

tion but that that which is alledged simply fits in and it is really an extension of that argument and that led us on to c. These arguments were the ones from historical backgrounds and this one needs a separate large heading for this one as it is a strong argument. It is wrong to try to explain away the facts. A very different historical background is assumed after ch. 39 and in the second place we notice it must be primarily suited to the needs of the people at the time. Then in the third place I mentioned that the two mentions of Cyrus names. One or two names does not prove a whole section to be a certain thing. One or two names might be later interpolations but this is not likely.

#195

When the names, Everlasting Prince of Peace, etc, are used they are not definite names but they are names indicating the characteristics. Dryver's argument is not that God could not predict a name 300 years in advance but his argument is that God does not do so. This is not correct according to the analogy of Scripture. Ques. about these names. The claim is not that he is predicting the names in advance. He says that he is presupposing and he is predicting the other things that are going to come. Dryver says it is unparalleled to do it in the 22nd ch. and there are many things we want to say about the historical background and this thing about Cyrus is a comparatively small point as we have noticed and I don't think that we need to spend alot of time on Cyrus and by this it does not prove that the whole section is wrong as God could surely give the name of Cyrus hundred of years in advance if he so chose.

Number 4 is something which I think is very fundamental. It would hard for us to think of someone in 1900 writing an exortation to soldiers in South Pacific and telling them to not get into too much of a hurry to go home as they will get there in due season anyway and there is no rush. Someone could have said that when thousands of soldiers were waiting there in a rush to get home but for someone years ahead to have presupposed that would have been inconceivable as you would have said it would be impossible and that is the claim here. He is writing to the people to encourage them and to help them as they are in their exile and they will eventually go back. It is not necessary to think of the prophet as simply writing for people living a century and a half later--there was a real purpose in Is. 40--for Isaiah's own contemporaries and there you see it is joining issue head on with Dryver's statement. Small a is to show us that he writes for his day but the Holy Spirit allows it to be preserved and kept for a later day and that which is meant for not only his own day but for a later time and it has