

be even better The end of 55 and the middle of 56.

We can pass on now to no. 2 under 6. Number 2 is that it must also be admitted --in fact, stressed--that a prophet regularly shows great interest in contemporary situations and normally writes in a way that is primarily suited to the needs of the people of his own time, even though his writings also have great value for future generation. That is to say that everything God put into the Scripture is not meant just for the immediate day. It has value for all periods of the history of the Jews and of the Christians. There is greater significance for some periods than for other times. It has value for all future ages and yet it is written with great interest in immediate and contemporary times. God caused writers to write in contemporary situations in a way that would be useful and valuable for future generations and that which they wrote was of interest only in contemporary times was not put into God's Word. ~~It must also be admitted--in fact, stressed~~ You might say it is negative and yet I don't see how it is as I think it is basic to the understanding of the prophets. That is not the foundation of the critical view point and many of the other critics did not deny God the ability to predict the future. They held to His ability to predict the future and what they denied was that God caused a prophet to write with a background which ~~caused the~~ would fit solely a future time and with little relevance to his own day. He caused the man to predict not that this is going to happen and that will happen but to put himself forward in that situation and writing in utter disregard of the conditions of his own day. The general principle upon which they are moving is a valid principle and thus we see how it is a necessary principle if we are to understand the prophet. We move on now to a rather subsidiary point perhaps and yet a vital one here. Number 3 is the two mentions of Cyrus by name are not conclusive evidence of a later date for these chapters. This is a comparatively small feature of the background but one of the striking ones for the using of the name of Cyrus. Ques. about this naturalistic view of the prophet. It is inconceivable you might say that Isaiah would predict the future but for a man who claims to be a Christian as Dryver did and to accept the teaching of the NT --for him I should say the two mentions of the name of Cyrus should not be conclusive. If a man is a thorough going naturalist then he can't accept both of these views because the supernatural is shot through it. Ques. The one phrase sounded very much as if he would reject all supernatural. If you reject all supernatural then you can't believe that Isaiah wrote all. We are concerned with those who