

here by Cyrus that God has called him by his name. In ch. 44, v. 24 you see the structure that ^{Awelis} points out. Quote these verses. God has done all of these things. It all leads up to the fact that he is sending Cyrus to be the shepherd of it all. It goes on that the Messiah tells Cyrus thus. His right hand is to subdue nations before him and the loins of kings are to be loosed and the gates are not to be shut and in v. 4 he says "For Jacob my servant's sake and for Israel, mine elect. I have even called thee by thy name. I have surnamed thee. as thou hast not known me." It is plain to see that God is naming him in advance and the very man who is going to deliver the Israelites. So while I don't think this is absolutely water tight, I think there is considerable strength to it. The greatest thing of this passage is that it is marvelous evidence to this exile and the fact that God is supreme even though his temples are destroyed and no armies of people are following Him, it is of remarkable evidence that He way in advance is naming Cyrus as the one who is going to do this. Then along comes Cyrus the great Persian conqueror and he proceeds to carry out what has been said. So the frame is that Cyrus is predicted well in advance and Dryver says the Bible predicts exact things in advance but it does not give specific names like that. Dryver is certainly speaking positively there. Our point c we might note it is not altogether as unique in prophecy -- to name a man far in advance. I Kings 4:13 names Solomon, 400 years before his birth. There is the evidence that in prophecy again we have the case that God says ^{to the wicked} ~~where the~~ people that he is coming, a man Josiah by name and he gives the name of Josiah hundreds of years before Josiah was born. So then it is not unique to give a specific name far in advance. It is uncommon and we readily grant that it is not the usual thing. Of course others go on with this argument and say that other names are given years ahead but I don't think that is much of an argument as Jesus isn't the name actually used for Jews but the specific name Jesus is not given. Names may be given to indicate a character or a personality but in this case a specific name is given by which that one is to be called. The only other instance is the one of Josiah and it is a very definite thing. (Min. 9-10 spent in assigning.) Take the next nine ch. and ^{pick} ~~pick~~ out the verses that lay stress on the power and omnipotence of God and the passages that lay stress on His knowledge, His omniscience. If I'm not mistaken you'll find more here than ^{in most any 90 ch. of the} ~~in the other ch. is the~~ Bible, if I'm not mistaken. So above we have noticed the two arguments of the three in favor of it, the one from style and the one from theological view point were not very strong. There was as much to be said against in viewpoint of style and the point that there is no contradic-