have great relevance for today. I would say then that all Scripture has relevance to believers at all ages, but that it all has relevance to the people in the immediate time and you have to learn a good bit about the immediate time in order to understand ~~it~~ truly its relevance to your own life.

Another matter I had a number of questions about and which is very important and is not fully grasped. I've touched on it a couple of times. The ~~imp~~ nature of the prophet's vision of the future. The prophet did not have a ~~book~~ book that gave an account of everything that's going to happen in the future and he picked things from it that he was going to tell us. God gave the prophet glimpses of future events where it related to His purpose and the message He wanted to give.

These visions he gave might be given in words; they might be given in pictures. He might see a picture and describe it. He might see an event happen and describe it in his own words but God would keep it from error as he described it. So that the words would not give a false idea of what God had given him. But as he looked into the future there is always some relation to the immediate situation.

When he makes a specific statement about the immediate future often the relation is very very close, as when Samuel told Saul that his father's donkeys had been found ~~and~~ and that they were now worried about him, and told him that when he went down ~~the~~ the hill he would meet a group of prophets coming up. He gave him some specific account of things that were going to happen in the immediate future that God revealed to him. The prophet, however, in most of what is preserved, looks further ahead. He looks further ahead and it is not always easy to tell how far he is looking.

Because in order to give comfort and encouragement in relation to a certain situation the Lord may give the prophet a view of something 100 years later. Or he may give him a view of something 10 years later. Or he may ~~give~~ give him a view of something thousands of years later. The distances are often foreshortened. I don't believe there is such a thing as the statement about the immediate event that also describes an event thousands of years later. Though there may be a principle as the relation of Isaiah to his disciples (children) is similar to the specific event of the relation of Christ to his followers.

When we look at the more distant future it is possible that some events may be telescoped. It is possible there may be a foreshortening in his view. I believe all these things are important to keep in mind as we try to understand specific sections of the Word.

We have taken quite a bit of time looking at Isaiah 7 and 8.

They lay a foundation for this whole section. In those chs. we noticed the great emphasis on the security of the people. That's naturally the thought of most people. What is going to happen to me in the near future? We find that God's desire was they should trust Him. They had no power to handle the various conquerors of the great powers who were at that time and work their way cleverly through(?) (to undo?) them. There was no way they could do that. But if God carries them through it they could safely trust Him. If God didn't carry them safely through they ~~could~~ could know it was for His own purposes, and there was a good reason. in back of it.

So he sent the word to Ahaz: You don't need to worry about Ephraim and Syria. God will protect you from them." But Ahaz had his own clever schemes which God says cannot protect you; in fact they will do you harm. So God rebukes Ahaz, and says all of this will just do away with the ~~buffe~~ state and bring you right against the terrible power of brutal Assyria which will do great damage to your land.

In this section I don't think that the vision of the prophet goes beyond the invasion of Sennacherib. Later on there are places where he sees clear beyond the exile, but in our present section as far as the question of the security of the nation, and as far as the relation of God to the political situation is concerned, he looks forward to a great climax that will take place c. 30 yrs. later in which Sennacherib's army will come and overrun all Judah. The only possible way they could be delivered is by supernatural deliverance by the Lord, and God assures them this is going to come. This is one of the high spots of our present section.

You might say as far as security there are two particular emphases: one is your clever schemes of looking to human forces to deliver you will only do harm; you are rebuked for them, they are wrong, they will only do harm. The other emphasis is it is God's will to give you protection from the Assyrians; they will never destroy you. Eventually at the end of ch. 39 he gives the specific word that it is the Babylonians who will destroy them 150 years later.

So when all the powers around --even mighty Egypt was falling to Assyria, God protected Jerusalem and enabled them to survive another century. So that is the great climax ~~xxxxxx~~ of the view so far as the security of the people is concerned

The other thing we noticed that was so important was that the House of David which was supposed to be God's representatives on earth, the leaders of God's people, here is Ahaz and others who are degenerate who are not following God's desires-- God will replace them. He will send His own Son. He will send the One who is the true King, the true Son of David, and we look forward to that in ch. 7; ~~We~~ a little in ch. 8, a great deal in ch. 9 and a great deal in ch. 11.



I want to turn rather hurriedly to ch. 31 which I wanted to look over today. By the way it is our idea ordinarily to take about 2 hrs. of preparation for a class. Plan to have the assignments not more than an hour and a half. But it's very hard to make it equal because I want to cover certain ground and it varies from point to point. The assignment for next time is one which you could spend 4 or 5 hrs. on it if you felt like it, but I think that in a hour and a quarter everyone should get a sufficient answer for the questions I've asked for next time. Probably in a hour. There may be some of it you can't answer, but you can at least get your mind open to the problem and a little idea of the ch. so as to be prepared for our discussion of it next week.

I asked you to look at chs. 30 and 31 and make an outline of them. I believe most everyone realized quite fully that these two chs. are parallel. He goes through certain material and then he goes through a little bit of it again! So we look at the second of them first. The ~~shortest~~ shortest one-- a summary of the first. In ch. 31 we have a situation which is evidently a little later than the situation in ch.30. Ahaz looked to Assyria for deliverance. Assyria has removed the border states that are right next to Assyria. Assyria has overrun a considerable amount of the land. There is danger of the Assyrian army coming and doing worse as they did 30 yrs. later under Sennacherib.

Now, what shall we do? Ahaz says, My plan to get Assyrian help helped me about the others; it delivered me from the others alright, but I'm in worse danger now but don't worry we'll get Egypt to help us, and we'll play off one great power against another." God says that playing off evil powers against one another will never work. So in ch. 30 and 31 he immediately starts by showing them the folly of this sort of alliance with wickedness in order to accomplish God's purposes and keep yourself going.

So he says, Woe unto those who go down to Egypt for help and rely on horses." In these days Egypt was the great land of the horse; the strong horses were the security of Egypt. Solomon had sent and gotten great numbers of horses from Egypt. Woe to those who go down to Egypt for help and trust in the multitude of their chariots . . . but do not look to the Holy One of Israel, or seek help from the Lord. Yet He too is wise and can bring disaster." No matter how strong the Egyptians are God can send the disaster if He chooses.

"He does not take back his words. He will rise up against the house of the wicked, against those who help evildoers. But the Egyptians are men, and not God; their horses are flesh and not spirit. When the Lord stretches out his hand . . . both will perish together." So we have three verses here in which they are strongly warned against looking to Egypt, for help. Then, however, the Lord says in the rest of the ch., Egypt will not protect you, but I'm going to protect you.

So he looks forward to the coming of Sennacherib with his great armies. The Lord says, You humanly could not possibly be delivered from Sennacherib. The Egyptian force will not be sufficient to deliver you from them, but I'm going to deliver you in a supernatural way. I'm going to deliver you in ways you would never dream of.

So in vv.4-9 he speaks of this. You notice the emphasis on supernatural means of deliverance. Look at the end of v.4, "so the Lord Almighty will come down to do battle on Mt. Zion and on its heights. Like birds hovering overhead the Lord Almighty will shield Jerusalem." And some say there is a prediction of the planes of the Israeli delivering them from the attack by the Syrians! Well, in the context I don't believe this has any direct relevance to our day. The principles are there--that God can protect His own and in His own way and time.

"Like birds hovering" to people in those days, and to people even 100 years ago, the idea of protecting by birds hovering -- here the birds are flying overhead but what harm can they do? What harm can they do to the people who are trying to attack? It is by means that are absolutely beyond your control that the Lord will deliver. Like birds hovering overhead the Lord will shield Jerusalem. . . he will pass over it and will rescue it."

Then there is a plea: "Return to him you have greatly revolted against, O Israelites. For in that day . . ." This phrase "in that day." One of these days I may assign -- I certainly will to the graduate students, I may to the rest, I'm not sure how the assignments will work out for the rest of the semester -- to look up all the occurrences in Isaiah of "in that day." If you do so, I believe you'll agree with the conclusion I reached that "in that day" in Isaiah may mean in the day I've just been speaking about; but it's more apt to mean "there will be a day." Since that fits equally in both cases, I think in all cases we should when we find him saying "in that day" something will happen we should understand it to mean "in the day I'm going to speak of which may be the day I've just been speaking about or it may not." But I feel that idiomatically we should say, "There will be a time when."

He says, A time is coming when every one of you will reject the idols of silver and gold your sinful hands have made." Perhaps the time he is speaking of is the time when Sennacherib comes, and the people see the folly of trusting in these. Or perhaps Isaiah is looking forward to the fact that after the exile that is one thing that become characteristic of the Jews. Though they often fell into sin, into wickedness, they were delivered after the exile from the sin of idolatry which they had so easily fallen into so many times before, And through the six years since the Jews have been noted for their deliverance from this sin of idolatry.

At any rate he says the time is coming, and to some extent the time would come when Sennacherib's army was all around.

People can talk very much as if there is no God, there is no higher force we can just depend on the strength of our own army, but when people get into a crisis people find that most of them try to look to some supernatural power. They realize that the forces of the universe are far beyond our control. If we know about God and Christ, God uses that situation to turn our attention to Him.

So there is an important principle in this verse and a prediction regarding Israel. Then he continues showing the supernatural deliverance from Assyria. Assyria will fall by a sword that is not of man; a sword, not of mortals will devour them." When do you find another prediction like that? How could that be fulfilled? It was fulfilled when the angel of the Lord came and slew great multitudes of the Assyrians. One of the greatest miracles in the OT!

That does not mean necessarily that God caused an angel to come with an invisible sword to smite all those troops. It is not impossible that God did that and that was the method He used. It is equally possible I believe that he caused a pestilence to come and there are those who think it may have been the bubonic plague, which spread rapidly through the army and killed great multitudes of them. We do not know what the precise method was that God used, but it was something the Israelites had absolutely no control over, no way of foreseeing something that could hardly parallel any other similar war situation, in ancient times.

Scripture tells us how this great miraculous deliverance was brought about to deliver them from Sennacherib. "Assyria will fall by a sword that is not of man; a sword, not of mortals will devour them. They will fall before the sword and their young men will be put to forced labor. Their stronghold will fall because of terror" --- you remember how Sennacherib had to go back to Ninevah quickly because the small force he had left was not enough to if but people realized the situation they could attack and destroy it. "At the sight of the battle standard their commanders will panic, declares the Lord, whose fire is in Zion, whose furnace is in Jerusalem."

I was in Berlin in 1959 not long after the end of the Russian blockade and just before Russia put up the wall to cut off West Berlin from the rest of that part of Germany. I went to a lecture there. A man called it Berlin, the Burning Point of Europe. He used those very words: the burning point of Europe. To them at that time it appeared as if Berlin was the place where things would come to a crisis. The West was determined to keep Berlin from being overrun by the Russians although they had allowed 1/3 of the ~~Russia~~ Germany around to be taken over and made slaves of by the Russians.

It's interesting the very words used here. "The Lord whose fire is in Zion, whose furnace is in Jerusalem." In other words many important things would center in Jerusalem

When

in these days just ahead. ~~WIZM~~ Sennacherib came about 20 or 30 yrs. after Isaiah spoke, he took all the fenced cities of Israel-- of Judah we read-- I don't know whether that "all" is to be taken absolutely every one. At least every one of great importance, and he over ran most of the country, but of Jerusalem all he could say was, "I shut Hezekiah up like a bird in a cage." He has to tacitly admit defeat by a supernatural force in that situation.

In ch. 29 which we won't look at for 2 weeks, but which in this connection it begins, "Woe to you, Ariel, Ariel, the city where David settled!" What does Ariel mean? There are two ways of taking "Ariel." One is that the word \_\_\_\_\_ which means a lion, could mean the lion of God. Woe to you lion of God. As he goes on talking it does not sound much like a lion! There is another word that sounds just about the same \_\_\_\_\_ which means a hearth. Most interpreters take it to mean a hearth, like a furnace-- the term we used at the end of this other chapter. The furnace-- the place where God is going to show His mighty supernatural power. We won't get to that for two weeks, but it fit right in at that point. I wanted to call your attention to it.

Look now at ch. 30 which is much longer than ch. 31. It begins exactly like ch. 31, that is the exact same idea, but different words. It also ends exactly where ch. 31 does. It begins rebuking them. "Woe to the obstinate children, declares the Lord, to those who carry out plans. . . forming an alliance, but not by my Spirit heaping sin upon sin; who go down to Egypt without consulting me. . . But Pharaoh's protection will be to your shame, Egypt's shade will bring you disgrace." Actually about 50 years after this an Assyrian army overran all of Egypt. Egypt had a great reputation for its great power from previous times, but it was now in a decline which they did not recognize.

Nations go into decline, and often it's not recognized at all. Back in 1898 when the U.S. declared war on Spain, practically everyone in Europe said, How silly for a little group of colonies over there in America declaring war on the mighty power of Spain. How ridiculous! But when the war started the Spanish forces melted away like nothing! Spain had been the greatest power in Europe a century or two before. It still had the reputation. Egypt still had the reputation, but Egypt's power was as the Lord says was minimal. It's great reputation was what they were trying to put their trust in.

A different situation but the same principle. They trusted Assyria and Assyria brought them more harm than good. They trust Egypt, but Egypt is unable to give them any real effective support. So they form an alliance but not by my spirit. They looked up to Pharaoh, but Pharaoh's protection will be to your shame, Egypt's shade will bring you disgrace. Though they have officials in Zoan . . . everyone will be put to shame

because of a people useless to them who bring neither help nor advantage, but only shame and disgrace."

IN NIV the next verse(v.6) begins, "An oracle concerning the animals of the Negev." That brings very vividly before us the problem of translation. KJV says, The burden of the animals of the Negev. The Negev is the southern part of Palestine between the ~~settled~~ settled area and the real desert. The semi-desert area, the Negev. Literally it is "the burden of the animals of the Negev."

Earlier in Isaiah there are several chs. that begin "the burden of Babylon," "the burden of Philistia," the burden of different places, and it's very evidently there the message of doom that God is bringing against that nation. Is what the burden means in those cases. So the NIV in those chs., I haven't looked at them but imagine they translate it oracle, it is not a strictly literal translation, but it certainly gives the idea in the original. And gives exactly the idea as it was then. It is a little bit in the direction of a paraphrase when you give a word that is not quite            but gives the idea where you think people wouldn't get the idea from the original. It's a very hard problem of translation. To know to how great an extent one should stick to ~~the~~ words which may not convey meaning, or to use a certain amount of paraphrase.

But here they have been influenced by cases earlier where "the burden" they have translated "oracle" which would be meaningful to people today. In this particular case I think they are wrong. An oracle concerning the animals of the Negev! Why bring rebuke against the animals of the Negev? Does he want to say that the animals of the Negev are going to be destroyed? I believe it is here in its literal sense: the burden of the animals of the Negev. He goes on to tell about their burden. "Through a land of hardships and distress of lions and lionesses. . . their envoys carry their riches on donkeys' backs, their treasures on the humps of camels . . . to Egypt." They are carrying big heavy loads. He is referring to the burdens that are carried by these animals through the Negev. You take it strictly literal I believe here; slightly figurative in the other cases where he means the messages of prophecy against forces God wishes to rebuke.

He is showing that Ahaz is now sending great amounts of stuff to Assyria(~~to~~) to get them to come and deliver them; now he is sending greater amounts of stuff to Egypt to get them to come and help from Assyria! They are carrying all this stuff, their treasures on the humps of camels to that unprofitable nation, to Egypt, whose help is utterly useless. Therefore I call her Rahab the Do-Nothing." Just why he calls her Rahab, I don't know. It certainly has nothing to do with Rahab of Jericho. The term is used 2 or 3 times in the OT to refer to Egypt, so it may be very well be a ~~sort~~ sort of slang term that was used in those days of which we have no precise record. We know it was Egypt because it is so used in 2 or 3 other cases.

And of course the context requires it to be so used here. "Go now, write it on a tablet for them, inscribe it on a scroll, that for the days to come it may be an everlasting witness." He has spoke against Egypt through v. 7. Now he goes on in vv.8-17 to give rebuke to the unfaithful whom he has just be critisizing for their looking to Egypt for help instead of looking to God.

"Go now write in on a tablet for them. . . these are rebellious people, deceitful children, children unwilling to listen to the Lord's instructions. They say to the seers, See no more visions....tell us pleasant things, prophesy illusions. Leave this way, get off this path, and stop confronting us with the Holy One of Israel. Therefore this is what the Holy One of Israel says, Because you have rejected this message. . . this sin will become for you like a high wall, cracked and bulging. . . it will break in pieces like pottery. . . "

failure

Is he looking to the utter danger of their attempt to deliver themselves from Sennacherib. Only God can deliver them. Or does the prophet look beyond and see how eventually they are going to go into exile and even further how in 70 A.D. they are going to find themselves unable to resist the power of the Romans as they go on in their ungodly ways instead of trusting Him and following His Saviour whom he sends to them?

Then v.15, This is what the Sovereign Lord, the Holy One of Israel says (NIV) but there the Hebrew ~~says~~ says, This is what the Sovereign Lord . . . has said." I believe "has said" is the better translation. Very often we cannot tell whether it should be "has said" or said in the sense it was then said, has said in the sense he has said and is still saying it. Actually there is no Heb. word exactly ~~corresponding~~ corresponding to our English "said." It's either "has said" or "will say" in practically all cases. You could say "is saying" but that is comparatively much less used.

Here is what God said, In repentance and rest is your salvation, in quietness and trust is your strength, but you would have none of it." He is saying to us ~~and~~ as he said to them" in repentance and rest is your salvation . . ." We cannot win our salvation. It is only through trusting in Christ. Thru quietly trusting in Him and throwing our sins on him, looking to him for salvation, and then looking to him to either give us a happy life to show forth His glory, or a life of many disappointments in which we can show His glory by the way we bear them, and take them. We don't know what His specific will is for us. But we know He wants us to have quietness and trust whatever he sends.

This is what the Lord said, but you would have none of it. You said, No we will flee on horses." Ahaz said, No we will not trust the Lord, we will get Assyria. Assyria became a bigger danger than Israel. Now he says, I'm going to get help from Egypt. Egypt is going to fail. What are you going to do? Well, we'll flee on horses. Therefore you will flee. They say, You said we'll ride on swift horses. Therefore your pursuers will be swift. A thousand

A thousand will flee at the threat of one, at the threat of five you will all flee away, till you are completely destroyed! It doesn't say that! I hope you have your Bible open before you. I don't know what version you have, but it does not say, You will flee till you are completely destroyed.

You will flee until you are left just a little tiny remnant somewhere. That's not what he says. He says you will flee till you are left like a flagstaff on a mountaintop, like a banner on a hill." When somebody is fleeing they don't go up on a hill and put up a big sign so everybody will see them! hey don't do that. They go and hid. They try to get away. But he says, You will flee until you are left like a flagstaff on a mountain top, like a banner on a hill.

Here is a specific prediction of the long distant future of the Jews. All the other nations of nations of antiquity have disappeared. We talk of Egypt today, but we call it an Arab nation. How much of old Egyptian blood is in it we don't know. But its culture is almost entirely Arab. There is a little group today called the Assyrians, but whether they have any connection with ancient Assyria we don't know. The area where the Assyrians were they call Iraq today. The powers of ancient times-- Greece, Rome, all the powers have disappeared. But today there is still found Jews in just about every land.

They've been scattered through the world. They have fled. They were persecuted and mistreated . Hitler was perhaps as much interested in destroying the Jews as he was in winning the war. Perhaps if Hitler hadn't bothered to try to destroy the Jews he might have won the war. The Allies couldn't understand the fact that during the bitter days of crisis during the war there were great German trains needed for transporting troops, that were going nowhere near where the troops were needed. They were carrying Jews on to Auschwitz to be destroyed. Hitler said, We are going to make a final solution of the Jewish problem by completely destroying them.

I don't know whether there were 5 or 6 million he destroyed, but I read of a man who went to Auschwitz shortly after the war and saw the glasses that had been taken off the dead bodies and piled in great heaps with many thousands of glasses that had been taken off people when they were destroyed. Hitler wanted to destroy the Jews completely. He thought that was one of his great objects in life. He completely failed. But they will be left "like a flagstaff on a mountain top, like a banner on a hill."

Question: Verse 17-- why couldnot that have an immediate fulfillment in the sense that in 30 years the ones in Jerusalem would be the only ones left?

AAM: That, of course, was partly fulfilled, but they did not actually flee. They stayed in Jerusalem. Some may have fled into Jerusalem. You could say the people who were able to flee

and get into Jerusalem fled into there. Jerusalem was protected and Jerusalem stayed. But why does he say "like a banner on a hill." The ancient world didn't care a lot about Jerusalem. There were 100 great cities most of them destroyed by the Assyrians. In some cases they didn't get to them. But it does not find a complete fulfillment in those days, but the prophet has a vision clear on through the centuries.

He saw that in the language he uses suggests that they are going to be terribly punished but not destroyed, but not merely not destroyed but there is going to be a remnant that is going to stand up as a sign! It will be like a flagstaff, like a banner.

Frederick the Great, the great German leader of 2 or 300 years ago, took a comparatively small area of Prussia and built it into a great force that eventually became dominant in all that area. He once scoffingly said to his chaplain, "Give me in one word some evidence that Christianity is true?" The chaplain said, "The Jew. The fact of the Jews being scattered throughout the world, and yet surviving. The one nation from antiquity that has survived. It is a sign of the fulfillment of God's prediction. Persecuted, suffering and yet standing true to their opposition to idolatry and continuing their existence. I don't believe there has been a single generation since the time of Christ in which there has not been a considerable number of Jews converted to Christianity and some of them have become great Christian leaders.

Yet there has remained this separate group through all this time as a flagstaff, a banner--an indication of the truth of God's Word. The selection of these particular words goes far beyond the tremendous prediction the rest of the ch. gives about the supernatural deliverance of Jerusalem from Sennacherib's seemingly invincible force. They say, "Oh well we'll look to something else for help. We'll flee." He says, "You will flee. They say, 'We'll flee on swift horses. The people who pursue you will be swift too. You cannot humanly survive, but there will remain a remnant and not only a remnant but a remnant that will be visible. It will not be hidden away in a cave. It will be up on a mountain. It will be like a flagstaff. Like a banner. It will be an evidence to the world of the truth of God's Word.

I thought we'd get through this ch. today, but we'll continue there next time. Some of you took a bit more than 2 hrs. on your assignment for today; I don't think anyone needs to take more than an hour and a half on the assignment for next time. . . . If in the hour and a half you have not seen the things I ask you to look for, just say no. But you will be familiar with the chapter and we'll look at ch. 28 and I think we'll see some interesting things emerge as we look at it.



In this course we are studying two passages of Isaiah. Two passages that are parallel. They are each a definite unit. Chapters 7-12 are sharply distinguished from what follows. It is lightly, but definitely distinguished, from what precedes. Chs. 28-35 are rather sharply separated from what precedes and also from what follows. So in each of these two cases it is quite clear we have a definite division.

In the ancient Heb. and ancient Greek they did not usually put in divisions. They did not have quotation marks or exclamation points. There are many cases where they have nothing corresponding with a question mark. So there is much more which we have to decide from context than there is with out modern types of typography. That means that often we don't have an understanding of the whole passages (if we don't) we are apt to mistranslate or misinterpret a certain part of the background.

The KJV is very difficult when you get to difficult passages in the OT for most people today, because so many words have changed their meaning. So many manners of saying things are different, to day from what they were in those days. In addition to that while on the whole it was a very excellent translation for 300 years ago, there are many points at which I believe their interpretation is better than the interpretation of most of the recent translations.

Yet in some rather difficult passages such as chs. 28 and 29 it is quite clear that the KJV revisers did not study into the passage enough to see what it was really about. Therefore they translated sort of word for word rather than in the light of context to present the idea that those words were supposed to present. I believe you find it much easier to get the sense of ch. 28 if you use a modern version, than if you use the KJV. But there are two or three cases where the KJV has unfortunately mistranslated or has translated in what I would say a rather sloppy manner due to their not having studied the passage as a whole.

We have the same situation at the beginning of both of these long chs. Both the section from 7-12 and from 28 - 35 start with Ahaz, the man who was supposed to be David's successor, head of the people of God but was not interested in God's will. A man who was a scorner, a scoffer, a man who was seeking by what he thought was clever reasoning to figure how he could advance himself and his country. The Lord said, If you would trust me, this being my people and you being the descendant of David who was head of my people---if you will trust me, I will see you safely through it. Your clever scheme is not going to profit you at all. You will be worse off as a result of it than before. Instead of it delivering you from Israel, Judah is going to be overrun by Assyria several times reaching a great climax in the coming of Sennacherib. Nevertheless, he says, You are still my people and Sennacherib is not



So in this situation where they are having this great banquet of celebration-- how many people there knew what the banquet was about we don't know, but at least the leaders in the banquet knew. Here they are having this big banquet and Isaiah comes in. You might say, Where is your ticket? What right have you to come in? It may be it was more or less open and a very general invitation given. A good many people were in there and some of them were people who thought highly of Isaiah, and they could not say, Look here; you're not invited, you don't belong here!

Anyway a prophet in those days had certain privileges. He could speak out on various occasions, and people were expected to listen. So Isaiah steps into the banquet and says something that pleases them greatly. They are going to be delivered from Ephraim's attacks because the Assyrians are coming. If only they could hold off Ephraim long enough so as not to be overrun by them before the Assyrians get there!

So he says, Woe to that wreath, the pride of Ephraim's drunkards." These fellows sitting at their tables and enjoying a sumptuous meal, they are happy to be reminded that they don't have to worry about Ephraim. Ephraim is coming. They are going to try to protect themselves from Ephraim. Isaiah says, Woe to Ephraim. Well, that's great. That makes everybody feel happy!

So nobody feels like throwing Isaiah out yet. They are interested in listening. "Woe to that wreath, the pride of Ephraim's drunkards." Oh yes that awful drunkards up there. That's not saying what we are! They are awful drunkards up there. We are glad to hear them rebuked. "The fading flower, his glorious beauty, set on the head of a fertile valley-- to that city, the pride of those laid low by wine!"

Some of these fellows here are barely able to stand up, but still they can look down on those drunkards up there! "Laid low by wine." "See the Lord has one who is powerful and strong. Like a hailstorm and a destructive wind, like a driving rain and a flooding downpour." What is this -- like a hailstorm and a destructive wind? Like a driving rain and a flooding downpour? Is this describing the coming of the Assyrian army? Is it going to sweep over ~~Egypt~~ Ephraim? This is grand to know it's going to happen, isn't it?

"He will throw it forcefully to the ground. That wreath, the pride of Ephraim's drunkards." He repeatedly talks about those drunkards of Ephraim. And they all say, Oh my, those awful drunkards of Ephraim. "That will be trampled underfoot. That fading flower, his glorious beauty set on the head of a fertile valley, will be like a fig ripe before harvest-- as soon as someone sees it and takes it in his hand, he swallows it." A figurative expression of someone going into a vineyard and seeing just one fig that's really ripe. He hasn't had any figs since last year. He grabs it off the tree and he swallows it down hurriedly. Just like that-- Ephraim is going to be overcome. My that's wonderful isn't it?

Then we have a break. They are very happy to hear Isaiah give this denunciation of Ephraim that they are so affraid will conquer them before the Assyrians get there. But here he turns his attention. He says, "In that day" -- I think in our present idiom it would be better to say, "There will be a day when." "There will be a day when the Lord Almighty will be a glorious crown, a beautiful wreath for the remnant of his people."

Here is this beautiful wreath. Samaria the city of that time, many times as big as Jerusalem. It was on a much higher hill than Jerusalem. Had a much greater outlook. It seemed to be far ahead of Jerusalem. Actually it was the capitol of the country that was twice as big as the country over which Jerusalem was the capitol at that time. He says, Here is this wreath that is going to be wipped out. It will completely disappear. But the day is coming when the Lord Almighty will be a glorious crown, a beautiful wreath for the remnant of his people."

There are going to be some people left. There are going to be people left from the northern kingdom; people who are true believers; people who may have to go through captivity and misery but whom God is going to bring out safely -- "for the remnant of his people he will be a beautiful wreath. He will be a spirit of justice to him who sits in judgment, a source of strength to those who trun back the battle at the gate."

So these two verses, the banqueters have sort of put up with. They say, That was great what he said to encourage the people who might begin to Ephraim. Because they believe God is going to protect us. We are going to win out. We won't be overcome by them. That's helpful. Fine! Of course he uses some pious expressions. You can expect that from a prophet. We won't worry too much about it.

But then (v.7) he says, "And these also stagger from wine and reel from beer." You may talk about the drunkards of Ephraim and we the way they are! But look at these folks. He says, They are just as bad! They don't like that particularly, but he's already gotten their attention. He's gotten their interest.

There are many lessons in tact in Scripture. There are times when somebody goes up to a man and shakes his fist in his face and says, You old sinner, it's time you turned to the Lord and repent. And the Lord uses it to bring him to Him. But in most cases the Lord uses more tactful methods. In most cases He wants us to get their attention, their interest. Then we're in position to give the message.

Question: Did you say that in v.7 he turns ~~to~~ his attention from Ephraim to Judah?

Yes. Exactly. "These also." That Hebrew word he put in

there --"these" -- ordinarily you wouldn't have a subject. The KJV just says "these" -- They" and it doesn't give the thought at all.

Question: Are vv.5 and 6 specifically or are they more general?

I think vv.5 and 6 are a general description of God's mercy to quite an extent of the remnant of the northern kingdom. Some may think, Well, Israel is gone; we're the remnant. They all are the remnant. That's great. Look at the position we're in when they are gone. We're the remnant. Probably both ideas were in it. People could take it either way they wanted to.

But then he turns his attention to "these". The people directly in front of him. And he says, "These also stagger. . . . priests and prophets stagger from beer and are befuddled with wine, and reel from strong drink. They stagger from seeing visions; they stumble when rendering decisions."

Of course the leaders think, That's where he is wrong. He says, We stumble when we make decisions. We we made a mighty good decision making the agreement with Assyria. They are going to destroy Ephraim and Aram and make you safe-- make us safe. A good decision! He says, They stumble when rendering decisions.

He says, All the tables are covered with vomit and there is not a spot without filth. That's a pretty strong statement. They don't like that.

The next verse(v.9) in NIV has quotation marks at the beginning. There are no quotation marks in KJV, and no quotation marks in Hebrew. But from the sense of the passage it is very clear that what follows, "Who is it he is trying to teach?" is somebody else talking about Isaiah. Who does Isaiah think he is trying to teach? talking to us this way. Who is he talking to? To whom is he explaining the message? Does he think we are children weaned from their milk, those just taken from the breast?

"For it is." And then the next words are hard to translate into English, precisely though the general thought is very clear. KJV translates them: "Precept must be upon precept" - the "must be" in italics should not be there. Precept is upon precept, precept is on precept; line on line, line on line. Here a little, there a little."

NIV has it a little differently. The same idea. "Do and do, do and do. rule on rule, rule on rule, a little here, a little there." He's talking to us like little children, repeating the same thing over and over. You get this this this. Isaiah is always coming with this talk. You trust in God. You follow Him. You remember the old way God did in the past. That's just baby talk! We don't want that stuff!

What's he trying to do? They are mumbling to each other now. This is what they are saying.

Isaiah answers them in v.11. That is not made clear in KJV. It says, "For with stammering lips and another tongue will I speak to this people." That ties in with what precedes where it does belong. It starts with "for" while the preposition ci could just as well be translated "but." The NIV is a little here but I think it expresses the idea pretty well. Very well then, with foreign lips and strange tongues God will speak to this people. What does that mean?

You don't want to take God's this, this, this, do this do this, do this. His simple teaching of the Bible. You think it's like treating you like children that way. Well, he says, God is going to speak to you with foreign lips and strange tongue. This people to whom he said, This is the resting place, let the weary rest, and this is the place of repose, but they would not listen.

So then the word of the Lord to them will become: Do and do, do and do -- he repeats their words --- rule on rule, rule on rule' a little here, a little there -- so they will go and fall backward, be injured and snared and captured." You say, We are trying to give you baby talk. We are trying to give you these little simple pious things you think are a lot of nonsense. You won't listen to this. Well, God will speak to you with foreign lips and a strange tongue.

It sounds to you sort of like baby talk if you hear these Assyrian soldiers calling to one another what they are to do and rushing to your houses, grabbing your property, taking your children away captive. He says, If you won't listen to what you say is baby talk and a pious presentation of God's will, God is going to speak to you in a way that will seem to you like baby talk. He will speak to you with another tongue. With other lips in what will sound to you like gibberish, but God will speak to you in that way.

Now that meant the Assyrian army. They might not be able to grasp that as yet, but in the light of context that is what it is. As you go on further in the ch. it becomes quite clear.

So this will happen: they will go and fall backward, be injured and snared and captured. Therefore -- now he speaks quite directly to them-- hear the word of the Lord, you scoffers who rule this people in Jerusalem, You boast, We have entered into a covenant with death, with the grave we have made an agreement. When an overwhelming scourge sweeps by, it cannot touch us, ~~for we have made a lie~~== what do they mean by that? We've entered into a covenant with death, with hell we've made an agreement, when the overwhelming scourge sweeps by it won't touch us. In other words, You have your clever idea that here is this aggressive Assyrian force that is threatening to overrun everything; we're getting on their side! We're getting Assyria to help us. When Assyria overruns Aram and Israel it

won't hurt us! They may go on and attack somebody on the other side of us, but they won't bother us. We're their allies. We'll be perfectly safe.

We've made a covenant with death. We've made an agreement with hell. That way we're going to fight fire with fire. We've worked our clever scheme, our plan that's going to put us on the side of the terrible aggressor and bring us safely through it. ////We've made a lie our refuge, and falsehood our hiding place.

This is what the Sovereign Lord says. What does God say in answer to that? What did God say to Ahaz in the first place when Isaiah went out? He said, Trust in the Lord. The Lord can deliver. Here's what the Sovereign Lord says, "See I lay a stone in Zion, a tested stone, a precious cornerstone for a sure foundation; the one who trust will never be dismayed."

That word "dismayed" could also be translated, "shall not make haste." Both meanings are involved in the situation, which is the correct interpretation of the word, we can't tell. It's like ~~two~~ many words in English which have two possibilities. Because two different words have come together. Like if I say == if I hold up a little pocket testament and I say this book is light. It has a black cover, and you say, That's not light; that's dark. If I hold up to you a great big wedding Bible, a big heavy one that has white covers, and I say this book is light, you say, It's not light, it's heavy!'

Well, two old English words that were completely different have fallen together like our English word "light." Usually we can tell from context what the meaning is but there are cases where we can't. In this case we can't tell whether it should be "dismayed" or whether "will never make haste" but both are true. The one who trusts in the Lord need never be dismayed because he knows that all things are in accordance with God's will. If he's truly following the Lord, God works all things for his good. He need not be dismayed, and he need not make haste.

There's a difference between doing things rapidly and making haste. When we make haste we get all bothered and fussed and get things mixed up and probably do things wrong. We should never that way if we are truly trusting in the Lord.

In this verse Isaiah is looking at the immediate situation, but he is giving a general principle, and he is giving a general principle in words which can very specifically look forward to what God is going to do when He will provide a precious cornerstone for a sure foundation, a stone in Zion. So there is definitely a looking forward to Christ's coming but that is not the immediate significance. It is a general principle which finds its full application in Christ's coming.

Question: Does the NT where this prophecy is quoted in the NT give the answer. In Rom. 9:33, the one who believes in him will never be disappointed."

I'd have to look at the precise verse and see. There is a problem there in using a NT quotation to decide on the precise meaning of an OT passage there is always this problem. The NT usually quotes from the common translation. But if the points the NT is trying to bring out is not brought out in the common translation, it will give you a direct translation from the Hebrew to bring out that point.

If the NT quotation is dealing with a precise point under consideration, then you can say definitely, That's the way the OT should be translation. That's like a virgin shall bring forth. But if the point that is being brought out is clearly brought out and is a word that is closely related to that, that is a little different from the way you might translate the OT. passage. It may be simply quoted from the common translation.

You and I do the same thing. We quote a verse to bring out a point. There may be some part of the verse that is not quite as precisely translated as we might wish, but we don't spend time discussing that part of the verse. I would say you would have to see how vital it is to the immediate significance, and of course, both are true. He will not be dismayed and he will not make haste. They are two different ideas. To be disappointed is more like in that category. But I don't have the precise Greek word in mind, and I would not off hand unless I did.

So he looks way ahead, but he's looking ahead in relation to the present situation. He says, You must trust in God and know that God will set in place his cornerstone. You must trust in Him and you will never be dismayed or make haste.

"I will make justice the measuring line and righteousness the plumb line; hail will sweep away your refuge, the lie, and water will overflow your hiding place." You think you are safe because of your alliance with Assyria. You think Assyria is going to deliver you from Aram, and from Israel and you don't need to worry about it because you are on Assyria's side. You will find out that doesn't do you any good. The Assyrians will take everything in their way. They will overrun the land and eventually they will be ready to take Jerusalem itself, and I am going to protect you through that, the Lord says. I'm going to give you a great protection but it won't be because of any of your doings, it will be because of God's miraculous way. He will keep the Assyrians from destroying Jerusalem.

He makes it very clear: Hail will sweep away your refuge of lies; water will overflow your hiding place. Your covenant with death will be annulled. That is your covenant with the Assyrians that is bringing death to so many countries.



If you think that by getting on their side you are going to be safe, it's not going to work that way at all.

I remember Dr. Chisholm who was a very fine missionary in Korea before the beginning of the world war. In Korea the Japanese were making people go to the shrine, of the Japanese ancestors. Many of the missionaries said its just a form; we go and bow to the Japanese shrine, but it's just a form, a patriotic thing the Japanese are interested in here. If we submit to it we can carry on our missionary work unhindered. They were making this compromise.

But Dr. Chisholm was one of those who said, No, this is idolatry. He said, We cannot present to these Koreans the necessity of believing in God and trusting him alone, and then go and worship a Japanese shrine. He refused to do it. There were a number of missionaries like that who did, and these missionaries were hampered, some were imprisoned. They had quite a bit of persecution, from the Japanese occupying authority at the time.

But then the time came when the war between U.S. and Japan was ~~ended~~ and the missionaries all had to leave and come home or else those who did not were interned for the whole course of the war.

/// immanent///

Dr. Chisholm got on the boat and there was another missionary on the boat, one who had compromised with the Japanese authorities and had gone to their shrines and had given all these excuses that he was free to preach and to give the Word without interference. He went through this form of bowing at the heathen shrine. Dr. Chisholm went from Korea to Japan on the boat and stopped there and was thoroughly examined by the Japanese and then allowed to procede.

He said the Japanese authorities came on board. He had the records of all these missionaries and he said, William Chisholm. And Mr. Chisholm came forward. He said, Where's your baggage? He glanced at it, marked it and let him go. Then this other missionary was called forward who felt that he having gone to the shrine and compromised this way the Japanese would realize he was their friend and make him no trouble whatever.. He had made Dr. Chisholm a little trouble there that was a bit embarrassing. But this other man, they went through everything he had. They took every bit of ~~material~~ material he had and spread it out on the deck and examined it very thoroughly. That was so embarrassing, so humiliating to him.

He said the Japanese could understand a man standing for what he believed even at the cost of loosing some things. But with the man who compromised, they were willing to take advantage of his compromise but when it came to his ~~being~~ leaving, they didn't trust him, and they were going to go through everything that he had before they would let him go on.

As he says here, "the water will overflow your hiding place. Your covenant with death will be annulled." In the end that kind of compromise does not help one to advance the Lord's work. How much more does it fail to help them to advance such objectives as these people had. "Your agreement with hell will not stand. When the overwhelming scourge sweeps by you will be beaten down by it. As often as it comes it will carry you away; morning after morning, by day and by night, it will sweep through. The understanding of this message will bring sheer terror." So he points forward to the series of Assyrian incursions through their land that they were as a result of Ahaz' scheme, instead of trusting God.

Question: In v. 17, "I will make justice the measuring line and righteousness the plumb line", what does this mean?

It means that they will not profit by their underhanded schemes; that everything will bow in the light of God's justice, and they will suffer from it much worse than if they had not been made to

Question: Does this just pertain to war or is this a basis for separation from other particular areas?

Yes, I would say there is an area in which it is not always ~~absolutely~~ easy to draw absolutely sharp lines. But it is an area in which this definitely does apply, and I would say it better to draw too sharp a line than to make compromise on it. There is a right point to find in relation to it. The one who things that he can work with and deal with those who are destroying the work of God and thereby get a chance to advance the gospel, is usually going to find it doesn't work out. It does not receive God's favor.

This, I believe has a great deal to this ch. that has much application to us in our lives. "When the overwhelming scourge sweeps by you will be beaten down by it." But then v. 10. What does v. 20 mean if you don't have the context and situation in mind?

"The bed is too short to stretch out on, the blanket too marrow to wrap around you." He means: this scheme of yours that you think is going to protect you, isn't sufficient, it is not satisfactory. This bed is too short to stretch out on. The blanket is too marrow to wrap around you. It is a figurative expression, but in the context the meaning is absolutely clear. That your human schemes that disregard the Lord's will and the clear teachings of His Word, they will not work in the end. They will not give you a bed that's long enough to stretch out on, and a blanket that's wide enough to wrap yourself in.

"The Lord will rise up as he did at Mt. Perazim, he will rouse himself as in the Valley of ~~Bx~~ Gibeon.-- this ~~is~~ is referring to the when God used Joshua's army in

order to defeat the Canaanites. The Lord miraculously interfered in order to allow them to accomplish far more than would have been expected. He says, The Lord is going to use the Assyrians for His purposes. Heis -- You are going to find that this which you think is going to stop them, they won't stop there. ~~That~~ That is what it said in ch. 7 == it will sweep on through Judah.

Vs.22 "Now stop your mocking, or your chains will become heavier; the Lord, the Lord Almighty, has told me of the destruction decreed against the whole land." These 22 vv. give us the situation rather precisely. You see him in the banquet hall there speaking to the people. Whether they let him get this far, or whether they rose up and drove him out and he continues to talk to those who were rather distressed == impressed and followed him. I believe it was likely (?) he was able to get this far then.

He goes on talking about this general situation clear on to the end of 35 (?). And I would guess that most of that is given to a group of men that were interested in hearing the word of the Lord as Isaiah gave it to them.

Where have this direct denunciation here. We have some more direct denunciation as we go on. In the in which he spoke, whether it was to the whole banquet hall or whether it was to a group that ~~came~~ came out, or whether it was a group he continued talking to the next day-- there were those who were representative of the people ~~as a whole~~ as a whole. Those who represented the scoffers and the unbelievers and were not interested in what he had to say, but there were also the true followers of God.

Question: I was wondering where at the beginning you got the idea that Isaiah was speaking in a banquet ~~hall~~ hall. I didn't follow that.

Yes. I would say we get it most particularly from vv. 7 and 8 where he turns after criticizing the drunkards of Ephraim and he turns his attention to these people right here. He says, These people are also staggering from wine and strong drink. Their tables are full of vomiting. Why say tables unless he is in a place where there are tables?

Question: Are we to think that Isaiah remembered what he had said at the banquet, and went home and wrote about it, or was someone at the banquet recording his words, or how are we to understand the preservation of this account?

We don't know. Either one of those is possible. In those days when there wasn't as much writing as there is today people had much better memories, than they have today. Although people today -- there are people who have memorized the whole NT. There are Mohammedans who have memorized the whole Koran.

My memory was far better 50 yrs. ago than it is now. I remember once in college I was talking to a fellow, and he happened to refer to something that happened 6 months before. I remembered everything he said, and everything I said. I could not do that now.

q Memory varies. It is altogether possible Isaiah wrote it down. It's also possible he had a friend who wrote it down. I would say it is almost certainly written down soon after it happened.

The next part of the ch. I don't believe we need to spend a lot of time on. If you read it without the early part in mind, you wonder, What on earth is he talking about? But with the early part in mind, you can see a figurative presentation of a great number of spiritual truths. He is saying God works in logical reasonable ways.

"Listen and hear my voice; pay attention and hear what I say. When a farmer plows for planting, does he plow continually? Does he keep on breaking up and harrowing the soil? When he has leveled the surface, does he not sow caraway and scatter cummin? He plants wheat in a particular place, barley in its plot; spelt in its place. His God instructs him and teaches him the right way."

He is saying, God has His purpose in relation to different situations. We find this clearly brought out in the fact that Isaiah predicted God would protect Jerusalem and Jeremiah predicted God would destroy Jerusalem. They had a different situation, but all a part of God's plan. God's plan is ordered. God's plan is systematic.

You might say life is like a rug. An oriental rug at which you look at the bottom part and you look at the bottom and you see threads here and there; you don't see any pattern. There is no clear picture. But you see the front of it and it has a beautiful picture. But you look at the back of it and you see the wrong side of it, and see no picture. We look at it that way, but someday we'll see the whole picture. We'll see that God has worked in our lives in logical and reasonable fashion. He has a purpose in it all.

"Caraway is not threshed with a sledge, nor is a cartwheel rolled over cummin; caraway is beaten out with a rod, and cummin with a stick." God deals with you in proportion to your situation, and to your need, and to your character. You can trust in Him.

"Grain must be ground to make bread; so one does not go on threshing it forever. Though he drives the wheels of his threshing cart over it, his horses do not grind it." He uses different methods. He uses the method that pertains to the result he wants to bring to pass. We don't know each of us the full result that God wants to bring in our lives.

But we know God knows what is suited to bring the qualities into us He wants us to have. That bring the situations into our lives He wants us to have. God works in mysterious lives in the lives of all of us, but they are ways that are logical.

I detest that phrase "unconditional election." I certainly believe God has chosen those who are to be saved, but when you say "unconditional" it sounds as if He just reaches His hand into a hat and picks out a few names, and that certainly is not true! Of course that is not what the term is supposed to mean, but the term was selected in order to make an acronym and it was a poor selection. Because God has purposes in all that He does. There are conditions involved. He uses that which will accomplish the best results that He desires.

He will do that which needs the hard beating. He will use that, but to that which will be broken by it instead of being built up by it He uses more gentle methods.

This passage about the farmer is a passage which applies to the people in Israel. God's treatment of the wicked, and His treatment of the true believer. God's treatment of them in different situations and which apply to each of our lives too.

It's a passage which means nothing, I think, when you first read it, but reading it carefully in the light of what it means is all figurative, but they are very important figures that can apply to the way God deals with each one of us.

At the beginning of ch. 29, I'm not sure there should be a big break there. There is a little break. "Woe to you, Ariel, Ariel, the city where David settled!" Where did David settle? David was born in Bethlehem. David conquered Jerusalem and made it his capital. So Ariel here means Jerusalem. He is speaking here about Jerusalem. "Ariel" can be interpreted in two ways: arie could be a lion, or it could be a hearth. It could be either the lion of God, or the hearth of God.

I don't know that Jerusalem is ever called this anywhere else. It is perfectly obvious from the figure that he is here speaking about Jerusalem, and as between these two possibilities I believe that we have a pretty definite answer in ch. 31 (where we ended the other day) -- "declares the Lord, whose fire is in Zion, whose furnace is in Jerusalem." This is the hearth of God. It is the place where God is going to work out some of His great mysterious purposes.

For next time I would like you to look over ch. 29. I don't think you need to take as much time on it as perhaps you did on ch. 28. I think it is one of the ~~most interesting~~

most interesting chapters in this whole section, when you get the key to its interpretation.

A part of the key, a substantial part of the key, is furnished by having looked at ch. 28 already, but not all of the key.

I won't put it on the board this time. The assignment to be turned in by noon next Friday will be to make an outline, just a few main heads of ch. 29/ Note the main divisions. What are the principal thoughts that are brought out in ch. 29?

If you are using the KJV, look at v. 5 and see if you think that the beginning of v. 5 has been well translated in the KJV. It is quite different from most other versions. That is the assignment for next time, and we'll continue there next week.

By the end of the hour all your test papers will be in your boxes. They were a bit difficult to mark, and I delayed in giving them back because in 2 or 3 cases I wasn't sure what mark to give. On one or two papers I did not give a mark because whereas the paper had an excellent answer to one question, it was just nothing on the next and did not know what to do in a case like that . . . . They are a tremendous help to me in letting me know what points I need to make clear and touch upon again since they are foundational. . . .

For today I asked you to look at v. 5 of Isaiah 29, and to note the difference between it and the KJV. That was not the main thing-- the main thing was the outline of ch. 29. But I was interested to know what you would do with that verse, and what I thought was a tremendous difference there was not one paper in 20 that even mentioned it. Practically every paper mentioned something I hadn't even noticed! Definitely interesting. Interesting difference, but not a vital difference.

The point I had in mind was a very vital point. That is, in KJV it starts with "moreover," and in most any modern version it begins with "but". A tremendous difference. If you say, I'm going here; moreover I'm going to do such and such when I'm there -- just going on. If I say, I'm going here, but I will do so and so -- you are making a transition. In Hebrew you can't tell which it is. It is a case where the Hebrew can be interpreted either way. But in the light of the context it should be clear that "but", or "yet" is correct.

Someone asked, "Was there a difference in the time when -- with which these two sections deal? That's a point I'm trying to get across. In chs. 7-12, Isaiah deals with a certain situation. In chs. 28-35 he deals with practically the same situation. He is talking to different people and he handles different details. One of them may in some regards look further forward than the other. But in both cases what he's dealing with is two problems: 1) the problem of the continuance of the nation, a temporary one and yet one of great importance. Is there anything they can do to protect themselves in this situation? The answer is absolutely not. They are between two great powers that are much too strong for them. The clever scheme of Ahaz is going to rebound to do the exact opposite of what he wants done.

It just lifts up a minor danger and places a tremendous danger in front of them. So Ahaz' scheme is one of the big problems of chs. 7 following. It will not work the way Ahaz thought it would. It brings them into tremendous danger with Assyrian incursions through the land reaching a great climax 30 years later with the coming of Sennacherib's army that puts Jerusalem in a situation such as is described in the two historical chs. we examined sometime back; puts it in a situation from which in a human way there seems to be absolutely no escape. Yet God intervenes miraculously to deliver Jerusalem and to give it another 100 years, of independent existence before it is taken not by the Assyrians but by an entirely different people.

So the great invasion of Sennacherib is the great climax he looks forward to from the viewpoint of security which was foremost in Ahaz' mind. From that viewpoint that he looks forward to, there is nothing you can do but God is going to miraculously protect you.

The other aspect (2) which for us is of greater importance is the House of David. David was a man after God's own heart, and God promised he was to always have a son to sit on his throne. This is one of the various strands that come together in the great Messianic predictions. Here is the leadership of the House of David in the hands of one like Ahaz who puts no trust in God but trusts in his human clever schemes that won't work.

God says, I'm going to replace Ahaz. He doesn't say how soon. He says, The House of David will not always have such leadership as Ahaz gives it; there will be a virgin-born one who will be a true representative of David and who will be God's king Immanuel God-with-us. So this is the second idea -- the turning over and getting rid of Ahaz and these unworthy ones and the coming instead of Messiah who is predicted in ch.7. These are the two great aspects in these chs.

The last class before I gave the test we looked at ch.8 and we noticed the various references to Christ in ch.8. About half of you had in your second question in the test the question: Point to all prophecies of Christ in ch. 7-8. I underlined all. Then I said, Discuss each briefly.

Very few discussed it at all. Hardly anyone listed them all. I was disappointed in that. So I'm going to take just a few minutes now to quickly glance again at those predictions of Christ in chs.7-8.

The first is 7:14 which we have discussed rather fully. Then in ch.8:8 I pointed out the Assyrian is coming, he is going to sweep on into Judah; its outstretched wings will cover the breadth of your land, O Immanuel. Here we have the Immanuel of ch.7 mentioned again. This is Immanuel's land. Your land O Immanuel. This being Immanuel's land the Assyrian cannot possibly take it unless God permits. It's your land, O Immanuel.

Then I mentioned 8:10 in most of our English translations says, Devise your strategy for it will be thwarted, propose your plan but it will not stand for God is with us. In NIV there is a footnote "Heb. Immanuel." This statement "God is with us" could just as well be translated "Immanuel" -- "for Immanuel", "for it is Immanuel's land." So vv.8 and 10 carry on the thought of the previous ch. with the prediction of Immanuel who though he will not be born for another 700 years is nevertheless already living. He is from all eternity. This is His land. Nothing will happen to it except as He chooses.

Then there is another clear reference in the light of the NT that is 8:17,18. "I will wait for the Lord"-- that word "wait" could just as well be translated "trust". I will wait or trust in



the Lord (either way) who is hiding His face from the House of Jacob, I will put my trust in Him. Here am I and the children the Lord has given. We are signs and symbols in Israel from the Lord Almighty who dwells on Mt. Zion."

We looked at that a week before the test was given, and we noted that as it stands here you would think it was just talking about Isaiah. But when you look at Heb. 2:13 you find that both vv. 17 and 18 are quoted there as referring to Christ. Of course God is the author of the whole Bible, and Jesus is God so you might say anything can be quoted as the words of Christ, but that certainly is not the intention of the author of Hebrews. He is definitely saying, This is Christ speaking.

Therefore we are justified in saying that in this case Immanuel speaks, and Isaiah simply quotes the words of Immanuel. Immanuel says, he trusts in the Lord. So Jesus said so often in His life. He trusts in the Lord, and the children God has given him, they are signs and symbols from the Lord. So this is Immanuel speaking in the light of what the NT says. The principle of it still in that time. Isaiah represented Immanuel and he had his little group that was following him.

So these are definite references, and if you referred to 7:14 and 8:17,18 I was well pleased with your second question. I don't remember whether there were many who did mention all of these, or at least discuss them.

Question: Verse 14 can also be mentioned.

Thank you, I was just going to go on and mention that. There were a number who did not mention some of these but did mention v. 14. I have no objection to your mentioning v. 14. But I would put v. 14 in a little different category. Because v. 14 says the Lord will be a sanctuary for both the houses of Israel he will be a stone that causes many to stumble and a rock that makes them fall." In Rom. 9:33 and in 1 Pet. 2:8 Jesus is spoken of as the rock against which people stumble.

So these phrases can very properly be taken as describing Him. But they do not have as direct a relationship as other passages. As far as the context is concerned they are simply said about the Lord Almighty. Of course Jesus is the Lord Almighty. I was glad to have this mentioned in addition to the others though it was not necessary that it should be. But I was disappointed when only this was mentioned and not the others.

These ~~st~~ tests like that are hard to mark. I don't know how much I should -- how large they should rank in the final mark as compared to the final examination. But they are tremendously helpful to me in letting me see just what I've been able to get across. And to see how much you recall. Our next text of about 20 min. will be two weeks from today.

Now we'll go back to ch. 28, and as we noticed last time ch. 28

begins with exactly the same situation, but instead of Ahaz being the one to whom speaks in the ? he directly addresses him in ch. 28 so we know they ~~are~~ are the ones to whom he is talking. So our thoughts center not so much on the House of David now as on the people of Israel. The people who are God's people in that time, people through whom He keeps alive the memory of His Name. The people through whom He prepares the way for the coming of His Son.

Both in chs. 7-12, and 28-35 we have many denunciations of the sins of the people. It is really a marvellous history, that this has been preserved through the ages the OT in Hebrew as the sacred books of the Jews. You take the books that are honored and treasured by just about any other people in the world, and in them they will tell what wonderful people they are, and how successful they have been in ~~everything they have tried to do.~~ And if you read between the lines, you can see where they made mistakes and failures occasionally, but they never stress them in their own books, at least not until very recently it has become customary in our country in the last 30 years instead of being like it was when I was a boy when our schoolbooks all told how the U.S.A. was the greatest nation in the world. Practically everything that ever was done was the best any country ever had done. Like just about every country has in its writings.

But in the last 30 years it has been customary to take the very opposite attitude. I don't think there has ever been anything quite like that in history. The way that our young people have been conditioned to see all the flaws they can possibly find in their own country, instead of recognizing that with all the flaws it has it certainly has stood for human liberty far more than just about any other country in the world. It certainly has given far more opportunity to individuals to develop their God-given qualities just about more than anywhere else in the world.

I say that a few people got a sower attitude toward their country about 50 or 60 years ago, but they were people who got good positions in colleges and passed on their attitudes to a few bright people and they passed them on to more and more and now we have our young people, a great many of them, brain-washed with that attitude toward U.S.A. But that's going from one extreme to the other. The OT does not go to either extreme, or you might say it goes to both extremes because it does ? Israel is God's nation, that God has called out and that God has tremendously blessed, but it is filled with passages of denunciation of the nation for its wickedness and for its sin.

Yet the Jews have treasured these books as their sacred books and as the holy books of their nation, through the years. As the prophet said, They would be like a beacon on a hill, they would be a designation that he worked through them and prepared the way for the coming of Christ. So in both these sections we have many passages of denunciation. We won't spend a lot of time on them in this course but we will to some extent.

Let me at this point mention that in ch. 7 and in ch. 8 we

had some pretty strong denunciations. Then in ch. 9, you start a long passage of denunciation which runs to 10:4 (from 9:8 to 10:4). We're not going to take a lot of time on that, but for next Friday I'd like you to start at 10:5 and go to the end of the chapter. Please make a brief outline, a brief statement of the principle progress of thought from 10:5 to the end of the chapter. That's a unified section. You are all aware that the first four vv. belong to the previous chapter.

In ch. 28 it began with denunciation of the northern kingdom. That dates the ch. very definitely. There is no question but that this was written before 722 B.C., probably 10 or 12 years before that. Because Ephraim was conquered by the Assyrians and its people taken into exile. Here is a prediction of their conquest.

He starts (8:1) "Woe to the drunkards of Ephraim". Then as we noticed (v.7), "These also stagger from wine and reel from strong drink." These nobles who are leaders of Judah. They refuse to listen to him, v.9. "Who is he trying to teach? To whom is he explaining his message . . . ? Does he think we are just children, those taken from the breast, to whom he says Do and do, do and do, rule on rule . . . here a little, there a little." He ends, Alright, God is going to speak to you in a strange way. He will speak to you with foreign lips and strange tongue will he speak to this people.

He calls them scoffers and says that the scheme that Ahaz and the nobles have worked out when they say, We have entered into a covenant with death, with the grave we have made an agreement . . . we have made a lie our refuge and falsehood our hiding place. The Lord says, I am going to destroy your plan, your covenant with death will be annulled, your agreement with hell will not stand when the overwhelming scourge sweeps by you will be beaten down by it.

In the last part of the chapter they were thinking of throwing Isaiah out, but they probably decided not to when he started talking about the farmer and the way he did. They said, Oh he's a harmless fellow, let him go on. I don't know whether that happened, or whether he left the place and some of his people went with him and he continued his discourse outside. But the thought continues right straight on from ch. 28 into 29. He continues right on. He speaks of what this is going to do with bringing the Assyrians right next to them. Now he looks at the time when they will be in terrible danger from the Assyrians when Sennacherib will invade which is something that is so very prominent in the book of Isaiah.

He says, Woe to you, Ariel, Ariel, the city where David settled. Ariel could mean "lion of God" or "hearth of God." In the two chs. further on that we'd already looked at (chs. 30 and 31 where he speaks of how God will deliver them from the Assyrian attack) he said "declares the Lord whose fire is in Zion, whose furnace is in Jerusalem." That suggests that "Ariel" here means the hearth, the place where God will work out

his great plan. The place where they will see the tremendous outworking of God, where human help has absolutely reached its end.

"Woe to you Ariel, Ariel, the city where David settled. Add year to year and let your cycle of festivals go on." That ~~waszbez~~ fits with the "hearth of God"-- the burnt offerings, the continuing ceremonies. He says, You are performing all these ceremonies but God says, What good is that going to do you? If you really don't know the Lord, what good is the ceremony? Keep them up, yet I will harrass Ariel. Yet I will vex Ariel. Some taanslate it "beseige Ariel." That's alright. I don't know as it's quite as specific as that. But you notice it is God who will do it. God will beseige Ariel. He doesn't say the Assyrians will beseige.

But what the Assyrians do will amount to the same as if God was beseiging it. That is to say, the Assyrians are in the land, they have taken all the other fenced(fortified) cities, of Judah. Who knows at what moment the great Assyrian army will come marching against Jerusalem. It probably will tear a hole through the wall and come in and take them off into slavery. Who knows how soon that will come. was beseiged  
for about 3 years God was beseiging them.

"She will mourn and lament, she will be to me like an altar hearth. I will encamp against you all around." This you notice isn't the Assyrians! God says, I will. In other words, God is putting them in a situation as if there was an army right there beseiging them. The army is not there, but representatives from that army come every now and then telling them to surrender, and telling them what will happen to them if they don't surrender.

God is encamping against them and encircling them with towers setting up his seige works against you. They are expecting the Assyrians will come and set up seige works anytime. "Low you will speak from the ground, your speech will mumble out of the dust. You voice will come ghoastlike from the earth, out of the dust your speech will whisper."

Then the KJV says, "Moreover the multitude of your strangers will be like fine dust." It gives you the impression it's just going straight on. But as you continue it is quite obvious that at v. 5 there is a sharp change of thought. Dealing with the same situation but saying that your enemies, those attacking you are going to become like fine dust when the Lord smote them in thenight and the great bulk of them were killed or died that night and Sennacherib had to go back to his own land in order to be saved. When God worked that wonderful miracle of delivering them, their enemies became like fine dust.

I had not realized until I got your papers that NIV has "emeies" where KJV says "strangers". I think all the recent translations have "enemies" and it is talking about their enemy. But the actual word used is strangers. So personally I prefer

for that particular word the word that the KJV uses. The word is used about 50 times in OT. In just about every one of them in KJV it is translated "stranger." Like "beware of the strange woman." Same word only feminine form. It is usually used of strangers who are not desirable. True. Of course in the context the strangers here spoken of are enemies. But the actual word is referring to those whom he said in the ch. before "with people of a strange tongue, people of other lips, God will speak to this people."

So this great number of people that they can't understand that are coming with tremendous power and strength into the land, coming as the result of Ahaz' clever scheme backfiring, these will be there--a great multitude of them--but they will become like fine dust. The "but" instead of "moreover" is a great improvement in the NIV (and in all the new translations). I think the substitution of "enemies" in practically all the new translations is not quite as accurate as if it said "aliens" or "foreigners" or something like that. To us strangers conveys a little more the idea of something good. Perhaps foreigners would convey more the idea. People of foreign speech that they cannot understand are coming into the land.

But they are going to become like fine dust. The ruthless hoardes like blown chaff. Suddenly in an instant, the Lord Almighty will come.

By the way I'll take a second to mention, I asked x you to compare one modern version with the KJV. Any one modern version. One man wrote that he compared with Moffatt's translation. He said that Moffatt left out most of the verse so that the comparison really didn't amount to a great deal. However, I think he should have looked a little further in Moffatt because what Moffatt does after v. 4, he then takes the last phrase of v.5 and puts it there, then he puts v. 6, and then he puts the first two parts of v. 5. So whoever used Moffatt if he'd looked just a little bit further he would have found that v. 5 is there!

I'm not recommending Moffatt to you. He is one of those who changed the Scripture around to what he thinks the people ought to have said. At the same time Moffatt was a brilliant man. A brilliant student. You go through Moffatt's translation and find that if he doesn't like what's there he just changes it around any old way. You can't depend on him, yet every now and then, he'll take a line or a verse that you know exactly what the Hebrew means. But how to put it into English is very difficult. Sometime x Moffatt will exactly hit on it, on a way to express the exact idea in English and then in the next verse he gives something that has nothing to do with it in the Hebrew! I don't recommend him. I just wish that whoever it was that referred to him, I think it would be wise to have looked a little further on and you would find that the verse is there in its entirety.

We noticed then that starting with 29:5 we have a complete change. Verses 1-4 are the conditions of which Sennacherib's army

there and Jerusalem is such that they don't dare go very ~~far~~ far from the wall because they don't know when there may be a roving band of Assyrians, or they might meet the whole army coming to make these expected attacks on Jerusalem.

Suddenly in an instant the Lord Almighty will come with thunder and an earthquake and great noise, with windstorm and tempest and flames of a devouring fire." These, of course, are figurative expressions. We do not believe that God caused thunder and earthquake and windstorm and tempest and flames to be the means he used to destroy this Assyrian army. It seems far more likely that he sent an epidemic among them that rapidly wiped them out. "The angel of the Lord killed them." What method the Lord used we don't know but it is very ~~unlikely~~ unlikely that it was an earthquake or a windstorm or anything like that. These are figures of speech (figurative expressions).

Occasionally I hear somebody say, I take everything in the Bible literally. Anybody who does that, I doubt if they have ever read the Bible. Because you cannot take everything literally in any book that ever was written. There are always figurative expressions, and there are many very beautiful figurative expressions in the Bible. We take the Bible and study it in the light of context--each section to see what it says, and we believe what it says is true and without error. But to say we take everything literally would be absurd! It has many beautiful figures of speech, and these undoubtedly are figures of speech.

"Then the hordes of all the nations that fight against Ariel, that attack her and her fortress and besiege her, will be as it is with a dream . . . as when a hungry man dreams that he is eating...." Who is this hungry man? Sennacherib. He says in his annals that he shut up Hezekiah like in bird in a cage (in captivity.) No Assyrian king would be proud of shutting up somebody like a bird in a cage in a captive city-- no Assyrian king ever said that about anybody else. They would say, this captive city I attacked, I knocked down its walls, I took a third of its people captive and the rest of them I ~~kill~~ killed. I piled their corpses in great heaps." That's the way the Assyrian kings speak about the capture of many of the nations they conquered.

But here he says he shut him up like a bird in his cage in his captured city. Sennacherib was like a hungry man who dreams he is eating but who wakes and his hunger remains." He has to go back to Ninevah without taking Jerusalem or giving Hezekiah the punishment he wants to. "As when a thirsty man dreams that he is drinking but he awakens faint . . ." Again beautiful figures of speech. You can't take them literally-- Sennacherib wasn't left hungry or thirsty. I imagine that if half his army starved he still would have had plenty! But what he wanted i.e. the capture of Jerusalem and of Hezekiah he failed. He ~~was~~ awakened with his thirst unquenched. So will it be with the hordes of all the nations that fight against Mt. Zion.

It says "all the nations." All the nations, all the people. The Assyrians had conquered so many different nations, and they made them supply soldiers for their army. It was a multi-national army which the Assyrians directed which for a period of two or three centuries terrorized most of the middle east.

After giving this wonderful promise of deliverance, he turns to rebuke these people. "Be stunned and amazed, blind yourselves and be sightless; be drunk, but not from wine . . ." In other words, he says, you folks here in this banquet hall you who were in this banquet hall (whether this is continued an hour later or the next day)--you were becoming drunk in your exaltation over this wonderful scheme Ahaz had worked out. But the time is coming when you'll be staggering, not because of drinking but because of the punishment God is going to give you.

The Lord has brought over you a deep sleep: He has sealed your eyes (the prophets), he has covered your heads (the seers). For you this whole vision is nothing but words sealed in a scroll. And if you give the scroll to someone who can read, and say to him, Read this, please, he will answer, I can't; it is sealed." He won't bother to open the seals! and read it. It's just an excuse.

Question: Why are the people in v.9 blinding themselves and sightless?

He means, Go on in the way you are going, refusing to look at the facts. Paying all your attention to earthly things instead of looking up at what God has caused. You are looking at your human schemes; you are blind to God's will and to God's cause. It is sort of ironic.

Question: Would you say from v. 10 there is a distinction between the prophet and the seer? Are they different?

No, I would say -- the true prophets, God called men here and there. There was no hereditary line of prophets. There was no appointment(?) of prophets. God called certain men to speak His word. But there were other men who claimed to be prophets. A prophet could be a seer in that he was able to give an answer to a problems people brought to him. He could be but would not have to be. There were others who would claim to be. That is you can't make an exact ? There are the true prophets, but then there were many people claiming to be. We have plenty of people today claiming to be able to predict the future. Most of them you forget the mistakes they make and you remember the times they happened to hit it right.

Question: In vv.5-8, do you say that is a prediction that goes beyond Assyria?

No I would say that is definitely and exclusively a prediction of the deliverance from Sennacherib. I would say that the principle involved could be stretched(?) on as an illustration. You can say, No matter what forces of what nations try to destroy God's plan, they will not succeed.

That just as God delivered them, God can deliver them when He chooses with windsorm, hail and tremendous force as He chooses. But I would say that this is specifically a prediction about Sennacherib. That would be my feeling. The principle continues, but I don't think it's a specific pointing to some event in the more distant future.

It could be if you had those words alone, in a different context, it very well could be taken as a prediction of great future events. But when it's tied directly with Sennacherib's invasion in the previous verses, it seems we should take it as this specific prediction.

Question: In v. 7 I sort of got that sense where it speaks of "all nations."

All the nations that are fighting them, yes. The Assyrians had a lot of nations from many different (conquests).

Questions: The Assyrian herdes were a multitude of peoples?

No, the Assyrians had conquered a multitude of peoples. They had held them in subjection by this time for a century or more and from them they had drafted soldiers into their armies. They had people from many different ethnic backgrounds.

Here he is rebuking these people who are like Ahaz. He rebuked Ahaz and said, God will replace you. God will send in his own time a king who is virgin born. Now he is rebuking the nobles, the leadership of the people. He is rebuking that great large part of the nation that follows Him with their lips (v.13) and honors him with their lips but their hearts are far from me, he says. He is here rebuking them.

In v.11, 12 he says they give excuses not to dig into His Word and find out what it means and follow His truth. They give all kinds of excuses. Those who can read won't bother to open the seals. Those who would bother to open the seals, say, What's the good, I can't even read. They give all kinds of excuses. So he says, These people come near to me with their mouth; they honor me with their lips, but their hearts are far from me. Their worship of me is made up only of rules taught by men. Therefore once more I will astound these people with wonder upon wonder. The wisdom of the wise will perish. The intelligence of the intelligent will vanish.

Here he is looking way beyond these situations. It is a parallel to the situation with Ahaz where he looks way ahead to the replacement of Ahaz with a true head of the House of David i.e. the virgin born Christ. Here he speaks his woe to those of the nation who are going in the line of Ahaz. He says, I will astound these people . . . the wisdom of the wise will perish, the intelligence of the intelligent will vanish. Woe to those who go to great depths to hide their plans from the Lord, who do their work in darkness and think, Who sees us? Who will know? You turn things upside down, as if the potter were thought



to be like the clay." You should be the ~~clay~~ clay in God's hands. God wants us to be the instruments in His hands, to become what He wants us to be and serve him as He wants us to serve.

But these people are looking to God to be their instrument! They are looking to God to deliver them and do what they want instead of seeking to find how they can be brought into line with God's purpose. They are turning matters ~~up~~ upside down. As if the potter were thought to be like the clay. The potter molds the clay, not the clay the potter.

When you look to God to do what you want, you are trying to make Him your servant. You are turning things upside down. That's what these people were doing. "Shall the thing formed say to Him that formed it, He did not make me? Can the pot say to the potter, He knows nothing? In a very short time, will not Lebanon be turned into a fertile field, and the fertile field seem like a forest." What does that mean? That means a complete turning about. Taking the forest of Lebanon, the country outside the land of Israel, the outside, taking them and turning them into a fertile field! And taking the fertile field, God's vineyard which He has ~~plowed~~ plowed and cultivated and which is ~~not~~ not bringing the fruit he wants, it is going to seem like a forest! He is going to turn things upside down.

Just as He predicted in ch. 7 that Ahaz would be replaced by God's own king, here he is predicting that for a time, the people of God who have not been loyal to Him, and not followed Him as they should will be replaced. As Jesus said, The kingdom of God will be taken away from you and given to a nation that will bring forth the fruits thereof."

It is a beautiful figure of the outside (Lebanon), the uncultivated forest, being turned into a fertile field. And the fertile field is going to seem like a forest. A prediction of the change that is going to come. In that day the deaf will hear the words of the scroll, and out of gloom and darkness the eyes of the blind will see. . . the humble will rejoice in the Lord; the needy will rejoice in the Holy One of Israel." He is telling here how replacement for a time as the people of God of these who refuse to listen to him, these who refuse to follow God's prophets.

Therefore (v.22), This is what the Lord, who redeemed ~~the~~ Abraham, says to the house of Jacob." The Lord who redeemed Abraham. You don't find that expression very much. He is not speaking of God's dealings with Israel. He is speaking of the progenitor who was brought out from a heathen land, whom God called and led out to be his. He says, The Lord who redeemed Abraham~~s~~ says to the House of Jacob, No longer will Jacob be ashamed; no longer will their faces grow pale. When they see among them their children, the ~~work~~ work of my hands. They will keep my name holy; they will acknowledge the holiness of the Holy One of Jacob . . ."

It reminds us of what John the Baptist said in Mat.3:7-9, "You say we're sons of Abraham; God can make sons of Abraham out of these stones!" Here is Jacob looking and seeing in his midst those whom God has supernaturally brought into the midst of the people of God.

It seems to me that in this ch. we have a parallel to Rom.11 where Paul uses the figure of the Olive Tree which grows up and the Olive Tree, he says the natural branches are taken out and wild branches are grafted in! That, I think is what we have here, It is an exact parallel to Ahaz and his ilk being replaced by the Messiah. The people of God becoming largely like the forest of Lebanon.

The people outside who were previously thought to be outside the pale.

I would not be dogmatic about v. 24 but I inclide to think v. 24 means the bringing back again of the natural branches into the tree, which Paul predicts in Rom. 11 where he says, So all Israel shall be saved. The eventual bringing back of them into the center of God's plan (?) time.

We'll ~~continue there~~ discontinue there. I've already assigned the lesson for next time. Please get those papers in to me by Friday noon.

You will have a 20 min. text next Monday that will cover everything up to the end of today's class. . . I'm going to try to give shorter questions and more of them so as to get a better cross section of how you do.

I had some questions on the papers which were turned in that were very helpful. . . I'm going to spend just a few minutes looking at some of these.

In Isa. 7 there were a couple of questions. In v.15, the suggestion was made whether the "he" there could refer to Isaiah's second son, Maher-shala-hash-baz. But since the second son was not even conceived until the next ch., unless you have some evidence for saying that the two chs. are not chronologically consecutive --which is oftenthe case, (I don't believe it is here) I believe we could not consider that as a possibility.

There are those who think he pointed to the older son, Shear-jashur, who was beside him and said, "Before he"-- and that would be a possibility. Personally I think the better possibility is to think of Messiah's life as a measuring stick since we're not told when he'll be born. If the virgin were already pregnant at this time then by the time he reached such an age such things would happen.

One of the exam papers gave a very brilliant statement. It said that curds and honey referred to the products of cows and bees! I would think we all knew that by this time. There was no further statement on that particular paper about it. I don't think everyone had a clear idea of that. I might say a word or two more about it. It indicates the depopulation, but just how? How do curds and honey indicate depopulation?

You find the clue in vv.22-24 where it says, (starting with v. 21), "in that day a man will keep alive a young cow and two goats because of the abundance of milk they give he will have curds to eat. All who remain in the land will eat curds and honey. In that day in every place where there were 1000 vines worth 1000 silver shekles there will be only briars and thorns. Men will go there with bow and arrow . . . with briars and thorns.

(FIRE ALARM WENT OFF!)

. . . the cows could go out and have plenty of pasture, and there would be plenty of room for bees, and there would be just what you could go and pick up and don't have a lot of work to do. That you can use and compared to these people left there would be plenty of it. So it shows the depopulation.

Then in ch. 28. We are going through these two sections more or less a parallel because as we've noticed they give every evidence of being written just about the same time. In one he is talking first to the king. In the other he is talking first to the nobles.

Question: Back to 7:14. The Scripture used uses this son of the virgin it calls Immanuel, and in other places the Scripture calls the nation Israel Immanuel. I wonder

Where is the nation Israel called Immanuel?

Question answered by student: In v.8 of the next ch.

No. V,8 of the next ch., I take that definitely as referring to Messiah. This is Messiah's land. Although Messiah is not yet born, he is already existing and this is his land. He is saying the \_\_\_\_\_ of your land, O Immanuel. I take it that the same thing is said again at the end of v. 10. "For it is Immanuel's land, therefore . . ."

I never heard before the suggestion that Immanuel here refers to Israel rather than to Messiah. If you can find some evidence elsewhere that Immanuel is used that way, then that would be a thing worth considering. But I don't think these two by themselves would give evidence in that direction. I'm glad my attention was called to that possibility.

In ch. 28, we have the same situation. When was ch. 28 written? It is very clear at the beginning of ch. 28 that he is referring to Ephraim as an existing nation. It is very plain where he rebukes the drunkards of Ephraim, and tells how they say we are going to rebuild, we are able to carry on regardless. It is quite evident that this is a situation where Ephraim is still a menace to Judah. So the time of the beginning of ch. 7 and the beginning of ch. 28 was probably identical.

In each case, whether Isaiah gave most of the material continuously over the course of one day, or a few days, or whether he gave a part of it and then gave another part a few months or even a few years later we have no way of knowing. But in most cases it is evident that it was before 701. Because that is the big climax he is looking forward to. Is his deliverance from Sennacherib. So it is somewhere between 735 and 701 in both cases. And in both cases it starts before 730.

I would say that ch. 7 is addressing Ahaz as he is preparing to hold off the attack of Israel and Syria, and that ch. 28 is addressing the nobles as they are celebrating his covenant with death, his arrangement with the Assyrians to protect him from Israel and from Syria.

As he goes on, whether he then imagines in ch.28 where he says that Assyria won't be protecting you, instead you have a new great enemy, they answer, Well, we'll then look to Egypt for help. So he deals with that. Or whether that section comes later on when after the Assyrian covenant has proven to be a failure and backfired on them, then they turn to Egypt --and at that time he wrote those rebukes, we have no way of knowing. which of the two. Whether it is an answer to a possibility they present, or an answer to an actual situation. At least it was an actual situation when it came.

Who was responsible for sending to Egypt for help? I would think it likely that that was Ahaz. We do not know the precise dates of Ahaz and Hezekiah. This is one of the parts in the OT where we have overlapping reigns. The fitting of them together exactly, we do not have evidence of which to be sure exactly where they fit together. It would seem most likely that Hezekiah was associated with his father for a time, but we don't know just how they fit together.

But I would think it likely that the sending to Egypt was Ahaz' carrying on his same method and that Hezekiah carried on the method his father was using until it also proved a complete victory.

Ch. 28 then begins with a rebuke to Israel that would greatly please the Judean nobles, but then he turns from that to them. In v.7 we noticed "and these also" stagger from wine. I would like it better as "also these" instead of "these also" because that could be read "and these also stagger from wine." But in the Heb. it is specifically it is "also these", they stagger from wine. He is evidently pointing to the Judean nobles there.

Then in vv.9-10 we have them responding by criticizing him. Is is talking to us as though we are little children telling us how we have to live and what we have to do. We're grown up and able to stand on our own feet. He says, Alright, if you won't take a gentle word from God, he will speak to you with foreign lips and strange tongue. If you won't take the gentle assurances that he would give you and put your trust in him, then you will have the harsh invasion of the Assyrians.

So he answers it and looks forward in v. 16 to the coming One as he looked forward to Him in chs. 7 and 8. The taster stone, the precious corner stone. Although in the context it is not so clear he is looking forward to Christ. It could be taken simply as meaning God. But of course Jesus is God, so it doesn't make much difference. with the sense which of the two ways you took that.

In --This ch. was devoted to rebuking them for their alliance with Assyria, and ch. 29 goes right straight on from it. It is going -- the alliance with Assyria is going to eventuate in the terrible situation described in the first few vv. of ch. 29/ when the city will be in a situation where its continuance appears absolutely hopeless.

God says, I will beseige Ariel. This does not mean that the Assyrians actually beseiged it. You can well take these ~~thax~~ terms as figurative. God says, I will encamp against you. I will encircle you with towers and set up my beseige works against you. Now of course they were encircled with towers, and seige works were set up against them in 586 one hundred and fifty years later. But in this case he is saying, You will be in a situation as if an enemy were beseiging you. I will beseige you. I will cause that you are shut in as a result of

the Assyrian forces all around so that you won't dare to go outside the strong walls in order to work in your fields. All you dare do for about 3 years is to rush out with an eye out to see if any of the Assyrian bands are coming, and gather what you can, what grows by itself.

Similarly in v.5ff where you have the promise of a miraculous deliverance -- it seems to me in light of context it clearly is figurative language where he says, "The Lord Almighty will come with thunder and earthquake and great noise of windstorm and flames of devouring fire." I don't believe that these in the context that these are picturing natural phenomena. The Lord does not use earthquake, thunder, tempest and flames of devouring fire to destroy the Assyrian army. But the angel of the Lord came in the night and smote them. In the morning there were all the many who were dead.

We cannot arbitrarily rule out a literal interpretation. If someone wants to guess that the way God killed all these Assyrians was to send a tremendous, storm, thunder and earthquake, tempest and devouring fire then we have no way to say that is not the correct interpretation. But my strong inclination in the light of the context is to say we don't know the method God used. Most likely it was a great epidemic that swept through the Assyrian army and that was the method God used.

But the results of the method God used was exactly as if he came down with the tremendous force that earthquake and storm and devouring fire (pictures). The determination in Scripture of what is literal and what is figurative as in any great book of literature is not always easy.

There are those who say, I take every word in the Bible literally. If somebody says that I wonder if they have ever read it. Because like all literature it has many figurative uses. I say always try the literal interpretation and see if it makes sense in light of the context. But recognize that in all great literature, and we have to interpret passages in the light of context.

Question: Since in the KJV verse 5 starts with "moreover" the next several vv. are a continuation of the explanation of God's judgment against Jerusalem, I took it that the thunder and earthquake, etc. was really telling the Assyrian army what appeared to Jerusalem, and that the dream of the night vision was like someone having a dream and then waking up and they were still hungry and so Assyria would try to satisfy their hunger by trying to conquer Jerusalem. That's the way I took it.

I would not say it is at all impossible that vv.5-6 go with what precedes rather than with what follows. KJV translates that "moreover". The Heb. word is simply "and." It can mean "moreover"; it can mean "but." It is entirely possible that vv.5-6 mean that--- well, I hesitate about it because of the "suddenly, in an instant." The Assyrians didn't come suddenly & in an instant.

That seems to suggest the sudden destruction of them rather than their coming. Except for that those verses probably could be taken with the ones before it. But once you get to v.7, it seems to me that the deliverance is quite clearly there. "So will it be with the hordes of all the nations that fight against mount Zion."

Most interpreters take x from v. 5 on as describing the destruction. And I think another point in favor of this is that it says "the multitude of your strangers will be like small dust" (KJV). Actually it is "will become." It is the verb hayah which is not ordinarily used as a copula unless \_\_\_\_\_. I went through the examination of that hayah once in Gen. 1. In Gen. 1 we have (I forget the number) maybe 50 times in the English Bible the word "to be". Like it says "God saw what he had made and it was good." And it says, It was evening and it was morning the second, third, and fourth day.

I went through all of those and looked to see how many of them were simply insertions, because there was no copula expressed in the Hebrew. The Heb. lit. is "that he saw that good." It does not say that it was good. In Heb. it is very common to have the copula understood. In Greek it also occurs, but not as commonly as in Hebrew, but I found that in about half the cases it was very clear from context that it was merely describing a situation. There the verb was not occur. When it says "it was evening and it was morning" it does not mean it was evening and it was morning all at the same time. It means, It became evening and it became morning and there the \_\_\_\_\_ is expressed.

I believe the Hebrew verb that is sometimes translated "was" really means "became." God created heaven and earth and the earth became without form and void. That doesn't necessarily mean the earth having already been created became with form and void. It could mean that, but it could mean God created heaven and there came into existence an earth that was without form and void. But I think that distinction does not always come out in the English, but it is immediately apparent in the Hebrew. In this particular case you have at the beginning of v. 5 a word which is best translated like our modern translations "will become."

But I would not be dogmatic about vv.5 and 6. I am strongly inclined to think they go with what precedes, but from v. 7 on I am inclined to think they must refer to the deliverance.

In ch. 29. Was there anything else we had not made clear? Verse 9-13 are a rebuke to the people, a rebuke which is taken up by Christ and quoted in part as showing the conditions still existing when He was here on earth. In connection with that we have a similar statement in ch. 30:10-11 where they say to the seers, See no more visions, and to the prophets give us no more visions. Tell us pleasant things; prophecy illusions to us. So all through this we have these many rebukes to the people of that day, but still valid whenever the conditions would change it would be the same.

In v.14 he says, I will astound these people. The wisdom of the wise will perish ; the intelligence of the intelligent will vanish. Here I think he is surely looking forward to the future situation. In v.16, "You turn things upside down as if the potter were thought to be like the clay. Shall what is formed say to him who formed it, He did not make me? You are turning things upside down. I am going to turn them upside down in v. 17.

(V.17) In a very short time Lebanon will be turned into a fertile field, and the fertile field seem like a forest." That I believe is a clear reference to the situation that Paul describes when Jesus said he would take the kingdom of God from you and give it to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof. The last verse in the ch. may be pointing to the bringing of Israel back into the olive tree. We cannot be so dogmatic about v. 24, but I incline quite strongly to that view.

A word about v. 22. In vv.22-23, This is what the Lord who redeemed Abraham --- it's interesting here that he is going back to Abraham who certainly was not saved because of his family, because of his heritage or because of his background. God called him out of the midst of heathenism. God spoke to him and called him to go out and to go into a far country. "The Lord who redeemed Abraham says to the house of Jacob: No longer will Jacob be ashamed, no longer will their faces grow pale. When they see among them their children, the work of my hands." That, I believe, fits with the idea that this represents turning to the Gentiles.

"They will keep my name hol ; they will acknowledge the holiness of the Holy One of Jacob and will stand in awe of the God of Israel." In NIV I noticed it is translated "no longer will Jacob be ashamed, no longer will their faces grow pale when they see among them their children . . ." The Heb. is singular--"he". That doesn't mean NIV is wrong translation, because nations are often spoken of in the singular with a collective.

But when speaking of the nations it would be more natural to say, and what he does say is                     . And his specific reference to Jacob not being ashamed seems to me to be imagining their ancestor Jacob and seeing the situation is as Paul says, They are not all Israel which are of Israel." Jesus said, God is able of these stones to raise up children to Abraham. These are their children, the work of my hands.

After ch. 29, it's some little time since we looked at ch. 30 and 31 and you all notice the remarkable parallel.

Question: Do you think 29:17 refers to the Gentiles? Could you expand on that a little bit?

Yes. The reference to Lebanon is a reference to something outside the life of Israel. That is obvious. It is a reference to something outside the land of Israel; it is a reference to something large and prominent that is outside of Israel. When it



When it speaks of Lebanon being turned into a fertile field it suggests that he is speaking of something that is at present not fertile. He is speaking of that which is outside the pale and which is not producing anything for the Lord, but he says the time will come when Lebanon will be turned into a fertile field, and the fertile field will be like a forest.

Jesus said the vineyard that was not bringing forth grapes he would take away from those husbandmen and give to those who would bring forth its fruits. It would seem to me that that makes very good sense for the interpretation of this verse, and I don't know of any other suggestion that brings much sense out of it.

Question: How does that fit into the historical context?

In the historical context he is saying that they are coming into serious difficulties because instead of trusting God they are looking to Assyria for help. This is going to bring you terrible calamity in the coming of Sennacherib, but God will deliver you. But in the midst of these statements, both from the section from ch.7 on and from the section here, he looks at the general situation of the nation and rebukes the great bulk of the nation for their lack of interest in the things of God, and for their excuses in turning against him.

I believe there are occasional glimpses into the distant future where he sees the coming of Messiah; he sees God answer to the unfaithfulness of Ahaz. He is to be replaced by God's own chosen one of the house of David, and from the unfaithfulness of the nobles he looks forward into the distant future when it for a time, they will be replaced by a nation bringing forth the fruits of it.

I think this is quite important to get clear. I've gone over it a couple of times rather hastily, and I would not be dogmatic on my interpretation of it. But I have not heard any other interpretation that seemed to me to get a lot of sense out of the passage. There are many things that seem to fit together.

Question(Mr. Mellon): Can you please restate what you said about Abraham and Jacob.

Yes. He says, This is what the Lord said who redeemed Abraham. He specifically calls our attention to the fact that God having called Abraham which was not a matter of someone saying, I am a descendant of Jacob, I am one of Abraham's children. Abraham came out of an entirely different background. God reached in there and brought him out, and it calls attention to God's electing power in putting in the center of his blessing whom he chooses. It reminds us of what Jesus said that God is able of these stones to make children to Abraham. Then after speaking of the Lord who redeemed Abraham, then he says to the house of Jacob, No longer will Jacob be ashamed.

Why is Jacob ashamed? Either because his descendants are not

being true to the Lord, are not carrying out as they should, or he is ashamed because his descendants are being greatly injured, are being cut down, are being sent into exile, many of them being killed. & not being embarrassed or ashamed for either one of these two reasons.

No longer will Jacob be ashamed; he will see among them the work of my hands." So it seems to refer to his bringing in like he brought Abraham. So there are these many things it seems to me that fit into that interpretation.

As I say, I do not present this as something that we can be dogmatic about, but it seems to me to be the best interpretation. These particular situations and particularly about v. 11.

Question: In v.23, does the "they" refer to the Jews or to the Gentiles?

Do you mean at the beginning of the verse?

Questioner: No, it says, When he sees their children, the work of my hands . . . they shall sanctify . . .

I would think he seems among them his children. NIV translates that "they", but I think it is better "he" there. But then you have "they will keep my name holy," and that refers to his children whom he sees---those who are true to God . . . they will keep my name holy.

Question: Why could not this coming back of the nation refer to the coming back from exile and at some later time being grafted into the olive tree?

I would say there are a number of indications in the section that it refers to the olive tree, but --- you turn things upside down. The potter says to the clay what are you doing, You turn things upside down, I'm going to turn things upside down. All that doesn't sound simply like returning from exile. If you did not have those expressions in there there is much of it that could be taken that way very well.

Question: Is it possible that God is speaking these things in veiled terms because of the NT nature of Israel?

Yes, I think this is important to remember that God gave the prophets glimpses of the future and when the event takes place you see how wonderful it is fulfilled. But I do not think that in most cases we can build a detailed picture of the future. I think someone in the time of Christ would have had a very difficult job in putting together from the OT the details of His life, and yet in point after point in the Gospels you say this is fulfilled and was taught by the prophets. When you see what happened, you can see how it was fulfilled. The more we have that is fulfilled the better able we are to make guesses as to other && things that happened.

But he only predicts a certain distance into the future. He does not give us full details, so we are always in the possibility of error when we get beyond the main features that we look at.

Unless there is some further question on ch. 29,-- we have noted 30 and 31, the parallel between the two. Ch. 31 being sort of summary, starting with the folly of trusting of Egypt and the last half of it telling how God will miraculously deliver them from Assyria. Ch. 30 being similar, starting with the folly of trusting in Egypt. I spoke briefly about v. 6 referring to the actual tribute he was sending to Egypt, or would be sending to Egypt. Ending up with the deliverance from Assyria just as ch.31 will, but in the middle having, like ch. 28 and 29, rebuke to those who are rejecting the message, and predicting punishment for them, and I believe, that in v.17 he looks forward to the scattering of Israel among the nations.

And yet not annihilated, but scatter not destroyed. When I heard how one night Hitler's forces attacked synagogues all over Germany and the big attacking beginning the persecution of the Jews there, I said -- I studied in Germany for two and a half years, and I knew many of the Germans, they were wonderful people. I loved the nation. But when I saw that happen, I said They are doomed to terrible misery because God protects Israel even though Israel is largely apostate, eventhough they be forgetful of Him and turn away from him, He has promised they will never be destroyed!

He has promised His blessings will be with them. They will have it continued. And of course Hitler set to work very determinedly to utterly destroy them, and he might even have won the war if he hadn't done that because he diverted an awful lot of energy and expense to his attempt to completely destroy the Jews but he utterly failed in that determination. It says here in v. 30 that they would be left like a flagstaff upon a mountain-top, like a banner on a hill. There still ~~remain~~ remain in every nation some Jews, and they still remain and are an indication that the Bible is true. That what God promised he has fulfilled and is fulfilling.

We go back to the earlier section-- chs. 7 on, and we noticed how ch. 8 ended with that passage of terrible misery ahead for the people. Where he looks toward a time of apostasy in which he and the children God has given him are to keep alive the truth within their groups.

He rebukes the people for consulting mediums and spiritists and going to the dead to get help instead of looking to God. In these days you might say they looked to astrology and all sorts of foolishness like that instead of looking to God as so many are doing now. He describes the misery that's ahead for them. Then in the very area where the Assyrian army entered, the area in which the darkness first came-- the land of Zebulun and of Naphtali, there the people who walked in darkness are going to see a great light. He looks forward to the preaching of Christ in v. 2(of ch. 9).

So we have in this early part of ch. 9 the wonderful prediction of Immanuel. His preaching here is bringing joy to them.

Then in 9:5 he looks way forward to the full outlook of Immanuel's work "Every warrior's boot used in battle and every garment rolled in blood will be destined for burning, will be fuel for the fire." A complete end of armament, a complete end of human warfare. Not an end brought about because one nation disarms and the other nations tramp over it. That's no fulfillment of this at all! That's what many of our people are trying to get us to do now. But that's not the way to bring peace. That is the way to make war certain.

He is speaking of a time when it will not be necessary for nations to have the booted warriors and the garments rolled in blood. So he looks there way beyond our present time even. Then in the next verse he tells what is going to be the cause by which that will come.

"For to us a child is born, to us a son is given." That could be Hebrew parallelism - to us a child is born, to us a son is given. It can be just Heb. parallelism and yet the way it is expressed strongly suggests, now that we know the facts of what happened -- the fact that a child was born to Mary but that the Son of God was given. So there is a suggestion of the coming of the one who is both God and man. It is not something on which you could base it in advance that it was sure ~~xxx~~ how it would happen, but when it comes to pass you see how exactly it fulfills these words!

To us a child is born, to us a son is given, and the government will be on his shoulder. Every Christian must try to put the government upon the shoulders of Christ. All who trust in Him are members of His kingdom and we try to obey him in all things. The time is promised when all nations will be subject to Him when he will establish his government universally. That is not specifically brought out in this passage except in the reference to v.5.

Question:(Reed) I missed something I want to get. In v.6 the first two phrases are parallelism. What else did you say they could be?

It could be a parallelism. It could also represent two sides of the birth of the birth of the coming virgin-born one. That he is both a son who was born to Mary fully human(that is a child), and yet a son of God who is given to be Saviour of the world.

Next time we will have a 20 min. test in which I will give you particular verses to discuss, and it will be ~~xx~~ on ~~anything~~ anything we have covered thus far this term.

Turn to the ninth chapter of Isaiah. In that ch. we noticed it begins with a prediction that in the very area where darkness and misery came because of the Assyrians, there a light will begin to come. A wonderful light for those people walking in darkness will see this great light. It looks forward imagining a situation of a great light.

It gives us that promise in v.5: "Every warrior's boot used in battle and every garment rolled in blood will be destined for burning, will be fuel for the fire." A wonderful promise. It is not an order that we should destroy all our armaments and let anyone come in and take over our nation that desires anymore than it is an order that we should take all the locks off our doors and leave our houses open for mauraders!

~~It is a prediction of a time when there will be no need of equipment for war, a time when there will be universal peace and safety. That is very important to recognize in passages like this. There is the promise given in the Bible of a time when there will be no further need for any kind of armament for protection.~~

It is true that where the gospel is widely taught, where many people come to know the Lord you are far safer from violence than in other places. This country of ours was founded mostly by people who came here in order to gain religious freedom. People who came here in order that they might worship God as they believed the Scripture taught. Now they were not completely sanctified! There were people among them who fell far short of the ideal that was being taught among them, and as generation came after generation there were groups who grew up among them--swindlers and people who would commit all sorts of evil.

However, the level of violence and crime in those days was far lower than in any country where the gospel was not being widely proclaimed. Chas. Dickens hated the U.S.A. He hated it because the printers here took his works that he had printed in England and made copies of them and sold them without paying him any royalties. So he paid a visit to this country and when he got here he ridiculed what he found here. The President of the U.S.A. invited him to dinner. He sent a brief note: It does not suit my convenience! I heard it said once that he was the only man who had ever refused an invitation to a presidential dinner. I don't know whether there was any truth to that or not but it certainly is unusual at least.

It showed that he was not prejudiced in favor of the U.S.A. Yet Chas. Dickens said at about that time (1840 or 1850) that in the U.S.A. at any time of day or night a woman could walk anywhere without any fear of being attacked or molested in any way. That was a tremendous statement made by one who was prejudiced against rather than for this country. It is not that way today. The Gospel is not preached as it once was. Many souls are being reached in our country for the Lord. But the

overwhelming majority of our people never hear the gospel. And crime and violence have increased as never before.

The statement was recently made by a federal officer that 50% of those who are arrested on charges of rape and murder are the age 17 or under! That is a situation we never had in our country before.

This verse does not say that people will open everything up and let the robbers take everything they want. It says the time is coming when they won't need equipment for war; that there is to be a time on earth not only when peace will reign in the hearts of those who believe in Christ--that is a marvelous work of the Gospel-- but this says there will be a time when there is no need for armament.

Question: The next verse talks about this ~~long~~ period of peace is going to begin with the birth of Christ.

It doesn't say when it will commence. It says it is coming through him.

Questioner: I'm going to assume that. It seems to me that one can say that this peace starts with the reign of Christ when he comes back to earth. If we take this verse literally of the birth of Christ we can apply that in a spiritual manner and say that when the nations are finally defeated and get scattered(?) over the Mediterranean that's when war ceased because they were no longer nations

Most of them were slaves and forced under the lash of those who had control. Some of course were free and but the early Christians --- the Christians say in the 3rd century and the 4th century said that the very predictions in the Bible of a time of universal peace were fulfilled because there was peace in the Roman world such as the world had never seen before!

Some of them said the birth of Christ not only cast its influence forward but also backward ~~because~~ at the coming of Christianity because Augustus had established a regime of peace within the Roman empire and people could travel hundreds of miles without fear of molestation and within that portion of the world there was such peace as the world had never seen. They said that is the fulfillment of many predictions in Scripture that through Christ universal peace would come.

But then at the end of the 4th century the barbarians broke through the Roman defenses and began marching back and forth across the Roman empire pillaging and destroying, and eventually reducing the level of literacy of the Roman Empire from perhaps 70% down to perhaps less than 2%, and then the pagans began to say, Look you promised this ~~it~~ would come through Christ; look what's coming up. As to whether that is the fulfillment, whether it refers to peace in the heart rather than external peace, or as to whether it is something yet to come, that is a question we could ~~not~~ discuss at length but it is a very good question to look at and to have in mind.

But I want to go on to the next verse. Certainly this is either going to start when the child is born, or it is going to be the result of the activity of this child who is going to be born. I don't think we can be dogmatic on the verse as between those two, but we can be dogmatic that there will never be universal peace on earth unless it is directly related in some way to this child who is born. It is not something that human effort and planning can bring about.

It is something that is brought about by this child who is born. "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given." We noticed last time that this may be Heb. parallelism. We cannot conclude from this that he is going to be the God-Man --that that is taught in this verse. It is true of many of the predictions that they are not absolutely clear in the OT so that those people were foolish not to recognize them. Jesus Christ's own disciples did not recognize this, that He was the Son of God for a long time.

He said to Peter, "Flesh and blood has not revealed this to you but my Father who is in heaven." The predictions are so given in the OT that taking them together the disciples could see eventually and came to see they all pointed to Christ.

So when it says, "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given," I believe we are justified in saying here we have a suggestion of the fact of the twofold nature. Not a proof of it. Not a definite prediction of it, but a suggestion of it, which we find wonderfully fulfilled in what actually happened. That he was indeed a child born of Mary, born of perfect natural way so far as the natural birth was concerned - an infant, crying in his mother's arms. At the same time he was the Son given by the Lord.

While he was in the cradle crying for his milk, he was at the same time controlling the stars in their orbits and directing the affairs of the universe which he had created. There's a mystery which we cannot understand. We can't understand the mystery of the God-Man. How there can be only one God and yet three persons. We can't understand it, but it is clearly taught in the Bible.

One God and three persons. We can't understand how Jesus Christ can be fully God and fully man. Not mixed and no division. The Chalcedon creed very definitely denies both attempts to rationalize it. It's interesting how our theological controversies through the ages have really added nothing to our knowledge beyond what a person who reads the Bible as it stands can get. But they have rid us of attempts to rationalize and explain how Jesus was part God and part man. He was not. Whether they agreed that he had two natures not separated, not separable but not mixed, two complete natures, then some tried to get around it by saying he is fully man and fully God, but the will is only divine. The monothelites. He only had a divine will, no human will.

That was condemned as a heresy by all branches of the church eventually, although there was a long discussion about it.

You get back to the simple statement of Scripture: Jesus Christ is fully God, and He is fully man.

Questions: by Philip (indistinct)

No, I ~~said~~ said, verse 6 says, a child was to be born. Verse 5 says that the result of the coming of this child is going to be a complete abolition of war. It does not say it will occur immediately. It might occur immediately when He was born. It might occur later in his life. It might be God's plan that it should occur many centuries later, but it does say, I believe, that it will occur.

~~Verse 6 therefore begins with this statement which does not have to be a statement about the two natures, but I believe in the light of our knowledge of the facts, it is reasonable to occur that way.~~

Then we read: The government will be upon His shoulders. I believe we can take that saying He will govern in the hearts of those who believe upon Him. But in this age he does not compel us to obey Him. He calls upon us to obey Him. He asks us, having believed in Christ and been born again to seek to bring our lives into conformity with His purpose; to seek to have our characters transformed into the character He wants us to be. To study His word in order to find out what He wants us to do. To seek to have the government truly upon His ~~h~~ shoulders, rather than in our personal desires.

But this does not say the government should be upon his shoulders. It does not say we should try to put the government upon His shoulders. There is a prediction there that suggests for us that we should be truly reigned by him. It promises us that if we seek to have Him directing our lives that He will take charge of our lives. He will enable us more and more to follow Him.

But I believe the promise goes beyond that. I believe it says that He will so completely govern that the time will come when it will be possible to completely irradicate armaments. Because He will be ruling either in the hearts or over the activities of every individual upon the earth. It seems to me to be pretty difficult to get away from that. I would not draw that from this passage alone but that certainly is the obvious interpretation of the passage.

Question: How does that interpretation differ from a double fulfillment? Fulfilled now and in the future?

Thank you. A very good question. If I were to say, Two visitors will enter the room this morning, if I were to make that prediction, well, about 5 min. ago two visotors entered and took seats in the back. I'm not asking you all to look at them, but I'm stating the fact.



I having stated that have made a prediction, a prediction which has been fulfilled. If somebody says, There are still 15 minutes until the hour, and Dr. MacRae two visitors are coming; we do wonder when they are coming. Well, they've already come. See. So the prediction is fulfilled.

Now if I were to say, Our class in Isaiah will be visited by others interested in this subject. Not to say when. Not to say the number. That might mean that two will come today and that is all the visitors we will have. But somebody else might say, He would not have spoken in such a general way if he only meant today. He may mean that through the rest of the semester there will occasionally be visitors dropping in. See what I mean?

You have to examine the statement, and see whether it is a specific statement of one thing, or whether it is a statement of which may be a series of events or a statement which gives a principle. Like if I were to say, Our classroom will be open the rest of this semester for visitors to come. Well, we might have no visitors ready to come, or we might have many, but I would have stated a principle. So each statement has to be examined in the light of the general situation.

When it says, For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given. There are those who say, Jesus Christ is coming back. He is going again to be born and to grow up as a child in this world. There are not many who say that, but there are a very few who say that. The Tibetans say that every time the Dalai Lama dies a new one is supposed to be born that instant somewhere in the country. They have to find him. He is the head of their particular branch of Buddhism.

They have a general series of events. But here where it says, Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given-- that is the answer to all our problems and it seems very clear in the description to be a description of one event. Though many results may follow from the coming of this child, this son.

~~So we have in this verse much more than that statement.~~  
"The government will be upon His shoulders" -- seems to me to say that He is going to control in the governments of the world. He has controlled already to some extent in the governments of Great Britain, Germany, and of this country. But there are many other periods when He has not seem to be controlling at all in these governments.

"The government shall be upon his shoulders" seems to be a statement that goes quite beyond it. Seems to suggest this. But it says " he will be called Wonderful, counsellor, mighty-God, everlasting Father, prince of peace." That is a very interesting statement. He will be called. The most natural way to take that would be: This is going to be His Name! That is the way the Jewish version of Scripture takes it. "For a child is born among us, a son is given unto us, and the government is upon His shoulder, and his name is called Pele el gibbor shar shalom. There is His Name. Take the Hebrew and simply transliterate it. But many of the Jews who

read that do not know what Heb. words mean. Maybe that is all to the good if the version is prepared for Jewish readers entirely. He's going to have this beautiful name-- Pele. . . . sar shaloam.

But in order to help them understand it, the Jewiwh version put the footnote: That is, wonderful incounsel, is God the mighty, the everlasting father, the ruler of peace. They insert an "is" which you can very often do in Heb. sentences where it is not ordinarily used. Most interpreters say that such a long stringy name as an actual name is so extremely unusual that it is hard to believe that is what is intended. His name shall be called: Wonderful in counsel is God the mighty everlasting father the ruler of peace.

At least all Christian interepreters feel that the "is" does not belong there. You take a so-called Christian interpreter, James Moffatt, a great Scottish Scholar, in these days when Scotland is not standing solidly on the word of God as it did a century ago. He translates the verse: For a child has been born to us, a son has been given to us, the royal dignity he wears. And this is the title that he bears: A wonder of a counsellor, a divine hero, a father for all time, a peaceful prince. That gets away quite nicely from anything supernatural. That would fit almost anyone. That was the way Moffatt translates it.

Most of our English translations translate it much more similarly to the KJV. It is very difficult to see how such a title can be given to any child who was born & who is not actually the mighty God. Actually the everlasting father, the prince of peace.

How is Jesus Christ the everlasting Father? Jesus Christ is the Son of God! Yes, there is only one God. One God. All the qualities are in the one God, though there are three persons ~~wh~~ though ~~are~~ in a very real sense Jesus Christ is the everlasting father though there is in the Godhead the Father to the Son.

Question: How do you explain the term Son?

A son is given. Yes. I interpret it that he is actually the son of God. But that as son of God he is fully God. As God he is the creator of all things. By Him all things were created. Therefore the term everlasting Father can be properly applied to Him, even though there is a sense in distinguishing the members of the Godhead, it would apply to the Father rather than to the Son.

We -- There is only one God, yet there are three persons in the Godhead. We cannot explain it. It is a great mystery. Here in the very strongest possible way it predcets the deity of our Lord.

Question: In v.7 it says, "upon his kingdom to order it" --does the "it" refer to the fact that Christ is going to order the kingdom to make it? How are we to take that?

We haven't gotten to v. 7 yet. I appreciate the question but we will get to it. (Not get to it today).

Question: Could you explain a little more what you are

saying about the Everlasting Father? concept?

I would say that Jesus Christ is God, and God is the founder of all things, the creator of all things. He is in that sense the Father of all. Now God is not a Father in the sense that a human being is father of a child. There is not the same physical relation. But God is the creator, the sustainer and former of all, and Jesus Christ is that just as much as God the Father.

Question: Is there a parallel to that in John 14? Philip asked the question, Shew us the Father and it is sufficient. The Lord responded - -

Yes, excellent. He said, Shew us the father and it sufficeth us. Jesus said, He that has seen me has seen the father. The unity of the Godhead is clearly taught in Scripture. Yet, there is a distinction of person. Those who put their emphasis one way go off into one heresy. Those who put it the other way, go off into another heresy. Early church history consists in showing how they went to this heresy, and the church said, No, you're wrong. They then went to the opposite way, and the church said, No, you're wrong.

When you get what the Scripture teaches there is a mystery none of us can understand. But we can take what is clearly taught, that there is one God and everything that can be said about God is true of the entire Godhead. But it is also true that there is a distinction of persons.

We'll have to continue there next week. I'd like to see all the graduate students for just a second.

We were looking at ch. 9. We noticed how it began in the first verse with pointing to the place where the Assyrian army would first enter the land and therefore where the darkness would first come i.e. the northern kingdom, the land of Zebulun and Naphtali, and Galilee, And while ~~the~~ most of this first part of Isa. where it touches upon particular areas is dealing with Jerusalem or the areas around Jerusalem.

Here in in this verse we look~~in~~ particularly to this section of the northern kingdom, the section where the Assyrian army first came in and where the darkness first began to come with the horrors of the attacks and the sieges and the deportations. He says that in that very area light will first appear, and we know it came thru the preaching of Christ who began His preaching in that area instead of down around Jerusalem.

Then we on with this wonderful passage about the great joy of people. Verse 5, the complete end of war that is to come and the reason for it all is given in v. 6-- a child is born, a son is given which could be just Hebrew parallelism. But on the other hand it fits so exactly with what actually happened that we can take it as a suggestion, though not a clear indication in advance, of the fact that this one thru whom all these blessings would come would have a dual nature. That He would be a child of Mary who was born, and also the Son of God who was given.

As I say I don't want to say that you could know it in advance exactly what was going to happen, but when it did happen you see it exactly fits with it, we are quite sure that it's not just Hebrew parallelism but an actual prediction of what would happen.

Then we have this name. This has been a great puzzle to the Jews all through the ages. Imagine a child born who is going to be called mighty God, who is going to be called everlasting Father. How are we going to apply those names to a child that will be born? You could not if it was merely a child that was born. But he is a child who is born and a son who is given. If you apply all these names to the promised Messiah, it certainly points definitely to Christ.

In the Jewish version of Scripture it translates it: A child is born unto us, a son is given and the government is upon his shoulder and his name is called Pele . . . . . Sar Shalom. The Jew reading that verse thinks, My what a long name that child is going to have-- Pele . . . . . Sar Shalom. I never knew of anybody who had a name quite that long. Though there have been some pretty long ones. It would mean nothing (to him) unless he happened to look at the footnote. But there is a footnote which says: That is, Wonderful in counselling is God the mighty, the everlasting Father, the ruler of peace.

There have been many names which have been like the first part of that. Wonderful is God. I don't know whether that = I don't know whether there ever was one who had exactly that name but many very similar names occur not only in Israel but also in

all the nations of antiquity. A greater part of the names that children were given had the name of a god in the name. A great number of Hebrew names begin with Jeho (as we pronounce it) which is the name of God. We translate it "the LORD" in KJV. Many have that at the beginning. Some have it at the end as Yah as in Hezekiah.

Not all names ending in Yah (jah) are that because there were ancient names which were shortened. Like we would shorten William to Willy. A long name could be shortened and the end of it could have yah(jah) for a short ending form like the "e" we put on many names. That occurs in Babylonian names very frequently. It could be that.

Also we have a great many Babylonian names, and names in other ancient lands, that end with names of particular gods. This is recognized by all scholars as in most of these names at least that end in "iah" as being the name of God. So it can occur at the beginning or at the end.

So if the name was Wonderful is God, or even Wonderful in Counsel is God that would be a natural name. But to give such a long description of God in the course of the name as this does would be quite without parallel. Anywhere else in the Bible is the name of anyone else or any Babylonian or Aramaic or any other ancient name that I have ever come across. I once spent thousands of hours studying the names of ancient Babylonian and related peoples. I never came across one which had a long description of the god included in a name like this one. A very unusual type of a name.

So it is much more reasonable to take it as rather than being a proper name, it is a description of the character of the one who is to be born. Very often names were descriptive of characters. His name is wonderful in counsel. In KJV I think it has a comma after wonderful. In NIV they leave out the comma. There is an argument for both ways. Whether it is two names: Wonderful and Counsellor. Or whether it is a Wonderful Counsellor.

Anyone who knows Hebrew immediately in looking at it says it cannot be Wonderful Counsellor, it must be Wonder and Counsellor. Because an adjective in Hebrew follows the noun; it does not precede. If it precedes it then you have a verbal sentence. It would be Wonderful is counsel. If it was Wonderful Counsellor the word wonderful would follow, In Hebrew.

However this word Pelleg doesn't have to be an adjective; it could be a noun. A noun in the construct. It could be a wonder of a counsellor! If you said he's a wonder of a counsellor in English that would be said as a wonderful counsellor. So a good argument can be made for making it one phrase, parallel with the other phrases here but the most natural way to take it is that you have two names: He is wonderful and He is a counsellor. We have further evidence that it is two names in the fact that when Manoa(father of Sampson)

when the angel came to him and predicted the birth of his son, he asked, What is your name? He replied, Why should I tell you my name seeing it is wonderful? That's this same word -- pele.

The angel of the Lord, one of the theophanies of the OT, says there his name is Pele. Here he says his name is Pele- . . . sar shalom. So we have here two characteristics probably described: he is wonderful, and he is a counsellor. Thought we do not rule out the idea that it is one name with an adjective. But the other seems to be more likely.

Incidentally, I'm not asking anyone to take my opinion on anything. I want you to interpret the Scripture for yourself. If in doubt find your own conclusions. But when we come to a test if you simply give me an interpretation that is different from what I think, I have no objection to your holding an entirely different view. But I cannot give you credit for it unless you first state what I think.

If you say the professor says this means such and such but I think he's quite wrong, I think it means so and so, that will not detract in the slightest from the mark. But I do expect you to know what I give whether you accept it or not, and in your papers to show you know what I give. If you go on to show in some way that I'm wrong I'm happy to be corrected, or at least to have another idea suggested. But when it comes to marking, I have to see whether you got the particular thing which I stressed in connection with that particular verse, even if you have some interesting things that I'm happy to get.

Where

Question: Was that a reference to the angel of the Lord being called wonderful?

Answer: Judges 13:18.

Question: Are you saying the Hebrew Bible says this is a name for God?

Says which is a name for God?

Question: The footnote in the Hebrew Bible.

No there is no footnote in the Hebrew Bible. The footnote is in the Jewish translation of the Hebrew.

Question: Jewish translation of what?

Of the OT.

Question: And what does it say?

It says: That is, -- and then gives the translation of of the words. It simply puts into English letters the Hebrew words (in the text), but in the footnote it gives a translation of these Hebrew words, and the translation it gives of them is different from the translation that we think is correct.

Question: What was the translation?

The translation they give they say, That is: Wonderful in counsel is God the mighty, the everlasting father, the ruler of peace. That's what they give for a translation. I gave reasons why I think I do not think that's what the name means.

Any other questions? We have this name given to him. Last time we had this verse we had discussion of the son being called the everlasting father. We noticed that as far as that is concerned there is one God, not three. Jesus said, I and the Father are one. God is not the father of the son in the sense in which a human being is the father of a son. It does not express that God the Father is first and then God the Son was later because he is co-eternal with the father.

From all eternity God existed in three persons. So the word father is somewhat figurative as it expresses a relationship of the first person to the second person of the trinity. It shows a certain relationship. A certain pre-eminence in a way, and yet they are equal in every way. There are three persons but there is only one God. The characteristics that God the father has as he shows love and kindness and care for the son and for all humanity, those same characteristics Jesus Christ the Son shows toward all of those chosen whom he has brought into the kingdom.  
children

So it is very proper to call him the everlasting father when he was going to be born in Bethlehem.

And he is a prince of peace. The one who brings not merely the cessation of hostilities but complete end of violence, and not only that but the coming in of life that is fully and truly worthwhile.

Question: Would you repeat that concerning the everlasting father? What you said about Christ's relationship to the believer.

That we read in Hebrews that Christ brought many sons into glory, many sons into the kingdom. Just as Paul speaks of Timothy as my son. He was not Paul's son in the physical sense but he was one to whom Paul had brought the knowledge of Christ, one whom Paul had brought into the kingdom of Christ. Similarly in one sense Jesus Christ is the father of all who believe. So the term everlasting father is not out of place as applying to Him.

Incidentally, just a word in that connection which has not perhaps a direct relation to our course, but in KJV monogenes is used of Christ. It is translated in KJV as "only begotten". In another place "the only begotten of the father." The word monogenes could be derived from either of two different roots. The mono is "one", "only", or "single." But genes could either be derived from a verb: to generate, to bring into existence. Or it could be derived from a noun which means "class" or "kind." In the 3rd cent. A.D. there were those who took it from the verb instead of from the noun, therefore they said Christ is the only one that has been produced by the Father. The only one the Father has begotten! Then the question was, Since Jesus is from all eternity

co-equal with the Father and co-eternal with the Father, how can he be produced by the Father? Therefore they originated a theory that God the Father is always generating God the Son! That that is a process that has always been going on, and is still going on.

There is no warrant for any such theory as that anywhere except for this misinterpretation of this word. The correct interpretation of the word is to take it from the noun, the one-class-son. He is the only son, the one and only, the unique son. That is, he is the Son in the sense in which no one else is son.

We are all sons of God if we believe in Christ. But He is a son in a unique and special sense. I saw a criticism of the NASB a few years ago, in which a man made a statement, It is terrible that it says Jesus is the only son rather than the only begotten. It said, No one but God could have an only begotten son! The person who wrote that article either was not thinking when he wrote it, or he did not know Greek! One or the other. Because the word monogenes, if I remember correctly, is used about seven times in the NT. About half of them refer to Christ. The other half refer to human beings.

It is even translated only begotten in the book of Hebrews where it says that Abraham did not hold back from offering his only-begotten son! So right there in the KJV you have it said Abraham had an only-begotten son! Of course he was not Abraham's only begotten son. Abraham begat Ishmael before he begat Isaac. So Isaac was never Abraham's only begotten son! But Isaac was Abraham's one class son. He was his unique son. He was his son through whom the promise was to come. He was his only son of Abraham through Sarah. So it is perfectly clear from that that it means his one-class or unique son. I don't know any English word which exactly gives it.

So here you have the son ~~described~~ described and called the everlasting father, the prince of peace. It goes on to say: Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end. Our country is now at peace. How can you increase its peace? You might say you ~~could~~ could get some internal peace as well as external. We have peace with other nations now, but internally we have more violence every year than ever before. So we do not have internal peace. In some sections of our country we have a tremendous amount of violence. Internal peace we do not have, and we could increase in the amount of internal peace which we have.

But this goes beyond that. The cessation of violence. It refers to well being. It refers to all that which makes life worth living. So a big increase of his government and peace there shall be no end. He will reign on David's throne and over his kingdom. Establishing and upholding it with justice and righteousness from that time on and forever. Here we have the marvellous prediction of the ongoing work of Christ. Then we read: The zeal of the Lord Almighty will accomplish this. This word "zeal" is interesting. It is the same word that is used in the first commandment where it says, Thou shalt have no other gods before me, for the Lord thy God is a



jealous God. The word is translated "jealous" in the greater number of cases. Jealousy translated "zeal" in a number. What can the jealousy of God have to do with the coming of Christ?

The answer is that we don't have any exact English equivalent for this Hebrew word. It is translated "jealously" usually, and a number of times it is translated "zeal." It expresses an emotion on the part of God. The desire for recognition of His exclusive authority over that which is His. It includes His care for that which is His. His determination to do all that is best and right for that which is His.

So the word as applied to human beings is a word which expresses usually that which is not desirable. But in God it represents his very rightful determination that people have no other gods before Him. That He is to have the supreme place and His interest in doing everything that is for the very best for those who belong to Him. So the zeal of the Lord Almighty-- there is much in that Hebrew word that is translated-- you can't say translated because our English word really doesn't get it, but it gives us something of the idea.

The word is more commonly translated jealously, but if you translated it here jealously I'm sure it would confuse most readers. If it's translated zeal, most readers pass over it without getting much idea from it. But the idea of the Hebrew word is one which is very important in the whole context. God is sending His Son the Lord Jesus Christ in order to vindicate His honor, in order to put an end to the power of sin, in order to bring salvation to all those who are His.

There we have a very important break at the end of v.7. A far more important break than at the beginning of v.9. Incidentally if any of you want to check any of these things in your Heb. Bible in the first part of ch. 9, you will immediately find yourself in difficulty unless you know Hebrew very well. If you know Hebrew only fairly well, you will immediately find yourself in difficulty, a difficulty which can be easily solved by noting a very small point.

That point is this: If the Hebrew in ch.9 what we call v.7 will be called v.6. What we call v.6 will be called v.5, etc. If you're looking for the verse and know Heb. only fairly well you will immediately find yourself confused, but if you look at the number one lower and you find it right.

The reason for that is easy to see. When the Archbishop rode on his horse looking into his Latin Bible, and deciding where it would be good to make ch. divisions, when he came to this place at the beginning of ch. 9, he may have realized that this was the place where the Assyrians first brought the darkness, and in that very place Jesus would bring the light. Therefore he included v.1 of our present ch. 9 in ch. 9 rather than leaving it in the previous chapter, as would see more natural if you were not aware of that fact. On the other hand the Archbishop may not have fully understood that.

We do not know whether he did, but I feel quite sure that he was familiar enough with the NT to realize that when Mat. said when describing the preaching of Christ: These things were fulfilled== were done that it might be fulfilled which were spoken by the prophet -- and then quotes these two vv., that Mat. quotes a part of v.1, and a part of v. 2 together, and therefore it was reasonable to think they belonged together and therefore he made his ch. division one verse short.

It would have been far better if instead of that he had made his division after v.7, where we have a really important change of subject. But when the Jews saw what the Archbishop had done, they felt he had rendered a great service to Bible study by making ch. divisions because it makes ~~xxxx~~ it so easy to find places. They already had verse division. Those are much earlier. But they didn't have ch. divisions. Therefore the Jews felt that it would be very helpful to put the ch. divisions into the Bible, therefore they made them it it following the ch. divisions the archbishop had made in the Latin Bible.

But in making one case out of seven or eight they thought he hadn't made a very good division. There are a good many places where it may be 8 or 10 vv. off in enumerations. In this case they made it just one verse off. If you did not understand its relation to Christ, or if you did not know Mat.'s quotation, if you are going to make a division anywhere earlier than v. 7, the logical place to make it would be where the Jews do rather than where we do.

Because you are talking about darkness is all of the latter part of ch. 8 and also in the first verse of ch. 9, and from there on you are talking about the glory of the life to come. So they simply made their ch. division one v. later. So if you are looking up the verse in the Hebrew Bible keep that in mind.

The old ASV issued in 1901 -- many Bible scholars prefer it to the KJV, but it did not take on with the masses of the people. So when the RSV came out they stopped printing it, and you hardly ever come across it any more. In some ways they made a version which is more up to date than the KJV, which corrected some of the words where the meaning has greatly changed, but in the course of it they did not give it as good smooth flowing English as the KJV has. With the mass of the people the somewhat jerkyness of it in some places detracts a great deal from it.

But one thing in that version that I like very much was that wherever the Heb. enumeration ~~xxxx~~ differs from the English in a ch., they put a footnote at the bottom. They put a footnote indicating what verse it was in the Hebrew Bible. That was very helpful, unless you know Hebrew real well. If the ch. starts 10 vv. off from where the English does, you can sometimes be rather puzzled, in finding the exact place. I'm sorry that so far as I've noticed none of our recent translations(versions) do give us that helpful note.

Question: I got one of those about 2 years ago - - -

Glad to hear that.

Question: About v. 7. In the middle of v. 7 it says: upon his Kingdom to order it. Is the it referring to simply the throne of David, and just to Israel?

No. I would say -- David was one Hebrew king who ruled over a great number of non-Hebrews. He extended his dominion over the Philistines, the Ammonites, the Moabites and over many other peoples until he had 3 times as large a territory as Israel had before. When you think of the throne of David, you think of David as the great king of the Jews. But you also think of him as the king who ruled over a far larger section of the world than the Jews have at any other time (or up to his time)(?)

I believe when it refers to David's throne here, it refers to the promise of a throne which eventually cover the whole world.

Question: It refers to a physical earthly reign, rather than to a spiritual reign?

I would think it includes both. I would think it begins with the going forth of the message from Jerusalem which led people to be born again into the kingdom of God, and that all who have been born again are truly members of David's kingdom and look to Jesus Christ as our guide and leader. This increase there is to be no end to but I would think it eventually covers the time when the whole world will be included by it and there will be no violence. And no evil outward acts done. Thank you, that's a very helpful question.

Now we have a new section starting here. When I asked you some time ago to make a -- to note the importance of the various divisions, you noticed that this is a far more important division than the ch. at the beginning of v. 9 (ch. 9)? and still more important than the one at the beginning of ~~xxxxxxx~~ v.10. In fact I think that one at the beginning of v. 10 the arch-bishop certainly must have stumbled at that point and made the mark where he didn't intend to, ~~xxxx~~ because I can't think he was stupid enough not to see that you have four stanzas, each of them ending with the same phrase, and to put three of them before and the fourth one after with a sharp change of thought before and after this four stanzas. I can't think he would be stupid enough to do that ~~xxxxxxx~~ intentionally. So I feel that something must have happened to make him move hurriedly and turned his attention away at that particular point.

So we have here what should be one ch. if you are going to have chapters. Beginning at 9:8 and ~~xxx~~ running through 10:4, a ch. with 4 stanzas in it. 9:8, "The Lord has sent a message against Jacob; it will fall on Israel."

Jacob and

What is Israel? We refer to Jacob as the man who was the grandson of Abraham. We speak of Israel as the nation. But actually God changed Jacob's name to Israel. In Genesis there are many places where he is called Israel, and there are other places where he still continues to be called Jacob even after God had changed his name.

Later on it is quite common to refer to the nation by the term Israel, but occasionally the nation is referred to by the term Jacob, particularly in parallelism. I believe in the context it is not referring to the individual Jacob, but referring to his descendants and these two are parallel as Hebrew parallelism == he sent a message against Jacob, it will fall on Israel.

Then another question comes up. Is he here talking about the northern kingdom which was the greater part of the region of Israel. What we now call Israel was Philistia. What was then ~~kw~~ Israel included what we refer to as the West Bank because it is related to Jordan, just as California is on the West Bank of the Mississippi River. It was on the west bank but it really was Israel in ancient times. When they came to divide it into two parts, the larger part was the northern and so it fell into Israel, and in order to avoid confusion the southern part is quite generally called Judah.

naturally  
So after the northern kingdom was destroyed ~~xxxxxx~~ the southern kingdom was again what you meant if you referred to Israel. The word Israel here means both parts or it could mean the northern kingdom. When you go on to the next verse: All the people will know it- Ephraim and the inhabitants of Samaria- who say with pride and arrogance of heart --- that suggests the northern kingdom.

But as you look through the whole poem he is referring in the first part to the northern kingdom and in the later part to the southern kingdom, so I would incline to think that this first part of the message that will fall on Israel refers to the whole. He talks first about the northern part and then about the southern. The message is sent against Jacob, it will fall on Israel.

Then he speaks specifically of the northern kingdom. "All the people will know it -- Ephraim and the inhabitants of Samaria - who say with pride . . . the brick are fallen down but we will rebuild with dressed stone; the fig trees have been felled, but we will replace them with cedars." A wonderful attitude. When you have a great flood. When you have an earthquake and when things are bad you don't sit down in discouragement and say, Isn't it awful, what can we do? You get busy and rebuild, and you rebuild stronger than you did before.

So if it were not for the last part of v. 9 (that I skipped) we would say, This is a very fine and commendable attitude! But unfortunately commendable as it is from one viewpoint, it is actually an attitude which receives God's condemnation because it is said with pride and arrogance of heart.

If we have a national catastrophe; if something goes wrong with us because of our own mistakes and we find ourselves crushed, it is wonderful if we get up and say we're going to rebuild better than before! We're going to make something better than before this happened. But if what comes comes because God has sent us it in order to show us the error of our ways, then the thing we should do is repent before him and seek his forgiveness rather than to stand up and defy him and say, What we have has been injured but we are going to rebuild better than before.

So here these two -- verse 10 would be a wonderful motto for us when catastrophe comes which is not due to our sins, or to our mistakes. But when it is said with pride and arrogance of heart, then it deserves God's condemnation. So it goes on to say how the Lord has strengthened their foes against them and they have come at them from all sides with open mouths. For all this -- in all this ( I think would be better) his anger is not turned away, his hand is still upraised.

The Hebrew is simply "in all this." The word "in" there is sometimes used to show the meaning -- why all this -- would not be out of place. The most natural translation is "in all this." The translation "for all this" is a rather natural guess in the light of context at the end of this first stanza but it doesn't fit the succeeding stanza! So I wish the KJV had been more literal and that the succeeding versions had not simply followed KJV in this translation. It can't be exactly literal in any translation.

There are many things that if put word for word into English don't make sense. You have to take context into consideration in any translation. There is no word yet in the Hebrew at this point and the word they translation "for" is actually "in." In this context with the first phrase "in all this his anger is not turned away" is more clearly expressed to us by saying "for." Yet for all this God is not satisfied. He has brought all these calamities upon them, but they haven't repented, His anger is still against them.

Yet "for" in light of context is perfectly right here. But it does not fit in the later stanzas. More literally it is "in all this."

Then we go on to the second stanza: But the people have not returned to Him who struck them, nor have they sought the Lord Almighty. So the Lord will cut off from Israel both head and tail." There is a figurative expression. The word head. How does a nation have a head? An individual has a head. How does a nation have a head? It is a figurative expression. But whether to call head a figurative expression is a matter on which there may be differences of opinion because very frequently figurative expressions come to be used so much that they come to lose the thought of a figure and come to be literal ways of expressing an idea. So we speak of the head of a nation -- originally a figure but as we use it it is simply a literal expression. He is the head of this nation. That is a literal expression.

But the word tail isn't. That is definitely a figure. The head and the tail he will cut off from Israel. Israel will have no individual as a tail, the nation as a whole did not have a tail! It simply is a figurative way for saying top and bottom. He is cutting off all parts of Israel -- head and tail. Then the next two expressions are clearly figurative. Both palm branch and reed. The palm branch refers to the beautiful top of the palm tree. Like the head. The beautiful thing you see that stands out. The reed is the little bushes down by the creek.

These thousands of little bushes down by the creek don't amount to anything. He says Nobody will escape God's wrath. They will not escape it because they are great, important leaders who say, Nobody will touch me; I can run away and take my money with me, and be safe in some other country no matter what happens. No, the head will not escape. Neither head nor tail. Neither the ~~xxxxx~~ palm branch or the reed.

The people in positions of leadership in most every country in most every country in which there has been a revolution or an overturning, in recent years, the leaders have escaped and taken great sums of money with them, and now they have been affluent in other countries. That will not happen there. The leaders will suffer as well as the people.

Then look at it from the other viewpoint. They will sweep over the country, they will destroy the leaders--the people who have money and influence and skill, they will be taken off into captivity, but the rank and file of society will be content whatever they have, they will not suffer. He says, They will suffer too. Both the head and tail, palm branch and reed. Four expressions all of which originally were figures but probably head has become by this time a literal expression. The other three are definitely figurative.

Of the papers that were turned in, most did a very good job in noting what were the figurative expressions. There were one or two of which I wasn't quite sure they understood what we mean by a figure of speech. A literal expression is using a word that is commonly used to point to the particular thing you are referring to. A figurative expression is a comparison usually not expressed as a comparison but actually a substitute for the thing you are referring to.

Anybody who says he takes the whole Bible literally is talking nonsense. The Bible is full of figurative speech. But very often a figurative expression is clearer and more understandable than a literal expression. So to say you don't take the Bible all literally isn't to say you don't take it as all true, and it doesn't mean necessarily is harder to understand. There may be places that are difficult to understand or there are different possibilities of interpretation.

I like to think of figurative speech as being like salt. You sprinkle some over the dish and it tremendously improves the dish. Every great writing of importance has figures of speech. But if you pour a whole bucket full of salt on it you ruin the thing.

thing. So when people take a part of the Bible as entirely figurative, they are reducing it to nonsense. One man said about the Book of Revelation, he said, Remember it is a symbolic book, and everything in it is a symbol! and nothing in it stands for what it says! Well, it is a wonderful book of symbols. It has many wonderful symbols. At least  $\frac{3}{4}$  of it has got to be literal or ~~any~~ anybody can make of it anything he wants to. It isn't all figurative.

Question: What is the difference between figurative and allegorical?

Allegorical is carrying the figurative idea to a much further point. The figure is a word or expression used to represent something. An allegory is where you have a full story in which all of it represents something entirely different from what is originally presented. An allegory can mean anything. If you know what he's trying to get across then the allegory can increase your understanding and be very helpful. But if you don't know what he's trying to get across you may just as well get something entirely different from the allegory.

Question: Verse \_\_\_\_\_ says "in one day". Does that mean on the final day somehow they broke through the walls, and the whole city was taken off in one day? One 24 hour day?

The word day -- I saw a very intelligent man who has written some very good books about the Scripture, who wrote an attack on people for taking a stand on inerrancy. He said, People who stand for the inerrancy of Scripture have to do all kinds of twisting such as saying the days in Genesis are not days. What do we mean by day. The common idea is that a day means 24 hours.

But if you would write down every time you use the word day for the next month, I would be surprised if one of them referred to a 24 hour period. Day does not mean 24 hour period. Day means a period of activity and is used in Genesis there was a day between darkness and darkness. There was a period of light between two periods of darkness. If I meet you tonight at 11 o'clock and say, Isn't this a wonderful day? You'd say, What are you talking about? This isn't day at all. We don't use day to mean 24 hours unless we're figuring interest or we're making use of a timetable!

It means a period of activity. When Jesus said Abraham saw my day and was glad, He didn't mean Abraham saw a particular 24 hr. period. He meant he saw Jesus' period of activity. So here when it says "in a single" day" in context it means a narrow space of time. But I don't think we can carry it to the point it necessarily means between two periods of darkness. It might have been, but we don't know enough about the precise details to know.

He continues:(9:15) The elders and prominent men are the head, the prophets who teach lies are the tail. That's a bit of sarcasm or satire.  
the Lord giving them true wisdom and telling them

ing them what they should follow when actually Isaiah says these folks are really so unimportant that they can be considered as the tail! This criticism of the prophets -- he's going to take head and tail and cut it off.

"Those who guide this people mislead them, and those who are guided are led astray. Therefore the Lord will take no pleasure in the young men, nor will he pity the fatherless and widows, for everyone is ungodly and wicked, every mouth speaks vileness. Yet for all this his anger is not turned away . . . That's utter nonsense. Yet, in spite of their wickedness his anger is not turned away! That doesn't make sense. The passage before it says he's going to give them this terrible punishment and yet in spite of that his anger is not turned away. He's going to go with something else!

But this stanza describes their wickedness. In spite of that His anger will not be turned away. That doesn't make sense. The Hebrew does not say that. Somebody long ago very well translated the first one in light of context, and most translations since then simply follow it in the other stanzas. The Heb. says there is no yet, not even an and. Most lines of Hebrew seem to start with and, but it does not even start with that. It simply says, In all of this his anger is not turned away. His hand is still upraised. In all this situation we've described His anger is not turned away.

We have the other two stanzas and then we have to go on and I know you would have a more pleasant Thanksgiving dinner if you were busy working on an assignment to get in by next Friday, but in spite of that I'm not going to give you one this time! So we will not have any assignment to turn in this week. But if you can look ahead to the rest of ch. 10 and 11 just to have it in mind as we discuss it I think it will add to the value of our lecture.



In ch. 9 we have that poem~~ix~~ in four stanzas which begins with rebuke upon the northern kingdom. Rebuke for their determination which would be good if it were not for the wickedness with which it is connected. Therefore what would be diligence and most commendable becomes arrogance and deserving condemnation.

The Lord predicts the destruction that is to come in the near future to them. Then he looks to Judah and looks further ahead describing the wickedness of the people declares God is going to punish but his punishment will proceed still further.

So the third stanza begins in v.18 and "Wickedness burns as a fire and consumes friers and ~~xxxxxxx~~ thorns. Even the ~~xxxx~~ small things are consumed by it. He sets the great forest ablaze and the columns of smoke rolls upwards. The Lord is going to put His wrath out upon them They will reach conditions where they will be feeding upon one another. They will be eating and not satisfied. Manasseh will feed on Ephraim, and Ephraim on Manasseh. Together they turn against Judah. Yet for all this his anger is not turned away, but his hand is still upraised.

Then the fourth stanza, which in our arrangement in ch. 10 begins again with speaking of leadership that makes unjust laws, makes widows their prey and robs the fatherless. Criticizes the injustice among the people. He says, To whom will you run for help? Where will you leave your riches? Nothing will remain but the fringe among the captives, the fallen and the slain. Yet for all this his anger is not turned away, his hand is still upraised.

There, of course, there should be a new chapter division because there we turn to a nother subject. The rest of ch. 10 is very similar to the book of Habakkuk except that Habakkuk, written more than a century later deals with a similar situation at a later time, and deals with the Chaldeans who are eventually to destroy Judah, whereas this deals with the Assyrians who conquered the northern kingdom and who reduced the southern kingdom to such a bad situation for a considerable time. Yet God promised that he would deliver from the Assyrian, but He did not later on from the Chaldeans.

So we being in 10:5, "Woe to the Assyrians, the rod of my anger in whose hand~~x~~ is the club of my wrath." A very remarkable concept. A very striking idea -- that the wicked Assyrian, the terrible aggressor, the one who is doing such terrible damage in the world, is nevertheless God's instrument for performing His purposes. He doesn't say, Woe to the Assyrians, those wicked people who are doing such great harm in the world. He says, Woe to the Assyrians, the rod of my anger in whose hand is the ~~xxxx~~ club of my wrath." Whether it should be Woe to the Assyrians, or whether it is really the woe that comes from the Assyrians, is a matter of interpretation here. But the sense of the v. is that the Assyrian is God's instrument. When things in the world seem to be very bad, and things we cannot control, we can know that God is still in control and He has His purpose in that.

He says, I sent him against a godless ~~xx~~ nation; I dispatch him against a people who anger me, who seize loot and snatch plunder and trample them down like mud in the streets." So these terrible things that occur are actually produced ~~x~~ by God as He sends the Assyrian as His instrument.

In v.7 he looks at another aspect. "But this is not what he intends; this is not what he has in mind. His purpose is to destroy, to put an end to many nations." Then he quotes the Assyrian kings in their boastings: "Are not my commanders all kings? Has not Calno fared like Carchemish? Is not Hamath like Arpad? And Samaria like Damascus? My hand seized kingdoms of the idols, kingdoms whose images excelled those of Jerusalem and Samaria. Shall I not deal with Jerusalem and her images as I dealt with Samaria and her images?"

There's a picture of the arrogance of the Assyrians. The Assyrian is God's instrument, but that does not excuse them for the wickedness they perpetrate. So he says, "When the Lord has finished all his word against Mt. Zion and Jerusalem, I will punish the king of Assyria, he will say. The wilful pride of his heart and the haughty look in his eyes.

How ready we are to think in some way we must be God's instrument to punish iniquity. How ready most human beings are to try to find ways to get even with those who injure them in any way. We must realize that those who injure us may be God's instruments to punish us for our sins. They may be His instruments to chastize us. If they are not we can leave their punishment in His hands.

That's not to say that governments should not deal with those who break the laws. God has established governments for the purpose of maintaining what is right and proper and put down violence. But those who injure us, it is God's will that we should forgive. We must remember that vengeance is His. He will repay.

The Lord says he will punish the King of Assyria and then he quotes him again where the king of Assyria thinks he's succeeded in doing all this because of his great strength. Verse 14, As one reaches into a nest, so my hands reach for the wealth of the nations. As men gather abandoned eggs, so I gathered all the countries.

God says (v.15), Does the ax raise itself above him who swings it? or the saw boast against him who uses it? As if a rod were to wield him who lifts it up, or a club brandish him who is not wood? Therefore the Lord, the Lord Almighty, will send a wasting disease upon his sturdy warriors. Under his glory a fire shall be kindled. . . ." This was fulfilled when the Lord sent what was possibly a plague -- at least in some way the Lord destroyed this great multitude of the Assyrian army, and delivered Jerusalem from the great danger it was in when the Assyrians had overrun most of the land of Israel and they were expecting any day they might come and attack Jerusalem.

So the Lord will send a wasting disease among his sturdy warriors. Under his pomp a fire will be kindled. The light of Israel will become a fire.' He looks on further to the ultimate

complete destruction of the Assyrian empire, as a complete a destruction of any nation has ever suffered in all history.

10:17 - The light of Israel shall become a flame. Their holy one -- He doesn't say Israel will become a fire and destroy ~~them~~ them. He says God who is the light of Israel will. Their Holy One a flame, and in a single day it will burn and consume his thorns and his briars. His fertile fields and splendor of his forests will be completely destroyed. As when a sick man wastes away. The remaining trees of his forest will be so few that a child could write them down.

Thus far he has dealt with the Assyrians very specifically and given several different aspects of the problem, and explained God's will in relation to them. As far as he has looked now it is to the immediate disaster of the Assyrians when they desire to destroy Jerusalem. Before the ch. is over he will look still further into the future, a century later, to the complete destruction of the Assyrians.

In v. 21-22 he turns his attention to Israel. "A remnant will return, a remnant of Jacob will return to the mighty God." Israel is not to be destroyed like the Assyrians are Israel is to have a remnant that remains. God is going to cause that they not perish. "Though your people, Israel, be like the sand by the sea, a remnant will return; destruction has been decreed overwhelming in righteousness. The Lord, the Lord almighty will carry out the destruction decreed upon the whole land. Therefore this is what the Lord says, O my people who live in Zion, do not be afraid of the Assyrians who beat you with a rod and lift up a club against you as Egypt did. Very soon my anger against you will end, and my wrath will be directed to their destruction. The Lord Almighty will lash them with a whip as when he struck down Midian at the rock Oreb. He will raise his rod over the waters as he did in Egypt. In that day their burden will be lifted from your shoulder, the yoke from your neck, the yoke will be broken because you have grown so fast."

Here is a promise that looks toward the destruction of Sennacherib's army, and glimpses the ultimate complete destruction of Assyria. In v. 28 there should be a minor break. There is quite an important paragraph division there. From v. 28-32 we have a very vivid imaginary picture. A picture of what the people in Jerusalem would naturally expect was going to occur. A picture of the situation if the Assyrian army comes and attacks Jerusalem itself.

The Assyrians had sent a considerable army up -- that is they would later on at the time this is given, but at the time of Sennacherib's invasion they sent a captain with a considerable army up from Lachish which is SW of Jerusalem. They came up to the border of Jerusalem and called on Hezekiah to surrender. Then they went back and it was probably 2 yrs. after that that they still were in the land of Israel conquering various cities, living off the land, destroying, devastating, and the people in

Jerusalem were expecting that at any time the army would come against them. But when the final attack would come, they would not expect it to come from that direction. They would not expect it to come from the SW, from the area of Lachish where Sennacherib's headquarters had been, because that would be the area in which it would be easier to defend Jerusalem against them because they would have to come rather steeply up the mountain side.

The natural way to attack would be from the north. It would be very easy for the Assyrians to go up the plain to the North and then come down on the northern ridge which would be a very easy approach to Jerusalem. So that's what they would expect. So we have a picture of their expectations here in 10:28-32 a very vivid picture of what they think is going to happen. They imagine that the Assyrian army comes, and they name places beginning 3 miles north of Jerusalem and coming nearer and nearer all the time.

"They enter Aiath, they pass through Migron; they store supplies at Michmash. They say we will camp overnight at Geba. Ramah trembles, Bibeah of Saul flees. Cry out, O Daughter of Gallim. Listen O Laishah. Poor Anathoth!" Anathoth is a town just a few miles North of Jerusalem from which Jeremiah was to come a century later. That is getting very close to the city.

"Madmenah is in flight; the people of Gebim take cover. This day they will halt at Nob" just short of Jerusalem. They will shake their fist at the mount of the Daughter of Zion, at the hill of Jerusalem." This is a vivid picture of the expected coming of the Assyrian army. The Assyrian army did not. This is what they expected would happen. We do not know where the army was encamped when God smote the great number of the force and made it necessary for Sennacherib to get up and go back to Assyria. But we have no reason to think that the Assyrian army actually did begin an attack on Jerusalem in this way.

This is what actually did happen a little more than a century later when the Chaldeans came. They came from the north just the way it is described here through these various towns just the way through these various towns just the way an invader would naturally come to attack Jerusalem.

So this is a vivid picture of the fear of the people. Of their expectation which seemed absolutely certain to occur one of those days. They did not know when. But then the Lord gives His answer. You don't need to worry about this, v. 32 says. "See, the Lord, the Lord Almighty will lop off the boughs with great power. The lofty trees will be felled, the tall ones will be brought low." These are figurative expressions describing the great Assyrian empire under the figure of a great forest. The Lord will lop off the boughs. The lofty trees will be felled. The tall ones will be brought low. He will cut down the forest thickets with an ax, Lebanon will fall before the Mighty One." Lebanon here is a picture of a great powerful empire outside the land of Israel. Here it is a figurative

expression to describe what was way beyond Lebanon in that direction -- the great Assyrian headquarters. So a century after Isaiah spoke, the Babylonians rebelled against the Assyrians and the Medes joined with them. They attacked Ninevah, the great capital city in 612, overcame it. The Assyrian army continued on. The Assyrian empire maintained its existence and succeeded for another eight years, until Nebuchadnezzar completely smashed it in the battle of Carchemish. That was as a complete end to the Assyrian empire as any force in history. It fell as completely as any nation in history. More than most.

Of course they had extended themselves very widely during the previous three centuries, conquering an area many times as large as their own area. The empire had become increasingly weakened as they overextended themselves so much. Finally they put them to desperate flight, and it took eight years to end them but when they ended them they were completely ended.

The only thing I can think of as having a similar complete destruction would be that of the Ostrogoths in Italy. In Italy in the 5th century A.D., the Ostrogoths (the eastern Goths) settled in the country. The Visigoths, who originally conquered and they went over to Spain. The eastern Goths came in.

Otho(?), the king established headquarters at Vienna. He ruled over Italy. He had almost complete control over the nation. He established so much of an empire there that during the second world war that with all that Hitler did with all the resources he had to win the war he nevertheless sent a group of archaeologists down there to Vienna in order to make charts and maps of Theoderic's palace and his capital in order that after the war was over he would have full details on this first great German empire that had been established.

After Theoderic's death, Justinian the emperor in Byzantium, in Constantinople, tried to reconquer Italy. He sent his force to Italy which attacked the Ostrogoths. They fought for 20 years. Battle after battle they fought until finally practically every one of the Ostrogoths was killed off. They left absolutely no trace in the Italian language of their language and culture. Justinian thought he had reestablished Roman power over Italy. What he actually did was to bring in a large number of other German tribes as mercenaries in his army, and after the Ostrogoths were all killed, they eventually took over.

So Constantinople did not actually hold them for more than 10 or 15 years after they defeated the Ostrogoths, but the Ostrogoths sought to -- about to establish a great empire were completely destroyed and annihilated. They had held this power for less than a century, while the Assyrians had for several centuries. That is the nearest parallel to this that I know of in history.

So we have this vivid description. "He will cut down the forest thickets with an ax; Lebanon will fall before the Mighty One."

Then we have a minor division between this(10:34) and ch.11.

Question: Does part of this ch. look far ahead to the destruction of Ninevah?

The last two verses very definitely.

Question: Everything before that would be ?

I would say that before that it is primarily looking at the destruction of Sennacherib's army with an occasional glimpse of the ultimate destruction. But in these two verses it is very definitely focusing on the complete destruction of the Assyrian empire. Which as we explained in the beginning was the instrument of His destruction, the rod of His anger, but yet it is not of itself doing all these terrible things and was so arrogant, and God said, Shall the rod boast itself against Him who wields it. Now He is going to completely destroy them for their wickedness.

So Lebanon falls before the Mighty One. But a shoot will come up from the stump of Jesse, from his roots a Branch will bear fruit. Here between the last v. of ch. 11 and the first v. of ch. 12 we have a transition. We have a comparison between this mighty force, the tremendous Assyrian empire which falls before the Mighty One under the figure of the forest of Lebanon crashing as God destroys it, but here is the stump of Jesse.

Here is the empire of David which has been reduced to a tiny thing, just a stump. It looks as if practically nothing remains of it. Yet from the stump of Jesse a shoot will come up. From his roots a Branch will bear fruit. Here we have the contrast: the mighty Assyrian army represented by the great forest of Lebanon falling with a tremendous crash, and the little remaining of the kingdom of David seeming to have disappeared and yet from this stump, from this root a Branch will bear fruit!

So out of David's lineage, out of the house of David of whom we've seen so much stressed in ch. 7. Here we have from it again a Branch will bear fruit. We have this wonderful description of Him. The next two vv. are not a picture of something that happens at a specific time. It is a description of a character. One who comes into this world upon whom the Spirit of the Lord rests -- the Spirit of wisdom and of understanding, the spirit of counsel and of power, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord -- and he will delight in the fear of the Lord."

We still continue the description of Him: He will not judge by what he sees with his eyes, or decide by what he hears with his ears; --this is a description of Him and applies to all time of His activity. "But with righteousness he will judge the needy, and with justice he will give decisions for the poor of the earth. He will strike the earth with the rod of his mouth, with the breath of his lips he will slay the wicked." What does this mean?

Is this a general description of His character now? Is this a specific mention of a specific action that He will perform? The Apostle Paul quoted this verse and looks forward to what is described in this verse as something that is still future. He says in 2 Thess. 2:8, looking forward beyond Paul's time, he says: Then the Lawless One will be revealed whom the Lord Jesus will overthrow with the breath of His mouth, and destroy by the splendor of His coming."

The picture which is given might be considered perhaps as a description of continued activity of Christ in overcoming wickedness, but Paul takes it as a specific description of a specific thing that's going to happen and that had not yet happened in Paul's time but was to happen in the future, when One would appear whom Paul called the Lawless One. This one, he says, Christ will slay with the breath of His lips.

Then it goes on to describe his character after describing this specific thing he is to do which he has not yet done, in Paul's day, "righteousness will be his belt, and faithfulness the sash around his waist." Then there is a description of the situation that will come into existence when He slays - slays this wicked one with the breath of his lips.

"The wolf will live with the lamb, the leopard will lie down with the goat." It doesn't mean the wolf will live with the lamb in the sense that the lamb will be inside the wolf! It means the wolf and lamb can be together without the lamb having any cause of fear of the wolf. "The leopard will lie down with the goat, the calf and the lion and the yearling together; and a little child will lead them. The cow will feed with the bear, their young will lie down together, the lion will eat straw like the ox, The infant will play near the hole of the cobra, and the young child put his hand into the viper's nest."

This describes something strange -- that a young child would put his hand in the viper's nest, or an infant would play near the hole of the cobra? You take a child, and he has no reason to fear the cobra. He won't be afraid of the viper. He's apt to stick his hand right up to it; perhaps he'll try to pet it.

I was in New Mexico one time doing mission work. I met a man who had lived quite a while in a little cabin in the desert. He and his wife. He said one time his wife was away on a visit, and he was there in the evening with the child. He sat in the back room and heard the child gurgling with great glee. He wondered what was happening. He said he heard a sound as if the child would hit against something and then he would hear as if a door flew open. Then he'd hear the door shut with a bang. Then the little child would laugh with great glee. He wondered what was happening. It ~~occurred~~ occurred two or three times. He wondered what was happening. So he came and peeked in the back of the room. What he saw made his blood almost freeze. He saw a big rattle snake in the front of the screen door. The child would look at the rattle snake and laugh and hit the screen door with his hand and the door would

fly open. Then the snake would strike with a bang. Hit the screen, and the screen door would slam shut! The child was having great fun. But I don't think that is what is predicted here when it says "the infant will play near the hole of the cobra, and the young child put his hand into the viper's nest."

It is the nature of the little child not to be afraid, until he's learned perhaps by sad experience or by what other people fear communicating itself to him. What is described here is a situation in which there is no need for the child to fear. It is a situation in which there is nothing that causes danger. The man said when he saw what was happening he immediately grabbed his gun, ran around to the front door and shot the snake. But this is a description of a situation in which such fear will be quite unnecessary.

Verse 9, "They will neither harm nor destroy on all my holy mountain, for the earth will be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea." Just as the entire sea -- what we call the sea is entirely covered, with water, so the entire earth will be covered with the knowledge of the Lord.

So there is a description of a situation in which all violence will be at an end. A situation in which all external danger will be at an end. In Calvin's commentary when he comes to this passage he says, There is here a prediction that the conditions that prevailed in the Garden of Eden will again be established upon this earth. That there will no longer be violence or fear of harm. Because no one will hurt anyone else. But, Calvin says a few lines about that and then reverts to his immediate situation of his day and says, As far as we are concerned the thing we're most interested in from this passage is that the gospel will take those who are wolves and change them into lambs; it will take the leopards whose nature it is to destroy and change it into one that is decent.

So Calvin saw the change in character brought about by the gospel as the great lesson for him as the gospel was being presented widely in this passage. But he also saw that the specific from the passage was that there is to come a time when violence will come to an end. A time when after the Lord strikes the earth with the rod of His mouth, and with the breath of His lips slays the wicked one, there will be a situation in which they will neither harm nor destroy in all my holy mountain for the earth will be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea.

So the great picture we have in ch. 7 of the virgin birth of the One, and the picture in ch. 9 of the wonderful preaching of the One who is to come from the house of David, reaches a climax here in the picture of the eventual activity He will perform when he brings an end to violence and destruction on earth and makes it possible for everyone to live in absolute safety. He says then in that day, "the Root of Jesse will stand as a banner for the peoples; the nations will rally to him, and his place of rest will be glorious."



This phrase "his place of rest" -- the term "rest" in Scripture is used in two senses just as the term rest is used in two senses in English. In English we ordinarily think of rest as being that we find relaxation; we find cease from activity. But we also use it as meaning "the book rests on the table." Or the "pencil rests on the ink stand." The word rest we ordinarily have the stress on the idea of recreation in it, but it can also mean to occupy a position. In this case it could mean either one.

The Roman Catholic say that where it says his place of rest shall be glorious it is referring to the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem to which they make pilgrimages. That that is His place of rest! Most of us do not think there is a reference here to the Holy Sepulchre. Rather it is to the place from which He will issue His commands which will bring forth complete peace and freedom from violence throughout the earth.

Then he says there is a day coming when the Lord will reach out his hand a second time to reclaim the remnant that is left of his people from Assyria, etc. Here there is a great re-gathering of Israel promised. "From Assyria, from Lower Egypt, from Upper Egypt, from Cush, from Elam, from Babylonia, from Hamath and from the islands of the sea." None of the Israelites had been as widely scattered as that in Isaiah's day. It was some centuries before they were as widely scattered as this, but here there is a promise of a great regathering of the Israelites.

"He will raise a banner for the nations and gather the exiles of Israel; he will assemble the scattered people of Judah from the four quarters of the earth." The rest of this ch. ~~xxxx~~ in v. 16 says there will be a highway for the remnant of his people that is left from Assyria as there was for Israel when they came up from Egypt."

Then ch. 12 concludes this section of the Book of Immanuel because it concludes it with a prayer thanking God for His wonderful promises and for His wonderful goodness. A prayer that you could get a blessing from studying.

Before we look on to ch. 28 again. First let me say, You have all received the papers back and anyone who would like me to look as his paper with him, I would be very glad to take time and look at it with you. Today or any time this week.

Question: In this section Is that yet future ?  
I've heard people say why should Jacob no more, etc.  
Do we take it in the sense that Isaiah's hearer's would know those places or ?

There is an interesting question of interpretation. We could easily take it as referring to the place where those nations were if you wanted to. But it seems more probable to me that he is looking out at the nations quite a distance away and showing the wide dispersement, a dispersement which had not yet then come but which eventually would be far wider than these places named here.

Question: What about v.14?(11:14). Verse 14.

I would not be sure how v. 14 is to be interpreted, or to what it might refer. Any other questions about this section?

Question: Some of this ~~w~~you went through rather rapidly as far as the end of ch. 10 and beginning of ch. 11. I was wondering if you could review what you said on v.4 of ch. 11?

11:4 - the last phrase is specifically quoted by the Apostle Paul, in 2 Thess. 2:8, as something that is yet to happen. It would seem to me that if that is true of the last phrase, it probably would refer to the whole verse, although I would not wish to be dogmatic. At least the last sentence in it refers to a specific event which Paul says will not happen until this wicked one becomes known. This wicked one whom the Lord will destroy with the breath of His mouth, when he comes.

Question: What was your comment concerning vv.2,3,5 as to whether they were general characteristics of the activity of Christ, or were they something specific?

I would think that vv.2,3, and 5 would describe the character of Christ as displayed first in his first advent and then in his second advent.

Question: V.11. What does it mean that the Lord will "reclaim the remnant that is left" the second time? When will that take place.

I would think that he looks to the first regathering which was to be under Ezra-Nehemiah, and it looks beyond to a far greater regathering to come at a later time.

Question: Do you have any feeling as to when the second time will come about?

I would not feel we can be dogmatic on it. I would feel it is entirely possible that it describes a movement of the Israelites going back to the land of Israel which any one 100 years ago would have thought was extremely unlikely to happen. It might describe the great regathering that has occurred recently, but I would not be sure of that unless it goes on to become much greater than it is yet. That is to say it might describe something that is still future. It might refer to the present reestablishment of the nation of Israel. I would not be dogmatic about it. I hope they would not have to go through a terrible destruction and still another regathering, but it's entirely possible.

Question: If someone says that, or objects to a literal interpretation because there is no place called Assyria any more how could that be answered?

I would say that when a term is used first in Scripture, it is usually an actual, literal term for something that is in existence at the time to which reference is made. But that after a

a place or a person has become well-known for certain characteristics, then the term may be used in a figurative way to represent others with similar characteristics. Thus I would think that in the day of Isaiah it would be very strange to use Babylonia for the figure for a great aggressor, or a great conqueror because they were not that as yet. They became later. Assyria was.

In this particular case I would think it refers to them as an area very distant, the area to which the northern kingdom had been carried off into captivity. Not as referring to a specific area.

Question: Concerning "rest" in v. 10. Occupying a position and what was the other one?

A place of rest. A person's rest is ordinarily his bedroom. It's where he finds his strength restored. The RC's take this as referring to a tomb where the body of Christ rested. In that case I would think it would be the second usage -- the body of Christ is placed there. It does not really rest there. Those are the two uses of the word. There are certain forms of the Hebrew word which differ as to which of these two is meant. But in many forms it's identical.

Question: In v.13 "Ephraim will not vex Judah, and Judah will not vex Ephraim" is that referring to just the historical context we are studying and if so where can you prove that problem that jealousy existed between them? Does that go back to Gen. 49 where it talks about the special blessings for the posterity of Ephraim? And then it also talks about the fact that the scepter would not come out of Judah ~~was~~ until Shiloh comes.

That, of course, is a prediction of the first coming of Christ. Until the One comes whose right it is to rule. But I would not think -- well certainly when the ten tribes divided from the two tribes, there was war between them. There were many jealousies between them, much hatred. I think as he looks forward to the future he refers to divisions among the people. That they will be restored to a unanimity.

Question: Is it possible that God -- of course we can't second guess the sovereign plan of God, I know that -- in the 49th ch. where he talks about it is it possible He intended that tension to exist in the nation for purposes of peace and not war? He lessened these 10 tribes but he also said that blessing would be experienced by the tribe of Judah through Messiah who will prove to be a Blessing to all people.

To the whole world. Wherever you have sinful people, you will have jealousy and hatred. He is predicting an ending of division. We could extend it to the Christian church and wish there could be brought about a cessation of the internecine squabbles among real Christians. I think there is a promise that God will bring an end to that sort of thing. We can bring

it to some extent but if you become pastor of a church or active in almost any group don't count on it that there will not come divisions -- bitter divisions arise. It is the nature of sinful man. We've all got a big job on our hands in bringing ourselves into conformity to God's will to the point == the extent where we do not share such jealousy toward others.

If there is no other question about this first part, we turn back to the parallel section which starts in ch. 28. We have taken quite a bit of time on ch. 28. In ch. 28 he begins with woes against Ephraim just as he did in ch. 7. Then as in ch. 7 he turns back to Judah to show how they are doing wrong and specifically refers to Ahaz' plans. He quotes the elders and princes of Judah as they criticize Isaiah for his method of teaching and tells them their covenant with death, their agreement with the grace will not last. True ~~peace~~ peace can come only through the precious corner stone that the Lord will establish in Zion, but hail will sweep away their refuge of lies and their covenant with death shall be destroyed.

In ch. 29 you look to the danger from Sennacherib. He began with showing Jerusalem in the condition where it was besieged, not actually besieged but in danger of a great siege. Almost any minute from the Assyrian army which was going through the land and destroying the other cities, of Judah and Jerusalem could expect to be besieged at any time. But in v. 5 that sudden transition. The many enemies will become like fine dust.

Personally I think the KJV translation is here better than that in NIV as far as the word "enemies" is concerned. It means not merely enemies but foreign enemies. There is no one English word that will give that idea. The KJV says strangers but it means hostile strangers. This (NIV) says enemies, but it means enemies who are aliens, from a distance away. KJV is certainly wrong there in beginning with "moreover". It does not give at all the idea of sharp transition from the terrible situation ahead for Jerusalem to the marvellous deliverance God promises to bring.

So he promises. Then there is that figurative language in v.6 - of how the Lord will come with thunder and earthquake and great noise, with windstorm and tempest and flames of devouring fire! It certainly must have seemed to ~~xx~~ to Sennacherib! When his army was so utterly destroyed and he became like a hungry man who dreams he is eating and he awakens and his hunger remains.

Then he goes back to the people of Israel pointing out their failure to follow him, their failure to study His word as they should. The excuses they give for not doing it, and so he is going to turn things upside ~~down~~ down. Lebanon will become like a fertile field and the fertile field like a forest. He will turn to the Gentiles and there will be reversal. Just as he told Ahaz there will not always be such wrong leaders, God will send his own leader. Here he says, Those who have this marvellous opportunity in Israel and fail to take advantage of them, there is to be a time when the natural branches will be lopped off and the

wild branches will be put in, and in v.22 he points out that God can do this. The Lord who redeemed Abraham. Abraham was not saved because of his genealogy. He was saved because God called him. Similarly he can call the Gentiles if He chooses.

I think more of you missed that verse on the test than perhaps any other. He redeemed Abraham and he says to the house of Jacob, You don't need to be surprised that if God can make children of Israel out of these stones if he chooses.

Then I think it very likely that 29:24 shows again the putting in of the natural branch, as Paul says, So all Israel shall be saved.

Then in ch. 30-31 we had two parallel pictures starting with the people looking for help to Egypt instead of to God, and going on to show how God is going to punish their wickedness and they will be left like a banner on a hill. Cut down but still existing and continuing as a sign of the truth of God's Word, but the immediate danger will be ended. God will miraculously intervene and like birds hovering overhead the Lord will shield Jerusalem, he will shield it and deliver it. He will pass over it and rescue it.

Ch. 32 begins, See a king will reign in righteousness and rulers will rule in justice. A man will be like a shelter from the wind, a refuge from the storm . . . as the shadow of a great rock in a thirsty land." I think that's a marvellous picture of Christ. The Heb. is just like the KJV there -- "a man will be." But all the recent translations follow the RSV. Most follow the RSV in trying to get away from that being a man which is just what the Hebrew says. We'll look at that next time.

I'd appreciate it if you would glance over chs.28ff.-35. Just glance over them to get a general idea of their contents in preparation for our discussion next time.

(Announcement regarding examination review questions to be gotten at the front at the end of the lecture. Most of the exam questions will be taken from these probably.)

I was very glad at the end of the last class to have a question handed to me. I appreciate it when students are thinking about the matters we are discussing. I have no desire for you to simply take what I say. I am anxious that you think through the problem and reach your own conclusions. When it comes to making a paper I have to know whether you know what I have presented in class. Whether you agree with it or not has nothing to do with your mark. The fact that you say what I think and then procede to say why you think it is wrong, you may get a better mark than if you merely ~~state what I thought. But if you don't state what I think~~ and merely state something else, I hardly can give you credit for that, in the course. The purpose is to get a mastery of the material.

This is a very interesting question. It says, In relation to the class discussion of the regathering of the dispersed people of Israel to the land, I have heard some quote ~~xxx~~ Jer. 16:14-15 and state that the present development of the nation Israel since 1949 is not the regathering prophecied in Scripture. The reason for this they maintain is because Jer. 16:14-15 implies that the future regathering will be a divine and miraculous as the exodus from Egypt, and even more so. The 1948 development of Israel was only a human development, under the decision of the UN, etc. Would you comment on this? Is this a valid inference from Jer. 16:14-15.

I will read Jer. 16:14-15 in NIV (reading text). There is a very specific promise that the Lord is going to bring back the children of Israel to the land of Israel -- a very specific promise. It is a promise which is tremendous in scope. It will surpass in their minds the deliverance that He gave when He ~~brought them out of Egypt. That is what is promised. I cannot~~ see, however, that that is a great deal stronger than what is said in the passage we looked at in Isaiah 11. ~~Where~~ Where we read in v.12 ff., "He will raise a banner for the nations and gather the exiles of Israel; he will assemble the scattered people of Judah from the four quarters of the earth." And v. 15, "The Lord will dry up the gulf of the Egyptian sea, with a scorching wind he will sweep his hand over the Euphrates river. He will break it up into seven streams so that men can cross over in sandals." There will be a highway for the remnant of his people . . . "

I don't think anybody can say this prophecy has been fulfilled, to this time. I don't think anybody can possibly say that. At the same time I don't think anybody can say that the establishment of the State of Israel and the coming of many Israelites to Palestine may not be the beginning of such a fulfillment. I don't see how we can be dogmatic either way.

Isaiah and Jeremiah both prophecy a tremendous regathering of the people. They use highly figurative language in both cases. Exactly how it is to be done is not told, but it is a tremendous even which goes way beyond anything that has yet occurred. But what has already occurred may -- I don't think we can say necessarily is -- but may be the beginning of it.

I'm sure that 100 years ago if anybody had said that as many Jews as are now in Palestine will go back there and that there would be a independent state of Israel established, they would have been considered as wild guesses. Hardly anybody, lest of all the Jews themselves would have believed 100 years ago that such a thing would happen, in this century.

If it happened -- It has happened through matters that largely never could have been humanly predicted. The Nazi attempt to completely destroy the Jews resulted in making Palestine look very attractive to men who previously were much happier in Germany or even in Poland, than they could have then imagined themselves to be in what was then the extremely backward land of Palestine.

They've had to undergo tremendous attacks and difficulties and they have made tremendous progress, but I doubt if anyone today can say that the regathering that has occurred is so great that it fills the imagination far more than their coming out of Egypt! I don't think anyone says that, and that is what Jeremiah predicts.

I feel personally it is very good for us to restudy predictions of future events and see what we can say is definitely predicted. Like in earlier part of Isaiah 11, it is definitely predicted (and in a number of other passages) very clearly predicted that there is going to be a time when violence will be completely at an end. When people can roam freely without any danger from external sources, whether from animals or from human beings. That is made very clear in Is. 11, in Mic. 4, and Is. 2 among others.

But when this is going to happen, many of the particular details about it we are not told. There are many statements which we cannot be sure are figurative or literal. But it is absolutely clear that nobody can say it has happened yet.

It is equally clearly predicted there is going to be a tremendous regathering. It will be so great that it will completely overshadow the wonderful deliverance from Egypt. That doesn't say that there will necessarily be such miraculous events connected with it as there was in their coming out of Egypt. God may work through miraculous events. He may work through remarkable providential workings as He often does.

I was just thinking of a minor situation that happened to me a few years ago. I was up in Northern PA. in the hills. I parked my car about a mile from a very small town. When I got

back to the car, I could not get it started. I put -- took out the little thing that holds the top of the air filter in order to remove the air filter to hold it open to get more air in there and in doing so I dropped that little thing( the wing bolt) down into the opening of the carbureator!

I've never done that before or since. There I was stranded. I walked the mile or so into this little town, and came to a motorcycle store. There was no auto place or repair place, but there was a place that sold and repaired motorcycles. I asked the man if he could give me some help. He showed absolutely no interest, and would hardly speak to me. It was quite frustrating. Just then a man stepped into the door from outside who was a salesman of materials for the store. He was coming in to see the man, but he addressed me most friendly and I mentioned to him what my problem was.

Oh, he said, You ought to have a magnet to pull that out. I said, Where will I get a magnet. He said, I have magnets here that I sell.(Laughter). That's the only time anyone ever offered to sell me a magnet in my life! I doubt if there was a place in the town where you could have gotten one. I could have fussed with that thing trying to get that little connection out for a couple of hours and probably not gotten it. But there he was. The only time in my life. And here was this little magnet available with which I was able to pull it out and proceed without any difficulty.

The Lord works in those providential ways and they are just as miraculous as the deliverance these different elements to me. Of course that is a very minor thing, but is an illustration of the way the Lord can and does work in making all the different affairs of human life work together in order to accomplish His purposes.

We don't know what the means will be by which he will bring about this regathering he has promised but we do know it will be a tremendous thing. It is altogether possible that we are now seeing the beginning of it. When it is completed it will seem to be as great as other developments we don't imagine yet. Today no doubt there are many in Israel who are very happy to be there instead of in Germany or somewhere in central Europe where they were wealthy and prosperous and 20 years ago would never think of leaving there. Today most of them in Israel I think wish they were in America. If the Lord is going to make them all wish to go to Israel He will change that in some way whether by making America unpleasant for them, or perhaps by reducing America's power to the point where we'd all wish we could go to Israel! (Laughter). Nobody can predict. We don't know what the Lord is going to do.

He does not give us His Word to satisfy our curiosity about the future, but he does give us in order to give us confidence in Him and knowledge that He has a plan and will work it out, and that He wants each of us to take our part as He directs, and particularly in leading people to believe in the Scripture and to



see its wonderful blessings, and to be saved from sin through Christ. I personally am interested in seeing what is positive about the future in Scripture, and then I'm interested in seeing passages which give little hints and suggestions that may throw further light on events in connection with it.

I didn't mean to say we can be sure that God is going to make this present return develop as He has described it there. When they came back from the Babylonian captivity, I am sure people were hoping that was the great return promised. It did not work out that way then. It is entirely possible that the Israelites might be driven out of Palestine, and that this might all be in the distant future. It's entirely possible. But it's also possible this is the beginning of the fulfillment of the tremendous regathering promised.

What is more important for us to believe is the fact it is promised in the book of Romans, that all Israel (that doesn't necessarily mean every particular individual, but certainly the great mass of people) are to be put again into the Olive Tree out of which the natural branches were grafted out (many of them) and the wild branches grafted in. They are going to be grafted in again, and all in God's own time are to come to a knowledge of Christ.

This is all the time we'll spend on Is. 7-12. The passage from ch. 28 on, I'd like to remind you again, of the dramatic movement in ch. 28 as Is. goes into this banquet and there tactfully wins the hearing of these nobles who are celebrating Ahaz' alliance with Assyria. He tactfully wins a hearing by pronouncing woes on Ephraim which is the enemy they then fear, and then after getting their attention he says, But these also stagger from wine.

The word "these" is a strong demonstrative in Hebrew pointing directly to these men ~~sit~~ sitting at the banquet. They also stagger from wine and reel from strong drink. They are befuddled from wine. All the tables are filled with wine. We hear what they say as they are beginning to wonder if they should continue any longer. His answer is: You think this is baby talk; you won't listen to an intelligent presentation. Alright God will speak to you through another tongue. In words you can't understand. It will sound like babytalk as the Assyrian oppressors come through the land.

And your covenant with death shall not stand. When the overwhelming scourge passes through you will be beaten down.

Then we don't know whether ch. 28 29 is a continuation of what he said in the banquet, or whether it is a continuation of ~~to~~ to a group of people who followed with him when he went out. Or whether even the Lord led him to write it down as a continuation of the talk he began in the last ch. But it looks on forward ~~xxx~~ and in the passages between ch. 28 and ch. 35 he is rebuking the sins of the people intermittently. And in between passages of rebuking them, God is giving him

glimpses of the great future allowing him to see how God is going to deliver them from the Assyrians. They are not going to be destroyed by the Assyrians. God will protect them from the Assyrians though they will suffer greatly from that.

I believe in ch. 29 he points out to the taking out of the natural branches and the substituting of wild branches just paralleling what we have exactly in 7:14 where the natural king of Judah is rebuked, and God says He is going to put His Son in the position of being Head of the House of David. The one who is going to be born of the virgin. He turns from Ahaz to Immanuel; here we have a turning from the disobedient people to the bringing in of the wild branches described in vv.16 and following.

You are turning things upside down. God is going to turn things upside down. Verse 17, The great outside force is going to be turned into a fertile field, and the fertile field will seem like a forest.

Then in v. 22 he refers to God as the One who redeemed Abraham reminding us that it was God's supernatural selection of Abraham from a pagan environment, not anything of birth or background but God's electing action which brought Abram out and he said Jacob will not longer be ashamed even though his descendants who follow the Lord are greatly reduced by their sin, yet he will seek new ones, the work of My hands among them. When he does that we will stop for a minute to note the fact that there are people today who say, Isn't it terrible if somebody equates Israel and the Church! And other people who say, Isn't it terrible if somebody makes a distinction between Israel and the church!

Both are wrong. The Scripture teaches that the Christian church is the continuation of the Israel of God. And the Scripture teaches also that the physical nation of Israel continues to have a place in God's plan, and eventually all will be brought back into the Olive Tree of His testimony. So they are both wrong. Israel is used in two senses: The term Israel can mean the true people of God, as here when Jacob sees in the midst of him he sees his children who are the work of My hands rather than his children whom his people have brought into the world. The people who are the work of My hands whom I have brought into Israel. Israel can truly be said to be the people of God. At the same time there is a physical people of God for whom He has blessing, for whom He has rebuke, for whom He has specific promises.

So to take either extreme on this makes it necessary to throw away many passages of Scripture. Then we noticed that chs. 30 and ch. 31 parallel one another. Ch. 31 being like a summary of ch. 30. Both of them begin a little later on when it is seen that Assyria will not bring them peace, but rather brings them a new danger far greater than the danger from Ephraim and from Syria that they had before. They have removed the ~~xxx~~ buffer states and how they are right face to face with

the great Assyrian force which threatens at any time to destroy them. They say, Well, then, we'll repeat the same old mistake; we will look to another great power (to Egypt) for deliverance. Instead of looking to God. He says, This also will not help.

So at the beginning of ch. 30 and of ch. 31 he rebukes rebukes the people for looking to Egypt for deliverance. He says, Egypt will not be able to give you protection; I will call her ~~x~~ Rabab the do nothing. In ch. 30 the prophet goes on to look far into the future. He rebukes the people for their disobedience to God and shows how God is going to punish them. He shows their spirit where they say (v.16), No we'll flee on horses. Therefore, he says, you will flee. You say, We'll ride on swift horses. Therefore your pursuers will be swift. A thousand will flee at the threat of one, and at the threat of five you will all flee away till you are left desroyed, nothing left? Till you are left a little remnant down in the ~~bdyx~~ bottom of the vally that nobody knows exists? No!

Till you are left like a flagstaff on a mountain top; like a banner on a hill. Cut down, persecuted, persecuted for their sin, suffering, and yet highly visible as they have been in almost every section of the world for the past 2000 years. A visible sign of the fact that God's people have been untrue to Him, and they are being hunted, scattered, but not destroyed. Eventually they are to be brought back into the Olive Tree.

Then chs. 30 and 31 both end with supernatural deliverance from the Assyrian's great attack. They won't get help from Egypt to deliver them from Assyria. Their clever schemes will not work. Assyria will fall by a sword that is not of man, a sword, not of mortals, will devour them. Like birds hovering overhead the Lord Almighty will shield Jerusalem. A prediction of the supernatural deliverance of Jerusalem from Sennacherib. It ends, "Declares the Lord whose fire is in Zion, whose furnace is in Jerusalem." The reminds us of the beginning of ch. 29 where Jerusalem is called Ariel, the hearth of God. A place of burning. God whose furnace is in Jerusalem.

The prophet ~~txx~~ then looks beyond the deliverance. God gives him a glimpse of something far in the future, and he says, See a king will reign in righteousness, and rulers will rule in justice. And a man will be like a shelter from the wind and a refuge from the storm, like streams of water in the desert, and the shadow of a great rock in a thirsty land." What a tremendous promise of Immanuel! A tremendous promise of the Immanuel who will be like a shelter from the wind, a refuge from the storm, etc. . . .

A tremendous promise of the coming of the One, the wonderful Immanuel, the promised King who will reign in righteousness. Some have tried to say this is simply a promise that Ahaz will be followed by a righteous King -- King Hezekiah. Hezekiah was indeed a tremendous improvement over Ahaz. But to call Hezekiah a refuge from the storm, a shelter from the wind, like streams of water in the desert and the shadow of a great rock in a thirsty land" is utterly ridiculous! It is language that goes far beyond what could reasonably be said about any

mere human being. It is a description of the wonderful Immanuel. And what follows: The eyes of those who see will no longer be closed, and the ears of those who hear will listen." He describes the wonderful blessings that will come through Immanuel.

It is strange that the modern versions, the various translations of Scripture, have everyone I've noticed practically followed the RSV. The RSV has some very fine translations at many points where there's nothing doctrinal involved! They have some beautiful translations at many points. But wherever there is a doctrinal point, wherever there is a Messianic prophecy in the OT and wherever there is anything pointing to Christ they have done their best to translate the words in a way that won't point to Christ. If they can't do that they make any sort of a translation and put in the footnote: Hebrew now clear!

There are several cases where if ~~xx~~ you take the Heb. words exactly as they are and translate them exactly the way the RSV translates those same words in other passages, you have your wonderful Messianic predictions. But they say, Heb. not clear!

Where it says "kiss the Son lest he be angry! they say, "Kiss his feet" and then they say "Heb. not clear"! The word they translate son there is not the ordinary Heb. word for son. It only occurs a couple of times in the OT in the Heb. portions. But in Proverbs it occurs twice and they translate it son there! Here in Ps. 2 they say Heb. not clear! Where it speaks about Christ's redeeming work it says "he will sprinkle many nations." Peter speaks of Christians as those who are sprinkled with the blood of Christ. The RSV translators think that makes no sense so they translate it "he will startle." The word never means "startle." It always means "sprinkle." It occurs 22 t. and in 20 of ~~them~~ them they translate it "sprinkle", in one they ~~x~~ translate it by "spatter" but in this case they say "Heb. not clear" and put in footnote possibly\_\_\_\_\_.

In this case here they could not accept this as a prediction of Christ -- A man will be like a shelter from the wind. So they make what I think was a perfectly ridiculous guess. This isn't describing the great king who will rule in righteousness (they say) but his rulers! Each of them will be like a shelter from the wind and a refuge from the storm, like streams of water, etc. . . . . You might find a very great hyperbole. You might possibly apply language somewhat like this to a great president or great leader. But to say this would apply to every man in his cabinet! To every one of the leaders under him is perfect nonsense!

But that is what RSV did. They say "each of them will be like a shelter of the Lord." KJV just translates what you've got there: "A man will be." I notice the NIV says "each man will be." It translates the word twice, but the word only occurs once! The RSV is better there than RSV is! But they both are much inferior in that verse than KJV. What the Heb. says there is very simple and clear. "A man will be." Someone can answer, Yes, but this word does sometimes mean "each." Right! It is translated hundreds of times in the OT as "a man." It is translated 5 t. as "each."

It is trans. 7 times as "each man"; and once as "each woman" in the KJV. That certainly would show a tremendous preponderance of taking it in a simple way as "a man.", But when you look further you find -- I looked at each one of these which is rendered "each" in KJV, and they are practically all passages like this: "And they spoke each one to his neighbor." You see it's plural - "They spoke." Lit. "a man to his neighbor." A man to his neighbor they spoke, is in better English "each to his neighbor." An entirely proper translation in cases like that.

But certainly this is utterly different from that. It could conceivably point back to the rulers i.e. the rulers will rule with justice each one like a shelter from the wind. But it's usually not that way. It's usually each to the other. It's used as a comparison not each something else said about them. And, if would be a great hyperbole to say of a king or a president, it would be an impossible statement to make of all his cabinet, all his leaders. Certainly it would be wrong to apply this tremendous terminology to anyone who ever lived except the Lord Jesus Christ!

So we have in this further beautiful prediction of Immanuel in 32:1-2. Now in ch. 32-33 the prophet has various glimpses of the future interspersed in between statements about the sins of the people who are living then. Like in v.9 he begins a rebuke to the women of Jerusalem who are putting their interests in vanities and the ordinary pleasures of this life and he is rebuking them and telling what bad things they will have to go through. The Lord then gives them a glimpse of the future.

He says in v.14 "The fortress will be abandoned the moisy city deserted." He looks ahead to Babylonian captivity. He says, "citadel and watchtower will become a wasteland forever." This word "forever" is usually in our English trans. translated "foever" but actually the word does not mean forever. It means for way off into the future. The fact it does not mean forever is shown by the fact that we often see "forever and ever." If forever meant on and on and on without stop. Foever and ever -what could that mean? It is a word which expresses way on into the distance.

A man sent me a picture paper some years ago that he was thinking of publishing. A manuscript. He was a very fine Christian leader. He said, this manuscript is on the eternal punishment of the wicked, and most of the arguments in the paper were based on this Heb. word. He said this Heb. word is the same Heb. word that is used of the everlasting joy of the righteous, and therefore it must mean the everlasting punishment of those who are lost.

I think the Scripture does teach the everlasting punishment of those who are lost. But it cannot be derived from this word because this word means something that goes on a long long distance. It does not say whether there is an end to that or not. I went through his MS carefully, and noticed the preponderance of it dealt with that argument from this word. I sent him a number of instances where the word is used of something in the past. Like where it speaks of the men before the ~~xxx~~ flood. The men of

"eternity" (olam). Of course it doesn't mean "eternity". It means a way way back. Or it says, Don't remove the ancient landmark. The landmark has been there way way back! So the word for way way ahead.

Here we have this great destruction which lasts for a long long time but it does not mean it lasts forever. Then v.15 he looks to the future --"till the Spirit is poured upon us from on high and the desert become a fertile field, and the fertile field seems like a forest." A repetition of what we had in ch. 29. The Spirit is poured upon us from on high. Is that a prediction of Pentecost? I don't know of anything which we can think it is a more likely interpretation than it is looking forward to Pentecost, and that is the very time at which a change began to occur which was a grafting out of the natural branches, and the grafting in of the wild branches, and so "the desert becomes a fertile field, and the fertile field seems like a forest."

The fruit of righteousness will be peace, the effect of righteousness will be quietness and confidence forever." 32:19,20 are interesting . . "Thou hail flattens the forest and the city is leveled completely, how ! == though you have all kinds of catastrophe == "how blessed you will be, sowing your seed by every stream, and letting your oxen and donkeys range free." Some take that as meaning when the cities are destroyed there is no longer the corruption and confusion of cities life and people are out in the country living under the trees, sowing their seed out there and letting their oxen and donkeys range free == how blessed that will be!

I don't think most of us would think that was a very blessed thing to look forward to, and I question that is the meaning here. My guess here is that this is pointing to the time after the Spirit is poured out from on high, and the gospel is sent out into what was previously desert and forest, and then how blessed we will be if we sow seed by every stream. We send forth the ox and the donkey throughout the world to carry the message of the gospel. It seems to me it is a picture of the outgoing of the gospel. I would not be dogmatic on that. The context is not crystal clear. But it seems to me most likely, particularly in this context it gives a picture of that.

It is a little clearer in the KJV than it is in the more recent translations.

Question: Would you just repeat that so we can get it down. That last little bit about the Spirit being poured out, etc.

The Spirit is to be poured out and we are to receive God's blessing. We are to sow the seed by every stream. We are to send the oxen and the donkey here and there carrying the precious seed.

Question: Would you look at v. 16 again? "Justice will dwell in the forest . . .

Yes, 32:16 looks forward to God's \_\_\_\_\_ in the future, and as to precisely at what time it will be done I don't believe we can be dogmatic. It shows us that injustice will not always prevail. Certainly there has been a tremendous increase in justice and righteousness in nations where the gospel has prevailed.

It has been customary in these last 40 years in our American schools and colleges to knock the country as if it was very bad. America has plenty of sin and wickedness in it -- no question of that. But America was founded largely by men who came here in order to find a place where they could worship God according to the dictates of their consciences. There were many who came for other reasons. But it is a fact that while there is much that is evil in our country, the general level of morality has been higher than in almost any country in the world. At least until recently.

Von Post(?) the great German constitutionalist historian said that civil wars are usually the most vicious of all wars, and the most brutal. But he said in the American Civil War both sides observed the rules of civilized warfare to an extent far beyond any other nation that he knew of in history.

Dickens said 100 yrs. ago that he detested America because he felt they were cheating him on his copyrights. He said, that after he'd made a trip all through this country, that after he'd made this trip that in the U.S. at almost any hour of day or night a woman could walk anywhere in perfect safety and would not be molested. There was hardly anywhere in the world that you could have said that of in that time. Except here. The level of justice and righteousness wherever the gospel has gone has certainly been far superior ~~w~~ to what it is elsewhere.

Question: In 32:15-17 you said that is connected with ch. 29 . Did you mean vv.17-23 or v. 24 of ch. 29?

Not v.24 I meant vv. 17-23, yes. In ch.33 the prophet continues with passages of rebuke to sin interspersed ~~xxx~~ occasionally with glimpses of the blessings that God ~~was~~ is going to bring. He says in 33:17 "Your eyes will see the king in his beauty and view a land that stretches afar. In your thoughts you will ponder the former terror . . . You will see those arrogant people no more . . . Verse 20, "Look upon Zion the city of our festivals; your eyes ~~wxxx~~ will see Jerusalem, a peaceful abode, a tent that will not be moved; its stakes will never be pulled up, nor any of its ropes broken."

He seems to look forward to great future blessings. It is not easy in each case to know what period in the future it looks to. But chs. 34 and 35 are parallel chs. Not parallel like chs. 30 and 31 which follow the same trend of thought and then repeat it in briefer form. But they are parallel passages in that ch. 34 at least up to its last two verses -- I'm not sure whether the ch. division is in quite the right place. But

in most of ch. 34, perhaps all of it, it is describing the lasting devastation and misery of the land that fights against God. It describes the day of vengeance. The year of retribution. 34:9 -- Edom's streams will be turned into pitch, her dust into burning sulfur." "It will not be quenched night and day; its smoke will rise forever. From generation to generation it will lie desolate no one will ever pass through it again."

This terrible picture in ch. 34 of God's punishment upon sin, His punishment upon those lands that turn against him, but in ch. 35 he looks at the other side of the picture. He looks at coming marvellous blessings that God will bring. So all of ch. 34 (unless it be the last 2 vv., which might possibly belong to ch. 35) -- all of ch. 34 is the picture of the one side, of the terrible devastation ahead for those who fight against God. And ch. 35 is the great blessings that are ahead that He is going to bring. It has a considerable amount of figurative language in it.

But it seems to look forward in a figurative way to the blessings that we receive through the gospel. But it seems to go beyond that and looks forward to the time which is described in ch. 11 where there will be universal peace and joy. Water will gush forth in the wilderness, streams in the desert. There will be a highway and a way of holiness. The unclean will not journey on it. No lion will be there or any ferocious beast. But only the redeemed will walk there and the ransomed of the Lord will return. Zion will sing and everlasting joy will crown their heads.

Now chs. 36 and 37 we've already looked at. I trust you recall that ch. 36 and 37 -- their ch. divisions are not really reasonable. There is a progress in ch. 36 and 37 taking the two chs. together. There are two progresses each of which is parallel with the other. Each of which has three parts parallel with the other three. The archbishop did not see the right place for the ch. division. He tried to get them more or less equal evidently in length instead of looking for the natural divisions.

When you see the division there, you see how the answer God gives on two different occasions promising the great deliverance from Sennacherib, and then that deliverance being given.

We have not taken time to look at ch. 38 in this class. Ch. 38 deals with Hezekiah's illness & his deliverance from it. Most scholars think that ch. 38 precedes in time both chs. 36 and 37. We cannot be dogmatic, but it is very likely. It is also likely that ch. 39 does. That ch. 39 represents the attempt of the king of Babylon, which was subject to Assyria, to get Hezekiah to join with them in revolting against Assyria. It is very likely that that is what it represents. It describes how Hezekiah showed them (i.e. the men from Babylon) everything in his house. He thought, They are suffering from Assyria; we are suffering from Assyria, therefore we should be friends and stand together!



Isaiah said to them, Hear the word of the Lord. And he told him something that must have been very difficult for him to appreciate in the day when the Assyrians were so powerful and Babylon was so very weak! He said in v.8 -- Isaiah said to Hezekiah, Hear the word of the Lord, The time will surely come when everything in your palace and all that your fathers have stored up until this day will be carried off -- not to Ninevah, the capital of Assyria (as you would expect) but to Babylon.

Nothing will be left, and so your descendants will be taken away and become eunuchs in the palace of the king of Babylon. And Hezekiah said, At least in my day there will be peace and security. He -- God gave him deliverance from Assyria in his day, but later on, a century later on they were to be taken into Babylon. Something that only God could have enabled the prophet to see. That thing which would have seemed utterly impossible in his day. That it would be to Babylon rather than to Assyria that they would be taken captive!

That makes a transition to the next section where Isaiah looks clear forward and sees the need of the people for comfort from exile and in the next ch. turns their thoughts from the comfort from exile to the fact that the exile is the result of sin, and if they don't solve the problem of sin there will be just one exile after another! So he gives the answer to it in the One who shall come to suffer for their sins.

So in what we've looked at this semester, we've been looking at the promises of the great king, the great conquering king who will bring justice and peace to the world. The next section looks to the coming of the great Saviour. They are two distinct sections of Isaiah, each looking forward to Christ but looking forward to a different aspect of his work. And from ch.40 to 56 there is more about Christ the Redeemer than any other section of the OT. It has marvellous pictures interspersed with the immediate problem of the exile. Just how they fit together is not immediately obvious.

It is my present guess that a year from now this course may take up that passage and deal with Is. 40-66. I might change my mind before then and select some other, particularly if there is any sizeable number of students who want some other section of the OT. But that is my present guess as to what we will cover next year.

The exam review questions are up here on each side. You may each take one copy of it. I think you will find it helpful in reviewing the course for the exam. (Applause)