

Verse after verse out of these chapters is beautifully developed in Handel's Messiah. And if you want verses of comfort surely this verse I just read is one of the most beautiful in the Bible and it can be paralleled with dozens of others from this particular section. There are other verses just as fine as this type in other parts of the O. T. but perhaps not so many of them in one group of chapters, as you have in these 17 chapters. ~~verses.~~ So that we would say that surely that this is a passage which people know enough about in different aspects that once they begin to realize it, is one of the most important sections of the O. T.

Well, now I speak of importance and difficulties of this section. This is one of the best known sections of the O. T. because of these many wonderful verses in this great 53rd chapter of Isaiah. The quotations about the Messiah in the 42nd of Isaiah, and the 49th and others, are so well known. But it also is ^{one of} the least known sections of the O. T. You will find many Christians who can give you a good outline of the main sections of Genesis, who can tell you a great deal about many parts of the Psalms, who can tell you much about the history of Israel at different sections, or a great deal about the ~~coming~~ ^{work} of Moses and the coming of the children of Israel through the wilderness, but you will find very few who could give you offhand a coherent outline of Isaiah 40-56, or to give you much of an idea of the progress of thought through this section. We have noticed how some of the verses in this section are among the very best known descriptions but others of them are hardly known at all. You go through these verses and you find verse after verse that most wonderfully predicts the return of the Jews from the exile. God's deliverance of them from Babylonian oppression. But most of these verses are not known to the average Christian at all. And you will find the same chapter ~~which~~ has many beautiful Messianic verses and also many verses dealing with return from exile. And the average Christian doesn't even know that those verses about the return from exile existed. To say nothing of having any idea of their relationship with the others. How do they come to be together in one

chapter? How does the thought of the prophet go from the one line, dealing with the wonderful deliverance from exile, to the other line dealing with the coming of the Messiah? What is the relation? We have five or six passages in this section that most vividly predict the coming of a great conqueror, Cyrus the Persian, who conquered the Babylonian empire and set the Israelites free. These sections make a most remarkable group of passages predicting this tremendous event, but very few Christians have ever heard of it or know anything whatever about them. So you see it is a passage which has much in it which is very, very well known but has many very important things in it which are hardly known at all to Christians. And to fit these two together and see how the relation of thought goes from one to the other is not easy. It is not like a legal section where laws are laid down in systematic order. It is not like a philosophic discussion where points are taken up and discussed one after the other. It is not like a presentation of history in which we are dealing with events one after the other, ^{as they happen,} You ~~could~~ pick up a passage here and read, and sometimes the thought of the prophet seems to you, at first sight, to jump rather wildly from one thing to something that seems quite unrelated, and yet actually there is a very close relation. There is a very closely developed logical thought running right through the passage but it is expressed in a different way than we are accustomed to express it. There is a movement of thought in it which utilizes certain principles which, one they become clear to us, are tremendously helpful in understanding the progress of God in the movement of the passages, but until they do we are apt to be rather at sea, in our attempt to understand the passage.

So it is a very important section and you can pick out many beautiful verses that are very clear and wonderful but when it comes to understanding the ~~g~~action as a whole it is a section which you take the average Christian person and just give him this and say take it, study it, and he 'd be lost. He doesn't see what it means, where it leads to, how the thought develops. He needs to get certain principles

that he can draw out from it and have them in his mind as he proceeds through it. So our purpose in this course is to learn what these principles are, to see what the proper approach is toward the understanding of the passage, and then to apply these principles ^{and see how the passage} ~~works out~~ and how it eventually leads into the great vital teaching about salvation, which are the great themes of the N. T. and which are expressed more clearly here than in any other passage of any length in the O. T.

I think that will be enough on the first heading on the importance and difficulties of the passage. Then we will go on to B:

B, The Historical Background of the Book of Isaiah. Now I don't know how much you people know about the historical background of the book of Isaiah, but in dealing with Isaiah as in dealing with the work of any prophet, you have to know something about the historical background. If you don't there is allusion after allusion that just isn't clear to you. And particularly is this true in the work of a prophet who is speaking directly to people and dealing with the problems that were right before them. He is not sitting off somewhere in an ivory tower, writing a book that can be put away and then hundreds of years later, people can take it out and find a wonderful treatise for them to get a blessing from. He is talking and writing to the people with whom he comes in contact, bringing the word of God to those people. And ~~he is~~ not simply dealing with personal matters that have nothing to do with political situations. He is tremendously concerned with the political situation of his day. And, that being the case, he has to know something of what that situation is. Now I imagine there is considerable variety in this class as to your knowledge of the historical background of the book as a whole. I'd like to just touch briefly on the main points of the historical background of the book of Isaiah, and then to go a little more fully into those which are particularly vital in connection with this section. The book of Isaiah, as we are told in this very first chapter, was written in the ~~re~~ reign of the kings Uzziah, Jothan, Ahaz and Hezekiah. That's of Judah.

Now Uzziah appears in the book hardly at all. In fact, the 6th chapter is dated by the death of Uzziah. Chances are Jotham is already dead by that time too. Ahaz enters into the book a great deal and Hezekiah enters into the book a great deal. And there is very good reason to think that Isaiah went on writing after the death of Hezekiah. Hezekiah was succeeded by his wicked son Manasseh who reigned for 52 years--55 years. And there is good reason to think that during Manasseh's reign Isaiah was still writing. In fact the latter parts of the book were written at that time. But these parts of the books deal very particularly with events about 200 years after the time of ~~writing~~ Isaiah, and so we want to just briefly glance at the events in ~~Isaiah's~~ time, most of which are not specifically referred in the section we are now going to take up, and then a little more at length into the events that happened in the next few centuries. Mr. Cohen, you looked as if you had a question? (14)

Yes, I would think so, I would think it entirely possible, very often they don't make a thing like necessarily complete. He was ~~after-th~~ active during the reign of Ahaz and Hezekiah, very active. During the reign of Manasseh there is no record of his having engaged personally in activity, but it is altogether possible that he went on writing after Hezekiah's death. We have very good reason to think it is so. There is a Jewish tradition that during the reign of Manasseh he sent his servants to kill Isaiah, and that these servants came to Isaiah's house but he had been warned and had gone to the forest and hid himself, and that there he hid himself in a hollow tree, and that these wicked men, knowing he was in this hollow tree, simply took and sawed the tree in two, thus sawed Isaiah in two. Now that ~~is~~, many things, is what it refers to in Hebrew 11 where it says he was sawn asunder, speaking of the persecution of the prophet. Now that is tradition, we are not sure of that at all. But that tradition does imply that he lived on after Hezekiah. Yes, Mr. Grauley? (15)...

...of Deutero-Isaiah is a question of criticism and we'll touch on it, but our interest at this time is not in criticism but in interpretation, so we'll say a bit about it but won't go into it much at length. But I will say this, that Deutero-Isaiah originally was 40-56, that was the second Isaiah. Now practically nobody believes that any more, but those today who believe not in the unity of Isaiah, hold that the second Isaiah includes all or much of the material from chapters 40-55. In other words, just about what we are going to cover this year, this semester, rather, what the critics call the Deutero-Isaiah. And many of them feel that this is the greatest of all the prophets, this second Isaiah, this Deutero-Isaiah. I do not feel that at all, I feel that it was Isaiah who wrote it, but I feel that it was Isaiah who was dealing with a different subject and dealing with it in a different way, in this section, than he did with what preceded, or with what follows. I feel there are certainly definite differences and we will look at those. Now as to the historical background of the book of Isaiah, we find in the 7th chapter of Isaiah that Isaiah is dealing with a plan which Ahaz had, to protect his nation against the attack of Israel and Assyria, Israel to the north, Syria to the northeast of Israel, and Israel is maybe 150 to 300 times as strong, as powerful as Judah. It is a much larger and stronger kingdom than Judah. Judah is probably stronger proportionate to its population, but after all it is only one tribe and a substantial part of another, at most two tribes, while Israel is ten tribes. And Israel is at least two times, maybe four times as large and as ^{powerful} popular. But Judah is wealthier and more powerful per capita than Israel, but nothing like as much as a whole. So when the two countries of the north set to work to attack Judah, King Ahaz feels that there is no way that he can resist; in the days of his great-grandfather, the troops of Israel had come into Israel, made a breach in the wall of Jerusalem, and had overcome Judah. Now if Israel alone could do that, what could the kingdom do against Israel and Syria put together? Syria is considerably larger than Israel. So under those circumstances Ahaz felt the only way he could protect the land was

to send clear across the desert to Tiglath p~~h~~leser, the Assyrian ruler, and invite him to come and protect from these two northern ~~the~~ kingdoms, ~~and~~ telling him that he will become his vassal if he does this. Now Isaiah in chapter 7 and also in chapter 28 speaks out against this plan of Ahaz. He says that the plan is not going to accomplish its results of protecting Judah. What the plan is going to do is indeed to protect Judah from Israel and from Syria, but it's going to not be a real protection because it will expose Judah to far greater dangers than it faced ~~from~~ these two kingdoms. It will remove the buffer states and will put them right next to ^{As}Syria the great terrible menace which was conquering nations in every direction. That is the warning that Isaiah give~~w~~ in chapter 7 and 28. There is of course an excellent parallel between this and our condition just twenty years ago, when western Europe was faced with attack by Germany. And when Hitler's power looked as if it would conquer ~~of~~ western Europe and some thought would come on and conquer the U. S. and in that situation our leaders said, we must destroy Hitler, that is the great menace of the century, ~~th~~at is a terrible danger, we must destroy Hitler, but there were those wh o said if you destroy the power of Germany, you completely put an end to Germany, you bring us face to face with the great force of Communis~~t~~ Russia which is determined to conquer the world and put us in an even more dangerous ~~of~~ situation, than when we are facing Hitler, and of course during the war that was pooh-pooed and they were told it was unpatriotic nonsense to say anything against our great wonderful ally of Russia. But there were those who felt it very strongly, that it would have been much wiser if we stood for the four freedoms and not unite to help build up a nation that did not allow any of the four freedoms in its own land. Well, that is so mewhat of the situation Isaiah faced. Isaiah said here you protect the land against these two fellows, but you are bringing us face to face with a far greater menace by the method you're using, far better to trust God to protect the land against these two menaces of Syria and

Israel than to put yourself in a position where your human schemes deliver you from them and you are facing a far greater menace against which nothing you could do could possibly avail you. It is only God's help that can protect you from the Assyrians when you bring yourself face to face with them. Well, this is tremendously important background for chapter 7 and 28 but is past ~~w~~ by the time we get to the section we are dealing with now. We just want to notice that what happened is described in chapters 36-39, which are the historical section of the book of Isaiah, four chapters in the middle of it which tell about events, one after the other, instead of being mainly made up of the messages of the prophet, so we call them the historic section of the book, and in those chapters we learn how, well before you get to those chapters we should first mention the Assyrians did come as Tiglath pileser had hired them to do, Tiglath pileser received a heavy indemnity from them to come, he attacked Syria, conquered them and made them part of the Assyrian empire. Israel he conquered and put a new puppet king there, in place of the king whom he destroyed, and then 9 years later he attacked again and destroyed this king, and incorporated Israel into his empire. So that now the Assyrian empire came right next to Judah. And Isaiah had predicted that is what would happen, that Tiglath pileser's plan would result ~~in~~ in bringing them directly next to the great dangerous power of Assyria, but Isaiah had gone on and said Assyria is going to attack and is going to produce tremendous danger for Judah, but God will deliver Jerusalem, said like birds flying. In other words, something up in the sky that he can't reach or affect at all, something that God is going to provide is going to protect you and deliver you from the attack of the Assyrians. So Isaiah predicted in chapter 10 and in chapter 29, 30, 31, he predicted that the Assyrian power would seem about to destroy Jerusalem but that God would deliver them from it, and that is what happened. The Assyrians came, they attacked Jerusalem, or they threatened to attack Jerusalem, they conquered most of Judah, and then God, as chapter 37 tells us, God sent the angel of the Lord who in one night slew thousands

of the Assyrians so that when the King of Assyria woke in the morning he found his army so reduced through the divine intervention, probably in the form of a pestilence, that it was necessary for him to pick up and go home without conquering Jerusalem, and he never did conquer Jerusalem. Now that is tremendously important for the background of those earlier sections in the book which we will consider in the course to be given next semester. But as far as his semester is concerned it is important for us to notice that in chapter 39 the last chapter of this historical section of Isaiah, we find that when Hezekiah was planning his attempt to gain freedom from the Assyrian power, he received emissaries from a country way across the desert which was also suffering from the Assyrian dictators. This was a power which 1500 years before had been one of the greatest powers in the world but which now had been subject to the Assyrians for many years, had occasionally gained its freedom for a brief time. Hezekiah looked on them as fellow sufferers under Assyrian attack and (10 1/4) to make common cause with them, so when the ambassadors from Babylon came to Hezekiah he received them with open arms and treated them as the closest of allies, and Isaiah said to him these people are from the nation which is going to conquer Judah. Judah is going to be conquered not by the great world power of Assyria, but by the people from Babylon, they are going to conquer Judah and they are going to take your own descendants and make them slaves in the palace of the king of Babylon. And Hezekiah said well at least it won't come in my time, because Babylon is an insignificant people now, it will be some time before anything like that can happen. And that's the way chapter 39 ends, and then our section begins with chapter 40. Well, that prediction then had been given by Isaiah, that it was Babylon, not Assyria, that would ~~suffer~~ conquer them. But for another century, after Isaiah wrote, Assyria was the great power, and Babylon was subject to Assyria, occasionally gaining freedom for a brief time, but Assyria was the great power, but Judah maintained its independence another century. Then came the downfall of the

Assyrian empire, and the empire which succeeded it was the Babylonian empire, with its headquarters at this place from which ambassadors had come to Hezekiah as described in chapter 39, and the Babylonian conqueror, Nebuchadnezzar, then proceeded to conquer Jerusalem in 586 B.C. The first two or three times he took the city and took many people into captivity, but in 586 he conquered the city and destroyed it, and took away most of the people that were left into captivity. So that that was the end of the kingdom of Judah, the end of the city of Jerusalem, the destruction of the temple that Solomon had built, was in 586, 150 years after the time when Isaiah had been most active, more than a century after Isaiah's death, and then at that time Isaiah's prediction was fulfilled, that the men from Babylon would take the people from Judah captive and carry them off across the desert, of course to make that long march across the desert, being driven, prisoners of war, hundreds of them doubtless would die on the way, it would be a very difficult thing to go through and the city just left a ruins, comparatively few people left in that area. Well, then, about 50 years after the first group were taken by the Babylonians over there, 45 years, nearly 50 years after the city was taken, God delivered the people from the exile, and the deliverance was through a Persian named Cyrus. Cyrus rose in the Median empire, an empire further east than the Babylonian empire, and Cyrus gained control of that whole empire, and having gained control of the whole Median empire he then proceeded to attack nations to the north of the Babylonian empire, and so Cyrus conquered the region to the north of the Babylonian empire and then continued coming west, north of the Babylonian empire, went into Asia Minor and conquered nation after nation in Asia Minor going very, very rapidly in his conquest, and his conquest is described in the book of Daniel. You have there a very picturesque description of his conquest. We find it in, let's see, which chapter of Daniel is it...

...I believe it's 8, yes in the 8th chapter of--yes, --we read in verse 3, I lifted up my eyes and ~~saw~~^{saw} and behold, there stood before ~~me~~ the river--that's the Euphrates-- a ram which had two horns and the two horns were high but one was higher than the other. And this, ~~he~~ would picture the empire of Media and Persia, which Media was first there and then the Persians under Cyrus got control, and then became superior to the Medes and he says but one was higher than the other and the higher came up last. There you get a picture of the rise of the Medo-Persian Empire. And then he says in verse 4, I saw the Ram pushing westward and northward and southward, so that no beast might stand before him, neither was there any that could deliver out of his hand, and did according to his will and became great. Now, let's see, is there, yes, when you get over to verse 20 you read the explanation. Verse 20, he says, the Ram which thou sawest, having the two horns are the kings of Media and Persia. So it is explained exactly what the vision means. The Ram pushing westward and northward and southward, not eastward, because he was far in the east and came in a westward direction, and then he came westward and then he went north into Asia Minor and then last he went southward, taking and conquering the Babylonian empire. And there was no beast that could stand before him, neither was there any to deliver out of his hand. So Daniel predicts this great powerful push westward of Cyrus, The first king of the Medo-Persian, previously it was the Median empire, the Persians were just a small group of subject people,

Well, when Cyrus conquered the Babylonian empire he reversed the policy of the Assyrians and the Babylonians. Their policy had been to take subject peoples off into exile, thinking that thereby they would strengthen their control over the empire, they would take people away from their homes and carry them off into different sections, taking the leaders of the people, taking the folks that were the highest trained, greatest organizing ability, but perhaps not necessarily of the greatest physical ability, and they'd put them in an area where they would be

strangers, to be looked on as those who had been brought in by the Assyrian kings and therefore the people of the area might look at them in an unfriendly way and they'd have to look to the Assyrian kings for protection, instead of looking at him as ~~an~~^{enemy}. A very clever scheme of the Assyrians and carried on by the Babylonians, but Cyrus reverses this and he lets the people go back to their homes, and he did that with various peoples, and ~~wh~~ ~~one~~ ~~he~~ did it with was the Jews. So he permitted the Jews to return to Jerusalem and rebuild the city, and in Ezra we read how ~~Cyrus~~ Cyrus gave his permission and how a great number of people ~~made~~ the long difficult trip across the desert and thus got back to their home in Jerusalem, and started in to rebuild their old homeland. Well, that's the general historical background of the book of Isaiah and of the succeeding two centuries as far as it's necessary to the understanding of our present section.

Our present ^{section} has nothing in it about kings of Assyria, it does not mention the specific situation with which Isaiah is so greatly concerned in the earlier part of his book. It jumps forward to a situation one hundred and fifty years after Isaiah's time. And predicts their deliverance from exile, and this is what leads the critics to say, this wasn't written till 150 years later, written toward the close of the exile. Conservative scholars who study the passage agree that it is dealing with the return from the exile, but they Isaiah predicted this 150 years ahead of time, so that as to what the passage means in the main there is little difference between the view of the conservatives and of the ~~Critics~~ critics on this point. That's why we will not have much to do with the critical theory ~~of~~ in this course, because the critical theories do not affect the interpretation particularly here. ~~So~~ There are points at which they do, but not many. They say it predicts return from exile. We say it is predicting return from exile. They say it predicts Cyrus, we say it predicts Cyrus. And there can be no question of that because Cyrus is actually named. Well they say how could Isaiah name Cyrus

150 years ahead of time? We say God could enable Isaiah to do anything that God chose to enable him to do, and if the unknown prophet in 1 K.13 could name Josiah 300 years ahead of time, why couldn't God enable Isaiah to name Cyrus 150 years ahead of time, if God chose so to do. We believe He did. But as you see, our difference with the critics is a tremendous difference when it comes to our belief in the integrity of the book of Isaiah, but it is not a difference that greatly ~~affects~~ our interpretation of the passage, and it would take us two or three weeks to look into the argument carefully ~~and~~ on that, and I ~~w~~ always did that in the course on prophets when I taught, I imagine Mr. Taylor does it now. It is a tremendous big area and he has to pick what he thinks is most important just as I did when I taught it. But at any rate, we can't take time for this in this class because we have much of interpretation to deal with. But at this point, we should move on to C:

C, The Relation of our present section (40-56) to the historical background. I already mentioned the fact that in this section we do not have references to Hezekiah, to Ahaz, to Tiglath-pileser, to the 'ssyrian empire as a great menace, anything like that. It is very different from what you gather in going into the passage as far as these particular things are concerned. Now chapter 7 begins with telling you when it's given, what the situation is. There is no such beginning of chapter 40. He just starts in and gives us a message. And in order to decide what the background of this message is, we have to ~~read~~ the message and see. But when we read the message we do not find it difficult to tell what it is talking about, because there are so many passages in it that make it absolutely clear that the immediate theme of the section is the return from exile. You get that as soon as you start reading ~~this~~ passage. Isa.40, comfort ye, comfort ye, my people, speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is ~~p~~ardoned; for she hath received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins. Isaiah never says anything like that in chapters 1-39.

In chapters 1-39 Isaiah is constantly saying you must repent for your sins, you must turn away from your sin, if you don't, God is going to send you into exile, that is the general note that is so prominent in those early chapters. Look right at the very beginning of Isaiah and that is the way he deals. Verse 3, the ox knows his owner, and the ass his master's crib, but Israel does not know, my people does not consider, oh sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity. And what is going to happen as a result of this, verses 7 and 8, your country is desolate, your cities are burned with fire, ~~your~~ the daughter of Zion is left as a cottage in a vineyard, as a lodge in a garden of cucumbers, as a besieged city. He goes on through the chapters from 1-35 and over and over he says, if you don't turn away from your sins and repent and turn to God, God is going to send you into exile and cause Jerusalem to be destroyed, now there were no threats like that, from chapter 40-56. The whole tone is different from that. Isaiah warns them over and over that exile is going to come if they do not turn to God, he is constantly warning them in those chapters, never any warnings from chapters 40-56. You have a very different tone in these chapters, the tone of these chapters is, something has happened, the people have been in distress, they have been in misery, they have been in a situation of great oppression, and this situation has already ~~been~~ continued for many years. That is the general expression that you get in these chapters. We notice in verse 1, there, what the situation is, if you look over to chapter 51, verse ~~17~~¹⁷, you read, awake, awake, stand up, O Jerusalem, which hath drunk at the hand of the Lord the cup of his fury, thou hast drunken the dregs of his cup of trembling, and ~~wung~~ them out. Isaiah 51 continues, in ~~verse~~ 19, says these two things are come upon thee, who shall ~~destroy~~ be sorry for thee? desolation, and destruction, and the famine, and the sword, by whom shall I comfort thee? ¹⁴_n In the first part of Isaiah he is not usually seeking how is he going to comfort them, but how is he going to get them to repent ~~for~~ their sins ~~so~~ that these things won't happen? Now the implication is they have come, they have been

there a long time, what can be done? Isa.51.22,23, thus saith thy Lord, the Lord, and thy God, that pleads the cause of his people, behold, I have taken out of thine hand the cup of trembling, even the dregs of the cup of my fury, thou shalt no more drink it again, but I will put it into the hand of them that afflict thee; which have said to thy soul, bow down, that we may go over, and thou hast laid thy body as the ground, and as the street, to them that went over. The implication is that they have already suffered the conquest, they have already gone into exile, they have been in oppression for a long time, God is going to deliver them out. That is the starting point of these chapters. It is more a finishing point than a starting point in the earlier chapters. The general attitude of these chapters is that the land has been in ruins for a long time. In Isa.44.26, God says that He is the one who both confirms the word of his servant and performs the counsel of His messengers, that says to Jerusalem, thou shalt be inhabited and the cities of Judah, ye shall be built, and I will raise up the decayed places there. In earlier chapters he says Jerusalem is going to be destroyed, and then he says later on it will be destroyed. But here he says they are going to be rebuilt and the decayed places built up. The implication is that it is already destroyed and been destroyed for a long time. In Isa.51.3 he says, for the Lord shall comfort Zion, he shall all her waste places, he will make her wilderness like Eden, and her desert like the garden of the Lord. In Isa.52.9 he says, break forth into joy, sing together, ye waste places of Jerusalem, for the Lord has comforted his people, he has redeemed Jerusalem. The implication is they have been in a state of ruins, Palestine has, for many years, and now God is going to bring deliverance. Now how can Isaiah write 100 years before the exile and talk as if the people had already been in exile? The critics say this is ridiculous. Isaiah wouldn't write like that. How could he? Well, I don't think it is hard to see how he might have done it.

Exile was nothing new to the people of Judah. Even as Isaiah predicted in his early days that the northern kingdom would be conquered by Assyria, the northern

kingdom was conquered by Assyria. At the end of maybe the first third of Isaiah's ministry the northern kingdom was conquered by Assyria. Its people were taken into exile, and when they started marching those thousands of people off across the desert, the probabilities are that a few escaped, or maybe even after they got way over there to Assyria, a few escaped and made their way back to their kinsmen in Judah, and the people in Judah would hear all about what was happening only ten or fifteen miles away from where many of them lived, how the land was left desolate and in ruins and the great multitudes of people were carried off into exile, and the oppression and misery that they had gone through and now the Assyrian power which did that to Israel, was only right next to Judah and within the Assyrian officers were within a mile or two of the border of Judah and within 20 miles of Jerusalem itself. And under that situation the people who believed in Isaiah as God's prophet and who believed that when he said if you don't repent you're going to all go into exile, they knew that this was actually going to happen, and naturally they would tend to give way to despair and grief at the thought of this terrible thing that was ahead for them. So Isaiah could easily in his own day, particularly in the days of Manasseh, the wicked king, when the man was going further and further into wickedness and the godly people could see that there was nothing possible ahead except the fulfillment of God's terrible prophecies of doom, they could almost feel as if the exile was right there already, and Isaiah could write a book of comfort for these godly people, not for the nation, in order to tell them that when the exile has gone on for a period of time, God is going to intervene and end it. It is not going to be the end of God's mercy and blessing to Israel...

~~C.4 (1/2)~~

~~... and capital E, I give a title to, which is my own original contribution to this study of this passage, I call it E, The Symphonic Structure. Now this is a term which I--maybe it was 25 years ago when I first went through the passage in class,~~

... Yes, there is a very good question. That's what the critics say. They say the time came and a new prophet came, a greater prophet came, but that is in a way the most natural interpretation. But we find that against that, the N. T. refers to the whole book as the writing of Isaiah. We have evidences that this is the N. T. attitude toward it, which / we, ~~we~~ believing in the inspiration (1) of the N. T. take to mean ~~that~~ that God says, no, Isaiah wrote the whole thing. Therefore, we believe Isaiah did write the whole thing, and then it is altogether reasonable for us to ask the question, why didn't he do the simpler thing, having a new prophet come later, why didn't ~~He~~ have Isaiah write it now? And I think we can find a reasonable answer. That when they got near the end of the exile, Isaiah's book could be read by the people then, and they could read it and they could see God's wonderful message of hope and all that, but that in addition to that the godly people in the land, right in Isaiah's day, in the midst of the coming of their misery and wickedness ~~of~~ ^{that} Manasseh ~~into~~ introduced, they could then be encouraged to stand for the Lord and to train their children to believe in Him, and to look forward to the fulfillment of the promise, of God's promise, by the assurance right then that the exile is going to come to an end, and that God has a great blessing for Israel after this. And that then beyond that, also, when the exile comes to an end, and their children could read in the book of Isaiah that God through Isaiah had predicted Cyrus' coming 150 years before, that would be an added great evidence of the truth of the fact that God had spoken through the prophets, and that this was really God's word, that wonderful miracle of telling all this beforehand. So for those reasons we, that is we don't put our faith in it because we ~~do~~ find good reasons for it, we put our faith in it because the N. T. considers as one book, written by Isaiah, and quotes from all parts of the book as by Isaiah the prophet, sometimes quoting from two of them right continuously, as when Isaiah says here and what Isaiah says in a different place. But seeing that, from the N. T., we base our beliefs on that,

and we find what I think is a very satisfactory reason for it. Mr. Miller? (3) Well, of course, Jeremiah, the exile hasn't yet come either. Jeremiah is still saying exile is coming if you don't repent. (stu.3 1/2) Yes, Daniel, he doesn't refer back to it, as far as I know. I don't know of any case where we have a book referring back to Isaiah, in that way. If we did, that would be an excellent argument, but I don't know of any. (stu.3 3/4) Could have, but we have no evidence. Well, there is then a reason why God might have done it this way and there is good evidence that this is the way God did it, and we have noticed that the background of these chapters is the background of the people having in a state of misery, for a long time. And in that state of misery, having lasted for a long time, Jerusalem was in destruction, their homeland was in desolation, they were off in a distant land, and in that situation they were subject not to Assyria, but to Babylon, and we find between Isa. 40-56 that there is clear evidence that it is the Babylonians who are the people holding them, not, as if an ordinary man wrote it in the time of Isaiah, it would've been the Assyrians, but it fits in with the prediction made at the end of chapt. 39. Babylon is mentioned four times, that is in four verses in the 17th chapter, and four times reference is made to the Chaldeans, and Chaldean is the name of the ruling group in Babylon at this time, the Chaldeans. And in chapter 46 the two leading gods are mentioned as those that are going to be overthrown when God destroys the power of the Babylonian empire, the background of this section is a background of the end of exile, and God's bringing deliverance. Then during this section we have the passages in which they predict the coming of Cyrus, we have vivid predictions of Cyrus as one whom God raises ^{up} to accomplish His purpose, we have this in chapter 41 already. Verse 24. Again in the latter part of 41.25 verse 25. In chapter 44.28--45.3 we have a section where we have quite a description of what Cyrus is going to do and Cyrus is named twice in those verses. And then 46.11 is again a reference to Cyrus, now we notice that out of these four cases one of them twice names Cyrus, the other three don't name Cyrus, but I've never heard any other suggestion as to what it is talking about

except Cyrus, and it fits perfectly with that. And the fourth again gives tremendous promise to the coming of Cyrus in this section. In 44.28 and 45.13 it is stated that Cyrus is going to allow the people to return and rebuild Jerusalem, God says of Cyrus he is my shepherd and shall perform all my pleasure, even saying to Jerusalem, thou shalt be built, and to the temple, thy foundations shall be laid. And in chapter 45.13 God says about Cyrus, I have raised him up in righteousness, and I will direct all his ways, he will build my city and he shall let go my captives. Now I think our time is about up today, there isn't much time to study between today and tomorrow (about assignment) (7 1/2) gap in record, starting again at 8 3/4) ...now we were speaking last time about C, the background of the section and we noticed how different this section is from other sections of Isaiah, the first thing we noticed particularly was that the other sections usually start with rebuke against sin. In this section we have no part of it starting that way. The other sections, everything up to this time usually starts, you have rebelled against God, you've done wickedly, you keep on this way God will send you into exile, and then after he gives the declaration of the exile that is ahead, then he very frequently looks beyond the exile to encourage the godly with God's promises of blessing after that. You find those promises even beginning as early as the 2nd chapter of ~~I~~ Isaiah but they're shorter as a rule than the rebuke against sin, and they practically always come second afterwards. In this section, exile is not present but rather presupposed, and the section starts in, not with a rebuke for sin, but with comfort to those who are suffering, and that is characteristic of the section as a whole, sin is dealt with in this section, in fact, this section has the answer to the problem of sin more clearly than any other part of the book of Isaiah, but it is given from a different approach altogether, it is not the same approach of rebuke against sin being the start. Now also we noticed how this presupposes exile is already here, people have been in suffering for a long time, Jerusalem has been destroyed, the temple has been destroyed, it is not Assyria which is the danger of exile before, but it is Babylon which has brought

the exile on them and from which they are to be delivered, that is ^{the background,} ~~to Babylon~~, and the approach that is so conspicuous in this section is the approach of deliverance from Babylon which God is going to give and dealing with the problem of the exile, ~~at~~

Now I want to go on to a section D, a rather brief section, rather vital one. It is called D, The Problem of Interpretation, of Isaiah's book of consolation. This is a section which is not easy to interpret until you get the principle with which to deal with. And there are various reasons for that. You take , you go through it from the viewpoint I just mentioned which is very clearly there, and you find that it is Israel in exile, temple destroyed, desiring deliverance, God promising deliverance, going to bring them back to Jerusalem. That is conspicuous and is frequent in the passage. On the other hand you take it the way , all the average Christian knows about the passage at all is the marvelous predictions of Christ, the coming of God's servant, the deliverance from sin, of His death on the cross, marvelous pictures of these. How do we get these together, how do they fit together into the same package, in fact, as a rule into the same chapter? How do they go from one to the other, what is their relation? The tendency of the Jews is to get rid of the references to Christ, all these are pictures of sufferings of Israel, well it doesn't work out thusly, you can't explain it that way. On the other hand, you take the attitude of some Christian interpreters to try to get rid of all references to the exile, you can't do it, there are specific references, with specific proper names, the teaching about Cyrus, I know of no one who has given a satisfactory explanation of those verses as a prediction of Christ, even though Cyrus is called my anointed, my Messiah, not yet know of no explanation of those as referring to Christ or as referring to anything or anybody else except Cyrus. But is it just a hodgepodge, are these things just stuck together so you jump from one to the other, or is there a logical relationship between them, and if there is it will help you to understand each of them better to see the relationship, and there must be, because God is not a God of confusion, but a God

of reason and a God of order. But also it is, yes, I put two heads here, Christian vs. Jewish or Exile vs. Distance, these are the same thing from two different viewpoints. Of time, how much is immediate, not immediate from Isaiah, but within the next two centuries after Isaiah, how much of it is way after that, how much of it is dealing with Israel returning from exile, how much of it is dealing with the coming of the Son of God, and then another thing that makes this passage very difficult for the average interpreter is the sudden transition. Just look at chapter 40, in chapter 40, we read verse 11, he shall feed his flock like a shepherd, he shall gather the lambs ~~with~~ his arms and carry them in his bosom and shall gently lead those that are with young, verse 12, who has measured the waters in the hollow of his hand, and meted out heaven with a span, and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure, and weighed the mountains in scales ~~and~~ the hills in a balance, how does that fit together with ~~the~~ verse about carrying the lambs gently like a shepherd, what a strange, sudden, sharp transition it is from one thought to another thought, and you find many such sharp transitions in this section. Just glance over to chapter 45, look at 45.17 but Israel shall be saved in the Lord with an everlasting salvation; ye shall not be ashamed nor confounded world without end. For thus saith the Lord that created the heavens: God himself that formed the earth and made it; he hath established it, --what a sharp contrast, what a sudden transition between these two different ideas of these two verses, and there are many of these very sharp seeming jumps from one idea to another. How do we interpret? No smooth ~~easy~~ transition as we have to try to make in our ordinary ~~w~~ writing. Well, the problem of the interpretation of the passage is one which has to be faced at the start, we can't get the answer to it at the start, but we can get a substantial part of the answer and then the rest we work out as we go along...

C.5. (1/2) ...and capital E, I give a title to, which is my own original contribution to this study of this passage, I call it: E. The Symphonic Structure. Now this is a term which I--maybe it was 25 years ago when I first went through the passage in class, and I thought of this title's fitting it, and for one who knows as little about music as I do, it is perhaps rather something strange to make such a comparison but as I understand the nature of a symphony I think we find in it a hint that gives us something of the answer to this problem. Now before stating exactly what I mean by the symphony, let me first state this in general, that God's word is not simply like the mathematics table. He is not giving us a set of rules, a list of reasonable principles to explain the universe. Some of the old Greeks thought, if you can give people an understanding of goodness and truth, they will immediately become good and truthful, but it doesn't work that way, something more is necessary. There is necessary an appeal to the emotions as well as an appeal to the mind. The mind of man is clouded with sin, and you might say that the outstanding doctrinal teachings of the Bible could be put in a doctrinal treatise perhaps no longer than the book of Genesis, but that would not get the thought across to people, it wouldn't get into their minds and into their hearts. God has sought means of getting the truth into people's hearts. And so in this section, 40-56, there is an amazing amount of careful thinking and of advance in understanding in the course of the passage, but the approach of the passage is not one of logical discussion, in order to examine matters and see what conclusions they logically lead to. That is not the approach of the passage, the approach of the passage is an emotional one. It is the approach of teaching people bowed in misery and bringing to these people consolation in their misery, but not only consolation, an understanding of the situation, and with the understanding, leading them to certain conclusions, which it is vital that they should reach. So that there is an emotional presentation, even though underlying it is a remarkable structure, a structure that is not apparent, until you get an idea of the emotional presentation. And here is where my term of the symphonic structure comes in. Because I have compared it to the theme of the symphony. As I understand it, in a symphony there are usually two or three different

musical themes, and one theme is played upon and developed in different regard, different features, and then there is another theme, and then we come back to the first, and then may be get a third theme, and then come back to the first, and maybe the second again, and the third, but you jump from one to the other theme, sometimes rather abruptly, but you go from one to the other, back and forth, until eventually you satisfy the longings for each ~~one~~ of the themes. Mr. Golin were you indicating a question? Well, in this situation we begin with one theme or motif, and that is the theme of comfort. Comfort ye, comfort ye, my people, saith the Lord your God. Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, she has received of the Lord double for all her sins. Comfort. That is how this whole passage starts and that is the theme which perhaps occurs and recurs more frequently than any other in the whole of our section. Comfort. Far more than anywhere else in the book of Isaiah perhaps than all the rest put together. Comfort.

Well, now this theme of comfort has various aspects which are stressed. We'll look at these aspects a little later, but there is an amazing number of verses here, which deal with this thought of bringing people comfort in their difficulty, giving them a assurance of God's presence, telling them of the marvelous things God is going to do for them. This theme of comfort is stressed over and over in the passage. But now as you stress the theme of comfort, the mind soon comes to feel a craving for the answer to a problem. Yes, God is going to help them. God says, don't worry, don't fear, be comforted. God will deliver you, God will bring you back from exile, you say, yes, but look at here, Jerusalem is destroyed, the gods of Babylon, their people who worship those gods were able to destroy Jerusalem. They were able to lead the people off into captivity. You see the great processions with the gods of Babylon carried down the streets and everybody worshipping them. What do you see of the God of Israel, He has disappeared. There is no more temple, everything that is connected with it, every

visible sign of the existence of the God of Israel has disappeared, has been destroyed. His people are in captivity. What's the good of comfort if there is nothing to back it up, when Kennedy said to the people of Berlin we are going to stand behind you, we don't want you to feel too badly in this situation, we're going to stand with you, they were greatly assured, when he gave them these words of comfort, but when he sent a group of American tanks, and some American soldiers there, it had many times more influence than his words did, because they saw visible evidence of power, backing up the statements of comfort, and so the second great theme of , at least the first few chapters of our section, the second great theme is the theme of God's power. Now this theme includes the fact that God exists, the gods of Babylon are powerful, they have conquered the world. There is no temple any more, there is not evidence that God exists. Well, God assures you, I do exist, and I am powerful. God has made bare His mighty arm. God is so powerful that man in comparison with Him is nothing. God is a tremendous mighty powerful instrument who created the universe, the theme of creation, the idea of creation as backing up this theme of comfort is stressed more in these chapters than anywhere else in the Bible except perhaps in the last chapters of the book of Job. God's tremendous power is stressed over and over and over, from various aspects, various means of stressing it, the idea that there is no other god. He is the only god is brought out over and over and over, in verse after verse, sometimes in one verse there will be four different statements of the fact that God is the only God who actually exists. So this idea of God's tremendous power is the second theme, not as common as that of comfort, but very near, it is tremendously important, in this section. Now then, you might say, like a (8 1/4) you've mentioned the great theme and that theme of comfort leads you to God's power. But now from God's power there are two directions you can go in. And either one of these directions leads you to a thought that is bound to occur to a people in this situation. And I don't know which of the two to state first. Perhaps I'll take the more obvious first.

God's power naturally contrasts with the weakness of the idols. There is a theme, I usually call it the fourth theme, but we'll call it another theme: The weakness of the idols. God is great and powerful, what are these gods of Babylon? They have to be carried around. Somebody cuts down a tree and out of half of the tree he makes an idol to worship and out of the other half he makes some kindling wood to warm himself when it's cold. How silly! There is more stress on the foolishness of idolatry in this section than in any other part of the Bible. The people need it, they're in Babylon seeing the tremendous power that seems to be connected up with these idols and these gods of the heathen, and God seems to have disappeared, there is no visible sign of His greatness, of His power, and so along with the stress on the greatness of God comes the stress on the futility of idol worship, and we have many incidental small reference to it, and we have many long passages dealing with it. Well, now, that's one direction of the Y, I have usually called that the fourth theme before, because the first theme is so closely connected logically with the second theme. The second, it's not apparent at first sight, how connected it is, but as you think of it, you see how it is. The second theme is the great power of God. God says well these idols are nothing, after all. He says, how did you come to go into exile, because the gods of Babylon took you, no, because I gave you over for your sin. It was I who sent you into exile, not the gods of Babylon, and He says my arm is so strong, nothing can stop me, I can take up the nations like nothing at all. And He says I'm going to bring you back from exile. Well, the natural longing of the heart is for some proof. Yes, you can say how great you are, you can say how powerful you are, but it doesn't look like it. You couldn't even protect Jerusalem, you couldn't even protect your temple from destruction. The gods of Babylon rule over the whole world and there is no sign of the greatness of the God of Israel. What proof is there of the greatness of God? So we have one line of proof which is stressed, not stressed near as much as the first

or second theme, but it is stressed a fair amount, it is stressed more I think than anywhere else in the Bible, and this third theme is the theme of God's power to predict the future. God's power to predict the future, sometimes I have described it as God's knowledge, sometimes as God's omniscience, but the central feature of it is His power to predict the future. Now you say, well you say you're so strong, so powerful, these gods of the heathen, you say they are nothing, where is the proof of it? You can say you're strong, but how do we know it? You say you have created the universe, how do we know it? God says, I predicted you were going into captivity to Babylon, not to Assyria, and here you are. He says I predicted two centuries ago that Cyrus would come, and deliver you, and here he is. I predicted that these things would happen and they have come to pass exactly as I predicted they would. The evidential value of predicted prophecy, that is a theme which while not occupying anything like the space of the first two, perhaps occupying as much as the fourth, the one on idolatry, perhaps not quite as much. It is a very important theme in the development of the thought. So the thought often runs from God's power, from help to the people, comfort, then God's power, then you go to the proof of His power, the power to predict the future, then maybe you'll go to the idols, maybe you'll come back to power, maybe you'll go to comfort again. You jump around a good bit on that. Let's look at Isa.40 and see just quickly how it goes, and incidentally, I found it very helpful in connection with this passage, to go down to Fifth Street, to the office of the American Bible Society down there, at 5th and Walnut and there for 6¢ a piece I got two copies of the little hand edition of the book of Isaiah, and then I cut up the two copies and I pasted them down a paper, so that I have them, our section, pasted on paper, with lots of room on both sides to make marks, and then wherever there was the theme of comfort I put a red mark on the left, and wherever there was the theme of idolatry I started a blue mark further over to the left, and wherever there was the theme of God's power I put the blue mark to the right a

little ways over, and wherever there was the theme of God's knowledge, or power to predict the future, I put a red mark, right next to it on the right, and any other other thing I wanted to notice I made a mark clear over to the side, or a question mark where there was a problem, and that way it makes it quick to find these different questions. Now I find that a very useful way of finding these and comparing them quickly.

I am not assigning you to make up sheets like this, I am assigning you to study the themes, but if any of you should find it convenient to work it in this way, you might in such a case if there was more than one, get together, and perhaps one could go down in that area, and could pick up these copies, they're 6¢ a piece and you need two, because you can't paste one side and another side over on another page. When you paste one side you ruin the other side of course, so you need two copies, if you do this, you better get three, in case you spoil one....

C6. (3/4)

...as good a time as any to mention your assignment for next time. As you know, if you're taking this for undergraduate credit you have 2 hours in class, and that means that you have 4 more hours of preparation for a week. If you fall a little under the 4 it's all right, but don't fall much under. The assignment for next time is to take the time you have for a week of study, leaving out whatever time you put on reviewing the lectures, and put that time on starting in at chapter 40 and noting the different themes. I would suggest that you take a piece of paper and write at the head the theme of comfort and next to it the theme of power, then the theme of God's knowledge, then the theme of the futility of idols. Then if you say, for instance, under one head: 40.1-3. Then below on the next line if another head 4-7 goes, put it under that line, then when you find something that doesn't seem to go under any one of these themes, write it over in the fifth column, so that you list over there, the fifth column material, the material that doesn't go under any one of these themes. (stu.2) Well, it does fit in a way more than you'd expect as when you get into it you'll find.

So you'll put Cyrus in the 5th column, there are some who say he had a fifth column in Babylon that introduced him into the city, but at any rate, I want you to see how the transition is from one to the other, go as far as you can in the time you have. Now if you strike something that seems to be real difficult, or not to fall easily into these categories just state the problem and go on, don't stop a long time at any one section, because the aim here is to get you familiar with the way that it moves from one side to the other, rather than to deal with specific difficulties at the moment. Well, now as you look at chapter 40, for instance, you notice the first two verses are dealing with ~~this matter~~ of comfort. Incidentally, at the end of verse 2, it says she has received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins. Since there is not a great deal on sin in the section, nothing like as much as before, and yet it's one of our vital problems, I put a little ^{mark} clear over to the left to indicate that the matter of sin is touched upon, so that I could bring those together later, to see what is said, how it's developed. But that's not part of this project. You have the theme of comfort through verse 4, then you read the glory of the Lord shall be revealed and all flesh shall see it--that's His power, His existence. Then you read for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it--His prediction, that's God's knowledge. He predicts it is going to happen and when you see it happen/you see the evidence that His glory really is as He says it is. Then/you have comfort from verse 9 through 11, 1-11, the main thing is comfort. We notice verse 11, feeding the flock like a shepherd, then verse 12, His power. Who has measured the waters in the hollow of His hand. Then 13 and 14, His knowledge. 15 we get His power again. 15, 16, 17, 18. Then from 19 on to 24 or 25 you have idolatry, the futility of idolatry, and between these themes you can divide just about everything in chapter 40. It is different from the following chapters, it has very little that is specifically tied down to precise events, so that in it you note the themes in general and as to the precise application we look into that later, don't worry about that at this moment. Then we start chapter 41, you have something that doesn't come into any one of these heads so much at first, but then you have the statement that

it is God who brought Cyrus, it is God who is responsible for Cyrus' coming, that's God's power, and then you have the declaration in verse 4 that God predicted it, there is His knowledge. Then from verse 6 and 7 you have idolatry, 8 you have comfort again, and you have comfort on through 19, and thus you jump from one of these themes to the other and in our early chapters of our section these are the themes that occupy the greater part of the space, but when you get the things that don't come under any one of these, then you see the beginning of the emergence of new ideas, which develop into the great logical process of the chapter. Now just one interesting instance of how God jumps from one theme to another, look at chapter 45. Turn to 45 look at verse 16, there is a section here from 16 to 22 in which you have about as much transition from one theme to another as any section I know of. Look at 45.16, they shall be ashamed and also confounded, all of them, they shall go to confusion together that are makers of idols. What is the theme of verse 16, Mr. (6 1/4) The futility of idol worship in 16. What does 17 say, But Israel shall be saved in the Lord with an everlasting salvation; ye shall not be ashamed nor confounded world without end. What is the theme of that, Mr. ~~Mr.~~ Carlson? Well there is a prediction but the theme is comfort. See He is comforting Israel, He is encouraging them in contrast to the misery of those who follow the idols that are useless, here is comfort for them. God has blessing for them. Then in verse 18, what is your theme? You can all see it in front of you, what is your theme in verse 18, Mr. Cohen? Power, God's power, and included in that is God's existence. Thus saith the Lord that created the heavens, God Himself had formed the earth and made it, He has established it. He created it not in vain, He formed it to be inhabited, there is power, God's power. But look, I am the Lord and there is none else. There is His existence, which we put under power, His existence, and the fact that He is the only one there is. Then look at verse 19, I have not spoken in secret, in a dark place of the earth, I said not to the seed of Jacob, seek ye me in vain; I the Lord speak righteousness, I declare things that are right. When God says something it will come to pass. There is your

theme of prediction. Now the other is a prediction, and there might be a question in some cases, whether prediction given should come under this head, but ~~if~~ if the prediction is one of comfort, something good, you could in a way put it under either, but I think it goes under what He is going to do, rather than His power, but when He stresses the fact He can predict, as here, I put that under prediction, under God's knowledge. Then look at ~~verse~~ verse 20, what is the theme of verse 20? Mr. Oliver? Yes, the futility of idols, verse 20. You see how we have had the four themes, now we start them over again. The futility of idols, now before when you had the futility of idols in verse 16, we immediately contrast ~~it~~ it with the misery that is coming for the idol worshippers, to the blessing for Israel, comfort. But here you have the futility of idols in verse 20, what do you have in the first half of 21? Mr. Golin? Prediction, yes. The idols are gods who can't save, they ~~can't~~ can't do anything, but God can predict the future, evidence of the fact that the idols are nothing, but that God is the one who can do what He chooses. He can predict the future, so prediction is given in the first half of 21, as the great evidence of God's existence and power to carry out what He promises, and the last half of 21 deals with His power and His existence. Have not I the Lord, there is no God besides me, and then the verse ends, there is none beside ~~me~~ me. Two statements of God's being the only God, and in between them, a just God and a Saviour, that just touches very lightly on the theme of comfort, but in 22 you have the theme of comfort put in very strongly, and again the theme of God's existence too. Look unto me and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth, for I am God and there is none other. God's existence, why comfort people if there is no power back of the comfort, yet you can comfort them because He is the one who exists, who is God and can comfort. So we have these four main themes and you don't often jump as much from one to the other, as you do in these 8 verses. In these 8 verses you notice how you have 1, 2, 3, 4, of them and then you have the same four in different order, in the next one, and in the last two verses of it you have two of them mixed up in one verse. Thus He goes from one theme to the other, in order to drive home

to people's minds, first the great promise God is going to deliver, God is with you, He has not forsaken you, the exile isn't the end, God is going to deliver, He is going to bring blessing, then to back that ~~up~~ up with the assurance that God who makes these promises can do so because He does exist, He is God, in fact, He is the only God, and He is tremendously powerful, He has created the universe, and then third to give a proof that He has this power, by the fact ~~that~~ He has been able to predict the future, here is the evidence that He predicted it, now you see it coming to pass. There is the proof that you cannot escape. You see a tremendous thing happen, you say, how powerful our God is, that does this. Somebody else says no, that's not your God ~~is~~ that did that, ^{it just} ~~somebody~~ happened that ~~else says,~~ way. I had an instance once, when I was in college, I went with some folks, and we went for a little walk up in the country, and one of our party was a missionary lady who was with us, a very godly lady, a very fine woman, and as we stood and looked out over a section of country, that had been burned over by a great forest fire, and as we looked at it we ~~saw~~ beautiful flowers coming up, on that parched burned over ground, and this woman said, my, wasn't God good to cause these beautiful flowers to come up that look so beautiful here, and just as we were standing there looking at them, a man came walking by and turned to us and said to us, you see all those flowers, I planted those seeds there so this place wouldn't look so bad, so ~~that~~ these lovely flowers would come up. He says, aren't they nice? And I felt what a contrast to what she had just said, was it the flowers came up because God sent them, or because the man planted them? They were beautiful, there was no question of that, they were there, there was no question of that. But if you had a statement, when the forest fire was occurring, a prophet of God said, this terrible forest fire is here and going to devastate all the land, and it's going to look frightful, but it won't all continue that way, because this particular section over here is going to have lovely flowers coming up, then if you came there, six months later and you found it all parched and bad except this one section and this section the flowers were coming up, whether God caused it supernaturally to happen, or whether

he led a man to go and plant flowers in that one particular place, there would have been a statement ahead of time, that that ~~was~~ was going to happen. A prediction of the future is the sort of evidence, that you have to examine it and be sure it actually was made, that it 's not like the old Roman predictions , that no matter what happens, the prediction was right, ~~but~~ like the ~~//~~ Oracle of Delphi in Rome, when Cyrus came with his army, and conquered half of Asia Minor, he came to the western section of Asia Minor where Croesus had his great kingdom, the kingdom of Lydia and Croesus was such a fortunate man that everything he did turned out right, and his name came to be a byword for tremendous wealth today, because of his ~~great~~ wealth and everything just seemed to work right that Croesus did. Croesus saw Cyrus' army coming and they reached the ~~highest~~ ^{Tigris} river that was the border between his kingdom and the kingdoms they had conquered, and he thought I am probably next in line, what had I better do? So he sent a representative to the Delphic Oracle in Greece, and he said, tell me, ~~it was across the sea of course,~~ ^{with the capital} (14) and he said tell me what will happen? Should I march out across the river and attack Cyrus, or is it better I just wait behind it and hope he won't attack, and the Oracle gave the answer, if you march out across the river, and attack Cyrus, a great empire will be destroyed. And that was exactly what Croesus wanted. This tremendous empire of Cyrus to be destroyed, that is exactly what he was hoping for, so with the absolute confidence and the assurance of the Delphic Oracle, he marched out and attacked Cyrus' army, they had a great battle, Croesus was utterly defeated, and the great empire of Croesus was destroyed, so the Delphic Oracle was proven true, but it would have been, no matter what happened. Well, you always have to examine any alleged prophecy, to see if they're like that. A man sent me a book for ~~//~~my advice about it, which he was printing on fulfilled prophecy of the O. T., and there were some wonderful statements of fulfilled prophecy, but then there were other statements he gave where I thought the argument was tremensously weakened by the fact that he included prophecies which, while they were true enough, or came out that way, they were situations that anybody

could predict, and so it was God's declaration of God's wrath, but it wasn't any evidence, because it was just would happen anyway. Like if you say, the city is going to be destroyed and it's going to become a place where shepherds will put up their tents, and then you say went and you found shepherds had their tents there. Well, if anywhere in that area where there aren't cities, there are shepherds, if the city is going to be destroyed, that is a real prediction, but the fact that shepherds are going to be there, is just a continuation of it, it is no addition. But if you have something that is unusual, something that doesn't happen in most places, that happens there, that is good evidence. So it is good to examine...

C.7. (3/4)

...it is one of the strongest arguments you can possibly get. There are all kinds of people today who claim that they can predict the future but you will find that it is very rare that anybody really can do so. I used to be tremendously interested in the predictions of the future in the newspaper, because the way I get my rest is to go for a walk, and if the paper says it is good weather, I'd much rather go walking then than when it is going to rain. But I sort of lost confidence in them about 25 years ago, one time, when I had four days with no classes. Had three days of work I wanted to do, and I could do any three of the four I wanted. So I said I'll go walking on the day that there is no rain, so I looked in the paper and it said tomorrow rain. So I ~~stayed~~ home, and it was a beautiful day, and the next day the paper said Rain, and I stayed home, it was a beautiful day. And the ~~very~~^{third} day the paper said rain, I ~~stayed~~ home, and it was a beautiful day. And then the fourth day I looked at the paper, and it said, fair and cooler, and of course, I had no choice then, that was the only day left, if I was going at all I had to go that day anyway, so I went, and I hadn't been gone an hour before the rain began to pour down, buckets, and it rained all day long, and if they had only stuck to their first prediction they would have hit it right eventually, but ~~these~~ were wrong in all four cases, and it is very, very difficult in this area, where the currents come from so many different

directions it is especially difficult to predict the weather, but when God's word claims to make predictions and you find they're fulfilled exactly as predicted, it is one of the most marvelous evidences of His predictive power. Some years ago, there used to be a magazine called Liberty Magazine, and I don't know there was some article in it about December 1938 and there was some kind of an article in it that interested me, so I bought it and read the article, and put it in a drawer somewhere and forgot it, and it just happened that one year later I happened to come across it and picked it up and noticed in it there was an article about an astrologist that said that this man was an astrologer and he was able to tell what was going to happen, and they said that many prominent statesmen and many outstanding movie stars would go to this person and get him to predict what the future is and they'd make their investment, and their plans in view of what he predicted. And so Liberty Magazine asked him to tell them what's going to happen in the next year, and so they, on the basis of this, they were going to tell their readers what is going to happen. So they said what is going to happen 1939? Well, no world war is going to break out, Hitler is going to die a tragic death during this year. Roosevelt is going to announce that he will not run for a third term. I think they had eight predictions and one of them came out the way they said, and the other seven were just like those three which were completely... It is very, very difficult to predict the future, and to do it accurately and have it come out the way you say. So this is an argument which we find in the scripture, in many places, but nowhere so much stressed as in these chapters here, the argument of God's ability to predict the future. So I want you then to go through and see how it goes from one thought to another. You won't often find it quite as much involved as this one place I showed you. I looked at this place a month ago, in 45, here, these 8 verses, and at first sight, it just seemed like a hodge-podge, and then I looked at it and figured out the theme of each and as I showed you, when you have the theme in mind, ~~and~~ ^{then} there is a beautiful logical development, but if

you don't have the theme in mind, it just seems like a mass of words talking about a lot of unrelated things. You don't get the thought. The thought in this passage is often sort of hidden underneath that way, and various aspects of the thought are brought out and stressed, rather than the thought being expressed in simple clear language. Well, now that is E, The symphonic structure. And before we start going in then to the passage as a whole, I want to take up F, The Theme of Comfort.

Now I am not going to go fully at all into the theme of comfort at this time, but I want to give you a little idea of the various features that enter in to this theme of comfort, in order that you can recognize them more quickly as you see them, and see how they are interrelated together, ^{and} interrelated with the other themes. And then the big thing that is going to interest us most of us all in our section is the new thoughts that come in that are related to these themes but sort of distinct from them, that gradually develop up until they reach their mighty climax in Isaiah 53. But how that comes about, how it develops, that's the thing that we want to see as we go through, but in order to see it, we have to have these things that are obvious in the first part well in mind, to see how the others fit in amongst them. And so we look then at F, the theme of comfort, and I want to look at a few aspects of this theme.

In chapter 40.1, 2 we have noticed that we have a general expression of comfort, and you might say this general idea, be comforted, this is something which somebody might say, well, what's the point of it? James says, somebody is in trouble, don't say be clothed and fed, and just give them a statement, what good is that? Do something for them. And it is true that often people make statements and there is no meaning behind them, but on the other hand, it is also true, as Lowell says, in his Vision of Sir Launfal, that the gift without the giver is bare, and that an expression of real encouragement and sympathy without any help often means more to people than help given in a sullen grudging way. You need to give the people the assurance, and also the reality, but the assurance is a tremendous part of it. So we find that the chapter begins simply with a general

statement of comfort and we find this note emphasized a great deal. In Isa.43.1 he calls on the people, fear not, and he has that over and over. 44.8 fear ye not, neither be ye afraid. 51.7 fear ye not the reproach of men, neither be ye afraid of their revilement. 51.12 who art thou, that thou shouldest be afraid of a man that shall die. This idea of don't be afraid, fear not, is stressed over and over in these chapters. And there is the thought stressed, that you are to bring good tidings, we find that right near the beginning of chapter 40. One is coming to bring good tidings to Jerusalem. Incidentally, if you look at that verse ~~right near~~ ^{at} the beginning of chapter 40.9, O Zion, that bringest good tidings, get thee up into the high mountain; O Jerusalem, that bringest good tidings, lift up thy voice with strength; lift it up, be not afraid; say to the cities of Judah, Behold your God!

You can just as well translate that verse as some of the Bible margins do, O thou who bringest good tidings to Zion, get thee up into the high mountain. O thou that bringest good tidings to Jerusalem, lift up ~~your~~ voice with strength.

After all, the last part of it is to say to the cities of Judah. Why not name Jerusalem first when you're telling about good tidings for the city of Jerusalem. And verse 2 is speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem. So there is a good deal to be said for translating it, not Jerusalem that brings good tidings, but the one that brings good tidings to Jerusalem. But this idea of bringing good news, bringing good tidings. How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of them that bring the gospel of peace. Another verse from our section here. ~~In other words~~ These various general expressions of God's love and mercy you find repeatedly from the beginning to the end of our section, chapters 40-56. But along with these statements there is another thought that you'll often find, that is the thought that the comfort is not simply telling you to be comforted but be comforted because of your relationship to God. Be comforted because God is interested in you. Isaiah 41.8,9 But thou, Israel, art my servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham my friend. Thou art my servant; I have chosen thee, and not cast thee away.

Now this idea of the servant of God is one that comes in repeatedly and ~~/~~you'll want to notice specially. But you notice how here it is a part of this general idea of comfort very specifically. Why were they to be comforted, because they're ~~G~~od's servants, they're the ones He has chosen, they have a relationship to Him. It is not just anybody be comforted, you be comforted because you belong to the Lord. People in general don't have any right to say the Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want. What reason do they have to think the Lord is their shepherd, if they have reviled Him and turned against Him and broken His holy law, what right have they to call Him ~~their~~ shepherd? But if He is your shepherd, then you certainly should have peace in your heart, and know that there is no reason why you should lack, because you have reason to believe that He is your shepherd. And naturally enough it continues, the next verse continues the same thought, Fear thou not; neither be thou dismayed--you notice the thought of comfort, but why--for I am thy God. This stress on the relationship of the person to God is one of the greatest reasons for comfort, and you find this over and over in it. You find verses stressing God's care for His people. We notice 40.11, He shall feed his flock like a shepherd, shall gently lead those that are with young. 42.16, I will bring the blind by a way they know not, I will lead them in paths they have not known. God's wonderful care for His own. 44.2, 3, Thus saith the Lord that made thee and formed thee from the womb, which will help thee; Fear not, O Jacob, my servant; and thou, Jesurun, whom I have chosen. For I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, 46.3, 4, Hearken unto me, O house of Jacob, and all the remnant of the house of Israel, who are borne by me from the belly, which are carried from the womb; and even to your old age I am he, and even to hoar ~~hair~~ hairs will I carry you; I have made, and I will ~~carry~~ bear; even I will carry, and will deliver you. God's relation to His people, therefore, they can be comforted. But of course, the comfort is not simply in a general sense, even the knowledge of the relationship to God, there is stress laid on what God has done for the people in the past, and

then there is stress on what He is going to do for them in the future. How He brought them out of Egypt, how He delivered them, led them through the wilderness, now how He is going to bring them out of Babylon, and how He is going to lead them across the desert and take them safely back into Jerusalem. The many aspects of this theme of comfort. Well, we'll look into these various themes a bit more as we go on, but for next time, please, go as far as you can, noting the main themes and noting what material doesn't seem to fall under any one of these themes.

8. (3/4)

...we discussed the symphonic structure of the section, discussed what I meant by that, and I asked you to look at these four main themes and to see how much material you could put under each of the four and what there was that you didn't think fit into any of them. Let's look at it a bit now. By the way, as you look at any material in the Bible to arrange it like this, you find out what the main thoughts are that run through your passage, and then it's good to see all the places those main thoughts are referred to. These first two verses are definitely on comfort, the last phrase of the second verse is comfort still, like the rest. She has received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins. But he introduces the idea of sin. Well, now that's not one of our main themes, but that is an idea which is stressed a great deal in the early parts of Isaiah and not the same way in the second. The rebuke for sin which is so common in the first part is very little found in this section. So that this is good to note in passing, that there is a touch on the thought of sin here, but it is not one of our main themes at all. The first two verses, though, Mr. Miller says, go under the theme of comfort. Mr. Charvoz, what do we do with verse 3? No, oh, excuse me, you mean the third one. Yes, now I'm glad you mentioned that, because that is not the way that I meant it. You could take prophecy as anything that is predicted about the future, but the theme as Isaiah uses it is, the proof of God's power by the fact that He is able to predict the future./That could

You see the difference.

go under the idea of prophecy, but it's not strictly speaking of this third theme, so that I would prefer to put verse 3 under comfort, rather than under prophecy. It is not a proof that God is because He can predict the future, but it is an assurance that God is going to bring blessing. Prepare a highway in the desert, the wonderful blessing that God is going to bring. Yes? (3) Yes. What I am calling it, now of course, it is to decide what your themes are in any section, the thing is you run through the section and see what the themes are that are emphasized and ~~expressed~~ stressed and that recur, and that, of course, you are not in a position to do yet until you have worked through it, but I'm giving you my observation, and you can test as you go on, see whether it's

(3 1/2) but the theme of comfort, as we take it, is whatever encourages people, tells us that God is going to bless. That is comfort, but the theme of power is God is so powerful He can do what He promises, that is the theme of power. God's power, God's existence, the theme of prediction is not the fact that a prediction is made, but it is the claim that God is able to predict. It is the claim that you can prove that there is a God, and that He is powerful by the fact that He has predicted something and it has come to pass, or the fact that He is claiming that He can do this thing, in ways that others cannot. Now that will be much clearer when we get to passages in which that is strongly done. But I wouldn't put this under that category, I would put verses 3 and 4 under the comfort, the assurance that God is going to bless. Yes? (4 1/2) Verse 3 says that God is going to straighten things out, He is going to make the desert (which is the great obstacle and hindrance), He is going to make it possible of access, He is going to prepare the way for some wonderful thing that He is going to do. We don't want at this point to get into a discussion of what is exactly meant by 3, because that we're going to take up a little later. (5) student) Yes. Well, primarily power. Certainly you couldn't say 7 was comfort. Of course, in a way the whole book is comfort. It is his book of comfort, that is what we are dealing with. The book of encouragement,

he has given us. And so in a way you could put anything under that, but what is the primary emphasis? And 3 and 4, they~~re~~ are not made so extremely clear, and if you want, you could say they don't come under one of these four heads, but if you're going to put them under one, that would be the one you'd put it under. We will discuss 3 and 4 a good deal more later, in order to get their precise place. But now I just wanted to get the way that he jumps from one theme to the other, what about verse 5? Mr. Miller just said power primarily. Now that, in view of the third theme, the way it runs through later chapters, it's possible to put the last part of five under the third one, the mouth of the Lord has spoken it, that is the claim, that this will occur because God has made a prediction. Now that isn't necessarily that way, it's a possibility. You will have far clearer ones under this theme. I wouldn't even mention the theme here under that, if it wasn't that it was brought out so clearly later, then as you come back you find that this can fit under. So don't worry too much about that. ^{vv}What do you do, however, ^{ar}about verses 6 and 7? Mr. Euredjian, what do they go under? Verses 8, 9, and 10 bring in an idea of the servant of God, which is an idea that is developed from here on, to chapter 53, but I don't think ~~he~~^{you} would have suspected that, if you just started at the beginning and read this far. It's only as you go on later that you discover how vital that servant theme is and you come back and find it here. But could that material be put under any one of our four categories? Which one? How? Yes. We noticed last time that quite generally, under the theme of comfort, one of the great reasons for comfort, is a relationship with God, that God has an interest in you because you have a relationship to Him. Here we are told that Israel, that God has chosen Israel, Jacob whom I have chosen -- that Israel is descended from Abraham who is God's friend. And we're told that Israel is God's servant, there is nothing in the passage right here to express what the servant is to do, who the servant is, anything about the servant, what there is to stress is that Israel needn't fear because it has a relation to God, the

relation of servant. So the theme here, while the idea of the servant begins here, and as we go on, we see how tremendous a theme it becomes, and then you look back and see where it started, and learn all we can about it. But we do get the idea here, the way it is introduced is for comfort. Don't worry, don't be discouraged, after all, you are God's servant, He won't let you just disappear, He has a purpose in your existence. So we have the theme of comfort, starting in verse 8, and how far does that theme run then, Mr. Grauley? (8 1/2) At least through 10, yes. How about 11, is there any comfort in 11? Well of course if He gave lemonade, it might be better, but I think you'd settle for water pretty quickly. T

The idea of power is, of course, stressed a great deal in the book as a whole. There are verses in which that is the big thing, then there are other verses in which it is suggested, and other verses in which it just doesn't enter into at all. But when He promises to do tremendous things, there is the implication that He has the power to do these, but I wouldn't put it under the theme of power unless He explicitly says He has the power, or I am the only God, my arm alone can do this--something like that. You do have certain stresses on power through this section, but your comfort theme actually extends right through verse 19, doesn't it? Surely from verses 8 -19 is comfort. And 22 and 23 are certainly not comfort in the least, but through verse 19 is clearly comfort, and what is 20? 20 is surely power, the hand of the Lord hath done it, the Holy One of Israel has created it. The note of God's power, and you have not merely that this can be done because God has power, but there is a new relation to it, that this is done in order to demonstrate power, that they may see and consider and realize God's power, that is a different aspect of the same theme. Now how about verse 21? What is 21? What is 21 talking about, do you think, Mr. Carlson? (10 1/2) The points you've mentioned are pretty clear suggestions that it is idols he is talking about, but the absolute proof of it comes in verse 23 where he says that we may know that ye are gods.

If you're going to convince us you are gods why they must be either the true gods or false gods. Must be one or the other, so that that is the clear proof that this is idolatry he is talking about. And what verses are speaking about idolatry, starting where and ending where? (11) ...this on idolatry he stresses very clearly for the first time that we've come to it so far, this third theme, you notice there in verse 22, he gives it as the great proof. Let the idols show us what's going to happen, let them show us the former things, ~~to know~~ and know the latter end of them or declare things to come. Show the things that are to come hereafter, that we may know that ye are gods. You see, there is a verse and a half which uses that theme very explicitly, the power of God to predict the future, as a proof that He exists, and is powerful. It is given in a negative way here. He says to the idols, if you're really gods let's see you predict the future. You see, that's that theme, very, very clearly. Usually it's given in a positive way, the Lord can predict the future and thereby prove that He is a God, but here it is given negatively, the idols can't predict the future, thereby ~~th~~ it is shown that they aren't gods, so this comes under idolatry but it also is a clear instance of the theme of prediction. The power to predict the future, as a proof of existence and of power. Then, your verse 25 has perhaps a certain stress on power, just like verse 2, but actually it's bringing in a different idea, there is something a little different that is brought in, but as far as it touches any one of our themes, it is power, now what about verse 26? What theme or themes do you have in 26, Miss Pickett? That we may know? and beforetime, --who has told in advance these things that are going to happen? Who is it that is able to do this? Well, he says the idols aren't, ~~but~~ the implication is, He is. So again you have the two themes, you have idolatry, and you have prediction, as a proof of ~~the~~ existence ^{and} of power. You have those two themes: idolatry and prediction.

Mr. Oliver, you had a question? (13) There again, you might have wondered who this man is here, that they say these things about, what is he anyway? But as you go on,

later on, you get Cyrus clearly described, and you can see how similar these are to it. At this point, all you say, here is a great powerful man coming ~~to do what he~~ ^{that everybody is} (13 1/2) frightened of, and then you learn a few things about him, and as you learn more about him, you see how it fits with Cyrus. Then we have these two themes in verse 26, and verse 27, you have good tidings again, surely that would be comfort, wouldn't it. What about 28 and 29? Mr. Vannoy? (14)

~~C.8. (3/4)~~

~~.. (student) (1 1/2) I would say that they express exactly the truth He wanted us to know, but that he might use more accurate words in some cases. For instance, He says that Jesus saw two disciples walking toward Emmaus. Instead of using the word disciples He could have used the word two men, or He could have said two women. Or He could have said a man and a woman, but He used the word "disciples." We don't know whether they were men or women. It would be more accurate if it used the term that told us whether they were men or women. That would be more accurate, but for that matter, if you want to know be more accurate, how accurate are you going to be? You say that it is ten miles from here to City Hall. Well, that's not accurate. How far is it? Is it eight? Well you say it's eight, but it may be eight and a half. If you say 8 1/2 it's not accurate, it may be 8 1/4. You say 8 1/4 it's not accurate, it's a hundred yards longer than that.~~

C.9. (1/2)

...in 28, what' are you going to fit ^{it} in with? But surely 29 is clearly idols. And when you fit 28 and 29 together, surely the implication of 28 would be the same. We are previously told in chapter 40, what is man, like the grass, it blows away, but the Lord is mighty and lasts forever. That's the insignificance of man, stressing the glory of God, but here it is stressing the insignificance of the molten images, the ones that can't predict the future, these images that are just nothing, though people worship them.

Surely idolatry is the stress there.

Now let's look at the next chapter, in chapter 42, we don't start in 42, fairly with any one of these ~~same~~ ^{main} themes, do we? You might say that it is a reason for comfort, what he is telling, but it's a specific thing he is talking about, so I think we'd better leave it aside as a new idea that he develops, the idea of the servant, of course. But the main themes we have been speaking of, where do they come in chapter 42, Mr. Roczey, what is your first place you find one of these main themes clearly brought out? Of course, there is a question in 3, what it is talking about? That's the thing we're going to see later, the servant idea is developed there? But there might be some question about that, 3, but what do you think of 5? What is stressed in 5? Yes, 5 is surely very strongly power. He created the heavens, he spread forth the earth, gives breath to the people, surely this is declaring the wonderful power of God. Verse 5 is very clearly power. And then he is talking about the servant again in verse 6, and verse 7 is surely comfort, showing how the servant's work is showing comfort. What about verse 8? Mr. Vandy? (2 1/2) Yes, they're both in it clearly, aren't they? Verse 8 is surely entirely clear. Now what about verse 9, Mr. Golin, any ideas on that? That is prediction, isn't it? God says I have made predictions, they have come to pass, now I am going to give you a new one. Before they spring forth, I tell you. He proves His existence, by His power to predict the future. What about the next few verses? What would you put them under, Mr. Miller? (3 1/4) Oh, you mean you just left them as a separate thing, yes. Now would anybody here feel that they do go rather definitely under one of these heads? Or do you think we should leave them as a separate thing? I had thought of putting them under power, but maybe not, maybe they don't belong under power. It certainly is a hymn of praise, no question that's what it is. Is it a hymn of praise of God's power, or would it be simply a new idea inserted there? There is one thing about these, that we have noticed in chapter 42, an emphasis on the unlimited power of God, isn't it?

And His reaching out to other parts of the world. That is an idea that is sort of touched on a number of times in this chapter. Now how about verse 16, what would you do with 16, Mr. Oliver? (4 1/2. Is that comfort?) Yes, 16 is a marvelous promise of comfort, isn't it. And what's 17? Mr. Charvoz? Yes, 17 is surely the futility of idols. Now how about chapter 43? What do you find there. How many of you have gone as far as that? How many have not gone as far as 43? Most of you have done through 42. Well in 43 what do you do with the very beginning of 43? Mr. Quarterson? Yes, but though~~y~~ the theme is comfort, surely you have a little stress in addition on the power of God. The Lord that created thee, that formed thee. In the beginning of verse 1, the power of God is stressed, and again in verse 3, but they also run into comfort, and you have comfort, as you point out, right through the first six verses, that is (5 3/4) Then you have the power of God in verse 7, don't you. I have created him, I have formed~~ed~~ him. The power of God. And how about the latter part of verse 9, what would that be? What do you have the latter part of verse 9 as, Mr. Vannoy? Yes, who among them can declare this and show us former things, let them bring ~~th~~ forth their witnesses. Let them hear and say, it is truth. The power to predict the future stressed. Yes? (6 1/2) Yes, that the idols couldn't, yes, so that is also touched upon there.

Now you have the power of God very much stressed between the middle of verse 10 and the end of 17, don't you? Constant stress on that through those verses. Where do you have comfort come in strongly, after verse 7, where is your next clear case of comfort? Mr. Euredjian? Mr. Cohen? (verse 18) Yes, 18 surely does, from 18 on through 21 is very strongly comfort. Mr. Grauley? (7 1/2) Yes, verse 14, the first half of it, there is no question, when He says I am your redeemer, the Holy One of Israel. Surely that is a strong comfort idea, that God is their redeemer, God is the Holy One of ~~Israel~~ Israel. Now when you come to the last half of 14, that is a verse regarding which the Graduates are going to discuss what it is talking about. If it is a prediction of deliverance from Babylon, it certainly is comfort. And if it isn't, then it would not go

under comfort. That is one of the most difficult verses in the whole book, I think, that 14th verse. We will look further at it in that class, and then we'll bring the results back into this one. We look at it some today and some next week, and by next week I hope we'll be through with it. I tell you that I have been absolutely uncertain what that 14th verse meant, very much baffled by it, I have been pondering over it for weeks, and yesterday morning, just before I got up, I reached the solution of it. And I believe that I have the exact precise answer to it which answers all difficulties and all objections. But, and I hope to present that in this class next week, but not earlier because I want to deal with the different strands that lead up to it. Miss Pickett? Oh, well, I think a week or two of suspense won't hurt anybody. (stu.9) Yes, except that the difference is there, there is, that God gave a revelation to him, which someone else wouldn't have the means to know. In this case I have seen how certain evidences reach a certain conclusion, and I want the graduate students to look at these evidences, and examine them, and if they can convince me that my conclusion is unjustified then I won't even need to tell what it is, will I? But I don't think they can, because I believe it is pretty definite. But we'll discuss that, then we'll bring it back into this class later. Let's see, somebody said, that comfort started in verse 18 and went right on through 21. Would you put verse 22 under any one of these four categories? Mr. Golin? You wouldn't put 22 under any one of these four categories? Would anybody here put 22 under any of them, or 23 or 24? How about 25? Surely 25 is very strongly comfort. But not 26 or 27 or 28. How about the beginning of 44, what do you find there? Mr. Cohen? (The first five verses are comfort.) Surely, very clearly comfort. Is there any other theme brought in in those five verses? Comfort is very clear through the first five and a half verses, but what other theme, Mr. Golin? Oh, you mean there is a prediction, but I don't think that's our theme. Our theme is the fact God can make predictions that work out. I doubt if this would go under that, but it would ~~through~~^{go} under verse 7, that way. He says, who, as I, shall call

and declare it, and set it in order for me, since I appointed the ancient people? and the things that are coming, and shall come, let them shew unto them. There is God making the claim, no one else is a god, because no one else can predict the future. Let them shew them if they are gods, He says. I am able to predict the future and nobody else can. So that's your theme of prediction of the future, in verse 7, I don't think you find that particular theme earlier in the passage, but you find the power^{of God} very strongly in verse 2. Thus saith the Lord that made thee and formed thee from the womb. That is stressing that God is the Creator. Stressing God's power, and you have it again stressed very strongly in verse 6. Thus saith the Lord, I am the first and I am the last, and beside me there is no God. You don't find many verses like that elsewhere in scripture. But in this section you find a good many like that, stressing the fact that God is, and He alone is, that He is the supreme God. Then in 44, yes? (12 3/4) ...very interesting thing, the chapters mostly begin with the theme of comfort, what does that prove? That proves that when the archbishop came to a new section of comfort he thought it was a good place to begin a chapter. So it tells us something about the mind of the archbishop, it doesn't tell us anything necessarily about the mind of God because there were no chapter divisions in the original. But if you see the ~~alternation~~ alternation of sections, that may tell us something about the mind of God. For instance, if you find that there is a section of comfort and then a section of something else and it goes like that, straight through, and the archbishop followed that alternation, that can tell you something about the structure of the book. But I don't think you will find that always comfort begins the chapters, though comfort is the most common thing in this whole section, and very frequently chapters start with it.

Now what is your next theme, then, in chapter 44? Those of you who have gone that far. Mr. Rocsey, you've gone past that, haven't you? verse 8 is comfort, yes. And also power, isn't it. Is there a God beside me? yea, there is no God; I know not any. Well then what's your next theme after that?

~~Well, then what's your next theme, after that?~~

...How far does the theme of idols go? Yes, that's our longest section on idolatry, isn't it? 9-20. 11 verses continuously, all of it on the theme of idolatry. A very, very vital theme in that day, one which now seems pretty much out of date because idolatry is something that most of us have no direct and immediate contact with. But it was then a very living theme, a ~~very~~ living problem. You have these 11 verses dealing with it. And when these 11 verses finish, and verse 20, what is the next theme that He deals with, right after that, or what themes do you find, right after that, Mr. Cohen? (1 1/2) Do you find that in verse 21. Well, you can say that 25 is comfort in a sense but surely it is not the major theme in 25. But comfort is quite common through the rest of the chapter, and in verse 21 there is a good bit of comfort, but is there something else than comfort in 21 of our main themes. How about creation, that's the power of God. I have formed thee, there is the power of God. Then, how about verse 24, he that formed thee, I am the Lord that makes all things, that stretcheth forth the heavens alone, that spreads abroad the earth by myself, the creative power of God is stressed in these chapters, more than almost anywhere else in the whole Bible. The creative power of God, and what is your theme in verse 25 and the beginning of 26? Well, it might be implied, but not directly. What is the direct theme there? Yes, prediction, the omniscience of God. First you have the contrary element, God frustrates the tokens of the ~~liars~~ and makes diviners mad. These people who claim to predict the future. He doesn't have it worked out the way they think it will. God makes their knowledge foolish; but confirms the word of his servant, and performs the counsel of his messengers. In other words, God has His messengers make a prediction and then God brings to pass what they have predicted. It's the power of God proved by the predictive power of God. It is very clear emphasis on this theme of prediction. And then of course you have comfort in verse 26, don't you, that says to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be inhabited, to the cities of Judah, ye shall be built, surely comfort is strongly stressed through the rest of this chapter, although the power of God

is also stressed, which it would take to do these tremendous things. Well, maybe that's far enough on that today, I wanted to bring out the way he jumps from one to the other, the way that ^{if} you have these four themes well in mind you can put, in these next ten chapters you can put the bulk of your material into one of the four themes, and if you take your material on comfort and read it right straight through, you get a tremendous picture of how God is giving beautiful words of comfort, and how He is comforting His people on the ground that they are His people, they are His servants, they are His chosen, they are related to Abraham His friend, He is their Redeemer, their Saviour, they have a relationship to Him. And then He is comforting them, specifically, He is comforting them by reminding them of what He has done in the past, how He led them through the desert, how he brought them out of Egypt, all the blessings He had given in the past, and He is comforting them by specific assurances that He is going to overthrow the enemy, He is going to deliver them from captivity, He is going to enable them to make the long difficult trip across the desert, in safety, and bring them back to their own land, there are all these aspects to the theme of comfort, and if you just take the stuff on comfort and put it right together you could get something enough to make several chapters continuously stressing this great theme of comfort, and that of course makes this passage one of the great sections of the Bible, because any Christian worker, one of his great tasks is comforting people, who are in discouragement, and verse after verse here is exactly suited for that, and the tremendous stress on how we can be comforted and have peace of mind, if we belong to the Lord, that He is our Saviour, and ~~is~~ our Redeemer, that we are His servant, His chosen ones, how we can--no matter what happens, He'll comfort us. It is a great theme, one great theme of the book, and goes on much more beyond what we have done, of course. But all these that we've looked at, fall under that general category, just that. And I called the theme of comfort F, didn't I?

Then after capital F, the next theme would be the one we have spoken of as our second theme, which would be G, The Theme of God's power. And this theme of God's power, I have included under it, that is, I've tried to make up the theme, not from what I think would make a reasonable theme, or anything like that, but from what I find in the chapters, in the section, that naturally goes together. And we've noticed that the theme of power is brought in for a purpose here, so you find the power of God, the glory of God, the unique^{existence}/of God, you find that brought in, in these chapters, definitely for the purpose of comfort. It is to assure God's people that they can be comforted, they can be at peace, that they can be encouraged, because of who He is. To assure them that the wonderful promises He gives will be fulfilled, because He is the one who can fulfill them. To assure them that though the gods of Babylon seem to be triumphant, and as they see the great idols of Babylon carried in procession through the streets and it would be all your life was worth to say a word publicly against them, people bowing down before them, and the mighty armies that carry these idols, conquering practically every country in the then-known world, you see all these evidences of the tremendous power of the idols, ~~our~~ ^{our} second theme here is to assure you that God's power is even greater. The Babylonians say their idols conquered Palestine, conquered Syria, conquered these countries, yes, but God's power created the universe, God's power did something far greater than any conquest (7 3/4)

God's power has made humanity, with all the intricate workings of the human body, the tremendous complexity of these--that you could take all the raw chemicals in the human body for probably less than \$2, and ~~over~~ over 90% of the body is just water, and yet to put these together and make such an intricate, complex organism as we have here, only God can do it, God claims He has done it, He has created the Universe, and everything that is in it, so this theme is stressed over and over in these chapters, for a purpose, but the theme itself can have that result to us today, it is a very vital thing

for us, and so this makes this one of the grandest sections of the whole Bible for us, its constant stress on the tremendous power and greatness of God. So under this theme of power, we have noticed some of its principal aspects already, as we've spoken about it. We've noticed first the stress on God's existence and that is repeated over and over here, and we've noticed the stress on the fact that He is the only God. Monotheism, which is clearly contained in this section. Critics will argue whether certain sections of the Bible are monotheism, or merely henotheism. When I was at the university of Berlin, I used to preach in the American Church in Berlin, and there was a graduate of McCormack Seminary who preached too, I preached two Sundays, and ~~he~~ he preached two Sundays. And he preached one time on how, when Jacob left his home territory, where he was in the territory of Yahweh, he went down across the Jordan, over, and came into the territory of Chemosh, he was in the territory of a different ~~of~~ god. His god was the tribal god of these people, and they had the different gods in all these different sections. That's what he claimed the people all believed in those days. Well, you can argue on Genesis. I believe you can prove that Genesis doesn't teach any tribal god, that it teaches one great God who controls the whole universe, it is not obvious on the face of it, but when you look at this section of Isaiah, it's perfectly obvious on the face of it, that it is monotheism, the clearest sort of monotheism, the tremendous stress on God as being the ~~only~~ God, which you find in these ~~chapters~~ chapters. And then of course the stress on the creative power of God, which is stressed over and over here. His power creating the universe, you have nowhere else in the scripture so much stress on it as here. Constant stress. Genesis tells the story, but this goes back to it, over and over and over, to show God's tremendous power over all ~~the~~ the forces of the universe. And then His power over the making of the nations, and the making of the individual, that is stressed over and over. He is the God that formed Israel, He is the God that has brought the nations into being, He is the God who has formed the individual and made the marvel of the human body, that is a marvelous evidence of God's power. And then ~~He~~ He tells about

Cyrus and he says I am the one who has brought Cyrus, who has brought the nations to his feet, the one who has established this, given Cyrus this tremendous power, God says it is His power that has done it. He has raised (11 1/4) up, He has the power to keep . So this theme of power is stressed over and over in these chapters, and the interlacing of these themes is very interesting, like a great piece of music which stresses this one and then stresses this one, and stresses that one, back to this, just driving them home to your consciousness, and giving you, not merely a knowledge of their truth, but building up an emotional realization of it, making it really a part of your inmost being. Now we continue there tomorrow. You might look over again a little bit, between now and then, what you've done, what we discussed today of the themes, and then look on ahead a ways further, whatever you get time for, in the little time there is between now and tomorrow.

C.11 (3/4)

...and of course we had looked together first at what you had done in preparing these themes in the way that you would, ~~and~~ ^{from} one of these themes to the other, and how comparatively little material there is in the first ten chapters, that doesn't go under one of these themes of the other. Most of it goes right under them and then gradually get other ideas developed in relation to them, gradually coming to the fore, and of course starting in with this situation of the exile, and the need of deliverance, you go forward until you eventually get (1 1/4) and the progress of thought there is a very interesting phenomena ^{on}, when we want to get to understand and to make all these individual verses mean much more to us, but we looked at the theme of power and we noted a particular aspects ^{the theme of} of power which are stressed and dwelt upon in these chapters, not in a logical arrangement, later discuss this and then that and the other, but with a driving home to you of certain things about God's existence, about His sovereignty, about His power, about His marvelous acts He has done in the past, and the ability He has to do tremendous things in the future. It's one of

greatest passages in all the Bible for the stressing of this great aspect of our understanding of the knowledge of God. We might go on to H, The Theme of Predictive Prophecy. Let's look at the theme of Predictive Knowledge. Thought maybe I'd call it Predictive Knowledge rather than Predictive Prophecy, because it isn't a question of having prophecy, it's a question of claiming the ability to make prophecy. It's a question of using prophecy, fulfilled prophecy, as proof of this ability, or of giving new prophecy not simply in order to tell people what is going to happen, but in order to prove by the fact that it does happen, the fact that there is a supernatural knowledge involved in the telling of it, given as evidence of God's power, evidence of God's wisdom and of His divine knowledge. I have a friend who is working in a scientific laboratory with some men who are engaged in theories of the universe and the new discoveries out in space, and so on, and he tells me that he tries to witness to them of Christ, and he finds that the thing that attracts their attention more than anything else and arouses their interest is when he gives them evidences of prophecy in the Bible that have been fulfilled. He says that seems to arouse their interest very much, when you can give real proof of things that have been predicted in the Bible and then fulfilled in a way that nobody would have guessed then. That seems to impress them more than other sort of argument which he can give. Actually, of course, God's great power in creation is the most tremendous sign of His existence, and of His importance in our lives, but when men work in science, learning under ~~ungodly~~ ungodly professors, who assume that everything is just a natural process, you get used to that way of thinking, and then you fail to ~~see~~ see the evidential strength of the evidences of creation and of God's control of the universe, you're blind to that, that is, those men ^{often} are. It is something that one should be very much aware of. I think the average person will be, the average person, seeing the tremendous natural phenomena is apt to feel his own littleness in the greatness, in the face of it. But when one has been

trained to think of these natural phenomena as just something that has come about by certain forces, not to think back to what makes the forces, it blunts that argument. He said this argument from predictive prophecy, he found very effective in dealing with them. Well now let's look at the things which we would put under this head, I mentioned to you that in chapter 40, since we have this suggestion later, we can find that perhaps suggested right in the ^{first}verse, Comfort ye, comfort ye, my people, saith your God--might be a very slight suggestion, the fact that this is what God says, but in the end of verse 5 we have stressed a little more. Why do we know this is going to happen, for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it. Then again at the end of verse 8, the word of our God shall stand for ever. Now over in 41 we have it quite definitely, verse 4--Who has wrought and done it, calling the generations from the beginning? I the Lord, the first, and with the last; I am he. You get over to verse 22 of chapter 41 and there you have the argument from predictive prophecy given in a negative way, but very strongly. Let them bring them forth, and shew us what shall happen; let them shew the former things, what they be that we may consider them, and know the latter end of them; or declare us things for to come. Shew the things that are to come hereafter, that we may know ~~w~~ that ye are gods: --very strong argument. If these idols can't predict the future they're not gods, it's a negative side of the argument. God is ~~God~~, is proven by the fact that He can predict the future, and the positive side of it is brought out in verse 26. Who has declared from the beginning that we may know [^] and beforetime, that we may say, He is righteous? Who has declared these things from the beginning? God is the one who has is implied there. Then in 42 the stress is on prophecy in verse 9. Behold, the former things are come to pass, and new things do I declare: before they spring forth I tell you of them. Why does He tell you of them? Of course, God may predict things in order that we can be ready for them, in order that we can regulate our lives in view of them, there

are various reasons for predicting, but here it is stressed, the reason that He is giving them as proof that He is and that He is the powerful One who strengthens them.

Then over in 43.9 we read: Let all the nations be gathered together, and let the people be assembled: who among them can declare this, and ~~it~~ shew us former things? Let them bring forth their witnesses, that they ~~may~~ be justified; or let them hear, and say, It is truth. This is the negative aspect of it, He called on them to give proof that the idols have been able to show the future. Now probably this theme is in verse 12. I have declared, and have saved, and have shewed--I am not sure that is (6 3/4) but there is a possibility. Certainly in ~~verse~~ 44.7, and who as I shall call and shall declare it, and set it in order for me, since I appointed the ancient people? and the things that are coming, and shall come, let them shew unto them. Who can declare it in advance? Who can explain what is going to happen the way the Lord can? We find this theme stressed very strongly in the end of chapter 44, where God says, thus saith the Lord, v. 24, and then He speaks of His creative power in 24, but then in 25 He says, the Lord who frustrates the tokens of the liars, and makes diviners mad; and turns wise men backward and makes their knowledge foolish. These men make predictions and God proves there is nothing to them, and that happens of course over and over and over. Things happen differently from what any man ~~who~~ would ever expect. I remember very vividly during the last two or three years of World War II. I don't think there was a month in that time that I didn't hear someone in a talk tell us how the Chinese people are getting such a great love for the Americans, for all they're doing for us in this war, once this war is over, nations will have an open door all through the Orient such as it has never had in history, and as I heard all these people so absolutely ~~confident~~ confident, I wondered just how they were quite so confident. Well, they were confident because of their own reasoning, their own observation, led them to this conclusion, they had no scripture

assurance for it, and actually, if you'd extend your own reasoning just a little bit further you would see that communism was making strides, not only in Russia, ~~but~~ and even in our own government, but in other parts of the world, in such a way, that it made it extremely uncertain whether there would be any possibility of missionary work in China. And the war hadn't been over many years before missionary work in China was cut down way below what it had been for over a hundred years. And today there is less missionary work in the mainland of China, than there has ever been since China was first opened to modern--because this force which people should be able to see but they weren't. But God knew, God predicted it. People make the craziest guesses about what the future is going to be, they only look at part of the evidence, they don't see it all. That's true, over and over. We cannot predict the future very successfully, on anything, but God is the only one who can, and so that's one of the big arguments here, He says He frustrates the tokens off the liars, but in verse 26 He gives it positively: That confirms the word of his servant, and performs the counsel of his messengers; --God that carries out that which He has predicted. And then in 45 we find this argument again brought out in a way that wouldn't be obvious unless you were familiar with the argument. He is speaking to Cyrus, and He says in verse 3, I will give thee ~~the~~ treasures of darkness and hidden riches of secret places, that thou mayest know that I, the Lord, which call thee by thy name, am the God of Israel. For Jacob my servants ~~ts~~ sake and Israel mine elect, I have even called ~~th~~ thee by thy name, I have surnamed thee, though thou hast not known me. The argument of the critics is that when you look at Isaiah 40-56 the whole background is that of deliverance from exile. Therefore, it is absolutely inconceivable, they say, that Isaiah could have written it 150 years ahead of time. An unknown prophet toward the end of the exile is writing, because the whole background of it is a discussion of what people then would be interested in, in getting deliverance from exile, and there

is no threat of going into exile, but actually when you look into it , you find such statements as this, the Lord has called Cyrus by his name, his surnamed him, though he has not known Him. What does that mean? Doesn't that mean that God is giving here as a proof to the Israelites of His power, the fact thae He 150 years before called Cyrus by name? It isn't that Cyrus is a great world figure and an unknown prophet rises up and says God is going to use this man to deliver you. He goes beyond that, says that God has 150 years~~e~~ earlier given his name and predicted what he is going to do. Now you see it happening.

If I were to write a book today and it claimed to be a divine book and I were to describe what's going to be the future of Khrushchev and these others today, I would write that book, it might be that I could~~x~~ persuade people that this is a divine book which I am writing now, but If I were to say in the book, here is proof of God, that He has predicted way ahead of time Khrushchev by name and told what he is going to do, people would say why the book has just come into existence now, what a silly fool. It is very evident that the claims of this book, that, while it addresses itself to the situation in exile, it was written long before. And, of course, the critics feel that i s utterly unreasonable, but it isn't when you realize that Isaiah had a large group of godly people for whom he could write, and who needed encouragement because to them the exile was an absolute certainty, they knew that his predictions were going to be fulfilled, they tend~~ed~~ to give way to discouragement, as they thought well this is just the end of it. ~~X~~ ~~I~~ ~~s~~ ~~a~~ ~~h~~ ~~a~~ ~~h~~ assures them, he says, no, the exile, think of it as here, but it's not going to last forever. He gives the word of encouragement, after. But there are these implications like this, that he is basing a great deal on the argument, that He has predicted this way in advance, so th~~a~~ t when the time comes you can see that God did see. I don't know as the last half of verse 11 would go under this category. I just have a red question mark opposite this, but this argument is brought

out very clearly in verse 19 of chapter 45. I have not spoken in secret, in a dark place of the earth, I said not to the seed of Jacob, seek ye me in vain; I the Lord speak righteousness, I declare things that are right. This is a claim that ~~He had~~ has predicted~~d~~, that He has not off in a dark place where nobody would know about it, but that He has clearly given the evidences. You find this more clearly perhaps in verse 21. Tell ye, and bring them near; yea, let them take counsel together: who has declared this from ancient time? who has told it from that time? have not I the Lord? He said I predicted this when Babylon was just a weak and insignificant nation, when ~~B~~abylon was subject to Assyria, trying to get independence and barely succeeding a few times, but always being reconquered, then, I predicted that ~~H~~abylon would become so powerful it would conquer Judah, take the people off into captivity, and it happened, I predicted it, and I am predicting further that I am going to deliver you from that. It is a great argument, based upon God's power of predictive prophecy. So he ~~says~~ says in verse 23, I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, ~~Th~~---now there is a prediction following, and here it is stressed the certainty of prediction. A little different approach to it, it is the evidence that He is ~~g~~ God, and here that again is used as the certainty that a particular prediction will be fulfilled. Now we find it again in chapter 46...

C.12 (1/2)

...we find it in verse 10 very clearly. He says, I am God, and there is none like me, declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying, --then ~~He~~ goes on and tells about the prediction to be ~~ma~~ de about Cyrus, and then He says, yes, I have spoken, I will also bring it to pass; I have purposed it, I will also do it. God is merely claiming to be the great creator of the universe, the great powerful one, but He claims to give proof of this by the fact that He can tell what is going to happen, and then you see it happen the way He predicted

it. I don't think in chapter 47 there is anything that would ^{properly} go under this head, there are predictions there but not used as an argument like ~~this~~. But we do find this argument expressed in very interesting ways in chapter 48.3. I have declared the former things from the beginning and they went forth out of my mouth, . . . **I** did them suddenly, and they came to pass. Because I knew that thou art obstinate, and thy neck is ~~n~~ an iron sinew, and thy brow brass; I have even from the beginning declared it to thee; before it came to pass I shewed it thee; lest thou shouldest say, Mine idol hath done them, and my graven image-- now that is bringing out the predictive argument in the strongest way, isn't it? He says, not only my doing these things, but I am declaring them in advance so that when they come to pass you can't say well now my idol did this. The idol never said he would. God said that He would do it, predicted what was going to take place. I remember when we had the great depression in 1929-33. --
 And then after Roosevelt became President and began all the pump priming and public works administration, and all these things began to improve, and they were improving and getting better and better, then about 1936 or 37 they began to get worse again, and we had quite a recession, and then after the recession spent itself to the full, and then things got better, then, as they improved, Roosevelt looks back and he says we planned it that way. Well, if he had said ahead of time he was planning it that way, we'd be a lot surer he really had, that's the way that it was, ^{up and then} down and then up. Well, did he make it go or not. Of course, he said he was going to make everything better, and of course when things got better he could claim he had, but anybody can say he made things get better. Maybe he did and maybe he didn't. But he never he was going to have a recession, in order to solidify things before they got better. But after it came back he said he had planned it that way. Well, God announces it in advance, not afterward. So this is a big argument used here in chapter 48, 5, 6, and then we have it again ~~st~~ressed in verse 14. All ye, assemble yourselves, and

hear; which among them hath declared these things? God says, who else is there who has predicted what's happening now? He says, I am the one who is predicting. And in verse 16 you have, come ye near unto me, hear ye this; I have not spoken in secret from the beginning;--surely there He is making a claim on the basis of predictive prophecy, as a proof of His ability of His power. Let's see, that's chapter 48 and I don't think we find that argument much in --after that. By 48 or 49 you're getting on into some of the big points that have been developed in the earlier chapters, and now that He goes into and leads more directly on to challenge. But this argument has occurred in these chapters as you notice, a goodly number of times. Yes, Mr. Golin?

(4 1/2) Yes, we will get to that, that is a very interesting section, extremely so. I don't see any reasonable way to interpret it except as a--not an absolutely clear revelation of the trinity as when you say it in so many words, but rather close to it, a passage which is very, very hard to interpret in any other way. But in order to get a proper understanding, you have to lead up to it with the servant passages that come before it. We will go into that but it will be at least a month before we get to it. I'm glad that you have whet our appetite for it. It is a tremendously fascinating passage. But there is certain territory which I want to go over first. Then, that was H. And I will skip I under I, it looks like two ones so we will make the next J.

J, The Theme of Idolatry. And this was a very vital theme in the time when it was written, and the teaching of it is certainly vital today, with a little bit, just a little bit of change in application, it can apply to our day with its deification of mankind, and it's man's mind, and man's ability that we are making a god, and that is the great tone of our present age. And that is different from making ~~of~~ an idol out of wood and clay, but to me the same principles apply. So these passages on idolatry are not something that is just dead as far as we are concerned, they have a living message for us today, but it has to be applied, it doesn't directly relate to our day quite as closely as some of these others do.

There aren't so many passages on idolatry as there are on the other themes we looked up, but there are some pretty strong ones. Remember, that in chapter 40 we had the theme of idolatry starting with verse 18, to whom will ye liken God? And then He speaks of how they make the idols, it is the work of man's hands, the idols that they make. There was a young woman who did some secretarial work in the seminary, part-time day student, when we were in Wilmington, and then she found it necessary to earn a larger sum than she could get as part time work, as we didn't have need for a full time secretary then, so ~~she~~ ^{she} went and got a position with ~~pharmacy~~ ^{pharmacy} (7 1/4) ~~Dupont~~ and being quite a good stenographer she became secretary to one of the chemists there. And this man begin giving her rather technical material about chemistry and she was a woman of quite a wide-awake mind, wanted to know a little bit more about what she was doing, not just typing words, so she asked him if he could recommend her a book that would give her a little understanding, and he recommended a book which she drew out from the Dupont Company library and ^{said it} ~~she~~ ^{was} a most fascinating book, it took up the different elements, and it would tell about each element, what it's characteristics were, something about it, and who had discovered it, and then she said the thing that amazed her was that practically every chapter ended with marveling at the marvelous wonderful mind of this man who was ~~able~~ ^{able} to figure this out and to understand ~~it~~ ^{the} properties of this element. She said they never thought of marveling at the God that made the elements and gave it these properties, but it was always the wonderful mind of man that could find it and discovered it. And after all, it is far greater to make it than to discover, but the mind of the ~~writer~~ ^{writer} of the book was just blind to this (8 1/2)

They are deifying humanity to a very ~~great~~ ^{great} extent. This is characteristic of our present age, it was more of a characteristic 20 years ago than it is today, there was more confidence in the great future of ~~man~~ ^{man}kind, today there is more ~~fe~~ ^{fe}ar in the world, but we have of course, we have an atmosphere of fear and semi-despair in our western

world to quite an extent, while we have so-called east which isn't east at all but a branch of the west, the communist~~s~~, is making a god out of the world's process, and he is absolutely atheistic, but he is making a god out of the state and the world process to which all people are utterly subservient. It is an idol actually, but it is an idol that man has made, an idol just like these idols, the work of man's hands.

Well, to begin with this, verse 18, To whom will ye liken God? and then he tells how the workman makes a graven image and the one who is too impoverished to buy one chooses a tree, and makes a rather primitive sort of thing, but nevertheless an idol like that, and then in verse 24, the Lord declares the futility and the coming downfall of the idols. So there are not many verses there but it is brought out very strongly, and then chapter 41, it is brought out again very strongly. In chapter 41 we have Cyrus coming (10) and then after Cyrus is seen coming, verse 5, the idols saw it and feared; so what did they do? They helped every one his neighbor and every one said to his brother, be of good courage. What a wonderful verse for a quotation, be of good courage, but I'm glad to say that this is not one of the verses that is quoted, by people. We have so much better ones, like in Joshua, that this particular one, in context, of course--they're saying be of good courage, let's make some idols. And so the carpenter encourages the goldsmith, and he that smooths with the hammer him that smote the anvil, saying it is ready for soldering, and he fastens it with nails, that it should not be moved. Again a stress on the fact that the idol is the work of man's hands. The idol is simply made by man, so why should the man worship it? And the thing is true of course of our philosophic concepts and of our theories, they're man-made, they're not a revelation of the God who can speak, but they're man's imagining as to what he would like to have there be, or what he can imagine. Then in verse 21 we have the challenge to the idol, 21-24--the challenge to the idol to do anything, and particularly to predict the future, and in verses 26 and 28 the idols

are declared to be nothing because they can't predict the future, and in 29 he says behold they are all vanity their works are nothing, their molten images are wind and confusion. In 42 the Lord declares in verse 8 that He will not give his ~~glory to graven~~ ^{praise to graven} images. He won't give His glory to another or His praise to graven images. Quite a different note in these verses from what you find in Toynbee, the famous historian of the present day, who speaks in a very religious tone sometimes, sometimes references to God and to Biblical statements in a way that would make somebody imagine he was a Christian. He is an intensely religious man but to him God can be described in any one of many terms. Life Magazine, I think it was, quoted from him a prayer which he prayed to God who is also Marduk of the ancient Babylonians and is Vana of the Hindus, and so on. He prayed to the Virgin Mary who is also Ishtar of the ancient Assyrians, and Venus of the ancient gods. And he named a whole string of gods from all the different religions, strung them all together and he prayed to all of them. It is just the same as the old Roman eclecticism, but it is the opposite pole from the Biblical attitude which says God exists and these idols are absolutely nothing. They shall be turned back, they shall be greatly ashamed that trust in graven images, that say to molten images, ye are our gods. And then we have the longest passage on idols is in chapter 44, it runs from 9 clear through to 20, and here it describes in great detail the making of the idol, the piece of wood to make an idol, another piece of the same tree used to make a fire to warm themselves with, showing the absurdity of it all. And when you get to chapter 45 you have reference to the makers of idols in verse 16, how they're going to be given into confusion and in verse 20, assemble yourselves and come; draw near together, ye that are escaped of the nations; they have no knowledge that set up the wood of their graven image, and pray unto a god that cannot save. Chapter 46, the idolatry becomes specific, not general, but speaking of particular gods. Bel stoops down, Nebo bows, Baal and Marduk were the two leading gods of

Babylon. Baal and Nebo stoop down, their idols were upon the beasts, and on the cattle, their carriages were heavy loaden, they are a burden to the weary beast. They stoop, they bow down together; they could not deliver the burden, but themselves are gone into captivity. This is a strong prediction of the destruction of Babylon, ~~but~~ the overthrow of Babylon, that is, but it also is of course the declaration of the futility of their idols...

C.13 (1/2)

...so chapter 46 is dealing with the downfall of Babylon and stressing the idols particularly, verse 5 is very reminiscent of verses we have had before, To whom will ye liken me, and make me equal, and compare me, that we may be like? They lavish gold out of the bag, and weigh silver in the balance, and hire a goldsmith; and he makes it a god: they fall down, they worship, they bear him on the shoulder, they carry him, set him in his place, and he stands, from his place shall he not remove, yes, one shall cry unto him, yet can he not answer, nor save him out of his trouble. And of course these statements are quite appropriate today to the idolatry of the Roman Catholic, they claim of course they don't worship idols but certainly a great many of the ignorant among the Roman Catholics, the statue is surely an idol. I don't think there is any question of that, and when you read of Bishop Sheehan, the great orator, great effective radio and television preacher, that when he gave his very effective television talks, that as he stood facing the camera giving these talks, he had up there in front of him where he could see it, a statue of the Virgin Mary, to which he looked for help in his talks. You can see, that while of course he didn't think of the statue as being the Virgin Mary, he was making a god of one who was only a human being. Roman Catholicism today is heavily (2) idolatry. The highly ~~the~~ trained would interpret it in such a way as to be very different from all that, but many of the practices are so much like it that with many of the people it is very close to idolatry,

I'm sure with some it definitely is. So that this is not simply a thing of ancient times, this relates to a problem of our present day. Yes, Mr. Oliver? (2 1/2) Well, of course, there is this problem. With all these things, it is not the thing but the use you make of it. And God has the people make a brazen serpent and they put it up, and whoever would look to the brazen serpent would be healed and that was a wonderful thing to remind them of God's provision, to bring home to them what He would do and how He would save them. So it's a marvelous thing. But then the people got to worshipping that brazen serpent, and Hezekiah took and destroyed it because it had become an idol. ^A~~The~~ thing which was a good thing and a helpful thing can become an idol. It depends on how it's used. And some protestants, their reaction against idolatry, and particularly against the idolatry of the Roman Catholic Church, have gone to the extreme of saying we must not have anything that could possibly be made a symbol of worship, we mustn't have anything, and so want a place with nothing whatever that has any appeal to the senses at all. Well, I think the human mind can find something to worship, you can make the church an object of worship, as they do in some of our denominations today. Actually pictures, representations, statues, forms and ceremonies can be marvelously used to impress spiritual truths on our minds, as God used the tabernacle, but then we can turn and can make it into an idol, and I don't think that we can draw a sharp line, there is an area, there is that which is definitely idolatry, there is that which is so far from it there is no question of it, but there is that which can be helpful, like the brazen serpent, but which can be made into an idol, if misinterpreted, and now in the episcopal church, the service of the episcopal church has beautiful prayers written by Cranmer, wonderful words, so much of scripture, so much marvelous scriptural truth, can become a marvelous instrument of worship, and many a person, who as a young person Sunday after Sunday, has later in his life, the Lord has driven those words into his mind to the place where it has been the instrument to

lead them to Christ, but there are many episcopal churches where they go through all these forms and it becomes simply a sort of an idol, something that appeals to the senses but that doesn't have any spiritual meaning to them, and particularly so in churches where you have those wonderful services, and then the minister will give a rank modernistic sermon, that will completely contradict everything that's been said in the prayers and the hymns and in the service. So that I think we have to, in a way, (6) between developing things that can appeal to people, and can strengthen their worship instinctively, make it easy for them to get into the (6) , into an attitude of meditation, and then

where people misuse it, get rid of that particular

Now I'm not meaning to speak specifically about this thing of the United ~~Nations~~ Nations, because I don't know anything about it, but to have a room that would be quiet, soft lights, that would induce to meditation, a person could come in there and could meditate about the Lord, meditate on the Saviour, and so on, it would be a great help to get away from the noise and bustle and confusion and debate, into a place like that could be very helpful. Then again, a person could take things about the fittings of it, and could make them objects of worship, (7)

So it's pretty hard, I think to draw, after all, it isn't the specific thing but it is the attitude ^{toward} and the use of it, that makes it right or wrong, and certain things have tendency in this direction, and when we find it's going in that direction, we'd better get away from it, at least for the time being. Yes? (7 1/4) The probabilities are that there was the same difference of attitude that there is in the Roman Catholic Church today, I would think it likely that there were great number of people who thought of that image as the god. Like there were certainly many people who thought of the image as the representation of a deity that displayed itself in certain ways, (8)

rather than the statue itself. The statue was a representation,

to many, but to others (8) it probably

came to mean the god itself. That is, Isaiah couldn't have spoken the way he did here unless there were many who thought this way, and they go out and they carry their ~~God~~ god, well, are they carrying a god, or are they carrying a representation, to remind you of the ~~the~~ god? Probably it varies. But certainly among the ~~the~~ Assyrians they thought of Ishtar, of Marduk and these gods as forces, as personalities that could move about (8 1/2)

But then they got to worshipping, there was the Ishtar of one city, and the Ishtar of another city, and Ishtar of a different city, almost as if they became separate individuals, just as you have the Virgin Mary of Guadalupe, the Virgin Mary of Lourdes, the Virgin Mary of all these other places, they almost become separate deities, in their own church, among some of the people at least. Well, I think perhaps we have covered this theme of idolatry for the present.

Now just for a moment to glance, I think I will call that special heading K. Having looked at these various main themes, now just to remind ourselves again of that which is the great stress in these chapters. That is, the initial stress with which they start. We note again, I'll call it K, Definite Promises of Deliverance from Exile. There is much in these chapters that is rather general in tone and that can be fit in with various things. But there are a good many pretty definite promises of deliverance from exile, and let's look at some of these now. Look at Isa. 43.5,6, where we read fear not, for I am with thee, I will bring thy seed from the east and gather thee from the west, I will say to the north, give up, and to the south, keep not back. Bring my sons from afar and my daughters from the ends of the earth. And we just read verse 14, we won't discuss it here now, we'll look at it, Thus saith the Lord, your redeemer, the Holy One of Israel; For your sake I have sent to Babylon, and have brought down all their nobles, and the Chaldeans, whose cry is in the ships. Specific reference to Babylon. Then 44.26--// 45.4, very definite prediction of what he is going to do about the exile. 44.26, God, that confirms the word of his servant, and performs the counsel

of his messengers; that saith to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be inhabited. Certainly the implication is that Jerusalem is now uninhabited. Jerusalem is thought of as being desolate, left a ruins, but he says, that says to Jerusalem thou shalt be inhabited, and to the cities of Judah, ye shall be built, and I will raise up the decayed places thereof, that says to the deep, Be dry, and I will dry up thy rivers: . What are the rivers of the deep? This is a figurative reference to Mesopotamia. Mesopotamia and the power of ~~the~~ Mesopotamia, spoken of as the deep, and as the land of the rivers. ~~Will~~ dry up the rivers, does not here mean a physical doing away with the rivers, but doing away with the power that comes from the rivers. I will dry up thy rivers, that says of Cyrus, He is my shepherd, (specifically named) and shall perform all my pleasure , even saying to Jerusalem, thou shalt be built, and to the temple, thy foundation shall be laid. And then Cyrus mentioned again in the next verse, ~~showing~~ telling how God is going to open up the gates of Babylon to him, going to give him the hidden treasures of Babylon, and in order that he can let the people go. Then look at 45.13. I have raised him up in righteousness and I will direct all his ways; he shall build my ~~city~~ city, and he shall let go my captives, not for price nor reward, saith the Lord of hosts. This is certainly a specific prediction about Cyrus, we have quite a few, but who could this be about except Cyrus. There is no other way that I know of to interpret it. I never heard of anyone interpreting it any other way. But we don't say much about it, it's not much known in the Christian world. Cyrus seems so long ago, but it is stressed in these chapters, Then in 46.1,2, specific declarations that the gods of Babylon are going themselves to go into captivity. Then in 48.14: All ye, assemble yourselves, and hear; which among them hath declared these things? The Lord has loved him: he will do his pleasure on Babylon, and his arm shall be on the Chaldeans. Explicit declaration that God is going to overthrow the power of Babylon. This same chapter, verses 20 and 21, He promises deliverance of the people from Babylon in the form of a command:

Go ye forth of Babylon, ~~ff~~--well, why command people to ~~go~~ forth if they're tied up. You go to the penitentiary, you say, walk out of the penitentiary, be free, go and enjoy yourself. Well it would be perfectly silly to talk that way, unless you had the power to open the gates and let them out. So it is a rhetorical form, implying that God is going to make it possible for them to do that which He is ordering them to do. A rhetorical way of saying ~~God is going to free them.~~ Go ye forth of Babylon, flee from the Chaldeans, with the voice of singing, declare ye, tell this, utter it even unto the end of the earth, say ye, the Lord has redeemed his servant Jacob. And then he continues, describing the long trip back to Palestine. And they thirsted not when he led them through the deserts: he caused the waters to flow out of the rock for them:--is this a description specifically, of the way they're going to get back after they leave Babylon, or is this a reminder of the way He brought out of previous oppression in Egypt? This is what He did for them as they went through the desert coming from Egypt, the implication being, not that God is going to provide water supernaturally--He did that--but that as God cared for the people and directed them in those days, and brought them safely through the wilderness, so now He is going to bring them safely back from Babylon, back to Help. Yes? ...

C.14 (1/2)

...unfortunately, we know comparatively little about Cyrus. Cyrus had a great name in the ancient world, but the actual things we have about him from his own town, are comparatively few. We have a few cuneiform writings, from the viewpoint of the Babylonians, telling how they were conquered, and from the viewpoint telling how he gained control. But most of the writing that he did was probably on perishable ~~material,~~ ^{material,} so we have comparatively little evidence on Cyrus. Quite a long time later, that is, a couple of centuries later, I believe it was, one of the Greeks wrote a great work which he called "The Education of Cyrus," which was supposed to describe the training of Cyrus to become the great world leader and the great conqueror, and there are various things in

the Greek writing telling about this conquest in Asia Minor, and so on, and all this, but Cyrus--the second ruler after him, Darius, left more great monuments. Cyrus established the empire, he ~~was~~ busy conquering and establishing it, he didn't put up so many monuments, but it was Darius who had to fight to maintain his power, but God had well established him, he proceeded to put up tremendous monuments, telling what he had done, and we have more material about Darius than we had about Cyrus. Then after Darius we have ~~Xerxes~~^{Xerxes} and Artaxerxes and these others, and they left us some monuments (2) of stone, but the bulk of material ~~on~~^{about} them was on perishable material which has perished. So that we have a great deal of ignorance about certain features of the (2 1/4) And when it comes to Cyrus who --as of Nebuchadnezzar before him, there is--compared to the ~~de~~ clear evidence we have of their greatness and the ~~g~~ tremendous things they did, the amount of specific details~~and~~ all that sort of thing, that we have, is very, very slight. I remember hearing Dr. Robert Dick Wilson 35 years ago--people say there was no such great leader in Nebuchadnezzar's court as Daniel because there is nothing in the cuneiform inscriptions about him, well, we have nothing in the cuneiform inscriptions about Nebuchadnezzar's wife, nothing~~about~~ his leading officials, we don't know their names, he went on telling how little we knew, we had lots of inscriptions ~~about~~^{from} Belshazzar, but they all said, I, the mighty king, conquered mighty nations, ~~ma~~rch~~ed~~ across great deserts, crossed tremendous rivers, and so on. He claimed he had done all these tremendous things, which he doubtless had done, largely through his generals, but then he goes on to give great detail about his building. Doubtless there was a great deal more written on perishable material, that is not left. Since Dr. Wilson said that, we have discovered a list of Nebuchadnezzar's officials at certain times. We do not have any one in this particular list that we can definitely prove to be Daniel, but we do have the name of two officials who are mentioned in the book of Jeremiah, which is a very

interesting corroboration at that point. But after all, that's only one list, and Nebuchadnezzar doubtless had great numbers of prominent officials under him during the 30 years or more of his reign, changing them from time to time. You have very little left, of specific information about them. You get on a few centuries later, into the time of the Greeks, and you have them doing a great deal more of writing than that. And then of course you get some of the Greeks who had a great genius in writing, and their writings were thought important enough to copy and were copied, so a great deal of detail has been preserved, but from these early days we know the great tremendous events, but when you get into the lesser details it often is very baffling, we don't have any histories or any narratives at length to tell us the thousand details that we would tremendously like to hear. I have been reading the text from the town of Mari which was about 1700 B.C. a very important city north of Babylon, and the kings of Mari were allied with ~~Hamurabi~~ Hammarabi for many years, and shortly before the end of Hamurabi's ^{reign} ~~reign~~ he conquered them and destroyed them. But in these letters we have, we have hundreds of letters connected with them, on clay tablets--and in these letters we read about other towns, and about important officials and the relations with Hammurabi and the official kings of different cities and all that, but unfortunately you have very little contact. There are all these letters so you know of the tremendous active civilization that is going on, but there is just nobody who sat down to write a connected, historical comment, to explain things to us, so you will have letters telling about getting the men ready for an expedition against a certain place, and then you'll have a letter telling how some man has been punished, because ~~he~~ of his (5 1/2) in connection with the expedition, and then you don't know how the expedition came out, or anything about it. And these hundreds of letters just give you a little inkling of so many different (5 3/4)

so that as far as Cyrus was concerned there is absolutely no proof outside of the Bible that Cyrus ever heard of the God of Israel. Absolutely no proof, but there is so little about Cyrus that is proof that we just can't say. I mean, if the Bible ^{says} that

Cyrus definitely knew and worshipped the God of Israel, we couldn't prove the contrary from what is known about him, but the Bible doesn't say that. There is some implication that he knew a little about the God of Israel, but the implications are not clear enough to build much on. And where it says I have surnamed thee though thou hast not known me, that certainly implies that he didn't know much about Him. So that we are in an area where there is a great deal we don't know, but for that matter there is a tremendous lot we don't know now. I don't suppose there is anybody here who could tell me about your father's mother's father's mother's father, tell me where he was born, how old he was when he died, where he lived, probably even what kind of work he did for a livelihood, probably nobody here. And yet that's not many generations back, probably many of your traits you derived from that individual, and you probably don't even know his name. And if that's the case of somebody who lived maybe a hundred and fifty years ago, or 200 years ago, why how can you expect to know a great deal of detail that far back, except when it was something that seems to be important enough to make a clay tablet about it, or put up a stone inscription. (7 1/2 stu. Josephus says something about that.) Yes, of course, Josephus, as far as I know, had absolutely nothing except (7 1/2) and Josephus is an excellent authority on things in his own day. He was a good observer and ~~my~~ very much interested on gathering information. Before the fall of Jerusalem, before the war started, he went and lived with different groups, in order to get to know them, know their views, and customs, and so on. He was a first class historian of his own day. But when it comes to the earlier period, all he could do was to read the O. T., and then write it up in his own words, and when he tells us what Saul said when he saw the Philistines coming, To be or not to be, shall I kill myself, or shall I run the risk of being taken captive? Shall I fight hand to hand, or shall I call on the armor-bearer to kill me? He gives us a beautiful soliloquy that he says is what Saul thought in the situation. But we know it's only Josephus' imagination, because he had no basis for it. But his

writings from this time are very interesting, but they don't add anything to the scripture, they're not accepted authoritatively, but merely like a historical novel today, based upon historical documents. Well, let's see, what verse is that I was looking at? 48.21. Oh, my, there is only one minute left and I do want to finish this particular head. I better give you the references on this and you can look at them yourself. I said 48.20,21, didn't I? Well, look at 49.8-12, see how it can be thought of as referring definitely to the exile. Look at 51.3, which can be thought of that way, very definitely. Look at 51.14, and 51.17, at 51.22,23, which is a very definite promise. And then look at 52.9-12, and you're getting mighty close to 53 when you get to that, but see how specifically that is a reference to the deliverance from Babylon, 52.9-12. Well, we'll have to stop here. Look on, at 40, tell me exactly what it's talking about, what is the subject of 40? Are there any specific predictions in 40, what are they of, and if so, how does it fit into the general situation? And then look at the beginning of 41, we'll look at that together next time...

(break in record, starting again at 10 3/4)...at the end of the last hour we were speaking about K, Definite promises of deliverance from exile, and we noticed that while there are many verses which seem to have as their principal theme, deliverance from exile, there are some that are absolutely crystal clear in this and you can pick out quite a number of verses which leave it absolutely undoubted, that this is the thing that is mostly stressed in the chapter.

Now these verses ^{we} were looking at, we looked at 43.5,6, 44.26-45.3, which stresses it so strongly and so clearly, it's absolutely unmistakable. 45.13, 46.1,2 ; 48.14, 20; and at the end of the hour I think we were looking at 48.21 weren't we? And had we finished looking at that one? Yes, well I gave you those references ahead but we didn't look at them in class yet. We looked at 48.21 which was a reference back to what God had done bringing them out of Egypt, with a suggestion that something similar would happen, coming out of here, that He would lead them through the desert

and give them water to drink. And in 49.8-12 we notice a section which speaks about deliverance from oppression and about regathering in the land of Palestine unquestionably. Then in 51.³ ~~3~~ "The Lord shall comfort Zion; he will comfort all her waste places; and he will make her wilderness like Eden, and her desert like the garden of the Lord;" --very clear expression that the land of Israel is thought of as waste and desolate and barren and the Lord promises to restore it. Then in 51.14 "the captive exile hasteneth that he may be loosed, and that he should not die in the pit, nor his bread should fail." You give that verse today, what does it mean? It is specifically related to exile, isn't it? It can have a beautiful spiritual application to us today, but the direct application of it is undoubtedly to the exile. In ~~51.17~~ 51.17, "Awake, awake, stand up, O Jerusalem, which hast drunk at the hand of the Lord the cup of his fury;" implied that this judgment has already fallen, which is the situation, in which the people imagine themselves, and in which the later people are when they read the book of Isaiah and receive the further comforting that is meant specifically for them also. And then in 51.22,23, he speaks very specifically of taking out of their hand the cup of trembling and giving it to the hands of those that afflict them. And in 52.9 to 12, there, just before chapter 53, we have this passage which could, certainly speaks of Jerusalem desolate, "Break forth into joy, sing together, ye waste places of Jerusalem; for the Lord has comforted his people, he has redeemed Jerusalem. The Lord has made bare his holy arm in the eyes of all the nations; and all the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of our God." Depart ye, depart ye, go ye out from thence, touch no unclean thing;" Who is to go out, what are they to go out from? "Go ye out of the midst of her, be ye clean, that bear the vessels of the Lord." And of course in Ezra we read how Cyrus gave orders, they are to be given the things out of the temple that had been taken away when they were taken into exile, they are to be given those and permitted to take those back with them to Jerusalem, so he says "ye that bear the vessels of the Lord. For ye shall not go out

with haste, nor go by flight; for the Lord will go before you; and the God of Israel will be your reward." Your rearguard, in other words. Rear, and guard as you know is Old English for what we say today guard. Very strange. Today we don't say you put anybody in ward, you say you put them in guard, you ~~guard~~ guard them, you don't ward them. But we speak of the controller of the penitentiary, not as the guardian but as the warden or the warden, using the Old English form in that particular connection. In certain connections we still keep it but in most we have taken the "guard," the two of which are variations of the same sound in Old Anglo-Saxon. Yes? ...

C.15 (3/4)

... so that the ward speaks of the one being guarded, and the guard speaks of the one who does the guarding. There isn't any withstanding. The guard, the guardian, but then the warden... (stu. 3/4) Now there of course is a question, whether in some of these cases they may not be referring to the exile, but to something future, and then there are other passages you might take where the question ~~would~~ would be much stronger than in these. But that's not our present point in our discussion, our present point is to see, as some of these verses, it is absolutely unmistakable, that there are verses which clearly bring out return from exile. And we want to get that solid, as we start. Now we have those who read Isaiah and never think of return from exile. They read it and all they think of is the coming of Christ and His work and the Millennium and all these things, all of which we find in Isaiah but they see that and they see nothing else, and then we have people who see the return from exile, and explain away everything else, but our question is, how can you have both of them there, and how can they be related to each other, that is our question? We want to get a logical relationship if possible so that we see a reason for both, that is, Isaiah didn't sit down and say I'm going to write a book for Christians now, telling them about Christ and His coming Kingdom. He wrote for his

own individual people, and he gave them a message, but as he wrote for them, God was leading him so that the message ~~he~~ gave would also be a great message for future people. But in the first place it was for people right then and there. Now just how do you relate the two? That is our big problem, for this semester, is to see how the two are related. And so at our present point I'm wanting to find this solidly, that some of these verses at least, sufficient verses, there are, of which are unmistakably pointing to the return from exile, to make it absolutely clear that that is a basic ~~of~~ teaching of the facts, that we want to get as a solid starting place. And some of these verses you may question, whether they belong in this category, but that can be done later. But for the present, I want us to be sure that there are sufficient verses that unquestionably belong in this category, that there is no question that this category is present, and that this is the thing which was in the minds of the people who first read the book. That was the thing they would be thinking of, and looking for, and (3 1/4) and it is there. How did the other get there? Where did it come from? Was it just thrown in? Did he say now I'm going to talk about--turn from myself, now let's talk about Christ. Did he just jump or is there a relationship? And if so, what is it? So don't hesitate to examine every verse most critically as to what's there. And get everything you can out of it, but at the present point, I just want to drive this home, that return from exile is very clear, definitely stressed within these chapters. Yes? (stu.3 3/4) There is no such thing as a canon of double sense. The word canon means an authority, a rule, and there is no rule, no authority idea of double sense, but there is such a thing as double sense, very definitely. For instance, if I say, if one of you here was to be very obnoxious in the class, and disagreeable, and everybody else were to find it hard to put up with you, and if that person were to be leaving school, I could say to him--I wouldn't but I mean I could--I could say, my, I'd say, you have left an unforgettable impression

upon every one of us here. Well, they would think, isn't it grand, how much they appreciated me. But the others would think, isn't that terrible, what an impression was made. There would be a double sense. Now there are people who will do that deliberately. They will deliberately make two different impressions. I'm just reading the Gilgamesh Epic again, in the Babylonian, and in the story of the flood there, there are some very strange things that are said by Aea the god to which Nepishtam, the Babylonian Noah, and he tells him, when you start making this ark and the people ask you, what are you building this for? you say this to them, and as you read it the words can be interpreted as meaning there is going to come a wonderful blessing, a great glorious outpouring of the windows of heaven, and you can take the words that way, and that's to lead the people to take the words that way and help them building the boat, but he understands that you can take the words in just a slightly different way and it means there is terrible calamity, and they are taken in such a way that Utopishtam is warned of the calamity, but that he sent the words in a way to deceive the people and make them help him, thinking there is something good when there is really calamity. Now of course that sort of thing, there are times perhaps when it is justified, but ordinarily I would say it was completely wrong. Well, in the Bible there are probably are cases where individuals did that sort of thing, and in such a case there is a double sense, but whether you could call it a canon of double sense, or a rule of double sense, that I would question. Now another case where there can be two senses to a thing is this: supposing that when Washington was president of the United States, there had been a prophet living in Washington, who had been given the divine task of speaking to an ambassador from Germany, and suppose he were to say, in the future, armies from the United States will cross the ocean and will crush the armies of Germany. Now that statement might refer to first world war and it might refer to the second World War. There would be a double sense because there would be two different things involved in it. But if he were to make the statement the time is coming, when an American army will crush a German army in Europe, if that

was the statement he made, and though World War I finished, the American army didn't crush the German army in world war I, it was the beginning of the tremendous number of people coming, that took the heart out of the German people and showed them that defeat was certain anyway. Well, say the American s had crushed the Germans in World War I. Well, then you couldn't say there is going to be another war with Americans in Germany, because of this prediction, because you could point the fulfilment of it, it had been fulfilled. You couldn't say it's got to be fulfilled, because it already had. In other words a prediction can refer to a series of like events, but in such a case it is usually plural. If not, it might be that it is phrased to describe a progression, like when Moses said, how will you know what to do when I am gone, they asked him, how will we know what to do when you're gone? Moses said, the Lord your God will send you a prophet like unto me, but that didn't mean one prophet, that meant from time to time as you have situations of difficulty, God as He sent Moses, will send another prophet, and so it is a prediction of a series of men who will do the work that Moses did, but when Moses said, a prophet like unto me, and Moses was head and shoulders above most of the prophets, it gave the idea that of the prophets who would come, there would be one who would be a climax, one who would be the supreme one, the one who really was like Moses, far more than anybody else. So that that was a prediction with several fulfillments, but with one climactic fulfillment, but you see how they are all definitely related. Now if somebody was to say that when Isaiah said that the Lord will give you a sign that the virgin will have a child and we'll call his name Emanuel, somebody would say well that's Ahaz' son Hezekiah, somebody else says, no, that is Isaiah's son, Mahershalahashbaz. Somebody else says no, that's Christ. But it'S not all three of them, and I would say it's not two of them, it's one or the other. When he says the Lord is going to give you a sign, He will send the Son, ^{to} ~~you~~ say this means two different people, well, you can make anything mean anything when you get into

that sort of thing. I would say, that ordinarily stay clear of any idea of double talk, ordinarily. If there is a clear prediction which, in the face of it, is one event, don't try to interpret it as two. It is one. But if there is something which may mean a series of like events, that may be the interpretation called for, or if there is something expressed in the plural, it may describe a succession of different things. But the idea of two entirely different interpretations being intended is usually a matter of deceit, and that I wouldn't expect unless it was a wicked person in the Scripture speaking. Mr. Cohen has his hand longer than you have, Mr. Golin. Yes? (10) A very good question, and I would say that chapter 40, being so near being our next heading, let's wait till we get to the next heading before discussing that particularly. Mr. Golin? (10 1/4) There, there is this question. Supposing that somebody had made this prediction in the time of Washington, the American army will crush the German army in Europe, Suppose that was made. Well, somebody might say, in World War I the American armies crushed the Germany/ armies. That prediction has been fulfilled. Somebody wise would say, no, in World War I, after the German and the British had practically killed each other off, they were both bled white, the American Army came in at the end, and in certain individual battles, the Americans won great victories. Were they sufficient to be the fulfillment of that prediction? Or does that prediction go beyond anything that happened in World War I and apply to something that happen in the future? It's one or the other, but as to whether the first one fitted wholly, or not, you might examine to see, is it already fulfilled, or is there another fulfillment instead, not in addition, usually, but instead. So that ~~if~~ ^{if} you find statements about return from exile, which don't seem to fit what actually happened, seem to go way beyond it, there is always the possibility of saying no, these particular statements are not talking of that return from exile, but speaking of something far greater that was in the distant future, and that's a matter to take up in connection with each one, but when he said Cyrus is going to let my captives go,

and send them back to rebuild Jerusalem, that is certainly not saying anything about the present day or any day that is future to now. That is talking about the return at the time ~~of Christ~~ ^{it happened}. Mr. Oliver? (12) ...of Elijah's coming is one which has considerable problem about it. I don't know the full answer, I know there are a-millennialists who say here is our warrant for spiritualizing prophecy. Elijah is supposed to come, Jesus said John the Baptist fulfilled this, therefore we can say the prophecies of the kingdom and can interpret them as being the spread of the gospel. Well I think that is going much too far, in drawing a conclusion from a usage like that. But the exact meaning of ~~these~~ ^{Jesus'} reference there is something that needs further study than I have given it, that particular problem, but let us say it's not a solid thing we can build something ~~on from~~ ^{else on}, but it is a problem we need to interpret in the light of our (12 3/4) . Yes?

It is, and in that case I am 100% convinced that it refers to Christ only and to nothing else, I am 100% convinced of that, but of course that is something that I take up about the 20th of next February. That we can't go into now, except to refer to it by way (13 1/4) but we have the big problem in this particular section, Isa.40-56, we have--now in those other sections there is much which refers only to that immediate day and there is no question about it, but here we have a section in which the problem is greater, because it is all prediction from Isaiah, and therefore from this section we have this problem, you can go through the whole section and you can find verse after verse which there is no question about its referring to the return from exile, and nothing else. And you can go through this section and can find verse after verse which describes the sufferings of Christ and the glory that shall follow and cannot possibly be in any legitimate way referred to the return from exile, or anything connected with it. People try to apply Isa.53 to that sort of thing, but it just doesn't work. You have that which is no question, it must be something entirely different from that. Now you have these two different things. Now you may have many verses of which you have the question, which

do they go with, and that we settled. But we have the two solid pegs, we have this, and we have this, and some people interpret and only look at this, and some interpret and only look at this, but we want to look at it all and see what is true. How do they relate? It is a problem. Mr. Vannoy? (14 1/2)

C.16 (1/2)

...and since there are people who do ~~w~~ say it it would be impossible to deny that it can be said, but there is a very, now there was a man who gave a great sermon, somebody told me about, they heard him give this great sermon, and he said that there is the parable of the Good Samaritan, and he said that the priest and the Levites passed right by the man who had been in this terrible plight. And he said why did they do it? Well, he says they were going from Jerusalem the place of holiness way down to Jericho, down and they were going downward, and naturally, being on the downward path, down towards Jericho, naturally they wouldn't do a good deed along the way. But the Samaritan, he was coming up you see, he was coming from Jericho up to Jerusalem. Well, maybe he was, the Bible doesn't say which they were going. I can't say which way they were going, but this man gave a most wonderful sermon on the importance of going up and not down, out of that, wonderful sermon. And there are many ministers who preach marvelous evangelical sermons on technicalities like this, and using it as an illustration of something that at first sight at least has ~~nothing~~ ^{take a principle} to do with it, but they ~~say, it is~~ out of it, and, if you have a wonderful message and you give the message, well, it's good to get a good message across, but the trouble is if you get your message by twisting something into a way which you can say perhaps it might mean, but it certainly is not obvious, if you can do that, somebody can do the other way. Like the time when I was asked to give an ordination sermon down in Washington, at the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, 35 years ago, and I gave it, and the pastor of the church gave the charge to ^{this was} one of my students who had just graduated from the Seminary I was connected with, who was a member of that church, and in the course of the text, he

took the parable of the man who hired people to go ~~an~~ into his field, and work for the day, you remember? Then, he hired them in the morning, he promised them a penny, he hired others in the middle of the morning, ^{others in the afternoon,} others at noon, and hired others an hour before it was over, and he gave them all a penny. And the first ones who went in were very disgusted, but he said to them, that's what I promised you, what right have you got to complain if I give the others more? Well, this he read for his text, and he said now from this parable we have the motive for the ministry. He said what ~~are~~ are the motives for the ministry? Well, he says, first there is the reward. He gave them a penny, so they have the reward for the ministry. So he went on, talked about the laborer worthy of his hire, and so on, and the minister gets his proper reward. Then, but he said, there are times when there is not much reward in the ministry. So he says there is the second motive and he says you find that in the parable, the joy of the work. These men were there, working in the fields, the joy of the work, and the minister has the joy of the work. And then he said sometimes though there is not much reward and there is not much joy in the work, and he said there is a third motive and we have that in the parable. He said somebody saw these folks who started working in the morning, there they were in the heat of the day, working their heads off, said, what are you working so hard for? And he said, they pointed to the man who had hired them, the one who said, that's the third and great motive. Well, he got it all out of the parable, but I don't think it was in the parable. (stu. 4 1/4) Well, I'm afraid he didn't believe that. But you can use the Bible, they say you can prove anything by the Bible and you can. The thing is we take wonderful teaching we find in the Bible, and then we present these teachings using something in the Bible unrelated to them, as our jumping off spot, Well, what is to prevent other people from jumping off to take things that are very different from what we disseminate. So while the big task is to get the truth of the Bible to people and it is valuable to have pegs to hang the truth on, it is also valuable to show the

people where we get the truth and how we get it, and for this study I am interested in knowing what can we get from this passage? Now of course if you find in the N.T. that it says this means that, that is God's word and it tells us, but for the present I'd rather not go to that, I'd rather come to that later, but as we said, you can find sufficient clear N.T. evidence that there are passages here that are telling about Christ and his work. You can find sufficient clear N.T. evidence that a Christian ~~should~~^{is} unquestionably right in saying. But does that mean the whole passage is? Well I've never heard anybody take the passage about Cyrus and interpret it as related to Christ, I've never had it. Most Christians don't even notice those passages. But you have the one approach which makes it all the exile, you have the other approach which either makes it all Christ or only talks about the parts about Christ and ignores the rest. How do they fit together? What is the situation? That's our problem in this course. And I believe when you have the answer to that problem that you have something far better than you have when you approach it simply from either one of these, when you see how it comes together. And it's wonderful to say the N.T. says this is about the Atonement, here it is, it's about the Atonement. The N.T. says this is about the birth of Christ, here it is, it's about the birth of Christ. It's wonderful. But I think it's a hundred times better to see it all in context and relationship and see that even without the N.T. you would be justified in taking it this way. And that's what ~~is~~ I want to do. So that I would not take time now on the question of double sense except that it is very vital to our whole problem, our whole approach, and so I'm ~~not~~ glad to have it raised and to look into it. And we will look into it ~~as~~ from time to time. But it is an easy way to get around all problems, to just say well it has another sense. But what we want to do now is to see what are the senses that are there for sure. That's what we want to say now. And then, if you prove the case of double sense, good, but let's not assume it anywhere unless we're going to prove it. Well, these cases then are the cases which some of them are more certain than others.

But there are undoubtedly sufficient cases to make it unquestionable that return from exile is the big thing in the mind of the people to whom Isaiah speaks when he first gives them the book. And that the people 200 years later who read the book, in the situation in which Isaiah's friends imagine themselves are also preoccupied with the thought of return from exile and they are definitely promised that God will deliver them from exile. ~~Ø~~ Now logically at this point it might be better for us to go into the main body of the book and look at the clear discussion of exile and see how it relates to the other, but I think it is proper for us to start with the beginning of our path, and that's what did constitute for me a very real problem, until I came to an answer which I believed to be the correct answer to ~~that~~ problem. And so this was K, the definite promises of return from exile, and we will now move on to L, The Overture.

And that will give you the hint of the solution that I have come to about chapter 40. As you look at chapter 40 you do not have very much that is specific. You have no mention of Cyrus in it, you have no mention of Babylon, you have no specific statement of deliverance from Babylon. Look at the beginning, "Speak comfortably to Jerusalem... her warfare is accomplished... her iniquity is pardoned." Very general. Does it say here the people are going to be delivered from Babylon, are going to be brought back? Does it say here on the other hand, Messiah is coming to redeem you from your sins? There is nothing specific in the language of chapter 40, and I have come to the conclusion that chapter 40 is a prelude or an Overture. Now there I am using the analogy which I've already used of the symphonic structure, the structure that stresses emotion, rather than simply logic, and that jumps from one thought to another, where the emotion seems to require it, where a problem is raised, or a longing in the heart is raised, which needs to be satisfied, with a ~~g~~ stress on the other emotions. Now this 40th chapter, I have come to the conclusion, is an introduction, a prologue, not in the sense of giving ideas, but in the sense of suggesting emotions, that is, suggesting general principles, general

approaches, general ideas, rather than giving specific data. And that, I believe, I would apply only to chapter 40. I would incline to think that hereafter everything you have is specific, but that in chapter 40 we have a general introduction. Now what I want to do now is to look at chapter 40 now, not in view of the section as a whole, but in view of the situation when Isaiah gives it. Supposing that you are to hear a grand opera, there would be an overture before the opera begins, this overture would be orchestral. It would contain themes taken from the opera as a whole. It would give you an idea of the outstanding themes and emotions, probably would echo something from the beginning, something from the middle, something from towards the end of it, it would put you in the mood for the logical and intellectual presentation of the story of the opera, and as you heard that, it puts you in the mood for what follows, then you get into the specific things that come. ~~When the~~ ^{The next} time you hear the opera your overture means many times as much to you as it did the first time, because now you hear it not from the viewpoint of one who approaches it for the first time, but of one who is already familiar with the matter as a whole, and has the ideas of the whole thing, and he sees all sorts of things in that overture that he didn't see at first, and that, I believe, is the explanation of chapter 40. Now I cannot ask you to make a full judgment on this interpretation at this point because we need more knowledge of the other chapters. I want you, therefore, at this point, simply as a suggested view to take this view of the overture and then when we get all through the chapters, we'll come back and look at the overture again, and you would see, naturally, after you heard it, the whole thing, you listen to it again and see what you can see that you couldn't see at first. Therefore, I want to go to the overture now, to see what the emotions are, and to see how these emotions relate to the situation when Isaiah spoke. Now if you find matters in this which relate very nicely to something much later, keep that for the next time we look at it. You even find that the N.T. says something in it, it's definitely referring to something later. Keep that for the present, for the present put yourself in the viewpoint of the

godly in Isaiah's day, who knew exile was certain to come, imagined it as already here, and needed comfort, and Isaiah gives it to them. Or put yourself in the viewpoint of people 200 years later, as the exile has been going for 50 years, and they read Isaiah's words of comfort and they begin to think maybe the time is actually approaching when these will be fulfilled, and read it from their viewpoint, and see how chapter 40 fits with that, and then after you've gone all through it, then you see things in 40 that are not obvious at all,

So let's look at it ~~from~~ from that viewpoint now, and from that viewpoint you look at the first verse. Now the first verse is very general isn't it? He doesn't say, my people, I'm going to bring you back from exile. He doesn't say, my people, you're going to be redeemed from sin. He doesn't say, my people, Christ is going to die on the ~~the~~ cross for you. He says, comfort ye, my people, comfort ye, my people, says your God. It is very definite. It fits the whole idea of Isaiah's book of comfort. It is a proper approach for an overture, or a prelude, or a presentation of the emotions involved in it. And the same is true of the second verse. And the second verse has in it the suggestion of redemption from sin. But you notice it is only a suggestion. There is very little said about sin in these early chapters of our section. There is far more said about sin in the early chapters of the book, of Isaiah, because there he is directly rebuking people for sin, calling on them to turn from their sin, but that's not the attitude of most of the chapters here, because here we are not approaching people going on in sin and exile is certain if they don't leave it, and saying leave your sin, turn to God. We are now approaching people who are suffering the exile, and they are suffering there and need comfort, and so there is very little rebuke and there is just a little touch on the matter of sin in this ~~section~~ second verse. But then look at the third, "The voice of him that cries in the wilderness." Now we know in view, as a whole, we know of a very excellent application, of verses 3, 4, and 5, and this application is quoted in the book of Matthew,

we are told what this is speaking of. But there is nothing specific in this literally speaking of John the Baptist or of Christ or anything like that. In this case I would say, instead of a prediction, it is an emotional expression, an expression of an emotion which finds...

C.17. (1/2)

...it is not a specific prediction of a specific event, but that it is a presentation of an emotion, and if that emotion can find application to various specific events, you see.

(3/4)(stu) I want to come back to the overture when we get through, but at this point I want to look at the overture, from the viewpoint of a person in Isaiah's day. (3/4)

They won't find in this, they have

nothing in Isaiah's day to say, this is a prediction that John the Baptist is coming, but what they have here is an emotion, comfort is coming, and what kind of comfort is coming? Well, there is comfort in the wilderness, there is deliverance, there is straightening out of the path, there is preparation for the accomplishment of God's great work. Now the N.T. tells us that John the Baptist prepared the way for the coming of the greatest work of all (1 1/2) So this emotion finds a greater expression there than anywhere else. But it doesn't describe John the Baptist, tell of the specific man in a specific situation, it rather gives the whole emotional background, and I'm saying that at the time of Isaiah, a person would not think of looking further for an interpretation for this particular verse, they'd say well this is the return from exile. Think of all the difficulty, think of all the obstacles, God is going to straighten them all out. God is going to clear the way, the mountains won't stop them, the crooked places won't stop them, all the obstacles will be cleared away, the glory of the Lord will be revealed, it's going to be a wonderful deliverance that God is going to give. Now it is an emotional description of great deliverance, that God is going to bring, at this point, and the reader in Isaiah's time has no difficulty in applying the

deliverance to them. It's not like what we have from 41 on, where we have specific prediction of specific events. There we have the overture, the declaration of the emotions (2 1/2) Yes? (stu) I would say that when hundreds of years before Cyrus comes, it says Cyrus is going to come, make great conquests, is going to let the people go, and give them help to raise up Jerusalem, that is a marvelous prediction of a specific event, which can clearly be seen to be fulfilled in that event, and therefore it is a marvelous evidence of the fulfillment of God's word. But I don't think you can do that with this, because in this case, the similarity to what John the Baptist said, is not such that anybody could say why just look, John the Baptist came and fulfilled this, isn't that wonderful? Somebody else can say, yes, but you can find that Elijah came and cleared the way for the message of God. You can find so many things that it applies to, it's an emotional presentation, rather than a specific declaration of a specific event. And the greatest event of this time, to which the emotion applies more than anything else, is the coming of Christ. But that wouldn't be obvious from the reading. There are predictions which give us an idea of something, and when it comes we see how it fits, but they're not such fitting, as to be useful as proofs, the proofs ^{specifically} ~~to fit~~, there are others which apply in such a way that they are marvelous evidence of God's predictive power. Now this is not (4 1/4)

Yes? (stu.) Yes, and so I was saying that the best place would be if we would start with 41 of Isa., and look at 41 later, but I think it's better to glance at 40 first, so I wish you would all hold that problem in abeyance, until we come back to ~~it~~ it, because we are not ready. If you would hold that problem in abeyance and would simply try at this point to get an idea of the interpretation I am suggesting for (5) then I think when you look at other chapters you can see the reason for ~~the~~ the interpretation I suggested before, that is my suggestion, at this point. Otherwise I'll have to look ahead and go over in advance a lot of things that I can go over better when we look at the chapter. So I merely say here, not a word of disagreement with anything in the N.T.

about this verse, not a word. All I am saying is that a person in Isaiah's day, reading this chapter would immediately see a relevance to eternal values. That's all I'm saying. And a person in Isaiah's day, reading this chapter, will say, isn't that wonderful, these people are going to get their way back, the way of the Lord, across the desert, to bring the people back, is going to be opened up and cleared up, so that they can be delivered from this. Now these people may be entirely wrong in what they say, or they may be entirely right, that we look at later, but for the present I simply want to say that that is the natural way for people at that time to look at it,...

So we now will look at verse 6 and 7, and they again, as you see, are stressing the emotion of God's power, which is suggested here as a necessary thought for God's people faced with these marvelous promises of deliverance from Babylon. Now this doesn't say anything about Babylon, it doesn't say the Chaldeans are great powerful men but compared to God they are nothing. It stresses an emotion rather than a specific fact, but the emotion which it stresses is that the people, that human power is nothing compared to the power of God, that's the emotion stressed. That's the emotion we need in connection with these wonderful promises. So that emotion, the weakness of man compared with the wonder of God is stressed in these verses and would have application to people in any time anywhere, but it can be applied and would be in the minds of those to whom Isaiah gave the book, to his power to deliver from exile. And then of course it ends with the "grass withers, the flower fades, but the word of our God shall stand for ever. That stresses the fact that his predictions are going to be fulfilled, but it doesn't enter directly into the big arguments on predictive power, which are given later. Then we have the theme of comfort continued again, which was in the first four verses, we have it continued in verses 9-11 and notice how little there is that is specific again in these verses. Notice how general is the term of these. O Zion, that brings good tidings, get thee up into the high mountain. O Jerusalem that brings good tidings, lift up=

thy voice with strength. There is a suggestion made, and I think very wisely, instead of translating it that it is Zion he is ~~g~~ talking to, that brings good tidings, but he is talking to the one that brings good tidings to Zion. Because after all ~~w~~ in verse 2 we are told that he speaks comfortably to Jerusalem and tell her God is going to give her a blessing, here the one who is bringing this news to Zion and to Jerusalem, is told to speak out to the cities of Judah, which is Zion and Jerusalem, and the rest of them, and tell them God is going to do His great work. Well, again you see there is nothing specific in this, there is not a specific prediction, but there is an emotion, there is glory in the fact that God is going to give a deliverance, and a person in Isaiah's day, thinking of it, will say, well, that's the deliverance from exile, but he doesn't say deliverance from exile, it applies to any deliverance or all deliverances which the Lord will bring to His people, as far as the word is concerned. And then verse 10, what is the theme in verse 10, again it is God's power. The Lord is going to do this, with strength, His arm is going to rule, He is going to accomplish it, it is comfort, but it is powerful comfort, because God is going to bring deliverance, well, what kind of deliverance is He going to bring? You can take this to describe Elijah, you can take this to describe the return from exile, you can take this to describe the coming of Christ, you can take this to describe the beginning of the millennium, it can fit any great act of God. It is an emotional stress on a ~~r~~ great idea that we all need to get, that God is going to perform His great work. But it doesn't say what the work is in this verse. So when we see the millennium come, we can say look, exactly as Isaiah says, the Lord is coming with strong arm, He is doing this great work. It is generally stated. But the person in Isaiah's day, immediately things of return from exile, a marvelous thing which God can do. He doesn't say in this verse He will, but He says He is going to bring a marvelous deliverance. Then you notice verse 11, which grows out of this. Why is God going to do this great work? Is this a great tremendous work that just shatters everything and then you've got to start from scratch and build up, no, the gentleness of verse 11, he will feed his flock like

a shepherd, he shall gather the lambs with his arm, carry them in his bosom, and shall gently lead those that are with young. It is a picture of a shepherd but of course it is not talking about sheep, it is talking about people. But what people is it talking about, it doesn't say. It is an emotion, rather than a specific event, it is a description of God's dealing with His own. It is the overture, it is the stress on the gentleness and kindness of God's dealings with His people. You can apply it in any (10 3/4)

which God . And then, after 11 you read of God's gentleness, His marvelous acts of goodness, and you immediately say well now, you think of exile, how can God do this? His temple is destroyed, His city has perished, God has disappeared, He is just in the minds of a few people, the gods of Babylon are ~~carried~~^{carried} through the streets in celebration and everybody worships them, they've conquered the world, how can our God gently lead those that are with young? Well, he asks a question, who is the real creator? Who really has the power? He says, don't you believe that your God is not merely the god of Israel and these are the gods of Babylon, but your God is the God of whole world, the one who has created everything, the one who controls all things, the stress on the power of God as the assurance that the comforting words can be fulfilled. But verse 12 doesn't say anything about return from exile. It doesn't say anything about the coming of Christ, it doesn't say anything about the millennium, it is a general stress which can apply at any time, it is an emotional thing rather than a specific prediction. Then of course verse 13 goes on to carry the same idea to God's knowledge, 13 and 14. God has the power and the knowledge which no one else can possibly compare with. Again it can predict any, can fit with any deliverance the Lord makes. You can't prove from these verses, apart from N.T. references, you can't prove whether these are talking about the coming of Christ or the Millennium or the return from exile. The emotions fit them all, it is the overture, rather than getting into specific predictions. Guess our time is about up. Yes? (12 1/2)...

...at Mat.8, yes, in Mt.8.16 you read, "When the even was come, they brought unto him many that were possessed with devils; and he cast out the spirits with his word, and healed ~~w~~ all that were sick, That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses." Here it says that Isaiah said that a specific thing would happen. Jesus Christ performed ~~thks~~ specific thing and fulfilled the prediction of Isaiah. That is what is stated here, now if you look over at the book of John, you will find that inthe book of John, you read in the first chapter, verse 19, And this is the record of John, when the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him, Who art thou? And he confessed, and denied not; but confessed, I am not the Christ. And they asked him, What then? Art thou Elias? And he saith, I am not. Art thou that prophet? And he answered No. Then said they unto Him, ho art thou? that we may give an answer to ~~thme~~ them that sent us, What sayest thou of thyself? He said, I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Make straight the way of the Lord, as said the~~x~~prophet Esaias. Now there are various possibilities of interpretation of this. One may say, just as Jesus healed in order that it might be fulfilled that Isaiah predicted he would be it, John cried in the wilderness that it might be fulfilled, which was ~~said~~ in Isaiah, a voice crieth in the wilderness, make straight the way of the Lord. Now that is one possibility of interpreting this. But there is also the possibility , he said, I am the voice of one crying inthe wilderness, make straight the way of the Lord, ~~and~~ as said the prophet Isaiah, that Isaiah describes the thing of voices crying inthe wilderness, make straight the way of the Lord, well, I'm going to be one in the wilderness that says make straight the way of the Lord. See what I mean. Does Isaiah specifically predict here John the Baptist coming to say make straight the way of the Lord? Or~~y~~ does Isaiah declare that God is going to make ways straight, and that there shall be voices predicting there, and John the Baptist says, I am such a voice. Now I don't want you to try to make a decision between these at this point. What I want to do at this point, is simply to say, that chapter 40

is the Overture, or the Prelude, and that from 41 on most of what we have is very specific. In chapter 40 we have very little that is specific. 40 is the general emotion, the general attitude, the general preparation of what follows. Now in the course of such a preparation you may have specific things, if you prove it to be such, but you don't necessarily have specific things, and after further investigation of 40 I want to come back to it at the very end of the course. But at this point I'm looking at chapter 40 as it would look to somebody in the day when Isaiah gave the book, and I'm saying what would such a person see in chapter 40? Well, he would see in it a great emphasis on comfort to God's people. God's people, he would say, are in exile. In Isaiah's day they'd look (4 3/4) forward to exile. They imagine themselves as already in it, and they say in this exile here we are in terrible suffering, but God wants to comfort us, He wants to assure us He is going to do great things, He wants a way prepared in the desert, a highway for our God, and they would say well isn't that wonderful. People in exile way across the desert, way over there in Babylon, far from home, in a strange land. God said He is going to prepare a way, going to make straight the difficult places, and make it easy. And then as they go on they find how God is going to take care of them like a shepherd and immediately the question is asked how do you know God will be able to do this? Well, look at his plans. He is the creator, verse 12-14. He is so great that all the great nations, as He says, are just like nothing in comparison with Him. And when you come to 18 you have this theme of idolatry which is so common in this section of the book. The people are facing the gods of the heathen, that seem to be all powerful and their God has accomplished nothing. Well here is the answer how these idols are really just the work of man's hands anyway. We looked at this in another connection so we won't linger over the verses of it now. But when we get to the end of about idolatry through verses 24, 25, Verse 22 stressed God's tremendous power --It is He that sitteth on the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants are like grasshoppers in

comparison with him, verse 26, lift up your eyes on high and behold who has created these things, calls them all by name, his power over all the universe. Well then 27 says, why do you say, O Jacob, my way is hid from the Lord, why should Israel say, God has forgotten? Well it is comfort, a rhetorical question, you shouldn't say it. Why should you say it when you shouldn't say it. Verse 28, don't you know, the great power of God, there is no searching of his understanding. God will accomplish the work that He wants done. Then immediately they think again, way off in exile, far across the desert, how are they ever going to make that long trip home? And the answer is, verse 29, he gives power to the faint, to them that have no might, he increaseth strength. How can we ever go this long distance? Well, God can give us strength. Even the youth shall faint and be weary, the young men will utterly fall, the young men of strength and vitality, they can't make this, it's too much, impossible to make that long, long trip across the desert, and to get back to their homeland, but he said, it's too much for men in their own strength, even young vigorous able fellows, but he said, they that wait upon the Lord will renew their strength, they will mount up with wings as eagles, they'll run and not be weary, they're full of pep and energy, they're not daunted by the task before them, they're going ahead, but not only do they feel abounding energy, it lasts, they run and not be weary, but they walk, they keep on and on and on, the long tedious trip across the desert, but they keep agoing, they don't faint. The Lord's strength enables them not only to make the great spurts and the sudden enthusiastic movements that are so important at times, but to keep up the steady, plodding pace that gets there, so these emotions are touched upon in this first chapter, the note of comfort, the futility of idolatry, the greatness of God's power, the tenderness of His loving care, the certainty of His deliverance from exile, are all of them brought out as introduction to what follows, and this is about all that a person in Isaiah's day, reading the passage, would see in it. Now he would see so little of specific prediction that he might very well

say, specific connection with definite proper names and situations, that he might very well say, well, we'll introduce the great note of comfort, let's see what all it's going to include, how many aspects will there be with what follows. But certainly his attention would be predominantly on the immediate aspect of the deliverance from exile. Now as to what other aspects he would see in this, I believe that in the first reading, this is all he would see in it. But after he has gone through to the end of Isaiah's book of comfort, then the next time he read it, as he'd read this, he'd read it with all the succeeding chapters in mind, and even though he'd never seen a N. T. or heard anything about the N. T. he would see much more in the N. T. now, after he had gone through the succeeding chapters and seen how the thought is developed, and how the presentation progresses too. But now we will go on to II. Question, Mr. Charvoz? (10) No, the thing with which we start and which is most stressed and to which all others are related, is comfort. But there are many verses, which, taken by themselves would immediately be a presentation of comfort, so they have a relationship. Comfort is the theme with which we start. Then we have these others, three main ones, which I mention because they occur so frequently in these next ten chapters, and all four of them, no, three of them occur in this chapter, and one of them is very slightly touched on. Not so much you'd even think of it in this chapter, but you have it so stressed later, and then you see little glimpses of predictions here, yes? (10 3/4) Yes, they dovetail together, each of them, when you stress one of them it develops a need for the other, a psychological emotional need, any one of them does for the other two, and so they fill that need, but you don't take one of them and talk about it for several chapters and then another, you jump from one to the other, as the psychological need wells up in the heart. Well, now we go on to II, what did we call I? General Principles, and the Overture, the Prelude, the Prologue would be general enough so that we included it in I. Then II will be a specific section which we will look at:

II, Deliverance from Babylon Assured; the Servant of the Lord Introduced.

In other words, the obvious thing in the next chapters that follow now is the Deliverance from Babylon, that is the thing that is stressed, over and over. It is stressed to such an extent that you can say it is assured, though it is contained to some extent in later chapters. It is stressed in our immediately following section, particularly, and we have a new thought introduced in this section, the Servant of the Lord, which will be developed more in later sections, it is only introduced in this section, but it is so vital in later sections that we stress it here as being introduced. Now this section is going to run through chapter 47 ~~41-47~~ Chapters 41-47. 48 will start another section, but 41-47 will be one continuous section of the book, with its great stress, that which I have mentioned but yet with a development of thought which introduced this new theme of the Servant of the Lord. And so we look at the beginning of chapter 40. I'm not going to give subheads now because we'll get those straight through which chapters. But we're going to look at chapter 41 first and as we see the beginning of 41 we find that we are in a very specific situation, immediately. We are not...

C.19 (1/2)

...general declaration at the beginning of chapter 40, we are in a very specific situation. ~~which~~ ^{We} can take isolated verses out and can ~~get~~ ^{get} great blessing for us at any particular time, but here a situation is described. Somebody begins to speak at the beginning and issues a challenge to some others, or he describes a situation. So we look at the beginning of this specific material now. Chapter 41, keep silence before me, O islands; and let the people renew their strength; let them come near; then let them speak; let us come near together to judgment. In other words, God is giving a challenge to some people, challenging them to come and to investigate certain matters, yet more than investigate, to face a real (1 3/4) And who are these to whom He addresses it?

Is He addressing the people of Israel, in verse 1 here? How many would think He is here

addressing the people of Israel? In verse 1. Chapter 40 begins with comfort to Israel, comfort ye, my people. But what ~~did he~~^{does He} say about Israel in verse 1, chapter 40? He is not speaking to Israel at all. If He just said people, people could be foreigners, people could be Israel, but He starts, O Islands. And the term islands is the term very frequently used in the prophets to describe the land to the west in the Mediterranean Sea, whether they are separate islands or whether they are coastlands, across the Sea, if you refer to the area of Greece, for instance, that is all included in the prophets under the title of islands. There is a great part of Greece was islands, but then there is a big peninsula, part of the mainland there, and that is all included under the isles, or the same word can mean the coastlands. Well, He is then addressing people who are not Israelites, people who are evidently not believers in God at all. He is addressing them in chapter 41.

At the beginning. O islands; and let the people renew their strength let these different nations come and see what they're going to have to say about this. Well, what are you going to have to say, what is the situation? Verse 2, the Lord claims to have done something. Who raised up the righteous man from the east, called him to his foot, gave the nations before him, and made him rule over kings? he gave them as the dust to his sword, and as driven stubble to his bow. He pursued them and passed safely; even by the way he had not gone with his feet. Who has wrought, and done it, calling the generations from the beginning?" ~~He~~ Now if these verses 2, 3, and 4 were to be read today in the average church, and then you would ask the people what they mean, do you think many people would have idea whatever they meant? Suppose the minister got up and just simply gave them the question, verse 2, Who raised up the righteous man from the east, and called him to his foot, gave the nations before him, and made him rule over kings? They 'd say what on earth are you talking about? It is not a general declaration that has relevance to all situations. It is a specific declaration of a specific situation. Here is a situation where someone has come from the east, and has pursued and passed safely by ways he had never been before, and before him kings have fallen and been

like dust to his sword, and as driven stubble to his bow. In other words here is a description of one who has made a very great tremendous conquest, a series of aggressions that have been completely successful in conquering one nation after another. And if you look over at the book of Daniel, as we've already noticed, we find an exact parallel to this. There are various things in Daniel that could be thought of as a parallel, but there is one which is not only very similar to it but which when it is compared with the other evidence there seems to be exactly the same thing that he is talking about. We find it Daniel 8.3, then I lifted up my eyes and saw and behold there stood before the river a ram which had two horns and the two horns were high, one was higher than the other, and the higher came up last. I saw the ram pushing westward and northward and southward, so that no beast might stand before him, neither were there any that could deliver out of his hand, but he did according to his will and became great. And that is exactly what was described over here. Our passage here simply says he comes from the east, Daniel says he pushes westward and northward and southward, it doesn't say he pushes eastward. He comes from the east, Isaiah. And so there is a situation where there is a force in the east moves westward and then northward and then southward. And we have historically a situation where exactly that was done. We have Cyrus who from being a petty prince secures power over the Medes, such power over them that his own group, the Persians, come to be thought of as dominating the empire, and it's no longer thought of as the Medes but the Medes and the Persians. And Cyrus the Persian gets control of the whole empire of the Medes and pushes west along the area north of Mesopotamia, and then he pushes north into Asia Minor and conquers city after city, country after country, till all of Asia Minor is conquered and having done that, then he turns south and attacks Babylon, and even goes on down further. Yes? (6 1/4) Yes, well there is a problem. If we had no other passage but this we would immediately say how can this refer to Cyrus? But we have other passages. We have one which calls him a venomous bird, which is quite a designation. And we have other passage which mention him by name, so the parallel

to succeeding passages makes it absolutely clear that there is no question that he is the one spoken of. Now that particular phrase we want to look at in the Hebrew, before we are through. But first I just want to be sure we have the general situation in mind. Let's for the moment leave the word righteousness till a little later. But here is a picture of a great force coming, and it's a force which is conquering and destroying and ravaging, and overcoming, and overwhelming. And this force comes and the nations and the islands, the regions way off to the west, as far as Greece and the many Greek colonies in Asia Minor, they all are filled with perplexity at this tremendous thing that is happening. What are they going to do? In the face of this great aggressor? So we have chapter 42, not a general expression of emotions that could fit many different times, and describe God's dealing with mankind in such a way that they can be referred to the life of any individual, almost, but here we have a specific historical situation, and in this historical situation we have God challenging the people to explain it, what are you going to do about it, and as you go on, you find He is not merely interested in the nations but interested in their gods, and (8 1/4) proof that they amount to anything. He claims that He is the one who has brought this great force into the world, that He has brought it forth for His own purpose. Now I find it difficult at this point to decide whether it is best to go on and see the whole situation clearly, or to stop and linger on the verse a little. I think we better perhaps stop on the verse before we go on and see the rest of the situation. Now this particular verse is a very difficult one to ~~be~~ render literally. Does anybody have a copy here of the ~~RVS~~ RSV? Mr. Miller that is excellent. Could everybody look at their English Bible now and see verse 2, and now Mr. Miller read it to us in the RSV. And everybody watch and see if it is identical or somewhat different. (stu.9) Yes, now as you see, aside from one phrase there is not a great difference between that verse and the KJ, but there is a very striking difference in that particular verse. Now we better look at the Hebrew Bible and how many of you have your Hebrew Bible with you? Of course,

everyone should have their Hebrew Bible with them, because while he has so far largely getting principles that we can get from examination of the English, there will be many times when we will want to look at the precise word and see their exact bearing. And so let us all look now at Isaiah 41, and there in Isa. 41, all of you who have your Hebrew Bible, and you better always bring it as we go on from here, because we will need every now and then to look at it closely, even when it has not been specifically assigned. Now this has not been specifically assigned, but I'm sure Mr. Oliver would be glad to feed it to us at sight. At least a part of it. Mr. Oliver would you begin at the beginning of verse 2. (stu. 10 1/2) Well, let us say in verse 2, the first line, how many words do you have there, Mr. Oliver, yes, six, and how many of those first six do you know? (I see righteous, and I see from) From? Where's from? (stu.) How many see from on that line? Where do you see from? The third word. (stu. 11 1/2) What's, do you know? The last word of the line? His foot. Now you know the first word, don't you, me. Yes, in Hebrew, don't you know, me is who, and who is he, and he is she. But she isn't me. Well, this then is who. And then the next word you probably wouldn't know, it's not near as common. Who has stirred up or raised up, and then min mizrah is from eastward. Who has raised up from the east, and what's your next word? Righteous? I wouldn't say righteous. What is the Hebrew for righteous? Mr. Cohen, do you know? (12 1/2) Yes, well, what is the adjective, righteous? TSadiq. Yes with a double vowel. This is not the adjective righteous, this is the noun righteousness. Now if you say someone is a man of righteousness, we can say in English he is a man of righteousness, but we're more apt to say he is a righteous man. But where is the man in the verse, Mr. Oliver? (13) Who called him, did you say? (13 1/4) Yes, better, he will call him. He will call him, what? To his foot. Well, now he will call him to his foot, what does that mean? The "he will call" can be a preclenative, that is, "He is steadily calling," "he is constantly calling," "he regularly calls," that is equally (13 3/4)

as an interpretation of it...

C.20. (1/2)

...and so the word call can also mean to meet. I think all of you know that is call or meet, so this can be a relative clause, who has raised up from the east, righteousness meets him at his ^{step, at his} foot. It can be that way, or it can be who has raised up from the east, and then you can include the word righteous with that, if you want, and then make a new phrase, he will or he does, call him or meet him, and the syntax of the RSV interpretation is altogether possible. See, there's no and here, the KJ says who raised up the righteous man from the east and called him to his foot. The other way, the RSV makes it, who raised up from the east, one who meets him at his foot. (1 1/2)

The only really vital difference ~~is~~ the KJ and the RSV here is the matter of sediq, what does sediq mean? If you were to look up in a Young's Concordance in the back, and see how it's translated in the KJ Bible you will probably find that it's translated righteousness, in the KJ two or three hundred times. I don't think you'll ever find it translated victory in the KJV. Yes, Mr. (2) Yes, just or righteous, they are pretty close aren't they? Except that "just" we're more apt to think of particular dealings with individuals, whereas "righteous" we're more apt to think of our dealings with God. But both of them mean that which is correct and as it should be, in this relationship. It-- as an offhand guess, tsadiq might be translated righteous 150 times and just maybe 7 times. But this noun tsedeg is very commonly righteous. Now Brown, Driver and Briggs gives a few cases where it claims that victory is the correct meaning but this is one case where it (2 3/4)

I personally am very, very skeptical about its ~~ever~~ meaning victory. Although it's easy to see where the idea comes from. Righteousness is not simply used of a man who is free from flaws, (3) negative, it can be a positive. We read, who ~~of~~ the Lord established in righteousness in the earth, it is establishing that which is right. And consequently it doesn't merely mean having an idea or a passive characteristic, but it may mean making this ~~own~~ character effective.

So God establishes righteousness, there is the dynamic idea of it, of succeeding in the righteous purpose for which ~~it~~ is undertaken. And then the RSV~~κ~~ claims that from that you go on, simply meaning victory, of which I know of no proof whatever that it ever means just victory, but if you were to take it as just victory, it would fit Cyrus perfectly. Cyrus is the one who just is victorious all the time. Victory is meeting him (4)

He is tremendously successful, but I don't think we should do that. They do that, the RSV, ~~with the~~ Zecharias where it speaks in the KJ of one that comes riding on an ass, just and having salvation. They translate it victorious and triumphant, or something like that, which is going quite a distance from what the Hebrew words are. Of course, he is victorious or He doesn't bring salvation unless He is victorious in bringing it. But He is victorious not just for anything, victorious in the right way. Yes? (4 1/2) It is hard to think of an aggressive conqueror like Cyrus taking nation after nation, calling that justice. Maybe after he gets there he is very just, but certainly the process is hardly one we think of ordinarily as justice. But I incline to think that either it is righteousness, his meeting God at every step, or that, who has raised up from the east righteousness, in other words, it's not the man, but the movement, the process, it is that which is going to accomplish God's purpose, and therefore is a movement which can be characterized as the bringing in of righteousness. Who is the one who has established what he considers righteous, by bringing one from the east who is so victorious, (5 1/2)

Yes? (stu.) No, I think that must refer to Cyrus, don't you? Righteous. Either who has raised up righteousness from the east, he meets him or calls him to his feet, or at his foot, or else who has raised up from the east one whom righteousness is meeting him, at his feet. (6)

It is a common Hebrew usage in a relative clause, to repeat the pronoun, like you~~s~~ say, the man whom Abraham killed, would be apt to be in Hebrew, the man whom Abraham killed him. The him would be the object of the clause, which often is the relative thing that it refers back to. Yes? (6 1/4) Yes, well, Cyrus can be thought of as characterized by righteousness ^{or by justice, --} ~~but just as~~ we don't know enough about

Cyrus to know. But at least the whole thing that happened was part of God's righteous plan. Who is accomplishing--these nations he is coming into think he is an awfully wicked aggressor. Who is bringing this great aggressor from the east, but the Lord says, who is bringing righteousness from the east, you say, how is this righteous, well, he says, I'm bringing it, it's to fulfill my purpose, it is righteous. Yes, that's right. So that the main thing here is not the question about the righteousness but the general situation in which a great tremendous conqueror is coming, what is going to happen in that situation? Mr. Myers?

(7 1/2) Yes, who raised up from the east and then what did he raise up, the relative clause without the relative pronoun, one whom righteousness either meets him or calls him. ~~W~~ To his feet, or at his step. Either is a possibility. Yes?

(7 3/4) The conquest is the thing in the whole context. The conquest is people scared to death because of the great conqueror.

(stu.8 1/4) It seems to me that to attribute it to Cyrus, we don't know, there may be lots about him we don't know, because there isn't a great deal known about him. But that my guess would be that rather than a description of his person it is a description of the result of what he does, the accomplishment of God's righteous purpose. Who is it that is bringing righteousness from the east? That is he is bringing a force from the east that is accomplishing what God considers righteousness. Or who is it that he is bringing from the east, one whom righteousness is leading at every step, that is, God's power, God's desire is effectually using him and moving him forward. Which it is between those two, I just don't know. But the ^{big} thing in it is, here is this tremendous world conqueror moving forward and it frightens the people greatly to see this happen. And so we find that verse 4 the Lord makes His claim, Who did this? I the Lord. God says to the idols, He says to the nations, to the west, He says, who has done all this, why, He says, I God am the one who is responsible for this (9 1/2)

Now that is something which by analogy you can apply to Hitler, to Khrushchev, or anybody else you want, but it is not speaking about them, it certainly is not speaking about Christ, it is speaking specifically about this conqueror at that time. So this specific one whom he speaks of, here is the

reaction to him, what happens. What do the idols do about it? Verse 5, the isles saw it, the Greeks knew it, the people in Asia Minor knew it, the Greek colonies know it, they see it and they are afraid. The ends of the earth are afraid, they come, they help every one his neighbor, they all say be of good courage, but then what they do, the carpenter encouraged the goldsmith, and he that smooths with the hammer him that smote with he anvil. What do they mean by all that, the goldsmith and the carpenter, they're not making bombs, the goldsmith wouldn't make bombs, they're not making spears, they goldsmith wouldn't make spears, what are they making ? They're making new idols. It is idolatry, they are making new idols to protect them from this great event, for a deliverance from this tremendous danger that is come from the east, they are all filled with terror, and so they build new idols, and they say it's ready for the soldering and they fasten it with nails so it'll stand up, an idol can't even stand alone, it has to be fastened with nails, in order to keep it standing up so it won't fall over. Well, this is the reaction of the ~~isles~~ isles, filled with fear because they saw the coming of the conqueror Cyrus. What about Israel? Would Israel be afraid also, well verse 9 says Israel, you're in a different situation, v.8--verse 9 says, you're the one whom I've taken from the ends of the earth, and called from thee from the chief men thereof, and said unto thee, Thou art my servant; I have chosen thee and not cast thee away. Fear thou not, for I am with thee, be not dismayed, for I am thy God. Now verse 10 is a wonderful verse, a general declaration of God's presence with His people, and we are entitled to quote it in any connection we want because that great thought is there, but the immediate application of it in the specific situation is that God is saying to the people of Israel, don't you be scared of your lives, of Cyrus, the way all these other people are. They are terrified because Cyrus is coming, they don't know what is going to happen, now don't you be terrified of him, because I brought him, he is part of my plan, and you are different from these nations. They are frightened of his coming, because they don't know what he is going to do to them, but you ought to know that I the Lord have brought him and control him and am leading him, and therefore nothing

will happen to you that isn't my definite plan in connection with him. It's like ~~er~~^{Dr.} Dr. A. V. Conrad, pastor of the Park Street Congregational Church in Boston about 40 years ago, and they had a big comet in the sky which some scientists said was going to go right through the (12 3/4) and they said do you think that this planet is apt to collide with the earth and that'll be the end of the world ? They asked quite a few ministers and other prominent people, and what A.V. Conrad ~~said~~, when they asked him, got to headlines, got the attention, because it was so vividly expressed. He said I don't know whether that comet is ~~eg~~ going to hit this earth or not, I don't know, but he said I know this, that ~~is~~ it's not just blind chance, that comet, he said, has got a pilot and he said that pilot is running that comet and he knows where he's going to run it and it's entirely in his hands and therefore His will is going to be worked out. Well, that is what God is saying to these people. He says Cyrus fills the people with terror, the islands, the heathen, the gentiles, they don't know what's going to ~~ha~~ happen to them when Cyrus comes, but you don't need to feel that way, because I am controlling Cyrus, I am going to accomplish my purpose from him, and you are in a special relationship to me, and what ~~relationship~~ are they in to him, that they shouldn't be frightened? Why they are his servants, thou Israel, are my servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham my friend. But it's very interesting that He does not start the statement, Israel his friend, Israel is his friend, the one who is chosen, but starts thou art my servant. In verse 9 again he says thou art my servant, and so here we have the theme of the servant of the Lord introduced for the first time...

C.21. (1/2)

...that's what he said, no question about it, Thou Israel, are my servant. Jacob whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham my friend. Israel is God's servant. What's that got to do with this whole picture? ~~W~~ These idol-worshippers, these heathen, they are people who can become terribly frightened when something goes wrong in the world, and when Cyrus comes, they don't know what's going to happen. But Israel is the servant

000533

will happen to you that isn't my definite plan in connection with him. It's like ~~at~~^B Dr. A. V. Conrad, pastor of the Park Street Congregational Church in Boston about 40 years ago, and they had a big comet in the sky which some scientists said was going to go right through the (12 3/4) and they said do you think that this planet is apt to collide with the earth and that'll be the end of the world? They asked quite a few ministers and other prominent people, and what A.V. Conrad ~~said~~, when they asked him, got to headlines, got the attention, because it was so vividly expressed. He said I don't know whether that comet is ~~is~~ going to hit this earth or not, I don't know, but he said I know this, that ~~is~~ it's not just blind chance, that comet, he said, has got a pilot and he said that pilot is running that comet and he knows where he's going to run it and it's entirely in his hands and therefore His will is going to be worked out. Well, that is what God is saying to these people. He says Cyrus fills the people with terror, the islands, the heathen, the gentiles, they don't know what's going to ~~happ~~ happen to them when Cyrus comes, but you don't need to feel that way, because I am controlling Cyrus, I am going to accomplish my purpose from him, and you are in a special relationship to me, and what ~~relationship~~ relationship are they in to him, that they shouldn't be frightened? Why they are his servants, thou Israel, are my servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham my friend. But it's very interesting that He does not start the statement, Israel his friend, Israel is his friend, the one who is chosen, but starts thou art my servant. In verse 9 again he says thou art my servant, and so here we have the theme of the servant of the Lord introduced for the first time...

C.21. (1/2)

...that's what he said, no question about it, Thou Israel, are my servant. Jacob whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham my friend. Israel is God's servant. What's that got to do with this whole picture? ~~W~~ These idol-worshippers, these heathen, they are people who can become terribly frightened when something goes wrong in the world, and when Cyrus comes, they don't know what's going to happen. But Israel is the servant

of the One who has established the universe, He is the servant of the One that controls Cyrus, that means that He has Israel here for a purpose, and God is going to see that His purpose is fulfilled, and therefore if they are on the way to accomplish His purpose, they need not fear. I had an experience 20 years ago when I suddenly myself due to poor planning on my part, but not directly so, due to poor planning I suddenly found myself taking my last drink of water out of my canteen, on a hot day in the desert, a long, long ways to go and there wasn't any more water. And I took my last drop out of the canteen, and all of a sudden I realized the situation and it might take me days to get any more water, actually I got it in three days, but three days (2)

And I got panicked, thought my ohmy will I ever get out of here alive? People have been in that situation and have been so panicky they have just walked straight forward, walked across roads, ~~that~~ across tracks and everything, and never even have seen them. Others have gotten so swollen and couldn't talk at all, couldn't say anything that people could understand, just lost all contact with reality, as a result of that sort of situation out there in ^{those arid lands.} ~~the canyon~~. But I felt, I was going to bed, I was going to go to sleep when I felt thirsty, and I reached over and took a drink and all of a sudden realized it was the last drop and no more within several days trip. And I felt panicky, would I ever get out of here alive. The day before I had been terribly thirsty, when I had water, and would I get out of there alive? Well, I was panicky, and then I realized, ~~I~~ said the Lord has given me a special job, the Lord has a definite work for me to accomplish, I do not believe that work is finished, I am confident that He has work for me to do while I am here, and I didn't (3)

I didn't just go ahead and not bother about things, I was careless, it was my fault/ but not foolhardy, and I said I believe the Lord is going to bring me safe through. I didn't have ~~many~~ ^{another} minute's panic after that, I had some misery. Mouth was so dry that if I put a little sugar in it tasted like sand, take your finger scrape it out, to get it out, and when I finally got water three days later there was so much mucous in my throat

that it took an hour and a half to get the water through, it was quite an experience, it was quite an experience, but there was no more panic, I was convinced the Lord had further work for me to do, and was going to bring me out (3 3/4)

But in this situation here, here is Cyrus coming, here is this great attack, plunder, aggression, what's going to happen? Well, Israel--these gentiles, these heathen, these people, they don't know what's going to happen to them, Cyrus may be nice to some, he may kill others, he may plunder, his army may just go through this place and that, well they--maybe his army may be just as bad toward you, but ^{don't} you feel--I control him, his army, and you are my servant, I have a work for you to do, and you notice He doesn't start you are my friend. He doesn't start, you are my pet, so be sure I'll take care of you, no. He starts, you are my servant, and goes on, the seed of Abraham, my friend, the one I have chosen, but the fundamental idea is that they are chosen for a purpose, there is an objective which God has in mind when He calls Israel in the first place, and even though Israel has failed and has had to be sent off into exile, God's purpose is going to be fulfilled, He is going to accomplish the purpose, He has called Israel for the accomplishment of His purpose, Israel is His servant, and therefore Israel can know that it will survive, that God's purpose will be accomplished. So that is the first definite note in a specific situation, aside from the general situation of chapter 40, that is the first time in a specific situation that we have the assurance that Israel is going to survive, and the assurance is based on the fact that Israel is God's servant, that is an introduction of our idea of a servant. Now you might have nothing more about it, you might go on ^{and have} to some other aspects, (5 1/2), comfort and so on, and you say this is just a passing mention, but we have many cases in the next ten or twelve chapters, where there is reference to the servant of the Lord, thou art Israel my servant, frequent references to the servant of the Lord, and so there are enough of them that we can say there is a new idea here introduced, a new suggestion of an idea which is

spoken about so much that you can think of it as special theme, the theme of the servant of the Lord, and it is so important that I'm calling our whole section here, "The Servant of the Lord Introduced," because **He** is introduced in these chapters, and then is developed still ~~more~~ and more as you go on, till you come to one of the great notes of this section of the book, the Servant of the Lord, that is introduced in this very natural way, Israel is God's servant and God has a purpose to be accomplished and it is for the accomplishment of this purpose that He has called Israel into the world. So that is our introduction to our idea of the servant of the Lord, and you notice ~~how~~ it's brought in, Jacob whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham, my friend, and He has taken him from the ends of the earth, He takes Abraham way from Ur of the Chaldees, and brought him way over to Palestine all that long trip for His purpose, and He says, Israel you are my servant, I have chosen you and not cast you away. So after that we get wonderful words of comfort, addressed to Israel in the situation, but you see how the contrast is developed here, you see the difference between chapter 40, ~~at~~ there is a wonderful emotional picture of difference, emotional idea, the theme, words of comfort, words of stress on God's power, and so forth, all that, things that continue, and then the specific situation as the great conqueror comes, and the nations are all filled with terror, and looking to their idols for help but **He** says Israel don't be afraid, you're my servant, you're the seed of Abraham whom I have chosen. Going to have to stop there for this week. Look on and study on into through chapters 41, 42, 43, noticing particularly what is said about the servant of the Lord, being sure you have the various main things in mind, and ask yourself this question, everytime you see a reference, who is this servant, that is here spoken of, exactly who or what is it?. **W**ome people say this time it's Israel, this time it's Christ, this time it's the believing remnant, how does he jump around to mean a lot of different people and call them all the Servant of the Lord? Does He? What does **He** mean by it? ~~The~~^A most interesting problem.

...last time we began at chapter 41, and chapter 41 we noticed that we have left the realm of the general, we are now not dealing with great general principles but with a specific situation, the first verse doesn't tell you what the specific situation is, but the second verse makes it absolutely clear what the situation is. How far had we gotten in discussing it, you remember exactly? So then we find out that from verses 2 and 3 we had a specific situation before us here and in view of that situation, verse 1 calls on the people to justify themselves before the Lord, and after He has shown the foolishness of the enemies of God, their inability to call the generations from the beginning, to do such things as this, to proclaim in advance that Cyrus would come. Then He turns to Israel, verse 8, ^{we looked at} and verse 8 and 9, and saw the difference in His attitude toward Israel from His attitude toward the ungodly nations. Now ~~th~~ back in that 4th verse, there seems to be a claim--calling the generations from the beginning--a claim to having predicted these things in advance. Skinner, in his commentary, says that this simply is a general claim that God has ordered all things through the ages, calling the generations from the beginning. If you take it as impresses me as more likely, as being a specific claim that He does predict, has predicted these things, Who hath wrought and done it, calling the generations from the beginning, if you take it that way, then it is a strong argument for this having been written by Isaiah long before the time of Christ. If Cyrus was already there, the people already seeing this happen, he was already an active participant in the will of (11 1/2) Then for God to-- God can say I brought Cyrus, but why would He say, calling the generations from the beginning. Of course, Skinner suggests the break should be between the two verses, after "who has wrought and done it," so that the first claim of the Lord would be, "who raised up the righteous man from the east, who has wrought and done it," and then he stops and starts a new sentence, "calling the generations from the beginning, I the Lord the first and with the last, I am he." In other words, God is one who always plans everything out but not specifically tied up with (12) So I

would like to ask the Graduate students who have been looking up certain things in particular commentaries, so you cover all the commentaries between you, look up this particular point and see if you can get further light on it. This place, "Calling the generations from the beginning." What do the commentaries feel about its going with what precedes or not, what do they feel it means? Is it just a general statement or is it a specific claim of prediction? Well, we notice in verse 8 and 9 He turns to Israel, and says that Israel need not be afraid, because even though these terrible world-shaking occur, Israel can know that God is doing these things and that God is going to protect Israel through them because Israel is His servant, and so we have the matter then of the servant of the Lord, and sometimes very soon it would be good if everyone here would take that phrase, "the servant of the Lord," "my servant," whatever you want to say, it means the Lord's servant, however it is expressed, you won't have difficulty in finding all the ^{between chapter 40} cases/and the rest of the section we're dealing with this year. There are quite a number but there won't be too many to take a great amount of time in locating them, and having located them, find out what is the servant, who is the servant, what is the evidence in the text? That specifically I want every member of the class to do very soon. Bring me in a list of all passages in which God says that somebody or something is His servant, or says something about His servant. Put the passage in in the first part, the reference. And then in the next column say who is the servant here? Who is He talking about? Now here He says Israel thou art my servant. Who is the servant? No question, is there? He says it specifically, Thou Israel art my servant. So you put a statement over there, Israel is the servant. Now this will probably take a couple of hours to do and I don't know whether you'd all have that much time before tomorrow afternoon or not. How many would have? Nobody? ...Well, let's try then to not discuss the servant until next week, have that done first. I think I can go ahead and discuss it but I think we'd get more benefit out of it if you did this first. So we will skip passages dealing with the servant, and...

...I would like this done with a column on the left saying the passage, and then the next one says who it is. Now if it's perfectly clear like this, why that's very simple to say, if there is a problem about it, you might discuss the problem a little bit, in the third column. And then in a fourth column, briefly summarize what it said about the servant. That won't be difficult. Now in this case it is said that the servant need not fear because he belongs to God. That's what it says here. You can briefly summarize what is said about the servant in the passage. You don't need to go into full detail. Get the general idea, quite briefly, to compare the different passages. Now this says, Thou Israel art my servant. If all through, every time it uses the word servant, it is quite evident that it is Israel He is talking about, then that's what it is, the servant is Israel. But you will find some passages where you will find it very, very difficult to think that this is Israel, particularly the whole of chapter 53. The usual Jewish interpreter says this is Israel, how can Isaiah 53 describe Israel? And if it isn't Israel, why isn't it Israel? The third column can give the reason. Why it isn't Israel, or what it is, or why it is what you think it is. And maybe you expect the Lord to use the same term about two or three different things, ones right along in a row, now Delitsch, I understand, the commentary says, the servant is like a triangle, like a pyramid. Sometimes you look at the base of it, that's Israel, sometimes you look at the middle, that is the godly remnant, sometimes you look at the top, that's Christ. Well, that doesn't sound at all sensible to me. Maybe you find it very satisfactory. Maybe not. Maybe you could think of something better. But put enough time--not for tomorrow but for next week--put enough time on it to have a really good idea what you're thinking about, what the servant is, in these different categories. So we have looked at this first one, fairly fully I think, but we will not look at others much until after you have that written. We looked at verse 9, in which the statement was made that repetition even more fully of what was in verse 8. Thou art my servant, I have chosen thee and not cast thee away. If God has chosen one as His servant, we can be quite sure that God will not cast that

one away until the work is done for which that one was chosen. I might choose somebody to do a task for me and after the second day of doing it, I might find that they were absolutely unable to do the task at all, and I would have to cast them away, and look about for another. But if God chooses one you would expect that God would know what He was doing when He chose, and if God says this one need not fear because the Lord has chosen him as His servant, you could feel that God is going to see to it that the work is done, ~~yes~~ He may not (3 3/4) He may have to give special assistance to us, but He will not cast us away. ~~Dr.~~

Dr. Philip Howard who was publisher of the Sunday School Times for many years, told me how Dr. Henry Clay Trumbull who was editor of it, had been head of the whole business before he died, (4) selected Trumbull to be his associate, and Trumbull found that the work was proving difficult and he questioned whether he was capable of doing it, and he went to Howard, and Howard went to Trumbull and asked him if he didn't think that he should drop out, and he said that Dr. Trumbull said to him, he said, Phil, he said, it was the father of Philip Howard, Jr., he said, Phil, I'd rather fail with you, than to succeed without you. So he said that after Dr. Trumbull said that to him, he said he buckled in and did the very best he could, and that ~~he~~ he wasn't going to fail under any conditions, after he talked that way to him. But of course Trumbull, under those circumstances, would have been ready to do anything he possibly could to help him, to give him advice, or to help him out of any bad mistakes he made, but we can be sure in addition to that that he knew pretty thoroughly what sort of man he was when he first took him, and when he started the arrangement. He wouldn't talk that way to just anybody. So that in this case it sounds very similar to that, doesn't it, where the Lord said, thou art my servant, I have chosen thee, and not cast thee away. Fear thou not, for I am with thee, be not dismayed for I am thy God I will strengthen thee, yea I will help thee, yea I will uphold thee by the right hand of my righteousness. That 10th verse we have a right, any of us, to apply to our-

selves. If we are convinced that the Lord has chosen us to be His servants, to do a task for Him, we have a perfect right to take this verse and apply it to our lives, and to count upon the promise. But as it stands in the context it is specifically speaking to Israel, so that when we apply it to ourselves we are applying the principle rather than ~~applying~~ saying this verse is specifically addressed to me. But the verse expresses a principle which, if we truly are the Lord's servants, we have a right to apply it to ourselves. I did not use this specific verse but one time when I found myself in a dire situation where I didn't know whether I could get out of it alive or not, a situation into which I had stumbled through carelessness on my part, I had not gotten into it with any just foolhardiness, but I had stumbled into it carelessly, and overlooked certain factors I shouldn't have overlooked, and I found myself in that situation where I didn't know whether (6 1/2) ~~lying~~ lying in the sun, many days' journey from any human being for the next hundred years or not, and after a few minutes of panic then I came to the conviction that the Lord had trained me for a certain work and the work for which He had trained me was not yet complete, this was in 1941 this happened, it was not yet complete, but there was more of it that the Lord was expecting me to do, and that I had not stumbled into that situation just through foolhardiness, and therefore I felt that He was going to bring me out, and for the next three days during which the situation still hung in the balance, humanly speaking, I was convinced that I had nothing to fear and I had no more fear at all, I had some misery but no fear, whatever, I knew I was getting out and that's all there was to it. But it was the same thing which is expressed here. Of course, they were not in a situation ~~wh~~ like I was, which terminated in two or three days, they were in a situation which might take decades to determine. And therefore the Lord ~~reque~~ expresses the principle here and drives it home to them. Thou art my servant, I have chosen thee and not cast thee away. Fear thou not, for I am with thee, be not dismayed, for I am thy God. And then verse 11, we have the negative ~~de~~ side of the picture: Behold, all they that were incensed against thee shall be ~~shamed~~ ^{ashamed} and

confounded: they shall be as nothing; and they that strive with thee shall perish. And here again there is a principle which applies to those who are the Lord's, who are His servants, to do His will, that those who try to destroy them, God will take care of. We do not need to seek personal vengeance against them, there is no need of it, the Lord has promised that He will take care of it, and we can depend upon it that He will. Specifically here, He is speaking to Israel and therefore this is part and parcel of the whole passage with its predictions of the downfall of the Babylonian empire and the destruction of the oppressor of \emptyset Israel. But the general principle applies in many situations though specifically here it is dealing with that situation.

Then verse 12 of course is a continuation of it. Thou shalt seek them and not find them. Them that consented with thee: they that war against thee shall be as nothing, and as a thing of nought. Now there the question might be raised, whether anyone, everyone in general has a right to apply this particularly to themselves, I would certainly question that. I think we can apply verse 11 to quite an extent, but when it comes to verse 12, they that war against thee shall be as nothing, and as a thing of ~~nought~~ nought, thou shalt seek them and not find them. Martin Luther certainly was a true servant of the Lord, and He accomplished as great a work as any man that ever lived, in the cause of Christ, and Martin Luther's enemies of Rome were determined to destroy him, determined utterly to wreck him, but, and Martin Luther had a right to take the promises of God to himself, but as for Rome becoming a thing of nought, where you look for it and don't find it, Rome today is stronger than it was in Luther's day, it is a tremendous force, which is reaching forward and taking over more and more of our own nation. Didn't somebody say that of the three top men in Washington now, seems to me they said two of them were Roman Catholics and that they thought Kennedy was against having McCormack chosen as head of --as speaker of the house because though he would very much like to have him, if he did it would make so many Roman Catholics in top positions that they thought

that he was afraid of the repercussions. They are moving forward in many, many ways, and the Jesuits revitalized the whole organization, have made it an effective instrument against everything that Martin Luther stood for. Much more effective instrument than it was in His day. Now there are ~~places~~^{cases} where God permits that which is harmful and destructive to succeed and to succeed to a very great extent. So in this case these statements, they shall be as nothing, ~~we sa~~ are certainly true of the Babylonian empire. It became as nothing, completely disappeared, it was ended, it never had any force again. God was giving this specific declaration about that specific situation. Now there are many other cases, of course, where the same thing worked up. You take when Hitler was determined to destroy the Jewish people, utterly determined to destroy them. Now it looked as if he was going to succeed, and if a godly Jew reading Isaiah, would read these words, which were applied to the Babylonian empire, and would apply them to Hitler, they certainly have been worked out as far as Hitler is concerned and most of his associates. The Nazi movement is become absolutely a thing of nothing today. It has worked out in that way. And it will often work out, but it certainly does not always work out, it certainly has not in the case of the Romanist group. But I think that is an important thing in the interpretation of Scripture, is to distinguish between the immediate means, the immediate application, of a promise, a command, or a prediction, and the correct applications of the principle which may be made. Because very often there are applications which can altogether correctly be made, and in other cases there are applications where it is questionable whether it can wholly be applied in a particular instance. And of course the predictions about Cyrus, we have no right to apply them to any other situation, they are very specific about Cyrus, and we have no right they will necessarily apply to any other thing that occurs. They are specific predictions of most specific facts.

I never heard of anybody trying to take those predictions in two different senses. Or of trying to apply the principle of His specific declaration about one man to specific situations. Yes? (13) ...that is said to God's servant, that those who war against him

will be made as nothing, and that did happen in the case of Israel, ~~relating~~^{relating} ~~relating~~ to the Babylonian empire, so I said that when we are sure we're God's servants, ~~th~~ and we're faced by some~~thing~~/ great enemy, that is a question, have we a right to apply this, and say this will work out? Well, of course, if you take the long range you can't. Martin Luther could say here is the church of Rome, it claims dominion over the whole of Christendom. He could say the time will come when this force will be nothing and of course that is true because God will bring to nought entirely all that is contrary to His will. But He certainly hasn't done it yet. 300 years later it is stronger than it was when Luther himself was speaking, so that we certainly can't apply it on the short range, necessarily to every particular enemy of God's servant. ...

C.23. (1/2)

...the 13th verse again is a wonderful~~y~~ promise of God to Israel in this situation of Cyrus' coming, but it is given to Israel as God's servant whom God has chosen and if you are convinced that you are God's servant whom God has chosen, even though it is in a different relationship than what applies to Israel here, you can apply this to yourself. This 13th verse is a wonderful promise that we have a perfect right to quote, as long as we are sure we belong to the Lord. And number 14, fear not, thou worm Jacob--isn't that an unusual expression? Fear not, thou worm Jacob, and ye men of Israel; I will help thee, saith the Lord, and thy redeemer, the Holy One of Israel.

I received a printed letter just a couple of days ago from a very godly man who had two pages of his letter headed with this verse, "Fear not, thou worm Jacob," and he told about certain experiences which he had had, in which he had overextended himself in trying to accomplish a great deal in the Lord's service and had taken on too much, and ~~th~~ as a result certain things had gone wrong, and he had to face up to them and had to make certain changes and he said the Lord was driving this thought to his heart, the Lord's work is not dependent on him at all, he is just a worm in the Lord's sight, but that he need not fear if he truly belongs to the Lord. The Lord will use him.

So he said the Lord crippled his judgment in order to bring him to a proper realization of his relation to the Lord. It was a very well-expressed statement showing the application of a verse like this which can be given by any Christian. This is applied to the people of Israel, he says, you're my servants, don't fear. But then He says, fear not, thou work Jacob, certainly we couldn't get an expression of greater humility than that, work Jacob. He is declaring that it is not because of any goodness of theirs, or any greatness of theirs, any special abilities of theirs, any special reasons for their deserving God's approbation, that they need not fear, but solely because God has chosen them, because they belong to Him, Him alone, and He has chosen them and they are His servants, therefore, even though only a worm, they need not fear. And if we begin to think that we're a good deal more than a worm, why the chances are the Lord will find He has to humble us too, but that we realize here, only a worm, but a worm in His hands, can become a tremendous force. If we realize that, we need not fear, but know that He will use us just as fully as He chooses to, if we have this attitude of humility before Him. I will help thee, saith the Lord. And then verse 15 is a rather figurative verse, 15 and 16 together. I will make thee a new sharp threshing instrument having teeth, thou shalt thresh the mountains, and beat them small, and shalt make the hills as chaff. Thou shalt fan them and the wind shall carry them away, and the whirlwind shall scatter them, and thou shalt rejoice in the Lord, and shalt glory in the Holy One of Israel. This comes very near to saying that the Jews are going to destroy the Babylonians by their armed attack, doesn't it? It comes very near to saying that they are going to rise up in insurrection, against the Babylonians, and ~~etc~~ utterly defeat them and wreck them. But it doesn't say that. It suggests that that is what it means. But of course that's not what it says and that's not what happened at all. It was through Cyrus' coming and conquering the Babylonian empire that Israel was relieved, and so these two verses though they seem ~~to be~~ to the people to mean something that they certainly didn't mean, ~~that~~ certainly didn't happen. It suggests that they would be the instrument to destroy

the Babylonian empire. Well, that is surely not it. But the servant of the Lord is going to thresh the mountains and beat them small, and fan them and the wind will carry them away, the servant of the Lord is going to accomplish to the very fullest the work that God has called the servant to do, that's certain, and these two verses do not say just what that work is. There is nothing in the verses to say that it means destruction of an empire or an army, they're so figurative it is hard to know just what they do mean, all we can say for sure is they mean that the work that the servant is to do is to be done to the very fullest. I think it is a case where superficial interpretation would easily lead people prior to the release from exile, to think they were going to destroy the Babylonian empire by their insurrection. And of course nothing of that kind happened at all. But He says thou shalt rejoice in the Lord and shall glory in the Holy One of Israel, as they see the work done, as they see themselves accomplishing what they are called to do, even though it is undoubtedly something very different from what they would suspect from these words. I mean what they would guess or generalize from these words. They are to rejoice in the Lord and glory in the Holy One of Israel, and that's very true of each of us, that if we are completely submitted to the Lord, completely consecrated to Him, and put Him first in everything, we can be sure that these two verses will apply to us and that we will be able to thresh the mountains. There are all kinds of sizes of mountains, there are the Himalayas, 30,000 feet high, I guess, and there are mountains, so-called, that are 500 feet high, depends what part of the country you're in and what the situation is. One may be called to be one and another one another one. I've known who wouldn't bother to climb a mountain that was several thousand feet high because they thought it was too easy, and something a few hundred feet high they think it is a tremendous feat to get up, there is variation in mountains, but whatever one of us is called to do, if we succeed in doing it for the Lord, we might be said to thresh the mountains. We will accomplish the work that He calls us to do if we're truly consecrated to Him, but it may be entirely different than what we think we ought to do, and we ~~be~~

may succeed in something that is what He wants us to do and fail ever to get a chance to do something that we think is the most important thing. You can't tell, now in this case, ^{if} the readers ^{of this} thought they were going to make an insurrection and destroy the Babylonian empire, they never even got a chance to make an insurrection, never even started it. But they did, the servant did the work the Lord called them to, but it's entirely different from what they would expect from this figure. But what a sharp change from verse 16 to verse 17. Here you're thinking of somebody threshing the mountains, beating them small, making the hills as chaff, so the wind can carry them away, and He says when the poor and needy seek water and there is none, their tongues fail for thirst, I the Lord will hear them, I the God of Israel will not forsake them. And so you think, just when you think how wonderful it is, that we're going to thresh the mountains, and we're going to do these tremendous things, just then you may find yourself poor and needy, seeking water, and you look to the Lord for help and He brings the help that He has promised. I the Lord will not forsake them, I the Lord will hear them. So that there is a rather sharp transition between the promises of 16 and the promise of 17, but they'll both work out in the life of any true servant of the Lord. Yes? (8 1/2) Well, it's hard to say. Certainly verse 8 says thou art my servant and everything that He continues to say fits together with it, because that is who He is talking to, He keeps right on talking to them, and I would think that we could certainly say that through verse 19, that everything that is said may be related to the servant theme, but we couldn't be dogmatic and say that it is. Though we can be sure that verses 8 and 9 are very specifically connected with the servant theme. From there on the succeeding verses, there is no evidence of any break, He is talking to the same people, they can be related but there is a possibility that that aspect might stop. I wouldn't be dogmatic, but I don't think we can interpret these succeeding verses without relating them to what preceded. Certainly the servant idea is very strongly stressed in verses 8 to 9. Then verse 18 of course is a continuation

of 17 , and verse 19 a further continuation. What does verse 19 mean: "I will plant in the wilderness the cedar, the shittah tree, and the myrtle, and the oil tree; I will set in the desert the fir tree, and the pine, and the box tree together." Is that a prediction that God is going to establish ⁱⁿ the wilderness way over here across the ocean in America, He is going to establish the great cedar of the Church of England, the shittah tree of the Presbyterian Church, the myrtle of the Baptist Church, the oil tree of the Methodist Church? Is this a specific promise of the building up of these great denominations? In years long after Isaiah spoke? Oh, there's another, there's still the fir tree, the pine and the box tree. You mean the box tree, the Hungarians, don't you? You see, we hadn't come to that yet. But that is the way many people interpret prophecy, and it would not be at all impossible that that might be exactly what He means, but you would need more light from concept to be dogmatic about it. And I would say that at any rate He does mean in verse 19, He means that He is going to cause to grow that which will be a blessing, doesn't He mean that? Isn't that the point of these trees. He is talking about the wilderness, the dry parched wilderness, and then He says He is going to plant trees, He means that He is going to establish that which will have some lasting quality to it. These are not just a temporary little shade, these are rather lasting qualities, He is going to make changes to bring that which is going to be a real blessing, to the needy people. And so certainly the establishment of true Christian denominations is a fulfillment, to some extent, of the general principles, but to apply them specifically would be without further evidence, to give us a right to, would be going quite beyond the Scripture. Yes? (11 3/4) Very good. This passage is from verse 17 to verse 20, it declares that God is going to bring great blessing to His people, He certainly is declaring that. Now He is very figurative in what He says. We know there are things that bring blessing, that bring health, comfort, that that is involved in it. Whether you can go beyond that and say that there are specific things included in it, you would have

to have either a definite statement somewhere else in Scripture to warrant it, or else you would have to have such a great similarity between the --certain of the statements here and certain of the particular things that fall into the general things, that it would be quite unmistakable, the relationship. Now as far as I know, we don't have. So I would say that as far as the servant of Israel is concerned, He is promising them that they will be able to have that which will make life more bearable. And when you think of the wilderness you think particularly of their trip back, back from the exile, and then you also think of when they get back to the land ^{that is} of desolate and devastated, you think of God bringing them water in the shade, but I think the prophecy [?] given ^{is} in sufficiently general terms that it applies to God's people from then on, not just to the immediate need. And certainly it applies from then on, because verses 15 and 16, they are certainly not specifically fulfilled in that generation, but they apply in a general sense. Then, we have, summarizing this section, verse 20, the result of God's doing all these wonderful things is going to be that they will see and know and consider and understand together that the hand of the Lord has done this, and the Holy One of Israel ~~is~~ has created it. The cause of having the witness is to witness to God's glory, God's goodness, God's grace and God's power. And He says that out of all that He is going to do there is to come a widespread witness, a widespread realization of God's wonderful power. Now you notice that the hand of the Lord has done this and the Holy One of Israel has created it. I believe the word is (14 1/4) barah there. I didn't look it up specifically but if it is, does that mean here, to bring something, make something out of nothing? It means to make a great change in something that was not there before, but does the word necessarily involve that there can be no previous substance involved in it...

C.24. (3/4)

...in Genesis that God created all things, bringing them into existence with no previous matter that could have naturally developed into it, that He produced ~~it~~ it, that the be-

ginning of all matter was God's causing it to come into existence, so there is a creation out of nothing, but does the word "create" alone teach that, can we derive that simply from the verse by itself. Well, if the word here is ~~brought-out~~ ^{barah}, it is ~~brought-out~~ barah, good--well, if it is, I would question whether this would fall in line with the statement that barah has to mean making something from nothing. It would mean making a situation that is very different, making quite a great, tremendous change that it does not necessarily completely rule out their being any previous thing there. I will open rivers in high places, fountains in the midst of the valleys. Does that mean that there was no water there before at all? Open it up, that means to make a channel so it could come up out of the ground, wouldn't necessarily mean a new creation of water that previously didn't exist. But He does say that the Lord has created it. If He said has created the world there would be no problem, it would be referring back to the original creation, but it doesn't seem to me that is what He is doing here.

Well, verse 21, then. Verse 21 comes back again to our original stand in verse 1. He is talking now to the nations, but as the verses follow here it would seem that it's not so much the people of the nation as the gods of the nations that He now has in mind. Produce your cause, bring forth your strong reasons, but, verse 23 says, ~~show~~ how the things to come hereafter that we may know ye are gods, so in 21 He is talking to the gods, rather than simply to the people. And He calls them, challenges them to prove themselves by predicting the future correctly. "Let them bring them forth, and shew us what shall happen; let them shew the former things, what they be, that we may consider them, and know the latter end of them; or declare us things for to come. Shew the things that are to come hereafter, that we may know that ye are gods; yea, do good, or do evil, that we may be dismayed, and behold it together."

Up to the middle of 23 it is prediction but from there on it goes beyond prediction, it's really anything at all. Do good or do evil. He says the idols can do nothing, but the greater part of His talk about them is their inability to predict the future, not that

it's more important to predict the future than it is to do great things in the world, but that it's easy enough when a great thing happens for someone to say the Lord did it, and someone else to say no, that's chance, that is the great intelligence, a great intelligence in these particular fields. I know a woman some years ago was very, very much aroused because of this.

One time she read in the paper about how the Germans had broken through into France, they captured all of France, Belgium, France completely capitulated and the result was that hundreds of thousands of British soldiers were caught in France, and the Germans began to say we're going to have all these men behind barbed wire inside of a few days, we'll have them all as prisoners. And then all the churches of England were filled, the people were praying God would give them deliverance, and the fog covered the channel, the British Channel, so that planes were practically useless, and all the little boats, --the sea was unusually calm, --and everybody that had a little boat of any kind went right across to France to Dunkirk and they filled them up with soldiers, and the German planes were unable to hit the troops out there on the piers because the high fog above them was so thick that the planes couldn't see them, so very few hit the soldiers at all, and great numbers of the soldiers were evacuated. There still were a great many captured and all of their material, all of their guns and equipment and everything like that, so that the Germans for the next two years had four or five times as many prisoners in their hands as the British had. But it was a tremendous unexpected deliverance of great multitudes of British soldiers safely brought back to England. And this woman, about , I think it was about five years later, she wanted to use it as an illustration of God's wonderful mercy and power, and so she began looking up recent articles, particularly in British sources, and found that they were all telling about the wonderful strength of the Royal Air Force, how they held back the German planes and made the evacuation from Dunkirk possible, and the divine part, which these people at the time felt so tremendously, was almost forgotten within a short time.

Somebody could say, well, God did this marvelous thing, to deliver all these British troops. Somebody else could say, no, it's just chance, you wouldn't get that particular combination of weather perhaps once in ten years, but you would get it at least in ten years. But you find it every now and then, it just happened to come at that time, and you had the well-trained RAF and were able to take advantage of the situation, and you can't prove that God had anything to do with it. You can't prove it but ^{if} the unbeliever doesn't want to believe He had anything to do with it, ~~if~~ he doesn't have to believe it. You can't force him. So He calls on the idols to do good or do evil, but doesn't give much stress to that because it's very easy, ~~wh~~ when a nation has a great ~~v~~ictory, to claim that their idols did it and nobody can prove the contrary. But when it comes to prediction of the future, there you can prove it, that they have told you what's going to happen, or they haven't. You can prove whether there was a prediction. Oh, I suppose there can be times when there ~~was a~~ ^{is} question whether one was made or not, but it's easy enough to make predictions in such a way that there is ~~not~~ question they were made and there is no question that it has been fulfilled.

So that is the argument the Lord puts the greatest stress on here. These ungodly-- the unbelieving generation that we live in today--the whole tendency is just to pooh-pooh any such idea, so the tendency of the Christians is to more or less disregard it and not say much about it, but it is an argument that ^{if} you hear evidences on it, is pretty hard to answer. It's easy to use the argument in the very artificial false way, I've seen that done, the argument from predictive prophecy. But it's an argument which you can examine carefully and use very thorough examination and still find sufficient evidence for an argument that is very, very difficult. And if you go into other attempts to predict the future, it is easy to see how extremely false and unsuccessful most of them are.

None of you remember back in 1929 when the banks began to fail, the depression began to come, but I remember very vividly. In 1929 when they had the big Wall Street

Crash, for the next 18 months I don't think there was a single month in which some great financial leader of the U. S., head of some big bank or somebody like that, did not make a statement that now we have reached the bottom. We are now just going to start up. And for at least ~~178~~ 18 months, there wasn't a single month except ~~some~~ some day during month there would be a big spread somewhere in the paper about some great, wise man of finance, who now saw all the evidences that we had now struck the bottom and were starting to go up. And they kept giving this and of course if they had kept on longer maybe one of them would have hit it eventually. Mr. Cohen? (9) This is, I think, something that we can understand from , why there is so much more stress on prediction than on the inability of the idols to do anything, not but what the inability to do is a much greater thing than the inability to predict, but the inability to predict is much easier to prove. If anybody starts telling you how tremendously wise they are, how they can tell just what is going to happen, or anything, /you just get them to make a prediction for you about the next five years, and tell you what's going to happen in a few different areas of life, including their own life and yours too. Look at it five years later and see how~~y~~ much is true. Chances are that they'll have hit about two things out of ten, ~~so that~~ correctly. It is very, very difficult to predict the future, but people don't usually realize just how difficult it is.

Well, then , there is this challenge based upon this claim, that only God can predict the future, and of course the great amount of stress on prediction is a big argument against the critical position that all this was simply written at the end of the ~~of~~ exile. By so-called second Isaiah. ~~By~~ another man who writes somewhat in the spirit and attitude of Isaiah. If he did, unless he was able to make people believe it had been written 200 years earlier, why did he put all this stress on prediction? How could he make them believe that? The critics don't think he made people believe that. They think it was written by a man who interpreted Cyrus' promise and gave the people the

notice that they were going to be delivered from Cyrus, made certain predictions like that, because of his evaluation of Cyrus' character and attitude. But who described the situation, they say it exactly fits the situation at the end of the exile, it does not fit the situation in Isaiah's day, and they're right, it doesn't exactly fit that situation. And it is very unusual thing in the Scripture for a prophet to look way ahead, 200 years, and write 15-16 chapters, all from a viewpoint of a time way in the future, presupposing the whole background of that later time. It is a very, very unusual situation, and it is quite easy for people to become convinced that it could have been written at the earlier period, no matter what you believe, but that it must have been at the later time, with which it deals. Now the argument I have given that people could imagine the exile at the time of Isaiah, the godly could, I think is a foil to that criticism, it is an answer that it could be imagined as having a reason to be done at that early a time. I believe that. But that doesn't prove it was done at the earlier time. But this great stress on prediction certainly does assume that they have something now which was given long before, else why make so much of having predicted Cyrus? He didn't predict him at all, merely described what happened.

So I think ~~at~~ that all the stress on prediction is actually a strong argument against the critical position of the date of these chapters. Well, now, it is very interesting, the end of this. Oh, we're still on 41. Here he says, "Behold, you are of nothing, and your work of nought; an abomination is he that chooseth you." And after verse 24 there is the natural contrast from the condition of the idols to the power of God. They can't do anything but He can do something, so He says I have raised up one from the north and he shall come, from the rising of the sun shall he call upon my name. We --how would we say that in prose language? I have raised up one from the north and he shall come, from the rising of the sun shall he call upon my name. How would we give that in one sentence instead of two? We'd say from the northeast. The rising of the

sun is the east. He says he comes from the north, ~~he~~ comes from the east. In other words he comes from the northeast. Of course that's just the direction from which Cyrus came. From the northeast. So here ~~we would~~ ^{he was} called in verse 2, the righteous man from the east. Of course we know righteous man ^{is not a} ~~the~~ translation, "man" isn't in it at all. But it depicts a man coming from the east in verse 2. Here the Lord says, I have brought one from the north and from the east. Mr. Cohen? (13 1/2) I don't think, "from the rising of the sun" would be apt to mean, to be used quite in the sense from that time on. It is more apt to describe the direction or a ~~selection~~ of it. I don't think that preposition would be the ordinary one for a period of time. And of course there is this about it, shall he call upon my name could lead people to think that he is going to be a real believer, a follower of God. Now that we have no answer for ~~wha~~ tever. He did write a ~~--the~~ Bible tells us that he declared that he was going to serve the Lord by letting His people go, and giving them ~~he~~lp. We have no evidence of that apart from the Bible. But we do have tablets which show him claiming to be the representative of Nebo and Marduk to deliver the people of Babylon from their oppressors, and so it would seem perhaps to be a habit of Cyrus' to claim to be the representative of the gods of all the nations. Well, would "he shall call on my name" fall under that general category. He does give a certain reference to God even though ~~he~~ he does to others too. The phrase alone could lead to further evidence, but since there is no evidence of anything further, I don't think we want to draw any more from the phrase than we're compelled. Well, we ~~continue~~ there tomorrow then, and would the Graduate Students please give me the papers right now, if you have them ready and I hope you do by this time. ...

C.25. (1/2)

...we were looking last time at chapter 41, and we saw there that great tremendous theme where he summons the false gods to account for this situation, and in this tremendous situation, the Lord claims that He is the one who has wrought this great cataclysm among the nations. And then ~~He~~ turns to ~~Israel~~ and tells them that they need

not fear because they are His servant. And towards the end of the chapter we have that great challenge on the ground of the inability of the idols to make predictions. I've used that 22nd and 23rd verse as a sermon text almost as often as any other text in the Bible. Because I've often spoken on fulfilled prophecy, and it is an ideal place for that subject. The end of the chapter, I don't think we looked at verses 27, 28, and 29, but in these verses He returns to the central theme of comfort, the deliverance He is going to bring, in verse 27. "The first shall say to Zion" is a very strange phrase. I think perhaps it originated with something like "I" shall say to Zion, or something like that. I haven't been able to figure yet exactly what it can mean as it stands, whether there is some slight error of transmission, or whether there is some way of taking it that I haven't seen yet, I don't know. But the sense is perfectly clear as a whole, it is just the beginning of verse 27, "the first shall say to Zion." Who is "the first"? What does it mean? It is a little bit peculiar there. But then verse 28, also, is not absolutely crystal clear. "I beheld and there was no man." There was no man for what. We have elsewhere very similar statements that later on in Isaiah, much later, that there was no one to bring deliverance until I brought it. That we find elsewhere. But that's not the context here. The context is there is no one who can answer. "I beheld and there was no man, even among them, and there was no counsellor, that, when I asked of them, could answer a word." Perhaps it should be no one, perhaps man is simply used as a term for "one." There was no one among them who could give any real answer. They're all vanity, their works are nothing; their molten images are wind and confusion. In these chapters of Isaiah, on the whole it seems to me that quite a good job has been done in making the chapter divisions. They're not major divisions at all. You could make them in another way. Probably almost as well. Perhaps from 41 to 47, there is no clearcut subdivision within that, but rather the thought oscillates from one page to another page. Nevertheless, 41 makes a fairly good unit. Certainly 40 is a definitely excellent chapter division.

But between 41 and 42, I would incline to think there is a pretty good division because 41 and 43 rather closely parallel one another. The progress of the thought, while the wording is quite different, the general progress of these next two chapters, repeats itself. The first chapter, 41, the great theme, of course, was the folly of the idolatry. But the fact that God's people need not fear. Now 42 and 43, He is directing Himself mostly to His own people. It is not so much about idolatry ~~as~~ or about the heathen in these two chapters. But in His dealing with His own people, here, the general progress of thought more or less goes through the same progress in 43 that it does in 42. So there is a rather definite parallel between them. You find that every now and then in the prophets. A structure which repeats itself in order to drive home the same thought.

42 begins with a scene, just as 41 began with a scene. The scene in 41 was the onward march of Cyrus. What does it mean to the nation? In 42 the scene with which it begins is the work of the servant, what is this work ^{that} ~~of~~ the servant is going to do? How is he going to do it? Now we said the main stress of thought is on Israel rather than the nations through these two ~~chap~~ chapters here, in the main. Yet we have the foreign nations right in the very first verse of chapter 42. Why is Israel God's servant? Is it simply in order that they can be His pets and that He can do special things for them? No, they are His servants to do a work in the world for Him. So we find that stressed right in the first verse of 42. "Behold my servant... I have put my spirit on him; he shall bring forth judgment to the nations." We have the nations right immediately here. Even though our main thought is on Israel, through the chapter, yet the ~~main~~ nations are stressed right in the first verse. Now Miss Pickett has a question which I suspect is an anticipating question of things we're going to discuss next week, is that not right? (6) Yes, which verse is that? 28, it seems to me, we have to take in the context as introductory to 29. 29 says the idols are nothing, and 28 surely gives a reason why they are nothing. I would think then that it parallels verses 22-24. In 24 we read, "Behold, ye are of nothing, and your work of nought; an

abomination is he that chooseth you." In 29 we read, "Behold, they are all vanity; their works are nothing; their molten images are wind and confusion." Why in verse 24 does He say they are nothing? Because they can't predict the future, He says they can't do anything. That is the previous two verses, and then this is what it starts out with. Well, then 28, it would seem to me, from the context, 28 must be a parallel to the previous. I beheld and there is no one among them, no counsellor who was able to answer. No one who was able to answer God's challenge to predict the future, and to prove that they were really a force in the world. Then He says they are nothing. It would seem to me that the parallel would give us the interpretation of 28, which taken just by itself could be the introduction to three or four different lines of thought. It isn't brought out clearly in 28 alone, just what it's talking about, but if you take 28 in connection with 29, I think it becomes very clear it's a close parallel to those previous verses. Any further question on that? Anybody? I'm glad you raised the question because it is good to have that clearly in mind. Otherwise, you just look at 28, you just don't see much, it's rather general, hard to see exactly what it means, but in line with context I think it becomes clearer in that particular case.

Now the next chapter then, in chapter 42, we have, from verses 1-7 we have the work of the servant, don't we? We have the work of the ~~servant~~, we have the Lord's blessing upon the servant, and the servant is going to accomplish ~~his~~ his work. We note the stress on the Gentiles, verse 1, again verse 6, "a light of the Gentiles." He'll bring forth judgment to the Gentiles, or nations, you can translate it either way. It is a worldwide work. End of four says, "the isles shall wait for his law." Verses 1-7 we spoke of as the servant's work, what he is to do, but verse 5 interrupts it, doesn't it? Verse 5 is not specifically dealing with the work of the ~~Spirit~~ servant at all. What is verse 5 dealing with? It is going back to one of our most common themes. You say all this, that the servant is going to do this work, going to make this tremendous accomplishment, going to open blind eyes, going to be a light to the Gentiles,

how can all this be? Well, who said it? The Lord, verse 5, the one who has created the heavens, stretched them out, set forth the earth, the one who provides all the nourishment, all the life to those upon the earth. 5 is an interjected thought in the midst of this passage, it doesn't itself add anything to the work of the servant, but it does tell us how we can be sure this can really happen. It is a tremendous thing, God says, to happen. Well how do you know this can happen? Why because He is the creator of the universe. He has the power to do what He chooses. And when we finish our passage, verse 7, again the same note is brought out in verse 8. I am the Lord, that's my name. Of course, that doesn't make an awful lot of sense in English. I am the Lord, that's my name. If you look at it as it is printed, and you see that Lord is capital L, capital O, capital R, capital D, then you know it isn't Lord at all, Lord is just a way of calling attention to the divine name which would be (10)

I am, whatever the name. And in English they adopted that expedient of indicating the divine name by putting it in capitals, but the name isn't the Lord. Well, here we are in the seminary, I am the president, that's my name, — doesn't make any sense at all. It's not (10 1/4)

But the capital letters are a way of indicating that it is the name of God that is here involved. The Revised American Revised Version tried to get around that by putting in Jehovah. I am Jehovah. The word Jehovah is already used four times in the authorized version. The Revised Version used it dozens of times, and it has this advantage, that the minute you see Jehovah you don't think of something like the Lord, the president, the king, you think of a name, you recognize it is a name. The average Christian thinks that God is a name, and Lord is a title, and it is exactly the other way around. God is the title, describing the sort of being He is. Lord, in caps, is the name, is His personal name, so Jehovah has the tremendous advantage of bringing out that idea, that it is a name, it has of course a disadvantage of being something that practically all scholars are

agreed, is not the way the name was ever pronounced actually. But of course when you get down to that, how did they ever pronounce it? You can't pronounce it exactly. There is probably not a person living who could say George Washington, the way George Washington said it. Somebody suggested that if George Washington// were living today and came and gave us a lecture, we wouldn't ~~understand~~ understand a word he said. Whether that is true or not, I don't know, but at least sounds are gradually changing in all languages.

I went into a barber shop in Germany and a couple of men asked me , they said, oh here comes an American, we've been having a big argument, will you settle it for us? Which is the correct pronunciation, Niagara Falls, or Niagara Falls ? Well when I said it's Niagara Falls, you could see the blank look on their faces. I might as well have said Swiss Cheese. It meant absolutely nothing, it was just a queer sound to them, and till you get your ears used to any other language, its sounds are just queer sounds. In Germany practically every sound is different from the corresponding sound in English. Some of them are ~~greatly~~ greatly different, some of them are slightly different, but all of them are at least a little bit different. And the sounds of languages are constantly changing, Over a period of time. So nobody today could say how this name was pronounced, actually. If we heard it we wouldn't recognize it. But practically all interpreters agree that Jehovah was not the way the name of the Lord was ever pronounced, because it seems evident that we know how this sound came into existence, and it looks like a mistake. The letters, (13) which were used in the O. T. to represent the name itself, were sometimes replaced as the Jews read it and didn't want to take the holy name of God on unholy lips, by simply saying the name, but then very early the custom developed of, instead of saying that, saying the Lord, and the Hebrew word for Lord is Adonai, which occurred in ^{the O. T.} ~~these days~~ a number of times, used of God a number of times, also used of man. But in the Bible, when you began putting vowels on, they put the vowels that were actually pronounced, so they put the vowels of "the Lord" on the consonants of "the name." The result is that you get the vowels of Adonai and the

consonants of _____, combined with these vowels and that gives you Jehovah. Well, now that doesn't prove that it wasn't originally pronounced Jehovah, but when you have a perfectly natural explanation of how a thing came into existence, it seems improbably that it was what was there before this particular process occurred. So therefore, I guess all scholars today would say, whatever the word that was pronounced it was not pronounced Jehovah. Well now of course the critics always talking about Jaweh or (14 1/4) _____ they have different pronunciations for it but they spell it Y or Jaw(or v) e...

C.26 (1/2)

...I suppose that pronunciation is probably nearest the way the name of God was originally pronounced, than the pronunciation of Jehovah. Personally, I don't like to use it at all, because so many books use that term along with the vilest anti-Christian interpretation, the lowest ideas of God, that the pronunciation has come to be associated with that so much that I hate to use it at all. And you don't feel that way about Jehovah at all, at least it wasn't until recently that Jehovah's Witnesses took it up (1)

_____ in some people's minds the term has become connected with that. So I suppose the best we can do is to stick to the "Lord" but realize that it is a name, it is not a title. This use of the Lord for it is certainly very early. We find in N. T. translation, quotation, that (1 1/4) _____ is used, so it is very evident that it was a very early use, but it does confuse when we ^{read} ~~say~~ this is my name, the Lord is my name. Now of course it doesn't make any sense unless you realize that the "LORD" is in caps, and it doesn't mean the Lord, like a man would say, if he is the owner of an estate, he is the Lord of the Estate, it doesn't mean that at all, it means a name. So he says, here in this ⁸th verse, "I am the (however you pronounce it), that is my name: and my glory will I not give to another, neither my praise to graven images." Then we have again, the note of prediction. You notice how much we had in 41. Here we have

it in 42, "Behold, the former things are come to pass, and new things do I declare: before they spring forth I tell you of them." The former predictions made about Cyrus, they've come to pass, that Cyrus is going to come. But earlier than that they they were going into Babylon, exile, and then that Cyrus was coming, that has come to pass, now I tell you new things that will come to pass, the deliverance from Babylon. "Sing to the Lord a new song." Just for two verses at this point He breaks into a song of praise, God, in view of the wonderful promises He has made. And then verse 13, 14, and 15, are verses in which you find a ~~new~~ contrast (2 / 3/4) to verses 1-7. In verses 1-7 you have the calm deliberate ^{unhurried} ~~contrary~~ activity of the servant of God and ~~without~~ ^{even} lifting up His voice, without/breaking a bruised reed, He steps forward confidently and without fear in absolute certainty of effectiveness, to do the work, but here in 13-15 we have the Lord pictured as one moving with vigor and with fury, with terrific force, energy, to overwhelm and to (3 1/2) and to upset. "I will destroy and devour at once." You don't have many passages in our section of Isaiah that are like these three verses, but we have here in these three verses, the recognition that the Lord's wrath will not wait forever, that the Lord will not, may seem to be indifferent, may seem to let wickedness go on, but that the time comes when He exerts tremendous force and an overwhelming lesson in a violent way, right in these three verses. And then in verse 16, the thought comes as to the violence of the three verses, ^{and the} ~~as He~~ kindly helpful attitude, the comfort to be given to those who are His own. I will bring the blind, you notice the word ~~of~~ blind, and we get it again only a few verses later, "I will bring the blind by a way they knew not, and lead them in paths they have not known, I will make darkness light before them and crooked things straight. These things will I do unto them, and not forsake them." The kindly help of the Lord brought into sharp contrast to the previous three verses of His violent action against evil. And then in verse 17, again He touches on a note of idolatry. While it is not touched upon in anything like the length in these two chapters, very little touched on yet, but we do have it brought in here

in 17 again. Greatly stressed in 41. The people that trust in false gods will be turned back and greatly ashamed. "Hear, ye deaf; and look, ye blind, that ye may see." To you that can't see, you that are worshipping idols, you that are doing what shows absolute failure to realize the true facts of the world, ~~hear~~ and look that you may see. But in contrast to that, verse 19, --we are thinking about the heathen, how blind they are that worship the idols, but listen to 19, "Who is blind, but my servant" or deaf, as my messenger that I sent" who is blind as he that is (supposed to be) perfect, and blind as the ~~Lord's~~ ^{LORD'S} servant? Here we're talking about the futility of the idol-~~wor~~ worship of the false believer, we're talking about the wickedness of the enemies of Christ and then He says yes, but look at those ~~wh~~o should be doing what is right, and see their blindness, and it's a thing we have to constantly to come up against. We see the wicked world that needs the message of Christ so much, that needs the story of salvation, that needs to have conviction ~~of~~ of sin, this wonderful story, and then we turn to those who should be God's people, out doing His work, and we find the pettiness of their squabbles over minor little things that don't amount to anything, and we find them dividing, --I heard of a church up in New Jersey that almost split over the ~~of~~ crucifixion was on Wednesday or on Friday, and there is so much of people having the knowledge of the great things of the gospel, and the world that needs them so badly, wanting to have a fight over little minor issues, that often are things that we can't know about in this world, and often things that if we do (7) and sometimes are things that the Scripture doesn't make clear and if the ~~Lord~~ Lord wanted us to make issues over them He could have made it clear with one or two sentences, so easily, but He doesn't go into them clearly, some particular ceremony maybe He doesn't even tell us how to do it, because He doesn't care how we do it, what He cares is that we have the truth it represents. And then people will get all het up over the precise way it has got to be done, and pay so much attention to that they ~~they~~ fail to carry out the work to which the Lord has called them, so He says who is ~~blind~~ blind but my servant? Now is His servant here? Of course,

you can apply it in a general way as I've just been doing, apply it to all those whom God has called for a witness, those who belong to Him, who should be serving Him, who is so blind as they are? Those who should be perfect, those who really are the Lord's servants. But of course in its most immediate significance, it refers to the servant of the Lord, and we're not going to discuss today who the servant of the Lord is, if any of you think the servant of the Lord is Christ, is this talking about Christ, who is blind as my servant? Deaf as the one I have sent? All the difference--next week I hope to have a list from all of you ^{with all} the references in our section to the servant of the Lord. It won't take you long to get them all because it's easy to look up the word servant in a concordance, and then from the number you find you can see whether they're under this theme. Like, for instance, if it says that Pilate sent his servant to get an ashtray for him, why that will not be the Lord's servant, naturally. But you can easily eliminate any such case, but when in doubt, include it in your list. Because that is one of the great themes of this section, 40-56, and see how much--we don't have the servant of the Lord in chapter 40 at all, the beginning of it, do you have it in 56, do you have it in 55? How far does it go? And all the uses of it? Does the context tell you who it is talking about? Who is the servant of the Lord? What does it really mean? Well, that, as I say, we're not going to discuss today because I want you to give me full information on it in written chart form at the beginning of our class next time. But we do note this very important verse here and this very important section, at the beginning of this chapter, the first seven verses. Now somebody might say, it is only the first four verses, but we'll at least raise the question, is it the first four or does it include verses 6 and 7? The word servant is not used in those two verses of course, but it is used in verse 1. Well, now, here we have in 19 this marked statement, now in 20 it's enlarged upon. ~~No~~ "Seeing many things, but thou observest not; opening the ears, but he hear~~eth~~eth not." They can see so much and yet be blind, and how commonly we find it, people so accute, and so in-

telligent on many matters, and yet completely blind often to matters that are still more important than that. It is the way the unbeliever is to the things of God altogether, he sees the great power of God in the universe and neglects to realize, neglects to notice it at all, but the Christian often is blind to so much that he ought to see clearly. Verse 21 is like a new start. The declaration again that the Lord is going to do His work, "the Lord is well pleased for his righteousness' sake; he will magnify the law, and make it honourable." You feel as if you are starting at the beginning of the chapter. The work is going to be done, the Lord is going to see that it is done. And then you expect to go on, and say, he won't be disturbed, he won't be disheartened, he is (11 1/4) verse 22. Verse 22 is a sharp contrast.

Here you talk about Israel as the servant of the Lord. Israel is supposed to bring light to the Gentiles. Israel is supposed to bring judgment to the whole world, the isles are supposed to wait for him to come with the message, well how can they do it, look at their condition. Robbed and spoiled, taken off into captivity, living in subjection to the heathen oppressors. You almost feel in verse 22 as if the people are ants or something. He says here is my servant, he has got this tremendous work to do, how are we going to do this work? Why don't you get at it? Well, you say, this is a people robbed and spoiled. They are all of them snared in holes, and hid in prison houses: they are become a prey, nobody is delivering them. They're for a spoil, no one tried to restore them, how can we do the work? Look at the condition we're in, look at how we are subject, look at how we are overwhelmed. What can we do anyway? Verse 22 isn't given in the form of the people objecting, but it is given in the form of an objection. How can you expect us to do this work, when we're in this condition? The exile. But what's the answer? Who among you will give ear to this, who will hearken and hear for the time to come? Who gave Jacob for a spoil and Israel to the robber? You note how the theme of sin, which is so stressed in the earlier parts of Isaiah, as he constantly warns the people that if they don't turn away from their sin, they are going to suffer for it,

going to be sent into exile, we do not have those rebukes for sin in this section. This section, the exile, is his book of comfort. The exile is here, he is giving them comfort, telling them God is going to deliver them, but when the thought of sin is brought in, it is brought in in a different way. Here he is not saying if you don't turn from your sin you're going to go into exile, he says, how does it come that you are in exile? Why because of your sin. Are you in this condition because you couldn't resist/ the heathen gods? They overcame you? No. Are you in this condition because God didn't bother to protect you? No. God didn't merely fail to protect you, God actually gave you into it, God actually brought the exile. Who gave Jacob for a spoil and Israel for the robbers? Did ~~not~~ the ~~Lord~~ LORD. And here is an interesting of person. He ~~against~~ whom we have sinned, for they would not walk in his ways, neither were they obedient unto his law. Notice the "we have sinned," the personal objection in it, and the personal answer comes right in the middle of it, and yet it goes on in the third person, but it is perfectly clear who he is talking to this time. Therefore he has poured on him the fury of his anger.

...

C.27. (3 1/4)

...to go over all of the direct clear explicit/ references to the servant of the Lord. Now at the moment I'm not so interested in finding with certainty just how far the discussion of this theme runs. Nor am I so interested, at all interested at the moment, in finding out whether there are passages which don't use the word but which are talking about the servant. In other words our approach at the moment is this: what can we learn for sure about the servant from those passages from which there is absolutely no question that they're talking about the servant. In other words we are most interested now in those places where the word is specifically used. My servant, the servant of the Lord, something like that. Now of course we will eventually be interested in all other passages that might be related to it, but it would be methodologically wrong, I think, to bring them into the discussion at this point. I think now we want to deal with

those of which there is no question whatever. I just happened, a couple of days ago, I was talking with a young Jewish Rabbi, and he remarked to me, it is very difficult, the interpretation of the Deutero-Isaiah, He said, you have all those passages about the servant of the Lord and, he said, there are some of them in which there is no question that they are talking about Israel. But, he said, others in which it would seem that the prophet is talking about himself. And describing the difficulties and problems that he has to go through. Well, we want to look at these passages and see in which of them can we say with certainty it is Israel he is talking about. In which of them can we say with certainty it is not Israel? Are some of them, the prophet talking about himself, or talking about some other contemporary of his, or what is there that can absolutely prove who it is that it is talking about. I think about a third of the class (5)...

41.8 then is the first reference in our section to the servant of the Lord. And who is the servant there? ...here that He is calling Israel his servant, is there? Yes, Mr. Golin? Yes, just as a preliminary hypothesis, if you can find any evidence to the contrary, we'd be interested in seeing it.--I would say this. Jacob was the name of the son of Isaac, and along in his life, Jacob's name was changed to Israel. Now in the case of Abraham, when his name Abram was changed to Abraham, the Scripture always called him Abraham after that, but in the case of Jacob, after his name was turned to Israel, the Scripture goes on speaking of him as Jacob. But it speaks of him--I would say about half the cases after his name was changed, it calls him Jacob, and about half it calls him Israel. So that while properly speaking, he should have always been called Israel, since God had changed it to Israel, yet both terms are used after that. Now in later years, the term is used of the nation, as the son of Jacob. The sons of Jacob are the sons of Israel--~~are~~ are referred to not as sons of Israel but simply as Israel, very often. And the term comes to be applied collectively to the nation that was applied to the individual from whom the nation was taken. But there is something of a tendency in the rest of the Scripture, when it speaks of the man, to call him Jacob, and when it

speaks of the nation, to call it Israel, but that is by no means a definite rule. You will find the man referred to in later scripture as Isarel, and you will find the nation referred to in later scripture, as Jacob. The two seem to be simply parallel, two names for the same thing, used for the sake of variety. And so in this verse here, when he says, but thou, Israel art my servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, he is saying that Israel ~~name~~ is Jacob. Israel, thou art my servant, thou ~~art~~ Jacob, thou art the one whom I have chosen. In other words, there is no distinction here between Jacob and Israel. They are simply used as parallels for the same thing, whether he is speaking of the individual or of the nation. But I believe that in this particular passage, speaking of the time of the exile we could think of it as quite definitely as the nation, rather than of the man Israel that he is speaking of. It is the nation. But whether He calls the nation Israel or Jacob, probably makes ^{to the interpretation.} no difference. And then He goes on to call it, the seed of Abraham my friend, and of course it is true that Jacob was the seed of Abraham, in the sense that he was one of his descendants, and similarly the sons of Jacob are still the seed of Abraham, so that is a literal statement of course.

But the ~~next~~ name Jacob or Israel is used for the nation here, and it says that ~~that~~ is God's servant. Now where is our next use of the term, "the servant"? Mr. Golin. 42 1-4. We have there ~~some~~ discussion of my servant, but it doesn't say who it is, does it? Do you think it is a Gentile that he is talking of? Since He is going to bring judgment to the Gentiles, that would suggest that it is not a Gentile, but this section does not say who it is. Its being the second reference, and the first saying Israel, it would be a natural assumption that he is talking about the same one he is talking to before but it ~~is~~ certainly is not so stated. What did you say, My. Myers? (9) A very good point, I think. As I understand it, his point is that if you take the first reference, it says thou Israel art my servant, Jacob whom I have chosen. Now chosen and elect are the same thing of course. So he says, thou Israel art my servant, Jacob whom I have chosen. Here it says, Behold, my servant, mine elect--so he uses the same two

parallel statements ^{about him} that were used in 41.8 but just doesn't give the names, and the fact of similarity of use suggests again that he is talking about the same one, doesn't prove it, but it does suggest it. Mr. Golin? (9 1/2) Now Mr. Golin is raising a different type of question, he is raising the question as to whether the description given here fits Israel, with particular reference to the 3rd verse. There is a very good question that has been raised for consideration. Mr. Cohen? (10) You don't think 5 is parenthetical, what does 5 say about the servant? (10) Yes. It certainly would be very difficult to say that the discussion of the servant didn't go through 4. That would seem to be unquestionably one united fact. Now when you look at 6 and 7, you find the use of similar phrases, there is a similarity, a parallel, with nothing to suggest that a different subject is in view. So that for interpretation of the chapter, I think you would certainly consider that 6 and 7 were part of the same description. For the present section, as to who the servant is, I would put a little bit less emphasis on any argument derived from 6 and 7 than from 1-4. Because, it would be very difficult to question. 1-4 is all talking about (11) Now I think you can prove 6 and 7 are also but if somebody wants to raise a serious question on those two, I'd put it in a little different category than the first part. The second stage of our investigation. Someone else had a question, yes? Not the singular. I see. Now Miss Pickett raises the question then whether there is an unusual singular reference in this chapter, more than elsewhere? Well now 41.8 says thou art Israel my servant, and thou is singular, isn't it? But if you would use thou in singular that would of course refer to him, wouldn't it? I think the line of investigation she suggests is a very good one, but I would question whether as yet we have evidence that will lead to anything proving it, but it might be good to keep in mind and see as we go on, do you find passages that would suggest with any clearness that it is an individual rather than a nation He is talking about. Well, what about this whole section, 1-4 or 1-7 here, does it sound like a nation, or like an

individual? There seems to be something of a tone of it more than just a matter perhaps of a pronoun, a tone that sounds more like an individual, doesn't it? I don't know as enough to prove it, but certainly sounds in that direction. Mr. Alders? (12 3/4)

Mr. Alders is continuing the question already raised, does the character here described properly fit Israel? Now of course if you're going to tell about something in the future, how can you say, I say look at Mr. Parkinson there who has got a pretty short on, a nice blue pen, now if I said he has a nice red pen, you could immediately say I wasn't speaking about Mr. Parkinson, but if I say look at that fellow, 20 years from now everyone in the world will have heard his name, and be familiar with the great things he has done. You can't prove whether that is true or not true. It is future, and so if you say something about Israel in the future, as long as Israel still exists it's pretty hard to say it's false. Now if Mr. ~~Parkson~~ Parkinson were to die and only half the world had heard of him yet, you could say my prediction was false, because I said all the world, but as long as he is living it is still a possibility. See what I mean? There have been men who have retired at 70 and then have been called back to a greater activity than they ever had before. So as long as a man is living. Now Israel is still living, who can say that it is impossible that verse 4 will yet be fulfilled about Israel? Mr. Cohen? (14) ...

C.28. (1/2)

...I didn't realize I had done so but it helped the illustration. Yes? (3/4) Well, now there is a good question. Can Israel here refer to spiritual Israel rather than physical Israel? Well. 41.8 said thou Israel art my servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham my friend. Is that spiritual Israel or physical Israel? (1)(stu.) Yes, but verse 8, what do you get from that, physical or spiritual? How about verse 9? It also has the word servant in it, thou art my servant, I have chosen thee and not cast thee away? Is that physical or spiritual? It seems to me that one can't dogmatically say 8 or 9 are physical references to spiritual but the whole tone is such that --not to

suggest that it is pertaining to anything but spiritual Israel that's implied there. Now when we come over to chapter 42, of course the name Israel is not used, so whether there could be a difference there would be a matter to think about. Anybody--yes, Mr. Grauley?

(2) Well, say, when Hitler was holding Belgium, if somebody were to say oh, Belgium is going to be freed from Hitler, going to be released from his yoke and so on, and then you'd say oh we're not talking about physical Belgium, we're talking about spiritual Belgium, why I don't think it would fit very well. They would certainly think you were talking about physical Belgium if you talked about it under those circumstances. Well, I'm not saying an argument couldn't be made along that line, but it certainly is not the obvious. Unless there is something more about this passage right now--now there is much we could say about this passage, of course. It is a very important passage and one that deserves careful study, but for our present question, who is the servant of the Lord? Unless you have something more to suggest about this passage in that connection, let'd move on to the next one. What's the next passage--oh, now in 42.19 Mr. Roczey says it's Israel. I don't see the word Israel there. (3 1/4) On what basis do you say that 42.19 is Israel? Well if you had 42.19 all alone with no context whatever, you'd have no way in the world to know who it was, would you? But you have ^{it}~~to~~ introduced that Israel is called God's servant. (3 1/2) Mr. Roczey suggests that in verse 19 there, we have one whom God called to be His servant, but who is falling short and who is failing to fulfill it, who has fallen ~~in~~ into sin. Therefore, one is really his servant but is proving an unfaithful servant. And ~~th~~erefore he is rebuked. And so he feels that that must be Israel. You couldn't say it had anything to do with Israel without some context, but since we have had Israel called his servant and have had no clear designation of anyone as his servant, I think Mr. Roczey has got a very strong point from which to argue that this is Israel. Does anyone want to argue for a different view? (stu.4 1/2) It is probably --the best way to take that is, who is blind as he who should be perfect? The one that has been called to be perfect, the one that has a great work to do, and yet

he is not doing it. He is the servant in the sense that he was called to accomplish the work of the servant but he has failed in it. And he is called to be a perfect, exemplar, now the word could also, the root for completeness or peace--there are various possibilities of interpretation there, but they all run along pretty much the same line. It is a very hard thing to describe, describing the actual condition of one who is spoken of as blind and deaf. So that I don't know of any way to take it except that the one that ought to be, the one ~~who~~ who has been called to be (5 1/4)

Yes, now that is, I think, is the best interpretation, I know of no other that strikes me as good, but would be very much interested in any suggestion any of you have, because someone might come upon something that would be better than that. But that is by far the best thing I've ever found yet. This then, we agree, looks as if the servant is Israel, this reference. Unless somebody raises a question, we go on to the next one. Miss Pickett, what is the next? 43.10. And in 43.10 we read, "Ye are my witnesses, saith the LORD, and my servant whom I have chosen:"¹ Is he talking about an individual here or a group. He is speaking here about a group, and is that a Gentile group and is that a gentile group. The passage would seem to indicate that ~~it~~ is Israel, so we are probably justified in putting this in with the others. ² Could this be Isaiah? (6 1/2) Why not? It is plural. It cannot be Isaiah, Jeremiah, or anyone individual, it is a group. Yes? (6 1/2) Could it be a select group among Israel, as far as the context is concerned, I don't ~~think~~ see anything to forbid that, but neither do I see anything to clearly suggest it. I see no statement, no ground in the context, for picking out ~~some~~ certain ones. Verse 9 and 10 seem to be contrasting the heathen outside, who follow the false gods, and Israel following the true god, just as chapter 41 did. Now whether you can say well this is ~~Israel~~ Israel, but only a part of Israel. I don't think you can find clear proof of it in the verse, in the context. Yes? (7 1/.2) The suggestion that the "ye" refers only to witnesses, how do you just fit the servant into the context? You are my witnesses and thou art my servant. You are my witnesses and this is my servant.

I mean there are various ways we could say it to indicate the witnesses, plus an additional witness. But there is nothing like that in the verse that I can see. It is an interesting suggestion but I don't quite see evidence to support the suggestion. It would seem to equate service and witnesses both with the you. Just like you ~~if~~ Israel are my servant, Jacob the one whom I have chosen, it seems to be all together as far as I can see in this verse. If there is nothing further in this verse, what is the next one, Mr. Quarterson? (8 1/4) 44.1,2, and is this one of those places where we are left in doubt as to just who the servant is? Is it Isaiah? Why? Yes, it is an exact parallel to 41.8, isn't it? Thou Israel art my servant, Jacob whom I have chosen. Here it is Jacob my servant, Israel whom I have chosen, and except for a difference in order it is an exact parallel to 41.8. It uses both terms, Jacob and Israel. It addresses him, or the group, it would mean the one he has chosen, and verse 2 again does the same thing. Thus says the Lord, fear not O Jacob my servant and thou Jeshurun whom I have chosen, and that Jeshurun is the form used for the nation, Israel. Israel, Jeshurun, a term used, collective term used to describe the nation. I don't remember ever seeing it used with the individual Jacob, or Israel, but of the nation it is used a few times. Jeshurun whom I have chosen. So that would seem to be very definitely Israel here. So we have so far, 41.8-19 definitely Israel; 42.1-4--difficult to be sure who is it; 42.19 seems definitely Israel; 43.10 seems definitely Israel; and 44.1,2 is stated to be Israel. So that we have two out of the five stated to be Israel, we have two others seeming to be very definitely Israel, we have the one 42.1-4 at which when we read what is said, it seems rather strange to think of it as a description of Israel. I mean just glancing at it. You can study it further to decide if the objections after all are not great, that it truly is Israel, or to decide that the objections are so great it can't be Israel. But at least up to the present point there is only one of the five that we have any serious question at all.

Now what's your next one, Mr. Euredjian? (11) 44.21, Mr. Euredjian says, is definitely stated to be Israel. Both Jacob and Israel, that is certainly not mentioning two

persons or two nations, two names used. "Jacob and Israel; for thou art my servant; I have formed thee; thou art my servant; O Israel..." That is very explicit, isn't it? Israel designated, named, indicated, surely this is the nation. Then we have now 6 cases, of which we really have only one of which there is any question at all. The question was raised, whether where it says, you are my witnesses, that might be a part of it at all, but certainly there is nothing in the context to suggest it. Next one after that, Mr. Oliver? (12) 44.26 could fit very well with the suggestion the rabbi made to me that some places the servant of the Lord is the prophet himself, couldn't it? It really doesn't quite seem to be in the series, because so far of course he has taken you are my witnesses, we haven't read of the servant as one who is specifically speaking the word of God. Is it possible that here we have the word used, but outside the series, simply referring to the prophet who has spoken his word. It would hardly seem to be Israel, would it? As a nation, it would be someone through whom God spoke, it confirms the word of his servant and confirms the counsel of his messengers. That is certainly not the nation, is it, but maybe it is not really in the series, that question might be raised. Then the next one--yes? (13 1/4) Well, the one that confirms the word of his servant, when did Israel give words? Mr. Myers says the entire O. T. is from Israel. In other words Israel gave us the O.T., this is the word of his servant, the word that God gave to Israel. Well, do you usually think of Israel as the author of the O.T.? Don't you rather think of the individuals? Mr. Grauley? (14) Yes, there's an interesting thing. The O. T. says, the Lord has said, the Lord has spoken, or it says according to the word that he gave to Isaiah, gave to Micah, gave to Moses, but does it ever say that He gave it to Israel? Yes? (14 1/4) Unto them were committed the oracles of God, yes, does that mean that they were the one who wrote them or that they were the ones who received them? (stu.14 1/2) Yes, responsible for living or proclaiming them. But for giving them. That unto them were committed the oracles of God, would that speak of Israel as the one who spoke to God? Don't they usually speak of the individuals

that way? Rather than of the nation as a whole? (stu.)...

C.29 (1/2)

...what advantage has the Jew? Well, he says, unto them were committed the oracles of God, they were given the oracles to follow, to spread, well, maybe they could be called in a way, (3/4) their words, even if they hadn't written them, they had the responsibility of spreading it. And here, that confirms the word of his servant. Of course, here we ask another question, is He talking of one specific word here? He is God he says is the one who frustrates the tokens of liars, and confirms the word of his servant, but what word? The word that says to Jerusalem you'll be inhabited. Wouldn't that seem to refer to Isaiah rather specifically? Did all of Israel give the word that Jerusalem is going to be inhabited, or was it specifically Isaiah? Yes, well that of course fits the messengers

(1 1/2)

Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Daniel, individual

prophets. Mr. Myers? ^(stu) What do you think it is? (stu) Well, that is a very interesting question. Do we have a series of different things here, or do we have a closely related discussion of what God does? What says the Lord thy redeemer, he that formed thee from the womb, I am the Lord that makes all things; that stretches the heavens, that spreads abroad the earth by myself. ^{verse 24.} This is the greatness, the power of God, isn't it? Then we go on to speak of His predictive power, His knowledge, His predictive power. He frustrates the tokens of liars, that's the negative side. The wise men, those who attempt to predict the future, God proved them false. But closely related to that is ~~the~~ the positive side. However, He does ~~not~~ allow His people to predict the future. He confirms the word of his servant and performs the counsel of his messengers, What does He allow them to predict? That says to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be inhabited; and to the cities of Judah, Ye shall be built, --that is Judah and Jerusalem are parallel, the same thing is said, only one ~~city~~ is smaller and one is larger, and this is a thing which has been said by his servants, by his messengers. Did He have this particularly in mind, ^{is He} ~~by~~ leading up to it, or is it unrelated? (stu.3) Oh, yes, verse 27 goes on

to show how Jerusalem is going to be rebuilt. Because the Mesopotamian power which is often represented by the figure "the deep," is to be dried up, its strength is to be taken away by God, because He sends Cyrus to make it possible for Jerusalem to be rebuilt. Mr. Cohen? (3 1/2) I would incline to think that in verse 26, the first half He is speaking of the fact that He made ~~these~~ predictions in advance, through His messengers. But that in the last half of 26, 27 and 28, He is going on to ~~say~~ that He is going to fulfill that which ~~his~~ messengers have promised. And He is here doing the thing that He said He is going to do, and of course He is right now speaking through His messengers. He is in the time of ~~Isiah~~ now declaring that Cyrus is going to come, and enable ~~them~~ to build Jerusalem and He is saying that He is going to (4)

so that it would seem to me there is a very close integration of the different thoughts. Miss Pickett? (4 1/4) Well, there was a man a hundred years after Jerusalem who, after Isaiah, when Jerusalem was besieged and people were saying there is no hope for us, ~~there~~ everything is just gone, and the Babylonian army had come and had taken all the country near, and they were besieging Jerusalem, and held the towns near and this man went to somebody else in Jerusalem and bought a field in the town of Anathoth, about 20 miles north of Jerusalem, in order to show his confidence that there would come a time when they would again be free, and he said, thus saith the Lord, the time is coming when fields ~~will~~ will be ~~bought~~, sold, and the land will be again rebuilt like it is now. That was Jeremiah. So that Jeremiah didn't make as many prophecies /as Isaiah did, but he made some very definitely. I would think ~~he~~ it was through Jeremiah and Micah and other prophets like that who predicted (5 1/2) though the main one is surely Isaiah.

Well, then, here it is a question whether it belongs in the series or not, but also the question has been raised, can you think of this as the nation being an instrument to bring the Word of God, even though it comes through individuals in the nation. That's the question that has been raised. Now what is the next one, Mr. Vannoy?

45.4, //For Jacob my servant's sake, and Israel mine elect, I have called Cyrus by his name. He has brought Cyrus for the sake, not of Jacob the man that lived a thousand years earlier, but for the sake of the nation that is called Jacob or Israel, and again, servant and elect are parallel, both parallel to 41.8 again, and surely this is the nation here in 45.4, that is another case where we have the word Israel explicitly used and where it is definitely parallel to those others, this is the fourth case where it says Israel is the servant, isn't it? Four cases where it definitely says Israel is the servant. There are two cases where the context seems quite definitely to point to Israel. Verse 44.26, where we have a question whether it is in the series at all or not, and then we have 42.1-4 which is in the midst of all this series but it doesn't use the word Israel, and some question has been raised, does it really fit Israel, what is said in 42?

Now what is the next one, after this, Mr. Cohen? (7 1/2) 48.20,21, and who is it there? Israel the nation. What makes you think so? (7 3/4)stu) Go ye forth of Babylon, flee ye from the Chaldeans, --seems to speak definitely of freedom from Babylonian captivity, and what they're to say is, The Lord has redeemed his servant Jacob. That would seem very definite, wouldn't it? It doesn't use the word Israel but it uses the word Jacob which is a definite parallel, so I think we can surely include it in the same series. That makes five in which He explicitly says this. But the next one, Mr. Carlson? 49.3. Who is that? (stu.8 1/2) It specifically states that it's Israel? Well, it would seem to be, wouldn't it, what's the difference between that and any previous one? Somebody kind of laughed when you said that. It explicitly states it is Israel. Thou art my servant, O Israel. What could be clearer? Yes? Oh, as I understand it, Mr. Golin is raising the question, verses 1 and 2 sound like the character of Israel. Is that the question? Well, the Lord has called me from the womb, from the bowels of my mother he made mention of my name. Haven't we heard in previous verses that God created Israel, that God formed Israel, that God made Israel from the beginning? What is the problem there? Mr. Miller? (9.stu) Mr. Miller thinks there is a certain

individuality of tone to them, which he thinks raises a question whether the whole nation ~~is~~ in mind. Mr. Cohen? (9 1/2) Verse 5 has got the mention of the word servant again, hasn't it, so we surely ought to include 5 on our list as well as 3. Of course they are one long passage but 3 and 5 should both be specifically mentioned. 5 and 6 uses the word servant. 5 and 6 which use the word servant say that the servant is to bring Israel. Well, that is 3, just read 3 alone, Thou art my servant, O Israel, you'd certainly seem to be talking about Israel, wouldn't you? Although the question has been raised, look at the previous verses and see if the character fits with it. But when you come to 5 and 6, He says this is the servant to bring Jacob, to bring Israel, to raise up the sides of Israel. Now how can Israel be the servant to raise up Israel? That sounds as if it is Isaiah, doesn't it? Yes? (10 3/4) First person. (stu) Thou art my servant, in whom my Israel will be glorified. Well, it's hardly Israel talking here. The whole passage is God talking. I don't quite see how Israel could be in the first person. Because the passage seems to be the powerful God speaking, rather than Israel speaking.

Mr. Grauley? (11 1/4) ...suggests that it's not the whole nation but a part of the nation. The preserved of Israel. Some of them died, of course, in the being taken into captivity, some of them died in exile, but there are some left. Couldn't it mean that? (stu.11 1/2) Oh, very good. Mr. Grauley suggests if you have here the servant raising up the remnant of Israel, how can the servant be the remnant of Israel? That's a very good question, very excellent. Miss Pickett? (12) Miss Pickett has a very good question here: if the servant sometimes means the whole nation, sometimes means the prophet Isaiah, how can it mean the prophet Isaiah here? How can Isaiah be the one who is going to be a light to the gentiles, be a salvation to the ends of the earth and raise up the tribes of Israel, how could Isaiah do that? Isaiah could speak the word of God wonderfully though. How could he do any of these things, other themes. I would question whether this could possibly be Isaiah. In fact, when I see this rabbi, I think I'll read this verse to him and ask him, how he figures this is Isaiah. Mr. Euredjian?

...Mr. Euredjian raises the question whether, you mean verse 5 as compared to verse 2, or 3? He raises the question whether we have a change of persons here, between verse 1, listen to me, the Lord has done this to me. Verse 3, the Lord said to me, ~~Thou~~ Thou are my servant O Israel. Verse 5, now says the Lord that formed me from the womb to be his servant, wonderful close parallel to verse 1, isn't it? The parallel would seem to be so close and a continuation of the verse 1, that while we won't say it's impossible that there might be a change of speaker somewhere along here. We will say that it would take some pretty good proof to say this. You do find places in the Bible where there is a sharp break without any clear indication of it in your (13 1/2) but there must be pretty strong evidence to prove that. You can't just take anything like that for granted. And here the parallel is so close between this verse, 5, and verse 1, that it seems highly questionable. Yes? (13 3/4) Mr. Myers gives us the next one which is part of the same passage here, the word servant. Thus says the Lord, to him whom man despises, the servant of rulers. Well that is not the series of the servant of the Lord, is it, a servant of rulers? It's the word servant, but it's the servant of rulers. And I don't know, whether we could (14 1/4) from that or not. But since it is the servant of rulers rather than servant of the Lord, I think it would at least be questionable whether it would be the same one. Yes? (14 1/2) ...

C.30. (3/4)

...in verse 6, what does this mean, it is a light thing that you'll do this, I will cause you to do that. It is a rhetorical form. Maybe some of you have heard Dr. Holdcroft speak ~~of this~~. If you have heard him much you will find that every now and then, he uses a certain rhetorical form. He will tell you some tremendous thing that happened, then he will say, "and not merely that, but..." and then he'll go on and tell a larger development of it, and he'll say, not merely this, and the term "not merely" sounds as if this was nothing, but he doesn't mean this was nothing, he's just been talking about tremendous events, but what he means is this is great but there is something even

greater, and when he says, it is a light thing that you should do this, it doesn't mean that this is a small thing, but it means that there is something even greater, there is something--you will do this. This is a tremendous thing, but, like, the Lord said, He that cometh after me and hateth not his father and mother, is not worthy of me. He does not mean that a person should hate the members of his family, nothing of the kind, but he means that a person should have such a love for the Lord that in comparison to it, the love we have to our family^{which}/should be very great, but in comparison is almost like hate, in comparison with our love to Christ, because that is so much greater. It is-- well, the Lord said, Jacob have I loved, Esau have I hated. He gave Esau great blessing, he didn't hate Esau but put Esau in a much lesser position so in comparison it seems that way. And here, it is a light thing, and then he goes on and says it is a tremendous thing. He doesn't mean a light thing in a specific literal sense, but he means that there is something even greater, something in comparison with which this seems like a light thing. We will of course discuss this passage at considerable length before the semester is over, and questions that you notice particularly, along the way, problems, particularly if they're important to the understanding of the passage, don't hesitate to raise them, but we won't go into the full interpretation of the passage now. We are now asking the question who is the servant. And of course here it is a light thing that you should raise up my servant Israel. Well if the servant raises up the servant Israel, how would it be Israel? It is a question, we can't get away from it. But then he goes on to say you should also be a light to the Gentiles. Well, now is there any parallel between this and chapter 42? In 42 He didn't say anything about his great (3 1/4) Israel. In 42 he says you are to be a light to the gentiles, so that this seems to say, 42 is going to be fulfilled, but it says, brings in something else that is going to be fulfilled which wasn't mentioned in 42. What's the next one? Mr. Miller? (3 1/2) 50.10. Of course, if anyone I call on skips one, the rest of you speak up, because we don't want to miss any. But Mr. Miller says the next one is 50.10 and I hear no voice of dissent so we assume

you all agree on that? And that verse says, "Who is among you that fears the LORD, that obeys the voice of his servant," could that be Isaiah? There is nothing to prove that it isn't Isaiah is there? Is this the nation of Israel? Why not? (stu.4 1/4) Oh, it is directly to Israel? Yes? (stu.4 1/2) Yes, it doesn't seem to you that this is Israel, but of course this could be outside the series, could be the word of his messenger Isaiah, or any other prophet, could conceivably be that, but it is in the series, it would seem to be a more individual (5) Certainly he doesn't say it's Israel. Miss Pickett, you had a question? (5) Yes, Mr. Grauley thinks that it is talking to Israel, when it says, who is it among you of Israel who fears the Lord and obeys the voice of God's servant. He couldn't be meaning, who is it that obeys your own voice. But it doesn't mean the nation that is talking to the nation and saying, which of them obeys the voice of his servant. So Mr. Grauley feels that this is the prophet rather than the nation. Yes? (5 1/2) Yes, verse 6, does verse 6 correspond to any phase of Isaiah's life? If you take it as figurative language, Isaiah certainly was looked down upon at the time of Ahaz, and the time of Manasseh he was probably pretty badly (6) Does this go beyond anything that could be said about Isaiah? And if you prove that it does and that in verse 5 someone other than Isaiah is speaking, still might you not in verse 10 be saying--I mean does the servant have to be the one speaking here? Who is there among you that obeys the word that Isaiah is given? It doesn't say obeys my word. Interesting question, but I'm not sure ^{whether} it helps much right here. Mr. Euredjian? (6 3/4) Could which refer to Christ? Verse 10? ~~//~~ Who is ^{there} among you that ^{fears} ~~obeys~~ the Lord, that obeys the voice of his servant? Well it depends who ~~is~~ he is talking to. If he is talking to Israel at the time of the exile, he would hardly say which among you obeys the voice of Christ. If he is here looking clear forward and talking to a people in a much later age, it might be. Yes? (7 1/4) But is that who he means by the word servant, I mean there might be a description of Christ in 6, 7 or 8, but is it, if so, is it necessarily the same one called the servant in verse 10? Obeys the voice of the servant. (7 1/2)(stu) Yes, well, now

couldn't I go out today and say verse 10. I could say, who is there among you that fears the Lord and obeys the voice of his servant. That is the word we have in the Bible. I wouldn't be calling myself a servant. Walks in darkness and has no light, let him trust in the name of the Lord. I could say that today. That is, I'm just raising a question whether you can be sure that the servant here is the same person as in the previous verse, unless you have further evidence. Well, we didn't get through all the servant passages today. That gives you a little time to look further ahead. I'm not sure you all got clear to the end. Think them through a little, if you're finished completely give me your paper now. If you have not quite why maybe you can finish them by tomorrow, there aren't many more.

(8 1/2)... we were looking at the different passages dealing the servant of the Lord and we hadn't looked at all of them. Now did I collect all the papers, last time? Not all. Well, I have quite a number here, so maybe I better give these back so you can have them in the discussion today. And then I'll collect them all at the end of the hour. Here, could you just pass these out Mr. Myers, please. And if I gave you anything else, just give them back to me later. Well, we were discussing these different passages, and the last one we looked at was I believe 50.10. So we don't have a great many more to look at. What was the next one after 50.10, Mr. Carlson, can you tell us? Between 50.10 and 52.13 you didn't find any? Did anybody? No. 50.10 we noticed was not very clear, just that obeyed the voice of his servant. There are many things that that could be taken alone. It certainly does not prove though that it is Israel, neither does it prove it isn't Israel. You can't really prove much from 50.10. Now the next you said said was 52.13. All right, Mr. Carlson, who is the servant in 52.13? Why couldn't it be Israel? I doubt if we'd have a great deal of trouble in referring verse 13 to Israel. He shall deal prudently, and be exalted and be very high. Many were astonished at thee, his visage was so marred more than any man and his form more than the sons of men. Now this is a misprint that I have here, it says astonished, it should be astonished. What do you have in your Bibles? Astonied. This has astonished, this little one put

out by the Bible Society evidently is not as accurate as I thought it would be. It's probably a typesetter who saw astonished and didn't know the word and did astounded without thinking. Astonished does not mean astounded but it's a very easy misunderstanding. Yes? (10 3/4) Astounded. Yes astonished is Old English for astounded. There is not such a great difference between astounded and astonished, except, well that is to say, half the meaning of astonished can be identical with astounded, but the other half ^{the meaning of astonished} of ~~astounded~~ is the opposite of astounded. Now if, all of a sudden, a bomb was to drop over here and to level Lynnewood Gardens flat with the ground, we'd all be astonished. But we would also be astounded, utterly astounded. Both would be true. But if all of a sudden I were to get a letter from President Kennedy that he'd like me to come to Washington to tell him what to do in the present crisis, we would all be astonished but I doubt if anybody here would be astounded. See the difference? Astounded is horrified. It is surprise at something terrible, something very unpleasant, while astonished can be bad or good. You are astonished when your best friend is killed in an auto ~~accident~~, and you're astonished when your best friend gets a tremendous reward that he hadn't expected. Either good or bad can be astonished. But astounded is always bad. And I'm not sure that astounded necessarily has quite as much idea of there being a sudden thing as astonished. You can be astounded at something more or less continuously. You're astonished simply at something you didn't expect, and it doesn't say whether it's good or bad. So astonished is Old English for astounded, and if you look at the Hebrew here, the Hebrew does not mean surprise at all, it means appalled, overwhelmed with sorrow, astounded. But this could certainly be said~~d~~ about Israel, that Israel lost its identity as a nation, and seemed not to be human at all, just overcome by the Babylonians no longer had their national existence. If you think of him personified as a man, why you would say that his visage was so marred that he didn't seem like a man at all, and so that verse 1 and 2 could seem to be Israel. Now so shall he sprinkle many nations, I don't know how Israel ever sprinkled many nations, and immediately somebody says I

don't know how Christ could either, so if you get the RSV , or if you get most modern translations, they'll say that it doesn't mean sprinkled, that it means startled. Well, the word is used about 30 times in Scripture and frankly every time except this it is translated sprinkle and it is never translated startle. The word definitely never means startle, that is purely a guess, but how on earth could you say that Christ sprinkled many nations. A lot of them are Baptist, aren't they, many nations. How ~~would~~ you say that Christ sprinkled many nations? Well, if anybody questions whether there is any sense in saying, that Christ sprinkled many nations, why they don't agree with the apostle Peter, because if you turn to 1 Pet.1, you find that Peter spoke to many nations. He said Peter an apostle of Jesus Christ to the strangers gathered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappodocia and Asia and Bithynia, that is many nations isn't it? And what did he say to these many nations? He said, elect ~~to~~ according to the foreknowledge of God the Father through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ. In other words, Peter says these many nations have been sprinkled with the blood of Jesus Christ, so that whatever it means, the wording is identical, and according to the wording what is predicted here has been fulfilled in Christ. Well, now of course that wouldn't be know to a reader of Isaiah, when he wrote it, so that while that is of great interest to us as Christians, it doesn't enter into our immediate purpose of seeing how a man at that time would reasonably interpret ...

C.31. (1/2)

...but you continue, what you continue to read about this one, that, as you go on into 53, he made his grave with the wicked and with the rich in his death, how is that fulfilled in Israel? And you look at verse 7, he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter and as sheep before his shearers is dumb, so he opens not his mouth. There are many different things people can say about Israel, but being dumb before his shearers and not opening his mouth is not the usual characterization of Israel. It is a strange way to describe Israel, and one would immediately ask how does it come Israel is described that way?

Now of course you might say it was ^Isaiah, or Jeremiah or somebody else, but it does not seem to fit Israel, and a good bit of this sounds personal and there is one thing I'd like to call your attention to, look at verse 14: As many as were astonished (or astounded) at thee; his visage was so marred more than any man, and his form more than the sons of men--as you look at that verse, isn't that strange the way that "thee" gets stuck in? Thee and his. Many ~~were~~ astonished at thee, his visage was so marred. Well the RSV solved all that problem, it just says something like this, many were surprised at you, his--no, many were surprised at him, his visage was so marred more than any man. And then under the "him" Hebrew "thee", so they simply solved the problem by changing it, as they do whenever they find a problem they don't understand, they just change it. But what the Hebrew says is "thee." And that's there, there is no question about it, no question in the text, that is what it says. As many were astonished at thee. Now what is the "thee" doing here? Well, if you look back at the beginning of the chapter, who is ~~stressed~~ addressed previously. Awake, awake, put on thy strength, O Zion. Put on thy beautiful garments O Jerusalem. He is addressing Jerusalem, addressing Zion, isn't he? And look at verse 12, ye shall not go out with haste nor by flight--who is the ye? It is Israel, isn't it? He is addressing Israel as you or thee right through chapter 52. He is addressing them, and now we get down to the end of chapter here, verse 14, just two verses after 12, he says as many as were astonished at thee. And actually the next phrase, which in English is, ^{as} ~~you see~~ the King James had "his visage was so marred," in the Hebrew the ~~so~~ is ~~at~~ at the beginning. As many were astonished at thee, so marred was his visage more than any man, and his form than the sons of man. In other words, as it stands in the Hebrew, with the so in the beginning of the second phrase, it is very clearly a comparison. Just as ~~many~~ many have been astonished at thee, Israel, conquered, no longer seeming like a nation, taken off into captivity, so is his visage to be marred so that he hardly seems like a man or the form like that of the sons of men. In other words, Israel has suffered, the servant is going to suffer. Now I don't lay that

down dogmatically, you will find hardly a commentary that says that. In general you can divide commentaries into two kinds, those that follow the RSV in saying there is a mistake in having thee where it should be him, and those that just ignore the problem and treat it as it was him. But actually it is thee and there is a comparison and the logical way to take the comparison is that the servant is compared with Israel, which has been nearly all through. So that there is at least a very strong suggestion in 52.13 to the end of 53, a very strong suggestion that this is an individual rather than the whole nation. And now what is the next occurrence of the servant of the Lord after 52.12? Mr. Golin? 53.11. Now in 53.11 what do we say about the servant there, Mr. Golin? I mean what specifically definitely about the servant, ignoring concepts. There is the name servant, and what does it say about it? (stu.5 3/4) By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities. Now who is that that justifies many by his knowledge? Is that Israel? That's a strange thing to say about the nation as a whole, isn't it? It certainly sounds like an individual, doesn't it? By the knowledge of him shall my righteous servant justify many. Of course, it doesn't have to be the knowledge of him, it could be the knowledge he has, or the knowledge about him. Either are possible interpretations of Genesis. But that by the knowledge of this one shall many be justified. It doesn't sound like a nation, but like an individual. So we have in 52.12 to 53.12 and specifically in the two places there where the word servant is used, we have an individual suggestion, perhaps not absolute proof but certainly looking strongly in that direction and some of the verses in the chapter are very difficult to interpret of the nation as a whole. Now what did you say was the next one, after that, Mr. Golin? 54.17, and there what do we read about the servant of the Lord? Yes, we have the servant (stu.7 1/4) Yes, well, it is not a continuation of this discussion of the servant, it is servants, a different idea. Where is the next one? After that, Mr. Oliver. 56.6, what does that say? (stu) Again 56.6 is servants. Is there any other? Anybody notice. These are all. In other words, after chapter 53 we never have the servant of the Lord. It ends with that

great climactic chapter. So it would be reasonable to think that the teaching about the servant of the Lord reaches a climax there. Then twice more we have the word servant but it's in the plural, speaking of individuals rather than in the singular speaking of one unit, whether it be an individual or a whole nation. So we have now looked at all instances of the servant of the Lord, and are we to say this sometimes--of course, you could, you can use the word just as a general term, say so-and-so is a servant of the Lord, so-and-so is, so-and-so is. But the frequent use here --the servant of the Lord-- seems to suggest there is one definite unitary concept, possibly leaving out a case where it may just be the thought, that as the man who speaks, God will fulfill the word of His servant, leaving out section 1 or 2 that might go under that category, we can say that the majority of the cases are shown definitely to be Israel. We can say that in many of them it is very clear from the context that Israel is what is meant, and that in 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 of them it is specifically said of Israel, my servant, thou art my servant O Israel, something like that, we have all these cases where it is very clear Israel is the servant of the Lord. And yet we notice that in 53 it sounds very much like an individual, and we notice that in chapter 42.1-4 it sounds strange for Israel and in chapter 49 the early verses it sounds like an individual. Now how can the servant be the nation and at the same time be an individual? Does he just jump from one thing to another or is there one united unitary thought? Mr. Myers? (9 3/4) In chapter 65 we are outside of our present section, we are dealing with 40-55 in which this concept the servant of the Lord is very frequent. We find the reference to such an idea comparatively infrequent in Isaiah, but we do, right near the end of the book, have a passage here where he compares the fate of the unfaithful members of Israel with his servant, and he does not specifically say there whether his servants are people not of Israel, or people of Israel, but they are contrasted with those who, though Israelites according to the flesh, are unfaithful. That is a very interesting discussion, yes, but it's not in our present area.

Now in our present area then, the servant is Israel, and yet when you come to chapter 42 it is very difficult to think that that is Israel and so we look at 42 and what are we going to do with it. Behold my servant, whom I uphold; mine elect, in whom my soul delights. Now that could be Israel all right thus far. I have put my spirit upon him; he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles. Well is Israel in bondage, in captivity, going to step out and to establish justice among the nations in the world, bring forth judgment among all the Gentiles? That could happen, God could cause that to happen. So thus far it would seem not impossible that it might be what ~~was~~ He was going to do with Israel, but certainly He has never yet done it with Israel. But then look at verse 2, He shall not cry nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street. How do you say that about a whole nation? How is a whole nation going to not cry nor cause his voice to be heard in the street? What meaning does it have for a nation? If it is an individual it shows an individual that is gentle and quiet, and yet effective. Verse 3, a bruised reed he won't break and a smoking flax he will not quench. Gentleness, which one can have when he is sure of himself. He doesn't have to thrash around wildly to accomplish what he is after, he can move forward steadily, confidently, quietly, and attain his goal. And verse 4 shows that characteristic, he will not fail nor be discouraged till he has established justice throughout the whole earth. And the distant lands will wait for his law. Now there is a picture which is hard to think of as describing a nation, and which doesn't seem to fit with Israel. That is the gentle confident moving forward. It is not usually thought of as Israel as a whole. And here there is lack of no discouragement and certainly there was plenty of discouragement among Israel and plenty of cause to be discouraged. And now you look at 6 and 7 which are very parallel to this, I the Lord have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thy hand and keep thee and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles; to open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the prison, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison house.

You might say that Israel in captivity would say God has said, Israel, you are my

servant, you don't need to fear, you're not going to be destroyed. You're going to succeed, you are my servant. Well, they say, what does he mean, Israel is his servant? Well, it means he has a purpose for Israel, He has a task which Israel is to accomplish. Well, you immediately say does that mean that this whole nation is going to accomplish that task, that every individual in this nation is to be a part in the accomplishment of that task? Immediately you say no that is absurd, it couldn't possibly be. There were, at the time of the exile, there were many very wicked in Israel who were opposing God's word, in the exile there were many of them who were utterly uninterested in what he wanted done. Who were either definitely opposed to Him or entirely uninterested. How then would the servant, Israel is my servant, mean that every individual in Israel is a part of the accomplishment of the servant? It couldn't mean that, so when He says Israel is His servant, if He is speaking of the nation as a whole, He must mean that the nation as a whole has a task to be performed, a task which the nation will do, but that doesn't mean every individual in the nation is going to have an active and vital part in the performance of that task. The task belongs to the nation...

C.32. (1/2)

...a responsibility is upon the nation that this task be done. If the task that God has laid upon the nation be not done, every member of the nation is at fault because their duty has not been done. But in the actual carrying out of the task it will stand to reason that it will be those in the nation who are anxious to be. Any nation is going to have some who aren't interested and some who are opposed, it can't mean every individual, it must mean those who are interested and endeavor to carry it out, and it must mean those who have the ability to carry it out, those who have the qualities that are necessary for the carrying out of this task. Now in chapter 41 God has declared that He is going to protect Israel because Israel has a task to do, Israel is His servant and His task is going to be done. Well now you say Israel is very anxious to get out of captivity, they

want to be released , they want to go back, yes, but naturally, if this is the reason they're going to be released, because they have a task to do, they would be interested to know what the task is. What is involved in the task that is laid upon the nation to fulfill? So we start chapter 42 with a presentation of what the task is. God says two things here, He says the task is going to be done, Israel says we are in captivity, we are in bondage, how can we do the task? ^{God says} ~~God's promise~~ is going to make it possible that the task be done, the task is going to be done. But then you say, what is the task that is going to be done? And those two questions are answered in this passage. They are not answered as explicitly as we might like, they're not answered as clearly as we might like, He is leading them forward, giving them a little more instruction, a little more idea, a little more understanding, and that is true of all teaching, you have to give a little more and a little more, till gradually the minds are opened to where they understand the thing to the full. And ~~God~~ does that allthrough the scripture. Mr. Miller?

(2 1/2) No I didn't say two tasks, I said two questions. Two questions to which this passage addresses itself. One of them will the work be done that the servant is to do? The answer is God assures us that He is going to see to it that the work is accomplished. He hasn't kept Israel from destruction and isn't promising to see to it they're delivered because they're His servant and then the work not be done. The work is going to be done for which Israel has been chosen. On account of which Israel has been preserved through the ages, through the centuries, this work is going to be done. That's the first and the second question is what is the work that is going to be done? And it describes it in these six verses. Yes, Mr. Charvoz? (3 1/2) Mr. Charvoz, you can't take the passage alone. You take the passage as the thought develops and you reach this, chapter 42, and you immediately say well there is going to be no difficulty, He is just going to carry out the task, that's what you say, but as we go on further, we find the details of the task developed more fully and we get a further understanding, if you just take this alone, as many doubtless did, and many may have found in it a reason for

rejecting Christ, because he'd say ~~He~~ He doesn't fit with this at all. But you have to go through the whole section and see how your thought develops as He opens up more and more. But what we find in 42 is what is the task which God has said is going to be done. And He doesn't tell us very fully what it is, but He gives us certain aspects of it here. And these aspects which He gives us of the task are described as a picture of what is going to be done by the servant. Now you know nobody things that the work of the servant can be done by the whole nation and yet you just take it for granted, it's got to be the whole nation or it's not. No. The responsibility is on ~~the~~ the nation, the task is on the nation, but the carrying out of the task, will it be fulfilled by the whole nation? Of course not. It will be some portion of the nation that will fulfill it. It has got to be a portion of the nation, but how big a portion of the nation, that is a thing which we have to investigate and find out. When Israel fought with the Philistines at one time, Goliath said give me a champion, and he said if he wins we'll be your subjects, and if I win you'll be our subjects, in other words, Israel was fighting the Philistines, but the task was to be performed for the two nations by two champions. And when the U. S. fought Germany they said it took 17 girls at typewriters to keep one man with a bayonet on the fighting front. Well, I think that our nation is perhaps extreme in that regard, but it is true that you have to have the service of supply, the equipment, the control of the bringing of the equipment and the goods and the food, the transportation, and everything, all that is necessary, but the actual fighting is done by a comparatively small group. The nation as a whole does it, but a comparatively small group actually ~~perform~~ performs the task, and behind them is a larger group backing them up, and then a still larger group backing them up and then the whole nation here backing them up, of which some are, and some aren't, but whenever a nation performs a task it is a portion of the nation that does it. So it is definitely Israel, but how big a portion of Israel is it? Is it 95%? Is it 90%? Is it 70%? Is it even possible that one champion who is from Israel and represents Israel will do the task, carrying out the responsibility that Israel has

that this task be done. We are not told, but there is a very individual picture, now is the picture here quite a figurative which may still represent the nation, or does it suggest rather strongly, that this responsibility of the nation which is God's servant for the performance of the task, is to be carried out by an individual who is a member of the nation and represents the nation and does the work which is the nation's responsibility, but who is an individual from that nation? Now that is the question raised by this passage, and as we look at the passage we find that the picture is one which is rather different from the usual idea of the nation as a whole or of any large number of the nation. It sounds very much individual, an individual who is going to do it, at any rate it is God's strength in which He is going to do it, and as presented here in chapter 42 there is not a single word to suggest that ~~it~~ He is going to do a work specifically for Israel. He is going to do a work for the world, Israel is here in order that ~~a~~ work be done for the world. What is the work that is to be done for the world? Justice is to be brought to it, He will bring forth judgment to the Gentiles, He will establish things in justice among them, and will put an end to the unevenness and the unfairness, the brutality, the misery, that is found not in Israel here but in the nations. He won't fail or be discouraged till ~~He has~~ He has established justice in the world, and the distant lands, the islands are going to wait for his law. And He says I will keep thee and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles; to open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the prison, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison house. And the Israelite may say well now look at here we're in prison, we're in captivity, we need someone to bring us out, what's the use of telling us that we're God's servant to bring others out? Somebody needs to bring us out. That thought could occur, and that thought is developed later. But at this point it is only suggested so that it may naturally occur to the mind without even being stated. Mr. Oliver? (8 3/4) ...that from this passage, yes. But do you have it earlier, do you have it further? Well, I think if you take Abraham, he was, all nations were to be blessed with him. Yes, it is an essential part--

God didn't call Israel simply for blessing for them, He called them to be a light to the nations, be a blessing to the nations. But it is easy to forget that, very easy.

Now in this passage here, here we start in in chapter 40 and we're thinking of Israel in captivity, Israel needs help, God's going to help Israel, all of a sudden He says here, why am I helping Israel? ~~Because~~ Israel is my servant. What is the servant to do? He is to bring justice to all the nations, so that the work of the servant for which Israel is to be saved is a work which extends to the whole world. That is suggested in, I mean that is clearly taught, in 42 here, The question is raised, how can this be done? And of course the Israelite reading this is pondering about the fact he is in exile, he is suffering, he is in oppression. How am I ever going to get loose from this, and so the Lord slipped in an idea here, and a little more here and a little more here, and He gradually develops the idea, along with all these promises of comfort. And you notice how verse 5 here stresses the power of God, the comfort to the people. God the creator, God the Nourisher, God the One who provides, the only One through Whom anyone draws their breath. God is the one who is going to see to it that the work of the servant is fulfilled. ~~How~~ Elsewhere we have our stress on the greatness of God as the One who is going to deliver Israel, but here the stress is on God the One who will insure that the task for which Israel is the Servant, that that task is going to be fulfilled. And when you get on to the end of the chapter, you have the problem which would occur to a person's mind in verse 7, that problem brought out clearly, verse 19. Well, now, Israel is God's servant, Israel is to do this great work. This great work involves never being discouraged, going forward in absolute gentleness, in utter confidence, never failing nor being discouraged, till the whole world has justice established throughout it, and the prisoners are brought out from the prison house. Well, how can Israel do this work, look at 19, "Who is blind, but my servant?" God says here is the work that my servant should be doing, and Israel isn't doing it, instead they are in captivity themselves.

"Who is blind, but my servant," as the one who should be perfect, who should be going out in God's power, establishing God's work for these blind, these imprisoned, these in bondage? Well, in verse 21 the Lord says He is going to fulfill His promises, the Lord is well pleased for his righteousness' sake; he will magnify the law, and make it honorable. The work of the servant is going to be done. But how can it be done when they're blind and in captivity. But this is a people robbed and spoiled, they're in prison themselves, how can they deliver others from prison? The Lord's answer is in verses 24 and 25, "Who gave Jacob for a spoil, and Israel to the robbers?" Why are you in prison? Why aren't you able to carry out the work? "...did not the Lord, he against whom we have sinned? for they would not walk in his ways, neither were they obedient unto his law. Therefore he hath poured upon him the ~~strong~~ fury of his anger, and the ~~strong~~ strength of battle: and it ~~h~~ ... burned him, yet he laid it not to heart." So you have the obstinacy, you have the forgetfulness of God, you have the blindness at the end of this chapter, you reach the end of the chapter, you ~~fr~~ just about feel, God has said Israel is called to do a tremendous work. Israel instead of doing this work has sinned so it has been necessary to send him into exile. Israel is called to lead people out of the prison, and yet Israel, on account of his sins, it has been necessary to put them in prison themselves. ~~Israel~~ is called to be a light to the Gentiles and yet Israel itself is blind, and the Lord says at the end of this chapter, He knew it not; it burned him, yet ~~h~~ he laid it not to heart. Why, logically, you think, after 25, you're going to say, well, it's just hopeless, Israel can never do this wonderful work, they're just gone. But look at the first verse of 43 and see the contrast. "But now thus saith the Lord that created thee, O Jacob, and he that formed thee, O Israel, Fear not: ...I have called thee by thy name; thou art mine." Israel need not fear because God is going to deliver. "When thou passest through the waters, I will be with thee," they are two of the most beautiful verses of God's wonderful care. Look at verse 4. "Since thou ~~art~~ ^{wast} precious in my sight, thou ~~has~~ been honourable, and I have loved thee ." God's wonderful verses

about God's wonderful that He is going to have for Israel, despite the fact that at the end of the previous chapter it just looks absolutely hopeless. In other words, the Lord is bringing out the two opposite ideas, God's power that is going to deliver Israel and nothing on earth can stop it, and the work that Israel is called for is going to be done, God assures us, and on the other hand the failure of Israel, their sin which made it necessary to send them into captivity, thus gradually through these chapters, little by little, without ever doing enough to get you so irritated that you quit reading, but enough to gradually impress it on the minds, the thought is brought out that after all, the vital question is not how can they get free from the Babylonians, but how can they get free from sin? It is sin that made it necessary they go into exile. If they are delivered from exile and the sin question is not solved, the only thing that can possibly happen is another exile, because sin brought this exile; deliver them from it and ~~there'll~~ ^{there'll} ~~they're~~ be another so long as there is no solution to the problem of sin, and so we find that chapter 43 is in many ways a close parallel to 42. Both chapters start with wonderful assurance of God, the work is going to be done, the people are going to be blessed, they are going to be delivered from exile, and both of them end with despair that the people have failed to accomplish that for which they've been called...

c.33 (3/4)

...well as far as establishing justice in the earth and bringing the law to the distant lands so that there will be judgment everywhere, why certainly not, they were always fighting for their existence, barely managing to survive, and this work was definitely not being done. Those who studied the scriptures knew there was a great work to be done, prayed that it would be fulfilled, but that they were actually doing it, when you stop and think, they couldn't, they didn't have the power to, it just wasn't being done, but yet God assures them it will be done, it is going to be done. (1 1/2) Well, it was future until it was done. Of course it's not all done yet, but in principle the basis of it has been laid. The complete outworking awaits the millennium. Judgment has not been

established in all the earth yet, it will take the millennium to do that. (1 3/4)(stu)

Yes, so that it is true that there has been an outreaching of the law of God through all the earth, but not a complete following. No nation has ever entirely been devoted to carry out God's law. No city, no village entirely.

Well, it is interesting to notice how 43 parallels 42. You have ~~this~~ wonderful promises about the servant of the Lord, the servant is going to do his work, God will stand by him and make sure that it will happen, and then at the beginning of 43 you have the assurance God is going to be with His people, He is going to deliver them, He is going to free them from their troubles, He is going to regather them. Verse 6, I will say to the North, Give up; and to the south, Keep not back; bring my sons from far, and my daughters from the ends of the earth! And you have the great emphasis on the power of God in the middle of both chapters, but at the end of both chapters you end with disappointment and frustration because the work is not being done. Look at verse 21, "this people have I formed for myself; they shall shew forth my praise." Wonderful, it's sure to be done, it's grand, but what about (3 1/4) Verse 22, "But thou hast not called upon me, O Jacob; but thou hast been weary of me, O Israel. Thou hast not brought me the small cattle of thy burnt offerings; neither hast thou honoured me with thy sacrifices. I have not caused thee to serve with an offering, nor wearied thee with incense. Thou hast bought me no sweet cane with money, neither hast thou filled me with the fat of thy sacrifices; but thou hast made me to serve with thy sins, thou hast wearied me with thine iniquities. I, even I, am he that blotteth out thy transgressions for mine own sake, and will not remember thy sins." God says He is ready to forgive them but they don't come. "Put me in remembrance: let us plead together; declare thou, that thou mayest be justified." And then you reach the extreme of frustration, verses 27 and 28, "Thy first father hath sinned, and thy teachers have transgressed against me. Therefore I have profaned the princes of the sanctuary, and have given Jacob to the curse, and Israel to reproaches." When you get the terrible accusation of

these these last two verses, and the declaration of how God has poured out his ~~wa~~ wrath upon, it's just like verse 25 of chapter 42, "Therefore he hath poured upon him the fury of his anger...hath set him on fire round about, yet he ~~knew~~ not; and it burned him, yet he ~~h~~ said it not to heart." And you felt at the end of 42, well, it's just hopeless. You feel the same way at the end of 43, and yet 44 starts "Yet now hear O Jacob my servant, and Israel whom I have chosen, thus saith the Lord that made thee, and formed thee from the ~~w~~ womb...I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and floods on the dry ground; I will pour my spirit upon thy seed..." Wonderful promises of what God is going to do for His people. So in each case, you have the two sides to look at. God has promised God's wonderful blessing, He is going to deliver them from captivity, He is going to carry out His promise He has given, on the other hand the failure of the nation to be worthy of it, failure to take advantage of it. This is the cause of being in exile, something has got to be done about this problem (5 1/4) So it is thrilling to go through these sections and see how the Lord gradually brings ~~out~~ ideas forward and drives them home, just a little, not enough to drive you away, but enough to get you thinking and then gets back to His wonderful promises again, and holds your attention, but gradually brings these other things in and gets you aware of them as ~~problems~~.

So if we had a year instead of a semester we ought to spend a good bit of time on 42 and 43, seeing all that is involved in them, but I think perhaps we will move along and look at 44 and 45. Mr. Grauley? (6) I was talking to a professor of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem some days ago and he was very, very interested in historical and archeological matters relating to Genesis and the Kings. And I said I was going to do a study in Isaiah, Oh, he says, Isaiah is (6 1/4)

and of course it's true of anything that gets away from simple historical narrative. When you get into a thing you have to get the key, have to see what it's driving ^{at}, and if you don't, it's just confusion. But when you get the key and you see what the line of thought is and where the thought is proceeding and where it is leading to, then you can read it

with understanding. But the sad thing to me is that so many, many of our Christian people know this whole section simply as isolated verses, wonderful verses, but they don't see the progress of thought, the development, how it logically relates to it, it isn't just a verse stuck in. You talk about Israel a while, and then you say a few words about Christ, then you go back to the deliverance from Babylon, then you say something about the atonement. Well, God isn't just a God of hodge-podge, jumping from this to that. There is logic in it, there is meaning in it. It is not apparent but when you get into it and find it, you find there is a reasonable development, and if a person will go to it, and say what does this mean, what is he driving at, how does the thought develop, he will find that it leads him out to certain conclusions. And so that is what I am anxious to do, with you, particularly this year, to get an idea of the progress of thought, and there are many things we could look at in these early chapters, beyond what we have, but I want you to get the principle of the moving from one theme to another, and the vital importance of these themes, and then I want you to see the development of some of these ideas, and particularly this one of the servant of the Lord. And of course, parallel with it is this other one about the problem of sin. It is not like the rest of his prophecy, rebuking people for sin, God is going to punish you if you keep on sinning, that's in all the other places, and in Isaiah, too, but not much here. You're in exile, God's going to comfort you, God is going to deliver you. Fine. How did you get there? What is the reason for it? Well, if He delivers you how do you know you won't have another one? Something has got to be done about this problem. If He delivers you, how do you know you won't have another one. And gradually it is brought to the fore. He doesn't talk about deliverance from exile and then all of a sudden talk about Calvary. He talks about deliverance from exile and gradually develops the importance of this other aspect of it, because you see something has got to be done about this. And then ~~He~~ ^{He} shows you what is going to be done. Well, chapter 42 and 43, we notice, were a remarkable parallel, but when we take 44 and 45, they are not a parallel like these.

We go through a certain trend of thought in 42, we go through more or less the same trend of thought in 43, driving this development of thought home to your mind, then we move to a little different aspect of it in 44 and 45. So as you start 44 you have these wonderful promises again of God, comforting promises, the assurance not only that God is going to deliver from exile, God is going to give tremendous increase, tremendous blessing. Israel seems as if it is going to die out, it is not going to die/ out. He says in verse 3, I am going to pour my spirit on your seed and they will spring up among the grass as willows by the water courses. One shall say I am the Lord's, another shall call himself by the name of Jacob, another shall subscribe with his hand to the Lord, and surname himself by the name of Israel. There is going to be an extension, an enlargement of those who were God's people, and then after verse 8, with its wonderful assurance of this and its stress again on God's uniqueness and His being the only God, then naturally the thought occurs again, well, what about the idols, what about the idolatry, what about these false gods that seem to be in control? After all, this is beautiful talk about God but you can't see God. He has His temples gone, His city is gone, the people are in bondage, subject to these Babylonians that march through the streets, their great processions, and their mighty statues, the people must have felt much like this rabbi said to me last week, he said this passage in Isaiah is sort of a bridge from Judaism to Christianity. He is a Reformed Rabbi, and he says, after all, he said, why should the Jew keep up his difference, his identify, why not join the majority party, after all. What is the difference between the two? Well, that must be the thought that was in the minds of the Jews and the Babylonians. After all, we talk about God, the Babylonians talk about their gods, the only difference is our God couldn't protect us, and their gods have protected them. He has ^{Babylon} made the great nation of all the world. And so they had this problem and it was a struggle, it's always a struggle when you're a minority anywhere. With a majority around. It is a struggle to keep sure you're right and that you shouldn't just join the majority. So God, of this

chapter 44, takes about 12 verses to stress the fact that idolatry after all is irrational. After all idolatry is not sensible for a man to make a statue and to make a god out of it. For a man to make a graven image, for a man to take a piece of wood and use part of it, burn part of it in the fire, and think that the other part --part of it warms him up and the other part is a god he worships. Why it's ridiculous, so He stresses the folly of idolatry, which is to urge the people their loyalty to Him and to realize that even though ~~it~~ everything obvious~~y~~ is against God being the true God, yet that these things that everybody glibly says, that sound as if they are the real thing, they're not much, they're not rational. And I found when I was in college that the college was becoming more and more modernistic and unbelieving, and all around me the teaching was being given, it was tearing into the Bible. I found that, though there was a tremendous pressure--I saw student after student give up their faith in the course of that pressure, and individual after individual who went there, intending to be a missionary or a minister, graduated and went into some kind of business life and completely lost the idea with which they had gone there. I saw that happening all around. Yet I found that as the things that were presented as a substitute for Christianity, you'd look at them and examine them and see how irrational they were, see how there wasn't--fundamentally, they were not any more logical than Christianity. In fact they were not as logical as Christianity. And when I was struggling against the unbelief ~~and~~ all around me, that was one thing that the Lord gave me a mind that could see the flaws and keep seeing the flaws, until when I graduated I think I was still quite convinced that the Bible was true, that what I believed when I entered was true, yet I ~~saw~~ said to someone just before I graduated, I said I hope I will be absolutely sure of many things by the time I'm 50 and by that time I'll probably have sense not to be sure of it. In other words, I could see that what they said was, ^{not} didn't have a basis to depend upon, they gave you no foundation for what I believed. I still believed it but I believed it, I didn't know anything else was any more reasonable. And then, in the next few years I got a backing up, an assurance which

strengthened me in what I believed, that it was not only true, because I knew the Lord, I knew it was His will, but it could be backed up with good solid evidence. I could see the others didn't have any evidence backing them than what we believe. Of course, we believe Christianity is strictly logical, but here he was showing the illogicality of the other, and there is (14 1/4)

I think, often, in Christian groups we simply ridicule the views of the unbeliever, in a way that is very moving with groups that are committed to our view but ~~is~~^{seems} terribly superstitious to those who have been taught other views. I think we should use that argument with extreme caution. It can drive people away instead of bringing them. People who sincerely believe something we should approach on a serious basis, and try to show them that there is a more reasonable to something else. But God here gives the people something to strengthen them in their stand against idolatry, and then after that He goes on to give His wonderful promises again, and then His very specific promises about Cyrus and the deliverance from exile. So next time look into chapters 45 and 46 and , yes, 5 and 6 and 7 we will probably try to run through in one or two sessions next time. And we have a new division of the book, chapter 48.

And I asked the Graduate Section to study chapter 42. I think perhaps we'll made that 49 next time, yes, you're all here, let's make it for next time 49 instead of 42. If you've already done 42, do 49...

C.34. (1/2)

...I trust that most of you saw the notice put up last Wed. on the Bulletin Board, maybe Mr. Roczey and Mr. Vannoy didn't but I think everybody else would have, about the test tomorrow in this course. I realized, all of a sudden, Tuesday night, that we hadn't had a test in it, and I have to have a mark in a week from today, for the first six weeks, to the office, so that the only way I could do it was to have a test tomorrow, so you had a week's notice. So that, but of course if you've been keeping up your work regularly, it won't take a lot of review, but I wanted to give you that much notice

anyway. Well, then that will, we won't have a lecture tomorrow so I can know what to turn in for you next week. Yes, Mr. (1 1/2) I'll guarantee that. What particular hint would you have in mind? (stu) (2) μ ...unless there should be an extra question for Graduates. Yes? Now that is a very excellent idea. I would go over the notes, see what we've covered in class, go over the work that had been assigned in class, and try to see what were the predominant ideas that were taken, the matters on which a fair amount of time was spent, what were the ideas that were stressed and dealt with more than once...what were the particular aspects on which we spent a fair amount of time. I'd try to get those fairly in mind and then having done those, then run over the notes again, and you might pick up odds and ends, but the main thing μ is to have the things that I've been stressing. (stu.2 3/4)

Well just what we've had in class thus far, what we have discussed or had assigned, I don't think we've assigned anything in this class ahead of chapter 45, except the dividing up according to themes, ~~we assigned~~ that, and then we assigned looking at the ~~servant~~ = servant's task ...but I don't think otherwise we got beyond this. I haven't thought yet what questions to give, so if somebody can give some good suggestions, I'd be glad to have them. But now perhaps we'd better continue with our examination ^{of the} passages and I'm not sure whether I made this altogether clear to you, that I would divide--don't know as I even said it this way before--but I would divide the section between 40-56 into four parts, really three parts with an Intro. Chapter 40, as you all know I consider as an overture or a prelude, as introductory to the rest, and as somewhat different from the rest in that it deals with, it's the approach to the ~~major~~ theme, rather than much of specific dealing with particular definite matters. That is (4 1/4) our approach thus far to chapter 40, we come back to it again, after we've gone all through them. But then after 40 as an introduction I feel that you have three main divisions, and the first of these divisions, as we notice, has as its main subject matter the deliverance from exile, and we've seen as far as we've gone

how very, very frequently deliverance from exile is stressed in this passage, and as we go on it is more stressed than we have had it yet. We go on from, we've really looked at it from about the middle of 44, have we, no, I guess 43 is as far as we've looked at, but the end of 44, and beginning of 45 we looked at in seeing the place of deliverance from Babylon in the passages, and it's very prominent there, and it's very prominent on through to the end of 47. 46 and 47 are dealing almost exclusively with it. That is the big thought of this first section. Now that big main approach which, you might say, is the occasion of the writing of it, the theme of deliverance from exile, that theme is dealt with very strongly in this first section. Then, after this first section ends, with the end of 47, that theme is still quite prominently in view. But it does not have the overwhelming predominance in the second main division that it has in this one. And then it's hardly mentioned in the third section, because by that time other themes have come to attention. Now in the first main section, from 41 through 47 we have the servant of the Lord introduced, and that is the new theme, the new idea, that you do not find directly mentioned at all in the overture, in chapter 40, not directly, but which you have mentioned and developed to some extent in chapters 41-47, the servant of the Lord is introduced, and of course you have only one passage of several verses that deal with it, you have many that lightly touch upon this subject, but you have one of several verses that deals with (6 1/4) and it's very important to have in mind exactly what that section says about the servant of the Lord. You all know where that one is of course. Then, in the next section, from chapters 48 to almost the end of 52, I believe it's 52.12 or 11, about there, that section, the servant of the Lord assumes far greater prominence. And the main idea of that one seems to me to be the servant of the Lord individually, that is to say, you've come to have a sharper, clearer idea of this subject of the servant of the Lord in that section, while you're still dealing to some extent with deliverance from exile. Then in the last section, which starts with the last three verses of chapter 52 and runs on to the end of our present

passage, you have the work of the servant of the Lord brought to fruition. You have his accomplishment and that is the big subject of that section. So you see how the progress of our full passage starts with a subject that is of tremendous interest to the reader, and this occupies the mind of the listener at the time of Isaiah who is a true believer, who is following Isaiah and knows that exile is absolutely certain, this is the great thing that so fills his mind and heart and he can hardly think of anything else, is exile the end, does our nation disappear, are our people completely destroyed, just become part of the heathen nations? Does our religion come to an end completely^{in it,} or is there a deliverance from it? And that is the thing that fills their hearts, and he starts in, to the godly in his day, who know the exile is certain, looking beyond the exile, to assure them that God is going to deliver, but as he goes on he gradually introduces these other things and leads them to see their great importance, until in the end the other things, this problem is taken care of. It is absolutely certain they're going to be delivered from exile, but^{by} that time the other problems have become so prominent in their minds that he goes on and deals with them, and you reach your great climax in the third main section of our book, which is far more important, as one recognizes by that time, than even deliverance from exile, because it is deliverance from^{the} cause of exile, and gradually through these chapters he leads them to understand that even more important than the problem of exile, is the problem of sin, because it was sin that sent them into exile, and if they don't find some way of dealing with the sin problem, even if God delivers them from exile, there will be new exiles and new captivities and new difficulties to be faced, the problem of sin is the root problem which must be dealt with, so by the end of our whole section we are brought to a realization of that fact, and then to an understanding of how God is going to deal with that problem. Now we were looking last time at chapters 42 and 43, and we noticed what a great similarity there is in general outline between 42 and 43, how each of them starts with

the words of comfort, the assurance that God's word is going to be fulfilled, and of course 42 is in rather general ~~of~~ terms, it is the great work of the servant going to be done, God guarantees it. In 43 it is God's particular blessing for Israel which He guarantees is going to be done, and then both chapters start with that guarantee of the fulfillment of God's word, go on to discussion of God's greatness in contrast with the futility of idols and end up with the thought, in both cases, that why are the people in this condition? Why are they not able to do the work of the servant? It is because of their sin, it is their own fault, that they have fallen into this terrible situation. So in 43 we begin with those beautiful words in verse 1 that the Lord says to Israel, "...I have redeemed thee,...thou art mine. When thou passest through the waters, I will be with thee..." General statements in verses 1 and 2 which of course guarantee them deliverance from exile but do not specifically speak of it. But then you look at verse 3, "For I am the LORD thy God, the Holy One of Israel, thy Saviour: I gave Egypt for thy ransom, Ethiopia and Seba for thee." And how many of you can tell me what the last half of verse 3 means? How many of you could tell me? I did not assign anyone specifically to consult commentaries on this. Mr. Grauley has a special basis of knowing something about it that probably very few others in the class would have. If you're referring to that, Mr. Grauley, I'd rather hold it. If it is otherwise~~ly~~, if it is from some other source you have something to say, I'd be interested to hear it. If it is ^{from} what you heard me say in another connection I'd rather hold it back a bit. Does anyone else have any idea of what that means. I gave Egypt for thy ransom, Ethiopia and Seba for thee. I believe that you will find the commentaries to be unanimous in the explanation. At least there is only one explanation of it I have ever heard. And that explanation is this, that Cyrus, the king of the Persians, conquered Babylon, and ^{thus} he has all of Babylon's dependencies, including the people of Israel in captivity, he has all of them under his control, and then he proceeds to release the people of Israel, allow them to go back to Jerusalem, and then God permits him to conquer Egypt and

Ethiopia and Seba, thus considering Egypt, Ethiopia and Seba, as a ransom given to Cyrus in payment for having let the people of Israel go. Now that is a historical fact that he started out to conquer these lands, he died before he got there, but his Cambyses continued his expeditions and succeeded in conquering Ethiopia, and so that he did secure these lands beyond Babylon held in (13) and God speaks of it as something that He has given to the king of Persia as a ransom for letting Israel go. Now that is an interpretation which would not immediately occur to a person, but if you know the history it corresponds to this historical fact, and this did happen ~~and~~ I have never heard of any other suggestion of anything to account for it. The other thing we would think of Egypt in connection with, of course, is the deliverance from Egypt and there are many references in these sections to God having brought the people out of captivity in Egypt, but that would have no relevance here. Yes, Miss Pickett? (13 1/.2)

The matter of the deportation seems to be a matter which began with the kings of Assyria. When the Assyrian kings, 300 years before this time, began making their great conquest, they found the great problem that when they would conquer a nation and lead it in subjection to themselves, they would go away and be attacking other areas, and next you know this region would revolt, and they would have to reconquer the same areas over and over. And they tried to find a way of solving this problem, to keep the regions subject to themselves, and one thing they ~~g~~ tried was to treat nations that had revolted with particular cruelty against them, and to spread the story of how cruelly they treated them all over, to scare others from revolting. Well, that helped but it didn't help tremendously, and then one of the Assyrian kings would seem to have hit on this idea, when he conquered ~~the~~ a land, to take the leading people, to take the leaders, the princes, to take the skilled workers, and to carry them away into captivity, and these people then would be a comparatively small part perhaps of a nation...

C.35 (1/2)

...and that being the case these people who were taken into captivity would be put in

a region where the leaders of that region had been taken captive, and so the new minority would not be the fighters, they wouldn't be the vigorous type so much as they would be the princes and the skilled people, and here they see, in a foreign environment, and the people there would think of them as people brought in by the king of Assyria who had conquered them, and so they'd tend to be hostile to them, and thus these people brought in would look to the king of Assyria to protect them. He figures that way he'd get their loyalty to him, and the rank and file of the people of the area would not have any leadership to start a real revolt. That way, by mixing up the people through his empire that way, he figured that he would be hold it with a smaller garrison, and keep them subject to himself. Well, that was the policy they instituted and the king of Babylon carried it on when the Babylonian empire succeeded the Assyrian empire. But then when Cyrus the Persian ~~o~~ conquered the Babylonian empire, he reversed the process, now you couldn't reverse the policy until you first had the policy, so there would be no reason to think that anybody had ever done what Cyrus had did before the policy was instigated. It was instituted by the Assyrians, and carried on by the Babylonians, and then Cyrus reversed it and I suppose he figured that the captive people, now being released ~~from~~ by him, would be loyal to him, and that ~~was~~ the policy he used and we have evidence of his permitting other peoples to go back to their homeland, and ~~see~~ gods statues that had been taken away, he permitted them to carry home to their country. Of course, in the case of the people Israel, they had no statues to carry back with them, so that he permitted them to take the vessels from the temple which had been taken ~~to~~ Babylon, which were there in Babylon, and that was the substitute for giving them the idols, so that as far as we can figure from his inscriptions that was the policy that he introduced. Now what led him to introduce it we have no way of knowing, all we know is the comparatively little information about Cyrus, from his own ~~o~~ inscriptions, and from other contemporary writings, and then what the Bible says. The Bible says that God raised him up to let the people go,

to conquer these nations and release Israel, and said that ~~He~~ would give Egypt and Ethiopia as a ransom. So we have two references in our section to Egypt and Ethiopia, as a ransom for Israel, that God is giving for them, to Cyrus. So we have this reference here in verse 3, to them, being the ransom that God gave to Cyrus, and then it is referred to again in verse 4, "Since thou wast precious in my sight, thou hast been honourable, and I have loved thee." Very strange to read that after reading the words at the end of 42, where he rebukes Israel for --telling them the terrible results of their sin, it is a shock (3 1/2) his presentation of his love here, there his presentation of his sorrow, the result of their sin. And also at the end of 43 of course. But he says, I have loved thee, therefore will I give men for thee, and people for thy life. He will give men. Verse 3 says I gave Egypt for thy ransom, so the "gave" we think of as a perfect ~~showing~~ ^{showing} that it is determined in the mind of God, the same as done. He has established it that Cyrus will receive it, but the actual doing of it is still future. And so in verse 5 and 6 he continues his words of comfort, fear not, for I am with thee, and then we have the promise of the regathering, the last part of verse 5 and verse 6, tells us about the regathering of his people, even everyone that is called by my name. Now the first reader of that would certainly think this is a prediction of the return from the Babylonian exile, but as later readers might read it and know about the wonderful return from the exile, they might think that these ~~were~~ words are too strong language to be simply a prediction of that return that they looked beyond at. That return was a wonderful thing, but it was after all a comparatively small portion of the people that came back. This one says, from all directions they're going to come back, even every one that is called by my ~~name~~, and so it makes one think of the possibility that even though he is giving them the wonderful promises of the return from Babylonian exile, he is giving certain general promises which are so worded as to go way beyond that and to show still greater things that God is going to do for ~~his~~ people in the more distant future. That wouldn't be obvious at first reading but might immediately become

apparent at second reading as a possibility. Then we continue here after that, with immediately turning his attention to the false gods. He calls on a nation again to be assembled, and he says who among them can declare this and show us former things. Who can show that they have done great things in the past? Who can show that they have been active in the world in the past? God has predicted things in the past and done them, now He is predicting new things that are going to be done. You are my servant, he says, I am the Lord and besides there is no saviour. And then we have verse 14, thus says the Lord your redeemer, the Holy One of Israel, for your sake I have sent to Babylon, and have brought down all their nobles, and the Chaldeans, whose cry is in the ships. And there, it uses the perfect, it sounds as it is something he has already done, but it is not impossible that it is again the perfect to show that it is something that is determined to be accomplished, but that is still future. And the commentaries usually say that this is a prediction of God's deliverance of them from Babylon. There are certain objections to that interpretation. One is that I ^{have sent} ~~object~~ to Babylon, the word used as in the piel which is the same word used for letting the people go, from Egypt. I have released, I have sent away to Babylon, I have let go to Babylon, it isn't that--you use the cal ordinarily if you send to do an errand. That is not a great objection, but it raises a certain problem. Another problem is He says I have brought down all their nobles. Now the word, as it stands, is not nobles, but ~~fug~~ fugitives. But by changing the pointing of the word, from ^{harelh}, making it instead of ~~harelh~~ ^{harelh}, making it buri, with a chewa instead of a comma, you get a word that means bolts, and once in a while this word for bolts or bars, is used to indicate the strong support, that which holds something together and therefore it could be used poetically to describe a prince, the one that holds it together. But it doesn't say princes, but if you change the pointing, it says the bars, and if bars means princes, means nobles, then the KJ translation is all right, but as it stands it is not nobles but fugitives. Brought down all their fugitives. Well have fugitives got to do with it? Most of the commentaries will tell

you that in Babylon they had people from many lands and therefore they called them fugitives. But suppose they were from many lands that wouldn't make them, they wouldn't be the ones to deliver the people from, the fugitives, you might deliver them from the nobles but hardly from the fugitives. And so that is a real problem. And "the Chaldeans, whose cry is in the ships." I have an alternative suggestion that I think fits better except for one rather serious problem with this. Now the alternative suggestion that seems to me to fit better is this--that up to this point God is speaking of His power. Not of the promised deliverance as he was earlier in the chapter. But now He is going along, speaking of His power, and of how He has done the former things. And therefore, thus saith the Lord, it was on account of you (you see, for your sake doesn't necessarily mean for your good) but on account of you (because of your sin, in other words) on account of you, I have sent to Babylon, sent away to Babylon, I have permitted Babylon to escape from the servitude that it was in to Assyria. You see, in the time of Isaiah, Babylon was subject to Assyria. The Assyrian power was in control, Babylon had been conquered several times by the king of Assyria. It was always hard to hold but they did hold it, most of the time. Several times they had big wars between the king of Assyria and the Babylonians, which the Assyrian king always conquered, during that century, and the Babylonian leaders often would have to flee down to the marshes ~~an~~ in the northern end of the Persian Gulf and there in the marshes where it was hard to get at them, they managed to hide and escape the Assyrians and then come back and foment rebellion again. That happened several times in the life of Merodach Baladin the king who is mentioned in connection with Isaiah, in Isaiah 39, in connection with Hezekiah, rather. And when Merodach Baladin sent representatives to Hezekiah, in order to join with him in fighting against the Assyrians, after they went away Isaiah came to Hezekiah, we read in Isaiah 39, and said what did you show these men? He said, where are these men from?

Hezekiah said, oh from a far country, from Babylon. And Isaiah said, what did you show them? Hezekiah said, I showed them everything I had, I kept no secrets from them. Well, Isaiah said, the time is going to come when the wealth of Jerusalem will be carried off to their city (10 3/4) and your sons (meaning your descendants) will be eunuchs in the palace. The Hebrew word son can be descendant in any generation. Your sons will be eunuchs in the palace of the king of Babylon. And Hezekiah said well, he said, it's good at least it won't happen in my time. Now of course, it was a tremendous prophecy for Isaiah to make because the Babylonians were constantly having to flee from the Assyrians. They were subject to the Assyrians, and raising revolt against them but never quite getting their independence from them. And often having to get into their ships and rush down to the ~~mouth~~ mouth of the Persian Gulf and to hide in the marshes there where they would be very difficult to get at.

Well, now under those circumstances God says here, according to this interpretation that impresses me as quite likely, God says, it's on account of you--He is looking forward to near the end of the exile. He says on account of you I released the people ~~from~~ of Babylon, I allowed them to gain their freedom from Assyria, and I caused that these who were fugitives from Assyria, these Chaldeans whose cry was in the ships, who were often having to flee down in the ships to the mouth of the Persian Gulf for safety from the Assyrians, that they would become strong enough that they could come clear across the desert, way over to Palestine, and could take Jerusalem captive. It is for your sake, it's on account of your sake, that I caused this tremendous change to take place, which Isaiah predicted, so the people, toward the end of the exile, could look back on how Isaiah a hundred years before had predicted that in Isa. 39, and now they could say, yes, these are the former things that God predicted and has fulfilled, now we can believe the latter things that He predicts also. Now that impresses me, in the context, as a far better interpretation of verse 14, than to think that it is here just an isolated looking forward again to the deliverance from captivity. It impresses me as far better,

but as not so much better that you can say the other is impossible. Not at all. It is possible that again He does what He does so often, looks forward to the deliverance from exile. Against the view that I suggest is the use of the word "I have brought down all their nobles." That word the hithphael of yahrath, "I have brought them down", according to the interpretation that takes this as looking forward to the deliverance from Babylon, it would mean I have overcome their nobles, I have caused them to be overwhelmed, defeated, so that the ~~Calde~~ Chaldeans would have to flee again in their ships down toward the Persian Gulf to try to escape from the new conquerors, and that the power would be brought down. It is a rather figurative use of the word "brought down" but it is not impossible. You don't find many cases of it. You ~~do~~ -- "go down" is ~~the~~ usually used in a literal sense for motion from one place to another, but there are a few cases where it seems to mean "to overcome." So this particular word looks a little more in the direction of its being the future deliverance, than in the direction of this being a looking back to their conquering. The use of the word fugitive as I say looks strongly, I think, back to this being a looking back to the Babylonian conquest of them. "I brought down their fugitives" doesn't seem to me to make much sense, in looking forward to the conquest of Babylon. And it seems to me the other fits better in the context. We cannot dogmatically say which of the two it is. After all both of them are predicted in the scripture, and both of them are clear facts, it isn't a question of getting any factual knowledge, but it is simply knowing which of the two facts this verse speaks of, but it seems to me that the position in the context and the preponderance of the problems involved are in ~~favor~~ favor of it looking to the original context, and God having made this great reversal in the position of the Babylonians because these who were fugitives and constantly fleeing in their ships could now come clear across the desert and conquer Jerusalem. Seems to me the preponderance is that way, and I would feel quite convinced it was that way if I could find one case where "to bring down" is used for going across the desert, but I haven't found any other

case. To go down, usually means to go from a higher place to a lower and Babylon is lower than Jerusalem. Now it is used for going west, a great deal, but that is from Jerusalem down to the sea, and that is down, while here from Babylon to Jerusalem is up. But that is the difficulty with that interpretation. I'm not sure on this verse...

C.36. (1/2)

...elsewhere, so that it is not a matter of tremendous importance which of the two it is. But I incline to think that that is the one it is. To me, it gives a better solution for bringing in all the elements in the verse than the others are. Mr. Myers? (3/4)

Some of the commentaries take it this way, "and the Chaldeans in the ships of their joy," "in the ships in which is their joy." In other words they take it as meaning that He causes that the nobles be overcome, be brought down, and the Chaldeans who are the rulers of Babylon, ~~be~~ lording over the world, that they be brought down to the place where they flee away in their ships, but I incline to think the word ~~be~~ they all agree that it shouldn't be "nobles" but "fugitives," so after all that depends only on one vowel, but since they agree on that and the use of "bars" for nobles isn't common anyway, I incline to think that the other fits better. If only we had some use of "go down" to mean "go across the desert". If we had one clear case of that that would prove it but I haven't found any, and I have been hunting vigorously. Miss Pickett? (1 3/4)

Well, this is--I was puzzled by the fact that the KJV says nobles. I couldn't figure how they got nobles out of it. Because you look up bareth in Brown, Driver and Briggs, and they say "fugitives." And the word barath means to flee and the word bareth would be "one who flees", a fugitive, and there aren't many cases of it as fugitive but there are one or two. But how do they get nobles? Well, the best I've been able to find of the way that meaning "nobles" came is, that there is a word, not bareth but bureth, that is, beth with a shewa under it instead of a comma, which means bar, and it's used for the bars of gates and so on, used quite a few times for bars, and of course a bar was a strong thing ~~the~~ to hold the gate and so there may be one case where it is rather

probable that it's used of people, these are the bars of the nation, they are the bolts that hold the nation together, and from that the idea of nobles^{might}/come, but it's rather a job to get nobles out of it, and I haven't found any recent commentaries that feel that it should be nobles, they're all quite agreed on fugitives, and it's pretty hard from my ^{notion}~~notes~~ to get much sense out of fugitive in connection with the deliverance from Babylon. Brought down their fugitives, I made them into fugitives, yes, but that isn't what it says. Yes? (3 1/2) Yes, now "I sent to Babylon" in the English immediately suggests that he caused that a command go to Babylon which would produce a result, but that you'd expect a kal rather than a phael. Of course the difference is only one of pointing again, but it is clearly established in Jewish tradition as a phael, and that tradition goes back a long ways. Now the kal, "I sent to Babylon" would mean "I sent "--somebody might say to--God might have said to the people of Holland 15 years ago, "For your sake I sent to Berlin and caused Hitler to come and do so-and-so." He sent to Berlin to cause something to happen. But in the pael it's "I sent away", "I let go," "I released." And that is a little hard to fit in in any case. But if "I let go," it seems to me that it might refer to--that in the time of Isaiah it seemed so utterly ridiculous to people then that Babylon would conquer Jerusalem because the Babylonians were constantly trying to defend themselves against the Assyrians, and usually subject to them. (4 3/4) that "I released the people of Babylon." Well yes, sent them away from Babylon, no, he sent to Babylon, but he sent releasing power to Babylon. He sent to Babylon the power that would let them go from ~~those who~~ what held them in subjection before, would release them to such an extent that these who were then fugitives, constantly having to flee from the Assyrians, and to flee in their ships, that they now could leave their ships in the Euphrates and come clear overland. No longer as fugitives but as a conquering nation, to take // Jerusalem into subjection. (stu.5 1/4) Yes, but it doesn't mean a motion. I mean, if God sent a force to Babylon,

that would be physical motion but if He simply caused something to happen, that would be the place toward which the influence would be ~~driven~~ ^{exerted} and He sent to Babylon, kal, yousee, would mean He sent His force, His order over, Pael, I would think, would mean He not only sent His order, but it was not a directing order but a releasing order. It's a tough verse, no question about it. About a month ago I just wondered how to get any sense out of it, I felt like Mr. Myers expressed himself a few minutes ago. But a good bit of floundering and thinking about it has reached the present attitude of mind. If only I could find a clear proof that yarath could mean to go the east, to the west,

(6 1/4)

As it is, that is a

but on the other hand it seems to me that the ~~future~~ fugitive is a rather serious objection to the other view. I don't think the commentaries make much success in getting around it. But in either ~~of them~~ ^{event,}, in either case, it refers to a fact which is clearly taught in the section as a whole, so that it does not affect our knowledge in either case, which way we take it, but merely affects our understanding of the fact as to which of the facts the individual verse is quoting. But just before He has been talking about how He did the former things, and the former things are to cause (7)

that he has taken captive to Babylon. These former things God has done and now He declares new things. The new things are His releasing from Babylon. Mr. Miller? ...can't quite say that. The KJ translators paid tremendous attention to the Massoretic text but they were also very familiar with the commentaries, they had in their day. They were very familiar with the Latin ~~comen~~ commentaries, familiar with translations like Luther's translation, other translations of their time. They were familiar with the Septuagint, and they were familiar with the Hebrew commentary, it is remarkable how many of the translators of the KJ version were men who were versed in rabbinic laws and ~~mf~~ familiar with the way the Jews interpreted these verses, and so we find that the KJV on the whole followed the original very closely in the Massoretic pointing. But when they find a difficulty in it as it stands, and they have a clear tradition of

interpretation which differs slightly from the obvious interpretation of the Massoretic text, they do change it. When they can't make sense out of it, they just follow it literally and let it go at that. But there are cases because we can't sense because it is quite evident that what they were trying to do is simply follow it exactly as they found it and they didn't quite know what it meant. But now one interesting case is where the--well I know of a couple of cases where the KJ has definitely changed the tense, and I think it is quite evident they changed it in line with the current interpretation. Two cases where they did, and I think they were wrong. But the number of such cases would be one in a hundred compared to the number of cases the RSV does it.

(stu.9) Oh, yes. Well, it's like the case in Judges. Is it 12.8, or 8.12? I think it's 8.12, where it tells about Gideon, and Gideon catches a young man and asks this young man who were the leading people of this town, and the young man, the KJV says, described 70 leaders of the town. And as you read it you think my what a wonderful memory Gideon had, he could listen to this young man describing these 70 leaders and really have something worthwhile ^{knowing} ~~while~~. But the Hebrew word is (9 1/2)

literally, it is he wrote. And I would think that the KJ translators thought well here is just a man caught at random, outside the city, and Gideon asked him, and he wrote down the names and perhaps something about 70 leaders of the town. Well, in those days, how many people could write in those days? If you would just grab a young man at random, he'd be able to write about 70 like that, they thought "describe" would avoid the difficulty, that's my guess. Because the KJ translates (10)

"write" in nearly every case except this. The cases where it's used "describe"--there are about 10 or 15 cases and those are cases of describing the border, where the people who went to take the borders of the tribes, in the book of Joshua, described the border as it went from one place to another, and of course what it means is they ~~we~~ wrote down how the border went and described it, not a bad translation there. But to say they described the elders of the city, sounds as if they just talked of them. And you'd

never use the word if they just talked it, they clearly wrote it. So of course now we know that in those days a great many people could write, and it is now taken as an evidence ~~that~~ ^{of} the wide prevalence of literacy in Gideon's day, that he could just grab a young fellow there and say write this down and he wrote it. But the KJV has translated it "describe" there. There it seems to be ~~that~~ they have interpreted in the light of their knowledge, of their ideas, and I would think they did the same thing where they took the word ~~drachma~~ and put dram instead. I would incline to think that. But there aren't many cases where the KJ did that, but in the RSV there are hundreds of them. But in this case I think it is very unlikely that the KJV got the word "bar" and said that would be a good way to translate ~~the~~ "noble" and translated it "noble." After all it doesn't say "bar." It says "fugitives." You have to change the comma to a shewa to get "bar." But my guess would be that they found that other men had already done that, perhaps, it may be in some of the earlier versions, or perhaps in some of the rabbinical interpretations, that they took it that way, and that it simply struck them as reasonable that way, that this ~~ba~~reth should be really bureth and represent "bar" as a figure for "noble", maybe it says "noble." If they said "bars" it wouldn't make any sense at all, in the English-speaking world. Be very interesting if one could get into their minds on some of these things. Of course, one way to do it would be to look up the commentaries they had access to. That's the way I get into the mind of the RSV in some cases, I look up the commentaries that they used, ~~and~~ ^{what} they say and then I know when they follow that, that's what ~~they~~ their reasoning is.

Well, this verse, then, is a very interesting verse and we know it refers either to the Babylonian conquest of Jerusalem or to the release of the Jews from Babylon, ~~one~~ or the other. I incline to think it is the former. That he is here not introducing a little of comfort in a section which is predominantly declaring God's power, but that it is showing His power by what He has done in building up the power ~~of~~ the Babylonians to the place where they could be His instrument, in order to punish the Israelites for

their sins. Then He continues about His power, the Lord, verse 17, who brings forth "the chariot and horse, the army and the power," and then He shows His destructive power, "they shall lie down together, they shall not rise; they are extinct, they are quenched as tow." Some say this is the destruction of Babylon but it doesn't seem to me it is, it seems to me just a general statement of His power to destroy what He chooses to.

Then you notice, back there, in verse 9, He says, let the nations be gathered, who among them can show us former things? (13 3/4) who can show that He has made great predictions in the past and then brought them to pass just as I predicted the rise of the Babylonian power and their being strong enough to come and take Jerusalem captive, but now in verse 18, he goes on, remember not the former things, behold I do a new thing. Now He is going on to the new thing He is going to deliver them from. I am going to do a new thing, I'll make a way in the wilderness, rivers in the desert, they'll be able to escape from Babylon, to make the long trip overland, back to Palestine in safety. The beast of the field shall honor me, the dragons and the owls...

C.37. (1/2)

...He tells, not very specifically there about deliverance from Babylon but it is a picture of a journey which they are able to make in safety and these are new things which are to come, new things. This people, verse 21, have I formed for myself, they shall shew forth my praise. He said back there in verse 10, they are my witnesses, they are my servant and my chosen, the purpose of the servant is going to be fulfilled, they shall show forth my praise. A wonderful climactic statement to this passage about the power of God, who is going to--not only is He going to bring a great deliverance from Babylon, but He is going to accomplish His full purpose, His witnesses ~~w~~ shall show forth His praise, and then in verse 22, He turns into this very poignant expression of sadness at

the fact that they have fallen so far short of doing what they were supposed to do, a parallel to the end of the previous chapter where He says they were blind and deaf, that the Lord's servant was unable to do what he was supposed to do, and we get this very strongly in verse 27, "Thy first father hath sinned, and thy teachers have transgressed against me. Therefore I have profaned the princes of the sanctuary, and given Jacob to the curse and Israel to reproaches." But after this terrible denunciation for the sin that has produced the exile, He immediately goes right back to the ~~scene~~^{theme} of blessing and comfort at the beginning of verse 40, or just as he did at the beginning of chapter 43.

Chapter 44, "Yet now hear, O Jacob my servant," The Lord that formed thee...the people whom I have chosen ~~are~~^{--I am} going to do these tremendous blessings for them, I will pour water on his that is thirsty and floods on the dry ground, pour my spirit on thy seed, they shall spring up among the grass, as willows by the water courses. One shall say I am the LORD's and another shall call himself by the name of Jacob; and another shall subscribe with his hand unto the LORD, and surname himself by the name of Israel. The wonderful things that are coming, that God is absolutely certain that He is going to do, He declares it, and then in 45 He soon goes in to the denunciation of idol-washippers, and we have the longest passage against idol worship in the whole book, from verses 9 of 45 right through 20, we have these 12 verses declaring the futility and folly and wickedness of idol worship, but in contrast to that, in 21, we read in contrast to that that Jacob and Israel is my servant, thou ~~sa~~ art my servant, thou shalt not be forgotten of me. Don't follow idol worship, don't turn your back on God, God is going to fulfill His promises, He is going to get the work of the servant done. Then ~~He~~^{He} gets to the theme, to the deliverance not merely from exile but from sin. I have blotted out thy transgressions and thy sin. We don't have so much of that yet, He is gradually bringing this to prominence. So He touches upon it here and then this wonderful verse, "Sing, O ye heavens; for the LORD hath done it," let all nature join in praising God, and then verse 24 starts one long sentence, that includes everything between 24 and 28.

Just one long sentence, thus says the Lord, and then He tells what the Lord does, ~~sub~~ showing the Lord's greatness and the fact that the Lord is going to deliver them from exile, so perhaps our clearest passage of all on deliverance from exile, is this one, that runs from verse 24 on through the next few verses of the next chapter. Thus saith the Lord thy redeemer, he that formed thee from the womb, -- He starts in with God's power, I am the Lord that makes all things -- God's creative power. Then verse 25, God's knowledge, those that try to predict the future, God causes everything to happen different ~~w~~ from what they expect, He makes their knowledge foolish, verse 25. The folly of trying to predict the future, except by knowing what God is going to do, and how absurd ~~i~~ it is for anyone today to think he can predict the future. You look forward and things can happen so many different way in the next ten years, nobody on earth knows what is going to happen. Only God knows. And so God is declaring that He is the one that frustrates the tokens of the liars and makes diviners mad. He told, through Isaiah, that Sennacherib the great mighty Assyrian king would not be able to conquer Jerusalem. The Assyrian king's power was 100 times that of the Jews, and yet God says that he won't conquer Jerusalem, and he wasn't made to. God delivered Jerusalem, When everybody thought everything was hopeless Isaiah said no he won't conquer Jerusalem, and then 100 years later when they thought they were going to be able to escape the Babylonians God had Jeremiah say surrender to the Babylonians, you can't do anything, they're going to conquer you. The exact opposite, but God knew the truth. God planned and God directed it. Yes? (5 3/4.stu) ...brings out. He goes forward to a climax which puts Cyrus in the great climactic point, this tremendous thing that God predicts that Cyrus is going to deliver them and let them go, therefore, Allis says this is true that this was written a hundred years earlier because of the great climactic thing, to give the name of Cyrus. The critics' big argument is, he used the name of Cyrus, Isaiah never heard the name of Cyrus, it must have been written in the time of the exile, by an unknown prophet. Allis tries to say Cyrus is put in such

a prominent position here that it must be making a claim rather than predicting it long in advance. I think there is something for it but I'm not sure that that argument alone can be carried near as far as ~~we take~~ it. But I do think the general point that he is constantly ^{speaking} of Cyrus here, not merely as a great figure in world affairs that God is going to tell you he is going to be on your side, but as one that He has predicted, it is constantly stressed, not just here, so I think in general it is a valid argument, though I wouldn't quite go as far as He does on that particular point. Well, here we have to stop till next Monday but we continue then... (7)

(7 1/4) ...I am sorry I don't have the papers finished marking yet, hope to get them finished today. We were looking last time at chapter 45 I believe. Mr. Euredjian could you see me after the hour, please. Thank you.

Chapter 45, and ~~not~~ noticing those words at the beginning addressed to Cyrus. Now it is very interesting the way it starts here, "Thus saith the Lord to his anointed, to Cyrus," that word that is translated anointed is what in the Hebrew, Mr. Roczey? (7 3/4) Mr. R. points out the word has a form which suggests the possibility of its being a participial form, but it's not an ordinary participial form, it is a noun ^{formed} ~~separated~~ from a verb by ~~separating~~ a prefix in the name. And the word here is a word from the ~~h~~ root to anoint, and it means , it is a passive construction, from the verb mashach, to anoint, so that it is an anointed one. Well, now this word Massheah, do we ever transliterate such a word into English, Mr. Grauley? (Yes, Messiah.) Yes, then would it not have been just as correct a translation, instead of saying "to his anointed," to say, "to his messiah"? (Yes.) Yes, that is exactly what the Hebrew says. Thus says the Lord to his messiah , to Cyrus. Who is the Lord's messiah, Mr. Oliver? (8 3/4) According to this verse, the Lord's Messiah is Cyrus. Now Isa.40-56 is the great passage, one of the greatest Messianic sections in the Bible, with its wonderful predictions of Christ, but here it says, Thus says the Lord to his messiah, to Cyrus. So we have a question immediately, exactly what is a Messiah, what is meant by a messiah, what is meant by one that is anointed?

Well, the simple meaning is, pointing out one to whom a ceremony, on whom a ceremony has been performed, a ceremony of setting one apart ~~for~~ ^{with} the use of oil. That is very simple, the meaning of just the word, but as to the application of the word, was anyone ever set apart with the application of oil other than Christ? Who was set apart that way? How many people were? How often is the term used in the O.T.? And so forth. Now I don't think ^{we will take} ~~time~~ ~~w~~ to tell you that information, think it would be better for you to gather it for yourself. So for next week--we won't assign this before next week, but suppose that for next week that you all bring me in a paper which will be rather easy to prepare I think, first that you look it up in Brown, Driver and Briggs. That should give you most of the evidence on it, look up the word Massheah and see to ~~whom~~ whom it is applied. You could do the same thing possibly with Young's Concordance, by looking up this form in the back, Massheach, and seeing how many different ways it is translated, whether just anointed, or whether also Messiah, and so forth, in the KJ, and then look up every one of those, find all the cases where the word is used in the O.T. to designate an individual, what kind of an individual is it, is it always used in predictions of Christ? Is it used of anyone else, is it ever used about kings? or about priests? or about prophets? Was it ever used about ordinary people? What is the use of the word? What does it mean to call Cyrus God's Messiah? Now that is a thing that you can easily get evidence on, and please have the papers ready, well you might turn them into the office by ten next Monday morning, so I could glance over them before class a little bit.

So that will be an assignment ahead, rather than to take time now on it, but I want you all to be aware of that, that when it says here, "to Cyrus, his anointed," it might as well have said, "To Cyrus, his ~~anointed~~ Messiah." But now we were speaking here about this Cyrus who is God's shepherd, we read in verse 28, who is going to perform all of God's pleasure, who is going to say to Jerusalem, thou shalt be built and to the temple, thy foundation shall be laid. In other words, Cyrus is the one who is going to be God's instrument to cause these things to take place. Now it does not say that Cyrus

is going to ~~re~~build the temple here, ~~it~~ it says he is going to give an edict to build it. Cyrus gives this word, if God says let there be ~~light~~ light, there is light. There is no question of that. Now if Cyrus says let the temple be built, what he means is, give the Jews permission to build it, give them some material to help, and so on, but there may be snags as we find in Ezra, that there were, many snags, that it took a long time before the thing was done. But Cyrus gave the official permission that it should be done. He removed all the official obstacles to the performance of this task. And so the Lord said to Cyrus, that the Lord has held Cyrus' hand, to subdue nations before him, the Lord is going to open up before him the great gates ~~th~~at would keep him out of this powerful city of Babylon. You will find modern translations, translate it the door, rather than the gates, and make it refer to the palace rather than to the city. The word is (12 3/4) the regular word for door, but the word is often translated gates also, so ~~th~~at gates is not an incorrect translation at all, but he declares ~~th~~at the obstacles in the way of Cyrus taking possession of Babylon are going to be removed, God is predicting this. God is going to break to pieces the gates of bronze, there were many of these gates of bronze, our Old English ~~sh~~ translation is brass, I don't know what brass meant 300 years ago. I know that today when we think of something made of brass we think of something weak and shiny, not of anything very strong, so I don't like the word today for this translation, because the Hebrew word (13 1/4) is a word which originally means copper, but of course brass is an alloy of copper, but so is bronze an alloy of ~~cop~~per, and bronze is one of the strongest things there is, an extremely strong material and the weapons made of bronze would probably be just about as strong as the weapons made of iron, it was easier to ~~ma~~ke a greater number of the iron weapons, they were coming to the iron age, had a great advantage, but the making of bronze weapons was a tremendous step forward in ancient times, and this is speaking of the ~~st~~rength of the gates, they're copper gates, gates made of strong forms of copper and bronze is the strongest form. I guess brass could be almost any alloy except those alloys that would be called bronze because they

have tin in them and it gives them a strength, but either copper or bronze would be better than brass here. The strong gates of Babylon of which there were supposed to be many powerful strong gates, and the bars of iron which would shut him out, means that God is going to remove the obstacles in his path, and he says I will give thee the treasures of darkness and the hidden riches of secret places, very poetic language, in the English translation. Actually what it means is the securely kept treasures of the Babylonian king, those which they have hidden away in their bank vaults, those which they have in the places where the ordinary person would never get a chance to see them, those which are blocked away safe from all burglars of any kind, Cyrus is able to go right in and take the treasures of the king of Babylon, the treasures of darkness and the hidden riches of secret places, the private possessions of the great Babylonian king, Cyrus will get immediate access to these, that thou mayest that I the Lord hast called thee by thy name, I am the God of Israel, and this phrase "have called thee by thy name" is a very interesting one. It...

C.38 (1/2)

...according to the view held by all critical scholars today, a year or two before the end of the exile, when Cyrus had already made great conquests and was conquering all the land around the central core of the Babylonian empire, this unknown prophet, Deutero-Isaiah, gave these declarations to the Jews, his man Cyrus is going to deliver you, he is going to--through him you're going to get your freedom, but why then does he say, "I which call thee by thy name"? Is not that a declaration of the fact that God is predicting the name of Cyrus long in advance. As something written by Isaiah 150 years earlier, it is very natural. I the Lord who wrote this 150 years before you came, I the Lord who called you by your name way ahead, I'm going to do these great things. It is the argument from prophecy added to the argument from the Power of God. Just given at the time there is not so much meaning to it. I have called thee by thy name. It stresses the fact that the mention twice here of the name of Cyrus is a remarkable thing,

something that shows the divine knowledge, that I the Lord which called thee by thy name, am the ~~god of~~ God of Israel. For Jacob my servant's sake. Who is God's servant? Jacob. And Israel my elect. Israel the one I have chosen. I have even called thee by thy name, I have surnamed thee though thou hast not known me. Surely stressing again the fact that God ~~is~~ claims to have predicted Cyrus far in advance, and then of course the power of God in the next three verses has tremendous stress, ~~and~~ ^{on} the power of God, and then verse 8, a great paean of praise to God for the wonderful things that are going to come to pass, and then turning the attention back to Israel, to the heathen nations, and perhaps to the unbelievers in Israel also, woe to him that strives with his maker, again a stress on the power of God, on the power of God and the fact that God works in a mysterious way, his wonders to perform. Verses 9 and 10 here are in brief the same argument which Paul gives in Romans 9. God is the potter and we are the clay, and God performs his great purposes and it doesn't do us any good to struggle against it. Someone quotes Carlyle that a man, somebody had decided to accept the universe. Carlyle said, "Gad, he'd better." And the fact is it is all we can do, we're here in the universe, as it is, and we can't help it. Many people keep struggling and take the attitude of the poet who says, "Out of the darkness that covers me, I thank whatever gods may be, for my unconquerable soul. In the foul clutch of circumstance I have not winced or cried aloud, .." It sounds very beautiful but actually it is very sinful. If a person is just a bit of dust in a great universe that is whirling around and going to crush him, for a little drop of dust to defy the universe, it is very silly. And God says woe to him that struggles against his maker, that denies the power of the potter to do what He chooses, and it is a denunciation of the attitude of one who turns against God and refuses to accept the universe God has made. But it is also a word of great importance to those of us who are believers, that we recognize that God is the potter, that He makes all things work together for good, according to His purpose, that therefore, though we don't understand the purpose we know His hand is in it, and that we can bring ourselves in line with

His purpose by recognizing His power and striving to learn from His word what sort of people He wants us to be, so there is a great deal of spiritual truth simply in these two verses, verses 9 and 10. Then verse 11, thus says the Lord...ask me of things to come, concerning my sons, and concerning the work of my hands command ye me. Surely that is a rhetorical statement. Who has a right to command God, who has a right to order him to do anything, but is not this a statement, look into it, see how reasonable, see how wise it is, see how wonderfully God works things in accordance with His marvelous will. Ask me of things to come concerning my sons. You find the answers in the Word, in the scripture, concerning the work of my hands, command ye me. Look into it with the principles of righteousness and goodness in mind and see how it all is done in accordance with His wonderful purpose. It doesn't mean that someone can actually command God, but bringing the principles that you think are right into the comparison and see if they are not worked out in the way God actually does control the universe. You may not see it all, there is much of it you can't understand, but you will be able to see enough that wherever you can fully understand what He is doing it is entirely in line with the principles of righteousness, and then He returns to Cyrus again, verse 13. From verse 4 to verse 13 He has been speaking in general terms, addressing Himself to the heathen world, addressing Himself to Israel, stressing His power and His majesty, and then in verse 13 He returns to Cyrus again. I have raised him up in righteousness, surely that is not to say that Cyrus is a righteous person, but that God has raised Cyrus up in order to fulfill God's righteous purpose. That through Cyrus God's righteousness is going to be accomplished. The RSV of course--I haven't looked at this particular verse in there but if it is in line with most of their other interpretations they probably take righteousness here to mean victory. I have raised him up in victory--wouldn't be surprised if they did. I know they take it that way in a good many other places. Of course the word righteousness does not mean victory, but it may mean God's effective carrying out of His righteous purposes and of course that is a victorious

thing but it is not merely victory, it is a righteousness, so I don't think victory is really a good translation of it here. But the Hebrew word means that which is true, that *which* is in accordance with God's holy principles. Have raised him up in righteousness, and I will direct all his ways; he shall build my city. Again this doesn't mean Cyrus is going to go with a shovel and an ax, and build a city in his hand power. It doesn't even mean he is going to order his military forces to do it, but it means that he is going to make it possible for it to be done. He is going to give the command which removes the obstacle to its being done. He will build my city. It is a very good example of the fact that we cannot take two or three words of the scripture and squeeze them until we get every possible meaning out of them. We have to interpret scripture by scripture and interpret it in the light of the context. Cyrus did not build God's city in any figurative or in any literal sense. But Cyrus gave a command which made it possible for the Jews to build it, so it is true that Cyrus built God's city but it is not true in an extreme literal sense. Cyrus gave, he was one of the factors that entered in to the building of the city, a very important factor, without which it could not have been done. But by no means the exclusive factor. He says ~~He~~ he will build my city, "and he shall let go my captives, not for price nor reward, saith the Lord of hosts." Mr. Roczey, you've got your Hebrew Bible, suppose you read us another verse. Read us verse 13, chapter 45, see what it says. (8 ~~34~~) Very good for Miss Pickett to call our attention to the connection with the verse in 43. Here he will let them go, not for price nor reward, in other words, the people of Israel do not have to pay Cyrus to release them, they are not released with them having the obligation of any price or reward, but God says, in the next verse that He is going to give them a reward for it. It is like when you say salvation is free. Heard CampbellMorgan tell onee, about holding an evangelistic meeting in the mining district in Wales, as a young man, and he said he talked to a miner there the the miner couldn't understand how salvation could be free. How could it be that he just absolutely freely be given release from the ~~pena~~ penalty of sin. How could he be changed

from darkness to light, ~~just~~ free. It just didn't seem sensible to him. And Campbell Morgan said that he explained to him what it had cost God, how God had given His only begotten Son and how Christ had given Himself on the cross to ~~make~~ make this possible. He said finally the miner said, oh he said, I ~~see~~ see. He said I work down at the bottom of a mine shaft, I have worked there, he said, and I come and get in the Skip there, which is pulled up by a machine, a mile down in the depths of the earth, and he says, I get into that and I just sit there, I don't have to do anything, that thing just pulls me right up to the fresh air. But he says it costs the company an awful lot to do that, to take me up. So salvation is absolutely free as far as we are concerned, but as far as God is concerned it cost Him a great deal. And here the Israelites cannot win their freedom from Cyrus, there is nothing they can do to get it. They're helpless there, ~~en-~~ ~~slaved,~~ ~~serv~~ helpless and there is nothing they can pay, nothing they can do to reward Cyrus, or to pay Cyrus for releasing them, so God says that without any effort on their part, without their having to pay anything, Cyrus will simply let go ~~his~~ captives, not for price nor reward, but in the next verse the Lord goes on and says, I'm going to pay a ransom for them. Now he does not use the word here as he ~~does~~ does back in chapter 43, but he refers to the same thing, the Egyptians and the Ethiopians. He says the labour of Egypt and the merchandise of Ethiopia and of the Sabeans, men of stature, shall come over unto thee and they shall be thine: they shall come after thee; in chains they shall come over, and they shall fall down and shall make supplication unto thee. Now this is an exact parallel to the ~~passage~~ passage, where was it, yes, in 43.3 where he says, "For I am the Lord thy God, he Holy One of Israel, thy Saviour: I gave Egypt for thy ransom, Ethiopia and Seba for thee." God gave the ransom but they can give no pay nor ~~re~~ reward. Yes, Miss Pickett? (12) There is a real problem there. Verse 14, the ~~parallel~~ ~~parable~~ parallel to 43 is clear enough and the statement coming right after the statement that he is, Cyrus is letting His people go, and then that these people come to Cyrus, it is close enough to suggest something of a real parallel, but the last part of 14 is very different

very difficult. The context would seem to require they are being taken by Cyrus, but the verse talks about their coming voluntarily and saying God is in thee, there is none else, there is no God. Can this~~///~~, in some way, be the people of^{Egypt and} Ethiopia coming to the Israelites, sometime to the Israelites and wanting to know about their God? Is it possible? I don't know, but I certainly don't know of any time they voluntarily surrendered to Cyrus. Cyrus started an expedition to conquer Egypt and Ethiopia and he was part way on his expedition when he died, so he never actually took them, his son Cambyses continued the expedition, and conquered and Ethiopia, so they were conquered by Cambyses, but this, their coming and making supplication, there is a problem there to which I don't know the answer. We'll have to see whether any of the commentaries have any helpful suggestions there. Just taking this verse alone my inclination would be to think that this verse is predicting some future time of conversion of the Egyptians and Ethiopians, and their coming to the Lord, but the parallel with 43 is very striking, and that is what he is talking about here, is Cyrus letting the people go, so at the present I just don't know how to interpret the last part of 45.14. Maybe in the Graduate Section the men will come up with an illuminating suggestion of value. Well...

C.39. (1/2)

...not inspired at all, but simply a human effort to divide it into meaningful sections. But if 15 is a continuation of the last end of 14, you'd be much more sensible to make a division, say, they shall make supplication unto thee, saying, and then new verse. Or else, they shall fall down unto thee, and then a new verse--they shall make supplication unto thee, saying. The man who made the verse divisions quite evidently thought this was not a part of what they said, but that doesn't prove it. But when you think of it in general in relation to the context, how many of you think it is a part of what the Egyptians and Ethiopians are going to say, raise your hands so I can see. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. Very good. How many think it is not? Nobody. The others don't think at all. Yes? (1 1/2) The big argument against that^{is} part of what they say is the use of the same

pronoun for a different object. They say, surely God is in thee. Who is the thee? Well, maybe Cyrus, maybe Israel, maybe the Christian church, whatever it is, the "thee" is not thou is it? And then to say, "Verily thou art a God that hidest thyself." God is in thee, thou art a God that hideth thyself. That is a rather quick δ jump from addressing whoever is addressed at the end of verse 14 to immediately addressing God. It seems rather strange for the same person to be saying surely God is in thee, thou art a God that hideth thyself. You'd think that after he says that he stops and looks up to heaven, and addresses God and says this. It seems a rather strange way to do it. It would be a more natural thing, if that is what it means, to say ψ surely God is in thee, there is none else, ~~no other~~, there is no God, it is wonderful that you are the ones in whom God is hiding himself. But the change ^{from} ~~to~~ the talking to some earthly individual or group, and then to immediately to continue with these meaning God, if it is part of the same discourse, seems a bit strange, while if he has given this description of this tremendous thing that is going to happen and then the prophet or the bystander or the church, or whoever it is, makes an ejaculation, in view of what immediately precedes, look at here, how God causes Cyrus, this great heathen conqueror comes and conquers Babylon and that is God's means of releasing His people, and then God is going to take these great distant Egyptian and Ethiopian folk and going to bring them into bondage to Cyrus as His means of repaying Cyrus for being His instrument to release God's people, why χ he says, God, how mysterious are your workings, how you hide the way that you conduct things, you see these tremendous things happening in the world, and underneath them is the hand of God directing and controlling them in order to accomplish purposes we would never have dreamed of. How mysterious are the ways of God. How wonderful is this God who makes things to work together to accomplish His purposes in ways the ordinary observer would never dream were the ways was working. Verily thou art a God that hideth thyself, if it is an ejaculation of the wonderful marvelous mystery working of God on the part of an observer, why it is understandable then how the person would

address a different one than was addressed before. Mr. Miller? I would think it is either the prophet or the believer, the prophet or the group of believers, whether you think of it as Israel, or think of it as the prophet, as followers, whether you think of it as future believers, whatever it is, it is the observers, whether it is the prophet or the believers. Yes? (4 3/4) Miss Pickett? ...section I am sure of that in the passages, they open up, one by one, you get light on this, that, the other thing, one *by one*, they open up, but there would still--you could study this for the next 50 years if you wanted to, ~~but there~~ ^{and still} be getting new light on different sections. But as one section opens up it throws light on another section and that opens up. You go through and see what you can understand, what is clear, and then you see what your problems are, then you go through again and a lot of those problems solve themselves in the light of what you've noticed in different places. And then you notice new problems you hadn't thought of before. (stu)

(5 1/4) Well, you give up if your thought is to completely understand the mind of God. You can't do it. It is an infinite book, you cannot reach the depths of it completely, but you can keep getting deeper and deeper into it, keep getting more and more out of God's Word, but you'll never reach the bottom. If you want to get everything that is in it, you'd better give up right now, you just can't. But this next section, now, it continues whether verse 15 is what the Ethiopians say or whether verse 15 is an onlooker observing, we have here from 15 on through several verses ahead, we have a section in which the change of ~~scene~~ ^{theme} occurs more rapidly than just about anywhere in the book. In fact, I believe I used this section as an example of change of ~~sc~~ theme when we were looking at the very introduction, and we noticed here how this, "Verily thou art a God that hidest thyself," just before it, "God is in thee; and there is none else, there is no God. ...thou art a God that hidest thyself." Certainly the main thought here is the greatness of God, the power of God, though the word "Saviour" does suggest the idea of comfort, but then verse 16, what is the theme of 16, Mr. Quarterson? (6 3/4)

Yes, so you have the theme of God's greatness in 15, in 16 you have the theme of the futility of idols, what is the theme in 17, Mr. Cohen? (7. stu: comfort.) Comfort is in 17; comfort, deliverance. And what is the theme in 18, Mr. Vannoy? (7 1/4) Yes, God's power, greatness of power. The theme in 19, Mr. ~~Grauley~~^{Golin}? (7 1/4) 19 declares that God has predicted this long in advance, it has not been a secret, it has been open, has been declared what is right, by God. The theme of 20, Mr. Grauley? (7 1/4) Idol worship. and 21? Mr. Roczey? (7 3/4) But what is the first half? Prediction, yes. And then you have the power of God, both of them in 21. And what do you have in 22? At the beginning of it you have comfort, ^{deliverance} and then at the end of it is the power of God. Mr. Roczey gave us the end first in both of these. But you notice in these verses how our four main themes each come out, you jump from one to the other, you have all four of them given at least twice, each one. And it jumps from one to the other, but it is a sort of a resume. He has been driving home this theme, this theme, now he ~~ø~~ touches lightly on all four of them. In fact, one to the other ^{in these verses} rapidly, so you have about eight different touches on these different themes, but they are the same great themes that we have been stressed. From a strictly logical viewpoint, you might say, it would be better to have verse 16 and 20 right next to each other because they are talking about exactly the same thing, but he is touching on the different aspects and winding them up, into one complete unit. Yes, Mr. Myers? (9 1/2) ~~His~~^{Just} comfort ye, comfort ye, it is comfort but it is comfort in view of the fact that something wonderful is going to happen, deliverance is the theme. Rarely is it merely words of comfort without a reason to be, and actual deliverance that is to come. So we end on the great theme of comfort, I have ~~sworn~~ by myself, the word has gone out of my mouth in righteousness, it shall not return but unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear, and God is going to fulfill His righteous purpose of deliverance, in the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified and shall glory. You notice in this chapter there is hardly a word of any sort of rebuke, the whole of the chapter is wonderful words about God's greatness,

proven by His predictive power, God's greatness in contrast to the futility of idol worship, God's greatness which means that you can trust His promises of comfort and know that He is going to deliver. We have had little touches of rebuke for the sin that sent them into exile before, but in this chapter the great stress is on the positive, and in general in our whole section from 41-47 the positive is the stress, it is the immediate positive. You might say you have three sections, after the preamble, chapters 40. You have three sections, the first of which is positive, near deliverance, the second is negative, near deliverance alone is insufficient. The third one is positive: eventual deliverance. So you have the positive and negative and positive. Now they're not exclusively that way. The first one which is primarily positive, you notice how several of our chapters ended with rebuke for sin. That note is constantly being brought in, but never brought in enough to discourage people or dishearten them. You give a little of it and then you jump back to these calm words of comfort, and this chapter is practically entirely comfort, then we have two more chapters in our present section, 46 and 47. 46 starts with judgment upon the gods of Babylon, and 47 starts with judgment upon the people of Babylon. 47 is entirely given over to judgment upon the great Babylonian empire, the great oppressing power. 46 is--stresses the fact that the gods of Babylon will be unable to deliver the Babylonians, that these gods have no power so the futility of idol worship is the great stress of chapter 47, but particularly of the gods of Babylon, starts in: "Bel boweth down, Nebo stoops." Now this word "Bel" is different from "Baal" in that one is Babylonian and one is Aramaic, they are originally the same word, the word "master." But the word "Baal" is used for the gods of Syria whom they call "master," the word "Bel" is the Babylonian word in which the letter

(12 3/4) has disappeared, so it is shorter than Baal, but in the Babylonian, we have Bel, Belu, which means master or lord, and the god Marduk, the primary god of Babylon, whose name occurs in Merodach Baladin, and in Mordecaiah, Marduk the god of Babylon in the later Babylonian empire is usually simply referred to as lord, Bel,

or Belu, so this is the common usage that you find in the Babylonian writing itself, is this ~~Belu~~ or Bel. So here He chose Bel and Nebo the god of wisdom, the two primary gods of Babylon, He shows them overwhelmed, unable to carry the burden, unable to deliver Babylon, but themselves going into captivity, and then come the words of strong comfort to Israel, these gods cannot carry their people, but God is going to carry His, verses 3 and 4. God will take care of His people from birth to death, even to hoar haris will I carry you, I will deliver you. And then a passage on the evil of idol worship the next three verses again, much stress on the futility of idol worship in this first section, very little thereafter. And then, after this section on idol worship, again the theme in verse 9, remember ye the former things, the former things. God sent them into captivity as He predicted, ~~and~~ ^{and} then He is going to bring them back as He is predicting ~~the~~ again, declaring the end from the beginning, the theme of prediction again. And from ancient times the things that are not yet down, saying my counsel will stand; verse 11, calling a ravenous bird from the east--quite a different terminology from what He used in 41--a ravenous bird from the east, the man that executes my counsel from a far country, this ^{He} is going to ~~come~~ ^{bring} to pass, hearken to me, ye stouthearted that are far from righteousness. Now if it wasn't for the phrase "far from righteousness" we would translate it "ye courageous," because the word is used in the ~~psalms~~ psalms to mean courageous, but it is also used elsewhere to mean hardhearted. And here, as he says they are far from righteousness, that certainly brings out the idea that they are hardhearted. This verse, just one verse here, in 46, of rebuke. Nothing in 45 and one verse in 46: "Hearken unto me, ye stouthearted, that are far from righteousness." In other words, you people, among the people of Israel, that are refusing to believe God's promises, you people who are far from righteousness, who won't believe this is going to happen, and think well we might as well give in and join the majority...

...is used of various kings, I believe, that are anointed, set apart for the service of the Lord, used of the priest, and used of the king. So that the word simply does not mean the one great common ruler, the Messiah. It is used of divine officials in the past, priests and kings, who were set apart by anointing, but it naturally becomes a term to look forward to the one who will be both king and priest. The only case that I recall where it is used of one who is not a Jew is this use that we looked at about Cyrus. Did any of you notice another case, or does anyone not agree? Mr. Oliver? (1 1/4) Very interesting. Mr. Oliver calls attention to the fact that when Elijah was at Mt. Sinai, I don't believe the noun, the adjective, the anointed one was used of (1 1/2)

but the verb was used when Elijah was down there and God gave an order to Elijah, let's look at that, a very interesting instance. 1 K.19, we have that incident there where the Lord said to Elijah who was so afraid that when this wicked woman Jezebel told him she was going to kill him, even though he had just killed in front of her husband all the prophets of Baal, she told him she was going to kill him and he was so frightened that he ran for his life. And he lies down there in Sinai still shivering with fear and the Lord says to him, v.14, Elijah says "I, even I only, am left; and they seek my life, to take it away." And in that utterly unjustified fear, fear that I'm sure would never come to Elijah who boldly faced Ahab before, showed himself so bold on so many occasions before, except that he was overtired. He had not watched his condition, let himself get overstrained and overtired and into an unnatural situation, where the threat of Jezebel's that she couldn't possibly have carried out, just filled him with terror, so in order to encourage Elijah God said to him, when he said, "even I only, am left; and they seek my life, to take it away," the Lord said to him, don't say down here hovering in fear, He said, go back and show that I the Lord am supreme over Israel, over even all the distant nations, ~~that~~ But going from the one extreme to the opposite, from the extreme of fear and misery before this woman who had no official position and no right to kill anybody and certainly couldn't have killed Elijah in the

situation he ~~was~~ in --from that situation, when she wanted to kill Naboth she had to get a lot of lying witnesses and so on to do it, and Naboth wasn't known as Elijah was by this time, when doubtless the mass of the people were in back of him, --but from this condition of abject fear God is saying to Elijah, you should recognize who I am, that I have control over all the nations, control over Israel, control over the nations at large, I can put up and put down rulers as I choose. So in order to bring that home to Elijah, the Lord said, go return on thy way to the wilderness of Damascus, and when thou comest, anoint Hazael to be king over Syria. And this is to show God's tremendous power, that He can rule over all the nations, so why should Elijah be afraid of this woman Jezebel? And then not only that, but the kingdom in which Jezebel is, that kingdom is going to change, God is going to make a complete change of sovereignty there and Jehu the son of Nimshi shalt thou anoint to be king over Israel: and Elisha the son of Shaphat of Abelmeholah shalt thou anoint to be prophet in thy room. This is old English, in thy room. Today we don't talk about rooms we talk about places. Really not much difference between a place and a room, if you would say that, when I die or retire, somebody else will come into my room, why people wouldn't know what on earth you were talking about. They would say that he 'd take my place (5)

old English room has that meaning. So ~~he~~ says Elisha shalt thou anoint to be prophet in thy room. Now that doesn't show God's power, this third one, this third one is a confession of Elijah's failure. Elijah, instead of staying at your task as you should have, and carrying on the work that you made such a wonderful beginning for, with this great display at Mt. Carmel of God's power, you have run off and deserted your post, well, God is going to show you how great He is by showing that He is going to change the rulers of these great nations, but you have proved yourself unable to carry on the work, so we've got to find somebody else to put in your place. So Elisha the son of Shaphat of Abelmeholah shalt thou anoint to be prophet in thy room. Well, now here we have the word "anointed" three times, and it indicates to put oil on a

person as a symbol of the fact that they are set apart by God to a position, and this is done for the man who is to reign over Syria, the man who is to reign over Israel, and the man who is going to be prophet. But when did Elijah anoint Elisha to be prophet in his place, where do we have the account of that anointing? Mr. Oliver? Three possibilities, #1, we can say definitely he anointed him because we're told he did ~~it~~; #2, we can say definitely he did not not anoint him because we're told he did not, or have strong evidence of it; #3, we just don't know because we're not told, but maybe he didn't. Well, now of these three possibilities, which one would you say the scripture is teaching? Does it teach that he definitely anointed Elisha, as it states, or did he disobey God's command? God said to anoint Elisha in his place. Well, Mr. Oliver said he threw his mantle over him, maybe the mantle had a bottle of oil in its pocket or something. But certainly--(sbu.7 1/4) --well, anointing is a symbol certainly, it is a symbol itself, isn't it? Well, now would the mantle be a symbol of oil, throwing oil over him. Well, let's look ahead and see, where do we read about it, we read in the very same chapter, and does Elijah say to Elisha, I didn't have any oil handy, so I threw a coat at you, but you are to consider this coat as if it was oil poured over you, to indicate that you are the prophet in my place. What does he say? He threw his coat over him and Elisha left the oxen and ran after Elijah and said, Let me, I pray thee, kiss my father and my mother, and then I will follow thee. So Elisha understood it as meaning that. But did he understand it as meaning he was anointed to take his place, and did Elijah say that is what it was? What did Elijah answer? He said, Go back again, what have I done to thee? Poor old Elijah, he has been rejected, cast off, and given himself the ignominious task of inviting his successor to take over, and he does it in a pretty gruff way. And when he does it the man says I'll follow you, and then he says, go back, what have I done to you? In other words, he does not even say anything about what it means, but Elisha understands it to mean that he is to go with him. What does he do, end of verse 21, he arose and went after Elijah

and now says to everybody , I've been anointed, I'm the great prophet, now Elijah is helping me but I'm carrying on the work. Is that what he said? It says he arose and went after Elijah and ministered unto him. In other words, he did his flunky jobs. Well, you read about him later on, somebody tells about Elisha, they say, Elisha is the man who poured water on the hands of Elijah. They didn't have a faucet then and he poured it on his hands for water. He did the menial tasks for him, just went along as a helper. ~~W~~ Elisha had doubtless been hearing about Elijah's work and the great stand and wishing oh if I could just go and carry that fellow's stuff for him, just do the menial ~~t~~asks for him, just to be a part of this phase of the Lord's work, oh wonderful, and he goes and does everything for him, and when we come to the time when Elijah is going to be taken up, do we read that Elijah said to Elisha, well, now Elisha, I'm going but you're my successor, you carry on the work once I'm gone. Is that what he says? We find in chapter 2 of 2 K, that Elijah said to Elisha , tarry here, for the Lord has sent me to Bethel. Elisha said , as the Lord lives and as thy soul lives, I will not leave thee. In other words, Elisha knows what's happening and he doesn't let ~~E~~ Elijah shake him off. It doesn't sound as if Elijah is going to anoint him or had anointed him, does it? And then he goes another direction and tries to shake him, and he doesn't, and another direction. And finally they come to the Jordan and they cross it over, and in verse 9, when they were gone over, Elijah said to Elisha, ask what I shall do for thee before I am taken away, and Elisha said I pray thee let a double portion of thy spirit be on me. You've been a great man but I want to be twice as great as you. You did a few miracles, I want to do twice as many, you were important but I want to be twice as important. That would have been a wonderful thing to ask him, but of course that is not what this means at all, even though some folks do say that he did twice as many miracles.--So he got his wish to be twice as great. That is not what this means at all. A double portion means the portion of an eldest son. If a man had three sons, in ancient times he divided his property in four parts, the eldest son took a double

portion. He didn't have anything like what ~~his~~ his father had, unless he was the only child, in which case he would get everything. But he certainly never asked for twice what his ~~father~~ had, but he got two of the portions, a double portion. And so the request for a double portion doesn't mean-it is utterly out of Elisha's character to suggest that he thought he 'd be a greater man than Elijah, but that he wanted to be the true successor to Elijah. Now Eli~~s~~ah had already anointed him and set him apart for this position, to be prophet in his place, so Elijah could have said, well of course, you're my heir, you're already anointed for it, naturally you will hve this. But that is not what he said. Verse 10, he said, thou hast asked a hard thing, nevertheless if thou see me when I am taken from thee, it shall be so, but if not, it shall not be so. And it came to ~~pa~~ss they still went on talking, a chariot ~~of~~ fire and horses of fire ~~parted~~ parted them both asunder, and Elijah went up by a whirlwind to heaven. So that it is perfectly clear that Elijah had given no definite word to Elisha that he was to be his successor, and that rules out completely any thought of his having ever anointed Elijah as his successor. So when God commanded him to anoint Elijah as his successor, it is quite evident that Elijah understood that as meaning, you~~are~~ are to have a part in the calling of Elisha into this task, but ~~I~~ I am telling you that your work is mostly done now, the main thing for you to do is to train your successor, because you failed at this vital point in the work. You have done a great work and deserve much credit for that, but you can't carry it on, you have made a great failure and from here on you train your successor. But he Elijah did not understand that he was required to tell Elisha that he was to be his successor, even at the last minute he wouldn't tell him, though in his heart he knew all the time of course that that's what Elisha was to be because God had sent him.

So God's statement given in the form of a command was interpreted by Elijah as a prediction that Elisha would succeed him, rather than actually as a command that he should ~~anoint~~ anoint, even though literally it was a command to anoint him. Now the first part of the command that was given related to Syria, and what was the command given

to Elijah there? 2 K. 8 tells us about Elisha going to Damascus, 2 K.8.7, and Elisha came to Damascus. There is nothing in the context to suggest how he came to go, why he made the trip, anything about it, it just says and Elisha came to Damascus. So Elisha went to Damascus, not Elijah. God had given the command to Elijah, Elijah didn't go but Elisha went. Now does Elisha go to Damascus and there anoint Hazael to be king of Syria, does he, or doesn't he? Does he? What does he do? (14 1/4)

How do you know whether he did or didn't? ...

C.41. (1/2)

...you can say that Mr. Truman visited Mr. Eisenhower and they had a very pleasant talk last week one day. Well now you say did Eisenhower tell Truman that he said he can understand, that he feels differently than he used about Truman's activities at present. Well you can't tell what he said. He may, may not. The account of it tells a little of what they said, but most of what they said you just don't know. Well, now in this case, they may have said a lot more than is here. Is it, from what is given here, you don't know, or is what is given here a vivid enough or clear enough of the whole situation that you can draw a pretty reliable inference as to the presence or absence of something else. Do you find here any evidence that he anointed him as king? (1 3/4)

Elijah, but did he? Elisha went to Damascus, he was carrying out the command God had given to Elijah, but when he got there did he anoint him? What did he do? Well, in the first place there is no evidence that Elisha took the initiative in finding Hazael. Elisha came to Damascus and the king sent Hazael as his messenger to see Elisha, what we would have done if the king hadn't sent a messenger, of course we don't know, but he did send a messenger, and Hazael came with 40 camels loaded with stuff to give him, quite a present. And he said Ben-hadad wants to know, can I recover of this disease, is this disease going to kill me? And Elisha said it's not a mortal disease, he ~~is going to~~ ^{can} recover, but he says, the Lord has showed me he will surely die. In other words, he was asked, --you go to a doctor and say look at here, is my heart in

bad shape, will I live out the day or not? The doctor looks at you, oh he says , your heart isn't in that bad a condition, you'll be living ten years from now, and that very afternoon you get hit by a car and killed. Well, the doctor didn't tell you a lie when he said you'd be living ten years from now. What he meant was that as far as this sickness here is concerned, there is nothing in it that would end your life. And that is what ~~Elisha~~ Elisha said . ~~W~~ Shall I recover of this disease? Why sure this disease

(3 1/4) ~~to be~~ But then he says to Hazael, however, the Lord has shown me he is going to die. And then we read on that he settled his countenance steadfastly until he was ashamed, and the man of God wept. Well, I guess he wasn't anointing him right then, it wouldn't fit with the context. And Hazael said why weepest thou and he said because I know the evil thou wilt do to the children of Israel. You're going to do terrible brutality to our people, ~~and~~ Hazael said but I'm just an underling, just a messenger the king sent. How could I do--I'm just like a little dog, how could I do this great thing? And Elisha answered the Lord hath showed me that thou shalt be king over Syria. Now that certainly doesn't suggest anointing. (2 K.8 we've been discussing for some time, I hope most of you had it) So then he departed from Elisha and came to his master and he said, what said Elisha to thee, and he answered, he told me thou shouldst surely recover. Well, now that is not what Elisha said, but still it is near enough that it wasn't a straight-out lie, and it came to pass on the morrow that he took a thick cloth, and dipped in in water, and spread it on his face so he died. Now Elisha hadn't told him to do that. But Elisha had merely said that the Lord had revealed to him he was going to be king of Syria. But when God said to Elisha when you come to Damascus anoint Hazael to be king of Syria, Elijah took it not as a command to go to Damascus, but as something which was to happen, a prediction of the future and evidently the way he treated Elisha just before he went up, certainly doesn't suggest that he had already told Elisha that Elisha was to go to Damascus, he didn't recognize Elisha was going to be his successor even, as far as anything he said to him. So the Lord

must've revealed to Elisha a further revelation And all he did
 there was to recognize the fact that God had predicted that Hazael would be king of ~~Syria~~
 Damascus. So God is showing, encouraging Elisha by claiming power over the nation.
 And when Hazael, the Assyrians call him son of the Nobites, becomes king of Syria,
 it is encouragement to all the Israelites who believe in God to know that what God pre=
 dicted some years before, through Elijah, has now been fulfilled, and it goes under our
 theme of prediction and proof of God's power. But it doesn't show much of the meaning
 of the word anoint, because in this case very evidently it was used simply as a way of
 pointing out that God was going to make a change, a way of prediction. Now there are
 two commands then we have noticed in 1 K.19, two commands, the first and last were
 not literally carried out--the meaning of them, they were recognized by the prophet
 as being predictions rather than commands, though given in the form of a command.
 You might say it is like a rhetorical question. The meaning of it is clear, but it is
 not here a command. It is a prediction of what God is going to do. Now the middle
 one was, Jehu the son of Nimshi shalt thou anoint to be king over Israel. Now did
 Elijah anoint Jehu king ~~over~~ Israel? I don't think anybody will say Elijah did that,
 as a period of at least 8 or 10 years passed after this command was given, before Jehu
 became King of Israel and Elijah was ~~not~~ then living. Did Elisha anoint him king over
 Israel? Elisha sent a man to do it, but this man whom Elisha sent literally ~~pour~~ poured oil
 over his head, and when the men saw him come out from the inner chambers with the
 oil flowing down over his hair and over his neck, greasing up his clothes, why they
 said what is happening there, he says you know what has happened. Why they couldn't
 help knowing, they could see the oil flowing down, and they knew that he had been
 anointed by the prophet. And they were all ready to revolt, just looking ~~for~~ for a chance
 to stop and they started their revolt, so that here we have the word anoint used of the
 anointed king who was anointed for his task. King of Israel. But we don't have any
 evidence of the actual anointing, of the term they used, of Hazael, and that is the only

case I know of, aside from Cyrus, where the word is used of a non-Israelite.

But the word is used in our passage of Cyrus, as a king, and a king whom God has designated for a particular purpose and appointed to this purpose and consequently is called His anointed one. Well I asked you to hand in these papers, I'm sorry there were some who didn't get them in, but I have from most of you, and now we turn to our direct observation of these chapters in Isaiah, and . . . we hadn't looked at the last two chapters of the first division at any length. The first of those was ch.46 which starts in with two verses about the two great gods of Babylon.

These gods he says are going to be overcome, to be destroyed. They stoop down, their idols have to be carried, they can't deliver the burden, themselves have gone into captivity. It is a prediction of the failure of Marduk and Nebo, but then in contrast to that in verse 3, he says, Harken to me, O house of Jacob, and the remnant of the house of Israel, you don't carry me around, I carry you, contrast to the gods of Babylon which are idols that have to be carried. He says, you are carried by me from birth to death. From --all through your life you can know that I am carrying you, I made you and I will take care of you, and then in verse, having introduced the contrast between the futility of the gods of Babylon and the actual power of the true God, then he goes on to speak of the futility of idol worship in verses 5, 6, and 7, and the same argument again that we had before on it, but it is a very vital point at that time, and needs to be stressed, and then in verse 8 he says, remember this and show yourselves men, bring it again to mind, O ye transgressors. Very interesting, how He is beginning now to use these terms, ye transgressors, that show that the nation He is addressing is still a nation which contains many who are impenitent, a nation which has in it great potentialities of disobedience of God. And in earlier chapters of Isaiah he has been rebuking the people for their sin, constantly. Now he is dealing in comfort but in the course of the comfort he brings in these few statements to rebuke the people for their sins, He is getting the emphasis back to the point of sin, he starts in with comfort and gradually

brings it to the point of sin, so he just brings in a touch of it here, remember this, O ye transgressors. He says remember what I did in the past, I am God who did that, declaring the ends from the beginning, and He says, I am now calling a ravenous bird from the east, as a man that executeth my council from ~~a~~far country.

Back in 45.1 he calls him his messiah, here he calls him ~~a~~ ravenous *bird from the east*, two quite different ways of speaking ^{of} the same ~~name~~ man, God's instrument, God's appointed one, but he is the ravenous bird from the east, the one that travels fast, is ravening, seeking what he can get for himself, but yet he is executing God's council, God has purposed it, God is using even the wrath of wicked men to serve Him. And then in verse 12, a ~~s~~light touch on this matter of sin again, Harken to me, ye --this word stouthearted is elsewhere translated courageous, could be courageous ~~ous~~ here but the last part of the verse makes rather clear it isn't courageous, it is obstinate--you obstinate ones who are far from righteousness. I bring near my righteousness, I will place salvation in Zion for Israel my glory. He will bring to pass his purposes, even if they are unbelieving and thus interposing difficulties in the way of going it. He is going to accomplish His purpose, the great theme of 46 is comfort to the people, the gods of Babylon will fail, God is going to prevail, and to prove His greatness, but these little touches show how some of them are falling into idolatry, others are tending that way and they need this rebuke, this warning, against doing it, and this assurance again, of God's having predicted what He is going to do and how He is going to do it, and to ~~prove~~ thereby His greatness, His power, He is going to place salvation in Zion, and His glory in Israel. And then chapter 47 is the concluding chapter of this first section and is devoted not ^{to} the gods of Babylon but to the people of Babylon. And it deals with the people of Babylon and the whole chapter is the expression of God's determination to destroy the Babylonian oppressors. The whole chapter is strictly devoted to that theme, and the--he starts in looking at the great power of the Babylonians.

...and He points out how from their great height of their power and their luxury they are going to be brought down to the position of a slave, the virgin daughter of Babylon is going to be reduced to being a slave, there'll be no throne, no more be called tender and delicate, take the millstones, take the menial position of the slave, He will take vengeance over them, and they will no longer be called the lady of kingdoms, then in verse 6 He was wroth with His people, you notice there is no rebuke here in this chapter to the Israelites, but He mentions the fact that He was angry with His people, He has polluted his inheritance, thou didst shew them no mercy, and thou said I shall be a lady forever, thou didst not lay these things to thy heart, therefore, he says, that the proud Babylonians who thought they were so supreme, are going to be reduced, to lose their position and the rest of the chapter is devoted to that theme. There are various things that are specifically references to Babylonian situations as in verse 13 where He speaks of their astrologers, their stargazers, their monthly prognosticators, all the many ways the Babylonians used to try to determine the future, He says all these are going to accomplish nothing, but God is going to destroy them. It is the climax of our section, our great theme of our first section, 41-47, is deliverance from Babylon, and it ends with a full chapter devoted to this destruction, overthrow, defeat of Babylon.

Mr. Oliver? (2) ...in the last series of public lectures he ever gave, he mentioned the medieval method of exegesis and mentioned this verse specifically, he said they were saying how when it says, happy shall he be ^{that} ~~when they~~ taketh thy little ones and dasheth them against a stone, why you look in the scriptures and you find that the stone is Christ Jesus, who is the cornerstone that the builders rejected, so what it means is happy shall he be that ~~g~~ takes the children of Babylon and brings them in touch with Christ. And that is the spiritualizing type of exegesis which was much used in the middle ages and much used by a-millennialists today, but hardly a fair way to deal with scripture. If you use that method you can make anything mean anything. It is plain that what it means is that Babylon is going to be brought low, so low that in the

course of the war, which they have to face, their people will suffer and happy will he be, well, that means that these people, these enemies, these brutal enemies who will get happiness through destroying the Babylonians, they're going to get that happiness. It doesn't mean that God is happy to see that happen. God is not the author of evil. He does not rejoice in the suffering and misery of the world in any way, shape or form. He does not rejoice in it, but He uses it for His own purpose, to accomplish His will, and He declares that it is going to come to pass that Babylon which seems so supreme and absolutely unable to be overcome, is going to actually not only will their front line troops suffer defeat, but the enemy will penetrate to the very heart of their land, so that they can even wreck their families, and that of course (4)

It means that Babylon which God used as His instrument to punish Israel deserves no credit for having been an instrument in punishing the Israelites, because they didn't do it to do God's work, they did it for their own aggrandizement, and they had brutally taken the Israelites into captivity, marched hundreds of miles across the desert, hundreds of them doubtless fell in their tracks, dead from exhaustion and suffering, and a small share of the misery that they wreaked upon them was going to come back upon their own nation, as their nation (4 1/2)

So the situation for which the Israelites need comfort, that of the Babylonian captivity, is the subject with which our whole section, 40-56, begins, it is present to some extent throughout the section, but it receives its direct treatment primarily in this first portion, and this first portion reaches its climax here in chapter 47, which is entirely devoted to the overthrow of Babylon. And then we start on a second section, as the plot moves forward, we have moved forward, we have reached a climax, you might stop right here, you might say everything has been told that is necessary, the people are in captivity, they are going to be released, they are in captivity to the Babylonians, the Babylonians are going to be destroyed, everything has been done that is necessary, why say anymore? Well the reason to say anymore is that God has other matters more

important than this with which to deal. This seems to be the most important of all, to the people in that situation, that is what they're interested in, and God is dealing with what they're interested in it too, but He is even more interested in other things and He is trying to call attention to these other things that He can deal with them. So He doesn't stop discussing the Babylonian captivity, He goes on with it, in the second section, but He is turning attention more to ~~the~~ other features, and there are two things that have been brought forward in this section, that are going to come into greater prominence as we go on. One of these is the matter of sin. Why are they in exile? It has been brought out repeatedly in this chapter, that you are in exile because of your sin. They cannot blame God for the exile, they are there because of their forgetfulness of God and their turning against Him. Well, it is wonderful to deal with the problem of exile and deliver them from it, but if you don't deal with the cause of the exile, there will be other exiles afterward. The cause of exile, the matter of sin, is the vital ~~problem~~, so that which has been introduced in brief passages thus far, needs to be developed further. Then of course there is the theme of the servant of the Lord, which is introduced right in chapter 41. Why is Israel going to be delivered, just because God likes them? No. Just because God out of His mere ~~good~~ pleasure, happens to pick them, no. Because God has a wonderful allwise purpose in mind. They are saved, they are delivered, in order that God's marvelous purposes may be fulfilled, and what is God's marvelous purpose, why does He save ~~them~~? Because they are His servants, because they are His instruments to accomplish something definite, and God has given the assurance that His purpose is going to be accomplished, but He has also condemned them for not being in a position to fulfill the purpose which they have to fulfill, to do the work which they have to do. Now as we notice, the thought should easily occur to anyone, Israel is God's servant, to do the work, but is it all of Israel that is to ~~do~~ this work? Certainly there is no work that ever yet was done by a nation in which every member of the nation participated equally in doing the work.

That is impossible, it must be a certain portion of the nation, but the nation as a whole has responsibility that the work be done, therefore the nation as a whole is God's servant, and it is for the fulfillment of the work of the servant that they ~~would~~^{were} called in the first place. Now in chapter we have the picture of the servant, the ideal servant the assurance of what is going to be done and what is going to be done? The servant is going to be a light to the Gentiles, he is going to bring judgment to the nation, there is nothing in chapter 42 that clearly says ~~He~~ has to do anything for Israel, everything He does is for the nation. It is for the world as a whole, that ~~He~~ brings His light, He is bringing judgment to the nation, He establishes righteousness throughout the world, the servant does this with quiet ~~constant~~^{confident} assurance, he steps forward to do this, he doesn't have to act with violence or with haste, he doesn't even have to quench a burning wick, he doesn't even have to break a bruised reed, when you're in a hurry you don't bother with bruised reeds, you just toss them aside and grab one that isn't bruised, and use it, but when you have time and strength and confidence, you can be careful about these little things along the way, while you are moving to your big objective, so the servant is going to do this, and the picture at the beginning of 42 doesn't sound like a whole nation doing something. It sounds more like an individual doing something, a highly individual picture, but of course a nation can be spoken of figuratively as an individual, but it doesn't give the impression as a nation, doesn't fit with the general situation of Israel, and at the end of the chapter, it is very clear, who is blind as my servant, or deaf as he whom I have sent? The servant who has to do this work is in difficulty, he is blind, he is deaf, how can he do the work? Well, why can't he? Because He has fallen into sin, it is his own fault. But that doesn't answer the problem, God has raised up Israel to do the work, the work has got to be done, so 42 would leave you thinking can it be that it is an individual from the nation who represents the nation in doing this tremendous work. It might raise the question, it doesn't explicitly state it, so that one might not even think of it on this

first reading, but eventually it would come to him as a possibility. So now I therefore call the second section, from 47 to the latter part of 52, I call The Servant of the Lord Individualized. In other words, this theme, which was introduced in this way in the first part, and we've had many brief references to the fact that Israel is God's servant and this one rather full description of the work of a servant, now we have a section in which we carry our thoughts forward a bit more while still laying a certain amount of stress on the theme of deliverance from exile, but we carry the thought forward a bit more and learn more about this servant of the Lord, so we start chapter 48, our new section and in the beginning of 48 he begins as he did not begin any previous chapter, He begins pretty close to direct denunciation. Practically every previous chapter began with comfort, comfort for the people, God is going to deliver them, but now after a whole chapter of comfort you might say the theme of comfort has been strongly enough driven home to their hearts, that you do not need to have so much fear that if you say something about their sin they'll just close the book and quit reading, you've got their interest and they're aroused to the point where you can develop this idea a little more fully, that previously has only been touched upon. The idea of the importance of the sin and rebellion which after all was the cause of the exile, so we start in with ~~it~~ while he is now declaring deliverance to them, declaring they are going to be delivered from Babylon, and yet as He does it He is rebuking the people for their unbelief and their sin. Hear ye this, O house of Jacob, which are called by the name of Israel, and are come forth out of the waters of Judah, which swear by the name of the Lord, and make mention of the God of Israel, ~~be~~ --all very good up to this point. Here it is, I'm going to deliver you, you who mention the God of Israel, however, He says, but not in truth nor in righteousness, that is pretty strong rebuke given to them, reminds me of what a member of the group of Plymouth Brethren was talking to me yesterday about one of the great leaders of the Brethren, and he said, you know, many of the Brethren believe in Believers' baptism but he says, this leader believes in household baptism, and he

says he was giving a message somewhere and after the message one of the men came up to him and said say, Mr. so-and-so, when are you going to start believing in Believers' baptism, and he said he turned to him and said when you begin to show some proof in your life that came from it. Well, it was a pretty sharp sort of rebuke which ordinarily I don't think advances the cause of truth to deal with inquirers in that way, maybe he knew the man from beforehand and had reason to feel that he was an arguer rather than one who was really seeking truth, but in this case, the Lord here brings him this not as sharp as that, but yet a pretty direct denunciation of them in the course of giving his marvelous promise of deliverance, and of course we're getting now into this second ~~chap~~ section where we have the matter of sin being brought more into the foreground as the problem ~~z~~ that must somehow be dealt with, ~~if~~ the deliverance is really to have a meaning, but he is still dealing in this chapter primarily with deliverance. Notice how the chapter ends with deliverance from Babylon, verse 20: Go ye forth out of Babylon, flee ye from the Chaldeans, with a voice of singing declare this, the Lord has redeemed his servant Jacob and they thirsted not when he led them through the deserts. He points back how they came out of Egypt, they're going to come out of Babylon and be wonderfully blessed in similar fashion. ...

C.43. (1/2)

...so here we have this brought out at various points in this chapter, deliverance from Babylon, but he says about the deliverance, why am I predicting this in advance? To comfort you, yes. To give you wonderful blessing, yes. But I have got another purpose, what is the other purpose? To show your own sin and to make it impossible for you to accept the wonderful blessings that I give and at the same time deny that they come from me. I met an instructor some years ago, guess he is a professor now, at the Univ. of Pa., a Jewish fellow, and I was, said to him, isn't it wonderful, when you think of it, how the alphabetic writing all began from Palestine, and I forget I mentioned something else, and he looked at me and said, oh yes, that shows what brains we

have, and there was no recognition of God's power, God's blessing. And that is true of all nations. God gives us wonderful blessings, and then we turn around and say what wonderful people we are, that we have accomplished so much. It is true of all people, we are all too ready to trust God and to look to Him for everything when things are going badly ~~and~~ but once they go well and we have everything, then oh it is our marvelous brains. It was God's wonderful power that delivered England from Hitler at Dunkirk, people were praying to God to deliver them, and He just sent the weather just right and they all were thankful for God's wonderful deliverance, but two years later it was a marvelous work of the RAF, the great RAF, as Churchill said, never did so many owe so much to so few, because what they owe, they owe all to One, but it is the human tendency, so here that tendency is strongly rebuked. This is a tremendous section here, God says, ^{48.13} I have declared the former things from the beginning, they went forth out of my mouth and I shewed them, I did them suddenly and they came to pass, because I knew that thou art obstinate and thy neck is an iron sinew and thy brow brass. I have even from the beginning declared it to thee, lest, before it came to pass, I showed it thee, lest thou should say mine idol has done this and my graven image and my molten image has commanded it. This is one of our great passages on our theme of prediction. God says He has predicted in advance so they can't give the credit to someone else. So we'll have to recognize that He is the one who did it. So this, and the end of verse 8, I knew that thou wouldest deal very treacherously, and wast called a transgressor from the womb, for my name's sake will I defer mine anger, and for my praise will I refrain for thee, ~~but~~ that I cut thee not off. Behold I have refined thee, but not with silver, I have chosen thee in the furnace of affliction. For mine own sake, will I do it, for how should my name be polluted? Hearken to me, O ⁻⁻⁻Jacob and Israel, my called, I am he, the first and the last. Then the power of God in creation, and then the comfort in verse 14, the Lord will do his pleasure on Babylon and his arm shall be on the Chaldeans. I have spoken, I have called him, I have brought him, I will make his way prosperous. God

4) will carry out His wonderful purpose. And then of course we have that very interesting problem, who is speaking in verse 6? Who is speaking in this tremendous verse? And what do you learn from this verse? It is a most marvelous verse, and the KJ is I think a little unfortunate in the translation, "and now the Lord God, and his Spirit, hath sent me." It is an entirely possible translation, but the Hebrew word is, and now has sent me the Lord God, and His Spirit. So that there is nothing to indicate whether His ~~Spirit~~ Spirit is subject or object, whether the Lord God and His Spirit have sent me, or whether the Lord God has sent me and has sent His Spirit. There is nothing to indicate with certainty. The KJV makes the Spirit part of the sender, the ASV makes the Spirit a part of those sent, and I think the AS fits the context much better than the KJ, but either one would make a possible translation. Yes? (5 1/4) That's very good. In other words, the modernists can't make meaning out of this verse, it just doesn't make sense. But if you're going to take the verse grammatically why it does seem a little more appropriate to take it as object rather than subject, I wouldn't say you could be dogmatic on that (5 1/2)

Well, now we won't be able to go into this verse and the next chapter today, and I am a little bit worried because I have to be downtown tomorrow at 1 and I hadn't realized--it was an appointment made six months ago--that it would interfere with this class but I'm afraid I can't be back ~~at~~ at 2:30. I'm afraid we'd better not take a meeting at all tomorrow because, while I think it's very likely I would get here at 3, yet it is the sort of thing that is pretty hard to figure. So in the rest of ~~the chapters~~ 48, 49, 50 and 51, note what the themes are, and see the relationship to these two particular thoughts that we've mentioned that are carried over from the first section and developed more here. How much do you find that fits in ~~with~~ with them in these four chapters, how much do you find of continuing the same things as before. These are not the easiest chapters in the whole section by any means, but they're very interesting chapters. Study them and I guess it's safer to say we won't meet till next week....

...I don't know whether I said anything last ~~at~~ time about , in chapter 47, the vividness of some of those pictures of Babylon, and particularly the emphasis on the astrologers. Verse 13, for instance, there: "Thou art wearied in the multitude of thy counsels. Let now the astrologers, the stargazers, the monthly prognosticators, stand up, and save thee from these things..." Someone--if somebody wrote this who wasn't familiar with Babylon, they hardly would have said it. But now that we have this tremendous amount of cuneiform literature from Babylon, we have whole libraries of material on how to predict the future by means of examining livers of animals and other sorts of omens, thousands of them, telling what this particular omen means, what that one means, what the other omen means, and shows the tremendous interest of the pagan in this sort of thing, and this chapter here reflects quite a knowledge of Babylon which I'm sure was quite unknown in modern times prior to the discovery of this cuneiform material. The chapter was a wonderful picture of the downfall of Babylon, and concluded the great emphasis on the destruction of the Babylonian empire. We still have the thought quite a bit in the succeeding chapters, but the great emphasis on it is finished. So in 48 we notice now in the first part of the chapter, how the Lord has stressed to quite an extent the sin of the people. He didn't start this way in chapters 40 and 41, it was all comfort there, and just an occasional little touch on the idea of sin of the people, but now that the great promises of deliverance have been made so very, very strong and clear, now there is stress laid on the people's unwillingness to believe, upon their sin. You notice that in verse 22 there is the wonderful picture of glorious holy people, were it not for that one little phrase at the end of verse 20, but not in truth nor in righteousness. Then you might think, well now that is a mistake, surely, not in truth nor in righteousness, it doesn't fit with the rest of the two verses (10), that this little suggestion in rebuke, but when you get to verse 4 and 5 you have tremendous strong rebuke which shows that the little suggestion of it was not misread, it is definitely there. And there we have this statement in verse 10, behold I have refined thee but not with silver, I have

chosen thee in the furnace of affliction." Mr. Oliver, would you explain to us just what this word means, please. (stu.) ...redeem something that is lost by paying a ransom for it, you can pay silver for it. You can get something for a payment, but do you refine that way? How does it fit with the idea of refining? Mr. Grauley? (10 3/4) ...silver in a furnace and you heat it up to tremendous heat and you go through all this misery, you might say, and it gets rid of all the dross and all the impurity, and it comes out pure silver and you might say, you put a man in the furnace of affliction, and he goes through all this misery, experience, but to come out as pure silver, so you would say you refine a man like silver by putting him in a furnace of affliction and then having him come out pure. But it doesn't say, I have refined you like silver, it says I have not refined you like silver, and it doesn't say I have not refined you like silver, it says, I have not refined you with silver. So except for those two objections, it is a very excellent interpretation.

Mr. Golin, what did you have in mind, I saw you indicating...? (stud. 11 1/.2) ...very interesting idea. You say that I have not refined you like silver would be refined and that silver is worth refining. I have ~~not~~ refined you, not like silver which would be worth refining. Very interesting idea, quite a bit to get out of the verse. (stu.) Yes, a very interesting idea, one that a verse could bring out very beautifully, but does the one we're dealing with? I don't know. Just skeptical about getting all that out of the verse, but it is a good idea. Mr. Myers? (12 1/4) ...two objections to the force of the idea. If they mean by ~~for~~ "for" for payment of service, why then there are only two objections, one that the preposition is not "for" but it is (12 1/4) Well, it could be for the price of silver, with silver as a price, it could be that. The second objection is, how do you mean, you don't refine for silver? What does God mean to say, I haven't refined for silver? Nobody has paid me to do it, I have just done it because I wanted to? I mean it sounds as if it is sort of a silly idea for God to say, nobody has paid him to do it, He just did it 'cause He wanted to. Who could pay Him?

It doesn't make any difference to God. I am rather skeptical of that. Now of course, you could take the "for" in another way, instead of for price, you could take it for an object, I have not refined you for silver, in the sense of, I have not refined you in order to get silver. Well, what would that mean? Mr. Vannoy? (13 1/4) I haven't refined you with silver, meaning I haven't refined you to be paying you to ~~refine~~ refine yourself. (stu.) Of course, the trouble is, God had given them everything, He'd given them the land, given them their king, given them great possessions, given them all kinds of things, and it hadn't refined them, but had made them the opposite. You mean, He tried to refine them that way and it didn't work so now He is trying the other way. That is an interesting idea. Mr. Grauley? (13 3/4) Kittel here says, in verse 10, under, not with silver, he says, read: to me like silver. Have not redeemed you for myself like silver, I have ~~chosen~~ chosen you in the furnace of affliction. No, it would not be "have not redeemed" it would be "I have redeemed," wouldn't it? "I have redeemed you for myself like silver, I have chosen you in the furnace of affliction." It is evidently just a guess, he gives no evidence here of any basis to put it on, but it certainly seems like a good guess, doesn't it? What changes are involved, dropping the aleph and putting a (14 1/2) in place of an aleph. I don't remember any case where aleph and are interchanged. to me is impossible. We have aleph and ~~wau~~ occasionally, interchanged, but that could happen because the word (13 3/4) whether you write with an aleph or a wau, it would be an easy mistake to make. You hear and you write it either way, but the change from ~~fr~~ to is quite a change. The change from that's an easy change. Just a change between the and the. And a change from with an aleph to low with a wau is an easy change. But the change from to would certainly require two changes, which is quite a bit. And then of course the changing the to is making two changes, but it does seem to make pretty good sense...

...Mr. Miller points out, it is the third change. Instead of, behold I have refined you, I have burned you (1/2)

but ~~not~~ ^{not} with silver, changed, leaving out the

so it seems like quite a bit of change, but it does make very good sense (1 1/4)

Behold I have refined you for myself like silver,

have chosen you in the furnace of affliction, that would make excellent sense but it is an awful lot of change. Miss Picket? (1 1/2) The references that Miss Picket has pointed out in Zechariah and in Malachi show God refining people like silver is refined, using chastening, putting them in the furnace of affliction to get rid of their dross and to have the good things remain, and that is a good parallel for the meaning that Kittel suggests by making these four changes, but that is a lot of change. How's that? (2)

The same figure where he says I'm going to refine you like silver, He says I sit as a refiner, and I sift you like silver and gold. Well, now here He says I have refined you, but not with silver, and it is very, very difficult to get any sense out of it. But the greater number of the commentaries seem to use a certain approach which nobody has suggested yet. And which I'm not sure it is possible to get out of ~~this~~, but it may be. And if it does, it has the merit of making no changes whatever in the text, and it does make enough sense which I would hesitate about finding, if you had the verse just by itself, but the verse being in this ~~chapter~~ where you start in the very first verse and praise people about their trusting the Lord, their following Him, their praising His name, but you say, but not in truth or righteousness. ~~How~~ Throwing that little slam, and then you go on with these tremendous criticisms about their trusting the idols, and their turning to the idols instead of turning to God, with that in the chapter it would seem that the suggestion that most of the commentators make is worthy of consideration, though I would say I'm not at all sure the words can bear that interpretation, but I certainly am not ready to say they can't. And that is this suggestion, that it is:

Behold, I have refined you, but not with the result of getting pure silver. I have refined you, but not with silver to reward myself for having done it. And the idea of that, of course, would be, I put you in the furnace of affliction, I put you through all these things, and by this time you would think that the nation would be one of pure silver, absolutely devoted to the Lord, free from untruth or unrighteousness of any kind, but alas, all the refining ~~that it had~~ ^{you've} gone through, while it has produced many very excellent characteristics, yet has left the nation as a whole still a nation that has the sin problem to face, that has the hypocrisy problem to face, that has the tendency to idolatry to face, a nation that still has got to find some way of dealing with its sin. Now that is, the majority of commentators seem to take as the meaning of this. I don't know that they interpret it fully the way I expressed it in the light of the context, but that is the suggestion they make to get out of these words, to get the sense. And the simple clear sense would be what Kittel gave. I refined you like silver, but that is not what it says, unless you make four changes. And it doesn't say, as it stands, I have refined you like silver, but I have refined you but not with silver, and if the (5 1/2)

~~above~~ can indicate the result, but not with the result of getting the You see, "but not for silver" wouldn't be correct statement because He is looking for silver. Silver is what He wants. That is using silver as a figure for pure character. But not with silver. It fits perfectly with the context, and the majority of the commentators seem to take that interpretation as the best ^{possibility} ~~one~~ they are able to find, as (5 3/4)

Yes, Mr. Charvoz? (5 3/4) ...references show God as using the method of refining, of putting people through suffering, and so on, to produce the results He wants, to get rid of the dross, and that is a common teaching of the whole Bible, that God does chasten us and puts us through experiences that are disagreeable, in order to refine us and get rid of our dross, and so on. The other verses show clearly that it is a proper figure to use of what God does, and then if you take it that way, if it means that in this case He is doing that, but that He is

by not finding it resulting in what He should have gotten out of it, in other words, the nation has gone into exile, they have suffered for their sin, they have gone through the refining process, but the sin problem still remains, while much has been accomplished there still remains the situation that it is not pure silver at that time. The refining process which He is carrying on, as the other two places say He is carrying on, and here in the exile He is carrying on to a very great extent, that refining process here has run up against unsatisfactory results, and of course that is exactly what we have been told in the early part of the chapter, that here are these people in exile, and yet He has to say now I tell you in advance what I'm going to do, because if I don't, you'd give credit to your idols. You are worshipping me but not in truth or in righteousness. Of course, He doesn't mean the whole nation by any means, there were many very godly and very true people. But He is trying to emphasize and stress the fact that the sin question remains, though they're delivered from exile, though much has been accomplished by the refinement in the furnace of affliction, yet something more is needed. This problem has got to be handled in some way, and that gets to be of course the big theme of our whole section, starting with chapter 40 and the great need is deliverance from exile. Comfort ye, comfort my people, they are going to be delivered, God is going to free them from the exile and bring them back, ^{but then} ~~and~~ gradually we bring it out, yes, He is going to bring them back, absolutely, He is standing on these wonderful promises, but this alone isn't enough, something more is needed, because this refinement has not produced the results that ~~is~~ are needed, there still is ~~sin~~ sin, if they're brought back, there will be more exiles yet to come, there'll have to be. Something has to be done about the ~~problem~~ of sin, more than simply sending suffering and then bringing you back. Deliverance. Something more is needed, so we're leading up to the climax of the great work of the servant of the Lord, which is to give the true answer to this problem, the only answer that actually solves the problem, so this interpretation which the majority but by no means all the commentators take out of this verse, as it stands, without any

emendation, that interpretation, fits beautifully with the thought of the passage as a whole, but I would like some more evidence from other use of (9) to show that it can be so, and of course, if it said "I have refined you but not with pure silver," something like that, it would make it a little clearer that He is talking of the results, not with silver, might suggest that there wasn't any silver, certainly there was a lot. So that, it is reading something into it, but it might be that some parallel could be found somewhere for a very similar use of (9 1/4) Now if one of you would like to take Brown, Driver and Briggs and look ~~it over~~ at all the uses of (9 1/4) and trace it through and see if you can find a good parallel, it might make a real contribution at this point. But I have not done that yet. But it fits with the passage very excellently, with the general meaning.

Well, now, we might continue then. This is a very interesting verse, thought, As you just look at it as it stands, it just seems to make no sense whatever. (stu.10) That is exactly what my wife asked when I presented the problem to her this morning. And unfortunately I had to reply that I was neither an electrician, a chemist, nor a metallurgist, and I have absolutely no way of saying. But I fear we have to not merely prove there can be such a process but prove that it was known in that ~~w~~ day. It would hardly make a figure that would be intelligible to them if somebody were now to find some wonderful use of silver that would be very wonderful as an alloy of steel or something like that. It wouldn't be any good for Isaiah to use unless it was known to them. (stu. 10 1/2) I don't think that quite helps in this particular case. Maybe I shouldn't have used the word electrician, that is probably ^{what} made me say electrician, was the thought of silver's use in electricity, but I don't think it would fit in this case. (stu.11 1/4)

Well I think that is perhaps all we ought to spend on this, and we *looked* of course at these passages about Cyrus in verses 14 and 15, not all commentators are convinced it is Cyrus. The suggestion is made that it is Israel, it doesn't say who, and there is something to be said both ways, but I incline to think that it is probably Cyrus rather

than--of course , if you take it the two ways, take it Cyrus, it would read like this, verse 14: all ye, assemble yourselves, and hear; which among them hath declared these things? The Lord hath loved --well, that ~~w~~ could be either Cyrus or Israel, couldn't it? The ^{Lord} has loved, ~~whether~~ or Israel, the Lord will do the Lord's pleasure ^{on Babylon} and the Lord's arm will be on the Chaldeans. I even I have spoken, yea I ~~ha~~ve called Cyrus, I have brought him and he shall make his way prosperous.

Or it could be, which among them hath declared these things? The Lord has loved-- either Israel or Cyrus, again-- Cyrus will do Cyrus' pleasure on Babylon, and Cyrus' arm will be on the ~~Ch~~aldeans. I even I have spoken , yea I have called Cyrus, I have brought Cyrus and Cyrus shall make his way prosperous. So that it is pretty hard to know whether it is Cyrus or whether it is Israel, that ~~he~~ is speaking to. And in either case, in some of these pronouns, which could be ~~ei~~ther Cyrus or Israel, some of them would be either Cyrus or the Lord, and you could take them ~~ei~~ther way, so ~~th~~at it seems to me that the only thing you have to go by as to which it is here is which fits best with the whole context. And there are reasons in favor of each, so I just don't know which it should be taken. Seems to me it mus t be one ~~of~~ or the other, though. That is the idea of a statement that could apply equally to both, there are places where that is appropriate but I don't think there are many. I would question here. It seems to me it means either definitely Cyrus, or definitely Israel. Though of course both are in view. If it's Israel it means that God has done all this for Israel, but Cyrus is the means He used to do it. If it's Cyrus it means that Cyrus is God's means for this, but that He is doing it for Israel. Perhaps it really doesn't make much difference which ~~of~~ the pronouns refer to. But it is an interesting problem.

Then verse 16, how much did we look at that? Well, in verse 16 there we have --we ^{have} God speaking in the whole chapter up ~~to~~ here, don't we? ^{And} we have God speaking in all the rest of the chapters, so that God is speaking before and after, now here, ~~who~~ is this that s speaking here, in verse 16? Is this God like the rest, or is it someone

else? And the first phrase, come ye near unto me--well who would say that, except God? Is that the prophet speaking? Is it somebody else than God? Hear ye this, I have not spoken in secret from the beginning. Well, that would be God speaking, or it could be the prophet, couldn't it? Could be either one. God speaking, or the prophet speaking as God's messenger...

C.45. (1/2)

...who is that? From the time that it was, there was I. Now is that Isaiah speaking to the people in the time of the exile, telling them that he was there, back before they went into exile? Is ~~it~~ Isaiah at the time when Isaiah originally wrote this, saying that at the time Israel was first called as a nation, he was there? Just how can you bring Isaiah into this? How can that be Isaiah speaking? Do you see any way of taking that except the Lord speaking? Time that it was, there I, there am I, there was I, whatever it is. But how can you take that as anyone except the Lord? ^u But then look _h at the next, ~~but~~ "and now the Lord God, and his Spirit, hath sent me." How does God say, now God has sent me? Well, that could be Isaiah couldn't it? Isaiah said, ~~now~~ now the Lord God and his Spirit have sent me. But why all of a sudden, after having God speaking to the first three-fourths of the verse, all of a sudden does the prophet speak up and say, now the Lord God and his Spirit have sent me, therefore thus says the Lord, thy Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel, I am the Lord thy God? How does this begin to have the prophet just all of a sudden say the Lord God and his Spirit have sent me? It is pretty hard to fit it in, and of course incidentally there is a problem here, -- is it the Lord God and his Spirit have sent me, as the AV says, or is it as the RV says, the Lord God has sent me, and his Spirit? Now of course if you look at it in the Hebrew, Mr. Myers, would you read it from the Hebrew please? Literally and in order. (2 1/4) Does anybody here understand the difference between a participle and an infinitive? You ask the average English-speaking person what is the difference between a participle and an infinitive, and he will say an infinitive starts with "to," and a ^{participle} ~~positive~~ ends

with "ing." And unfortunately that is false. Now if the English was a logical language, that would probably be true, because it would be a very handy way to distinguish. We can say this, that whenever you have a verb, a simple verb form, with no ending on it, preceded by "to" in English, that is an infinitive, so all statements like "to buy" , "to sell," "to be," "to sit," are infinitives, but not all infinitives are preceded by "to." So that a great many English infinitives are that way. But when you have an ing on the end of a word that does not prove that it is a participle. A better way of approach to the form is not the formal approach, to say that every word that ends this way is that, or that has this, but to look at the meaning. What is an infinitive? Now, Miss Picket, could you define an infinitive for us? (3 1/4) Yes, an infinitive is a noun which describes the action of a verb. Now for instance if I were to say, "to run is good exercise," "to run" describes the action of the verb. I don't say I ran, I don't say I will run, I don't say I did run, going to run, have run, it doesn't say who does it, doesn't say when he does it, all these other things about it are incidental, it is just the action of the verb, without regard to time, person, or anything like that. And it speaks about that action. I say "to run is good exercise." It is a verbal noun. Well, now what is the difference between saying "to run is good exercise" and saying "running is good exercise"? What is the difference? The difference ~~is~~ is that one says "to" and the other says "ing." And that is the ~~only~~ only difference between them. In meaning they are absolutely identical. He likes running. He likes to run. That's the only difference. In other words the "ing" can be put on the end of an English ~~noun~~ ^{verb} in order to make a verbal noun. Or you can put a "to" before it, either one, in English makes a verbal noun. And that is a very unfortunate feature of English because it introduces the confusion of having two ways of saying exactly the same things. Well, as you know, there is no harm in having two ways of saying exactly the same thing, except that you can use one of them to say an entirely different thing. You say, "running is good exercise" there is no person involved, there is no time involved, it is just the act. But

if you say, "running horses are dangerous," the word running is no longer a verbal noun. It is a different thing, it modifies a noun, tells something about that noun, it has person, gender, everything that is true of that noun, ~~is~~ true of the adjective. So ~~it~~ a participle is a verbal adjective, and an infinitive is a verbal noun. And in English unfortunately you can take any verb and made a verbal adjective or a verbal noun out of it, by adding "ing." And the meaning is utterly different but the form is exactly the same as with so many words. And the only way to tell is to see how it is used in the sentence, and usually that will tell. Not always. I heard a lecturer down at the University of Pa. last year who gave a sentence, which he said, you could not tell from the sentence, which it ~~was~~. And here was the sentence: Visiting relatives can be a nuisance. Now in that sentence is "visiting" an infinitive or a participle? Well, if you use in that sentence, instead of ~~and the~~ "can be" if you said "are" or "is", you'd know which it was. Visiting relatives are a nuisance. What is "visiting"? It is an adjective, it's like the relative who are visiting. Visiting relatives is a nuisance. What is "visiting"? It is a noun. You're doing the visiting. There it is a noun. In one case it describes the verbal idea, the verbal action, visiting. Maybe you're doing it, maybe somebody else is doing it. It doesn't say who. But in the other case it describes the relatives and there it is an adjective. Now in Hebrew, which is ~~much~~ more logical than this, you can always tell by the form whether it is an adjective, whether it is a participle, or whether it is anything else, the form tells us immediately, and so in this case this word which would mean "to be," can also mean "being."

The two are identical, except that in English we can use the word "being" in certain contexts where we couldn't use ~~the~~ "to be" even though the meaning was identical. So when you say the time of her being, you ~~se~~ mean the time when she was, the time when this was true of her, that this action was defined, the time of her being, the time when she came into existence, the time when this happened. So in this case we have ~~infinitive~~ which is very, very often used to show the time. You say from my going,

when you should say , from the time when I've been stress the time when something happened. So this not only describes time by an infinitive but used a word time, "from the time of her being,"way back when she began becoming Israel (8 1/2) The KJV makes

it the Lord God and his Spirit sent me, the Lord God sent me and his Spirit sent me. The ASV makes it the Lord God has sent me, and has sent his Spirit, and Kittel has a footnote in which he very definitely says this is the object, the Lord God has sent me and His Spirit, which seems to be a more logical interpretation, but then Kittel throws up his hands and says well even so it doesn't make any sense, so he says, let's delete the whole last ~~part~~ phrase. So he says, it is definitely object if it is so, but he says, it shouldn't be there at all, let's delete the whole phrase. So he wants to leave off the whole last ~~part~~ of the verse and if you leave it off you save yourself a lot of trouble. Yes? (9 1/4) It is a word which drives commentators to--I don't know what to say it drives them to--but it certainly is--you take the chapter alone, ~~if~~ you take the person who is writing this chapter and gets to this point, and he says this, and you say what on earth is he driving at. How can God who was there from the beginning, before it was there was I--way back then--say, and now the Lord God has sent me . I the Lord God--the Lord God has sent me. Doesn't make sense. And if you want to try o make sense out of it, it is very very difficult, unless you look ahead. But when it comes to looking ahead a little bit, that is not ruled out, because we find that very frequently in the scripture, an idea is suggested, there is a little bit of a hint of an idea, and then the idea is developed more fully later on. And you can't understand the hint many times until you see how it is developed later, and we found right in our first verse, as all these wonderful things about them, but not in truth or righteousness. And you say, what on earth is the idea of putting that in, that must be a mistake in the text, but then you read on, you find that idea that was hinted at there, is developed. So that there often are anticipations that don't clearly prove things but suggest them,

and fit in with later teaching. So when we get on into chapter 49, we find as 49 starts, who is talking. Well, it is very easy to decide who is speaking there, isn't it? Because He says, listen to me, the Lord has called me, so it is somebody other than the Lord who is talking as 49 begins, and this one says in verse 3, the Lord has said to me, Thou art my servant, O Israel--so you have definitely early in the verses of 49 one talking who says that he is God's servant, O Israel, God's servant, Israel, and as you go on, He speaks about what he is to do for Israel, so it becomes quite evident that the servant who speaks in 49 is Israel, but he is not all of Israel, he is one who represents Israel, one who is from Israel, who can properly be called Israel, and yet he is distinguished from Israel because he has to do something for others who are also part of Israel, so you have in 49, very clearly taught, that there is an individual servant, that the work of the servant is a work committed to Israel, a work which Israel must do, but which not all of Israel can do, in fact, which no substantial part of Israel can do, but that for which Israel has responsibility must be done by one individual who is so marvelously described in the beginning of chapter 42, this one who comes without discouragement, without hesitation, does not break a bruised reed, He goes forward calmly, steadily, to accomplish His task, this one is the servant of the Lord, who does the work that Israel must do, but can't, and which He does, representing Israel, so he is truly "my servant Israel." Well, then if we have this one talking for several verses in 49, could this one already say a verse or two, previously, could he speaking toward the latter part of 48? Is it possible that this 16th verse is the servant speaking? So the servant who is the one who must represent Israel declares that not only is he one who is going to do something in the future, but that he is one who has in the past spoken, he sent certain prophets as his representatives, He spoke to them, He was the one by whom the worlds were made, from the time when things began to happen, there was He, performing them. He is one who goes far beyond being an ordinary human being. He is one who can do things that it is hard to think of any but

God as doing, and He says, that now when it comes to the great climax, now the Lord has sent Him and has richly endued Him with the Spirit of God. As it says in chapter 11 where it describes the Spirit of the Lord rests upon Him, the ministry of the Spirit of God upon the Servant of the Lord. So you have the Lord, you have here the servant of the Lord whom the Lord sent, and you have the Spirit whom the Lord sends with the Spirit, and you have the servant himself who is active in doing things over a period of tremendous wide area of time, and so you have a suggestion, of teaching, which you have not had clearly expressed anywhere in the O.T., up to this time. You have them suggested in other places, and you have it suggested here, but it would be questionable whether anyone would get a full understanding of this verse, until he gets to the N. T. and learns ^{things} ~~there~~ about the Spirit of God, which fit any of the teachings about the servant in the O.T., but were not clearly explained, and in the light of which, we then can see exactly what this verse means, and see what a wonderful anticipation of the fact of the teaching. A marvelous verse, but it is a verse which gives you an anticipation rather than a clear explanation, a verse which would lead one to think, what on earth can it mean, you try to interpret it, try to explain it, every interpretation runs into difficulty, till you go ahead, you get more truth and more truth, and then when you get a great deal of truth it just opens up and you see clearly just exactly what is meant in the statement, Well, I think it is a marvelous verse. (15 1/4) Pretty good commentary, then, what is it? Yes, but of course it is one thing to know...

C.46 (1/2)

...we were looking at chapter 48, at the end of the last hour. We were still on verse 16, were we, yes, on verse 16 there, it is pretty hard to make much real sense out of the verse, aside from recognition of the trinity, and once you have that key, the verse is very clear and very simple. And why should the servant of God all of a sudden speak here, in the middle of this chapter. Well we have him speaking at the beginning of the next chapter, no question of it, so it is not at all unnatural to have a sentence by Him,

thus earlier. This verse then brings out the great truth, we've just been talking about God's servant Cyrus, here God's greater Servant speaks, immediately after what it says about Cyrus, and declares His preexistence, His deity, and His mission. Now the mission of the servant is something which we have of course in chapter 42, it describes His mission. His mission is to be a light to the Gentiles, His mission is to bring judgment to the ends of the earth. That is what the servant of the Lord is sent for. We have that wonderful description of Him in chapter 42, which sounded very much like an individual, rather than like a whole nation. Now here we have a statement by Him which adds ideas which fit with the ideas of 42, the idea of His being one who moves steadily, confidently, calmly, without ever discouragement, absolute certainty of accomplishment of His mission, fits exactly with the picture which it gives here in this verse, but it is rather hard to fit together with the many things said about Israel, in other parts of the section that we have been going through thus far. Well, then we go on to verse 17, and the Lord declares His greatness and His love to Israel, but immediately followed again by the disappointment with them. Verse 18, O that thou hadst hearkened to my commandments! Think what would have happened in that case. His name should not have been cut off nor destroyed from before me. Again it is not the denunciation of sin, depart from sin, or punishment is coming, like we have in the earlier parts of Isaiah, but it is the disappointment that sin made it necessary that the exile come, and that even after the exile there is still sin, within the heart of the nation. But still it ends with that wonderful promise of blessing in verses ~~19~~ 20 and 21: Go ye forth of Babylon, flee ye from the Chaldeans, --they are to be freed from the Chaldeans. You can't very well say go ye forth to people who are tied and ~~g~~ can't get away. The implication is they are going to be delivered, and they are told to announce to the end of the earth, the Lord has redeemed His servant Jacob. Then if that is what 20 is, what is 21? Well, there are 2 ways of taking 21, here they are told to do something, then it immediately is followed with statements in the perfect, describing something which would seem to be a de-

scription of something which has happened. It is strange to tell them to go forth, and then jump forward further and look back on what they do as they come forth. Is it a prophetic perfect, the declaration that this is certain in the mind of God, this is going to happen? Or is He looking back to their previous deliverance from bondage? Is he in ~~verse~~ verse 21, not specifically predicting what is going to happen as they go out from Babylon, but looking back to the other great deliverance, and telling what God did then, giving the assurance that the God who did these things for them then is with them now. And not specifically saying what He is going to do now, but telling what kind of a God it is, who is with them now. That would certainly seem the most natural interpretation of the words as they stand. They thirsted not when He led them through the desert, because the water is to flow out of the rock for them, He clave the rock also, and the waters gushed out. That is of course what happened as they went through the wilderness coming up from Egypt. Going out from Babylon, it is not quite the same situation. Cyrus gives them royal authority to go, gives orders to give them supplies for the journey, they're in quite a different situation, but it is the same God who makes it possible, who made the other possible, He delivers them in a somewhat different way. So I think to say verse 21 is historical rather than prophetic is altogether reasonable, I don't say it is required, but it seems to me probably the best interpretation. But it is historical here but historical with the implications that the God who did those things and took them out of Egypt, can be trusted to take care of them, when they come out of Babylon, a thing He has declared He will do. But then the chapter ends on a note of again, not of rebuke to the nation, but of reference to the fate of individuals, who do not follow the Lord, there is no peace. Peace of course in the Bible is not simply cessation of war, peace is well-being, it is prosperity, it is health, it is all that makes a good life, called peace. So the ordinary Hebrew greeting, Shalom, doesn't just mean I hope you're not at war, it means, I hope that all is well with you. And He says here, ~~I hope~~ there is no peace to the wicked, to individuals, to Babylonians, or the

individuals in the nations, or the individuals within Israel, who are opposed to God's ~~and~~ moral law, who are guilty of evil, there is no peace to them. Now there are those who ~~try~~ try to divide books according to arbitrary indications, and I think that that is a mistake, ~~if~~ the book of Micah divides naturally into three sections, and when we pick out the three sections we find that each of the three is introduced by the phrase, Hear ye, or Hearken, pay attention, and when there is a logical division, sometimes there is put a sort of a seal on it to show that this is the division of the book. But it is always wise to find your logical divisions first, and then see whether the author has given you additional evidence of it there. I feel that it is doing the other way round when people say, look at the end of 48 here, there is no peace saith the Lord to the wicked, and then look at the end of chapter ~~4~~ 57, I believe it is, I find my text here only goes through our present section, sort of--have to get out the larger Bible, and there I find chapter 57 ends with the identical words, there is no peace saith my God to the wicked, but the previous verse goes with it as part of the statement, in that case, while in this case it is an isolated verse, and then when we ~~come~~ come to the end of the book, we get to chapter 66, and the end of that chapter has a very similar, though not identical statement. After telling about the blessings of the righteous, then in the last verse of the book of Isaiah, says and they shall go forth and look upon the carcasses of the men that have transgressed against me, for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched, and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh. Which is certainly a parallel to these other two. So there are those who say, Isa. 40-⁶56 divides into sections, one: 40-48, ending with this phrase, there is no peace saith the Lord to the wicked; 49-57, ending with, there is no peace saith my God to the wicked; and then 58-66, ending with the verse I read you.

Well, if that was the logical division, these would be a good seal upon them, that it was. But actually that is not the logical division, the book divides very clearly in the middle of 56. The last half of 56, and 57, are very close in material with what

follows, and very unrelated with what precedes, and in the present place I am quite convinced that the end of 47 with its great climax in the destruction of Babylon, is the end of the first part, rather than the end of 48. So this is a case where purely artificial divisions will mislead you, I think. And I urge you, look for your logical divisions, look for your thought structure, as you make your outlines, and then after you've made that you will often find that the author has given a particular designation, to make it easy to find them. But in other cases you can be misled, as in this case.

So that, we have started our second part, we have 40-56 divided into two main parts, of which we are dealing with one this semester, and then that one is divided into three sections; an introduction, and three sections, and it--we are now in the, finishing the first chapter of ^{the second of} those three divisions. Now Delischz says, Delischz follows the other division, starts his second main part with 49, and he said, just look; Listen, O isles, unto me. See the contrast between 40: comfort ye, comfort ye, my people--in 40 He is looking at His people, now He is looking at this wider world. Well I was rather disgusted when I found that in Delischz, it lowered my opinion of him as an exegete, quite materially, ^{because} ~~but~~ after all, if you're going to compare the beginning of 49 with the beginning of 40, and say 40 is the people, comfort ye, comfort ye, my people; and this is the nations, listen O isles unto me--how about the beginning of 41: keep silence before me, O islands, --where ^{He} is dealing with the great outstretch just as much in 41 as He is in 49, so that you have many such introductions but the fact that it happens to come at the beginning of one of his sections, leads to a false conclusion. I was quite disappointed to see that in Delischz because it definitely lowers my opinion of him as an exegete. But now between 48 and 49, there is no question there is a chapter division. 49 begins a new speaker. We have heard the Lord speaking in chapter 48 and even if we have the servant of the Lord speaking in one verse, which I believe we do, from 49 's start we ~~have~~ have a long passage with the servant of the Lord

speaking so it is definitely a new chapter, but not I believe a new main section. The servant of the Lord only speaks for a few verses in 49, it is not the section as a whole. So in 49 it is quite plain that it is not the Lord in the general sense speaking, in the first verse, because He says the Lord has called me from the womb, from the bowels of my mother hath he made mention of my name. You don't expect God to speak in that way, so that it is not God in the sense that most of us ~~can~~ perceive of God speaking. This is presented as one speaking who has been born upon this earth, and who is declaring that God has given him a work which will reach out to the distant islands and the people from afar, so He is to do a work of significance to a very large area. And this one is saying that God has planned his work from before he was born, the Lord has called me from the womb, from the bowels of my mother hath he made mention of my name. Even long before I was born, He has called me and designated me for this work. And when you get to verse 3 you know that this is the servant speaking, because he said to me, Thou art my servant. This is the servant speaking very clearly. But of course verse 3 goes further, Thou art my servant, O Israel. So those people who go through the section and say, now what chapter, here is the servant, now who is it, is this Israel? Is it the prophet, is it Israel, is it Christ? And they make an antemone between the two and try to see which each thing goes under. Well, right here, they'd have to say it is Israel, because it says thou art my servant O Israel. And of course the fact of the matter is you cannot divide it that way. The servant is Israel and the servant is Christ. The servant isn't sometimes Israel and sometimes Christ. But the servant is an expression of the fact that God has a specific work for the doing of which Israel was called, and it is brought out repeatedly in our earlier section, that this work is something that is very difficult for Israel as a whole to do, because Israel is blind, deaf, Israel has fallen into sin, Israel has gone into captivity, how can Israel do this work. And of course that is made all the stronger and clearer when we notice the first extensive discussion of the servant in Isa.42 and see how there, the servant

was presented as one who does a worldwide work with calmness, with peaceful stepping forward, with no hesitation, no discouragement, no need to act violently, to act in the way you do when you've just got to put your whole strength in back of a thing to get it done, He goes forward steadily and calmly, and accomplishes His work, that is the picture in the beginning of chapter 42, that wonderful picture of the servant, and it isn't merely that in later verses we find that Israel can't do the work because Israel is in ~~ed~~ile, and so on--the whole character of Israel shows that it cannot be the one who with peace and confidence and utter lack of discouragement, steps forward to accomplish His work. Israel has the responsibility to do this work, but it cannot be the whole of Israel because it certainly would not be typical of the nation as a whole, nor would it be any sizeable portion of the nation. This work has got to be done and 42 tells us how it is going to be done, and suggests very strongly that it will be an individual who does it. So the...

C. 47 (1/2)

...and suggests very strongly that it will be an individual who does it, so the idea of its being an individual rather than the nation as a whole that is the one who is to do the work, the work ~~that~~ for which the whole nation is responsible, and for which it is called, that idea has been strongly ~~sketched~~ ^{suggested} in our first section. So I called our special section, the servant of the Lord individually, because it goes beyond suggestion, and is made absolutely clear, becomes clear here in this beginning of chapter 49, where we have here the Servant speaking and this servant is Israel, and He says, the Lord said unto me, Thou art my servant, Israel, in whom I will be glorified. And the second verse, which I skipped over for the instant, the second verse fits in with the first part of 42 again. The servant is one who is effective, one who accomplished the work to which He is called. The ~~of~~ Lord has made his mouth like a sharp sword, has hid him in the hollow of God's hand, made him a polished shaft, He is one who is adapted

to the accomplishment of His purpose, and one who can be depended upon, He will accomplish the purpose for which He has been called. Now this then is true of the Servant, it fits exactly with 42 and brings all we've read about the weakness of the servant, his blindness, and his failure, all of that comes up again and we say how can the nation as a whole do such a work? God says the work is going to be done, but how can the nation as a whole do it? And then we find a verse, verse 4, which at first sight seems sharply to contrast with verse 2 and 3, and also with verses 5 and 6. Verse 4 seems to stand apart, and the question is, who is speaking in verse 4? Now there are two possibilities that occur to me. One possibility is that the servant in the course of his earthly life, at a time when it appears to the world to be a ~~failure~~, as it is recorded in verse 4 as showing the problems and difficulties which he encountered. The other suggestion which seems much better, is that in verse 4, Israel thought of as a nation, as a whole, Israel says, well, I am the servant of the Lord, how can I do this work? I've labored in vain, I've spent my strength for ~~nothing~~, yet surely my judgment ~~is~~ is with the Lord and my work with my God. That is to say, that it sums up all that we read about the servant, blind and deaf, weak, in captivity, how can I do this work? Contrasts sharply with the beginning of 42, which shows them stepping forward in calmness, never a trace of discouragement, until He has made judgment in the earth and the isles shall wait for his law, it contrasts sharply with that. So, one sees the task, sees the responsibility and feels utterly helpless to accomplish it, and yet coming to that confident assurance, my judgment is with the Lord and my work with my God. Now I can't be dogmatic as to the true interpretation, but I do not know of

any (3 3/4)

As far as I can see, it is one of these two, at any rate that is the problem, it sums up this problem of the inability of Israel to ~~be~~ ^{do,} or else it shows the servant actually at some time in his life, seeming to be accomplishing it, but that doesn't seem to fit with the picture in 42. I would incline to the other view, ~~that~~ this is the nation as a whole speaking in ~~this~~ (4 1/4) verse 4.

But then in verse 5 we have the ideal servant again speaking, we have the individual, the one who fulfils the task to which the servant is called and we find the proof that he is individual in that he is now distinguished from Israel. Thou art my servant, O Israel, in verse 3. But in verse 5 he says, the Lord that brought me from the womb to be his servant, to bring Jacob again to him. You don't bring yourself, this is one who brings Israel to Him, so he is differentiated here, he is individualized here. Now back in 42 ~~his~~ his calling was to be a light to the Gentiles, and that might conceivably be the whole nation if the nation as a whole could fulfil the picture given in 42, but here we find that he is to be a light to the Gentiles, yes, but that, there is something else that needs to be done. The servant is to bring light to the Gentiles, that's why God called Israel, but Israel needs the work too, as well as the Gentiles. The work has to be done for Israel also. ~~Israel~~ Israel has fallen into sin, Israel is far short of God's desires for them. Israel needs the work of the ~~servant~~ servant done for it itself. So in verse 5 He says, now, saith the Lord that formed me from the womb to be his servant, ~~to~~ to bring Jacob again to him, Though Israel be not gathered, yet shall I be glorious in the eyes of the Lord, and my God shall be my strength. How could this be the nation? ~~this~~ It is very clear that the individual who performs that which is the responsibility of the nation as a whole and the work he does is so great that even if Israel were not yet, yet the servant's work could be done, the great work to which the servant has been called. Yet shall I be glorious in the eyes of the Lord, and my God shall be my strength. However the work is to be done as relates to Israel, He said unto me, it is a light thing that thou shouldest be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel. And that of course does not mean at all that it is a little thing, doesn't amount to much. It doesn't mean that, it is a term of contrast. Like where Jesus said, if a man hate not his father and his mother he cannot be my disciple. Of course, nobody takes that literally. It does not mean that he wants us to hate our parents, He says very definitely

what is to be the fate of those who mistreat their parents, who do not give their parents what is their due. What Jesus means is, if one is to be my disciple he must love me so much, and follow me so closely, that in comparison with his love to me, even his love to his parents, even that very, very strong emotion of humans, will seem like hate in comparison. He certainly did not mean hate your parents. It is one of the fine features of Christian life and one of the great testimonies of Christian life, is family (7 1/2) that it produces. So the terminology as used is an expression of contrast, rather than a statement of liberal fact. And the same is true here.

It is a light thing thou shouldest be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel. Well, taken by itself, out of context, it is unscriptural. It is not a light thing, it is a tremendous thing. It is a tremendous thing, you'd think it was worth everything. Well, look at all the statements given thus far, to delivering from exile. A tremendous thing. How can it be a light thing? Well, it is light in comparison with the whole work of the servant. The whole work of the servant is to be far greater and far more extensive than simply his work in relation to Israel. In 42 we just saw his great world-wide work, but now we see that also Israel needs to work. And the work, however, that is done for the world, is a far greater and more extensive thing than all that could be done for Israel. It is a light thing thou shouldest be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob and to restore the preserved of Israel. Note the term, the preserved of Israel. God said to Elijah that He would preserve 7000 that had never bowed the knee of Baal. It looks back to that, the ones who remain true, the ones who follow the Lord, the remnant of Israel, it does not mean that all are going to be raised up, but it means that there is a godly remnant, there will be a godly remnant and it will prove to be very large (9) prove to be very large and no human being can know who is going to be included in it. It is a large remnant but it is not the entire nation. Sometime~~s~~ the entire nation will be

saved, like a nation born in a day, but that will be those living at that time. It does not speak of those before them. But he is to restore the preserved of Israel I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles. It is a little different from our usual way of thinking. Here in Isa.42, He is going to be the great light to the Gentiles, now, not only is He to raise up Israel, but to be a light to the Gentiles. We would say, He is going to be a light to the Gentiles, but not only to be a light to the Gentiles, he also will do what is necessary for Israel. He would say it in a reverse order, a little different approach, but the idea when we get into it is quite easy to see. And he says, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the ends of the earth. We read in 42 that he was to be a light to the Gentiles, to bring judgment to the nations, the islands were to wait for his law, and to set judgment throughout the earth, but now he says he is to be his salvation. So it fits with 42 but goes beyond 42 in recognizing more fully the needs of each individual. So these six verses are a marvelous expression of the individuality of the servant, the certainty of his work, and the differentiation of the servant from the nation as a whole, even though he is Israel, and he represents Israel and he does the work for which Israel is called, yet He is differentiated from the nation as a whole, because He must do the work for Israel too. So in verse 7 we have the Lord's assurance of the completion of the work of the servant. Now is the servant still talking, quoting what the Lord says, is it simply part of the prophecy telling what the Lord says? We have no way to be sure, but it doesn't make much difference in sense which of these two we take. Thus saith the Lord, the Redeemer of Israel and His holy One, to him whom man despises, to him whom the nation abhors, to a servant of rulers. Is this talking to the nation as a whole, or is this talking to the servant? Is this saying that this servant who will be so successful, so effective, who will be a light to the gentiles, is yet going to have to suffer humiliation, to be one whom man will despise and whom the nation will abhor, who is the nation? The nation certainly must be Israel, who else

can the nation be? That would certainly seem to disprove the idea that this is the nation as a whole. I know some Jewish interpreters try to make it be Jeremiah, or some individual like that. But that doesn't fit with the larger concept. And it doesn't fit with the last part of the verse either. Him whom the nation abhorreth, servant of rulers, Kings shall see and arise, princes also shall worship. God~~s~~ declaring that the work of the servant is not going to be merely a work that affects a few people and is unknown to the world as a whole, it is going to reach the people in great positions of leadership. Kings shall see and arise, princes also shall worship, Because of the Lord that is faithful, and the Holy One of Israel, and he shall choose thee. Thus says the Lord, In an ~~acceptable~~ time have I heard thee, and in a day of salvation, have I helped thee. There we are seeing the servant as sure that his work is going to be accomplished, God will give him the power. Yes? (13) I would think so, yes. I would incline to think that this is pointing out that the one whom the nation abhors, the one who is despised, is nevertheless going to do a work which will cause great rulers and leaders to be impressed by it tremendously and to worship on account of it. I wouldn't think that this was (13 1/2) the millennium here. Now of course it is true that a general statement can extend far into the future and can include the millennium, but I don't think it is specifically jumping over what is in between (13 3/4) (stu.) That is a ~~sa~~ statement which we hear. It is much easier to make a positive statement than a ~~negative~~. If you say, I find in the O. T. a case where the ^{niphal}~~mitra~~ph is used to mean that something must be done, showing necessity, you can make that case, ~~wh~~ showing the case, here it is, context requires it, all right, now you make a statement, there is no place in the O. T. where the ^{niphal}~~mitra~~ shows a compulsion. Well, you've got to look at all the niphals before you can say that. And I say, let's go slow~~o~~ on making negative statements (14 1/2)

If you want to say to me, the emphasis seems to be on this, this is what is stressed in certain sections, talk that way, if you want, But when you say, something never

occurs, that is a (stu.) Yes, well, it's the sort of statement which it is best not to make unless one has examined the details, and can speak positively on it. And the unfortunate thing is that if you are a Bible teacher, if you are a presenter...

C.48. (1/2)

...presenting it a great part of the time to people who know very little about it and the result is--or even if they know a good deal, people who know much ~~less~~ less than you do, and you run into a conceit, people will ^{tend to} take anything you say, and that reflects on the audience. And it is true, that when you say the people, you say, this is it, the average person will either think you're no good or think you're excellent. You say, this is it, that's it, it proves it. But if you ~~w~~ say, well, I don't know, there's evidence this way, that way, and so on, you get through, they say, well, if he doesn't know, why should we even listen to him. And for the dealing with and for the general popular ministry, you must take the great truths, and present them cleverly. Well, it is very, very difficult, when you do that, to keep realizing that you must confine yourself to that which is absolutely clearly taught, and that even if these people are ready to take what you say on lesser things, and take conclusions you have ~~jump~~ jumped to, in the end you'll do them more good if you can teach them that there are things that are absolutely positive, if you don't have a positive message, you better quit. Because a "this, that, and maybe" message doesn't get anywhere, but that there are things that are positive and must be given, but that there are many other things that are on the borderline. And a great many things we don't know. And that on these things we want to reserve judgment and go slowly. But it is hard to do that.

I spoke in a Bible conference some years ago and a conference where they had 6 or 8 Bible teachers every year, each month a different one, for a series of meetings, and I went there for seven years in a row, and this was the first year I went. And, it had been going for thirty or forty years, and a woman who had heard, I think, 8 or 10

messages, came up to me afterward and said, we never had a speaker like you before, never had one like you. She said, they all say, this is it, this is it. But you say, well, now look at this evidence, look at this, this fits this way, and here you see, you trace the evidence out, and here you come to this conclusion, this is what is taught. She said, we never had a speaker like that before. And she said we were kind of bewildered the first two or three times you spoke, but she said, now we've heard several messages, she says, we're enjoying it. And they liked what they got from it. But if you're just that way, why it is no accomplishment. But what I'm saying is, that the tendency reacts on most people, and particularly popular speakers, where you're uncertain and people ask you a question, ^{to} just speak positively, and say there is no such case, and ~~then~~ even some of the greatest scholars, when they get popular ministry, will do that. Well, the result is that the man who gives wonderful blessing, much that is of tremendous value, you will find mixed in with it here and there, instances of statements which are not quite true, and that is true of people of all viewpoints. You can't take people of any particular group and say this is true or characteristic of them, because it is characteristic of people of every viewpoint. A tendency to speak too strongly on matters of secondary importance, on which you don't have sufficient knowledge. And I always feel that a person who is going to serve the Lord should think of two aspects of the word, one aspect of the word is to learn what the truth is, and in that you should be very, very humble and careful and examine the evidence and say does it teach this way, does it teach this way, is the evidence insufficient to know the answer, and the other phase of the work is the spreading of the message, the getting it out, and on that, take what you have decided on careful, analytic study, is really true, and present that strongly. And don't say anything you can't back up, or put your emphasis on the positive, you're trying to get the negative across to them. The other thing you ~~have~~ to do is to think the thing through very carefully and the two should be kept separate, I think. But one should do both of them.

...and so there is that danger and I have found in writers of every viewpoint ~~con-~~ceivable, I have found that danger, and if I find much of it, I lose interest in the writer, I decide he is just not helpful, but if I find a great deal that is helpful and then I find a little of that, I try to be charitable to him, and hope people will be charitable to me with the mistakes that I know I will make. And so when somebody makes a negative statement why I just say right away, well, now let's see if there isn't so much good in them that we can overlook this unfortunate thing of his making a negative statement which he probably hasn't examined all the evidence. Or let's see if he has examined all the evidence. But such a statement as that would be a difficult one. Now if you say the word such-and-such doesn't occur in the Bible, that with a concordance is fairly easy to substantiate. If you say such-and-such a form doesn't occur, that is harder because you can't get them together quite so easily. But if you say a certain idea never occurs--ideas sometimes are difficult to be sure, and therefore that is the sort of thing that would be extremely difficult ever to be sure of. ~~But~~ When Jesus Christ said that the O. T. was full of references to Him and to His words, and when James claimed Peter wrote and said, which things the angels desire to look into, and said of which salvation the prophets inquired and diligently sought, to know or what manner of time they did speak of, when the Spirit of Christ was in them spoke of the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow. How far does that glory extend? There is certainly sufficient warrant in the N. T. to feel that any particular event[?] that is going to happen may be properly anticipated in the N. T. in the verse, but not sufficient to say any particular thing is unless you evidence of it (7)

But when somebody makes a categorical statement it isn't, well, if they can give me a statement from Christ or the apostles that says it isn't, that settles it of course, but unless they can do that, if it is their own opinion and one that is based on--well, very often, people jump to conclusions. So I say when a man is giving Christian teaching, and giving much that is tremendously helpful, let's be charitable in the mistakes he

makes, but let's be careful in our study to find out what they are and not repeat them in ourselves. So I like to avoid all negative statements, unless there is sufficient to prove them and that's a very, very difficult task. Well, when it says this, that kings shall see and arise, princes also shall worship--that certainly is true of the millennium. But I don't see any warrant to say this refers only to the millennium, it would seem that--you see, another thing, we're trying to look at this from two viewpoints, more or less at the same time. It might be better if we looked at them separately, these two viewpoints. We are going, not to the O. T. as a set of proof texts to which we can go to find proof of things that we have in the N. T. that are illustration of this in the N. T. There is value in that. But I think there is far greater value in going to the O. T. as the revelation that God gave at a certain time, to a certain people, and seeing what God gave there, and seeing what those people could reasonably gather from it if they studied it properly. What we should be able to find is really there, and where we find that something must have been a mystery to them because they had insufficient yet revealed to understand it, see if God has later revealed that which would make it possible to understand it.

Now like in 16, I think we understand 16 in the light of 48 and 49. We don't fully understand it yet, but then we go back and look at Isa. 9, there we have further evidence, and you put that with it, and it becomes clear. But I believe--you take a N. T. passage you are studying and you 'll get light thrown in the N. T. from the O. T. And when you look back and find the illustration of it and you find much that helps you in your N. T. study, but I think you'll be on far safer ground in using it for your N. T. study, if you first have looked at it from the viewpoint of the ^{first hearers,} ~~verse here,~~ and tried ^{to see} what they could legitimately find. So the first reader of this will say, the servant is one whose work appears to be despised and looked down upon, but yet it is a work which is going to be effective in a way which will reach the attention of the great ones of the earth. That

you can say, and that has happened. Well, now that it will happen still more in the future is true, but it has happened now. So I don't see how we can get away from saying that this ~~passage is~~ ^{has been} fulfilled, even if there may be other aspects of fulfillment still going on. Because it doesn't say a king. If it said "a king" I'd say who is this great king it is talking about and I would look for some one great king who was the one spoken of. But when it says, "kings," you have there the law of double fulfillment, only it's not doubled then, it may be a hundred-fold because Kings is a plural, and you don't know how many cases have been fulfilled. If it said "a king" it would be one of course, it couldn't be two, because it would say one. So that, I appreciate these questions, anything that any of you have to question or suggest that opens up these problems, that throws further light upon them, we are very anxious to have. Mr. Miller? (10 1/2)

...that thus saith the Lord the Redeemer of Israel, His Holy One, to him whom man despiseth, you say right away, who is the "His." Well, His Holy One, to him whom ^{man} despiseth, could refer to the "him whom man despiseth," but it is a little bit unnatural to use it for the description of the one he is talking about like that. It seems a little more natural, coming right after Israel, the redeemer of Israel, his holy one, to think that it means the one who is both, the redeemer and the holy one of Israel. And if so, just the redeemer of Israel, his holy one, would give the sense, but I think that in English ^{it gives} the sense a little more clearly, if that is what is meant, to put in an "and" there. So that, the redeemer of Israel, that is to say, if the "his" refers to Israel, then the Holy One is the one who is the Redeemer, it is not Israel. You could say, the Redeemer of Israel, his servant, and there the "his" would be God and the "servant" would be Israel. But the Redeemer of Israel, His Holy One, is not saying that Israel is God's Holy One, but that God is Israel's Holy One. So I believe that the AV did a reasonable thing in putting in the and to make the sense a little clearer to English-speaking readers. But I think it was already perfectly clear in the Hebrew, from the Hebrew (12)

(stu) Well, trouble is, the even conveys not merely the idea of "the one who is," but the one who, more emphatically, the one of whom we put more stress on, that is the difficulty, to my mind, of the "even." I think it introduces another idea that is not in the original. Otherwise of course it does convey (12 3/4)

Well, the wonderful promise is given then of success, of effectiveness, is given in verse 7, and now in verse 8, ~~s~~thus says the Lord, in an acceptable time have I heard thee, and in a day of salvation have I helped thee; and I will preserve thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people. It is people, not people--it is singular rather than plural. It probably means the people of Israel. To establish the earth, probably the land would be better here, to cause to inherit the desolate heritages. This would seem most likely here to be referring to Israel, which has had its land desolated and destroyed and wrecked, that God is going to give this one, to rebuild it, to enlarge it, that would fit in with the millennium, of course, more than with anything that we know of that has occurred before. Give thee to be a covenant of the people, to establish the land, to cause to inherit the desolate heritages. It could be, of course, to establish the earth, but that doesn't fit with the desolate heritages quite as well. It means to re-establish the areas that belong to them, they're their heritage, but they have been made desolate by the result of the captivity. And this one is going to free them, to say: (verse 9) That thou mayest say to the prisoners, Go forth; to them that are in darkness, Shew yourselves, They shall feed in the ways, and their pastures shall be in high places. A promise of God's blessing upon His people, a blessing which could be thought of again as referring to the return from exile, but which is stated in such a language...

C.49. (1/2)

...as to make one think that it surely goes beyond anything that has yet happened, that it looks forward to a still greater blessing, that God is going to bring to His people, a blessing that is a result of the work of the servant, and that is far beyond anything

yet, and, they shall feed in the ways, their pastures shall be in all high places, they shall not hunger nor thirst, neither shall the heat nor suns' smite them, for he that hath mercy on them shall lead them, even by the springs of water shall he guide them. The return from exile is a wonderful thing, but this seems to go beyond that, and to have terminology that doesn't fit precisely with that, and to suggest that there is an even greater gathering, an even greater blessing in the future, and I will make--for God's people--and I will make all the mountains a way, and my highways shall be exalted, behold, these shall come from far, and lo these from the north and from the west, and these from the land of Sinim. So here they have come together, the outreach of the work of the servant leads to the coming of God's people, coming back, they have been scattered widely. Those who have been true to him and followed him, who have been in many lands, not just in Babylon, not just in the Babylonian captivity, but in many lands, in many areas, they have been, people who truly know the Lord and who are to receive His wonderful blessing, to be brought together under His blessing, He is going to make His mountains a way and His highway exalted, and they're going to come from far off, where are they going to come from, from the North and from the West and from the land of Sinim. Now some people say, well, we've got four changes, two of them are points of the compass, so the other two must be points of the compass. So if you have north and west, the other two must be east and south. Now ~~the~~ does far mean east and Sinim mean south, or does far mean south, and Sinim mean east? Well, it seems to me that it is a possibility if you can prove it, but to say it must be so is certainly going way beyond the evidence. What do these mean? Well, how can far mean any one particular ~~group?~~ direction? The suggestion is made that we take the word (2 3/4)

far, and change it into , what was the word suggested? (stu.) Yes, (3)

Well, that's easy, as Dr. Albright used to say, it is very easy to change Moses into Mephibosheth, all you have to do is drop "oses" and add

"ephibosheth," and that is true of changes in the text, the text may be corrupt, in the passage of time, in the copying, errors have come in, there's no question about that. But the number of them is small rather than large, and it is very difficult to be sure and particularly of any change involving a substantial change in ~~∕~~a word like that. If you find a case, like I spoke of in Intro. this morning, like where you have, the O.T. says, shall possess, and the N. T. says, "shall seek," and then you find the difference is merely a difference of one letter in Hebrew. Well, it is quite easy to see the possibility of such a change, the change of one letter, and particularly so in cases where it is a letter in which you find other examples of the same change, as where you have a proper name occurring in two forms, of which only one of them is the true one and the other one is very clearly an error of copying. But when you change a whole word like this ~~∕~~ it is highly questionable and I don't think we advance our understanding of scripture by going into that sort of thing. So when it says it is far, then it names three, well, of course, if it should be thought of as Babylon, if you think of it from the viewpoint of Babylon, people would come from the north and from the west, ~~∕~~ they wouldn't come much from the south because south of Mesopotamia is just the ocean. West of Mesopotamia is Palestine and Africa, and Europe, and America. East of it is Persia, India, and China, and so on. North of it is Russia, Hungary is west of it of course. But south of it what is it? So that if you think of it from the viewpoint of Babylonia, or even from Palestine, why south could easily be omitted. And Sinim could represent the easterly direction, they would come from the easterly direction. There are those today who, I think, if I recall correctly, the RVS says from Sayim which is a small and unimportant town in Egypt. Well, that could refer to south of Palestine, though it is quite a bit west as well as south, and it is questionable whether this town is of any special importance, or whether there would be any particular reason to use it to indicate south, and besides, and it would be very strange to leave out the

east altogether, extremely strange, and it doesn't say Sayime, it says Sinim. Sinim would be plural, the people of Sin, and who are the people of Sin? Well, commentaries for decades, I guess for centuries, have said Sinim means ~~the~~ the Chinese. If you look in a newspaper today you can read about the Sino-Soviet relationship, it is a common term today for China, this Sin. Well, some say, yes, but that can't be in the Bible here because ~~that~~ that comes from a dynasty which derived control over China about 250 B.C., that is centuries after this was written, how would they use the term Sinim for China? So that there is various discussion about it. China would certainly be logical here, because if you ~~want~~ want to say east and if you want to say way east, you get a very large country which is a very long distance east from there, it ~~would~~ would be a very natural one to take, to show the widespread extent of the work of the servant. And today there are Chinese scholars who say that it would not be at all unreasonable ~~in the time~~ ~~on the part~~ of Isaiah to refer to China this way, because they say, the land from which this Sin dynasty came, was the section of China which was furthest west and through which the caravans went in going to China, so it was the first part of China you touch. And very often lands are named after the first part of it that people come to. Like the people in Germany who heard about a girl from Illinois out there and said oh she comes from the back country of New York. And you see they thought that you come to America, you come to New York, the back country of New York, everything beyond it, and it is quite possible for countries to name other countries according to the first thing that you come into when you enter it. To the people of the continent of Asia, the difference between Asia Minor and Arabia and Persia and China and India, is tremendous. But to a person coming from Europe and ~~the~~ you enter Asia, but it is all so different from what you're accustomed to and it seems unified, and what the Romans called the Province of Asia, which was what we call Asia Minor, came to be the name given to the whole continent, it was the first thing they entered. So it would not be at all strange, if in

Isaiah's day this name Sinim was used for China. We have no other evidence of it that I know of. We can't prove it was, ~~but~~ it seems very reasonable, and in the providence of God, that hundreds of years later that a ruler from this area would conquer all of China and even though his dynasty only held China for a few years, that the name of the first unification of China from him would be given to the land so ~~though~~ the Chinese don't call themselves by the name China, it is the name used among foreign countries, and has been for two thousand years, and today we speak of them as China and we speak of the Sino-Soviet relationship derived from this word Sinim. So it is a very interesting thing, a wonderful way of showing the great (something happens to the speed of the record here, 9 1/2~~7~~- the voice speeds up)

...finishes one main division and it starts another. But now suppose a person didn't know that , suppose a person hadn't studied what we've been over in recent weeks and discussed the end of the first division and the beginning of the second. Why you would notice if you look at 47 that the whole of 47 is devoted to the destruction of the Chaldeans, that's the subject of the chapter as a whole, and when you start chapter 48 you are in an entirely different subject, you are on God's relation to the people of Israel, there is I would say, except for its force which is a definite (10)

I would say this is the best chapter division by far that we've had yet, since the beginning of 41, but since that , some of them have run right straight along so it is highly questionable where you would make a division. From 41 through 47 is very continuous, the beginning of 47 is quite a definite division, because the whole of 47 is on the relationship to the Assyrians, or ^{to} the Babylonians, the destruction of them, but that finishes at verse 15, and you start a new theme altogether, that is, as far as 47 is concerned. A highly different theme, never once mentioned in 47, the relation of God specifically to Israel and to their unbelief, so this would seem to me to be one of the best chapter divisions in the whole Bible, so I personally would rate it four-star excellent, not just fairly good.

Well, how about the beginning of 49, what would you do with that, Mr. ?

(stu.) If you have studied this carefully as we have thus far, have been present at our last few lectures, I think that quite an argument could be made for what Mr. Quarterson said, ~~that~~ the servant is already talking and he continues to talk, but I don't think that would be obvious if ~~one~~ hadn't ~~heard~~ made a fair amount of study. Certainly a big argument could be made ~~that~~ the servant is speaking in verses 15 and 16, but when it comes to 17 to 22, if you prove 15 and 16 are ~~the~~ servant speaking, it can very well be he continuing, but there is no proof of it in those verses. In those verses, thus saith the Lord, ~~the~~ ^{the Holy One} Redeemer, ~~of~~ Israel, He is talking to Israel and the Lord is speaking to Israel from 17 on, whether this Lord is the servant, or not, but when you start 49.1, it is very definite that one is speaking who says the Lord has called him, that this, these next few verses, is a definite soliloquy of the servant, whether it should be put back of it or not. So that it would impress me that to make a chapter division where it is, is infinitely better than if it was a verse earlier or a verse later. It is at the beginning of a main paragraph division, if you think of extending the servant's talk back to 16, or 15, of course an argument could be made. But on the face of it, on the rather obvious--without studying into it that much, surely there would seem to be ~~quite~~ a main division. Not as main as the beginning of 48, which is a main division of the book, but yet quite an important division. So I would incline to be well-pleased that the majority of you thought of it (12 1/4)

Though I think ~~an~~ argument can be made along the line that Mr. Quarterson suggested. Now we look at chapter 50. How many of you said that (12 1/2) ...agree strongly with Mr. Cohen that these 3 verses stand out very sharply from what follows. My Bible here has a paragraph division at the beginning of verse 5, chapter 50, and I noticed another Bible that has the same one, a different Bible I noticed had a different--Beginning of verse 5 mine has it, paragraph. Well I am amazed here to see the 5, I don't see how anybody could ever put it at 5. Just read those last two verses, 3 and 4:

I clothe the heavens with blackness, and I make sackcloth their covering. The Lord God has given me the tongue of the learned, that I should know how to speak a work in season. How does that ever fit together? How can those two verses possibly belong in the same paragraph? There is a sharp division between verses 3 and 4. Seems to me there is no question that a paragraph division begins at , belongs at the beginning of verse 4. The only question is , is it simply a paragraph division or is it more than a paragraph division? Should it be a chapter division at the beginning of verse 4? Mr. Myers? (13 3/4) ...

C.50. (1/2)

...Mr. Myers just pointed out is a very sharp division, extremely sharp. There should be at least a paragraph division at verse 4. Now our question is should the chapter division come at the end of verse 3 and at the ^{beginning} ~~end~~ of verse 4, or should the ~~end~~ chapter division come at the beginning of 50? Now it could be that the three verses were separate by themselves, shouldn't go with either one, that could be, but that is unusual. The more usual is that it goes with one of them. Now let's look at it a little bit before further discussion on it. Let's just look at it a little, the two suggestions that were made for division at the previous. One the question whether you have the ^{parent} ~~parent~~ as spoken of before, and the relation of the child to the parent as follows, that might make a difference between what precedes and the first verse, but I don't see anything like that in verse 2 or in verse 3. Now they can be assumed to go with verse 1, at least you don't have that idea explicitly there, and I don't see it anywhere in the rest of the chapter. It doesn't seem to me that it then describes any of the chapter, except just verse 1, with possibly 2 and 3 later. Now it could be, you could have two chapters divided on that as the basis. But if it is, I would look for more evidence of it, further on in the chapter. The same way with what Mr. Roczey suggested, you have comfort given before that, here you have a little more *emphasis perhaps than before* on the fact that there is going to be an actual deliverance but --

of ~~evidence~~ ^{emphasis} on deliverance before, like in verse 25, ~~as we suggested~~ ^{of the previous chapter}, and 19, but and after this, ~~the~~ actual deliverance, whatever you have of it, would be perhaps in these first three verses, there is very little ^{of it} in what follows. So I don't think that makes a difference in these chapters, it might make a little difference ~~between the first~~ ^{three} ~~verses~~ but I'm not sure that it is pervasive enough to make a real chapter division here. On the other hand, if you take the subject that is under discussion, you find that after the servant has spoken in the first 12 verses, verse 13 is praise to God for what the servant has done. The servant tells of these wonderful results of his work, lo, these from the north and from the ~~west~~ west, and these from the land of Sinim, in verse 12, and then in verse 13 we have this wonderful praise to God, Sing, O Heavens, and be joyful, O earth, ...for the Lord has comforted his people. Surely that is praise for the wonderful work of the servant, and so it seems--my Bible here has a paragraph division at 13, and it surely should be at 14. But at 14 then you have, ~~for~~ after this wonderful expression of praise and joy, which you had in 49, all through these verses, about the work of the servant, then Zion turns to the servant, and says, yes, the Lord is going to do these wonderful things in making the servant a light to the Gentiles, and says it is a light thing to raise up the people of Israel, we've heard you're going to bring judgment to the Gentiles, but Zion says, the Lord has ~~of~~ forgotten me, and my Lord has forsaken me. Well, Zion's complaint that God has forsaken her is stated in verse 14 and ~~this~~ is answered in succeeding verses, and how far does the answer go? God says, do you think I have forgotten you? ~~Can~~ Can a woman forget her suckling child? I have graven you on the palms of my hands, I'm going to do wonderful things for you, and He goes on and describes these wonderful things that are going to be done, right through verse 23, then having told the wonderful things He is going to do, in answer to Zion's complaint, the Lord has forsaken me. He says, Can a woman forget her suckling child? No, I'm going to ^{do} wonderful things. Then in verse 24 is another answer to Zion. You might say, perhaps a continuation of Zion, shall a prey be taken from the mighty or the lawful

captive delivered? You talk about this wonderful thing for Israel, but we're in captivity. We're under the mighty Babylonians, will we ever be delivered? Well, God says yes, you will, thus says the Lord, even the captives of the mighty will be taken away. I'm going to destroy your oppressors, so he is continuing the same thing. But then in verse 50 the Lord continues to answer Zion's complaint. The Lord has forsaken me. God says, where is the bill of your mother's divorcement, what makes you think I have forsaken you, what makes you think I have broken relations with you. Where is the evidence that I have divorced from you? No, He says, it is your iniquities that have made the separation, but as far as I am concerned there is no separation. Is my hand shortened at all that it can't redeem, have I not power to deliver? Behold, at my rebuke I do these tremendous things, so you have Zion's complaint in verse 14, and God is answering it right through verse 3 of chapter 50. It is a unified passage, and so between 3 and 4 is a very marked chapter division. And there is somewhat less marked but rather definite at 14 of 49, but at the beginning of 50 there is hardly a paragraph.

Now I don't know how much time Mr. Oliver and Mr. Roczey had worked on this particular division, they each noticed a difference between verse 1 and what precedes, which could make a valid reason for a chapter division, if it is carried through, but I don't think we find that it is carried through. Well, these three verses go very closely with what precedes, but if you think this chapter division is rather bad and it seems to me that it is, seems to me right in the middle of that discussion, if this is bad, I think the verse division is twice as bad between verses 2 and 3. Look at that third

I dothe the heavens with blackness,
verse, and I make sackcloth their covering. What a verse to preach a sermon on. What is the meaning of this verse? What is it talking about? Is He describing some tremendous calamity that is going to come at the end time? Is He describing God's great power over nature? What is verse 3 about? You don't have to bother with that verse because verse 3 is not a unit, it is the last part of verse 2. The sensible thing would have been to make the division much earlier, verse 2 and 3 are closely tied to-

gether, and within this section, if you're going to divide it into two verses, there are three other places that would be far better than here. Suppose it was this way. Wherefore, when I came, was there no man" when I called, was there none to answer? Is my hand shortened at all, that it cannot redeem? or have I no power to deliver? Here is His question: what makes you think I haven't any power? Now here is the answer: behold, at my rebuke, I dry up the sea, I make the rivers a wilderness, their fish stink because there is no water, and die for thirst. I clothe the heavens with blackness, and I make sackcloth their covering. It is simply the last part of verse 2, and as a part of it it makes perfect sense, stressing God's power, that they don't need to think that God can't deliver them, that God can't ^{protect} help them, because look at His tremendous power over nature. He has shown and does show. So that verse 3 as a part of verse 2, or you can divide it up into two or three verses if you want, but this is the silliest place you could get to make a verse division, it wrecks the whole thought. I don't know as I'd say wrecks, but it leaves a section alone which does not convey its meaning alone, which has to be tied a little tighter to what precedes, to make its meaning clear. And that is one thing of course that throws us off in the chapter, but it would be much better I would say, if the chapter division were made at the beginning of verse 4.

Now how about chapter 51, how many of you said that that was a terrible (record scratches here, and goes on)...obvious that between verse 11 and the beginning of 51 there is a suggestion of division. I don't think that is obvious. Because it isn't obvious at first sight what 11 is talking about, but on close examination you find that verse 11 goes closely with verse 10. And if you look at verse 10, Who is among you that fears the Lord, that obeys the voice of his servant--the servant is talking, and the servant has begun talking in verse 4, The Lord God has given me the tongue of the learned. The servant talks from verse 4 through verse 11, and then after verse 11, you have the beginning of a long discussion in which the Lord deals with the people of Israel, in this long discussion, and in this he continues for a long time on this discussion, and the discussion

is directly to the people, there is nothing in it specifically referring to the servant, while we have a servant's soliloquy undoubtedly from verse 4 to verse 11. So it might not be obvious without more study that 11 belongs in the servant's soliloquy, but let us say between 10, or 9, 8, or 7, any of those verses, and 51.1 is a sharp division, and you might be uncertain whether to make it after 10 or after 11, but somewhere right in there there is a pretty good division so I think a good argument can be made for considering it an excellent division. (break in record, 9 3/4) ...

At the beginning of 51 you have a section in which God gives comfort to His people. And He starts in hearken to me you that follow after righteousness, there is not a thought of rebuke here, ~~the~~ it is all comfort. The Lord is going to comfort Zion. Here are three verses of comfort. And then in verse 4, again He speaks to the same people, Hearken to me my people, give ear to me. Verse 5, my righteousness is near, look up to the ~~heave~~ heavens, see that my righteousness shall not be abolished. So here we've had two paragraphs starting with "hearken" and giving comfort to His people. Same is true of verse 7, hearken to me, ye that know righteousness. Fear not the reproach of men, they won't last and my salvation endures forever. So these 8 verses consist of 3 paragraphs, each starting with "hearken." Each blessing His faithful people, each promising His blessing, so these 8 verses form one connected form, and after 8, between 8 and 9, would be a very good place for a division of some sort, because you have three sections, three paragraphs, each starting the same way, and each having the same general thought, ending ~~w~~ at verse 9, but now from verse 9 on, you have the same general thought continued, the thought of God's blessing on His people, the material we've had before, all this about God's rebuke, for their sin, their turning against Him, you have no thought of this here, it is all blessing. So that the section, through verse 8 and the section which follows it, are still dealing with comfort to His people and with blessing, but now in verse 9, we start a poem: Awake, awake, O arm of the Lord. Think of what the Lord has done, verse 11, therefore the redeemed of the Lord shall return, and come

with singing unto Zion. So we have here the theme of God's blessing on His people. Awake, awake, starting with verse 9, and continuing until you get another paragraph starting "awake" in verse 17: "Awake, awake, stand up, O Jerusalem" and then God's blessing on His people, and then 52.1 says, "Awake, awake, put on thy strength, O Zion," and continues God's blessing on His people, so you have, just as you had three short paragraphs starting "hearken to me, hearken to me, hearken to me," and each of them having God's blessing on His people, then you have three long paragraphs starting with "awake," giving God's blessing to His people. So that from the beginning of chapter 51 until way on in 52 is one definite unit, and anything that breaks it up is not an excellent chapter division. A very reasonable place for chapter division might be at the end of verse 8, but that is not half as important a place as the beginning of 51, I would say. (stu. 12 3/4) Well, I thought it was a somewhat good division, from this viewpoint, that it is a paragraph division. You have "awake" --a long paragraph. "Awake"--a long paragraph. You have "awake"--a long paragraph. And it separates the second and third of these. So I would say it is a thousand percent better than a verse earlier or a verse later would be. But that after all, it does break up^a three - stanza poem, cuts off the third, so that perhaps that should push it over into the fairly poor sheet, but I don't think it should be terrible, unless it had been a verse later or earlier. Mr. Cohen? (13 1/2) Yes, did he say the same thing about 50? (stu.) That is a much worse division than this one, much worse. (stu.)...

C.51. (1/2)

...I think these things^ø we have noticed here brought out, one rather strong difference between our present section, that is, the second main thought of our whole part of Isa., and the first, in the first one, from chapter 41-47, 47 is a very definite unit, and there are some other units of fair length, but as a rule the thought jumps rather sharply back and forth among different themes, and sometimes (1 1/4)

and just about every chapter of those chapters divides up into three or four sections so that the beginning of the chapter is the beginning of one of the section, but it is not a great deal better than it would be at the beginning of a different one, anywhere along in the chapter. There is much movement during the first part, you might say, you think of a people all upset about the certainty of exile, and terribly tense and confused and anxious about it, and dealing with them in that mood, he deals with this one, and with this one, and with this one, ~~the~~ goes back and forth a great deal in those sections, until He reaches that great climax in 47 of the absolute certainty of deliverance from the Babylonian exile, but then after He finishes that then you might say that that has been fairly well taken care of, the deliverance from Babylon, and there is a more calm attitude possible now and in this there is not nearly so much a jumping from one thing to another, there is more of a continuous section divided, and so we have perhaps more variety of thought in 48 than any of the following sections, ~~the~~ following chapters, but 48 has that long rebuke in the first part of it, and then has mostly blessing in the latter half of it, 49 has this long soliloquy of the servant in verses 1 through 12 or 13, and then it starts this section in verse 14 which runs clear through verse 3 of the next. So there is a section and then the soliloquy of the servant, there the 8 verses, and then 51 and most of 52 makes one rather unified section, with these three parts, with parts within these three parts (3)

So it is more of a continual discourse

than what would be, and yet in this continual discourse, the thought is being brought forward the main theme of the first part, deliverance from Babylon is still touched upon occasionally, driven home. But the two stresses brought out in the first part are emphasized more now, the work of the servant, what it is, what it means, it's developed greatly in this section here, and the theme of the necessity of deliverance from sin. Something must be done about the sin question. That is brought out, not persistently throughout, but in certain key passages rather strongly and particularly in the beginning of 48, and so here we have this section that runs from 14 through 50.3, a section in

which God is answering the attitude of those who tend to give way to despair, they say well God is going to bring judgment to the nation, He is going to bring a light to them all, the servant is going to do the great work, yes, but as far as we're concerned we are left by the side, we are cast off. Zion says the Lord has forsaken me, and so His answer to that includes a number of figures of speech, but not only a number of figures of speech, wonderful promises of deliverance, but in these promises here there is comparatively little, well, I'm not sure--maybe we can say there isn't anything specifically referring to the deliverance from the Babylonians. It is of general nature and some of it would seem to go beyond anything that happened at that time. It shows a continuing blessing upon His people, and so that ~~is~~ His first answer to them is, can a woman forget her sucking child? Well, He says, they may, but I won't forget you. In other words, He is not saying here is an argument that proves it, the fact that a woman can't turn against her child proves I can't turn against you, that--you can't prove things that way, because even though it is true that the love of a parent to a child is such a general biological fact that in most cases it is very deep and very intense and very lasting, there are exceptions. There are individual cases where it goes quite in the opposite direction, so we cannot prove anything by ~~an~~ analogy, we can only illustrate by an analogy, and God is not attempting to prove by an analogy, He is merely illustrating. He doesn't say ~~is~~ -- I remember one time I was much impressed with hearing a minister talk on the security of the believer, and instead of resting his argument on good strong clear Biblical statements which is the only way to prove anything, he rested ~~it~~ on analogy. He said, would I forget my little child, would I? No matter what my little child did, I wouldn't turn against him. It was all an analogy. And then I went home and happened to pick up a story of Bret Harte's about a man in the west who'd been kicked out of home by his father and his father had absolutely no use for him, and then ~~in~~ the story the boy came back and saved the father's life, and the father's conclusion ~~was~~ was to send to the other brothers and say, who do you think

that was who came along just as I was drowning there and pulled me out, he said, ~~he~~ it was that no-good brother of yours coming back to insult his poor old father, and such things are very exceptional but they do occur, and we cannot prove by analogy, we cannot prove the character of God by an analogy to anything, but we can illustrate, but we have to have definite Biblical teaching to prove a thing. So here it starts, it sounds as if God is attempting to prove by an analogy, can a woman forget her suckling child, that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb? How ridiculous! Why of course God won't forget you, a mother won't forget her child. That's not what He says, He says, yes, they may forget, yet will not I forget you. In other words, He is ~~and~~ making an ~~analogy~~ ^{analogy}, He is saying it is very rare that a mother should forget her child, it is very rare that a mother will turn against her child. Think, He says, what a strong emotion maternal love ~~usually~~ ^{usually} is, but He says my love for you is far stronger even than that. He says yes they may forget yet will not I forget. It is God's word rather than any analogy that proves the matter, but He gives the analogy in order to show what He is talking about, I think that is an important thing for us to have in mind here. Then He goes on, behold I have graven thee upon the palms of my hands, and God's promise, His definite statement here is worth far more than any analogy. An analogy helps us to understand things, analogies are great things in getting truth across but it is good for us to keep clearly in our minds, when we deal with an analogy that it is a method of showing what an idea is, not a method of proving an idea is true. And so He says they children shall make haste, thy destroyers and they that made thee waste shall go forth of thee. In other words, God's constant blessing that is going to deliver them and is going to save them from the destroyer, the children shall make haste, they may come to great catastrophe, great misery, but they are not going to be overwhelmed, be destroyed, they're going to have a great future. Yes? (9 1/4) ...at the beginning of his book, very beginning, shows the three ways of getting truth, through a legend. One way is the way of Biblical setting, what does the Bible teach? Then, he says,

there is the way of the rationalist who tries to reason things ought to be this way, or this way, from human reasoning, and he says that is the wrong way. And then he says, there is the way of the mystic, who has a feeling, and of course the prophets had a feeling but God gave them the feeling, but today God has given us our truth in the Word, and many people have different feelings, and you better not trust them, so he warns us against the two wrong ways of getting truth, but then he goes on and in every discussion he starts with the Word of God and gives us the evidence from the Bible, which should follow. But he doesn't stop there, he then continues and brings in all sorts of analogies and arguments, some of which are very, very strong and very excellent, and occasionally some are very weak, but I think we should interpret it in the light of his first statement that the truth is what the Bible says. And any other sort of an argument is merely an argument to help you to answer objections to it, and not a basis on which to put it. Sometimes you say the analogy of human experience proves something, well, if you say that with enough emphasis it'll carry weight with a lot of people, but he says at the beginning that that isn't the way to get the truth, it is to get it from the Word. So I'm glad you said that again, because sometimes I think you can get quite a false idea of his method of (10)

Well, we continue here tomorrow, read on and study into these sections. I took a little longer on this than we might have today, but I think methodologically it is worth it. (break in record, starting again at 11 1/4)

...the second main part has much longer sections in than the first part, which hang together as units and are separate from what preceded, and one of these of course is the servant's soliloquy in chapter 49, which would run from verse 1 doubtless through verse 13. Then we have Zion's complaint, starting in verse 14, Zion complaining that the Lord has forsaken her, the Lord has promised what He is going to do for the world, He has promised to give light to the Gentiles, He has promised that the work of the servant is going to be completed and incidentally in the course of it, said it was a light thing

to raise up the tribe of Jacob, that he had given to the world, and now Zion says the Lord has forsaken me, forgotten me, so the Lord answers from 49.14, through 50.3, and we notice that the Lord takes up the complaints of Zion, and answers. Can a woman forget her suckling child? Yes, she may, yet I won't forget you, in other words, it is not an argument at all, but an analogy. A definite statement of the Lord, a statement including an analogy, we mentioned that yesterday and I think that is tremendously important to realize. And then we have the same sort of thing in verse 24, shall the prey be taken from the mighty, or the lawful captives delivered? Zion recognizes it is a lawful captive, the Babylonians have taken them prisoner as they have many other nations, and they're all subject to them, they're lawful captives, the mighty power of the Babylonians is far superior to that of the Israelites, the Syrians or these other powers. Can they be taken away from them? Yes, the Lord, says, I'm not only going to take away from them but I am going to destroy their power, and then in chapter 50.1, the Lord points back to His wonderful promise, and He says His promises are just as good as they ever were. Where is the bill of your mother's divorcement, or to whom of my creditors have I sold you? How ridiculous, to say that God would make a promise and then would divorce Himself from it? How ridiculous to say that the Lord would sell His people, that He would have an obligation that He could only meet by selling His people into slavery, it is an absurd thing, the Lord is just trying to point out the absurdity of it, the fact that He is entirely dependable, and that if His promises are not being fulfilled, it is not because of any weakness on His part, but as He says in the end of verse 1 here, behold for your iniquities have ye sold yourselves, and for your transgressions is your mother put away. So then verses 2 and 3 stress God's power, as has been stressed in previous verses to some extent. The power is not stressed as much here as it is back in our earlier section. Much stress has been placed on that there, now there is comparatively less. But the specific promises of deliverance that we have in the part of this section prior to the beginning of chapter 50, these

specific promises do not definitely mention the Babylonians except in the statement in verse 26 about *their* destruction and even that doesn't mention them specifically. It can refer to any oppressing force, but it does carry on promises of blessing which are parallel to the wonderful promises in the statements of the servant in verse 12...

C.52. (1/2)

...that these shall come from far, and lo, these from the north and the west, these from way off from China. Well, the people around near Babylon, why should they come from China? This is evidently going clear beyond the deliverance from the Babylonian captivity. It is looking forward to marvelous blessings that are going to come through the work of the servant. These marvelous blessings are going to reach out to the whole world, so the promises here include the rebuilding, the putting an end to the destruction, that is included, but there is beyond that an outreach and a wonderful blessing which goes beyond anything we know of in connection with the return from exile. They are promises of God's continual dealing with His people for a long time in the future, on a basis of very great blessings indeed. I think then that therefore it is altogether justifiable if anyone takes a particular verse out of this section and says look, here is a promise, not fulfilled in return from exile, something that is yet future, and yet they are rather general, most of them. Now, one very interesting statement is this one in verse 20, the children which thou shalt have after thou hast lost the other, shall say again in thine ears, this place is too narrow for me, give place to me that I may dwell. Then shalt thou say in thine heart, who hath begotten me these, seeing I have lost my children, and am desolate, a captive, and removing to and fro? Who has brought up these? Behold, I was left alone, and these, where have these been? Thus saith the Lord, behold, I will lift up mine hand to the Gentiles, set up my standard to the people, and they shall bring thy sons in their arms, and thy daughters shall be carried on their shoulders.

Well, now the most immediate superficial way of interpreting this simply is of course, Israelites are going to be brought together from all over the world. That's the most immediate obvious thing, and yet as you look closely at it, you wonder if that really does encompass the full thought of the passage. Why would they say, where have these been, who are these children of mine? If they simply are physical children who had been widely scattered. Does it not suggest that God is going to provide true ~~continuous~~ continuers of the people of God, who were unknown to those before, that these people are to come from among the Gentiles, they are to be brought from very distant lands, and that they are to be brought to increase the number of the people of God, far beyond what the earlier people of God had ever dreamed possible. I don't say that this is obvious at first reading in the passage, or even that it is necessarily so, but certainly the way it is worded suggests that the bringing of the Gentiles may be in mind in this section.

Well, we now look on to the next section, after 49.13 to 53, which would make an excellent chapter by itself. It really is one definite unit. You look on then to the next unit and that starts with verse 4, the Lord God has given me the tongue of the learned, very clearly a change of speaker from the speaker in verses 1-3, and this speaker now continued most likely until the end of the chapter. There might be a little discussion as to just how far it goes, but it would seem it at least goes through verse 9 and very likely through verse 11 also. As verse 10 says, who is among you that fears the Lord, that obeys the voice of His servant, this sounds more appropriate for the servant to speak than for the Lord to speak. And there are those who suggest that this passage is the prophet speaking himself, and it is pretty hard to find anything, I think, in the passage, which would be impossible to refer to the servant, to the prophet. It could not be the prophet who speaks in 49, he certainly is not the servant of the Lord there, and it could not be the prophet who is described in Isa. 42, that certainly is not a description of the prophet, but you cannot say that this could not describe Isaiah.

The Lord has given me the tongue of the learned, that I should know how to speak a word in season to him that is weary. He wakens morning by morning, wakens my ear to hear as the learned. No reason why Isaiah couldn't speak that, for he is claiming divine revelation and divine direction. The Lord has opened my ear and I was not rebellious, neither turned away back. That seems a little strong for a fallible human being to say about himself, I was not rebellious, ~~neither~~ neither turned away back, and yet we have no evidence of Isaiah having ever turned back in any substantial way from following the work of the Lord. Jeremiah, we find, found it very difficult, time and again, Jeremiah was tempted to turn back from following the Lord, but in the end he was a great example of loyal following of the Lord, but he gives us a ~~clear~~ clear picture of his struggles and of his disappointment and of his difficulties, but in the case of Isaiah we have no such evidence. There is no reason we can give why Isaiah might not have said, what is here, I was not rebellious, neither turned away back.

Verse 6 I gave my back to the smiters, and to them that plucked out the hair, I hid not my face from shame and spitting. Well, Isaiah certainly boldly proclaimed the word of the Lord in the time of Ahaz, In the time of Hezekiah, Isaiah was in favor with the king, but in the time of Manasseh, we don't have any scriptural statements about Isaiah, but we do have scriptural statements about the great wickedness of Manasseh, and there is a Jewish tradition about Isaiah having been persecuted and in fact martyred, and it is pretty hard to say that Isaiah could not have said this about himself. Verse 7, for the Lord will help me, therefore I will not be confounded and I know I will not be ashamed--why surely that could fit Isaiah.

Now verse 8, He is near that justifies me, who will contend with me? let us stand together, who is my adversary? let him come near to me. Well, that sounds pretty brash, doesn't it? Doesn't seem likely that Isaiah, a mere man--it doesn't sound very humble, for him to start that way, but that is not complete. It has before: He is near that justifies me. And it follows: Behold, the Lord God will help me, who is

he that shall condemn me? So that, it is like the statement, resist the devil and he will flee from you. People quote that. Resist the devil, --in the N.T.--and he will flee from you. And I tell you that is a pretty dangerous thing to say, resist the devil and he will flee from you. It is, the devil is pretty powerful, and when we think we can resist him in our own strength, we need to read Jude who said that even the archangel Michael, when disputing about the body of Moses with the devil, did not rebuke him, but said, the Lord rebuke you. The devil is mighty powerful and when any one of us things ~~if~~ he is going to meet him in our strength, we are apt to fail, we're showing the pride that goes before a fall. But the N. T. doesn't say, resist the devil and he will flee from you. It says, submit yourself to God, resist the devil, and he will flee from you. And if you leave out the first step you are in a pretty dangerous position when you try to carry out the second step without the first. But submit yourself to God and then resist the devil in the power of the Lord, and we are ~~is~~ perfectly safe in His strength resisting the devil, and knowing that he can overcome the wiles and the vices and the power of the devil, and it is exactly that here. He starts, the Lord will help me, therefore, then as a result--I set my face as a flint, I know I won't be ashamed. Why? First, the Lord will help me--in the beginning. In the end --He is near that justifies. And then in verse 9 again, the Lord will help me. And so this is a statement here which could be made by a very, very loyal brave human being, like Isaiah. And then verse 10, who is among you that fears ~~the~~ the Lord, that obeys the voice of His servant. Well, all it says about the servant here is ~~He~~ he has a voice. Isaiah in a sense was certainly the servant of the Lord, this certainly could be taken of Isaiah here. So there is no reason why, if you take these 4-11, these verses, and you say here Isaiah describes himself, nobody can prove that the words don't fit Isaiah, that they could not be Isaiah. But there is a factor to notice, and that is this, that Jeremiah is perhaps the most personal and intimate and autobiographical of the prophetic writings, if we omit the first three chapters of Hosea. And Isaiah is perhaps among the least. Jeremiah--we see his

heart burning, as he faces the terrible dangers, as he calls out to God to curse the day in which he was born, such is his anguish over the situation he is in. And he cries out in misery, but we have no such thing in Isaiah. Isaiah is more a simple mouthpiece speaking the word speaking the word of the Lord. And the autobiographical is at an extreme minimum and the revelation of the prophet's own character and attitude. And consequently, if you take the book as a whole, and you take this, you suggest that this is an autobiographical statement of Isaiah describing himself, you find that it is quite isolated, it is not typical of passages in the book as a whole, and therefore that is not a conclusive proof that it is not Isaiah, but it is a very strong argument against adopting that view, unless you can find pretty weighty arguments for it, and no other satisfactory explanation. And as over against that we have in our section here, we have our many references to the servant of the Lord, speaking of the one who is going to bring a light to the Gentiles, and to establish judgment throughout the world, we have those many statements of that type, and we have the servant of God who is described in Isaiah 42, he speaks in 49, we have long description of him, 52.13 through 53, it would be a very reasonable question to ask, is this a part of that theory? Is the speaker here, not Isaiah, who hardly ever gives us any personal picture of his own feeling, thought, and emotions, but the servant of the Lord who is so vividly described in these three other passages. And when you raise that question, you immediately have in opposition to it, the question, well, the servant of the Lord in Isa. 42 goes forward with no difficulty, no problem, no discouragement, he steps forward calmly and powerfully, to accomplish the work. In 49 he has a little more of difficulty and of problem. But still no statement of persecution or anything like that, rather a little of frustration, nothing of persecution. But when you look at the fourth passage, you find the servant described in the end of 52 and 53, described as one who undergoes tremendous persecution, a persecution which is strikingly parallel to these vivid statements given here. So that being the situation, it is reasonable to guess the interpretation of this in the light of the other parallel

passages, and to say that you have a theory. As a matter of fact, if you take 42, chapter 42, with the servant's absolute confidence and certainty, 49 with absolute confidence and merely a little frustration, and then you jump into the 52 and 53, you have that tremendous suffering, it is a tremendous leap from 49 to 53, and this passage makes a reasonable bridge between the two. Those two are undoubtedly talking about the same thing, there is no question of that, this makes a reasonable bridge between the two, so that it is not one of the things you can say, here this is, this is obvious what this is. It is a building stone we put in and we interpret others in the light of it. But it is one of the things which when you take others that are clear like 49 and 53, you have them as solid stones, and then you have, you find two possibilities, one of which is quite unique in the book of Isaiah, and the other one fits exactly in line with these, why there doesn't seem to be much question as to what its interpretation is. So I believe we are quite justified in saying this is the third of the four great servant passages, in our present part of Isaiah. And having made them ~~be~~ that step, of deciding that that is definitely what is in mind here, that this is the servant of the Lord who is here speaking and describing his experiences, then we return to it again, this time not to make the preliminary decision as to just what it is, but this time to get further detail in relation to the main teaching of the passage, I think that is very important here. It is so easy in Bible study, or in any science, it is so easy to take something that is hypothetical, and take another thing that is hypothetical and take another, and you can take 50 things that are questionable and they don't prove anything, you have to have some that are absolutely definite and unquestioned. But when you have them, then you interpret the question^{able} in the light of the clear, not the clear in the light of the questionable...

C.53. (1/2)

...they'll have 50 things that may mean this and when you get through they don't prove anything, but one clear thing definitely settles it, and then the other 50 can throw further

light on the interpretation in the light of it. So here then, in the light of these others, we are safe in saying this is not Isaiah, it is the servant of the Lord, and so the servant of the Lord, in this passage, shows himself as one who is very dependent on God. In Isa.42, we might almost think of him as one who was quite independent, one who did action in His own strength, and of course both are true. Jesus Christ was the second Person of the Trinity, all power was committed unto Him, He was solid, He was supreme, He could what He wanted. But Jesus Christ subjected Himself to the limitations of human life, and lived His life here in the power of the Spirit, leaning upon the power of God and depending upon the Father, and upon the Holy Spirit. And so both are aspects of Him, there is no contradiction between them when you realize that they are features of the one of whom both of these matters are true. And therefore, we have here in this passage the great emphasis on the dependence of the servant upon God, the fact that the servant goes through terrible difficulty and persecution and misery, and he doesn't try to run from it, he voluntarily submits to it, I gave my back to the smiters, I hid not my face from shame and spitting. We have here the two interpretations whether it is the servant, or whether it is Isaiah, it is very common in speaking of the servant of the Lord, to make an argument, this is Israel, this is a description of Israel, even Isaiah 53 is often said to be a picture of Israel, but it is hard to see how 53 can be a picture of Israel, but it certainly is impossible to see how this passage here can be a picture of Israel, it might be of Isaiah, but certainly not of Israel as a whole, --I gave my back to the smiters, I hid not my face from shame and spitting. That is certainly not a picture of Israel, it is impossible (2 3/4)

but it is the servant, and the servant's relying on the power of God, and so we have the servant in verses 4 and 5, declaring His dependence upon God, His acceptance of God's will for Him, we have Him in verse 6 showing His voluntary abnegation and humility, His voluntary undergoing of persecution and suffering, we have Him in verses 7 and 8 declaring His absolute faith in God and His certainty of fulfilling the

work to which He has been called. In verses 7 and 8 and 9, and in 9 there is the conclusion that those who oppose him will all wax old as a garment and the moth shall eat them up. Jesus faced the great power of the Roman empire, and the Roman empire has disappeared, and He continues stronger than He ever appeared to be in His earthly life. He faced the power of the High Priests and the Jewish Church situation, and that, within 40 years, that power was torn down and scattered throughout the world. His adversaries whom He faced, and who seemed so strong, compared with His apparent weakness, they wax old as a garment and the moth has eaten them up, figuratively, but the meaning of it isn't quite clear. So we have the last two verses of the section, verses 10 and 11, and 10 is quite obvious, and yet there is that in it which might not be apparent at first sight. Who is among you that fears the Lord, that obeys the voice of His servant? What does one do that obeys the voice of His servant? He seems to be walking in darkness and has no light. Well, what is the answer? Let him trust in the name of the Lord, and stay upon his God. It is salvation by faith alone. It is justification through faith. It is trust in God, it is God's work, through which the one who fears the Lord is justified and accepted. The continuance of the servant's work in verse 10, on those who follow the servant, who obey His voice, they can trust in the name of the Lord, and know that He will hear. Well, now, verses 10 and 11 are the reaction of the individuals to the servant of the Lord, the attitude that they take toward Him. Verse 10 is the attitude of those who follow, they trust in God, they are justified by faith. Verse 11 is the attitude of those who reject Him, and how do they reject Him, behold, all ye that kindle a fire, that compass yourselves about with sparks, very peculiar language, but it is evident that instead of coming to His light, He was to bring the light to the Gentiles. Instead of coming to His light, they are seeking to have their own light, they are not willing to rest in His light, and take His truth, but they must determine for themselves. It is characteristic of ^{this} the attitude of

our present generation of thinking people. They have got to know for themselves, it is only what they can figure out, that determines anything. In fact, one of our most prominent philosophic schools of today, the so-called logical positivists, takes as its primary basis that man cannot know anything but what he has discovered himself, and they say such questions as the nature of God, or whether there is a future life, they are not questions the answer to which is wrong, they are questions ~~of~~ that are meaningless, they have no answer, they are simply meaningless. But anything outside of human experience is absolutely meaningless. And that which used to be called the Vienna Circle, they today have leading philosophical places in most of our American Universities. And they are characterized here by this expression, behold all ye that kindle a fire, that ~~comp~~ compass yourself about with sparks, that doesn't mean you shouldn't seek knowledge by our own effort, we shouldn't try to see everything we can, but it's those who instead of coming to His light, are substituting for it, a method of trying to determine the ultimate things ~~of~~ life by ^{our} own efforts, by our own kindling of fire. Walk in the light of your fire, He says, and in the sparks that you have kindled. In other words, what He says, if you don't follow Christ but you insist on following your own ideas, well, He says, just see where these will lead you. Just see what conclusion you get from them. Walk in the light of your fire and in the spark that you have kindled, where will it lead ~~you~~? This ye shall have of mine hand, ye shall lie ~~down~~ in sorrow. In other words there is no answer to the problem of life, aside from the answer that comes from the life of Christ. And we who think that we can find an answer through our human thinking, our human speculation, our human determination, we find in the end that it leads to ~~nothing~~ but darkness and sorrow. It is a very important mind of apologetics is to take the various phases of interpretation and light ~~that~~ people get in their own thinking and see where they lead and they lead to nothing, every one of them which does not start with God's revelation. Mr. Miller? (8 1/2) That is the one statement perhaps in the whole section here that couldn't be by Isaiah. Now of course one can say, well,

the section stops with verse 9. One~~s~~ can say that. These^{two} are a continuation of the section. But the most natural interpretation of them is that they go with what precedes rather than with what follows, what follows being very much a unit. It is most natural to take them as going with what precedes and verse 10 specifically speaks of the servant, and if you take 11 with what precedes, this ye shall have of my hand, it would be pretty good answer to (9 1/4) Isaiah. Appreciate Mr. Cohen's bringing that point to mind, which I think is very helpful. This ye shall have of my hand. Here God is speaking, and God all of a sudden, after Isaiah talks a bit, God all of a sudden intervenes, this ye shall have of my hand. If Isaiah is continuing, we'd say, this the Lord will do, something like that. A~~s~~ rather sharp contrast. Now such a thing is not impossible, but it is much more natural that the One who is the One who can affect the future results of these who are making their own fires, and they think they these little sparks that fly out from the fire are enough to give them light. And of course it doesn't. To me it is a comical thing, that the attitude of people today. Suppose that people lived in this room here, and they always were in this room here and had no way to get out, and they were in here, they were given food, were enabled to get along, they could live their lives in this room and could have quite a happy existence in this room if they were supplied with the essentials of life. But then, one of them manages to get out through the window, and he's got the whole place inside the fence here, and he starts roaming around, and he says, boy, I've conquered the universe, just look where I've gone, I've conquered the universe, and actually when he is roaming through this place, inside of the iron fence from one end to the other, he hasn't begun to learn about this globe we live in. ~~The~~ It is tiny in comparison to the whole. Well the attitude of Khrushchev says, he sent his aeronaut up into the air, and he flew around the world and he didn't find any God at all, there is no God, he went up to heaven and looked and there wasn't any, that's what Khrushchev says, Well, Americans who would call themselves God-fearing, some of them, will say, well, look, man is conquering space. Within a few ~~sp~~ years

we'll have a man on the moon. Well, suppose they do, suppose we send a whole column to the moon. The area you get to to get to the moon would be about like this place inside the gate, as compared to this room, or maybe it wouldn't be quite that big, probably less than that, but when you do, if you take the part of the universe that man can see with his telescope, and the telescope can only reach a certain distance, and nobody has ~~any~~ reason to think that things end with the distance our telescopes can reach, ~~in~~ fact, it is thought that galaxies we see are moving out of that range, there still there but they're just moving so far away that we can't see them with our telescopes. But you take the areas ~~of~~ that our telescopes can see, and if we covered this whole solar system we wouldn't in proportion to it have covered near as much as you would have covered in this room by getting into the space within the iron fence. In proportion to the universe God has made, it is such a tiny thing, the tremendous advances man has made, they are like little sparks. And actually ~~of~~ course if you take them from the other viewpoints, if you take them from the viewpoint that God has put man on this world, and told him to occupy it, told him to subdue the creation, to put it under his control, why with God's help, it is tremendous, it is marvelous, what man has done, in carrying out that command. If you take it from the human viewpoint, that he is conquering the universe, it is so tiny, as to be utterly laughable. In proportion. When you think of what the scientists are telling us now, that if a big H-bomb was to go up that it would take up millions of tons of rock up into the air, and grind it into tiny bits smaller than grains of salt, and that over a tremendous area it would drop these grains, --of the total amount taken up, not one percent hardly would be what they call the fallout, ~~but~~ the radio-active material, but that one percent would be enough to cover a tremendous area. They say, with radioactive material which would destroy all life in the area where it was, unless it was in heavily shielded sections, where the radiation couldn't reach, and that that would continue for about two weeks, ~~Well~~, if man can ^{work up} ~~do~~ a thing like

that, think what God could do with the tip of His finger if He chose, He could cover a whole section of the universe and end all life there. The figure here is a very good one, ye that kindle a fire, that compass yourselves about, you compass yourselves with the beautiful fire you've made, no comfort yourself with sparks, little sparks in comparison to the great light of the sun. That's about the difference between the human knowledge and the divine revelation. Mr. ?...

C.54. (1/2)

...the amount of force in the sun, the amount of force in the hurricane is beyond description in comparison with (3/4)

but we don't realize the tremendous power of God which is the marvelous thing which God has enabled us to accomplish, yet in comparison to God's sun (3/4)

So I think the average reader, comes to the Bible, turns to this particular verse (1)

but you take it in context, in the light of what precedes and what the meaning must clearly be, and it is a tremendous thing, a wonderful picture which it gives, (1 1/4) and a very true one, and one that is very appropriate for our present day. ~~Well, we~~

Well, then, we have a new section which starts where the archbishop made a very excellent chapter division at the beginning of chapter 51, and here at the beginning of 51, he started a section which is a continuous clause, and this continuous clause which ends our second main part of our book of comfort, this continuous clause is here divided into two parts and yet the two parts are very closely related, and the first of these two parts is 51.1-8, and the second part is from 9 I believe you could say unto 52.12, at least well into 52. But of these two parts, the first of them, they are differentiated by the fact that the first of them has three divisions, each of which is introduced with "hearken," and the second one has three divisions each introduced with the phrase "awake, awake." And the general meaning of the two is the same, it is God's wonderful blessing to His people. And so this wonderful blessing to His people, which is

put into pretty continuous thought in these two main sections , but they're divided into six paragraphs really, of which the first three are comparatively short and the last three are quite long, and the first three, "hearken to me , ye that follow after righteousness," now this reminds us very much of the beginning of chapter 48, but in the beginning of 48 ~~we~~ we have that ~~here~~ little slur , but not in truth, nor righteousness, ~~here~~ we don't have a slur, there is nothing in these sections here to suggest that God is criticizing the people. He is looking to the people's misery, and promises to help them. And He is --hearken to me , ye that follow righteousness--then He gives the advice, if you do. If you seek the Lord, look to the rock whence you are hewn, and to the hole of the pit whence ye are digged. Well, you are hewn from the rock, you are digged from the pit. While there is not a direct rebuke, there is a very good suggestion of the fact that we have not come up by ^{our} ~~own~~ strength, our own power, but that we have been taken by the Lord for His purpose, the result of His blessing that we are where we are. You that--look , He says, to your beginnings, look to your source, look to how the Lord put you in a situation, look at what He has given, and then that is made specific in verse 2, look at Abraham your father, and to Sarah, for I called him alone, and blessed him and increased him. It was God who called Abraham, one of millions of people. God called this one and blessed him, and used him for His purposes and for His glory. And then we look back to the past and are reminded to think of where it has come from, then we look ahead to God's wonderful blessing. The Lord will comfort Zion, He will comfort her waste places, and make the wilderness like Eden, and the desert like the garden of the Lord, joy and gladness shall be ~~in~~ found therein, thanksgiving and the voice of melody . It is a very general promise , a wonderful promise, a blessed promise, but a general promise. Was it fulfilled in the group of exiles who came back to ~~At~~ Jerusalem, and built some little houses, after many, many years finally got a Temple built. They had great joy and happiness, certainly, but ~~was~~ was the joy that they had in their struggle to build up a new--to rebuild their

nation comparable to this, did this look forward to the completion of their struggles, or does it look forward to God's blessing on His people, looking forward to a time when they were yet to be blessed far beyond anything that they have yet experienced at all. It is a general statement but a wonderful statement. Then we have our second part, and here we have a different word here. Instead of (5 1/4) it is

The meaning is the same but ~~it~~ it is a different Hebrew word. Mr. Charvoz, you have a question? (5 1/4) ...rejoicing, wonderful happiness, but there ~~is~~ also are many questions, many problems, many differences of opinion and many differences of attitude, and many disappointments too, and you have ~~at~~ Israel today in a state of constant danger, with the Arab nations all around, constantly being inflamed by Nasser against them, and told that they must drive them out altogether, and there is theoretically a state of war still. You can't cross the borders. I know a man last year who wanted to visit Israel, and visit Jordan and he had to travel 250 miles to Cyprus and back again, to go from one to the other, because you couldn't cross one block from one to the other. There is tension, there are problems, it is a great step forward, but I don't think it is fulfilled, this verse. This verse speaks of a time when they're not merely in the great joy of going forth, but when they have actually attained, and how much they're going to attain, how far they're going to attain, today, is not easy to tell, ~~there~~ because of the many different conflicting viewpoints, and of the external problems which they have to face. So that it would impress me that, ~~when~~ while there are many steps in this direction, that the actual wonderful consummation described here is something which is still quite future, when the desert blooms like the garden of the Lord. Well, many parts of it are, today, there are great strides in this, but there is a tremendous distance yet to go. Just how far they will be permitted to go in that direction --. Now you remember a few years ago, when they attacked Egypt, and they pushed Egypt out of Gaza, and out of southern Palestine, and went down and took all of the Sinai Peninsula, and

their armies marched forward and boy what a wonderful step of progress they seem to have made and then Eisenhower said, no, you've got to withdraw, back up, give all that back to Egypt, and they backed up and gave it all back again, and lost everything they had conquered. What a disappointment it must have been to them. Must have been a tremendous disappointment to them, especially when they know that Nasser is constantly inciting everybody to go in and kill them all. Utterly annihilate, and here they were able to make great strides against him and then they were forced to back up, but there was nothing they could do, but I mean it shows that great as their strides are, compared to the great powerful forces in the world today, they are just a tiny thing, and how these forces are going to move in the next 15 or 20 years, humanly speaking, nobody knows. So that they have much reason for rejoicing but it is far, far short of what is described here. I would say that real fulfillment of this looks forward to something much more wonderful than the return from exile, much more wonderful than what we have had yet, it looks forward to the time when sin will be out of the picture and when somebody goes in with wonderful ideas of development and wants to build a great school there, he won't be held up by a crooked contractor for two or three years like this, it is a different situation. So that, then our next ~~part~~^{hearken}; verse 4, hearken to me, my people, for a law shall proceed from me, and I will make my judgment to rest for a light of the people. ~~Thou are~~^{God's} righteousness going out, His salvation going forth, the isles shall wait on me, and on mine arm shall they trust. Now this is a beautiful picture, ~~isn't~~ isn't it? Somebody might ask, in the statement before, where it spoke about their bringing them, the Gentiles bringing them on their arms, from the east, from the west, from China, they bring them in, you might say, well, that is simply a Greek term, of scattered Jews, that's all, even though He does say, where do these come from? I've lost my other children, where do these come from? It certainly suggests there is something more, it's an outreaching of the people of God beyond those who are physically Jews.

But now look at this, in this verse here, the wonderful promises extend not simply to a conquest of the islands, and of these distant lands, but on my arm shall they trust. My salvation has gone forth, my arms shall judge the people, the isles shall wait on thee, and they shall subjugate themselves in utter terror, no on my arm they shall trust. Here is a going out of God's Word to the distant lands. Surely this is the calling of the Gentiles, surely this is reaching out beyond one particular people, with the wonderful mercy of God and the enlargement of the people of God, or of the Olive Tree as described in Romans. Yes, Mr. Oliver? (10) Amils, in dealing with--I would ~~not~~ incline to think that they would take verse 5--you mean verse 5 or verse 3? (stu.) Well, they would take it as being the calling of the Gentiles into the church, I think undoubtedly that is the way they would take it, and I don't think we should react from that and say nothing in the Bible speaks about the calling of Gentiles into the church. We should take each passage on its merits and see what it is talking about. There are people who find the church everywhere, and there is nothing but the church, and they try to rule out the millennium and you can't do it, because the millennium is very, very clearly taught in the Bible, but then there are other people who get so enthused about the millennium that everything is the millennium and they say things that are quite clearly not a picture of the millennium and insist they are the millennium, and I would say that we should take each passage on its merits and see what the Lord is speaking about in His future dealings with mankind. And I would incline to think that verse 3 is looking forward to the physical blessing, the universal prosperity of the millennium, but that in verse 5, He is looking forward to ~~the~~ things that would precede the millennium, when the ~~the~~ Word of God goes out and reaches into different lands, and there are individuals here and there in all of them who are trusting Him. Well, then in verse 6, He says, Lift up your eyes to the heavens, for the heavens shall vanish away like smoke~~s~~, and the earth shall wax old like a garment and they ~~that~~ dwell therein shall die in like manner, but my salvation shall be forever, and my righteousness shall not be abolished. I don't believe that is a specific

promise of the millennium, I think that is a definite declaration that God's will is going to be accomplished, His purpose is going to succeed, Evil may seem for a time to succeed but in the end it will always fail to triumph. But there may be different reasons at different times why evil fails to triumph. The great evil of the Anti-Christ will be destroyed by Christ at His coming, but then there will be previous times when evil is destroyed in other ways. Like you take England in the beginning of the 18th century and the nation as a whole had turned away from the Word of God, and wickedness and immorality ~~was rife~~ ^{all through} ~~and also~~ the country, it was a terrible situation, and then God sent the great revival under Wesley and Whitefield, and made tremendous changes clear over the whole country, with the result that in England in the 19th century there was a standard of acceptance of the Scripture and a standard of morality which ~~was~~ would be hard to duplicate anywhere in the world. That was the so-called Victorian age, only Victoria didn't have anything particularly to do with it, ~~she~~ happened to be the queen at the time, and of course she was a good woman, she fit in with it, but she didn't produce it. It was produced by the great revivals of the previous century. The previous century, which was a century largely of unbelief and indifference, and Darwin, you know, when Darwin came forward with his theory that would knock at the (13 1/2) why all through England people were upset terribly, the indignation was tremendous at denying the truths of the Bible, and the morality of the Bible, even among people who were not professing Christians, there was a standard of morality and of decency of duty etc. at that time that was very, very strong. But Darwin was amazed when he looked into the history of his grandfather, and he found that his grandfather had lived the sort of life that in his day a ~~person~~ would be utterly repudiated and ostracized, if he lived that way, and nobody thought of anything of it in his grandfather's day, because you ~~hadn't~~ had the great revival. And the level was not as low as it is today, ~~but~~ it was perhaps halfway between today and the Victorian Age. But ~~here~~ then we have the promise that though evil seems to triumph, God's salvation is forever, and those who believe on

Him, they are His forever, and His righteousness cannot be destroyed by human efforts. ~~Y.~~

C.55 (1/2)

...well the third and last part , verses 7 and 8, Hearken unto me, ye that know righteousness, the people in whose heart is my law; fear ye not the reproach of men, So you see the difference. In the first of these three "hearkens" the Lord is going to bring His wonderful material blessing. The second one, the Lord's salvation is forever, those who trust on Him can safely depend upon His care for them. And the third one here, those who are His, don't worry about persecution of others because this will not endure, but my righteousness shall be forever, and my salvation from generation to generation. So of the three hearkens, the first looks back to the beginning of their relationship to Him and looks forward to the wonderful ultimate complete blessing He is going to bring. And then the other two are comfort along the way . The other two are assurance of His continuance, His blessing, and that which is true to Him will last, while that which is not, will not. So these are the emphases in the three "hearkens" which introduce the three "awakes." Six "awakes" you might say, for each one starts with two, and they are the next part of this great section, we'll have to leave that, I guess, till next Monday but by the way, Christmas vacation is getting very very close and then here is very little time afterward, so you'd better look forward rapidly and hastily through 51 and 52, don't worry too much about the first part of 52, look it over and have a general idea of it, but start with verse 13, of 52, and from 52.13 through the end of 53, study it carefully in the Hebrew and the commentaries, decide exactly what it means, for we want to go into that very fully. Do all you can on that before Tuesday, even though it may be Thursday before we get to really discussing it. Though we might get into it Tuesday. Oh, this is Tuesday, isn't it? Oh, good; well, then , do all you can for this Thursday...(2 3/4)-- (break in record, starting again at 3 3/4)..... we are getting ~~Y~~ nearer the second of the three main parts of the book of comfort , the section of Isaiah that we are dealing with, and this second part, I'd like to spend a little more time on than we'll be able to, because

I didn't realize how near we were getting to the end of the year. We will lose, of course, right after Christmas, we don't have any class Monday right after New Year's, so we lose half a week there, which is quite a handicap, and then of course the Day of Prayer came on a Tuesday, and I had to be gone two weeks ago, so we are sort of jammed here, so that we want to rapidly get into the third section, but first we want to finish this second main part of this section of the book ~~and~~ we noticed last time, at the end of the hour, that the last part of chapter 51, or, that is, all of 51, and two-thirds of 52, is one long discourse, and that this discourse has three parts that start with the words "hearken" and then three parts that start with the words "awake, awake," and we had looked at those that started with the word "hearken" a bit, and then we had begun to look at the three that started with "awake." The first of these 3, we noticed--I think we had finished the three with "hearken," hadn't we? Mr. Myers, how far were we on that? I see, well, let's look at the 3 hearkens. Chapter 51, hearken to me, we have the first one there, second is verse 4, and the third is verse 7. And then verse 9 starts the three starting the 3 with "awake, awake." And the first of these 3 hearkens calls on the people to follow after righteousness, to look upon the place ~~upon~~ ^{from} which they came, in other words, their righteousness is nothing that they have produced themselves, but it is something that God gave them. God called Abraham, they come from Abraham, they're to look to the source from which it came. He says, ~~he~~ ^{look} back to the blessings I have given in the past, and know that I am going to continue to bless in the future. Verse 3 says the Lord will comfort Zion, comfort all her waste places, And then verse 4, the second of these hearkens, looks at a little wider space. This first was simply for the people themselves, their blessing through Abraham. The second one tells them that the law is going to go forth from God, which is going to reach out so that His arms will judge the people, and the isles will wait upon Him and on "mine arm shall they trust." Now that is a strong statement there. We've been dealing with Israel, very largely, God's blessing to Israel, and we

had been told that the isles, that God would set judgment in the isles, we'd been told that His power would reach out to them. But verse 5 goes beyond that, the isles shall wait upon me and my arm shall they trust. The isles means the foreign nations, way out on the circumference, it points to Greece, and to the other distant countries. Here is certainly a definite promise of the Gentiles coming to know the Lord, to trust in Him. The isles shall trust on my arm, it is the work of the servant which is to reach to all the world, not just to Israel, and here is a very definite promise, reaching out wider than we have found in many such, thus far. And then in verse 6, He assures them that this is true, because He says that He who has created all things, and will destroy all things when and as He chooses, is never going to let His salvation or His righteousness come to an end. So this sixth verse is the assurance that this tremendous promise of the 6th verse will come to pass. Not merely that God is going to bless His people who are called by His name, but that He is going to bless distant people, that He is going to bring them to trust in Him, to trust in His arm, that His word is going to go out to these nations that hate Israel and hate Israel's God, that are worshipping idols, and opposed to all that is related to God, they are going actually to trust on Him and to wait for Him. And He assures it by declaring that the whole world is in His power. And then in verse 7, the third of these "hearkens" is Hearken unto me, you that know righteousness, the people in whose heart is my law. You notice how these three have advanced, the first one, people who are following after righteousness. The second is my people, but the third is you that know righteousness and have my law, not merely in your knowledge, but in your heart. There is, we had some rather strong rebukes in some of the previous chapters. There is no rebuke in this chapter. This chapter is addressed to God's people, whatever rebuke there is is implied rather than expressed. But the blessing here is for those not merely for those who know His law, but who have His law in their hearts. There is just an implied statement that if you're going to have these blessings, you don't get them just through being born the descendants of Abraham.

You don't get them through belonging to a nation that does certain ceremonies. You get them if you actually have His law written in your heart, and so this third one here is reaching a rather high climax. ^{Those,} ~~Through~~ He says, not just those who are called by the name of God, those born into a certain family, or a certain group, but those who actually know righteousness and have His law in their hearts, they are the ones who need not fear the reproach of men or be afraid of their reviling. Because He says that the human things are going to be eaten up like a moth eats a garment, but He says my righteousness shall be forever and my salvation from generation to generation. So these three "hearkens" here with the verse following them, 8 verses, point out the importance of not merely being called by God's name but actually knowing God, and points that those who do know Him can know that His teaching is to eventually come over the whole world, not merely in force, but in actually bringing people to where they trust in Him and look to Him as the one on whom they depend, and that they are to look back and see how it ~~ed~~ ~~all~~ came from Him and to be assured that the future is secure because He is the one who controls heaven and earth, and His salvation is from generation to generation. There is very little that is specific in these 8 verses, very little that speaks--nothing that speaks directly about deliverance from Babylon, or about the return to the land of Palestine. But there is a definite word about the rebuilding, about the restoration of the waste places, that is the nearest it comes to a specific connection with the immediate situation. It is general terminology that would seem to look way beyond that, God is not merely giving them a release from exile. He is giving them blessings of salvation, blessings of righteousness that are going to endure forever. Mr. Myers? (10 3/4) ...that you can point to in the O.T., which would be a specific command to the Jews to ^{proselyte,} ~~profit~~. There is very little of that type. The Jews did a great deal of proselyting up until the time of the destruction of the Temple, but since, they have gathered themselves into a sort of a closed group and the general attitude has been against proselyting, has been an acceptance of people who come to them as converts, but not a trying to win people to them. That has

been the general attitude since, but at the time of Christ, He said Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, you compass heaven and earth to make one proselyte. So evidently there were ~~of~~ efforts in that direction at that time. But there is no such command in the Scriptures. I think that God's great purpose with Israel, was to keep the truth alive in a world of wickedness and denial of the truth, and to prepare the way for the coming of Christ. The spreading out of the message at that time was not His specific plan. That is, there was provision for individuals, there were individuals, but there was no concerted effort to reach it out beyond Israel, but the great thing was to keep Israel true, until the message should be fully given, and after the death of Christ, then the message would be broadcast. Well, then we have these three "hearkens" we have looked at, and now come the three "awakes." And the first of these starts in verse 9 here:

"Awake, awake, put on strength, O arm of the Lord. Here you have a different speaker. The three "hearkens" have been specifically God speaking to the people. But now the first of our "awakes" sounds as if it is the people, or the prophet, turning to the Lord, and asking the Lord to proceed to do the work that He has promised. Actually, however, there is very little of pressure on the Lord on anything that follows, to do it, so I think we are justified in saying, though it sounds like that, at first, actually it is a rhetorical way of saying, God is going to act in the future. He is going to act in strong ways for His people. So it is a rhetorical manner of putting it rather than actually a free, if it was a free, you'd have repetition of it. But it is a rhetorical way of assuring them that He is going to act on behalf of His people. So we read "awake, awake, put on strength, O arm of the Lord." But what we're actually doing is pointing out how strong the arm of the Lord has been in the past, to help His people. And implying that He can, if He chooses, do the same thing in the future. And then to go on to assure us that He is going to. So this rhetorical way, we are reminded of what God had done in the past. "Art thou not it ~~also~~ that hath cut Rahab, and wounded the dragon?" Rahab here is a figure used for Egypt. It is used occasionally in the O. T. this way, the word Rahab as a figure

for Egypt. And the meaning here is that God had delivered the people from Egypt in the past. Art thou--think of what the Lord did in deliv^{er}ing them from Egypt, --"Art thou not it that hath cut Rahab and wounded the dragon? Art thou not it which hath dried the sea..." That's the Red Sea, the crossing of the Red Sea--"...the waters of the great deep; that ha~~th~~ hath made the depths of the sea^a way for the ransomed to pass over?" Usually we think of the great deep as being the ocean, but here the reference simply is to the breadth of water that shut them in so that Pharaoh could have destroyed them...

C.56. (1/2)

...that God delivered them from Egypt in the past, and had opened a way for them through the Red Sea, a way of escape. The implication then is, if God could do this in the past, He could do it in the future too. He can deliver them from Babylon, just as He delivered them from Egypt. So He says, art thou not it which hath dried the sea and made the depths of the sea a way for the ransomed to pass over, and then looks ahead to the future. "Therefore the redeemed of the Lord shall return, and come with singing to Zion." Here is specific reference to the return from exile. Shall come with singing to Zion, but, see what follows--everlasting joy shall be on their head, they shall obtain gladness and joy, and sorrow and mourning shall flee away. Well, this of course, was the way they felt when they got back, was tremendous joy, the end of all sadness, but before they'd been there for very long, they found sadness coming back, difficulties, obstacles, trouble. So as you read this over, after that, you say, well now this is what should have been when they came back, why wasn't it, do you think? Well, why did they go into exile? It was their sin that sent them into exile, their turning against God which had put them into trial, now God gave them a marvelous deliverance, but here is a promise which goes way beyond anything in that deliverance. Does it not suggest there is to be a far greater blessing for the people of God in the future? They are going to be comforted by the Lord, they are going to have everlasting joy upon their heads. He says, I even I am He that comforts you. Who are thou, that thou shouldst be afraid of a man. Here we

get back to the Babylonian situation, why should they be afraid of the king of Babylon? Well, the king of Babylon has such power he could shoot them off into execution if he chose. They were quite helpless before him, but God says, why should you be afraid of a man who is going to die, and forget the Lord who is so much more lasting than any man, and so much stronger than any man? The Babylonian king may be far stronger than you, but God is far stronger than the Babylonian king. And forgettest the Lord thy maker. Here is general reference to the creation which you have stressed so many times in these chapters. God who has stretched forth the heavens and laid the foundation of the earth. Interesting--He stretched forth the heavens--where did they get that figure? It would be an interesting question, how much do we find this figure in ancient writing? Stretched out the heavens. Why should you think of the heavens as being stretched out particularly? I don't know, I don't know whether it is a common figure in ancient times or not, but it is very interesting how it does fit with the present attitude of scientists toward the heavens, the present attitude being that the universe is stretching out and expanding rapidly and constantly in all directions. That isn't taught specifically in this verse, but it is remarkable how it just does fit with it. Now if you would find that it was a very common term in ancient usage to refer to the heavens as having been stretched out, then its use here proves nothing at all. But if you should find that it is a comparatively rare or almost non-occurring term, except in the Bible, it would be very interesting as having used a term that would fit with the newer discoveries that people would make about the nature of the Bible. It wouldn't give them this astronomical knowledge but when you get this new astronomical knowledge, you would see how God allowed this writer to use terminology that would fit precisely with the facts as they would later be discovered. He stretched out the heavens then He says, and laid the foundation of the earth, and hast feared continually every day because of the fury of the oppressor. Now of course this should be a break, there is a semicolon in the KJ--forget the Lord who has done this, but you have feared continuously every day, as if the oppressor was ready to destroy you.

He says, where is the fury of the oppressor. In other words, God is going to bring an end to this fury. He is promising in previous chapters deliverance from exile, now He assures you that it is coming. The captive exile hastens that he may be loosed, that he should not die in the pit, not that his bread should fail. God says, deliverance is certain, it is coming, how is it coming? Because the Lord is bringing it. You question whether verse 14 would ever be fulfilled, things look actually hopeless, looks as if Babylon is going to endure forever. He says, but I am the Lord thy God, that divided the sea, the Lord of hosts is my name, and I have ^{put} ~~my~~ words in thy mouth, and have covered thee in the shadow of mine hand. Now here, is He speaking specifically to the servant of the Lord again, is He speaking to the prophet specifically, or is He simply in general referring to the fact that through Israel came the oracles of God, that they were the ones through whom He gave the word to the world, and that He is preserving them as the instrument through the rest of the Bible will come into existence, and as the group through which the Lord Jesus Christ Himself will come? I have covered thee in the shadow of mine hand, that I may plant the heavens and lay the foundations of the earth, and say to Zion thou art my people. Well, this is the first of your three "awake" paragraphs.

Now the second one is addressed very definitely by the Lord, Awake, awake, stand up, O Jerusalem. The first was a rhetorical address to the arm of the Lord, now this is God giving the answer. God in His answer points out the condition of Jerusalem. He says, awake and stand up, O Jerusalem, but then He describes the condition of Jerusalem. Jerusalem has drunk at the hand of the Lord the cup of his fury, has drunk the dregs of the cup of trembling, there is none to guide her among all the sons whom she has brought forth, the terrible condition of Israel in exile. Jerusalem a desolation, Jerusalem used as a figure for the nation. These two things are come unto thee, who shall be sorry for thee, desolation, and destruction, famine and the sword, by whom shall I comfort thee? Thy sons have fainted, they lie at the head of all the streets, this describes the destruction,

this would be very appropriate for Isaiah's own day when the people knew what had happened to the northern kingdom within the previous twenty or thirty years, they realized exactly what had happened there, which is what is described here, they knew it was going to come to Jerusalem, and then of course later it did come, and then later on, near the end of the return from exile, the people still felt as if they were living under the shadow of these events. Thy sons have fainted, they lie at the head of all the streets, as a wild bull in a net, Therefore, hear now this, thou afflicted, and drunken, but not with wine, He says in verse 21, thus saith thy Lord, the Lord, and thy God that pleadeth the cause of his people. And then here is the promise, Behold, I have taken out of thine hand the cup of trembling, even the dregs of the cup of my fury, thou shalt no more drink it again, but I will put it in the hand of them that afflict thee. Now what does this mean, Thou shalt no more drink it again? Does it mean you will never again have to go through the experience of suffering this way with an attack and a conquest, and a taking into exile? Well, if that was the case, it certainly has not been fulfilled. Because there have been other captivities as bad or worse than the Babylonian captivity, since that time. But what it means here is, the cup, the situation that they're in then, is going to come to an end. I have taken out of thine hand the cup of trembling. Thou shalt no more drink it again means actually you will not continue to drink this cup, it doesn't mean that you won't at a later time have another similar one. You will not keep on drinking this situation --this situation comes to an end, thou shalt no more drink it again. It would be easy to interpret that in a universal way that would not be true, and I don't think the Hebrew word would require it at all. It means not to continue that which is now in progress, with this particular cup. But I will put it into the hand of them that afflict thee. There is the declaration for the destruction of the Babylonians, for those who are holding them in subjection. They themselves are to be brought into captivity. And of course that is exactly what happened. Babylon had been a great independent nation, which had been conquered at various times, but through the ages had (9) been

independent, and often a great leader, and now for quite a time before the deliverance of the Jews it had been the great mistress of the world, but after that it was subject to the Persians, then subject to the Greeks, then subject to the Romans, and then subject to the Moslems, and has never again had its supremacy as it had then. This cup was put into the hands of those who afflicted thee, who have said to thy soul, Bow down, that we may go over, and thou hast laid thy body as the ground, and as the street to them that went over. And then we come to our third "awake, awake."

So that we have here a definite division between two paragraphs which is not a bad place for a chapter division, and yet if you're going to have one there, you probably ought to have one also at verse 9, and also at verse 17, and that makes chapters too short. So it would be better to have it at verse 9, and then at the end of our period of three "awakes." Because a chapter division is nothing inspired, it is not a part of the original, but simply a method of division that has been adopted. Yes? (10) There is a definite problem in interpretation of Scripture, what is there that has immediate significance, and how many things look way on to the future? Now if the statement is made, the time will come that such-and-such a thing will happen. Well, if it hasn't yet happened, you say it is going to happen in the future, but when it isn't a picture of something that is going to happen, but a condition, that is described, it is a little hard to take it that way. Now this of course is a prediction of something future but it is pretty closely tied to a condition which is described, so you have your condition described from verse 17, 18, 19, 20, it's pretty hard to think that that is not a description of that particular suffering, and then when he says at the end of that, Behold I have taken the cup out of thy hand and given it to the one that goes over thee, does he name, a future time will come, when I will take a similar cup out of your hand and give it to the one who is then oppressing you, does he give a general principle that each time you have a suffering like this it will come to an end, and a fate similar or worse will be met by those who have been oppressing you, or is the whole thing a description of a future

situation. There is a problem of interpretation, and my inclination is to feel that with all the circumstances, ~~is~~ ^{the best interpretation here is} probably to relate it to the immediate (11 1/4)

Now just let's look at the Hebrew of this particular statement that thou shalt no more drink it again. That is the end of verse 22, here, and verse 22, Thou shalt not ~~add~~ to drink it further (11 3/4)

is the English, thou shalt no more drink it again, is probably a pretty good way of rendering it, but my impression is that as the word is used, it usually means to repeat the same thing over or to continue steadily, rather than, not so much not a series of things, as a continuance, of closely related things, one after the other. And I would incline to feel that it could be interpreted the way I have suggested but I suggest you all think about it a bit further, and the interpretation I suggested, I see at the moment greater difficulties than any other I have thought of, but maybe on further consideration we will come across one with less difficulties than any we have thought of. But let's think about that.

But now we go on then to look at the third of the "awakes," which starts at chapter 52. Here again He addresses Jerusalem. Put on thy strength, O ~~Zion~~, put on thy beautiful garments, O Jerusalem, the holy city, ~~literally~~, the city of the sanctuary. Perhaps, it is not a reference so much to that word, as Jerusalem's being itself holy, as being the place where the holy sanctuary is, the place where, the abode of holiness, here. Jerusalem, the city of the holy place, for henceforth there shall no more come into thee, the uncircumcised and the unclean. Now surely here we are looking pretty far distance into the future. The cup is to pass from them, to be given to those who are walking over them. You might say that is fulfilled when the Persians conquer the Babylonians and the Babylonians became subject people and always remained such. You might think of it as fulfilled, but then you go on, you say, well now what happens? Is Jerusalem now to immediately experience this great joy and happiness which was described earlier? Well, we say, we certainly hope so. Put on your beautiful garments, but what is going to happen? Henceforth there will no more come to thee the uncircumcised and the unclean.

Well, the suggestion is, when Jerusalem reaches the stage where God's blessings will be continuous and permanent, it will be at a stage where you can say, the unclean do not any longer come into the city, and actually they went back with high hopes of having a great wonderful holy city in which righteousness would reign and happiness and joy everywhere, and then before long, the prophets had to come and say you're neglecting the Temple and putting all your effort into building your own lovely house, and you forget the Temple, it has gone on all these years and it isn't finished and little more is done about it, and you're building your nice houses, what right have you to love in these houses when the Temple ^{of God} is not even built, and you have things coming up again, showing that sin is still there, showing that the people are still a sinful people and that strife and wickedness is coming in again, though there are many among them who are very devoted to the Lord and who would say well I guess this wonderful promise God has made is going to be fulfilled, but that we haven't actually reached the fulfillment of it yet.

So this first verse would seem probably to look...

C.57. (1/2)

...we look at verse 2 and verse 2 they are told that they can get up out of the dust in which they are, they're in Babylon, in bondage, "get up" sounds funny in the English, "arise and sit down", "get up and sit down," sounds very funny in English, but actually what it means is "arise and take your seat." Get up out of lying in the dust, ~~and don't~~ get up out of lying in the dust and stand around there as a suppliant, waiting for somebody to do for you, get up and sit down in the fine place that is reserved for you. Get up and take your seat, I think, would give it in English much better than "get up and sit down." Sit down, O Jerusalem, loose thyself from the bands of thy neck, O captive daughter of Zion. But now, from verse 2 on, we are pretty definitely in the situation of the release from exile. Thus says the Lord, you have sold yourself for naught and ye shall be ~~revel~~ ^{deemed} without money, now what does that mean? You have sold yourselves for nothing, you got into this situation, not through selling yourselves into slavery,

not through getting a great deal for it, what did you get for it? You got nothing for it. You fell into sin and the result was that God let you be taken into captivity. You have received nothing, you didn't go into captivity for ~~naught~~ in the sense that there was no reason, there was plenty of reason, there was the sin for which they were sent into it. But you sold yourself without getting any proper return, you followed the will-o-the-wisp of human pleasure and personal desire and matters like that, and the result of all this was that you were sold into the results of sin, into captivity. Now you didn't go into this situation here because you sold yourself, and now a ransom can recompense it, you pawned an article, you take something that is valuable to you and you go to the pawnshop and he gives you some money, and you go away and have the money but have given up the thing, Well, if you can raise the money again you can come back and reclaim what you have pawned. Israel received something for letting themselves go into slavery, now they have to pay back what they've given for them and get them out, but ~~no~~, that's not the way, you didn't get in that way. You sold yourselves for naught, you got in, not for a matter of money, or payment or advance, you got in as a result of your sin, as a result of your ~~g~~ turning away from God and therefore, if you are going to be redeemed, something else than a money payment will be necessary in order to secure it, and we find the parallel to that in I Peter, where in I Peter the first chapter we read, in verse 18, forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers, but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot. You sold yourself for nothing, and you cannot be redeemed with money, it will ~~take~~ take something else, something that goes deeper, something that doesn't pay back the advantage you got, you didn't really get any advantage, but something that compensates for the sin that resulted in your going into captivity. You will be redeemed not with money but with something that is far harder to get than money. Yes? (4 1/4)

Here perhaps a little of the knowledge of the ancient legal customs is necessary.

Slavery was a very common thing in those days, and there was such a thing as self-enslavement, as for instance when a family was heavily in debt, and they had had very heavy expenses and had gone into debt for it, and there didn't seem to be just any way to get out of debt, and then some member of the family would sell himself into slavery and the money that he gave would go to release the rest of the family and enable them to continue to get along and they would hope to raise the money to buy him back out of slavery again. There was a great deal of that in Babylon and in Assyria, those various countries there and we even find it mentioned in the laws in Exodus where it says that if your poorer brother has fallen into difficulty, and he has sold himself as a slave, that after a certain number of years you must let him go out free, in the Law in Exodus and in Numbers. It was a custom in those days, that--of course, self-enslavement usually was through debt, a person would go, they would be in a bad fix and would go and borrow money and the conditions of the borrowing were we pay you back by such a time but if not you can take us as slaves to sell for the money, but usually there is a condition on it that for a certain length of time they are subject to being redeemed by the payment back of the money. I was just reading the Laws of Hammurabi of Babylon, the great king of Babylon, and in this law code that he put up in his central square so that everybody could see it and know what their rights are, he states that if a man, gets into debt, gets into difficulty, and if he sells his wife, or his sons, or his daughters, that after three years that they are to be subject to redemption, if he sells a concubine who has borne him sons, then for a certain number of years she is to work for the person to whom he sells her, she is subject to his control, but she is subject to redemption, but if that day goes by and she has not been redeemed, then he can sell her on, but not before. And, while if a man sells a slave for his debt, that slave, the person who buys from him can sell on, he has no right to (6 3/4)

But that was the custom of those day, a custom which we are happily rid of now.

But it was what people were familiar with, so it could be used as a figure, that these people hadn't gotten into their situation through receiving any real advantage for themselves by it, they may have thought that in ~~sinful~~ life they were getting some advantage, but it proved to be like the will-o-the-wisp, no permanent advantage in it, they sold themselves for nothing, for naught, but it doesn't mean there was no cause for their being sold, there was a terrible cause in their sin. Well now they can't be redeemed for money, they weren't sold for money, they didn't sell themselves for money, but something is necessary to get at the cause of their going into exile, in order to redeem them. It is used as a figure based on an analogy of a custom which is no longer (7 1/2) Miss Pickett? (stu.) A whole nation wouldn't be apt to sell themselves into slavery, and yet in a way you have a similar situation in the Gibeonites. The Gibeonites were faced with the Israelites coming into the land, the Israelites were destroyed^{ing} every one in the land, and they were, they knew they probably would be destroyed too, so they came to Joshua and pretended to have come from a distant country so that he wouldn't think that they were included in that declaration that all of the Canaanites would be destroyed, and they made a pledge with him of mutual protection, and under those circumstances, when Joshua found out that he had been tricked, he had given his promise, so he said the Gibeonites should be hewers of wood and drawers of water, they were subject to the Israelites but their lives were preserved. And you might say that the nation of the Gibeonites had sold themselves into slavery in order to save their lives, and hundreds of years later you find them still there in the land, in fact, that was one of the causes of the division of the northern and southern kingdom, you had this big group of Gibeonites in between, which cut down the intercourse between the two^{halves of the} nations and made them drift apart. In the day of David there was great difficulty in the country, and he was told that the cause for it was that Saul hadn't kept the promises to Gibeon. You remember he made certain sacrifices from the family of Saul to recompense for the failure to keep the promises to Gibeon. So they had sold themselves and thus saved their

freedom. Well now that is hardly an analogy in our present world, but it was a familiar thought in ancient times, and so can be used for a figure in this verse. An interesting verse, we repeat it glibly often without stopping to think what it means. When we get into it we find we need the background of the ancient custom in order to understand what it does mean, and yet that it points to a great truth, that sin cannot be taken care of without some very serious measures, you can't simply pay for it, you can't hire somebody to do your religion for you. Some people think they hire the minister, that he is supposed to do the Christian work for them, he does the praying for them, he does the Christian work for them, he does the witnessing for them, he does the singing for them, he is to do ^{all} the things of Christianity for them, the trouble is they don't expect him to go to heaven for them when they die. Yes, Mr. Oliver? (10 1/4) Of course, that is a little aside from our present point, but we are in a world of sin, and such a thing as complete righteousness is impossible, you have to get the best way of dealing with a situation that you can find. You cannot take principles of absolute rightness and carry them through --according to absolute rightness, if a person contracts a debt, he should have to pay for it. Ridiculous to excuse him for that which he has taken, and he has borrowed and used it and spent it, and it's gone, he should have to pay for it in some way, but in a world of sin the only way he can pay for it is by bringing something in that is worse than the breaking of that. That is, introducing conditions like you had in England, a hundred years ago, where you had the debtors' prison, people put in prison for payment of debt, where they were no good to themselves or their family, or anybody else, and you had a situation which something had to be done about, and we have many people in our country who have done very dishonestly by going through bankruptcy and getting rid of their debts and then going out and starting over again and making new debts. And it is very much to the credit of Sir Walter Scott that when the banking, publishing house failed which he was a silent partner and he hadn't bothered much with the direction, had confidence in the others and then they went terrifically into debt so that when

there was a debt of half a million dollars and he could have said well, I didn't contract it, I had nothing to do with it, and I'm sorry but the firm has gone bankrupt and it's a shame. He had invested in the firm, he was a silent partner, he had an obligation to know what they were doing and keep track, though he just put confidence in them and didn't know, he said I'm going to do my best to pay that off, and he worked himself to death trying to pay it off, worked night and day, and finally when he had an illusion that everything was paid off and he was happy ^{just} to relax a few months before his death. People just let him go on in that illusion, but within a very few months after his death, the return from his books had been sufficient to pay it all off, the half a million dollars, he ~~paid~~ off, but he wrote night and day, worked feverishly, and did everything possible to do it, and everybody I think praises Scott for his carrying out a moral principle where he was not legally obligated. I think when he ~~paid~~ paid off maybe a third of ~~the~~ sum, his creditors had a meeting and expressed their great gratitude to Scott for what he was doing, and ~~put~~ ^{they took} his home and gave it back to him, it had been taken for the debt, and everything, but they ~~gave~~ them back to him, those things, and showed their great gratitude but of course they let him go on and pay off the rest of it and eventually it was all paid off. But we don't require a man to do that, we permit a person to declare himself bankrupt, and to pay off ten cents on the dollar (13 1/4)

and start over ~~again~~, it is the only way you can do in a wicked world. The way to do is to try to build up in people principles of honesty so they won't go into debt in the first place, beyond what they can pay off. Mr. Cohen? (13 1/.2) ...look into sidelines that ~~have~~ are of interest that have some relation to what we're doing, but if the relationship is not great, we can't spend much time on it, we must move forward, but our main consideration, which is, the Lord says, something more than a money payment is necessary if you're going to be redeemed, He says there is something more necessary but that God can and will provide it. He doesn't say yet how. So in verse 4, thus saith the Lord God, My people went down aforetime into Egypt to sojourn there; and the

Assyrian oppressed them without a cause. Now they went to Egypt, they went there voluntarily, they went there to sojourn there, and then they got into the captivity and the difficulty there. They got something for it, they got help through the famine, they got all that, but the Assyrian oppressed them ~~wi~~without a cause, they simply marched in to where they were and took them over. So that he says, though God sent the Assyrian, God used them to punish them, nevertheless the people are in a ~~situat~~situation ~~w~~ here where they are God's people and God is going to deliver them. So he says, therefore, what have I here, saith the Lord...

C.58. (1/2)

...that my people is taken away for nought? The ones that are ruling over them are putting them in misery, making them so they just howl with misery, says the Lord, and my name continually every day is blasphemed. His name, people say, what is that God of Israel, what can He do, His people are captive, they are subject to the Babylonians, their God couldn't deliver them. My name continually every day is blasphemed. Therefore, He says, my people shall know my name. The day is coming, He says, when they will know that I am He that does speak. Behold it is I. They are going to see as a result of what I do, how great my power actually is. And so in verse 7, you have the cry of joy ~~in~~view of what God is going to do. Is this in view simply of His delivery from the captivity, or is in view of the whole promise of redemption that He has made? How beautiful on the mountains are the feet of him that brings good tidings--the Hebrew word of one word is translated by three words: bring good tidings. It is a word that means to declare abroad wonderful news, very good news. It is the very word which is used in the Syriac for the Gospel (1 3/4) ...that brings good tidings, that publishes peace. And of course, peace in the Hebrew doesn't just mean end of war, it means well-being, it means that which is wholesome all around, --that brings great tidings of good, that publishes salvation, that says to Zion, thy God reigns, thy God has taken possession, He is adopting the power. The form there is the Hebrew

perfect, your God has _____ and the word _____ we generally take as
 reign, ~~act~~ually means, "to begin to reign." To take over the power. It is used regularly
 in Kings whenever a king becomes king, it says and he reigned, _____ means he
 began to reign, and he was so-and-so old when he reigned and he reigned for so-and-so
 many years, and so on. But the word means to take over power. So this is not simply
 that says to Zion, your God is the one who controls the universe, we've had that stressed
 greatly, but here it is, that says to Zion, your king is taking over possession, He is
 going to take over the kingship over the whole world and He wants to take over the
 kingship of our hearts now. He wants to take complete possession as king, the one
 that says to Zion, your God has taken his rightful position as king. Thy watchmen
 shall lift up the voice, with the voice together shall they sing, for they shall see eye
 upon eye, when the Lord shall bring again Zion. The watchmen all rejoicing over the
 same thing that they see together, they see the great victory when the Lord brings again
 Zion. Break forth into joy, sing together, again the stress on the waste places, you
 notice, not much specifically here about ~~return~~ or deliverance, but upon the rebuilding —
 the waste places of Jerusalem, for the Lord has comforted His people, He has redeemed
 Jerusalem, the Lord has made bare His holy arm, in the eyes of all the nations, all the
 ends of the earth, that see the salvation of our God, so up till here, in this ~~busy~~^{fifty-} second
 chapter, the Lord has been declaring what He has done in principle. He, in principle,
 has established ~~Hi~~ himself as king, He in principle has declared that Jerusalem is to be
 rebuilt, He has made bare His holy arm in the eyes of all the nations, in bringing Cyrus
 to overcome the power of the Babylonians, ~~that~~^{and to} make it possible for them to be released
 therefore, in verse 11 and 12, He calls upon them to take advantage of the situation which
 He has created. Depart ye, depart ye, go ye out from ~~thence~~ thence, touch nothing unclean,
 go ye out of the midst of her, be ye clean that bear the vessels of the Lord. Though He
 tells the people to go back from exile, actually there was a comparatively small number
 that went back, though it was quite a sizeable group, there were many who stayed.

But they are called upon here, to take advantage of the situation, to leave Babylon, to return, you that bear the vessels of the Lord, and we read in Ezra, how Cyrus gave the command that the vessels of the Temple should be given to the people, to take back with them to Jerusalem, to ~~e~~ reestablish themselves there, and so they are told to go back, you that bear the vessels of the Lord, be ye clean, they are to remember, in the midst of their deliverance, that God is holy. And you won't go with haste, or by flight, it won't be a thing that you work out with some clever scheming, or some rapid running, this is something that God is going to provide in such a way that there is no question of your ability to carry it through. You won't go with haste or by flight for the Lord God will go before you. And here we have the picture of the vanguard, the Lord goes before and opens the way, and then you have the rearguard, the God of Israel literally is the one gathering up in the back, the one who picks up the stragglers, the one who follows along behind, the Lord is the one who leads ahead, and the Lord is the one who protects in back. He is interested in all parts of--reminds me of the time when we were going out the Grand Canyon to rescue those flyers, when we got into the jeep, and we started in at the head of the procession, and here was the jeep and then behind were all these other cars, and then the major simply had his jeep turn and go off the road, across the country, and headed back and we got to the rear and looked to see how things were going there, and gathered things up and made sure things were going fine, and then we shot ahead to the side, and got up to the front again. He was going his best to keep the whole line, there were about 30 cars, moving right, and all together, and so on. Of course, the Lord can do it far better than any man could, the Lord says He is interested in every phase of the going, He is interested in the head ones, the ones who do it rapidly, and efficiently, He is leading them, the ones that are stragglers, that are apt to be in difficulty, He is behind. Here is the return from the Babylonian exile, a great climactic statement about it, in verses 11 and 12, but previously we have had many statements that seem to look far beyond the exile, and previously we have had many

statements stressing the fact that the return from exile is not enough unless the sin question is dealt with, and He says be ye clean that bear the vessels of the Lord, and they would think, here we are serving the Lord, doing our best, and yet others still sin, we still have uncleanness among us, we still have that, which if not checked will mean that new exiles are necessary, that God has to send another exile, and another, until the sin question is properly dealt with, and so He follows immediately after that, with His wonderful declaration ^{about} ~~with~~ the way this problem is to be dealt with. Behold, my servant shall be successful, he will be exalted and extolled and be very high. As many were astonished at thee, so was his visage marred more than any man, and his form more than the sons of men. ~~So~~ we get right into our next section here, and I asked you to study into 52 and 53, we'll want to get into that tomorrow. Many were astonished at thee, --is interesting here. Who is the "thee"? ~~What~~ is it dealing with? You might look through the chapter and see if you can find out, but an easier way would be to get the ~~Y~~ RSV. There you read and it says many were astonished at him, and then there is a footnote, "Hebrew, thee." So they have a very nice way of solving the difficulty, they just push it aside and do away with it. Well, I hope we can find a better way than that, but we'll discuss that tomorrow...

(break, starting again at 9) ...during the last hour we had just finished the second main part of our section of the book of Isaiah, and we're starting the third ~~part~~, and the third part is closely bound to the second part. There is a big division here because there is quite a difference of material after this, in general, from what is before. But the two join together very closely. In 52 we reach that great climax of those departing from Babylon, and carrying the vessels of the Lord, and there was a stress laid that God is protecting them, but also that they must be clean, that they should be free from sin, that they should be properly fitted to represent Him, bringing up to mind the whole ~~matter~~ that ~~it~~ is necessary that something be done about this question of sin. ~~Other~~ ~~wise~~ a mere physical deliverance means nothing in the end. It will simply, there will simply

be more exiles, there has got to be a solution to this major question, the question of sin, so there we start our new section of the book, with verse 13, which certainly should be a chapter division, it belongs very closely with 53, it is ridiculous to have 53 start four verses after the section begins, and yet in a way it's rather nice to have it come right after 12 because it is so tightly bound in a way with what precedes. So that if you're going to have chapter divisions, they should be at 13, but in a way it is nice there isn't any there, you just lead right from one into the other. Here is this situation. Here is deliverance from Babylon, greatly stressed in the first part of the book, a whole chapter given to it, chapter 47, ending the first section.

Second section, touching upon it somewhat, ending with two verses dealing with it, and then we leave deliverance from Babylon behind now, and go on to deal with the two main new thoughts, that have come up in the first section, and developed further in the second section, the work of the servant of the Lord, and the solution of the problem of sin. So now we immediately attack the problem of the work of the servant of the Lord, we've been told he is going to do his work. We have been told that his work is going to be successful, it is going to accomplish the work for which the servant has been called into the work. This is going to be done, and we've been told that it is a work which will affect the whole world, affect the nations as well as affect Israel. We have been told that, and we have been given to understand pretty clearly that He is an individual, that it is not a full nation, but a part of the nation, in fact, just one individual, who is from Israel and represents Israel, doing the work for which Israel was brought into being. But yet who is only one from among Israel, and therefore can be thought of in a way as separate from Israel, as well as thought of as representing Israel. So now we have a long chapter dealing exclusively with his work and how He carries it out. And this work is a work which must solve the problem of sin. So our section starts with verse 13.

Behold my servant shall deal wisely, I don't like this word "prudent" here very well. Of course the KJV is in the Old English, and these words have all of them had slight

exalted, and the work of the servant is going, not to be confined to the land of Palestine, ~~it~~ it is going to reach out into distant lands. And those who are delivered from bondage and oppression are going to come from very distant sections, some from the north and some from the west and even some from as far east as China. Sing O heavens, be joyful, O earth, the Lord has comforted his people and will have mercy ~~on~~ on his afflicted. So we have the work of the servant here shown as a world-wide work which we could gather from chapter 42 where he is told he is to be a light to the Gentiles and to bring judgment to the nations. But here we are told he is going to deliver people from all these nations, he is going bring great ~~the~~ blessings to people even in these most distant lands, and even in the land of China there are going to be people who will be blessed by the servant, delivered from bondage by him, and will be his followers. These shall come even from the land of China. Sing, O heavens, and rejoice O earth. And then in verse 14 we come back to the present situation, ~~Zion~~ Zion said the Lord has forgotten, forsaken me. They said, oh that's wonderful, the servant is going to do a tremendous work reaching out to the very ends of the earth. But look at our condition, we're in bondage, in suffering, in misery, we're subject ~~to~~ to the Babylonian imprisonment, the Lord has forgotten us, now he is talking about a great wonderful work of the servant to reach out to China, but we're forgotten, we're dropped in the course of it, and so the Lord turns his attention back specifically to Israel now. He says, can a woman forget her sucking child, he says, I have brought Jacob out, I have graven thee on the palms of my hand, great blessings for Israel described in the succeeding verses.

Now maybe we'd better quit for tonight, especially as these men are ~~leaving~~ waiting, don't want to keep them waiting too long. Go on though in chapter 49 and look into 50 and 51, 52 I guess. I think you might spend a bit of time in ^{fifty} ~~history~~ perhaps. I discussed fifty some last week and it's on the records, but you can look it over and perhaps with the help from the records, we can get on maybe to the end of 52 next time. Say to 52:12 because 13 goes with 53. I wish you would take a special assignment though, look at chapter 41:2, look in the RSV see how they render 41:2, look at the Hebrew and see if you think the

~~Hebrew~~ King James is exactly literal, or see if you think the RSV is literal and look at one or two commentaries and see what they say. 41:2. Maybe we better quit now then...

Isa. 41. (1/4)

...of course always say that the vowel points are not inspired, and that is a rather deceptive thing to say because can vowel points be inspired or consonants be inspired? What is inspired? The words are inspired, it's not the thought that is inspired, the thought is revealed by the Lord, the thought is overseen by the Lord, directed by the Lord, but it is not inspired. The inspiration, we believe in verbal inspiration, we believe it is the words that are inspired, but it is not the vowel points or the consonants that are inspired, it is the words that are inspired. That is to say the words which the original writer wrote in the original manuscript were so overseen and directed by the Spirit of God that they expressed the idea He wished clearly expressed, and did not import erroneous side ideas or suggestions which were contrary to truth and fact, that's what we mean by verbal inspiration. Inspiration is not a matter of thought, it is a matter of words expressing thought, but it is not the vowel points, it's not the consonants that are inspired, it is the words, and consonants and signs and vowel points are merely a means of writing down words, it's the original words that are inspired, the words that are written by the original writer. Well now these words which were written by the original writer were written simply in consonants, he did not write vowel points, these vowel points are an invention not earlier than perhaps 500 A.D. So the original writer could not have written vowel points, they did not then exist. And we think it is a queer way to write, without vowel points, but we do the same thing all the time, we write read and nobody on earth knows whether it's read or red, it isn't like just our read, which could be rade or rede or red or ride or rode, but still there are two possibilities and there's no way of telling which except by context, and if you just write rd instead of read, 9 times out of 10 you can easily tell what the vowels should be from the context. And so they wrote the consonants, and in most cases you could easily tell what

it should be from the context. But more than that they did it ~~as~~ as the inspired word of God and people took it ~~and~~ and studied it and paid attention to it and therefore many of them memorized it and so as people would look at it they would read it the way they had heard it, and so even though the vowel points were not written, the words were passed on but naturally it is a lot easier ~~for~~ for a change to come in something that is a matter of memory like the vowel points, than something that was written, a matter of copying, ^{though} so you can make errors in copying too, of course it's very easy. And then when it came about the 5th century A.D. the people began to fear that they would forget what the correct vowels were in some of these cases, when some of these words could be read two ways, like this could be (3 1/4) or it could be two possibilities and so the Massoretes began to put in vowel forms, not what they thought ought to be there but what had been passed on to them, as they had heard it read, over and over. They were passing on a tradition, in other words, not a judgment. So our protestants say, there was a big debate in the Christian church 300 years ago, a tremendous debate as to whether the vowel points were inspired or not, that is to say, here is a Hebrew Bible, you have to stand on the vowel points as they are, or whether the vowel points were not inspired. But of course the whole thing was wrongly expressed, the words are inspired, the consonants if they are correctly preserved tell us what the words are but in some places you can't be sure, between two or three possibilities which vowels should be there. And in such a case the vowel points pass on the tradition which was carefully passed on by the Jews and consequently in most cases is doubtless correct. But there is a greater possibility of error in the vowel points than in the consonants, though there is a possibility in both. And consequently in general we have taken the position that the interpreter is free to change the vowel points up to the limit of his judgment, he is free to change the vowel points if he thinks it makes a better sentence. And the RSV committee took that as a definite principle anyplace they felt like changing vowel points they do it without hesitation and do not give a footnote, they feel

that they are perfectly free to change the vowel points any place they take a notion to.

That was their definite viewpoint in their translation and Dr. Orlinsky the Jewish member of the committee does not approve of that, did not like it, but that was their policy. And in the new Jewish version that he is a member of the committee that has been making it, he said that in that committee they are not taking that policy, they are ~~to~~ translating it as a stand including the vowel points. So that we say an interpreter up to the limit of his knowledge has freedom in changing vowel points if he has reason to say that this is more likely what the original was. He also has a right of course to say, I feel quite convinced that this context has been incorrectly transmitted, but the chances of his being right in that are smaller than (6) vowel points and therefore we feel he has far less reason. We

want to make a desperate effort to make sense out of it exactly as we can before we

So here what it says is not to his feet but to his ^{foot}~~prey~~, that is the word as it stands. Now Mr. Haffly mentioned that the RSV ^{translates}~~translation~~ it at every step, and to his foot, to at every step is a bit free, it is not utterly free, there is a definite relation there, foot and step, but we ~~wonder~~ if that is quite the way, you feel you'd like to have a parallel, you'd like to have another case where it's clear in the light of context, that to his foot means the same thing as what we say when we say at every step. It could very well be, we have all kinds of phrases, idioms in English, all sorts of expressions that just don't make sense as they stand but they have developed, I found myself (7) saying, my, it's good and warm today, isn't it, and most of my friends didn't think it was good and warm, they thought it was bad and warm, they didn't think it was good at all, and mid-winter ~~when~~ when they say it's good and cold today, ~~people~~ people would think it isn't good at all, it's bad. It's an idiom, we say good and but we mean bad. How does good and come to mean very, I don't know. It just doesn't seem to make sense. But we all know what it means, we're used to it. And somebody, you translate this English into some other language, and you say it's good and hot and you say oh here is this terrible heat and he says it's good and hot today, then you

translate it and they say it's nonsense, so they say we'll have to render it , it is very hot today. They say how on earth could good and come to mean very? Well, I don't know how it comes but there's no question ~~th~~at it does. And when you, but you would not accept anybody's word for it without proof, you could very easily get a few cases in colloquial speech that would make it absolutely clear^{that} that's what good and means to us today. Now in this case, does to his foot mean at every step? It could be, it's not very far removed, but it's just far enough removed that I would ~~hesitate~~ ^{hesitate} tremendously about taking it, unless somebody can give me a good parallel, where the word, where that meaning makes sense in the context. But continuing, Mr. Haffly answered the question here. Mr. Ruble?

(student. 8 1/2) I believe that the idea of vowel forms originated with the Syrians, in the Syriac translation, the Old and New Testament. They began to put in dots to indicate long vowels and various things, and then somebody thought of the very interesting idea of putting Greek vowels in, and in Syriac, in the type of Syriac that we usually read, in Syriac translations, you have Greek vowels written on the side, written sideways to represent the (9) and the a sound and the s sound and the a sound and the e sound, and the i sound. You have ~~the~~ Greek vowels written on the side, and the idea seems to have come from that to the Massoretes, but there were two groups of Massoretes, there was a group in Palestine, around Tiberius and a ~~group~~ group in Babylon, and the Babylonian ~~Massoretes~~ Massoretes used one system of vowel markings and the Tiberian vocalization, that is the Tiberians in Palestine, used the system which has come down to us. Now in the Babylonian system, you do not have separate marks for (9 3/4) and . You have one mark to show both of them. You see, a and e are very similar, many people today, many foreigners find it difficult to see any difference between a and e, you see certain foreigners mentioning Canada and ~~you~~ it will sound to you as if they say Ceneda, they just don't know any different, a and e. That sound is unfamiliar. And that evidently is the case with the Babylonian Massoretes, but it was pretty good proof that it was pronounced a and not ah,

You'd never get ah ^{and} ~~into~~ e confused. But that was the Babylonian vocalization but of course the Tiberian vocalization which we use does have the difference between them. And you see, it wasn't a question of what had been passed down, a (10 1/2) or a it is a question of what sign had been passed down, and they said, when they said (10 3/4) or when they said the Babylonians heard the same sound, they didn't hear any difference, but the Tiberians heard it different. So they said it's (10 3/4) in some cases and in other cases. And so they made a system of vowel points thinking it would be easier to keep their tradition of what these words were without its becoming confused, and they just added the vowels. (student. 11 1/4) Yes, that is a part of the development. Originally of course in the earliest time the writing has no vowel letter, when they have like the word (11 1/2) with a y in it, it was originally pronounced and the w is pronounced. And when you have the o at the end, the wau means his, it originally was a w in front of it, the original marks were all plain. But then as certain w sounds became silent, left out, just as many of our English sounds, that used to be in English, they're gone now. We used to say have, h-a-v-e, today we say have, but we still write the e, and many sounds disappeared in the course of time. (12 1/4) became . But they were used to writing it with the wau so they kept on and naturally, after a time, somebody would (12 1/4) that wau in there, that means (12 1/2) and getting that idea, then when you take another word which had a long ou in it somewhere and, that was not in the original context, it's the verb form simply but it has a long oo in it or a long e, the yoh (12 3/4) in many cases and become just an e instead of a ye, they become used to that idea from it, then they began in their writing, in order to clarify, putting in the y and the yoh in order to make it clear that this long vowel was in there, and it didn't have to be written but it could be written as a help, and you find in the writing of the Bible, before the vowel points were invented,

it was customary to put in vowel letters to show long oo's and long e's, but they weren't always written, and in fact it wouldn't be customary to write more than a couple of them in a word, if you have a long word, with several long vowels in, someone writer might put certain of them in (13 1/2) and others would put others, so a long oo can be either a (13 1/2) or a short one, can be either short or long oo, just But the (13 3/4) only indicates the long oo and it makes sure that this vowel here is a long vowel. So they got to writing vowel letters in, then of course when they added the vowel points many of these vowel letters were quite unnecessary, but it was already customary to put them in. Consequently the vowel letters are a remnant of a time when they didn't have vowel points. After they had the vowel points they quit then writing the vowel letters.

Isa.42. (1/4)

...it's good to have these matters clearly in mind because they affect our interpretation at many points, although of course this particular point is a comparatively slight one, whether this is his foot or his feet.

...be here simply a variant way of expressing the same thing, or is the RSV another possible interpretation, of what the Hebrew says, though different from this one? Or is the RSV actually a one that differs from it in a way that shows that someone has done something which we don't think was justified? I'd like your judgment on that, if I may.

...find that this verse, which is the first we hear about Cyrus, and therefore very important, and of course all this in here about Cyrus is very important, but let's go on now to chapter 49, we looked at last time and found that at the beginning of 49 there was the servant speaking. Listen, O Isles to me, and hearken, ye people, from afar, the Lord has called me. So one who speaks speaks in a way what God can see, that says the Lord has called him, and he says that the Lord has said to him, thou art my servant, O Israel, so we have introduced here this strange truth that he is God and he is at the same time

an Israelite, it's hinted at, it's not clearly expressed, but what is clearly developed here is the individuality of the servant, that he is not all of Israel, he is a part of it, he represents Israel, he is Israel, but he is only a part of Israel because he can do something for Israel. So we have his individuality taught very clearly here, in chapter 42 he was to do a work for the nations, for the world, and we might think of Israel in that verse, but ~~here~~ here we find he is to do a work for Israel as well as for the nations. And then we notice that the discussion of the servant which comes up to verse 7 doubtless continues through verse 13, that we are still dealing with the servant, and we read of the great work that the servant is going to do, in these succeeding verses, and we read how his work is going to reach out to the very ends of the earth, even to the land of China. And then we have the doxology in verse 13, sing O heavens, and be joyful O earth, a great word of praise. And there we end our present discussion, of the servant, and in verse 14 we return to Israel. Zion says something, and it's as if Zion is becoming a little bit disturbed with all this talk about the servant's great work reaching out to the ends of the earth, it's already been said the servant's going to do a work for Israel but here's Israel in bondage, well now you're talking about the great work to the ends of the earth, well what about me? I'm in Babylonian captivity, I'm in suffering, the Lord is so interested in this great work reaching out to the land of China, that he has forgotten his people Israel. The Lord has forsaken me, I am forgotten. And how far does Zion's statement run, Mr. Grauley?

(student.4) There are no quotation marks in the Hebrew so we have to judge from context how far the quotation would be. RSV puts in quotation marks in the book, I don't remember in this particular verse, I suppose they do, but I know they do in Matthew and I feel they put them in quite incorrectly, they leave out part of what the angel said, they leave out of quotation as if it's not the angel, but Matthew who is speaking, and I am sure they are quite incorrect, in that use of quotation marks. But once you put quotation marks in you have to make a decision. Here there are no quotation marks in the Hebrew and the King James doesn't have them, so we ought to judge by context, but there is no question of course that

49:7-13

49:15

what Zion says is only verse 14, but then we have the Lord's answer, and Mr. Grauley doubtless interpreted my question as not being how far does Zion's statement go, but how far does he keep talking about Zion, and he certainly continues after verse 14, he answers with 15 and 15 is the Lord answering Zion, isn't it? 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20 and 21 are the Lord answering Zion. 21 is an interesting verse, or 20 and 21 both are, they are worth thinking about, they are a rather peculiar expression, and I think they deserve considerable thought, I don't think we'll give it to them now, but I would suggest that you note chapter 49, verses 20 and 21, and try to be sure one of these times, to consider those verses carefully, and see if you think there is anything peculiar about them, about the thought of these two verses, Now in verse 22, who is he talking about?

...says these shall come from far, from the north, these from the ~~south~~ west, and these from the land of China. 22 says I lift up my hand to the Gentiles, and they shall bring thy sons in their arms and thy daughters shall be carried upon their shoulders. Is he talking here about the same people that he talks about in verse 12.

49:22
 ...22 it certainly would seem that he is speaking of the Gentiles helping the Israelites to go back to Palestine, wouldn't you think? It might even be that this was not fulfilled at that return from the exile, but that it was fulfilled to some extent when the Flying Tiger line sent its ~~planes~~ to Yemen in South Arabia and picked up Jews down there who had been there for centuries, oppressed and mistreated and put them in the planes, they were the first wheeled vehicles those men had ever seen. ~~And~~ they carried them in the planes to Palestine. That might possibly be, it certainly fits with this, they shall take thy sons in their arms, and thy daughters shall be carried upon their shoulders. It might fit with that, the sons of Israel living in oppression as they have for centuries, in South Arabia, in Yemen, one of the few remaining absolute monarchies in the world, being carried by these Gentiles from Yemen up to Palestine. That would fit with what this speaks of. Yes? (student. 7 3/4) Yes, well it would sound as if some time or other Israel

is told that a time is coming, is he speaking of the Babylonian exile, is he speaking of ~~the~~ a time that has not yet come? Some time it's coming when the Gentiles who oppress Israel are to be judged and to be forced Israel to make up somewhat for the oppression which they have given them, and to themselves suffer, they who have oppressed, you might say verses 25 and 26 might very well be read ^{41:25} ~~by~~ ²⁶ Jews in ~~Israel~~ Israel today, ~~when~~ they would think of 20 years ago when Eichmann was in charge of a group of men who were ordered by Hitler to exterminate 4 million or 5 million Jews in Europe, and ~~appease~~ these people and put them in gas chambers and put them in concentration camps, torture them, and oppress them and they who had, Eichmann, Hitler himself died a terrible death, and Himmler and these others have suffered at the end of it, but Eichmann escaped and living in Argentina and in other countries, fleeing from one country to another country, going under assumed names, trying to hide and keep it absolutely unknown who he was, finally some Jews grabbed him as he changed buses in Argentina, as he was going home from his work, where he had an hour and a half to go on the bus, changed from three buses to get out to the place where his wife and four children were living, out in the country, under assumed names, and as he went to cross, these Jews grabbed him and set him in a plane and carried him to Israel, and they're going to have a big trial this summer. ~~That man~~ And certainly it would seem likely, I would think it very surprising if it were not, in Palestine today, hundreds of people who are reading these very verses, but says the Lord even the captives of the mighty shall be taken away and the prey of the terrible shall be delivered, for I will contend with him that contendeth with thee and I will save thy children. And I will feed them that oppress thee with their own flesh and they shall be drunken with their own blood as with sweet wine, and all flesh shall know that I the Lord am thy Saviour and thy Redeemer, the mighty One of Jacob. It would seem to be entirely possible that what is described in this verse is exactly what is taking place in the destruction of the forces of Hitler and of ~~his~~ ^{his} leaders and the terrible disaster that befell them, and Eichmann as a present example of it because he escaped and did not suffer at the overwhelming of the Nazis, but has had a long time of being a fugitive

and now has been seized by them. Yes, Mr. Grauley? (student)

...of course in any particular verse or passage there is that question. There is a type of interpretation in which I think it is extremely false, which is called the double fulfillment interpretation. Here is a picture, here is a case where somebody has a child, and well does that mean this person has a child, or does it mean Chr ist was born, well I'd say it means one or the other. But the fact that double interpretation, an artificial sort of thing, having one prediction that refers to two unrelated things, is absolutely wrong. That does not mean that there may not be two types of passage where we do not have a single one event involved in a prediction. You can have a prediction which represents not one particular event, but which represents the series of events, like if someone had said when the U.S. won its freedom from Great Britain, someone were to say, from that nation that now has won its freedom from European domination, armies will come to Europe and will conquer European nations, that could describe a series of events. In 1917 the U.S. Army went to France and while they didn't get into a great deal of fighting yet when the two sides were both just about exhausted, the realization of a seemingly endless of fresh soldiers starting to come into the one side, was enough to lead the other side to realize that it was now hopeless, while before it was just even and nobody knew which way it was going to be, and now it was utterly hopeless, and so you can truly say that in America, even though it was a comparatively small thing in that war yet the American Army going into Europe did decide the outcome of that particular war, and then certainly in this last war the American part was greater and American Armies went to Europe and conquered quite a number of nations of Europe this time, and who knows what may be in the future. That statement like that could describe a whole series of events, and then there is the other type of thing which may be you might say a general principle, like Mr. Grauley suggested, heard the suggestion made. A general principle in which it is stated that when certain conditions occur a certain result will occur either by natural providence or because of a definite divine prediction (13 3/4) under certain circumstances he will bring to pass a

certain thing. And so we have these two cases in which a prediction may have more than one fulfillment, but there neither of them at all like the so-called double fulfillment which consists in saying, well this represents that and that, two things which are quite unrelated, both predicting, I feel that that is utterly wrong, it is either one or the other, except two exceptions we just mentioned. Now in every passage we have to ask ourselves the questions, what sort of a prediction is given and decide from the words of it and from the...

Isa. 43. (1/4)

...you see, in every case, it's not a simple matter, interpreting words. I saw a statement about Genesis 1 the other day, the man says a day is the time that it takes the earth to revolve upon its axis. It's perfectly ^{simple} what a day is, he says we have no right to take Moses' words about a day and interpret them in the light of some present-day theory of geological aeons, he says we have to understand Moses' words, meaning a day as we know it. Well, that's utterly false, it isn't a day as we know it, it's a day as Moses knows it, and Moses certainly never heard, as far as we know, that the earth revolved on its axis. I am sure, when he said a day, he never dreamed of such a thing as its meaning the time it takes the earth to revolve once upon its axis. And the Hebrew day was definitely not a 24-hour day, because their day starts at sunset and runs until sunset. And your sunset never occurs at the same time two nights in a row. For half the year it's getting later and then for half the year it's getting earlier, and consequently it's always a minute or two off from a 24-hour day. So such a thing as a 24-hour day was utterly unknown to Moses. And such a thing as the earth revolving on its axis, we have no reason to think he even knew it had an axis or that it revolved. And we must not read 20th century theology into the Bible, but neither should we read 18th century physics into the Bible. Take the words as they stand and see what they mean as they stand. And a day is a period of time, probably a period of light. In most cases, by day we don't mean 24 hours, we mean--somebody comes

up to you at midnight and says, "Isn't this a lovely day?" You'd think they were crazy. We don't use day for 24 hours, we use a day for the time it's light, and then just for convenience we figure the middle of the darkness to the middle of the next darkness, which includes a day and we call the whole thing a day. But a day is a period of time, you have to know from context how long a period it is, so with these words we have to decide from the context what are the possibilities and then which one does the context require. And when we look at this verse, chapter 49:22-26, it surely would seem that he is talking about a deliverance of Israel, a regathering of Israel, a punishment of enemies of Israel, those who oppressed them, and whether it is here giving a general statement or not, certainly there are general statements given elsewhere in the Scripture, whether this is a general statement or whether it is a specific prediction of some particular time, which perhaps someone may say would fulfill the time of Babylonian captivity, someone else may make an argument that that does not represent what is described here, it looks forward to a later fulfillment, but in any event, it either has been fulfilled or it will be fulfilled or (3 3/4)

the general principle of God's dealing but God has said that He promised to Abraham, them that bless thee I will bless, and them that curse thee I will curse, and I believe that you can trace it as a principle of God's dealings with Israel, that He has punished them who have oppressed Israel. But when you look at verse, I tried rather unsuccessfully two weeks

ago to bring out the fact that I think that verse 12 is very different from verse 22. Superficially, they look alike, they are a gathering. 12 is people coming from great distances, including the land of China. 22 and 23 are people coming from great distances, particularly 22, also 23 to some extent--people coming from a distance, being regathered to Zion.

There is a similarity of idea but are they talking about the same people? Well, 22-26 I think is talking about Israel, but verse 8 I believe continues the discussion of the servant of the Lord, and that the servant of the Lord is the one who is going to say to the prisoners go forth, verse 9 tells us, to them in darkness, show themselves. This is not Israel, this

is the one out of Israel, the servant of the Lord, and that one we ~~believe~~ believe was Christ.

And ~~He~~ says these things, He does this work, those who follow Him do not hunger nor thirst,

49:10 they have, He guides them by the streams of water, this has many physical applications in our own lives, we know that He very definitely cares for those who are His own, and it certainly has a wonderful spiritual application to our lives, as He makes all His mountains a way and His highways are exalted, to those who are following Him, ~~for~~ who are truly His, He opens the paths before them, and makes the rough places straight. He is talking here of the followers of the servant of the Lord, whether they be Jews or Gentiles, they are two overlapping groups in 22 and 26, but two distinct groups, they overlap but there are many in either one who aren't in the other. And so verse 12, it seems to me, is speaking of the

49:12 followers of the servant of the Lord, whether Jew or Gentile, who comes, the One who is to be a light to the Gentiles, and who is to be salvation to the very ends of the earth, He is to have those who follow Him coming from the north and from the west and even from the land of China. But later on we read about the Jews who have been taken into captivity, how they are going to be regathered, and it would be possible that that also was the work of the servant of the Lord, but in the context there is nothing to suggest that. But there is the definite implication, I would think, in verse 12, that that is speaking of the followers of the servant of the Lord, whether Jew or Gentile. And 22-26 is speaking about Israel.

Well now if we have Israel now spoken of in 22-26, and don't simply take my word for either of these, I want to present possibilities to you, I want to present to you what impresses me as the correct interpretation, but it impresses me because of various factors which seem to me to be evidence in that direction and I hope you'll evaluate the factors and if you find other factors which change the balance that you'll let me know. But if 22-26 is Israel, now, what about chapter 50:1, who is he talking to there? Is the Lord talking to the servant of the Lord, in 50:1.

...50:1 the Lord seems to be speaking to Israel and there is a parallel surely between 50:1 and 49:14. In 49:14 Zion's despair and discouragement is quoted and then

the Lord answers. In 50:1 the Lord answers Zion's despair, it is not expressed here again, but it is implied, and the implication is here of the despair and of the despairing statement that Israel is considered to have made. The Lord says, where is the bill of your mother's divorce, whom I have put away? The implication is that Zion is saying, the Lord has forsaken us, my Lord has forgotten me. The Lord says, where is the bill of your mother's divorce? You say I have forsaken you, to which of my creditors have I sold you? He says what's your evidence that this has happened, that I have forsaken you? And then He goes on in the verse and He denies it completely. He says behold, for your iniquities have ye sold yourself, and for your transgressions is your mother put away. His answer is you are in a miserable situation, not because God has forsaken you, but because of your sin. You see how the thought develops. In chapter--actually, it seems to me there ought to be a paragraph division at 49:14, there's a sharp break between the wonderful picture of the servant of the Lord in verse 1-13, and the new discussion here of the situation of Israel, 14, the Lord hath forsaken me. God says no the Lord hasn't forsaken you, I won't forsake you. He says I'm going to give you tremendous blessings, He lifts them up from their despair, and He gives them the encouragement before He gives them the rebuke, and there's a very good point there, there are times when the ~~best~~ thing to give people is a rebuke, which they deserve, but there are other times when people are in difficulty and in trouble, as a result of their sin, when the thing to do is not to give them the rebuke but first to give them the encouragement and bring them out of despair and then to give them the rebuke later on when they are ready for it. And so the Lord here first gives to Zion, which despaired, the word of encouragement, the absolute certainty of his continuing blessing, with only the one question in it which I've asked you to look into sometime, verses 20-21, but otherwise he is continuing with his blessing to the people, and his great mercy upon them, to the end of 26, and then in 50:1 He is continuing the same discourse but He is bringing in the element of rebuke. He says I haven't put you in this situation, you've brought yourself to it, because of your sins. And then in verse 2, whom does He talk about in verse 2? Mr. Ruble?

50:2 ...He continues His discussion about Israel. When I came why was there no man, why were there none to answer? He says is my hand shortened that it can't redeem, have I no power to deliver? Why look what I've done in the past, look at the wonderful blessings I have given in the past, don't you think that I could continue to give them if it wasn't that your iniquity and your transgression have cut you off? It certainly continues the thought of chapter 49:14, which is all helping them through the despair of 26, and then bringing the note of their fault in it, which we have in many previous chapters, just brought in at the end. --After the promise of blessing first. It would be good to look at the parallels to this in earlier chapters in our section. ✓

But then verse 2 that was, but what about verse 3? Is verse 3 talking about Israel, is it talking about the servant, what is it dealing with? What do you think verse 3 is talking about, Mr. Grauley?

50:3 ...verse 3 you feel is a continuation of verse 2, still speaking of God's power and of God's sorrow for their sin and His desire for their return. It seems to fit right in with the context of verse 2, in fact so much so, ~~it~~ you'd almost think it ought to be part of the same verse, because of course the verse divisions are all much later than the original writing. That would make ~~it~~ a pretty long verse, maybe ~~a~~ too long a verse if it was included in it, and yet maybe you could have divided the verse a little earlier, ~~but~~ --I don't know that it matters much, but it's very tightly tied to verse 3. Then, you come to verse 4. Who is speaking in verse 4? Is the Lord speaking to Israel, is Israel speaking ~~the~~ to the Lord, what is the relation of verse 4 to verse 3, Mr. Ruble?

...appears to be a very sharp break between verse 3 and 4. Now of course there is a relation to the general idea that is running all ~~through~~ through, unquestionably the section that follows verse 4 has a relationship to the section that precedes, but the relationship is the relation of section to section, rather than of verse to verse. The division between the --the break between 3 and 4 is many times as sharp as the break between

49:26 and 51. It is an important division as compared to the comparatively very minor division at the end, at the place where the archbishop made the ~~division~~ at the end of 49. It would seem to be quite a sharp division here...

Isa. 44. (1/4)

50: 2-3 ... is definitely not the same one who is speaking in verse 2 and 3. God is the triune God. 4 is someone speaking about the Lord God so it's definitely a different speaker from two and three. Now the suggestion is made that it is the servant of the Lord. There is nothing in the verse to prove that it is the servant of the Lord, but certainly there is nothing in ~~the~~ verse to contradict the suggestion of the servant of the Lord, is there?

I heard a very interesting thing on tape, given by ^{some} scientists in England, who are now lecturing at Cornell University, advancing the steady ^{state} ~~date~~ theory of the universe. -- That the universe was never created, it always is being created, there is always matter coming into existence between the galaxies, and then when the galaxy goes out after a few million years, there's a new galaxy coming in, so that there's a steady state out from creation rather than any one creation, which they call the (1 1/4) theory, and this is a new theory which is getting quite a vogue now, and I was listening to it on tape, ~~lectures~~ taken down by a friend there, while of course I wouldn't publish these things because it's theirs to publish, but they've given it as a public lecture, so there's no harm in my hearing it, and it's good to know the latest theories, if you can know them a few years before they become widely published in text books you're ready to know how to answer them or discuss them, when they become widely discussed. And I was struck with what one of these scientists had to say, he said science has nothing to do with truth, or anything like that. He said we're not interested in truth, he says, what science is stick your neck out, to make theories, and he says, these theories which you make, must be, if they're scientific, must be theories which can be tested. You make a prediction and then you see if your prediction comes true, and if you predict something will work when

an experiment is carried on and you see if it works out, or something that'll happen if it could, something like that, so you can see whether your theory works out. And he says the test for a theory is whether it can be disproved. He said you can't prove a theory, he says there's nothing in science that can be proved. But he said that the thing is, you make a theory and see if it can be disproven. And if it is disproven of course it's wrong. But if it ~~isn't~~ isn't disproved then you stand on it until something comes along which disproves, and if it does we give it up. Otherwise we hold it. I thought that was very interesting. Very suggestive. And I was mighty glad to hear that idea, which I think is a great deal of truth in it.

But now here we look at this verse. And you can easily disprove the idea that verse 4 is the triune God speaking, who has spoken in verses 2 and 3, because the Lord God has given this to me, so that suggestion that it's the same speaker as in 2 and 3 is immediately disproven. But now you advance the hypothesis that it's the servant of the Lord. And there is nothing in verse 4 to disprove that hypothesis. But that doesn't prove that the hypothesis is correct, you must see if you can think of another hypothesis and naturally the one that will occur and that I'm sure that any Jewish commentary will give is that this is Israel. Israel now ~~w~~peaks and says the Lord God has given me the tongue of the learned that I should know how to speak a word in season to him that is weary; he wakeneth morning by morning, he wakeneth mine ear to hear as the learned. Well now that could very well be Israel, couldn't it? As we look it, it seems to us that verse 4 fits the servant of the Lord as he is presented to us in chapter 49 and 50--chapter 42 and 49 I should have said. Much better than it fits Israel. But we would be hard put to it to disprove that verse 4, taken alone, to disprove that it might be Israel. We would find that extremely difficult, but now we look at verse 5. And who is speaking in verse 5, in verse 5 is a different person speaking than speaks in verse 4? Would anybody be ready to argue that 5 is a different person than 4? I don't think so. Yes, Mr. Grauley? (student. 4 3/4) Well, it seems to me that that is incorrect.

I would think it ~~was~~ would belong with 4. I don't know why they would make a paragraph division ~~except~~ to separate 4 and 5. It could be of course that the prophet speaks in 4, the Lord God has given me this message, and then we stop and start a new chapter with 5. That would be possible, I don't think it's very likely. Verse 5 is very similar to 4, they both start, the Lord God has done something to me. What has He done? He has given me the tongue of the learned. He has wakened my ear to hear as the learned, the Lord God has opened my ear, the first part of 5, is a simple repetition of what is at the end of 4, and while it might be that this is said by one person and another person proceeds to say the same thing, that is a possibility but hardly likely, without some definite evidence of it. I think that, while we can't prove that verse 5 is talking about the same one as ~~or~~ verse 4, the parallel is so striking that it would seem, ~~that~~ ^{and} the similarity of expression and everything, that it would seem that you would need pretty definite proof to say it is a different person. So if verse 5 is the same person as verse 4, then who is verse 5? Well, it's not the Lord, the triune God speaking, because the, for the same reason applies against that, that does in verse 4, and in addition to that, we think the two belong together, and we are left then with the question is verse 5 talking about the servant of the Lord, who is Israel of course, and represents Israel, but is not Israel as a nation but the individualized servant of the Lord, or is verse 5 talking about Israel as a nation? And do you find anything in verse 5 to disprove either of these two suggestions? Mr. Grauley? (student. 7)

Yes, I was not rebellious, neither turned away back. Now if the Lord said to Israel, behold for your iniquities have ye sold yourselves and for your transgressions is your mother put away, why is it when I call there was none to answer, Israel answered and said I was not rebellious, neither turned away back, there's a pretty sharp contradiction, isn't there? A pretty sharp contradiction. It is quite inconceivable in the context that after the Lord has made that accusation, Israel would answer I have not been rebellious. The Lord repeatedly condemns Israel in previous chapters for her rebellion against God, and ~~N~~ now this one says, I was not rebellious, the Lord opened my ear, the Lord has given me experience.

50:5
 which have made it possible for me to understand these truths, but I was not rebellious, I didn't turn back. No human being can say that. Every one of us has experiences by which we learn about the Lord, but we turn back from it, we detest having something disagreeable to go through, we don't like it, anyone who has children has the experience of having to teach the children lessons which are disagreeable to the children. The child will be grateful to us in later years that we teach them lessons. If we just don't teach them the lesson, and say I don't want to hurt the child, don't want to displease him, we'll let him do what he feels like, we're not being kind to the child. In later years he is going to, if he turns out well, to feel very, very bad toward us for not having taught him a lesson as we should. Of course, if he turns out badly, he may not be the one that brings up (8 3/4)

But every child is rebellious and has to be subdued at various times, and we have to be subdued by our heavenly Father but this one says w/ I was not rebellious neither turned away back, and if that is not the Holy perfect sinless servant of the Lord, I don't know who it is. Certainly if any Israelite today wants to make an argument that that's in the character of Israel through the ages, she has not been rebellious, she is absolutely been loyal to the Lord, we honor Israel for her great loyalty to the law of God, we honor her for it, but we cannot say that there have not been many times when they have been very rebellious, and certainly if someone says that, he is sharply contradicting statement after statement in previous sections of this portion of Isaiah. The Lord says I told you in advance what's going to happen because you'd say my idol did it. He says, you sold yourself for your iniquity, time and again He points out their rebellion, so here when someone says the Lord has opened my ear and I was not rebellious neither turned away back, surely that is the disproof that it is Israel who is spoken of in verse 5, and that would seem very definitely to suggest then that the ^{one} ~~work~~ in verse 4 also is not Israel but the servant of the Lord. Now if you look at verse 6... there's a natural connection between 5 and 6, the one who has not been rebellious though he had disagreeable experiences, here describes some experiences. Now there's no reason for a change

50:6

50:6 of person. Verse 6 by itself could certainly be taken, at least the first part of it as a description of Israel going into exile, into suffering. I gave my back to the smiters and my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair, I hid not my face from shame and spitting. It's hardly a natural description of a nation compelled against its ~~own~~ will to suffer oppression. Because he says I gave myself, I went into this--there certainly is a suggestion of voluntary suffering, rather than of being compelled against His will to suffer. It doesn't quite fit with what Israel had gone through and yet it's near enough that you could take the giving the back and the smiting of the face as simply descriptions of its going through it. So that it could be Israel, though it doesn't quite fit. But the context ties up with verse 5, suggests very strongly that it is not Israel here spoken of, but the servant of the Lord, and if so we have a new idea here about the servant of the Lord which I don't recall having seen in any previous place in these chapters, if any of you do I wish you would call my attention to it. But I don't recall any previous place in these chapters where anything similar is spoken of. It is, this that the servant of the Lord, not that Israel is going to suffer, and the servant of the Lord is going to deliver Israel and be a light to the Gentiles, but here we have the servant of the Lord Himself going through suffering. It is a new idea suggested here, I believe. As I say, I'd like to reread the chapters from 40 to 49 with this one thought in mind, ~~is~~ is there any previous hint of it? But I don't recall it, if you see any, I wish you'd call my attention to it. And then in verse 7 surely it is still the servant speaking, for the Lord ~~he~~ will help me, therefore will I not be confounded, therefore have I set my face like a flint, and I know that I shall not be ashamed. He is near that justifieth. (12 3/4)

I believe it's the which
 could ~~mean~~ make righteous, but this we have various ^{indications} ~~implications~~ that it means not to make
 righteous but to ~~de~~clare righteousness. Who is he that will vindicate, that will declare me
 righteous? Yes, very good. It means to ~~de~~clare righteous, to justify, in the theological
 sense of justification. He is near that justifies, who will content with me? let us stand

g together, who is mine adversary? let him come near to me. Behold, the Lord God
 will help me, who is he that shall condemn me? lo, they all shall wax old as a garment,
 the moth shall eat them up. Who is among you that feareth the Lord, that obeyeth the voice
 of his servant, here we have the servant very definitely, don't we? that obeys the voice
 of the servant, the servant is brought in again, we've just been talking about the servant.
 Who is he among you that obeys the voice of the servant, that walks in darkness and has no
 light, and then, ll a rebuke, which is hardly a rebuke to Gentiles, a rebuke to Israel, at
 least to the ungodly of ~~Y~~ Israel, (14) hardly consistent
 with their truly saying I was not rebellious, and it fits with the idea that we have a passage
 here in which the servant again speaks...

...Mr. Grauley, you have a question?

But isn't that interesting , how we have that in verse 10 ? Who is among you that feareth the Lord, that obeys the voice of his servant. Here is the servant brought ~~In~~. Verse 4, the servant starts with his having the tongue of the ~~Lord~~ learned. ~~In~~ 10, who is among you that obeys the voice of his servant. The servant is able to speak the word, he gives the word in season to him that is weary, but who is he among ye that obeys the voice of his servant? This ye shall have of mind hand, ye shall lie down in sorrow. You who won't obey the voice of the servant, but instead, verse 11, would kindle a fire and compass yourselves with sparks, walk in the light of your ~~fire~~, and in the sparks ye have kindled. You who refuse to believe in God, refuse to accept His word, refuse to take the word of ~~His~~ servant , you think your human wisdom is sufficient to explain everything, to solve the mysteries of the universe, to tell you how you ~~should~~ ^{should} live, walk in the might of your fire and the sparks you've kindled. What's the result going to be? This shall ye have of my hand, ye shall lie down in sorrow. That is word that is true of Gentiles, and of Jews today. You take our American people, the bulk of at least our intellectual leadership, and it is going on in human wisdom alone, it is what we think, what we've planned, how clever we are, that is going to determine our survival~~d~~ and our success, and there's no thought of actually obeying the voice of the Lord, or listening to the word of His servant. There's no thought of it, in most of our leaders. And you take Israel today, and Ben Gurion they say is a (2 1/4) the leader of the nation of Israel today, but he is definitely a (2 1/2) He made a speech in Israel not long ago in which he said that he believed that the exodus from Egypt was a group of 600 people. It says 600,000 footmen, or 6 00,000 men of war, in the Pentateuch, he says there's just a slight ~~d~~ exaggeration there, 600 people, and the Orthodox Jews demanded a vote of no -confidence in the Prime Minister, in the Kenesset, and so they took a vote and I ~~took~~ ^{think} he got 9/10~~s~~ of the vote of confidence in him, despite the fact of his uttered unbelief in

50:11 the clear statements of the Scripture. Well, Isaiah says here ye that kindle a fire, comfort yourselves in the sparks. Ben Gution is a brilliant man, he is a high quality man as far as I know, he is a man who is working for the welfare of Israel, for the good of his people, he is trying to do what will make them comfortable and happy, he is ~~doing~~ it in his human wisdom, his human understanding, his human plans. The Bible is a wonderful book of Israelite culture, and fine helpful maxims, but as far as the word of God must be obeyed, that is (3 1/2) far from his thoughts, and it is to the leadership of most of our Gentile nations today. So this statement here could be very well expressed, verse 11, in our own day, this would make a wonderful text for a sermon sometime. Behold, all ye that kindle a fire, that compass yourselves about with sparks, walk in the light of your fire and in the sparks that ye have kindled. You're not those, you are those described in verse 10 who walk in darkness and have no light. You're trying to get a light by your own human efforts, this ye shall have ~~of~~ of my hand, ye shall lie down in sorrow. And so we have a wonderful picture here of the servant of the Lord, and the faith of those who are not attempting to, who do not follow Him, but we have our first suggestion, that the servant of the Lord, the one whom we are ~~first~~ told of in chapter 42, goes forward steadily and calmly and without fear, effectively, to be a light to the Gentiles, to bring judgment to the ends of the earth, He is going to suffer, He is going to be subject to spitting and shame, but there's a suggestion that it is a voluntary thing on His part, I gave my back to the smiters, I hid not my face from shame and spitting. It is a little suggestion thrown in here which for the first (5 1/4) of Isaiah must be very different. Just what does it mean? Well, the Lord often does that, He begins to give hints of an idea, He begins to give a suggestion, and then He enlarges on it and develops it and eventually makes it clear. Yes, Mr. Ruble? (student. 5 1/2)

...therefore will I not be confounded as the Lord went up to Jerusalem, He set His face as a flint to go, He knew that He was going to face misery and death, and

humiliation, He went up, people advised Him not to go, they warned Him against it, knew there was terrible danger for Him. But He told them that He would suffer many things, of the Scribes and Pharisees, that He would be killed and would rise again on the third day. He knew as He went up to Jerusalem, He knew that He faced, that the terrible death was ahead but also the resurrection. He knew that the Lord was with Him, He knew that He was God Himself, He knew that His victory was certain, He knew that after the cross came the Resurrection, and the Ascension, He knew all this, and He set His face as a flint, ~~no one~~ knowing that the Lord would help Him, and that the victory was assured. So, I don't think it's jumping back and forth, but it's as He starts the process, seeing the ultimate goal as well as the misery that comes before it. (student. 6 1/2)

Yes, very good. He submitted to the humiliation, knowing that He would not be confounded, that there was no permanent end, therefore I have set my face as a flint, He is near that justifieth me (7) or that vindicates me. Who will contend with me? I think justify is better than vindicate, if you understand what justify means. Justify means to show that one is right, and of course we should know what it means, I'm not sure everybody would. Vindicate, everybody would know what it means. It's not quite as exact as justify, but it's perhaps slightly clearer to the average person, I don't know. But that's a problem in ~~the~~ translation, sometimes, Here's a word that exactly fits the idea, but it's not quite as widely understood, and here's another that isn't quite as exact, but that would be more vivid, and people would get more readily. And you have to pick between them. Well, this is a tremendous passage in verse 30, chapter 50, here. Actually I think that chapter 50 should start at verse 14 of 49 and run through verse 3 of 50 here. And there should be 51. But from verse 4 on I'd say it's a tremendous passage, and ~~actually~~ it's not much understood in context. Some people know individual verses, but to know them in context, have any reason to feel they are descriptions of the servant of the Lord, not simply descriptions of Israel, I don't think there are many people who have an understanding, (8 1/4)

the book as a whole. Like Shakespeare, it's wonderful to have a nice quotation from Shakespeare, but most of them mean a hundred times as much when you have the whole passage and know the context. And it is infinitely true of the Bible. You want to know your context for individual verses don't mean so much. They mean a lot but they mean much more if you have your context.

Well I was thinking that chapter 51 was all about Israel and now I just happened to glance down at verse 5, My righteousness is near; my salvation is gone forth, and mine arms shall judge the people; the isles shall wait upon me, and on mine arm shall they trust. Now of course that may simply mean the triune God, but it certainly has some parallel to some of our statements about the servant. It's very close to some of these statements in chapter 42, that's very interesting. But I don't think we have any section of 51 that is quite as, you might say, as definitely raises this servant thought, as this very interesting part of chapter 51. (9 1/2)

(10 1/4) ...righteousness definitely means not simply holiness or justice as an abstract quality but it may mean the establishment of success for this (10 1/2)

When you say that righteousness is established, you don't mean merely that somebody has an idea in his head, but you mean that he makes an actuality, and therefore there are a number of cases in the Bible that righteousness or the idea of making righteousness is translated to justify, to show righteousness, to indicate. Now there are a number of cases where the RSV renders that verse as vindicate, and I think that's a very good rendition of it, to vindicate, is to show that he was right, isn't it? To win out in some way thereby showing that you were right. That is vindication, and consequently in certain cases vindication is a very good translation of righteousness, but to go a step further and say ^{if} ~~that~~ you are vindicated it means that you win, it means you have victory, and therefore if you have victory, this word righteousness you might as well translate it as victory, why that is something outside of the meaning of it altogether. Establishment of righteous-

ness may require victory to do it, but when you take it as definite victory you drop the idea of righteousness altogether. Vindication means victory to establish righteousness, but just to translate it ~~the~~ victory, it is a development of thought which might conceivably occur. ~~we're~~ Words do develop in all sorts of ways. But to assume that such a development has occurred, one should have proof.

There ~~are~~ a number of verses which make it absolutely clear that the word righteous, may mean not merely an abstract quality but making this quality effective, and therefore vindication, justifying, succeeding in declaring outright, is a definite idea which the word represents in many cases. But to go beyond that and say triumphant without implying at all whether one is triumphant in establish^{ing} righteousness or triumphant in establish^{ing} wickedness, or just triumphant in getting himself in without any reference to righteousness or wickedness, is something which the words could develop to, conceivably, but it would be a rather unnatural development, and therefore we would need ~~so~~ me proof.

Now this word is used hundreds of times in the Bible, and you can easily get them all out of Young's concordance, and it's not a big job then to look at the instances in Young and you'll find there that the translation in, I would say, 95% of the cases, they translate it--or I guess 98%--~~it~~ either righteous, upright, just, or maybe to vindicate, or vindication, or righteousness, occasionally that. But the idea of victorious, or victory, or triumphant, I don't believe you would find more than 2 or 3 % at the most of cases where (13 1/2)

And that would certainly be not enough to prove the word has developed that way, and also it would leave us entirely arbitrary to decide on which cases it would mean that, and consequently for them in this case here, and in that case in Zachariah, and possibly more, to translate it as victory is utterly unwarranted,

And of course having salvation...

...so that they take a passage in Zechariah which describes a king who represents righteousness and holiness and bring salvation and they make it simply one who is victorious and triumphant which would fit any king whether good or bad. And that is utterly unwarranted to get that idea out of the Messianic prediction of Christ, if there is anything about having salvation or receiving holiness, when that is what those words mean in hundreds of other cases. To me it just simply shows their bias about (3/4)

Now our present passage about Cyrus might be advanced as a warrant for the rendering in Zachariah, because in this case we have no reason to think of Cyrus as a righteous man. We have no reason to think that he knew anything about the Lord, that he worshipped the Lord, that he served the Lord, he is conquering all these nations, but we have no reason to think that he was doing it for any other purpose except for his own advantage. And therefore if that's the case, why should he be called a righteous man? But the fact is, the Hebrew doesn't call him the righteous man. The Hebrew says that the Lord brings righteousness from the east, if you take it as (1 1/2)

412
And why should not Cyrus' conquests of the areas which had been taken by the ruthless Assyrian destroyers, be considered as a coming of righteousness and ~~overflow~~ overthrow of course of these wicked aggressors that held the people in sub~~je~~ction. It could be spoken of as bringing righteousness from the east in a very reasonable way, though to me the Septuagint makes much better sense to take it literally, than the King James which inserts the word man. Man of righteousness, you can take as a righteous man, but there's no word man in the Septuagint. So that the Septuagint ~~w~~ seems to me to mean literally what it says. Who is Christ? Righteousness. ~~He~~ Raise up righteousness from the east, all these nations are frightened to death, Cyrus is coming. The Lord said He has brought him but he not only says that, He says I have brought something which is an improvement, which increases justice, which does away with many wrongs, it's a bringing of righteousness, without necessarily saying anything about the specific (2 3/4) of the man

who is to come.

Now Addison Alexander makes ~~this break~~ after the words ~~from the~~ "from the east." And he translates it "who has raised up from the east? Righteousness shall call him to its foot." Now that is perfectly possible, to make the break after "from the east" except that it leaves it sort of hanging in the air. Who is raised up from the east. ~~Who~~ Raised what up from the east? It would seem to imply an object there. Then he goes on, "righteousness shall call him to its foot." And of course that is making righteousness, this abstract thing, a subject. What a sentence. Righteousness shall call him to its foot. That could easily occur in English poetry, but it doesn't seem to me that it is particularly common in Hebrew. Righteousness shall call him to its foot. Doesn't quite fit with general Hebrew usage, to use an abstract quality that way to personify. It does occur but not much in this sort of passage. Yes, Mr. Ruble? (student.4)

...RSV does the same thing there. It takes ~~it~~ the last part as a relative clause, without being introduced by the relative word (4 1/4) So it takes it, who has raised up from the east, well raised up what from the east, well raised up, in this clause, the one whom (4 1/2) calls him to its foot. Or meets him, the word could mean call or meet, the one whom meets him at its foot. And so they take tsedeg here, instead of righteousness, meaning Cyrus, they take it victory to mean Cyrus, they think of that as a more natural idea and it is a more natural idea, but it's not what the Hebrew says. But aside from their translating the word tsedeg in a way which I think is quite unjustified, the construction they get is just the same one (5) constructed. He takes it as a relative clause, who is raised up from the east? The one whom righteousness or victory they say meets at his foot. The King James says, who has raised up the righteous man from the east? He calls him to his foot. Which makes it (5 1/4)

Mr. Deshpande?

...If you supply a noun, who raised up a righteous man from the east, that makes

a very natural idea, who stirred up this man Cyrus to come. If you take--but the word man isn't there. Now you take tsedeg as a quality and you have a certain amount of personification there in any event. Now who has raised up righteousness from the east, if you take that as meaning who has brought it about, that a change is coming, so that conditions are being made better, it's coming from the east, who raised up righteousness from the east, that is not an altogether natural way to take it. Most commentators do not take it that way. But it seems to me it's an altogether possible way. If you take it as --righteous with the next part, as Alexander does here--righteousness calls him to his feet. Righteousness meets him, that seems to (6 1/2)

And there are difficulties with all of them but my own inclination is presently toward the Septuagint. Who has raised up righteousness from the east, he calls him to his foot (6 3/4)
the King James says calls him to his foot.

Rather than make it a relative clause with no relative word to indicate it's a relative clause, that is possible but rather unlikely. Mr. Grauley? (student.7)

...to see where there are various possibilities of interpretation. Now if the order of the words were a little different here in the Hebrew, some of these could be completely ruled out. You see why it seems to me the (7 1/4) does not fit with the active form. With the passive form it fits very --a very good interpretation of it. But the one thing it seems to me we cannot do is to take the word righteousness and translate it as victory. It seems to me that is utterly unwarranted. But in this particular passage it certainly would make it much easier to make sense out of. If you took it as victory. Victory from a situation. Victory meets him at his feet. That would be very sensible in describing this tremendous onrush of Cyrus' army. But I just don't think they are justified in giving that meaning.

Well, shall we look ahead then to the next place we were going to look at, which was chapter 50, 51, 52.

Looking on now to chapter 50 and 51, Mr. Deshpande, what would you ~~say~~ is the first most vital turning point in chapter 50?

...at 50 we have this great section of the chapter that is very definitely dealing with the servant. Now you start 51 and Mr. Deshpande, who do you think is speaking in the first verse of 51.

51:1
 ...servant continues to speak into 51. Whether it is simply the ~~triumph~~ God might be difficult to say. But at least we have here God speaking. I don't think we have the prophet speaking. Hearken to me, you that follow the Lord, look to Abraham your father, for I call him alone and bless him and increase him, end of verse 2, that could be the prophet, too, could it. That's verse 2 has got to be the Lord, whether it be the servant or whether it be the Son of God, it's got to be the Lord speaking, because He called Abraham, it wasn't the prophet who called Abraham, and it would seem likely to me that verse 1 is the same speaker as verse 2. And then in verse 3 of course it speaks in the third person about the Lord, which we find often anyway. But verse 4, my people, my nation, a law will proceed from me and I will make my judgment to rest for a light ~~of~~ the people. Now that could be the servant, or it could be God. But I wouldn't think the prophet.

51:5
 Here we have then a wonderful promise don't we? In these verses, a wonderful promise of God's righteousness, God's justice going out to the ~~very~~ ends of the earth. Now it's interesting here, that verse 5 starts, my righteousness is near, my salvation ~~is~~ gone forth, and then we have in the words, we look at Zechariah 9:9, he is just, there's your righteousness, and having salvation. It's an interesting parallel to this verse, isn't it? Just and having ~~salvation~~. My righteousness is near, my ~~salvation~~ is gone forth. I don't think the RSV translates it my triumph is near, my victory is gone forth. There certainly would be no warrant for it. But it does mean not just an idea, righteousness, it means the establishment of righteousness. And, do you notice any common phrase that occurs more than once in this chapter? Anybody notice anything like that? Mr. Grauley? (Hearken unto me.)

Yes, hearken unto me in the first verse and where else? 4th, and the 7th. That would suggest, would it not, that we have a poem there? Hearken to me, verse 1, hearken to me ye that follow righteousness. Verse 4, hearken to me, my people. Verse 7, hearken to me, he that know righteousness. There would seem to be a poem there, with three stanzas all starting with the word hearken, wouldn't there? Well do we have anything else like that? Yes where do you have that, Mr. Deshpande? 9 and 17, is that the last place you have it? No more? (oh, 52:1.) Yes, well now here we have a poem, hearken to me, verse 1, hearken to me, verse 4; hearken to me, verse 7. You have three stanzas with more or less the same length. Then you have awake, awake, put on strength, ~~O-Zion~~ O arm of the Lord, verse 9. In verse 17, awake, awake, stand up, O Jerusalem. And in 52:1 awake, awake, put on thy strength, O ~~God~~ Zion. See how strikingly parallel 52:1 is to 51:9. So it would seem likely that you have a poem here also, with three stanzas. And that the chapter division would have been better if the three stanzas had been put together. Maybe if there had been a chapter division between ~~88-a~~ 8 and 9 so as to have the three hearkens in one and then to have the three awakes in one chapter. Yes? (student. 13)

No. The--Campbell Morgan, a very famous English expositor of the last generation, I heard say once in a talk that he felt that 9 times out of 10 the chapter divisions in the Bible were wrong. I think that's much too extreme. But I do think that in many cases they are wrong, that in many cases they are very confusing, though there are many cases where they are absolutely right. I don't think they are anywhere near as wrong as that. My guess would be two-thirds of them are pretty well placed. But there are quite a few of them that are very bad. But I would be very much against with any tampering with the chapter divisions. Because the chapter divisions are so convenient for finding § places. Such a wonderful convenience that we can give a reference and anybody can find the verse that wants. And to confuse that I think would be very unfortunate. I think it would be much wise to try to get people to understand that they're only matters of convenience for finding places and

not logarithmic thought. And I always like to start reading before the beginning of a chapter into the chapter following, to be sure that I haven't missed a vital concept chapter division (14 1/2)

GRAI like a new chapter ~~has~~ division would be foolish I think. There are many cases are ~~not~~ right, there are many cases where these are wrong, and many cases ~~where~~ (14 1/4)

That is to say, look at Hebrews. Nearly every chapter in the early part of Hebrews starts with a wherefore. What does the wherefore mean? It means review what we've just been saying. Why the chapter divisions then? It is the conclusion of what has been said, but it's the beginning of what follows. And the chapter divisions in Hebrews might all be moved forward a little bit. But I'm not sure that ...

Isa. 47. (1/4)

...we have these poems here, and these poems deal with God's faithfulness, God's faithfulness in the present, God's faithfulness in the past, how much of--did you find much of rebuke in these chapters? Mr. Deshpande, did you find much in chapter 51 of rebuke? In 50 the last verse is strongly rebuke. And the chapters before that we have a very considerable amount of rebuke, but in 51 there seems to be very little of rebuke. There is more comfort, it's encouraging to one who is in very bad condition, ^{verse} ~~page~~ 17
O Jerusalem, which hast drunk at the hand of the Lord the cup of his fury; thou hast drunken the dregs of the ~~cup~~ of trembling, and wringing them out. There is none to guide her among all the sons whom she hath brought forth. A terrible picture of misery into which they had fallen. But the answer is the Lord is going to take away the cup from them and give it to those that are oppressing them. It is vindication, it is release, it is comfort, it is deliverance. But there is a tremendous amount of deliverance in this chapter. And that's one then of the big thoughts in this chapter, is deliverance. Do you notice any other of our

primary themes in this chapter, Mr. Ruble?

The power of the Lord is very definitely in this chapter. How can they know that God will deliver them this way. Well, He stresses His power. Look at verse 6, tremendous stress on the power of God. Look at verse 9, what the arm of the Lord has done in the past, 9 and 10, looking back to the victory over Egypt and the μ leading the people through the Red Sea. Look at verse 13 with the great stress on God's power, He stretched forth the heavens and laid the foundation of the earth. There is not such a tremendous large part of this chapter but there is tremendous stress in this chapter on the power of God. God will deliver and is powerful and He is able to do it. It would be worthwhile to go through the chapter and look at the specific predictions and see just where they are fulfilled, the specific predictions of deliverance. Let's look on at 52 now. The beginning of 52.

It's still dealing with the ~~w~~xile, isn't it? Shake thyself from the dust, arise, O Jerusalem, loose from the bands of thy neck, Thus saith the LORD, Ye have sold yourselves for nought, and ye shall be redeemed without money. My people went down to Egypt to sojourn there and the Assyrian oppressed them without cause, now the Lord is going to deliver them. Surely the stress is on the deliverance from Babylon there.

And then in verse 9 we have Jerusalem which has been destroyed is going to be delivered. Break forth into joy, sing together ye waste places of Jerusalem, for the Lord has comforted his people, he has redeemed Jerusalem. And then verse 11 and 12, what is promised in those verses, Mr. Ruble, what is promised there?

Deliverance from what, deliverance from the exile, isn't it, Babylonian exile. Go ye out from them, from where, go out of the midst of her, be clean, that bear the vessels of the Lord. Would not that be a reference to Cyrus giving them the vessels, something to take back to Jerusalem with them, to rebuild the temple? Ye that bear the vessels of the Lord, I notice one commentator takes it, the armor bearers of the Lord.

But this word vessel, it can mean, it's implements of any kind, it can mean armor, it can mean agricultural implements, it can mean the cups from the temple, it doesn't necessarily mean the temple vessels, but certainly in the context that seems a very natural way to take it. In fact I would think the best. Did you notice what the RSV does with that, Mr. Haffly?

...a case of their trying to get away from ~~our~~ archaic language, that word vessel is certainly archaic. You go to the ordinary person on the street and you say to him, would you like to carry some vessels for me? What would he say? He'd say, "How could I carry a vessel. I would expect the vessel to carry me." ~~That's what~~ Vessel in modern English means a ship and I don't think it's ever used for anything else. And I'm a little surprised the RSV uses ~~it~~ here because it's so utterly outdated. We never use it except for ship, that I know of, do you? Or are there some things we do occasionally call a vessel? Is there a gravy--no, it's a gravy ^{boat} ~~bowl~~, not a vessel. It's about the same thing, isn't it, the gravy boat? That is a common expression, a gravy boat for the pitcher that has gravy in it. We have a few uses, expressions, like that, conveying that idea, but I doubt if many people today, aside from reading the Bible, would think that vessel was anything but a boat. But the Hebrew word (6 1/2) translated vessel is a pretty hard word, noun, to translate, because it is a broader noun than anything I know of in English. It can be called a utensil, perhaps, but it's more than a utensil. Utensil wouldn't include cup, would it? This includes cup, dishes, ~~includes~~ hoes, rakes, agricultural implements, includes various pieces of armor, almost any movable equipment. Small, comparatively small things, movable equipment are called (7 1/4) and this word vessel has come to convey that idea to some extent. I don't how many people have any clear idea what vessel means. Mr. Deshpande? (student, 7 1/4)

...I hadn't thought of that before. The tying up with the carrying of the vessels

(7 1/2)

fit with these being the vessels of the Temple, very definitely. Rather than it being armor or something like that. Fits very definitely with it. Yes? (student. 7 3/4)

...I don't like that word spiritualize, because the word spiritualize is used in many cases where to me it means taking literal description and changing it into mere description of qualities or something like that. That is, it is making language figurative far beyond the original understanding. The original intention. The way spiritualize is usually used, I'm very much against spiritualization of prophecy, understanding it that way. What you speak of here, is taking something as figurative, and of course it conveys a spiritual sense, but you notice in verse 20, he says in a great house, there are not only vessels of gold, silver, but also wood and earth. If a man also purge himself from these, he shall be a vessel to honor, sanctified and meet for the Master's use. He is using the various things in the temple as figures for the people who are part of the temple of God. The use of figurative language, and a very proper use, but it is very proper to do that with anything, but I just don't like the word spiritualize because of the way it is often used today. Yes? (student 9) No, this one in 2 Tim. 2: 20, 21 here is a figurative language, but when he speaks of presenting his vessel, if I recall correctly, he is there speaking of a portion of the ~~Body~~ body, and the portion of the body which is like an instrument in that it has a definite purpose, it is useful, yes as a hoe and a rake, or a spear, anything like that, is a useful utensil for the accomplishment of something. He is speaking of the part of the body in that way and speaking of a person's responsibility to see that he is clean and is used only for the purpose for which God intended him. So that there, I think that whether it is somewhat figurative, using that word for a part of the body, or whether it's become a common usage (10) I couldn't say, but I think in the context it is quite clear that that is what is meant. I don't think it's (10 1/4)

In this case he is comparing a whole person to a vessel in the temple. One portion of the equipment of the temple, one of the movable things connected with the

Temple. Well, here then, this verse 11 and 12, seem to me quite clearly tie up with the Babylonian captivity. They ~~are~~ not speaking of just a general command of some sort, they are specifically pointing out that the captivity is coming to its end, that God is bringing to pass His wonderful promises, they are definitely going to go forth with God's blessing and mercy upon them. And so up to verse 12 here, from the beginning of 51, we have a section which is largely devoted to the Lord's declaration of promises of deliverance to His people, some of which are of the general type, and could look forward to their whole future of Israel, but most of which relate specifically to the Babylonian captivity. And which end, I believe the chapter ends in verse 12, we have a new chapter begin, a new vital section begin now, with verse 13. So this section deserves a good bit more study than we have yet given it. A good bit more discussion, I mean. Chapter 51 and 52. It's a very interesting section but not one of the most important sections in our part of Isaiah.

After the great section that dealt with the release from the Babylonian captivity then we have come on to get the individuality of the servant better in mind, clearly brought out in 49, and the thought suggested in 50 that the servant is going to suffer, somewhat as Israel has suffered. That's brought clearly out in 50. The servant is going to do the work that Israel was raised up in order that it be done. Israel cannot do the work, Israel ~~is~~ is weak, Israel is in bonds, Israel is in captivity, Israel needs help itself, and the work ~~of~~ of the servant, who is of Israel and represents Israel, must be done not only for the Gentiles in distant lands, but also Israel must be benefited by the ~~the~~ work of the servant. Because though Israel is raised up for the servant, regarding the servant, yet Israel ~~is~~ ^{is} itself (12 3/4)

And the work of the servant has been not much connected up specifically with the matter of sin, though it has been touched on, the thought of sin (13) occasionally they're in exile on account of their sin, their sinfulness, their wickedness, the thought has been gradually been brought out, that though God is going to deliver them from exile, if

000582

freedom. Well now that is hardly an analogy in our present world, but it was a familiar thought in ancient times, and so can be used for a figure in this verse. An interesting verse, we repeat it glibly often without stopping to think what it means. When we get into it we find we need the background of the ancient custom in order to understand what it does mean, and yet that it points to a great truth, that sin cannot be taken care of without some very serious measures, you can't simply pay for it, you can't hire somebody to do your religion for you. Some people think they hire the minister, that he is supposed to do the Christian work for them, he does the praying for them, he does the Christian work for them, he does the witnessing for them, he does the singing for them, he is to do ^{all} the things of Christianity for them, the trouble is they don't expect him to go to heaven for them when they die. Yes, Mr. Oliver? (10 1/4) Of course, that is a little aside from our present point, but we are in a world of sin, and such a thing as complete righteousness is impossible, you have to get the best way of dealing with a situation that you can find. You cannot take principles of absolute rightness and carry them through --according to absolute rightness, if a person contracts a debt, he should have to pay for it. Ridiculous to excuse him for that which he has taken, and he has borrowed and used it and spent it, and it's gone, he should have to pay for it in some way, but in a world of sin the only way he can pay for it is by bringing something in that is worse than the breaking of that. That is, introducing conditions like you had in England, a hundred years ago, where you had the debtors' prison, people put in prison for payment of debt, where they were no good to themselves or their family, or anybody else, and you had a situation which something had to be done about, and we have many people in our country who have done very dishonestly by going through bankruptcy and getting rid of their debts and then going out and starting over again and making new debts. And it is very much to the credit of Sir Walter Scott that when the banking, publishing house failed which he was a silent partner and he hadn't bothered much with the direction, having confidence in the others and then they went terrifically into debt so that when

there was a debt of half a million dollars and he could have said well, I didn't contract it, I had nothing to do with it, and I'm sorry but the firm has gone bankrupt and it 's a shame. He had invested in the firm, he was a silent partner , he had an obligation to know what they were doing and keep track, though he just put confidence in them and didn't know, he said I'm going to do my best to pay that off, and he worked himself to death trying to pay it off, worked night and day, and finally when he had an illusion that everything was paid off and he was happy^{just} to relax a few months before his death. People just let him go on in that illusion , but within a very few months after his death, the return from his books had been sufficient to pay it all off, the half a million dollars, he ~~paid~~ off , but he wrote night and day, worked feverishly, and did everything possible to do it, and everybody I think praises Scott for his carrying out a moral principle where he was not legally obligated. I think when he ~~paid~~ paid off maybe a third of ~~the~~ sum, his creditors had a meeting and expressed their great gratitude to Scott for what he was doing, and ~~put~~ ^{they took} his home and gave it back to him, it had been taken for the debt, and everything, but they ~~gave~~ them back to him, those things, and showed their great gratitude but of course they let him go on and pay off the rest of it and eventually it was all paid off, But we don't require a man to do that, we permit a person to declare himself bankrupt, and to pay off ten cents on the dollar (13 1/4)

and start over ~~again~~, it is the only way you can do in a wicked world. The way to do is to try to build up in people principles of honesty so they won't go into debt in the first place, beyond what they can pay off. Mr. Cohen? (13 1/.2) ...look into sidelines that ~~have~~ are of interest that have some relation to what we're doing, but if the relationship is not great, we can't spend much time on it, we must move forward, but our main consideration, which is, the Lord says, something more than a money payment is necessary if you're going to be redeemed, He says there is something more necessary but that God can and will provide it. He doesn't say yet how. So in verse 4, thus saith the Lord God, My people went down aforetime into Egypt to sojourn there; and the

Assyrian oppressed them without a cause. Now they went to Egypt, they went there voluntarily, they went there to sojourn there, and then they got into the captivity and the difficulty there. They got something for it, they got help through the famine, they got all that, but the Assyrian oppressed them ~~wi~~without a cause, they simply marched in to where they were and took them over. So that he says, though God sent the Assyrian, God used them to punish them, nevertheless the people are in a ~~situation~~ ~~w~~ here where they are God's people and God is going to deliver them. So he says, therefore, what have I here, saith the Lord...

C.58. (1/2)

...that my people is taken away for nought? The ones that are ruling over them are putting them in misery, making them so they just howl with misery, says the Lord, and my name continually every day is blasphemed. His name, people say, what is that God of Israel, what can He do, His people are captive, they are subject to the Babylonians, their God couldn't deliver them. My name continually every day is blasphemed. Therefore, He says, my people shall know my name. The day is coming, He says, when they will know that I am He that does speak. Behold it is I. They are going to see as a result of what I do, how great my power actually is. And so in verse 7, you have the cry of joy ~~in~~view of what God is going to do. Is this in view simply of His delivery from the captivity, or is in view of the whole promise of redemption that He has made? How beautiful on the mountains are the feet of him that brings good tidings--the Hebrew word of one word is translated by three words: bring good tidings. It is a word that means to declare abroad wonderful news, very good news. It is the very word which is used in the Syriac for the Gospel (1 3/4) ...that brings good tidings, that publishes peace. And of course, peace in the Hebrew doesn't just mean end of war, it means well-being, it means that which is wholesome all around, --that brings great tidings of good, that publishes salvation, that says to Zion, thy God reigns, thy God has taken possession, He is adopting the power. The form there is the Hebrew

perfect, your God has _____ and the word _____ we generally take as
 reign, actually means, "to begin to reign." To take over the power. It is used regularly
 in Kings whenever a king becomes king, it says and he reigned, _____ means he
 began to reign, and he was so-and-so old when he reigned and he reigned for so-and-so
 many years, and so on. But the word means to take over power. So this is not simply
 that says to Zion, your God is the one who controls the universe, we've had that stressed
 greatly, but here it is, that says to Zion, your king is taking over possession, He is
 going to take over the kingship over the whole world and He wants to take over the
 kingship of our hearts now. He wants to take complete possession as king, the one
 that says to Zion, your God has taken his rightful position as king. Thy watchmen
 shall lift up the voice, with the voice together shall they sing, for they shall see eye
 upon eye, when the Lord shall bring again Zion. The watchmen all rejoicing over the
 same thing that they see together, they see the great victory when the Lord brings again
 Zion. Break forth into joy, sing together, again the stress on the waste places, you
 notice, not much specifically here about return or deliverance, but upon the rebuilding ←
 the waste places of Jerusalem, for the Lord has comforted His people, He has redeemed
 Jerusalem, the Lord has made bare His holy arm, in the eyes of all the nations, all the
 ends of the earth, that see the salvation of our God, so up till here, in this ^{fifty-}~~busy~~ second
 chapter, the Lord has been declaring what He has done in principle. He, in principle,
 has established Himself as king, He in principle has declared that Jerusalem is to be
 rebuilt, He has made bare His holy arm in the eyes of all the nations, in bringing Cyrus
 to overcome the power of the Babylonians, ^{and to} ~~that~~ make it possible for them to be released
 therefore, in verse 11 and 12, He calls upon them to take advantage of the situation which
 He has created. Depart ye, depart ye, go ye out from ~~at~~ thence, touch nothing unclean,
 go ye out of the midst of her, be ye clean that bear the vessels of the Lord. Though He
 tells the people to go back from exile, actually there was a comparatively small number
 that went back, though it was quite a sizeable group, there were many who stayed.

But they are called upon here, to take advantage of the situation, to leave Babylon, to return, you that bear the vessels of the Lord, and we read in Ezra, how Cyrus gave the command that the vessels of the Temple should be given to the people, to take back with them to Jerusalem, to ~~re~~ reestablish themselves there, and so they are told to go back, you that bear the vessels of the Lord, be ye clean, they are to remember, in the midst of their deliverance, that God is holy. And you won't go with haste, or by flight, it won't be a thing that you work out with some clever scheming, or some rapid running, this is something that God is going to provide in such a way that there is no question of your ability to carry it through. You won't go with haste or by flight for the Lord God will go before you. And here we have the picture of the vanguard, the Lord goes before and opens the way, and then you have the rearguard, the God of Israel literally is the one gathering up in the back, the one who picks up the stragglers, the one who follows along behind, the Lord is the one who leads ahead, and the Lord is the one who protects in back. He is interested in all parts of--reminds me of the time when we were going out the Grand Canyon to rescue those flyers, when we got into the jeep, and we started in at the head of the procession, and here was the jeep and then behind were all these other cars, and then the major simply had his jeep turn and go off the road, across the country, and headed back and we got to the rear and looked to see how things were going there, and gathered things up and made sure things were going fine, and then we shot ahead to the side, and got up to the front again. He was doing his best to keep the whole line, there were about 30 cars, moving right, and all together, and so on. Of course, the Lord can do it far better than any man could, the Lord says He is interested in every phase of the going, He is interested in the head ones, the ones who do it rapidly, and efficiently, He is leading them, the ones that are stragglers, that are apt to be in difficulty, He is behind. Here is the return from the Babylonian exile, a great climactic statement about it, in verses 11 and 12, but previously we have had many statements that seem to look far beyond the exile, and previously we have had many

statements stressing the fact that the return from exile is not enough unless the sin question is dealt with, and He says be ye clean that bear the vessels of the Lord, and they would think, here we are serving the Lord, doing our best, and yet others still sin, we still have uncleanness among us, we still have that, which if not checked will mean that new exiles are necessary, that God has to send another exile, and another, until the sin question is properly dealt with, and so He follows immediately after that, with His wonderful declaration ^{about} ~~with~~ the way this problem is to be dealt with. Behold, my servant shall be successful, he will be exalted and extolled and be very high. As many were astonished at thee, so was his visage marred more than any man, and his form more than the sons of men. ~~So~~ we get right into our next section here, and I asked you to study into 52 and 53, we'll want to get into that tomorrow. Many were astonished at thee, --is interesting here. Who is the "thee"? ~~What~~ is it dealing with? You might look through the chapter and see if you can find out, but an easier way would be to get the ~~Y~~ RSV. There you read and it says many were astonished at him, and then there is a footnote, "Hebrew, thee." So they have a very nice way of solving the difficulty, they just push it aside and do away with it. Well, I hope we can find a better way than that, but we'll discuss that tomorrow...

(break, starting again at 9) ...during the last hour we had just finished the second main part of our section of the book of Isaiah, and we're starting the third ~~part~~, and the third part is closely bound to the second part. There is a big division here because there is quite a difference of material after this, in general, from what is before. But the two join together very closely. In 52 we reach that great climax of those departing from Babylon, and carrying the vessels of the Lord, and there was a stress laid that God is protecting them, but also that they must be clean, that they should be free from sin, that they should be properly fitted to represent Him, bringing up to mind the whole ~~matter~~ that ~~is~~ is necessary that something be done about this question of sin. *Otherwise a mere physical deliverance means nothing in the end. It will simply*

be more exiles, there has got to be a solution to this major question, the question of sin, so there we start our new section of the book, with verse 13, which certainly should be a chapter division, it belongs very closely with 53, it is ridiculous to have 53 start four verses after the section begins, and yet in a way it's rather nice to have it come right after 12 because it is so tightly bound in a way with what precedes. So that if you're going to have chapter divisions, they should be at 13, but in a way it is nice there isn't any there, you just lead right from one into the other. Here is this situation. Here is deliverance from Babylon, greatly stressed in the first part of the book, a whole chapter given to it, chapter 47, ending the first section.

Second section, touching upon it somewhat, ending with two verses dealing with it, and then we leave deliverance from Babylon behind now, and go on to deal with the two main new thoughts, that have come up in the first section, and developed further in the second section, the work of the servant of the Lord, and the solution of the problem of sin. So now we immediately attack the problem of the work of the servant of the Lord, we've been told he is going to do his work. We have been told that his work is going to be successful, it is going to accomplish the work for which the servant has been called into the work. This is going to be done, and we've been told that it is a work which will affect the whole world, affect the nations as well as affect Israel. We have been told that, and we have been given to understand pretty clearly that He is an individual, that it is not a full nation, but a part of the nation, in fact, just one individual, who is from Israel and represents Israel, doing the work for which Israel was brought into being. But yet who is only one from among Israel, and therefore can be thought of in a way as separate from Israel, as well as thought of as representing Israel. So now we have a long chapter dealing exclusively with his work and how He carries it out. And this work is a work which must solve the problem of sin. So our section starts with verse 13.

Behold my servant shall deal wisely, I don't like this word "prudent" here very well. Of course the KJV is in the Old English, and these words have all of them had slight

changes during the 300 years. Language is always changing. There are many words in English which mean something quite different today from what they meant when I was a boy. Just in those few years, some words have disappeared, new words have come in. Great changes have come in to the meaning of words. When I was a boy, ^{in fact I think even} /20 years ago, the word "terrific" meant bad, today it means good, has completely reversed its meaning, in this length of time. And particularly with words like "prudent" and "wise." What is the difference between them? Well, you probably none of you have ever defined it, but if you stop and think about it a little bit, you would find that you could probably define very exactly what you mean by "prudent" and what you mean by "wise." And when you define exactly what you mean by "prudent," And then you ask yourself is that what they meant when they said "prudent" 300 years ago, you would find it very difficult to know whether they did or not, because the shade of difference between "wise" and "prudent" is such that it would naturally change a bit in the course of time. Even the last 150 years the words "science" and "philosophy" have completely reversed themselves, maybe even in the last 100 years. I wouldn't be surprised. But I know when I was a boy I saw old books often which spoke of natural philosophy, and they were books of geology, chemistry, books of the analyzing and studying of natural things, they were natural philosophy. And Shakespeare speaks about, "there is more in this than your science dreams of," and uses science in the sense of meaning the conception of the universe, the interpretation of things. The word science, actually is Latin, and philosophy is Greek, and they mean just about the same thing otherwise, but we specialize them, we specialize science today into what philosophy meant a hundred years ago. We specialize philosophy today into what science meant a hundred years ago. They have just reversed, so I don't know what exactly "prudent" meant 300 years ago, but I don't think that "prudent" is what this verse means in this context here. ...

...now let's think just a minute or so about this word "prudent." What would you mean by prudent? Apt to mean careful, aren't you? He is very prudent, he saves his money, he doesn't waste, he ~~he~~ makes his resources spread out sufficiently to accomplish what is necessary, he doesn't take on things that he isn't sure he can carry through. That's what you mean by prudent, isn't it? You don't mean by prudent today that a man shows great skill in undertaking great endeavors and carrying them through successfully? You would use some other word for that than prudent. And this word is not translated, I have not looked it up specifically, it is not my impression that it is ever translated prudent in the O. T. except here. Now if it is, not many times. It is often translated "wise." Yes? (stu.1 1/4)...skeptical of that. It is so translated in Joshua 1.8. This book of the Law shall not depart out of thy mouth. But thou shalt meditate therein day and night, so shalt thou, what is it, and have something and have good success. And that is exactly what it is. It is translated as "good success." But in I believe three-fourths--quite a lot of cases--it is translated to be "wise." There are a very few where it is translated "prosperous." And there is that one is the only one I recall where it is translated "to have good success." So it is true that if you follow the Bible, ^{if Joshua} follow ^{ed} the Word of God, and study and meditate on it, ~~you are~~ ^{he is} going to have good success. But I incline to think that the more common meaning of the word would fit better there. That if you, Joshua, are going to solve wisely the problems you face, and do the wise thing in your dealing with each one of them, ~~they~~ way to prepare for that is to meditate on the Bible, seems to me that that fits better, and that is the sense of three-fourths of the cases. Of course, if he does act wisely in it, he will have good success. But the Lord says I will be with you and I will give you success, but this verse is ^{not} saying how the Lord will give you anything, this is saying, you meditate in the Word of God. And I don't think the Lord is saying here, I'm going to give you a reward. You meditate in the word of God, and I will reward you and give you success, I don't think that is what He means. I think He means you meditate in the Word of God and you'll get the truth God wants you

to have, and as a result of that you will act wisely and get the success that comes from that. So my inclination is to think that while the word may refer to the success or the accomplishment or the prosperity that comes as a ~~r~~result of acting wisely, that the emphasis is on the ~~w~~isdom of the action rather than on the result that occurs, and that the word, I don't believe, ever means a success or a prosperity or an effectiveness which comes from causes altogether outside what one does (3 1/2)

You get into a good environment somewhere, you'll be successful. You might say, you have a brother or a sister who goes through a certain school just ahead of you and gets high marks, and you will have good success. Well, that is true, at least for a year. Maybe they ~~catch~~ on to you after that. I had a sister who went to the college I went to, and the first year she got top marks and the ~~next~~ year middle marks, and the third year low marks. And I think she was going ~~on~~my reputation the first year, and it is very easy to do. I had to build a reputation~~y~~. I got much higher marks the second year than ~~I~~ did the first. By my fourth year I wouldn't have had to study, I'd get the marks naturally. Your reputation, you can't get away from it, it has an effect. But I don't think this word is dealing with the effects of suffering, outside of yourself, like the reputation that comes from others, or something like that. It is dealing with what you do. And I think that is very appropriate here, in this ~~particular~~ place. Because here ~~He~~ is not saying, here is my servant, I'm going to ~~give~~ him great blessing. Now that, of course, is all true, but that is not ~~what~~ the message is at this point. The message at this point, is, here is my servant, the servart of the Lord, and He is going to do things and ~~experience~~ things that you would never expect. You (4 3/4) how

the servant of the Lord is going to solve the problems of the world. ~~What~~ do you think He'll do, well, He'll get a big army and go out and conquer the world, and then He'll give some laws and make people follow them. That may be the way you think it will be carried out, but that is not the way that this is ~~going~~ to be carried out, that light is going to be brought to the Gentiles. The ~~judgment~~ is going to be established there, is it?

That He is going to have a great army there, and so on? Well, it is not the first step, at least. The light is going to come, and how is that, that He is going to become a great logician and great philosopher and go around through the Roman Empire and give great lectures that will win people to understand Him? No. He is going to act wisely, and prudent has the advantage over wise, that wise refers to anything that is well thought out, but prudent refers to a wisdom in practical affairs, and this is "act wisely" in the sense of doing the thing in a way that is going to bring results. But I think prudent today has a little more too much the idea of being cautious, and not enough the idea of being wise in the sense of (5 3/4) effective, that is reaching out and doing great things you never dreamed of, but doing them in a way that will accomplish results. I don't think you'd call a man today a prudent man, who had that particular type of ability and accomplishment, and that is the type that is meant here. Now here is the situation, people coming back to Jerusalem, well, they should be clean, but how can they be clean? Well, the servant of the Lord has a task to perform and how is He going to perform this task the way you or I might think wise? No, He is going to act with real wisdom, with divine wisdom, He is going to act with wisdom such that what He does will really accomplish the purpose for which God has brought the servant of the Lord into the world. So we start out then with the assurance of the success of the mission, He will act wisely, but it is an assurance that this success is the result of an action which involves true wisdom, not necessarily the method of doing that you or I might think would be correct. In other words, there is a new revelation, a wonderful new thought ahead, as to how the servant is going to rightly perform the work to which God has called Him. And this new thought has been suggested before but only lightly, it has not been brought out clearly, until now. So now it is introduced with this word, He will act wisely. But then before telling how He is going to act wisely, what He is going to do, He goes on to tell us a little bit of the results of His action. ~~It~~

This servant is going to be successful in accomplishing His work, that is the

meaning of this first line of our new chapter. ~~My~~ ^{My} servant shall deal wisely, and the next three words, they show ~~His~~ success. He will be high, it is the (7 1/2) to be high, exalted// can simply mean occupy a high position. Exalted, literally, in English means to be raised up, and that is not involved in this form of the verse. That would take a Hithphael, or a (7 3/4) and here we have a . So this is just showing the situation, He is high. But then the next word shows action. He is lifted up. He is (8) He is lifted up, and He is very high. is to be high in the sense in which a hill is high. Gibeon is high hill. And so this is, He is like a hill, He is raised up. So these three words, after the word of His dealing wisely, bring out the first idea here, the idea/ that the servant is going to be successful in His work. And this idea is a vital one, it was given us in Isaiah 42 already. There we read how He goes forward calmly, confidently, without fear, without discouragement, and accomplished the work. Here we are told He is going to be successful. But now we want to know how He is going to be successful, how He is going to accomplish His work and we are given the method in brief. These first three sentences, three verses, here, which are separated into another chapter in the English Bible, are in a way, separate from what follows, ~~are in a way~~ ^{in that they} give us a sort of a summary, of the whole teaching of the chapter. He is now going, ~~He~~ is going to be exalted and to be successful, how is He going to do it? Well we are next told how He is going to do it. And there is where the great revelation ^{comes in,} there are certain facts that have been suggested about them before, but it hasn't been brought out that these facts are the way in which he performs His ~~work~~ work. Now, immediately after saying He is going to be successful we have what seems to be the exact opposite. The next verse goes on: as many were astonished at thee--the correct editions of the KJV say, as ~~amazed~~ ^{amazed}. There are unfortunately some publications of the Bible in recent years in which, I don't know whether some publisher intentionally got rid of the Old English word astonished by inserting two letters in it that don't belong in it, or whether a linotyper, not knowing the word "astonied,"

simply looked at it and thought "astonished" and automatically wrote astonished, I don't know which happened, but I have noticed some translations, some copies of the Bible recently, which, instead of saying "astonied" which is the correct KJ, say "astonished." And astonished is quite different from astonied in Old English means our modern English "astounded." As many were astounded at thee. Now, of course, you might say it doesn't matter much what the Old English meant, after all, that's not the vital thing, what the Old English means, the vital thing is what does the Hebrew mean? Well, the Hebrew word is (10 1/2) and the Hebrew word Shamam is translated in the KJV "astonished" a few times. Here it is translated "astonied" but a few times it is rendered astonished. But usually it is rendered to be appalled, to be desolated, to be overwhelmed, to be terrified, something like that. So just (11) desolate, terrified, like that. Well, now here are two cases where it is "astonished," and let's just glance at them. One of them is Lev.26.32. I saw somebody come in the Seminary I hadn't seen for a long time, I didn't know was in this area, I said, my, I'm surprised to see you here. It was a happy surprise, an astonishment perhaps. Our English word "astonish" can be happy or unhappy, but it's usually happy. But this word is never happy. (11 1/2) is never happy. is to be desolate, to be disturbed, to be horrified. And so we find it in Lev.26.32, where it says that I will bring the ~~land~~^{land} into desolation and your enemies which dwell therein shall be astonished at it. Well, your enemies are going to be surprised. You say, my, is this a surprise, look how desolate it is. You don't say that. They are going to be astounded, overwhelmed with terror. It is not our modern word "astonished" at all. Maybe Old English "astonished" carries, I don't know. But certainly not today's "astonished." Yes? (12 1/4) You could say, your enemy will be happy about it but that's not the context, the context here is that the enemy is going to be perfectly astounded to see the terrible desolation of the land, as a result of (12 1/2)

Well, let's not build too much on one case.

Look at Ezek.28.19 where you read about the downfall of Tyre, and verse 19 it says,

All they that know thee among the people shall be astonished at thee, thou shalt be a terror, and never shalt thou be any more. Not that they're just going to be surprised at what happens going to come, something they didn't expect, but that they are going to be overwhelmed with terror at the sight of what happened to Tyre. ~~So~~ There is, I believe, not a single case where you can prove that the emphasis is on a sudden observation of an unexpected thing, there may be unexpectedness in it but the emphasis is on the terror, the desolation, the disturbance. If it is an astonishment, it is an unhappy (13 1/2)

Now of course you can have other ideas, you can say how happy your enemies are going to be, and if it said your enemies will be astonished and they will shout for joy, ~~th~~ I'd say right away that "astonished" in that context means something joyous, but the whole context there, as in all the cases I've looked at is a gloomy one...

C.60. (1/2)

...surprise here in Isaiah, because the verse is: many were astonished at thee, so marred was his visage more than any man. Yes? (3/4) ...evidences of how people say, or a good many recollections of what people say. Now if, my impression of "astounded" is being sort of horrified, terrified, if that is not the impression of the rest of you as to what the word means today, then I would say that's not a good way to say what I conceive "astonied" to have meant 300 years ago. But the Hebrew word (1 1/4)

it is quite evident is desolate, usually, I think in half the cases translated "desolate," made desolate, desolated, overwhelmed with misery, something like that. That's what the Hebrew word means. (stu.1 1/2) Horrified wouldn't be bad at all. They were horrified, many were ~~hor~~rified at thee, it is very clear in the context here, it is not something joyful he is describing. Because His visage was marred *more than any* man and his form more than the sons of men, well you wouldn't be so joyed at that unless you were his deadly enemy. And usually you don't think of it well for a deadly enemy to be pleased at your terrible misfortune. It is a picture of something that horrifies.

Usually will horrify, even if you detest somebody, when you see them have a terrible accident and be in awful misery, you usually feel sorry for them, rather than joyful. But this is the sense of horror that is brought by the marred, corrupted condition of the visage, and of the form. And so, as many were horrified at thee--now the Hebrew (2 1/2) as horrified at thee were many again, so corrupt and marred was his visage. These two you see, as and then so. Well, now this "thee" in here is very strange. As many were horrified at thee. And immediately we ask why does the "thee" get here in the midst of all the rest, and as I mentioned in this class, the RSV solves it very simply, just says, as many were astonished at him, and as a footnote: "Hebrew, thee." And of course if the imagination of the translators of the RSV, what they think makes good sense is the final arbiter, why then it should be "him." But if the Hebrew is the arbiter, it should be what the Hebrew says, "thee." Well, what sense would that make? ~~We have~~ ^{The average} commentary just translates it as it says, many were astonished, or astounded, whatever you want, at thee, so marred was his visage and say this was a description of the terrible suffering of the Lord, who was made, was so affected that he hardly seemed like a man at all. But they don't say anything about it. Well, how are you going to decide what the "thee" means? Well, the best thing is to see what it means in the context. So let's go back to the beginning of 52. Awake, awake, put on thy strength, O Zion. Who does the "thy" refer to? Israel. Put on thy garments, Jerusalem. It refers to Israel, personified in its principal city. ~~Set~~ ^{Shake} thyself in the dust, O Jerusalem, loose thyself from the bands of thy neck, O captive daughter of Zion. Thee, thee, thee, meaning Israel, Israel, Israel. And then of course when we get nearer it is, (4 1/2) is used for the Israelites going out from Babylon. Depart ye, go out from thence, go ye out of the midst of her, ye shall not go out with haste or flight, the Lord will go before you, and so in the context, immediate context, he has been addressing Israel, and ~~this is~~ ^{is it} not reasonable to consider whether the thought

that he is still addressing Israel would make good sense, to take it and apply it to that. Now if that doesn't work, then we look for some other proof, but if it does work, then we have got an answer which is to be accepted unless someone comes in with some mighty good evidence for a different answer, and I don't know of any evidence for any answer except this one. And this one is that it is Israel he is talking to, makes perfect sense here. He has been talking in the previous chapter about the misery of Israel. What condition has Israel been in? Well, it is described in chapters 51 and 52, look at 51.18. Jerusalem has drunk the dregs of the cup of trembling, there is none to guide her among all her sons. Her sons have fainted, they lie at the head of all the streets, they're full of the fury of the Lord. She has the cup of trembling, she is taken into exile, she is conquered by the Babylonians, it looks as if she is ended, she seems to be a nation no more, she is utterly corrupted and marred, as far as her condition is concerned. Well, as many were horrified at thee, so is his visage marred more than any man and his form than the sons of man. We've been talking about Israel in its humiliation and in its suffering. They seem to be no longer a nation, they just lost their identity, scattered among the Babylonians. Well, it seemed as if there was just nothing left for them, they had just reached the end of everything, they were no longer a nation. So is He to be so marred that He will hardly seem like a man, that He will seem to have just reached the end of life, we thought that it was He that would've redeemed Israel. But now they've taken and they've crucified Him and it is just the end. It is a comparison. Israel has suffered, why has Israel suffered? Israel has suffered for her sins. Well, the servant of the Lord is also going to suffer, and to suffer very greatly, but He will suffer not as a punishment for any sins of His own, but in order that He may redeem others from sin. So we have the comparison expressed very clearly with the two "so's." *The (7)*

just as many were astounded at thee, so He shall be marred from a man and His appearance from the sons of men. Well, now this word translated "visage" simply ^{really} is appearance, and form is another form of the word (7 ~~1~~ 2)

appearance, both appearance, you take one here as the face and one as the form, well, that's all right. I don't know as we can be sure. They both mean appearance in general, two aspects of His appearance. Well, the next question is this "min." The preposition "min" is used there, and the preposition min is here translated "more than," or perhaps just "than." Now the word "min" is a preposition of separation. Where did you come from? I came from Babylon. "Min" is the place that you left, it is separation from, away from, is min. Now "from" then can be used in Hebrew to express comparison, this is good from that means that this is good in comparison with, separated from that, You take that thing is good, but in comparison with that, this seems to be good. In other words, it is more good than that. It is separation from that, as to the goodness of this. This is more good than that. So the regular way in Hebrew of expressing comparison is to use an adjective and then say "from" and then the thing that ^{it} is more than, so you can take this as the KJ does, if you want, as a preposition of comparison. He is more marred than a man. The word "any" is not in the Hebrew. He is more marred than a man, and his form marred more than sons of man. Well, is a man marred, per se? He's taller than a man maybe, he is wider than a man, he is brighter than a man. You think of the average brightness ~~of~~ of a man, the average tallness, the average breadth, but when you say He is more marred than a man, how are you more marred than a man, than any man, that is selecting one out of all the men, and there is no word to indicate that it is one, and more than the sons of men. Well, are the sons ~~of~~ of men marred? If you mean, they're marred by sin, yes, they're corrupt by sin, but this is actually expressing misery, and so on. Maybe you could say, men suffered a lot of suffering, as a result of the sin in the world, His is more so, maybe you could say that, but it doesn't impress me as a satisfactory interpretation. It impresses me rather that the "min" here is the "min" of separation in the sense of "away from," ~~so~~ so that He doesn't seem to be one of them at all, He is away from them. His visage is marred from that of a man, in other words, Israel hardly seem to be a nation any more, its people scattered among the Babylonians.

Well, He, taken with the crown of thorns upon His head, with the scourging and the lashes, with the misery of the crucifixion, He hardly seems to be a man, He almost loses His identity as a man, He doesn't appear to be a man, just a mass of suffering flesh, He is marred away from being like, seeming like a man, at all, and His form from that of the sons of men. Our commentators vary between these two interpretations, that it is from here, in the sense of comparison and that it is from in the sense that he no longer seems to be one, away from, separation in that sense. Now I wouldn't be dogmatic as between them, I state to you difficulties in the comparison. If it said "more than any man" if there was something in the Hebrew definitely giving that idea, it is more than the man who is most marred, something like that, but just more than a man, doesn't seem to me to convey it. You think whatever you want on that, but I just express to you the possibility, but the fact is, whatever you decide about the men, that we have first His exaltation, and then His humiliation, and now we are told He is going to deal wisely and be successful and be exalted, and then we're told ~~He~~ He is going to go through terrible humiliation and suffering, and what is the reason for this suffering, you have another kane, you have a third kane. You had line starting with a kane, a verse, in fact, "just as many were astonished at thee" then you had a comparison. "So marred was His visage," and so on. And then a third "so"--so shall He accomplish His work. It is through His humiliation that He accomplishes His work. It is as a result of or by means of being humiliated and suffering this way, that He is going to sprinkle many nations. Now that is what the Hebrew says there, He is going to sprinkle many nations, and that, naturally, to the Jewish reader, seems to be utterly fantastic nonsense. What can it mean? How can you sprinkle nations? What possible sense would there be to that, and so the Jews who translated the Septuagint, did not render it, they ~~just~~ just didn't know what to do with it, and they said so shall many nations be surprised, or something like that. And I don't know where they got the idea, looks to me as if they just threw up their hands and said we just can't make any sense out of it. So we'll

just make some kind of a guess as to what this may mean in view of the general atmosphere of surprise in the context. Maybe that's what they did, I don't know, but the Septuagint, ~~it~~ gave a translation for it which we have to know etymological justification for. Now the word that is used there is a word which occurs 24 times in the O. T., including this one, and these 24 times which it occurs in the KJV, if I read my concordance correctly, in the 24 cases it always is translated sprinkle. Now those cases, many of them occurred in Exodus, Lev., Numb., where it speaks of sprinkling the different things in the Temple, in the Tabernacle, sprinkling them with clean water, or sprinkling them with blood, or sprinkling them with oil. It is regularly used in the services of the sanctuary, to indicate cleansing, that is the common use of the word, that is at least 20 of the cases where it is used in that sense. The word is used 4 times in the kal and 20 times in the hiphael. Two of the times when it is used in the kal are interesting. They are different from this, there is no cleansing in probably either of them, certainly not in the first of them. The first of these two is 2 Kings 9.33, an incident with which I believe you are all familiar, where Jezebel looked out of the window and she spoke to Jehu who was below and he spoke to the eunuchs who were beside her and he said, throw her down, and they threw her down and some of her blood was sprinkled on the wall, and on the horses and they trod her underfoot. Now that is the kal, and there is no cleansing there...

C.61 (1/2)

...that is the kal, does it mean the blood leaped upon the wall, or does it mean the blood was sprinkled upon the wall? It is translated as "sprinkled." Now the other case there to which I call your attention is in Isa.63.3. It is a case where we have: "one came from Bozrah with dyed garments," and he says I that speak in righteousness of the people mighty to save, and he says in verse 3, I have trodden the winepress alone and there was none with me, for I have tread them in mine anger, and trampled them in my fury, and their blood shall be sprinkled upon my garments. That doesn't mean leaped, it means

sprinkled. It is kal, and it is the blood is sprinkled upon his garments. Now most of the uses are hithphael and, as I said, most of them refer to cleansing. There is one in Ezek. 36 which is a little different from most of the rest, it is where he says in verse 26, a new heart will I give you, a new spirit will put within, and just before he mentions that wonderful promise of regeneration is verse 25 where he says then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean from all your filthiness and from all your idols will I cleanse you, so the figure of sprinkling with clean water is here used to indicate cleansing, and this is this word in the hithphael, just the same. Well, if you have the word used 24 times in this way, and if all these 24 times it is translated sprinkle, and in the great bulk of them it indicates a cleansing, why not translate it sprinkle here? Well, it would seem to be that all the evidence is in favor of it, there is no evidence against it except if a person is convinced that it makes no sense. Well, if it makes no sense, absolutely no sense, if you can't get any sense out of it, there are three things you can possibly do, one is, you can say, let's wait, when you get further, when we study further, when we learn more, we may see how it makes sense, we may understand. As God develops His universe, as He works out things, we'll see how the things makes sense.

Another you can do is to say, well, I studied very, very thoroughly, I'm just ~~serious~~ sure this doesn't make sense, I think that it must be that there is a different meaning, and then you hunt for a different meaning and try to find evidence. Or another thing you can do is you can say the text must be correct. There must be a mistake in the text, such things do occur but not often, but in this case, then, unless there is some evidence of a mistake in the text, we say the word 23 other times means sprinkle, why not here? Well, there is only, aside from the statement it doesn't make sense, the only other argument, the only philological argument I know against it, is the argument that is given by some interpreters, who say, well, the word sprinkle is always used to indicate a substance that is sprinkled, you sprinkle water, you sprinkle blood, you sprinkle oil

and you sprinkle it upon the altar, upon the bed, upon the tabernacle, the vessels of the tabernacle. Her blood was sprinkled upon the wall. I will sprinkle clean water upon you, but this doesn't say he'll sprinkle oil or water or blood, it says he will sprinkle nations, and how are you going to sprinkle nations, and so A.B. Davidson, quoted by one of the latest works on the account of Isa.53, this Scotch O. T. student of about 50 years ago, A. B. Davidson said, that it means absolute, it is a crime against Hebrew philology to suggest that it means sprinkle here, one of these books written by a fine conservative on Isa.53, he says that that is what Davidson says, it must be it means, it makes no sense here (4 1/2), it is a crime against the laws to interpret it sprinkle here, well, if it means sprinkle everywhere else, why should it be a crime against Hebrew philology to interpret it sprinkle here? Well, the reason he says is because it should say you sprinkle something upon the nations, rather than sprinkle the nations. Well, these people who are so free in making emendations in the Scripture, why not suggest that it was originally, therefore I will sprinkle upon many nations, why not one or two letters that have been lost, if you're going to be that finicky about it, rather than change the whole meaning of the word? I don't think it is necessary. We sprinkle water on the lawn, but we sprinkle the lawn, Most every language carries that process of, after sprinkling something on something else, they will easily get to the point where they use it with the other object without the preposition, and you can find many cases where that happens. You pay money, you pay your debts to the store, but you pay the store, you use it both places, and every language has those, and I think you have no difficulty in finding plenty of cases in Hebrew where one word is used both ways. Now in this particular case, the other cases all are sprinkling a substance, this one, to say that it cannot be used to sprinkle the thing upon which it is sprinkled, is making a negative statement, which maybe you could make with three or four hundred cases, but for 20 cases, it is much too few to say that is impossible. So that methodologically, it seems to me that it is a very, very poor approach, ~~as~~ that Davidson ^{has} ~~is~~ mistaken and very un-

fortunate that this conservative writer simply takes over what he says. Mr. Miller?

...in the text because we have no manuscript that differs. The text is unanimous, and there have been those modernistic commentators, who said it must be a mistake for some other word, there have been those. But the tendency now is to follow the guess that was made, that when this means, this hithphael means to sprinkle, the reason is that in the k
kal it means to leap, because when you sprinkle, the blood or the water, you cause the water to leap, so you cause it to leap, therefore you sprinkle it, so if in the original it means to leap, then he will sprinkle many nations means he makes the nations jump. And that of course means, make them jump with joy, and therefore to jump with joy would be to startle them, so the recent translations all translate it startle, therefore, shall he startle many nations, and they say it means startle, that's the real meaning of the word, but there is no evidence to the word every having that meaning, absolutely none, there is a word in Arabic (7 1/4) a similar word in Arabic which means to leap. But it doesn't mean to startle. Of course that would be like kal, they say (7 1/2) means to startle, therefore this can mean startle. Now that's a pretty big jump. He will make the nations ~~leap~~^{leap}, therefore he will make the nations jump. It is accepted by all the modernist interpreters and all recent modernistic translations, but it is methodologically very, very poor. But now, if you ask from a Christian viewpoint, is there any sense in this? Well, we saw the case in Ezekiel, He is going to sprinkle you with clean water and cleanse you, certainly the idea there of sprinkling people is not an unusual idea, and we've been told that the servant is going to be a light to the Gentile, He is going to bring God's Word to the very ends of the earth. Why then should He not sprinkle many nations, but when you look at the N. T. you find first that Peter had no doubt what this passage means. Because Peter addressed his first epistle to many nations, he said, Peter an apostle of Jesus Christ, to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia, many nations. And Peter, writing to these people of many nations, says to them, Elect according to the Foreknowledge of

God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ. And so Peter addressed many nations as having been elect unto sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ, and Isaiah said, that therefore, shall he sprinkle many nations, and logically you expect, after being told he is going to be successful, but then told of his humiliation, to see the reason for His humiliation, that it is for the purpose of providing the cleansing which is needed. So shall He sprinkle many nations, by means of His humiliation will He bring this sprinkling to many nations. Yes? Mr. Myers? (9 1/2) Yes, Heb.9.13,14, brings out again the figure of being sprinkled with the blood of Christ, Peter of course makes it specific of many nations. The two together show that the idea was no unusual idea to Christian thought, and it finds an origin in this definite statement of Isaiah here of how the servant will accomplish his work, so shall He do it, so shall He sprinkle many nations. But of course those who say it must mean startle, say, well, after all, verse 14 starts, many people were astonished, well He is going to startle them, and they're going to be so surprised they're going to shut their mouths, because what they have been told, they shall not see, and that which they had not heard shall they consider. But now if you're startled, do you shut your mouth when you're startled, did you ever see anybody shut his mouth when he is startled. You open your mouth when you're startled, you don't shut your mouth. Shutting the mouth does not indicate being startled, it might indicate being horrified, being appalled, it might indicate being unable to answer, unable to give a proper response to the thing that is put before you. So Kings will shut their mouths, they will be unable to answer, does not mean the kings are going to be startled. So we certainly don't build our faith upon this word, or this statement here, but it's a wonderful prediction which it is a great shame to have eradicated from the Scripture, on the pseudo-philological argument. Yes? (11)(stu.: by using startle, are they trying to get away from the Atonement?) I would say so, yes. You know, when the RSV of the N. T. came out, I was surprised that these modernists could put out a translation which would be in so many ways so accurate. I

was amazed, because I would expect they would have far more unbelief than they have, in the N. T. But then I got to thinking about it, and these modernists could go to that Greek and say what did these apostles believe, it is a lot of foolishness, but yet they had these ideas. What were the ideas they had? And so on the whole they can give you a translation that shows what these men thought, and express that idea, but how can they can go to the O. T. Because the N. T. says that prophets writing hundreds of years before, laid a foundation for ideas they didn't understand, and predicted definite N. T. thought. Well, how can modernists who don't believe such a thing go and translate the O. T. ideas. They come to these O. T. prophets and when there is the N. T. thought expressed, they can't believe that that is what they had in mind, it is just utterly contrary to their whole philosophy. So even if they're not trying, even if they're consciously trying to keep from putting in what they think, ~~th~~ and to put what they believe the writer meant, they can't believe that ~~the~~ writer of an O. T. book meant any Christian thought. So in the O. T. they think well now what could Isaiah have thought, he certainly never heard of Atonement, he ~~never~~ heard of Christ, he never heard of anything like this, he couldn't mean anything like ~~that~~, so naturally to them it is utter nonsense, and they've got to get some other way, and that's the way they do with nearly all the Messianic predictions. Kiss the Son lest he be angry. Well, what sense does that make to them? They just say, text corrupt, and they put at the bottom something like , "Kiss his feet" or something like that. And, text corrupt. Well, it is not corrupt. If you believe that God inspired these men to predict what God was going to bring to pass centuries later, but if you mean that it expresses ideas that human beings thought of at that time, out of their heads, without any divine revelation, why naturally, how would they get such ideas? God gave them to them is the only way they could have had them. But the words that are there express the ideas which God gave to them.

Well, so shall he sprinkle many nations, and then the ~~result~~ of that is, that kings are unable to answer. I really think that we should have a break after nations.

So shall he sprinkle many nations. Here we have had the exaltation, ~~we have had~~ ^{the accomplishment} of his work, the humiliation, the means by which he does it, and then the cleansing, what is the result of his humiliation that he sprinkles many nations. Then we go on to show the result of His Atonement, of His sprinkling many nations, why this is not going to merely affect a few poor people who were there and see it happen. It is going to reach so far that even kings will be involved. Great leaders, prominent people are going to be affected by this. They are going--you would never dream when you saw that a man crucified outside the gates of Jerusalem, you would never dream that this was going to be something that Roman emperors would be tremendously impressed by. Something that kings and nations all over the world and prominent people would take a position in regard to. It is continuing this thought, His exaltation, Kings are going to be unable to give an answer, they are going to shut their mouths at it, going to say, we see something we never heard of before, we now understand, we perceive something that previously was never told to us. Well, I thought we'd get over 8 or 10 verses today, we only got over 3, and the end of the year is unfortunately...

C.62. (1/2)

...it is pretty hard to discuss Isa.53 intelligently without at least referring, at least two or three times in each verse, to the Hebrew, to see precisely what it means. There is quite a variety of possibility on some of the sentences, and on some of them there have been interpretations suggested that have no worth at all. We were looking at our last meeting at the beginning of the passage, that is to say at the end of 52, and we noticed there we first have His exaltation, then you find that the exaltation is by means of humiliation, and humiliation which is comparable to that from which God is now saving Israel. And then you find that it is through this humiliation that He is going to accomplish His great work of redemption. His work of cleansing, which can be compared to the cleansing of all the various objects in the tabernacle. The sprinkling of them. So shall He sprinkle many nations, and those are the three expressions here, which--the three

steps in the summary of the argument. Now the passage then, having stated the summary of the argument, a summary which is far from what human beings would naturally have thought of, ~~as~~ or had invented, or had seemed to them immediately to be logical, most things don't seem to us to be logical until we find the evidence of it. We get the facts regarding them, and then we get so used to them that nothing else seems logical. But at first sight they don't seem, well, nothing in life, hardly, seems logical at first sight. We have to learn what the facts are, and see how they are, and then, whether other things seem logical, depends on whether they are similar with things with which we are already familiar, as being factual. So this is something which no human being would ever have thought of. It is most remarkable, very, very strange indeed, until one gets to understand it, and see its inner coherence, and its fundamental clear logic which is not apparent on the surface. So, having given these three sections, the exaltation, the humiliation, and then the cleansing that comes through the humiliation, then we find that this is going, though at first it seems strange and improbable that it is going to come to be accepted over a wide area, people are going to recognize its truth and to be unable to give any answer against it. And not only are people going to be, but it is going to be so effective and spread over such an area that the time will come when even the leaders of the world, that is our English "the" is sometimes a difficult word, sometimes it means all the leaders. It doesn't mean it at all, but it means some of the leaders. It means men in positions of great importance, men who are outstanding, who are widely known, who never heard of what was happening in Galilee ^{or in} ~~during~~ Judea, thought of it as a little country somewhere way out on the outskirts of civilization, that they will come to be impressed tremendously as a result of what has occurred there, and to see the logic of it and to be unable to give any answer to it. So we start that with the word, Kings shall shut their mouths at him. Now of course, some try to take this "kings shall shut their mouths," as showing their great astonishment, their surprise, but I don't think you've ever seen "shut his mouth" as a figure for astonishment or surprise. As I

mentioned last time, if you're surprised, your mouth just opens involuntarily, it doesn't shut. To shut the mouth shows determination, or it shows inability to answer, or it may show acceptance, but it does not show surprise. I don't think it ever would be used as a figure for surprise. But kings will shut their mouths, they will be unable to give any answer, they will recognize that his claims are true. So this is the beginning of the new section, after our first introductory section, 13-15a, the new section describes the unexpected nature of it. The inability of people at first to recognize his true meaning. And as this inability of people to recognize its true meaning, is presented, gradually the meaning of it is brought out in the course of the presentation of how people at first unable to recognize it, come to do so. So we read that kings will shut their mouths at them, and for that which had not been told them they shall see, and that which they had not heard they will consider. And then we hear what they say, and it is a continuation then of the same thought exactly. This is something brand new to them, this is something they never heard of, never dreamed of, now they see it, examine it, come to understand it, they say who would have believed (5 1/2)

and what does mean? ...had not been told them, now they see that which they had not heard before, now they consider, they say, who has believed (5 3/4)

How would you get the exact idea of that word into an English expression? You say who has believed our report? ...cannot say. It is entirely possible 300 years ago, who has believed our report would convey exactly the meaning to an English-speaking leader, that (6)

would convey to a reader of Hebrew. But today who has believed our report means aren't you surprised at what my report card shows. The word report doesn't convey the meaning of this word today. It did at one time, perhaps, I don't know. What does (6 1/2)

mean? Mr. Golin looks as if he has an idea, what would you say, Mr. Golin (6 1/2) I would think the best English way of saying it would be, who has believed what we have heard? Most literally it would be who would have believed what has been

told to us? Who has believed our having been heard/~~and seen~~^{thing--} the thing that we have heard would be the most natural way to say it in English. Who has believed the thing that we have heard. It is a passive participle. It isn't, who has believed the thing that we are going to say? Who has believed the thing we're going to tell you now? It isn't that. Of course they will tell you, that is how you find out about it, but it is, the thing that the word conveys is that it is something they have heard. Yes? (7 1/4)

No ^{you} in it, only a we in it. (stu) The subformative , the suffix nu on a noun, or a verb, that is not the subformative, I call it a subformative where ~~is~~ is part of a verb and expresses a subject, like kapalnu means we have killed. I use the word subformative for that which is an essential part of the word, like kapalnu, we have killed. The (7 3/4) means "we." But the suffix nu added onto a noun or a verb can have one of two meanings, it can be an object suffix, or it can be a genitive suffix. On a verb, it is an object suffix. He has called us. On a finite verb. On a noun, it is a genitive suffix, our telling, and our telling, we ~~are~~ regretted our having told him about this. You see, it could be, our having told, the genitive can express the ~~suffix~~ subject. Or it can, the genitive can express an object, or a possessive, and of course, this being--of course, an infinitive, a verbal noun, can take an accusative or a genitive, so it could be either one on an infinitive. On a participle, well, I doubt if it could be as accusative, think it would be a genitive. It is our being told thing, and our being told thing, would be the thing that we have ~~that~~ has been told to us. If it was the thing we are going to tell, it would be active , it would be our telling thing, not our being told thing, so the stress here is we've heard something, and who would ever have believed, but the important thing here is that this thing is going to reach ~~so~~ far that kings are going to be saying this, not just one king, but kings are going to be expressing acceptance and wonder at it. So that it is a part of the original statement of his effectiveness, of *the success* of his activity. He is going to be so exhaustive, that kings will be among those who will marvel at it, and say who would have believed what we have heard? And then they

--it continues, and to whom, concerning whom is perhaps better than "to whom," it is not a le there it is an al, and al with an ion means upon or near or concerning. El with aleph ~~means~~ unto, now there are cases where al is used where we would expect el, but el is the regular way of saying unto and al is regularly upon, near, or concerning. To whom is the arm of the Lord revealed, then, hardly seems to me to mean, well who has understood this? Now that would be a natural thing to take it, because it would be parallel with the first part. Who has believed the thing we've heard? Who would've believed this, and who would've understood, who would've seen the arm of the Lord revealed, to whom is it revealed? So it is not impossible that ~~over~~ al is to be taken that way, as if it were el. But it would seem to me that since it is al instead of el it would be more like that it's concerning whom, and concerning whom has the arm of the Lord been laid bare, opened up and revealed. Just how, what is this wonderful thing, in other words, ~~that~~ the Lord has done?

And then we find in verse 2, that he will grow up before him, "~~before~~ him," must surely mean before the Lord, who else could "Him" be? He will grow up before the Lord, is the way the Lord's arm is revealed, he causes him to grow up before him as a weak little plant, as a tender plant, something that you 'd think that anybody could just kick out of the way. It is not a son born in a royal family with thousands of troops around to protect him, it is not a man born in a family of ^{one} the leading philosopher's of Greece, ready to go out and explain all the mysteries of the universe, it is something that seems to be just a weak little plant, growing up, a little root grown up out of a dry ground. Now is this sentence, a root out of a dry ground, is this the prophet speaking, is this the Jews speaking? Who is it that is speaking here? Well, if is the prophet speaking, how can ~~a~~ ^{the} prophet think of a dry ground as being the ancestry of David, the house of David? The family that has kept alive the memory of God's great deeds to Israel. The one through whom the oracles of the O. T. have come, how could that be a dry ground, could the prophet think of that? Could the Jews think of it that way? How could it

possibly be? Yes, Mr. Cohen? ...interesting idea, as something that has withered because for this length of time it has not seen true accomplishment. In other words, the dry ground then is not, from that viewpoint, not a ground without real potentialities, but one which has seemed to ~~w~~ither, and not to show them. Now that's an interesting possibility. The one which I would incline more to is to think that this is the king speaking, and that it is these kings speaking, who look for the great deliverer of the world to come from ~~a~~ Roman Senatorial family, or ~~a~~ from a family of great Athenian philosophers, and would not believe that in that little remote country of Palestine, that there, out of a carpenter's family there, even if they did claim to be sent from some king who lived a thousand years before, that from there there would come one who would be of any great importance in the world. That is, I would incline to think of it as from the viewpoint of the kings who doubtless were speaking when the passage began in verse 1. But of course it is also true that they said of him, could any good thing come out of Galilee, that was said at the beginning of his ministry, and it is true that there had been a period of comparatively little evident accomplishment. Yes? (14)

changes it from an imperfect, yes, to a perfect. This is what we see that has happened. It would express, I think you're quite right that the "he will grow" is probably not the best way of rendering it, because after all, they are saying "who has believed what we have heard?" Have we heard that he is going to grow, or have we heard that he did grow? Imagine that somebody of 300 A.D. comes into Constantine's palace and says, do you know what we've heard happened way out there in Palestine? That the Saviour of the world was born there, way up in that remote country, and people are believing this all over the Roman Empire now, and Diocletian is trying to destroy it, and he utterly failed to, but he grew up, like a root out of a dry ground, in an area we never would have expected anything of any real importance to come. I think that's the idea of the report we have heard must be something past rather than future, so even though we're looking to the kings, to see what they say, from the viewpoint of the kings, we're

looking back at the thing they've heard. The time element is rather elusive here, because it is the picture of something way future at the time of the prophets, but yet ~~has~~ looked back to from a time shortly afterward. So the ~~purpose~~ ^{perfect} is probably a more accurate way of rendering, he has...

C.63. (1/2)

...(stu) Yes, use other methods? It's like 42 describes, that a bruised reed he won't break, he doesn't have to come in with force, he comes with gentleness, then--and when we see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him, well of course that doesn't mean that there was not tremendous beauty in the character of the Lord Jesus. The attractiveness drew great crowds to Him. There was much that was very appealing about him. It would seem to me that it must mean that from the viewpoint of these who were expecting the world to be put in shape by a great highly-trained thinker, or a great military man, that from their viewpoint, there is just no beauty, there is nothing to attract them, in the story of the cross, the story of the simple Galilean peasant, teaching to a group of common people, going about with them, and then eventually from a human viewpoint, seeming to end in disgrace at that. Yes? (2) ...has been made by various ones but there's nothing in the Gospels to suggest it in the slightest, in fact, the impression would seem to me to be quite the contrary, in the Gospels. (stu.) Well, the crucifixion, per se, would be very unattractive, I would think so, but He personally was, there certainly is no evidence in the Gospels or in the Epistles to suggest such a thing. Well, then the third verse, He is despised, this of course as a participle can be either past, present or future. He has been despised and rejected of man. A man of sorrows, and acquainted with pain. And as one hiding the face from him, we despised him and did not esteem him, this of course goes on to the viewpoint not only of the kings but the leaders of the people, ^{those} who turned against Him, refused to recognize Him, as being it. And the common people heard Him gladly, and multitudes followed Him, certainly it is not the answer, the attitude ^{of} ~~by~~ all, by any means, toward Him.

And then verse 4, let's see, Mr. Grauley, could you read us verse 4 from the Hebrew please? (stu) ...argument that can be made for this that this is the Atonement is the fact that in many reference Bibles there is a marginal note which refers to a note which is in, I believe, I Peter, and in most of your Greek texts that have a reference to N. T. quotations, in the N. T. quotations, it will refer to this verse at that place, is is 1 Peter 5, I think it is, where you will have a statement which quotes from Isa.53, and which they will refer a part of to this verse here. See if you can find it. ...1 Pet.2.24 a quotation of this verse showing that this is a picture of the Atonement? How many of the words in this verse are quoted in 1 Pet.2.24? There are words from later verses quoted in 1 Pet.2.24. How many from this verse? Yes, carried away is quoted there. How about sin? This verse says, He bore our sicknesses and carried away our pain. First Pet.2.24 says He carried away our sins. Well, the word carried away is quoted if you want, but when there is only one word quoted, what right have you to say it is quoted at all? Cannot two people use the same word without one being a quotation of the other? If I say that Dante went down to Hell in his great poems, and somebody says yesterday I went down^{to} to buy some Christmas presents, is he quoting my statement about Dante? You have to have more than one verb to show anything of a quotation. And 1 Pet.2.24 is a description of the Atonement which quotes from verses in Isa.53, but does it quote from this verse? Only if you can say that sickness is another way of saying sin. And I don't think anybody would say that. Now most reference Bible which refer to 1 Pet. 2.24, also refer to a verse in Matt. Does somebody have that verse? What does that verse say? Mt.8.17, well, let's look at that. In Mt.8.17 we read, or starting with 16, when the even was come, they brought unto Him many that were possessed with devils and He cast out the spirits with His word and healed all that were sick that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Isaiah the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses. Matt. specifically says here, he doesn't just quote a word, using the same word Isaiah uses, he says he is giving a quotation. He says he is

quoting from Isaiah, what passage from Isaiah is he quoting? This one. There is no other. This is the passage which Matthew says he is quoting, and what does he say this passage means? He says that this passage is the description of Jesus' healing ministry and that it was fulfilled when Jesus healed people there in Palestine, at that time. Therefore, we have two positions regarding this verse. We can follow the inference which might reasonably be drawn from the reference in many Bibles to 1 Pet. 2.24, that this is a description of the Atonement, that sickness and sin are identical and therefore that ~~none~~ who is saved will ever have any sickness. Or we can follow the teaching of Matthew that the work was fulfilled in Jesus' earthly ministry, his talking about healing of diseases and is not in itself a reference to the Atonement at all, but we can't have it both ways, it is one or the other. Matthew is right, or people's interpretation of Peter. I don't say Matthew is right or Peter is right, because Peter doesn't say he is quoting Isaiah. Peter doesn't say here is a fulfillment of this verse in Isaiah. Matthew says this happened that this verse might be fulfilled, and if that was fulfilled then that is it, and not something of an entirely different nature. Mr. Myers? (8)

Isaiah had nothing to do with it. (8)

with this

particular verse. I would say this particular verse is a description of the healing ministry of Jesus, at that time. Yes. Well, whether you're going to confine us to that one day, I would say it is a description of all his healing ministry during those three years. (stu. 8 1/2) No. I would find no reference to anything else in this verse except that. And my reason for that would be first that I don't believe in any law of double or triple or sextuple fulfillment. I believe that if you say there will be wars and rumors of wars, there may be a thousand wars and they're all fulfillments of that verse, but if you say that a Roman army is going to besiege ~~Africa~~ ^{Athens}, and the Roman army comes and besieges Athens, you say this is the fulfillment of that, then it is fulfilled, and then there could be a hundred other times when armies come and besiege Athens, or there could be none.

They would not be fulfillments, because the prediction would have been given in the form of a reference to a ^{individual} specific thing. And here these people are saying, what are they saying? They are saying, this man has really healed our sicknesses, carried away our diseases, and yet we've seen him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. Jesus said to the people, if you will not believe my word, believe me for the work's sake. Jesus said, a house divided against itself, cannot stand. If I do these things by Beelzebub, he says, it just isn't. He said, these acts show the power of God. And these people said we have seen him show the power of God, we've seen Him give the evidence through His tremendous healing ministry, that He was indeed what He claimed to be, the Son of God, with power over the creation. And yet, they say, even after we have seen this tremendous evidence ^{of His tremendous} power, we thought Him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. Like the men on the road to Emmaus said, they said, we thought it was He who would have redeemed Israel, but look, they've taken Him, they've killed Him. We're all wrong. Now these men are saying, who has believed our report, who would've thought it. Why, they say, we shouldn't have been quite so stupid. We saw Him do these great miracles of healing, and yet in spite of seeing those things, we thought they could take Him and could slay Him on the cross and that was the end. And that He had no power to prevent it. But they go on in the next verse, and the next verse says, but the meaning of this is not that He was stricken, smitten of God and afflicted, that He couldn't help Himself, there was nothing He could do about it, but the meaning of it is, that the wounds that came to Him were not because He couldn't help Himself, but they were for our transgressions, He was bruised for our iniquity, the chastisement of our peace was on Him, by His stripes we are healed. In other words, verse 5 is the Atonement, and verse 4 is not. Verse 4 is saying, after seeing His mighty miracles and His wonderful healing ministry, we should have known that He was not just a failure who couldn't help Himself and who was taken out and crucified because He had no power to resist, but that if He was crucified it was because He willingly went through it, for a

good purpose, and now we find out what the purpose is. It is a sort of a parallel to our summary at the ^{very}beginning in chapter 52. Here He is exalted, He is high, He has tremendous power, He can perform these great wonderful miracles, and yet He is humiliated, and when He is humiliated we forget His miracles. We think He couldn't help Himself, He is smitten of God. But we were completely wrong, He wasn't unable to ~~help~~ Himself, He voluntarily did it because it was the way of healing our sins and of bearing our stripes, so that you have a logical progression in the two verses, which you lose entirely when you ~~just~~ grab anything that sounds like the Atonement, and then you're left with the other one without any particular meaning, and especially as Matthew specifically says, this is the picture of Jesus' healing ministry. Yes? (12 1/2) 4b you're still continuing the thought with which you started, of the people who have now accepted Christ and believe on Him but who are looking back at their previous attitude of non-acceptance of Him. And here you're not thinking simply of the kings any more, you're thinking of the general mass of people who after following for a time, turned against Him, or you're thinking of the disciples who said we thought it was He who would've redeemed Israel, they said everything is hopeless, they've seized Him, they've crucified Him, He couldn't help Himself, the poor fellow, there is nothing He could do about it, He has undergone all this shame and it proves we were wrong, thinking He was the great powerful One, Well, that's all right, if He was just someone who came and gave great claims about Himself, and He was a great strong husky fellow and when He said He was going to set the world to rights, we believed Him but now in His first real effort He has failed, so we see it was all a mistake, but He didn't just make great bluffing claims, he actually did such miracles of healing as no human being could ever have done. He proved He was God by His actions, and yet we didn't believe Him, we thought He was stricken, smitten of God and afflicted. (stu) The next verse is the Atonement. We thought He was stricken, we thought He couldn't help Himself, that He just fell subject to an act of God, which ruined Him. But no, He was smitten for our

sins, it was for our crimes that He suffered. With His stripes we are healed, His death was not an accident. It was not a thing He couldn't help, it was not a thing that God put on the poor fellow and He couldn't help Himself. It was His voluntarily giving Himself in order to save us from eternal suffering. (stu) (14 1/2) Exactly. That is what is stated in verse 5. Verse 5 states that the reason that He suffered isn't because He couldn't help Himself and was smitten of God and afflicted, He just couldn't Himself, but it's because He voluntarily took on Himself the judgment that should have fallen upon us, and with His stripes we are healed. (stu. 14 3/4)

Well, now the next verse then, you see, verse 5 very clearly brings out the Atonement, very strongly stresses the...

C.64. (1/2)

...verse 6 we have the implication of the Atonement brought out in reference to the individuals. All we like sheep have gone astray, we have turned every one to his own way and the Lord has laid on him the iniquity of us all. Here you have a summary of that which was gotten in verse 5. Against their will they believed, they were forced by the ^{evidence to} ~~believe~~. As they look back they see they should have seen it all along. Yes, Mr. Miller? (1) Well, at least it is a statement of the fact that it was something which was just difficult for human beings to believe, because it is so contrary to all their experience and all their expectation. It is God's work, not what man would've expected, or would probably have planned. So, verse 7 goes on to describe His voluntary humiliation. He was oppressed and afflicted, and He didn't ~~try~~ ^{cry,} and try to escape, He opened not His mouth. He is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a Ewe lamb before her shearers is dumb. Now anybody who has worked with sheep may know that though most of the sheep set up an awful bleating, yelling, whenever you try to shear them or to do anything to them, there may be one particular kind of ewe lamb that doesn't (2 1/4)

I personally have never sheared a

sheep and am unable to speak from experience, but it evidently was a figure which would have meant something to people ~~κ~~ in Isaiah 's day who were raising sheep and familiar with them. Everytime I've seen sheep they haven't been being sheared, but they haven't been dumb by any means, they've been making an awful lot of racket. You hear them a long distance off and you think there is a whole multitude of people. Yes? (2 3/4) I've had no connection with ~~sheep~~ being sheared, I've seen them drinking, seen them --in going through the country--pasturing, heard the racket they made on those occasions. Maybe something in the shearing stops them. But of course the bringing in the figure of the lamb here is a useful part of the presentation(3) to compare Him to a lamb, that is a comparison which is valuable because it is connected with the sacrificial, certainly. And it cannot have been an absurd comparison, because that would have been impossible. Those were days when everybody knew sheep, and therefore, it must have been quite appropriate. To say , as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, well, this particular kind of sheep he was referring to, people must've known would be, or it just wouldn't have made any sense. Nobody would've said it, like if I were to say, just like a seminary student, he was always prepared, why it wouldn't get the point across because anyone who knew seminary students would know that it was not a universal characteristic. But this must have been something that fit with their experience. But the picture of course is the voluntariness of ~~His~~ humiliation, that he is not resisting it, but submitting to it. And verse 8, he is taken from prison and from judgment, and of his generation, who would declare it. Now, of his generation, is the one some people state it. Of his generation, who would have thought that he was cut off out of the land of the living. But "his generation" being introduced by the s, the sign of the accusative, it seems to me that a big argument can be made for the rendering of the authorized version, that who shall declare His generation, and if so, it would mean , in light of what follows, who would say that ~~He~~ would have any posterity? Who would expect that ~~He~~ would leave any impression on the world? Who would expect there

to be a ~~an~~ continuation of results ~~for~~ of what He did? Who would declare His generation. Some try to take it the other way, and it has been much discussed. "For He was cut off out of the land of the living" could have been "that he was cut off out of the land of the living." In "of his generation" who would say that he ~~w~~ was cut off out of the land of the living--doesn't seem ~~x~~ to me to make nearly as good sense as taking it ^{what is} in the more natural way, probably. Yes? (5 3/4) That is a thing which is a little hard to determine, perhaps we should look up all the uses of "door." I would say this, that the word "door" is regularly used for a generation, like, there is a door, and ~~n~~ another door, and another door, and another door. One generation after another, so it could say, who in His generation, but I 'd sort of expect ~~h~~ an "in" then rather than an f. Who among His generation, and I'm not quite sure that door is used in that sense. Who among His contemporaries. That is, it seems to refer rather to people in a genealogical table, to one list as derived from the other. That is, there is the generation, and then there is the next generation, which proceeds from the first. And of course here we have two ideas either of which is a little remote from the most common use of the word, one being a little remote in the sense of being the contemporary, the other a little remote in the sense of being the succeeding posterity, and whether you can prove as between them, I'm not sure, but interpreters do vary between the two, but the f seems to me to look rather strongly as if this is what is declared rather than this is the people who ~~is~~ are declaring. Yes, Mr. Myers? (~~7~~ (7 1/4) These suggestions ^{in the footnotes} here are based upon various commentary suggestions, ~~but~~ it is not given as a reading of any version or translation, simply as a guess. That is, who would declare His generation, whoever was the editor of this section ^{of Kittel} / didn't seem to ~~n~~ know ^{what} quite / to say it meant, so they suggest, who would declare his way, but even there, who would declare his way--that doesn't give a lot of meaning. Yes? (7 1/2) ...anyone to suggest--the stroke is to him, ~~is~~ the end. Now is it from the transgression of my people, the stroke is talking

about here? When he was cut off from the land of the living, from the transgression of my people the stroke was to him, or, but he was cut off from the land of the living, from the transgression of my people, relative understood, whom the stroke was to him, who deserved the stroke. This latter one is a little complicated, but I don't think it is impossible, I don't think it makes much difference for the sense, which of the two you take. Yes? (8 1/2) I rather question ~~the~~ quite saying that men means on account. Now it is hard to tell exactly ~~the~~ prepositions, but I would say this, that the commonest meaning of min is source. Min often means separation from, comparison, but it very often is source--he went from here to there, it is that from which something began, so you can get the idea of "an account of" from the source ~~quite~~ easily, that it was from the transgression of my people that the stroke came to him, that this was the source of His suffering, not that He couldn't help Himself. Not that he was cut off out of the land of the living, because He suffered an act of God, was injured, nothing He can do about it, but because the source from which His suffering came was the transgression of my people. Then the next verse is a very interesting one, verse 9, and he made, or he gave, with the rich, with the wicked, his kever, his tomb, his grave, with wicked ones he made his tomb, his grave, and with a rich man, you notice it is singular. Wicked ones is plural, he made his tomb with wicked ones, he was crucified between two thieves. And with a rich man (singular), now this (10 1/4) the KJ translates "in his death," and with a rich man in his death, a rather peculiar way of saying, the present Jewish version which was made by Prof. Margolis, about 30 years ago, thinks it much better to take it from (10 1/2) a tomb, so it says then "with a rich man, his tomb," and that of course fits very well with the account in the Gospels, that He was buried in a rich man's tomb. And it is a parallel that He made His grave with wicked men, which really means He made it, He headed for it, He came toward it; with wicked men, being crucified between two thieves. And

with a rich man was his tomb. Now of course in his death may mean in his tomb, but I think the tomb is a little clearer of the two. And of course this is not an organic problem, I would say that most of the rest here are organic, they describe the meaning of His death, they describe the tremendous work He is going to do, for our sin, but when it comes to being buried in a rich man's tomb, what is there of exaltation in that? After He is dead, His body is put in a rich man's tomb, that's no part of a great success. What is there of humiliation to it, it is no humiliation to be buried in a rich man's tomb. How would it contribute to cleansing, to be put in a rich man's tomb? Not at all. But is a little inorganic prophecy, a little key there, a little pointer, that says this is the one, among various ones crucified, this is the one who is predicted, the one who had this strange thing happen to Him, that He was the one crucified, to be taken and buried in a rich man's tomb, and then in addition to that, of course, it had a great place in the plan of God, because if that had not happened, if He had been like the others, thrown into a pauper's grave, simply tramped into a hole in the ground with a lot of other malefactors, there would be no proof of the resurrection, but to be put into a rich man's grave, where a big stone would be rolled against the door of the cave, gave the possibility of the truth of the resurrection. Yes? (12 1/2) It's strange how the "made" here is He attained, He gave, and it would seem to be the heading for the grave, the making toward the grave. Yes)? (12 3/4) Was acquainted, yes.

"was given" can be "designated" or "acquainted". His grave was acquainted with wicked men, but with the rich man was his tomb. It might be that He was put up on the cross, and the three together, three malefactors, on three crosses, expected to be thrown into the common grave for the malefactors, with the wicked men, but instead of that, His tomb was with the rich man. Now I guess our time is up, we'll have to continue there tomorrow...

...in this 53rd chapter of Isaiah that are absolutely clear, there can be absolutely no question about. There are matters in there on which arguments can be made two or three ways but the preponderance of evidence is quite clear, and then there are matters on which it is very hard to be sure which of various possibilities is the correct answer. That is true of any complex passage in any language. I am trying to lead you along in our thinking about it and also to show you some of the results of my own study. Now of course no one is under any obligation to accept the results of my study on anything. If I say something is an imperfect, and you think it is a perfect, feel perfectly free to think so, ~~but~~ you have to be able to give good evidence on it. But I want you to know what my views are for this class, I want you to know what I think and why I think it. And then, if you accept it or not, it is entirely up to you. I want to take time for any further evidence or suggestion that any of you have, but I don't want to take any more time than we have to, because we have a lot of ground to cover. So if it is merely a matter of difference of opinion why I'm glad to have you state it, but having stated it, we'll just move on, because what I want is to ~~cover~~ cover the necessary ground and get the important facts before you. Now this wonderful passage which starts with 52.13 and runs to the end of 53, as we've noticed starts in with a general summary ~~of~~ of the teaching of the passage. Two and a fraction verses. Or a general summary of what is presented. Then we have the strangeness of it, how ~~con~~trary it is to ordinary human expectation, presented in the last part of ~~15~~, verse 15, and in ~~verse~~ verse 1, 2, and 3. Verse 4 is sort of a break between the strangeness of it, how it is God's plan, not man's plan, not a man would have done it, that is not the way man would've thought it could be done. There is no way man could have done it, but the way he would have thought of to try to do it. You get to verse 4, it's sort of a break, verse 4 is a continuation of the previous. It didn't look so to us, we couldn't quite believe it, but yet it introduces ~~what~~ what follows. We didn't understand it, but God has given us the explanation, and so ~~verse~~ verse 5 is the first clear statement of the Atonement. We have the Atonement suggested

in the sprinkling many nations, but barely suggested, not clearly brought out. We have in verse 5, the Atonement brought out, the ~~Septuagint~~ Substitutionary Atonement in many clear ~~phases~~: wounded for our transgression, bruised for our iniquities, chastisement of our peace on Him, with His stripes we are healed. Four different statements of the Atonement in one verse. And then in verse 6 we have the Atonement stated again very clearly, the Lord has laid on Him the iniquity of us all. So that we have these five expressions in two verses, clear expressions of the Atonement. Then in verse 7, we have the description of His bearing, as He came to suffer, the fact that it was a voluntary submission on His part, not something He couldn't help. And then in verse 6, the --how it seemed to be the end. He was taken from prison and judgment. Who shall declare His generation. In other words, it didn't look as if ~~w~~ anything was going to fall. That was the end. He was cut off out of the land of the living. No more He could accomplish. He was gone from the land of the living, and then the explanation in the last clause, again a statement, clear statement, of the substitutionary Atonement. Then we have the beginning of verse 9, He made His grave with the wicked, He was between two wicked men in His death, He was headed for a grave with them, a pauper's grave, a grave of a malefactor, but He was buried with the rich man. ~~Whether~~ in His tomb, or whether this ^{word} ~~was~~ (4 3/4) "high place" can also mean a tomb--many think it can--but we have no other clear usage of it. ~~Already~~ Or whether you must take it as the KJV takes it, in his death. (4 3/4)

But whichever way you take it, it clearly brings out the inorganic prediction, which points the finger at this particular death, One who died as a malefactor among thieves, is nevertheless buried in a rich man's grave, and which also prepared the way for the evidence of the empty tomb, because if He was just dumped in a *hole in the ground*, you couldn't prove an empty tomb, but put in a tomb with a big stone in front, gave the evidential possibility of establishing the proof of the resurrection. So it is an inorganic prediction, not organic to the development of the wonderful work of God in saving us,

but an indication that this is the One predicted, and a laying ground for the evidence of the fact that He has been raised from the dead. And then we come to *that* last half of verse 9, and we strike a real difficulty. Let us look there at the Hebrew there of verse 9, and Mr. Rocsey could you translate it for us? (6) ...of the Middle Ages tried to explain this by saying it is his humiliation in the first half of the verse, the second half must be the same. He is with the wicked in his death, his tomb with wicked people. And so they say well, you read about how the rich oppressed and how they ground down the poor and how they treat people and so on, so this is part of his humiliation, that he has to be buried with the rich, but certainly that is stretching things pretty far, there is no humiliation in being buried in a rich man's grave. And there is no logical meaning to the statement in the context here. Just read it. Here is a wonderful picture of one who is going to save his people by what he is going to do, yes, but what does this say about it, that he is going to be in a rich man's grave. It has no logical connection with the unfolding of the thought, but is rather an evidential presentation of an incidental fact that it is going to occur, and they found it impossible to give a sensible explanation of it as you can't, except by saying it is simply a fact that is going to happen, and has happened in the case^{of Christ,} as an evidence of the fact that this is the one spoken of.

Now the second half, Mr. Rocsey. (7 1/4) ...last half of the verse concerns

Well, does that mean because or on account of, that's quite a jump, isn't it--to get because or on account of, out of concern, here. And if you do get because, or on account of, what sense does it make? He was put in a rich man's grave because there was no violence, is that why he put him in his grave? I don't think that's why. If you asked Joseph of Arimathea, why are you burying this man in your grave, is it because He has done no violence? Do you think that would be a reason? It doesn't seem to be a reason for His being in a rich man's grave. Certainly not the reason for His being crucified. It seems to me that it is pretty hard to find much direct relationship between the first and last half of the book, and I would incline to think that this is one

of the cases where it's not particularly good. You know, verses were not in the original, when the Bible was written there were no verses in it. Later verse divisions were put in, and usually it is fairly obvious where a verse division should be put, but it's not always obvious at all. Let's look at Psalm 19. The first stanza here, the heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament sheweth his handywork. Day unto day uttereth speech, night unto night shews ~~kn~~nowledge. There is no speech nor language, where their voice is not heard, their line is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the ~~we~~ world. One stanza. Now you have a new start. In them hath he set a tabernacle for the sun, which is a s a ~~br~~idegroom coming out of his chamber, and rejoiceth as a strong man to run a race. His going ~~for~~th is ~~fr~~om the end of the heaven, and his circuit unto the ends of it, and there is nothing hid from the ~~hea~~t thereof. That is one definite stanza--goes together. But these two stanzas have the last few words of one of them and the first few words of the next one, stuck together in the one verse, and you notice in your KJV there is a period put right in the middle of the verse, and the verse ends simply with a comma. It is a very irrational verse division. Doesn't belong that way at all, and there are not a great many like that in the Bible. Whoever put in these verse divisions had on the whole fairly good sense and judgment in putting them in, but there are some places like that ~~one~~ in Psalm 19 where it is just ridiculous. And we noticed one the other day in Isaiah here, where it took the last few words of a thought and made them into a separate verse in such a way that it just confused you frightfully. Having a long verse followed by a short one, when if you put the two ~~to~~gether and made a division in the middle, it would've made much better sense. Now in our particular case here, it combines the first and last part of what appears in verse 9 here, and it seems to be the reason for this, that he had done no ~~vi~~olence, nor was there any deceit in his ~~mo~~uth. Now of course the fact of his doing no violence nor any deceit in his mouth is a very important fact. It stresses the fact ~~tha~~t He did not deserve to die, that He gave Himself voluntarily for our sins, though He died the death of a malefactor, He did not deserve it, it is a very

important thought, but it doesn't have any particularly great connection with what preceded it, at least not unless you put an "although" instead of a "because." But al-
 can't mean "although." I doubt if it can mean "because." Though it can be a lot nearer
 "because," than "although." The (10 3/4) is often "therefore," but al-
 along wouldn't be therefore, as far as I've ever noticed. But these are two important
 facts, but not particularly related unless you're going to get an "adversity" between them
 and if you do, that leaves out the riches. He was buried in a rich man's tomb in spite
 of the fact that He had done no violence doesn't make any sense. He was buried in a
 rich man's tomb because He had done no violence also makes no particular sense. This
 is not the reason Joseph put him in his tomb, it was because of his great regard for His
 teachings and His life, not because He didn't deserve to be killed. But it would be all
 right in the first part but you have the rich man in between, and it seems to me it is much
 more reasonable to say, the verse should properly end with His being buried in the rich
 man's tomb. And then you start a new expression and you say that comparing the fact,
 in regard to the fact, that he had done no violence, and there was no deceit in his mouth,
 the two reasons which should lead a man to be executed, outward violence, robbery,
 that which is clearly wicked, and then hidden violence, hidden sin, hidden crookedness,
 deceit, neither one of these was present in his case. This was a fact, he was innocent,
 He did not deserve to die, and yet, verse 10 begins, But--there is just a way which can
 carry the force of "but" in certain cases, --though this is a fact, that He had no violence
 nor deceit, yet the Lord was pleased with bruising Him. (12 1/2)

an objective suffice. It's a genitive but an objective
 genitive. With bruising Him. Yet the Lord was pleased to bruise Him, with bruising Him.
 Despite the fact that He didn't deserve to die, the Lord was pleased to have Him die.
 It fits exactly of course with John 3.16, that God gave His only begotten Son. It please
 the Lord that He should give His Son, not that He should be punished for His sin, be-
 cause no sin, but that He should give Himself, as a ransom for our sin. So we have in

verse 10, with its introduction, what is now the last half of verse 9, although this was true, or concerning this, yet it pleased the Lord to bruise Him. He has made Him sick. Now this is a very nice English phrase, He has put Him to grief, and of course to put to grief can mean bring to any kind of a suffering, so that it is perfectly all right, the Hebrew word though is a bit more specific. (13 3/4) is translated about half the cases "sicknesses" and about a quarter of them "disease." Then occasionally grief or sorrow, and this is to bring Him to grief, to pain, to misery, of course actually to death. The Lord has permitted that he should be taken and crucified. He has brought Him to grief in spite of the fact that He did not deserve to die. And then again you have the Atonement, very clearly, in this next phrase. Let's glance at that next phrase now, Mr. Myers, could you read us that next phrase, do you think? ...

C.66. (1/2)

...shall put His soul for a senach. Now that is if you put it as 2nd masculine. But you also said it could be 3rd feminine, how would you take (3/4) Two possibilities here, if his soul shall place a sin offering, 3rd feminine, or 2nd masculine, if thou shalt make his soul a sin offering. Now who is the "thou"? Well, we have had no address to God in recent verses, have we? Israel was referred to at the very beginning, and so it would seem that, --now one possibility is that you just all of a sudden look to somebody that hasn't yet been referred to. We can't rule out that it is God, it is a possibility. But it is most likely when you simply address someone without an introduction that it is someone who has already been addressed, or referred to in the context, and there is no one referred to in the immediate context, but you get back to the beginning of the section and you find what is clearly Israel referred to, and that we knew because of the comparison with previous ~~section~~ second person --which were all Israel in the previous chapter. So that the context which would make it Israel is quite a distance back, but yet it might be an evidence that it is Israel here. Is Israel here the one who is to make his soul a sin offering or is God the one who is to make his soul a sin offering?

Mr. Golin? (stu) Now of course that you have to decide on the basis of context. We are looking forward here to the crucifixion, forward beyond the crucifixion, to these kings who started the chapter, they look back. We look forward, first with a general statement, before the kings, general future prediction, then we looked at the kings and they looked back and described this past, something that was ahead from our viewpoint, now we have left them pretty far to the back now, and we are now just looking at the scene, and as we look at the scene, are we looking ahead or are we looking back? Having done both fairly near, it is rather hard to say, but here, if he does this, or if she does this, that is his sorrow, or if you do it, well, it is something which in the context, is definitely going to happen. It was not a contrary fact condition, at all, it is a condition that will be fulfilled, and will show the results. Now from the context there is not much to prove which it is, and to a man, in Isaiah's day, it could constitute a very serious problem. How can the (3 1/2) come into it? Does the mean God, if so, how is God going to make His ~~throne~~ soul a sin offering? Would the (3 1/2) mean Israel, is Israel going to make the servant of God a sin offering for it? Is that what it means? Who is going to make him a sin offering? So you would then think, well, how about the other, his soul ^{will} make a sin offering. Well, how does a soul make a sin offering? Usually it is you that makes a sin offering. You present an offering. If a soul or a life could present an offering, what offering could it present except itself? So it's the "you make his soul an offering," or it is "the soul makes the offering," would the offering his soul makes be itself? Would it offer itself an offering? Just how is it? Well, it becomes a little easier perhaps to get meaning out of, after you get N. T. understanding of the fulfillment and of the fact of the trinity. And whether his soul makes an offering, or whether God makes an offering, after all, it is the same one making it, because He is God. So if Thou, God, will make His soul an offering, ~~or~~ or if His soul will present itself as an offering, it still is God who is making it, so the meaning isn't so different in either case. Well, our KJ says when thou shalt make his soul an offering

for sin, and the Septuagint is more, I believe, just the same. But the--when Jerome made his vulgate, he tried to get both ideas in, after all, it is he who makes the offering, and it is his soul that is made the offering, so he translated it, either when he shall make himself an offering for sin, when his soul shall make itself an offering for sin-- I don't believe they are the exact words, but anyway the Vulgate, the translation of Jerome brings in ^{both the ideas,} ~~the exact words~~ it is his soul that is the sacrifice, and he is the one that makes it. Well, now the Revised Standard Version, in this case, follows the Vulgate, which brings us the Christian teaching very, very clearly. When he shall offer Himself, an offering for sin, something like that. It gives an excellent translation, ~~and~~ ⁱⁿ the Revised Standard Version, but unfortunately it doesn't stop at giving this excellent translation, it makes a footnote which says, "So the Vulgate, Hebrew, and Septuagint, 'when thou shalt.'" As if to say we throw aside the Hebrew here, we adopt the Vulgate. If there are two different renderings. When actually the Vulgate has simply ^{-- it is} ~~given~~ a little free~~r~~ translation brought in~~t~~ the different parts (6 1/4) meaning in the Hebrew, and is not out of accord with the Hebrew at all. So that here is a case where the RSV seems to have a very good translation though it is unfortunate that it seems to take a slam at the Hebrew in the note that it puts under it. But it is of course God who makes it, so it would be perfectly correct to say that God accepts his soul~~d~~ or makes his soul an offering for sin, it is perfectly correct to say that it is Christ who makes it. He is God, and He offers Himself voluntarily, and of course the sacrifice, that is made, is his life, or his soul, so his soul is an offering for sin. So there is a great deal of meaning in the verse, though just exactly which way to render it is not so easy to be sure, but all these facts are true, and any one of these ways that it is rendered, it fits with the fact~~s~~ as it was brought out, ~~and~~ I mean as it occurred, but the result of it is, if you shall make, and when you shall make, and of course if you wish to take the you as Israel, which is not impossible at all, in view of quite a few

verses before, and yet it's the only in the whole context being Israel, then it could mean when members of Israel, or possibly members of other nations shall take his soul as their offering for sin, something going to happen then, thus look forward to the result, and of course you do have the results now in what immediately follows. Up to this point we have had the Atonement, we've had what he did, we've had how he did it, but now we begin to get the specific results. When this happened then something happens. Now Mr. Myers, you could give us a word or two more on this. The next line, how does it start? Yes. He shall see (8 1/4) Yes.

In other words, we read a few minutes before, he has come out from the land of the living, who shall declare His generation? Does He have any generations that come after Him? Is there any posterity? He is cut off out of the land of the living, is there any result? Well, when you take his soul as your offering for sin, He sees seed, he has posterity, you are born again through His blood, or when His soul makes an offering for sin, when He is offered as the Atonement, the result is that those who come to Christ--to God through Him, they are His posterity. They are a generation which follows, which is the result of what He has done. Which has the new birth, a new life, as a result of His activities. So we have the result of the work of the servant shown now, that when his soul becomes an offering for sin, and is utilized, is accepted by individuals as such, he sees seed. Where is this generation, there is no future? There is indeed. He sees seed, he has a continuing effectiveness, he has a continuing posterity, and so he will see seed, He isn't just cut off out of the land of the living. And then He will see seed, and can you give us the next word, Mr. Myers? (9 1/2) Yes, except that it is what tense? (stu) ...declare his generation, now we find he will see seed. We read about He was cut off out of the land of the living. Now we read He is going to prolong days. Well, how is He going to prolong days if He is cut off out of the land of the living? Well, you might say He prolongs days through His effectiveness, through the continuing effectiveness of His work. And you would not in Isaiah's day have to make a tremendous

jump forward and say, not only does He see a continuing effectiveness of His work unless He goes on doing things after He is cut off out of the land of the living, but actually though He has been cut off out of the land of the living, He doesn't stay cut off out of the land of the living. He prolongs days as a living human being, because He comes back, He is raised from the dead, He prolongs His days, His soul ~~ma~~ makes an offering for sin, He is offered for the sins of ^{all} those who will believe on His name, and then God accepts the sacrifice, and raises Him from the dead, so that He can prolong days, so that here is a very clear suggestion of the resurrection. Not clear enough that somebody with no background would say that is resurrection, but clear enough that when the resurrection occurs anybody can say, well look ~~that~~ that is exactly what Isaiah predicted, it is exactly fulfilled, what ~~he~~ He promised. He will prolong days, and then this next word (11 1/4) some of you might not know. None of you might have known it prior to studying this chapter, and if some of you hadn't studied the chapter at all, you might not have noticed prior to five minutes ago. But all of you who watched the beginning of the verse and saw the translation of the first two words of this verse, "and it pleased the Lord ~~to~~..." (11 1/2) would immediately recognize that then kaphek, the noun, must mean pleasure, of course. There we have in the first two words of the verse, (11 1/2) and the Lord was pleased. There we have as a noun, the same two words exactly except a noun instead of a verb. "And the pleasure of the Lord." It pleased the Lord to bruise Him. Not that the Lord just enjoyed this, it was not enjoyment, it was sadness, it was misery, to have to give His only begotten Son to accomplish what He desired to accomplish. It was misery, but yet it pleased Him to do it because, as we read at the end of the verse, the pleasure of the Lord in His death, or by means of His activity, it will prosper, it will (12 1/4) So the pleasure of the Lord will prosper in His hands. In other words, there are ^{definite} ~~separate~~ results, this Atonement, it is not merely a marvelous thing that He ~~do~~es to bear sins on the cross, it has results

in the salvation of many individuals, it makes a tremendous change in God's universe. The pleasure of the Lord prospers in His hand. And then verse 11 is interesting, of the travail, of the labor, of the toil (12 3/4) of the labor of his toil, He shall see (13) He shall be satisfied, He shall see it and shall be satisfied. The toil of his soul, the travail of His soul, the misery of His soul, His passion, what He suffered, what He undergoes, what He struggles, it accomplishes something, He sees it, and is satisfied, you can see the travail of your soul as you see yourself laboring and endeavoring to accomplish something, but you're satisfied if the thing is accomplished. Mr. Myers? (13 1/2) He looked upon all He created and it was good. He shall see of the travail of His soul. No, that's just to look, well and this is just to look too, but there He looked and the result is He sees it's good, here He looks and He sees results, yes, I guess it's very close. Yes, an interesting thought, I guess, I hadn't thought of it before, an interesting parallel between the original creation, the Lord sees what He has done and it is good, and the recreation through Christ, that Christ looked upon the labors He had performed and it is good, what He has done, it has accomplished. Very interesting parallel. ...

C.67 (3/4)

...and then He looks upon His toil, His suffering, His travels, His travail, His life, His soul, and is satisfied to see results. Had a thing a few years ago when the papers were full of it, I think it was out in California, there was a hole there in the ground, a narrow hole that went down to the ground maybe 30 or 40 feet, and a little child, very young child, fell into it, and when people realized that this child was down at the bottom of this hole, everybody from the neighborhood came and began feverishly digging, and they dug another hold, like a well, just a few feet away from it, and dug down at a feverish rate, down to get to that same level and then across to it, they had one or two caveins, were greatly disappointed, worked through the day and night, just wore themselves out, working as hard as they could to try to get there and

to see if they could save that child's life, and when they got to the child they found they were able to take the child out and the doctor looked at the child and found there was no serious injury, just a few days in the hospital and the child was just as good as ever. They worked at this tremendous labor and toil and saw the travail of their life, their effort, but it accomplished, it was satisfying. Now if I were to say to one of you I want to show you how much I am interested in your welfare, I'm going out here and dig a hole out here in front, going to take a shovel, dig a hole right deep and when you come and see me working my head off there, you'll say oh isn't that wonderful what he has done for us. Isn't that wonderful he has gone to all that labor and toil for us. Of course that's the moral influence theory of the Atonement. According to the moral influence theory of the Atonement we see Christ going to the cross and we say oh my look at what He did for us, and therefore we are changed, we are so grateful, we are changed as a result of that and it affects our life and changes our character. And of course there is tremendous moral influence in the Atonement. It's one of the greatest forces to lead people to give up everything of their own and turn to Christ, to see and realize what He did for us, but if it's just digging a hole in the ground for no accomplishment, why there's no purpose, but if it was digging a hole down to the place where we had fallen in order to bring us out, it has real purpose, so a substitutionary atonement, has moral influence, tremendous moral influence, but a moral influence theory that is just a moral influence, without an atonement that actually changed God's universe and did something for it, is not moral influence at all. So here we have the real ^{burden}~~version~~ of it, the travail of His soul, He

(3 3/4) and there are results of it. He sees it and is satisfied. I heard

Campbell Morgan once tell how he had been in his early days holding some evangelistic services, and he was at a mining town in Wales and there was a miner there who couldn't see it. He says, you mean that all I have to do is say yes, I accept Him and my life will be changed, I will be free from my sin and will be on my way to heaven, I don't have to do anything, there's nothing I have to do to earn it? Nothing at all. Well, the man just

couldn't get it through his head, how that could be, how you could get such a tremendous thing without paying anything, or laboring, or doing anything for it, and finally he thought and he said oh I see it, when I go down in the mines, I'm half a mile down in the ground, working, and when I want to come up I just go and get into that little skiff, that little box down there, and he said I just go in there and sit down, that's all I have to do, I don't do a thing, just go and sit, and that just pulls me right up to the top, out into the fresh air, but he says it costs the company an awful lot to dig that hole and put in that machine and to pull that thing up, And salvation is absolutely free as far as we are concerned, but it cost God an awful lot. There was the travail of His soul, the toil, there 's the sorrow, there's what He put into it and what He did. He sees this and He sees that it accomplishes something, the last part of this chapter deals with the results of the Atonement, that it really does affect what it was His desire that it should affect. So He sees of the travail of His soul, He is satisfied, and then, by His knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many, and Skinner here in the Cambridge Bible for schools and colleges, is a very helpful little commentary on Isaiah, He has just a few brief words about the words and the form and the context and the interpretation, and it is a very helpful book even though he is quite a thorough-going modernist and follower of the higher critics. He devotes his energy here to giving you solid material. You don't always by any means agree with his results, but he gives you material which is very useful, in a very handy form to you, but he is perhaps worse along here than anywhere else in his whole commentary. And here he says by his knowledge the genitive is not that of the object, by the knowledge of Him, but of the subject. The knowledge of God and salvation which He possesses, and which He communicates to others. By His knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many. He says the reference is to the prophetic activity of the servant which has seemed to be cut short by his death, but will be resumed and found with success in His exalted state. And of course that is not the meaning of it

at all. It is not His knowledge, a subjective knowledge, ^{what} ~~but~~ He knows that makes many righteous. It's not the wonderful teachings of Jesus, not what Jesus tells us that results in this, but it is the knowledge of Him, ^{it is} ~~the object~~ ^{ive} ~~of~~ ~~(7)~~ genitive. It is by the knowledge of Him and what He did that many are justified, Yes, they are the subject, He is the object. The genitive here is an objective genitive. It is their knowledge about what He did, which is the instrument used of God to justify. It is actually what He did, the salvation, but it is through the means of carrying to them knowledge of what He did, that they are justified. And then on this word "justified" Skinner is very bad too. Shall my righteous servant justify many? Skinner says, rather shall a righteous one, my servant, make the many righteous? But the Hebrew is very peculiar. The ordinary sense of the word for justify "declare righteous," is here unsuitable. You notice he recognizes the fact that the hithphael of "sadiq" does not ordinarily mean to make righteous, it means to declare righteous. And you can look up all the uses of the history of this word in the Hebrew and you find that, with one exception, it is very clear. God says how shall I justify myself. God is not saying how shall I make myself righteous. And God condemns the wicked who try to justify themselves. It is not to make righteous. You won't condemn anybody for making himself righteous. It is to declare righteous, and the history of "sadiq" means to declare righteous, just like (8 1/2) in the Greek means. To declare righteous, to justify, not to make righteous. There is only one case where it would seem that it may perhaps mean "make righteous" rather than declare. As Skinner points out here. He says the only case, aside from this one, where it means to make righteous, he says the only other passage where it says the ethical sense of making righteous is probably based on this verse, Dan.12.3, they that turn many to righteousness. Now is Dan.12.3 speaking of those that cause many to be justified? But the way it's translated, "turn to righteousness" they that make many righteous. Probably it actually means they that cause many to be declared righteous, and therefore actually have the same meaning as here. But Skinner

rejects all the other cases and wants to accept this one, to get the Atonement out of this verse and it's a very silly thing for him to do, because he has plainly admitted it. We have had it before given at least six or eight times, we've had clear statements of the Atonement and Skinner has admitted ^{it}, you can't get away from it in the statements in the early part of the chapter, and yet when you come to this one, he tries to explain it away and get rid of it, and not find the Atonement here. By his prophetic teaching, by the teachings of Jesus, He ~~will~~ make people righteous. That's not what it says at all. It is by His knowledge, which could be what He knows, but can just as well be what is known about Him. My righteous servant will justify many if the word has the meaning that it normally has in the other passages. In all except the one in Daniel and probably there too. So by the knowledge of Him shall my righteous servant may justify many, and here is the reason, for He shall bear their iniquities. Now there is a clear statement of the substitutionary atonement, right in the end of the verse, absolutely clear, why then did Skinner get the Atonement out of the phrase, by His knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many, when it is so ~~clearly~~ clearly in the next statement, for He shall bear their iniquities? Another statement of the fact of the Atonement. And then verse 12 is a very interesting verse.

Therefore will I ~~at~~ divide him a portion with the great, --maybe Mr. Grauley you better read us that from the Hebrew. (stu) Yes, with many, the word doesn't ordinarily mean great, it means many, with the many. And so some try to interpret it, he is going to have a place with the many great conquerors, The ones who have been called the great conquerors, who after all have been very few. The many--that would be a very queer way to refer to the conquerors. But there are many who are taking spoil and He is going to divide some of it with them. And continuing? (stu.) (12 3/4) Now, this is a statement which does not fit with universalism. You notice? Therefore, He will save everybody from the hands of the many mighty ones, Satan and ~~his enemies~~ his emissaries.

Maybe you might, right now, I'll just mention to you, since it comes up in this way, what I will be doing next semester. I'm expecting to give another elective in Isaiah, like the one this semester. In other words, it is a ~~re~~ course which requires Hebrew reading completed. ~~So~~ It is open to anybody who has completed Hebrew Reading, anybody who has had Beginning Hebrew, but not Hebrew Reading, if they were a very top student could take it. But of course this semester, there wouldn't be anyone like that. It'll be conducted more ~~or~~ less like this time, with assignments including some Hebrew, and consideration of English passages, cover a passage about the same length or a little longer than this one. It will be quite a different type of passage, however. This one is dealing with the predictions of the sufferings of Christ, prediction of the Atonement, prediction of Redemption. That one will be the ~~C~~oming King. It will be the Emmanuel passage. It will discuss chapters 36 to 39, the historical section, and then 7 to 12, the Immanuel section, and then 28 to 35, the closely related section to the Immanuel section. And probably there will be a little more stress on 28 to 35 than on other sections, since it is less covered in general than the others are. But that will be a separate course altogether ~~than~~ from this one. I mean neither course is a prerequisite for the other, in any sense, they're entirely distinct. ~~Th~~ A person can take either one without the other, or both. Question? (2 1/4) Not this year. Well Daniel is an interesting study but this is also. Isaiah is just as interesting as Daniel is, and of course Daniel has some principles that are a little different, a little unusual, and there is a course I've given in the Prophets including Daniel, chapter 2 and 12 I've given several times. And I'll give that again some time, but not this year, we're pretty well filled.

Now we were in chapter 53 and had nearly completed the chapter, had spoken I believe about verse 11, with its statement ~~again~~ of the fact ~~th~~at the Atonement is to be effective, that it will accomplish something, because it says that He will see of the travail of His soul and be satisfied, it is not just an empty show, but something that really accomplishes something, and then, by His knowledge shall my righteous servant

justify many, and the "His" we notice must be here an objective genitive, not a subjective genitive, not what He knows, but what is known about Him, by the knowledge of Him shall my righteous servant justify many, by people coming to know what He has done, they will be justified. And this is very interesting, this reference, my righteous servant, because it is the last reference to my servant, the servant of the Lord, in the book of Isaiah. This chapter ends with discussions of the Servant of the Lord, After this, we never have any reference to the servant of the Lord, it is the servants of the Lord, plural. There are a few ~~se~~ references to ~~the~~ His servants who are the followers of the Servant. But this ends the specific picture of the Servant of the Lord. He shall justify many, and He will justify many and then hear the reason for it stated, going back to the fact of (4 1/4)

Because he will bear their iniquities, and

you notice it is the "many," it is many he will bear. It is no universalism, it is not that the whole world is redeemed from its sin, but it is those who belong to Him, those who believe on Him, He will justify many, for He will bear their iniquity. Substitutionary Atonement is very, very clearly expressed. How you can possibly apply this to the ^{Jews} ~~view~~ and say they are bearing the iniquities of other people, it just doesn't make sense. It is--or to Isaiah or to Jeremiah. It is Christ (5)

And then verse 12, therefore will I divide him with the great, "a portion" with the great, "a portion" is in italics and really doesn't need to be in italics because it is the word "divide" here means apportioned, means to give a portion, and a dividing portion, He will receive a portion, while the great ones also receive a portion, these great ones are of course the enemies of God, the enemies of mankind, Satan has seized this world and holds it, but a portion of what Satan has will be taken away from him. Again no universalism ~~is~~ but a redemption of His own. He shall divide the spoil with the strong, the "strong one" here of ~~course~~ is Satan. Satan has the spoil which he has taken through Adam's sin, Jesus is going to seize a portion of it from him, is going to take away from Satan some of the spoil which he has. Is going to take it away. Why? Because He

poured out His soul unto death. Certainly this would not make sense from the viewpoint of one who does not recognize substitutionary atonement. Why would that enable Him to divide the spoil with the strong one, the fact that He poured out His soul unto death. It is only in reference to Christ, that the verse makes sense at all. The reason He can divide the spoil is, not because He was victorious and saved His life, and destroyed the enemy but because He poured out His soul unto death. And because He was numbered with the transgressors, because He bare the sin of many. It is a clear presentation of substitutionary atonement, you just can't get rid of it. It is very clearly here. And it is a wonderful thing because the thought is so little expressed in the Old Testament, there are sacrifices, there are allusions, there are pictures, but a clear statement like this, we do not often find, and so it is very interesting that here we have this extremely clear statement of it. Now would you please all open your Hebrew Bible at chapter 53, and I wanted to look at chapter 53, and I won't ask any one person to read the whole verse of this last verse, but I want to have several read portions of it, and I want to read it very specifically and accurately. Chapter 53, the last verse, would you begin, Mr. Charvoz, please? (7 1/4) ...a million transgressors in the world. ~~You~~ He was not crucified with the transgressors, not with all the transgressors of the world, not with a couple of the most outstanding transgressors, but just with some of them. Just between two thieves. It is indefinite, not definite. Not with the transgressors, but with transgressors. He was numbered with transgressors. ...expect me to make a better translation than those great scholars. Well, I can't expect you to, but I can expect you to see certain obvious things. And here is an obvious thing, that it says, that he will divide this, why? Because He has poured out His soul unto death. It is perfect. Because He was numbered with the transgressors, perfect, and he bare the sin of many-- it is perfect. But now it is not ~~imp~~ perfect (they were all perfect), it is imperfect, and it is not imperfect with any kind of a wau conversive or anything like that, there's no wau on it. And for transgressors He will make intercession, is what He says. And if you

take it literally and exactly as it says, it makes far more sense than it made. I puzzled over this, before I knew Hebrew. Here was this wonderful picture of the Atonement of Christ. Why will He do this? Because He poured out His soul unto death and was numbered with the transgressors, and He bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors. I never could figure the sense of it. Why do you say, after you tell that He bore the sin of transgressors then because He made intercession for the transgressors? How does it fit in? ~~He~~ Where does it come? Well, it doesn't. It's an imperfect. He divides spoil with Satan. He takes things away from him because He has been numbered with transgressors, has been humiliated for the cause of God, has borne our sins upon Him, and He has done all this, but not only has He done all this, not only does He take spoil away from Satan because of what He has done, but He continues His intercessory ministry, He is even now at the right hand making intercession for us. This is not one past act which has been done and completed and is the Atonement which He has made, it is the continuing intercessory ministry of the Lord that is continuing all the time through the present age and is so vital a part of our Christian life. And we have a right to know that He is at the right hand of God, making intercession for us even now. And the time of it is entirely different from (10) and the Hebrew has indicated the time by ceasing to use the perfect and introducing an imperfect here, to show a difference of time. And the KJ, they've often had very excellent translations on the whole, it is a fine piece of work, but they certainly muffed it here, in this case, by ignoring--~~they'r~~ there are a few other cases where they have ignored the tense of the original and have missed a great part of the blessing of the original. Here the chapter ends not with just a repetition of something that has been said a dozen times, before, that He is atoning for sin, that's wonderful, that's been said over and over, but the chapter ends with a new note, His intercession continues on. He will continue His intercessory ministry all through this age, at the right hand of God. And so it makes a far greater sense out of this last verse. Instead of having two parts of it, God is going to divide

Him a portion with the great, because of these things which He has done. Or three parts, as the punctuation of the KJ would suggest, first God is going to divide this, second He poured out His soul unto death and was numbered with the transgressors, third He bare the sin of many and made intercession for the transgressors, as if that's some sort of a summary of the whole, and pretty hard to see how the intercession would be part of the summary. Instead of that there are three parts to it, but the first is the effectiveness of His work, what God does, divides Him a portion with the great, second the reason for His effectiveness, because He poured out His soul unto death, being numbered with the transgressors, and bearing the sin of many, and the third, His continuing work on all through the present age, for those who believe in Him. Just a change of tense here, makes the verse make sense, and it is full of meaning for the life of the believer, and anyone should be able to see that even if you don't know what these words are, even if you don't. Now it is fine to take your grammar and take your dictionary and look up (12) and find out exactly what it means, take it ~~on~~ without an English Bible, just use the Hebrew and go to the dictionary and get the meaning of each word and work it through, and it is fine to do that, and you ought to do quite a bit of study that way, but it is also good to cover a great deal of territory without doing it thoroughly like that, just look at the verse, and it should be easy to figure that it is an imperfect, and then as you get your meaning, (12 1/2)

You notice the fact in the Hebrew of the change of tense, and you ask the question why, and the answer is not hard to find, and it adds tremendously to our understanding of the passage. Mr. Golin? (12 3/4) The normal Hebrew order is verb, subject, object, but this order may be changed for purposes of emphasis, and may be changed greatly in poetry. In English poetry, word orders change around quite a bit, and if it is changed too much in English, it gives us a jar. Because in English the word order is part of the meaning and structure. In Hebrew it isn't. In Hebrew you can twist the order around just for emphasis very easily any time. It doesn't jar in Hebrew to have the verb second,

it is unusual in prose, but in poetry, it is quite common to switch it around just about any way that fits the needs of the poet.

Well we finish then our examination of ~~this~~ marvelous 53rd chapter, and it is one of the great chapters of the Bible and is clearly a picture of substitutionary atonement as clear as one think of having or could find anywhere. Here it is very clearly, and what does it mean? ^{If it is} ~~is it~~ a prediction of the coming of the Messiah, the answer to the problem of sin? It is perfectly understandable and very clear. If it is anything else, you have to do an awful lot of twisting to get sense out of and leave many phrases, either unexplained or so twisted around that they're just unrecognizable. But that is one of the big clues in interpreting anything. Anything you're apt to interpret, you try to get an interpretation that answers all of the passage, not just part. Something that runs through consistently, that every bit of the evidence is taken in in your answer, (14 1/4) and related to your answer, and it certainly works in relation to this.

Well, now, you looked at your next chapter, your 54th chapter, and you're not in nearly as clear a place...

C.69 (1/2)

...at your 54th chapter, the--one can immediately ask well now just what does this have to do with all that. Well, you find the end of it says, this is the heritage of the servants of the Lord, and their righteousness is of me, ^{saith} ~~that's~~ the Lord. So that would suggest that this chapter, or at least the last part of it is dealing with that which will come to the followers of the servants. To His people the servants of the Lord. But just how to make sense out of chapter 54 is a problem which needs consideration. It is not nearly as clear as you approach it as 53. But that is true of any book you're trying to interpret, of any problem you're trying to deal with, of any matter in any field of study. There are certain things that are absolutely clear, certain things that are not clear. And you have to interpret the less clear in the light of the more clear, that is true of any sentence you express. In a sentence that you express there are going

to be words that can be understood in different ways, going to be phrases that have different possibilities of interpretation, but you see the hold of that which is absolutely clear and then you get the relation to it of that which is less clear, and soon it becomes equally clear in the light of that which stands on its own feet and is perfectly clear. That's true of anything whatever, any sort of study. Well, another thing about it is, as you go into a field of study where there is a passage of Scripture, whether it is a matter of a doctrine, an interpretation of the problem, whatever it is, and as you find certain things clear and certain things less clear, and so it is good, often, to start from one end and then from the other end. In going ahead and you find difficulty jumps ahead a ways. See how things relate and find those things that are clear. And so, from the viewpoint now of not simply telling you what this means, but the viewpoint of leading you into methods of interpreting to find what it means, we are wise to glance ahead beyond the 54th chapter, and see what we find next. See if it is clearer at this point than the 54th is. So we look at the 55th chapter, and the 55th is a chapter that is almost unique in Scripture. I know of hardly anything else in Scripture that is exactly like this 55th chapter. And as you look at this 55th chapter, one thing they're apt to say is what is the 53rd chapter talking about? Just saying, here, people, come, I got a blessing for you, come and get it, it won't cost you anything, here it is, take it. Well, what does that mean? It must be related to something, and it is very reasonable to say it is related to the 53rd. The 53rd is a clear picture of the Atonement of Christ, the 55th is an invitation to partake of its result. It is the call, the offer of the result of the work of the servant described in chapter 53. So in 55 He starts with this wonderful call. Whom is it addressed to? Is He here talking to Israel, in Babylon, saying I'm going to deliver you? Ho, whoever is in bondage. There is no mention of bondage here. Whoever is in captivity, whoever is far from home, whoever is needing deliverance from the Babylonian. ~~Let's think~~ No such thing to it, it is a very general statement: Ho, every one that thirsts--a call to all who have any need. This

can include the Jew ^{in Babylon,} ~~ish family,~~ it can include the Jew in captivity, it can include the person with any need whatever, can include the person struggling under the load of sin, but it does not address itself in this verse specifically to it. It is the person who had a need, the person who has a longing, the person who has a hunger; Ho, every one that thirsteth, and so we have this wonderful call here, at the beginning of 55--very different from the way 53 starts, but related to it, the result of the work of the Messiah done in 53 is that this marvelous call of 55 can be given. Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters. The ~~was~~ word waters must be used figuratively. A thirst (4 3/4) as it clearly ~~used~~ is, not just an offer to give a drink of water, it is an offer to give all that a drink of water can signify, to give anything which answers a need a deeply felt need of the individual. Every one that has a need, come to the place where this need can be satisfied. And he that has no money, come ye buy and eat, how can you buy if you don't have money to buy anything. In other words, come and secure without price, an offer of something that is free as far as you ~~are~~ concerned. It is not free as far as God is concerned. It has cost Him a great deal. It has been purchased with the death of His Son, purchased with a terrific suffering, described in chapter 53. But it is something which is yours freely for the asking. Come, buy and eat. Buy wine and milk, pictures of that which is strength and that which is nourishing, that which satisfied your need, and satisfies your desire. Buy wine and milk, without money and without price, and then the second verse, we haven't had anything like this second verse in our whole section. Yes, Mr. Miller? (6 1/4) What about it? (stu) Yes, because the water, while a person in a dry land, going through the wilderness ~~of~~ finds himself getting so thirsty that just a drink of cold water from a spring, seems like the very grandest thing that you could ever think of in life, and so thirst and the waters that will satisfy your thirst is a wonderful picture for the deepest need of the human soul. Yet for the ordinary person,

in ordinary things of life, water is something that doesn't cost you anything, you just pick up where you find it, drink it and think nothing of it. But the milk requires an animal from which you can secure it. It is a difficult thing to get milk, you have to have an animal, a goat, a camel, or a cow that can give milk, you have the animal cared for, you have to have the milk available, something that you 'd ordinarily think of as costing, rather than being gotten like you'd ordinarily get water. And the same is true of the wine. They have to grow the grapes, have to care for them for a long time, to press them out, there is the getting the fruit juice, a great deal involved in it. So the first part of the verse suggests the very deep need, that if it isn't satisfied you're just helpless, the last part speaks more of those needs that the person who doesn't have money is in difficulty to get. If you're in the desert the water is hard to get, but wherever you are it takes money, takes means to get the wine and to get milk, and here he is looking at the aspect of your effort necessary. You can have these valuable satisfying things without money and without price. Of course it is all figurative, I don't think anybody would question it was figurative, but it is an easily understood figure because they are the common things of life.

Actually if you get fruit juice and milk, between them, you get most of the vitamins you need right there. But without any effort on your part you can get them. And then verse 2 is something quite different from any experience, anything else that we've had earlier ~~in~~ these chapters. We've had God is going to deliver ~~the~~ His people, He is going to take them back to their home, going to free them from Babylonian oppression, He has had them rebuked for the way that they have failed to show gratitude to the Lord, had it pointed out that it's on account of their sin that they're there, but here is an entirely new note, why do you spend money for that *which is not bread*, and your labour for that which satisfies not? A picture of the people struggling to get something to satisfy their need, and not finding it satisfying. Why do you spend your efforts, your struggle, your hard efforts to get what you need? Why listen to me,

and you can have what is good, and your soul can delight itself in that which satisfied all needs. A call to receive for nothing the most deeply satisfying things of life, and that which you would struggle for, and here you're told you don't have to struggle, you just have it--a marvelous picture of the free grace of God that can be received as a result of the tremendous expense and effort put into securing it, but which you don't have to put in, which the Lord has put in. He is the only one who could do it as described in chapter 55. So it certainly is the gospel call, very clearly and very strongly, and closely related to 53. Yes, Mr. Oliver? (10 1/4) I don't see how anybody could read 55 without getting a thrill out of it. It is a marvelous moving passage. But to just understand what it means, unless you relate it to 53 would be something that one would be puzzled by. Here you're told to carry on your sacrificial systems, to go through all these rites and ceremonies, told that God requires a quiet heart, an obedient attitude, and all these qualities pointed out, all this has been (11) but here you're just told to take everything good and just take it (11) Well, the reason is because He has provided, but how many people saw, understood what it meant, it would be very hard to understand in Isaiah's day, but one could get an apprehension, something of a realization, that God is in some marvelous way going to supply, going to satisfy them. (11 1/4) It would take on a far greater import when you understood the full meaning, certainly would.

Well then this marvelous Gospel call is here given, and you notice how much emphasis there is on listening, how much on accepting, on paying attention, not on working, not on toiling, not on improving yourself, but simply listening. Listen, hear ~~then~~ diligently unto me, incline your ear and come to me, hear and your soul shall live, and I will make an everlasting covenant with you, even the sure mercies of David. Now this is very interesting, the sure mercies of David. Does that mean that David is going to give you mercy? Is David a subjective genitive here, the mercy that

David can give you? Or is it an objective genitive, the mercy that has been shown to David? Or is it a possessive Genitive, the mercies that David possesses or that he did possess? The everlasting covenant that God will make is similar to the covenant made with David. The wonderful blessings that David has had, the marvelous things we find in David's life, of how God cared for him, how he gave him so much, was so wonderful, but what is the greatest promise ever given to David, the everlasting covenant, the promise that He would always have a son to sit upon His throne. And the Israelites went back from Babylon, and they came back to Jerusalem, and they did not have a king, they had a high priest but not a king, they were still under the Persian control, and they were under the Persian empire and then Alexander conquered them and they were under the Greeks, then they were under the Ptolemies, then they were under the Syrians, and then in the Maccabean time they won freedom from them, and they appointed Simon Maccabeas to be their high priest and king forever, or until a prophet should come and tell them what they should do, but they had no king of the line of Judah which they were supposed to have, and then of course the Romans came and ~~put~~ conquered and put an end to the Maccabean line, and they had no king, and ~~had~~ had no actual king since, but the promise was given to David that he would always have a son to sit upon the throne, and now we are told that God will make an everlasting covenant with us, even the sure mercies of David. It ties it up with the great promise to David of the Son of David to sit on his throne, and also with the blessings shown to David as David was blessed of the Lord and protected and cared for, and enabled to write those marvelous psalms of trust in God. Then we have, verse 4, behold I have given him for a witness to the people, a leader and commander to the people...

... And of course David was a witness to God's grace, and he was a leader and commander to the people in his day, a wonderful leader, but is this pointing back and saying David was a leader or is this pointing forward to the promise given to David, a promise of a son to sit on his throne, that this coming One is going to be a witness. You think of Christ's properties, you think of His wonderful statements, you think of His life on earth here, as a leader and commander. Behold, thou shalt call a nation thou knowest not, and nations that knew not thee shall run unto thee because of the Lord thy God, and for the Holy One of Israel; for he has glorified thee. Here we have again the outreach, it is not any one nation that is involved. Nations that knew not thee shall run unto thee. We had it in the very first picture of the Servant, in Isa.42, that He will be a light to the Gentiles, and that He will establish judgment to the very ends of the earth. So we have this wonderful promise which is given there at the very beginning of the work of the Servant. It is a universal work which affects all nations, not every individual, but all nations. Yes? (1 3/4) It is not made clear who the "thee" is. Is the "thee" here speaking of Israel, the nation to whom the others are to come, or is the "thee" here speaking to the group thought of as a unit, who are following the Servant. Is that who it is speaking to? The group, thought of as a unit, who follow the Servant, and have trusted in Him and are receiving His blessing. This group is to be enlarged by the coming of people from nations far off that have never heard of the existence of Israel or of the life of Christ at all, but they are to come to this group because the Lord has glorified Him. Now I don't think we can dogmatically ^{say} which of the two the "thee" is, but I don't see how it could be anything else, but what is given here. Then, again the call, Seek the Lord while he may be found, call ye upon him while he is near. There are three things in this, one the wonderful invitation. Without money, without price, seek the Lord while he may be found. Second the assurance that he may be found, that He is near; third, the suggestion that He won't always be near, that ~~He~~ ^{it} won't always be possible to find Him. Today is the day of salvation. Seek

Him while He may be found, call upon Him when He is nigh. Now we have our first reference to sin in the whole chapter comes not till verse 7. Let the wicked forsake his way and the unrighteous man his thoughts: and let him return to the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him, and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon. And then the wonderful verses 8 and 9, For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord. For ~~was~~ as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts.

It was about seven or eight years ago, I got a letter from a young woman who was a student in West Chester Teachers' College, and she said Dr. MacRae we have a class down we are required to take, in Western Civilization. ~~W~~ And she said, in this class we have a textbook which just tears the Bible to pieces and she said, our professor does not claim to believe it but he is teaching what is in the book, and that's that. She said we speak up in class and he lets us talk but she said, this is what is in the book, this is what he is to teach, and he teaches it, and she said there are a lot of things that we just can't answer, could you come down and give us some help? I said all right, be glad to, if you'd send me a copy of the book so I can look it over first. So she did that, and I went down and they announced it in his courses, and she was hoping he would come, but he didn't. So we met in the Bible Presbyterian Church which was at that time just a half a block from the West Chester Teachers' College and we had quite a group there, and she said now you want to stop at quarter of eight (they started at seven), because they have to go to Study Hall at eight o'clock, so when it came quarter of eight, I talked for half an hour I think then threw it open to questions, and I said now we'll have a hymn now, it's quarter of eight, and I understand you have to go and study and all of you who want to go just go and if any of you care to stay, we'll continue discussion. And you know out of 30 I think there were two left, and we discussed for three-quarters of an hour more, so they were really interested. But this book showed the development of religion through Animism and all the different stages

you know, and then it talked about the second Isaiah, and it said, in the second Isaiah, we have a new stage of religion, a stage that thought of God as so far distant from man that he would say God will have no interest in humanity at all, he was far removed, so far removed, that Isaiah said, my thoughts are not your thoughts nor my ways your ways, but as the heavens are higher above the earth, so far distant are my ways from your ways. And ~~that's~~ what the book said, and then I said, now that's what the book says, let's see what the context says. So we just turned to this and read the verse before it: Seek the Lord while he may be found, call upon him while he is near, let the wicked forsake his way and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him return to the Lord and he will have mercy upon him. What is the meaning of verses 8 and 9, the meaning is very clear. You do something to a human wicked, treat him meanly, steal from him, hurt him, do real damage to him, and then come around and say oh I'm sorry I did that, please forgive me and give me a share of these good things you've got. And he'll say well you'll have to make up for what you've done first, and I won't trust you after what you've done anyway, and so on. He--a man won't forgive that easily, it just doesn't appear natural to the human being. But God says, let him forsake his way and return to the Lord and he'll have mercy upon him, he will abundantly pardon because my thoughts are not your thoughts nor my ways your ways. For the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways. In other words the point of it is that God's goodness is so great and His interest in humanity so great, that He ~~shows~~^{shows} these this wonderful loving character, utterly different from that of any human being. So the professor in Rutgers had the verse interpreted the exact opposite of what he means. He interpreted it to show how lofty and distant God is, with no interest in humanity, when actually what it means is, how different He is from sinful, wicked man, that He can show this wonderful love and mercy, a complete reversal of its meaning. And I just went through the book and showed how most of his

quotations from the Bible were like that, simply taken out of context, and had nothing to do with what it really meant in context at all, and it was so bad that I can't imagine that the men who wrote the book ever read these things in the Bible, I think he copied them from some other book that gave them probably. Yes? (8) Oh, no, no. Nobody puts any first Isaiah later than chapter 39. No. You--they might divide up almost any part of the second Isaiah, that's what we're studying this semester, is what they originally called the second Isaiah. They might take most any part of it and say this is written by another writer. And there may be a few verses here and there, they'd say this was written long before. But they practically never would think of it as first Isaiah here. Some of the writers would have the servant's § (8 3/4) all by a different writer than the regular section, but others think it is the same one. But they wouldn't--first Isaiah is pretty well restricted to about a third of the material between 1 and 39, scattered through according to their view. But, here these are wonderful statements but these are not statements here of the great unapproachable majesty of God, that's taught in the Scriptures, but that's not the thought of these two verses. The thought of these two verses is the marvelous love of God, so different from human attitudes, that a human being would never be at all like it, that it is almost incomprehensible to the human being. Well, this--yes? I'm afraid I have to stop. It is 25 after, unless my watch is a minute fast. We'll assume it is a minute fast, can you speak rapidly, or had we better leave it till next class? (9 3/4) Yes, that is parallel, return to the Lord, he will have mercy on him; return to our God, he will abundantly pardon. Purely parallel. (stu.) No, he returns to our God. But I wanted to say though before you go, that 55 is very clear in relation to 53. Now for next time please study 54 and see what it means in relation to what precedes and follows, and also look into 56, verses 1 through 8. What is it talking about? What connection does it have with it? Those are the more difficult things: 56.1-8... (break in record, starting again at

Isaiah 55, and just to review a bit the contents of the chapter--we noticed that the verses 1 to the middle of 3 is the invitation. This invitation in Isa. 55 through the middle of 3 is purely a call to receive great blessings through grace alone. That is the idea~~s~~ that is stressed here is grace, undeserved favor. Unmerited receipt of wonderful blessings. Nothing one can do for it but wonderful things that one will receive. Specifically what it is is not really told. We are to buy wine and milk, we are to come to the water, we are to let our soul delight itself in fatness. Perhaps the nearest to a specific statement would be the last part of the first half of the third verse. Hear and your soul shall live. That would be perhaps the most specific thing in it. These others of course are matters that are useful for physical life, figures of that which is necessary for the spiritual life. Yes, Mr. Myers? (12 1/4)

...55, and I was starting at the beginning again to review what we looked at, we touch~~s~~ this point, that and the other, when we're going over it, ^{to gather it} now/together maybe will give a little better understanding. And bringing out perhaps a little bit that we didn't so clearly state last time. That is the first two and a half verses of 55, and then the next from the middle of 3 through 5, is the covenant with David, or the covenant of David. That is the unifying thought in this two and a half verses. They might be considered as an extension of the first two and a half. You might consider that the first part includes all of verse 3, but if you do you have the everlasting covenant the sure mercies of David and you're talking of him very specifically in the next verse. So that it's probably one through five makes a definite unit, but this unit breaks rather definitely in the middle, with the stress on the covenant of David. We've had life given with no expense, life as purely a gift of God. Now we have--this life is connected in some way with David. It is an everlasting covenant, even the sure mercies of David, the mercies that God gave David, or the mercies that God promised to David, or the mercies that God promised through David. It is not clear as you glance at the verse, of which of these three are involved, and probably actually all three are true.

But when you come to verse 4 it is quite evident that no matter to how great an extent that the mercies given to David and the mercy is involved in this as an example. Certainly something given through David is contained, because verse 4 specifically refers ~~later~~ to David in relation to this. Behold I have given Him for a witness to the people, a leader and a commander to the people. And immediately the question comes up, is this here speaking of the historic David, or of someone in the future who is here described by the name of David. That would be the question that would arise, and one would have to consider that from various ~~angles~~ angles...

C.71. (1/2)

...what does it have to do with the wonderful gift of grace, that you come to the waters and receive them without price, and buy wine and milk without paying anything for it, what does it have to do with that David is a commander, even a commander to the people? Well, David brought relief, deliverance from their enemies, establishment of a ~~situ~~ation of independence and of prosperity to the Israelites in the past, it would suggest then that as David brought this in the past, someone in the future who can be referred to as David is going to do the same thing. It would be natural to think of it as meaning a son of David, a representative of David, One who carries on the covenant with David, that he will always have a son to sit on ~~his~~ throne, one who is to be like David was, a witness to God's grace and God's mercy, and a leader and commander to God's people, so that this would tie up with chapter 53, but if so, it brings in an idea that was not explicitly stated at all in 53. The fact that the Messiah ~~there~~ spoken of ~~is~~ the suffering One--is also the Son of David. We have no specific reference to David before, I don't recall any specific reference to him in our whole section, ~~except~~ chapter 40 on, do any of you think of any? I haven't looked to see, but I don't recall any. But here he is explicitly brought in, and brought in in connection with this wonderful offer of God's grace, and this offer of God's grace, is not an offer simply to the

Jewish people, because verse 5 makes it very clear that it extends very widely. Thou shalt call a nation thou knowest not, and nations that knew not thee shall run unto thee. Certainly not just a picture of conquest, not a picture of Israelites overcoming other nations, but a picture of people coming to desire the blessing that they can receive through David. Thou shalt call a nation thou knowest not. Who is the "thou"? Is He talking to the people to whom He has given for a leader and a commander, or is He talking to the David who was given as a leader and a commander? Thou shalt call a nation thou knowest not, and nations that knew not thee shall run unto thee because of the Lord thy God, and for the Holy One of Israel, for he hath glorified thee. We have no chapter exactly like this that fits anywhere else, and it certainly here, in its place, in relation to chapter 53, the base upon which it all rests. And then after the covenant with David, we have something of a break, or you might say a new start, we have the invitation repeated. Verses 6 to 9 again invitation. But in this case the invitation is a little different from the previous invitation. The invitation in the first part was to receive life, and there was no mention ^{in it} of anyone's having an ill desert, that deserved something different from life, that deserved punishment rather than life--there is no such suggestion in the first part. It is not excluded but it is not mentioned at all. But here in verse 7, we find that this wonderful invitation given, is an invitation given to those who are ~~with him~~ ^{wicked and} who are unrighteous, given to those who deserve punishment--and they are told that they can turn to the Lord and receive His mercy and His abundant pardon. So that the grace which is given in general terms in the first two and a half verses, is now made specific, a grace that involves forgiveness. And in verse 6 we were to seek the Lord while He may be found, call upon Him while He is near. What is the implication of that? Is that that previously He couldn't be found, now He can be? Or is ^{it} that now He can be, maybe He won't always be so easily found, or

(4 1/4) Now that Christ has suffered on the cross, now that Isaiah has occurred, or now that you can look forward to His suffering on the cross,

at any rate, in view of His suffering on the cross, it is possible to find the Lord, and therefore you should seek Him who is now easily found by virtue of what He has done in Isaiah 53. Call upon Him while He is near, He is now near, now is the day of salvation. How long it will continue, no promises are given, but now it is. And the wicked and the unrighteous^{, however} man~~s~~, in receiving it, must be sincere. There was no condition given in the first three and a half verses. Simply to come to the waters, but now we are told that the wicked man should forsake his ways and the unrighteous man should forsake his thoughts, as he returns. The coming to the Lord for mercy must be a sincere coming, must be a coming which includes an attempt to turn away from one's sin and one's rejection of Christ.

And now this ^{edition of} ~~division~~ the Bible that I have here has a paragraph division at verse 8, and that is I believe is a very unfortunate place for a paragraph division. Because there certainly is no paragraph break between verses 7 and 8. Verse 6, it gives a paragraph ~~division~~ and that's quite a reasonable ^{place,} ~~thing~~, the new beginning of the invitation, but the invitation is explained or discussed in verses 8 to 9. Certainly verses 8 to 9 are not ~~preparation~~ for verse 10. Verses 8 and 9 said God is the Lord, the mighty One who has created the Universe and can accomplish all He chooses, therefore, verse 10, as the rain comes down, and the snow from heaven, and returns not thither, but waters the earth, so shall my word accomplish my purpose, that would be very reasonable, and that would make 8 and 9 part of the same paragraph with 10 and 11, but that is not what 8 and 9 say. And I wonder how many readers of chapter 55 see the meaning of 8 and 9. It is not expressed but it is very, very clear in context. We discussed that a little last time. And we noticed that it undoubtedly in the context means for him to abundantly pardon those who have sinned against Him, ~~since~~ simply because they return, without their making any atonement, any recompense, something that you could not expect any human being to do, it would not be in line with human thoughts or human

but it is the divine thought , the divine way, to forgive man freely, but God Himself pays the penalty, God opens the way. The divine plan which no man could have thought of, has made it possible that God could do what no man could be thought of as doing. And so 8 and 9 undoubtedly are part of the paragraph that begins with verse 6~~4~~, the invitation to receive forgiveness, a subsidiary part pointing out the relation of this to the character of God. And these two verses, as I mentioned last time, are dragged out of context, and used to endeavor to show that the second Isaiah believed in a great distant God who wasn't interested in humanity. Which is a contradiction of everything else from chapter 40 to 56. And certainly is taking two verses alone to get a thought that contradicts everything else in the whole context. And if you take them in the line of context, that's not the thought of them at all, but the thought is the very opposite. It is the forgiving nature of God, so contrary to the nature of man. And then after invitation to forgiveness in verses 6 to 9, verses 10 and 11 certainly go together and certainly have one definite thought involved in them a thought which has not previously been directly expressed in the chapter. And what is the specific , definite thought that is expressed in verses 10 to 11? Mr. Myers? (8 1/4) ...you were giving what I wanted until you got to your last sentence. Because up to there, I thought what did you say that wasn't already in verse 3, hear and your soul shall live. A result comes. The Word comes down and life comes. A result comes. Up to your last sentence, and so a result will come, and I think that brings out the idea of the certainty of a result. Surely that is the thought of these two verses, the certainty of the result. God does not simply give an invitation into the air , which may or may not produce results. Here we have election. Here we have the certainty of the accomplishment of God's will. Here we have His promise that He is not merely giving an invitation to the air, maybe somebody will take it, maybe they won't. If they do, they have the chance, if they don't, well, that's that. But no, He says, His invitation He has given in the earlier verses here, His wonderful offer of salvation is not simply

something shot out into the air in the hope that somebody will grab it, but He says, that just as God provides ~~the~~ⁱⁿ nature, that which produces results, so He says, His word will not return to Him void, but will accomplish the purpose for which ~~it~~ He sent it. In other words, It is sent forth in order to bring souls into salvation, in order to cause spiritual life to spring up, in order that His own may be saved, and it will accomplish its purpose. It is the great assurance of those who go out with the word of God, they can go out and give His word and know that results will come, because He says it will accomplish that which I please, and it will prosper in the things whereto I sent it. God's purpose will be accomplished. Here is the divine mystery of election, and here is the certainty of the result, which the Lord has planned from all eternity. His Word is not going to return to Him void, It is ~~going~~ to accomplish the purposes which He has ordained for it. Some of the German commentators from about a century ago said that this could hardly be what is meant here, because they said the ancient Israelites could not know that the water that comes down from heaven returns up to heaven by evaporation. They couldn't have know that, so they couldn't have used the figure, it will not return unto me void. They couldn't have used the figure, they said, because they didn't know it. Well, how are we going to prove ~~what~~ what they knew and what they didn't know. But the fact is that we have the statement here, that the rain and snow come down from heaven, and they've come down and so shall the word be, it will not return unto thee void, why should the word return? Surely it is the ~~figure~~ figure of the rain and snow coming down. They come down, they water the earth, and then they evaporate again. Whether the Israelites knew it or not, certainly the picture rests back upon a true fact of nature. They return and their time is ended. Now as far as the word is concerned, this is a figure. How does the word come back to you? Well, the Word is sent forth and the word doesn't just disappear, it accomplished its purpose. If they disappear, they go into the ocean and then they evaporate. Yes?

(11 3/4) There are two possibilities of the interpretation of the verse. One interpreta-

tion is God sends His word out to give everybody life. It will not return void but it will give life to every person, so there is universalism. Now that is one way to try to interpret the passage. If we found universalism taught elsewhere in the Scripture we might say this fits in there. But as we look closely at the verse we find that there are certain phrases in the verse which incline against universalism rather than for it. He says it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing for which I sent it. The two phrases imply, it could be ^{if} He meant it to save everybody, everybody will be saved. But they don't say everybody ~~is~~ going to be saved. They say that everybody for whose salvation He sent it will be saved. So we have the great mystery of the divine will. We have the absolute power of God who can accomplish whatever He chooses, and He says my word is sent forth and will accomplish that for which I sent it, but we also have the wonderful invitation given, the invitation which is extended to all men and which makes them the wonderful offer and we know that the invitation is sincere, and so we know that God is sincerely offering it to all, and that anyone can accept and that anyone who accepts will receive eternal life, but we know that God has foreordained from before the foundation of the world those who are going to accept and He says that the Word will accomplish the thing that He has sent it for. So we have just a brief glimpse here of the marvelous mystery of the divine person in these two verses, and we know that it is our duty to do everything possible to reach people with the word, to do every possible way to reach them, we know that, but we also know that if we faithfully and sincerely and earnestly endeavor to the ~~the~~ best of our ability, and then if the results are not what we wish they might be, we know that they are what the Lord intended them to be. So we have the two which is a hard balance to get, because it is very easy to sit back and say oh well if the Lord wants to convert the heathen He can convert them without your effort and mine, and of course that isn't true, the Bible says ~~that~~ God uses men for His purpose. But on the other hand, when we exert ourselves to the very utmost and do the best we can, we can know that the

results are in His hands, and that He will accomplish what He has begun to accomplish, and we don't need to feel worried or fretful or frustrated, because the results are not more than they are. That is in His hands and He has declared the Word will accomplish that unto which He has sent it. It's a mystery, but the mystery is touched upon very clearly in this and both sides of the mystery ~~of~~ are emphasized. Free invitation, couldn't make it stronger than it is in this chapter. But also that the divine purpose is going to be accomplished....

C72. (1/2)

...verses 10 to 11, the certainty of results, then we have that very interesting verse --12 and 13, two verses which at first sight don't necessarily seem to be closely related to (3/4) what precedes. Certainly, simply verbally, they are not, you have to see the inner meaning, and the relationship, and that relationship, well, these two verses express great joy, and certainly there is joy in what precedes--the marvelous invitation, and there is the certainty that this invitation is going to bring results and so there is great joy. And the fact that it starts with the word, for ye shall go out with joy and be led forth with peace, leads many interpreters to say this is a picture of return from Babylonian exile, we're going to go out with joy, going to be led forth with peace, but it is the only thing in the whole chapter to suggest it. The rest of the ~~chapter seems~~ to rest upon something much larger and greater than that, something which may include that, but which is hardly restricted to that, and since it is so isolated, that which would seem perhaps to have specific reference to the return from the exile, since that is the case, it certainly seems justified to take it in relation to the chapter (2) and take it that the acceptance of this wonderful gift of God's ~~of~~ free grace, of this wonderful forgiveness, and turning away from their unrighteousness, that God's promise is a going forth, being led out. And that it is rather that which is in mind here than specifically the return from the Babylonian exile. We have had no specific references to the return from exile, since the two-thirds through chapter 52, we are in a larger

sphere now, a sphere that is related to that but much larger, and a sphere up to which that leads. Ye shall go forth with joy and be led forth with peace and then we have an expression which the people use to try to show us that we should not put too much dependence on the Old Testament, or think we can take it literally. They say how are the trees of the field going to clap their hands? Do we take that literally? Do the trees have hands, do they clap their hands? And of course it is a pitfall into which children fall when they have been taught over-simplified attitudes, and it is typical of the pitfalls into which any Christian people can fall when we are satisfied on giving them an over-simplified idea of Christianity. We cannot give all the complexities of everything, we have to simplify, but as people become older and more mature, and more able to understand it is our duty to give them a fuller understanding, so that when they come in contact with caricatures of what we believe they will recognize them for caricatures and not for an actual picture, because there are great simplicities of the Gospel which we can use, but we want to lead people on into a fuller understanding, to see that it is not the thing that is caricatured. And here, to say you take the Bible all literally is ridiculous of course, but to say that you take the Bible as a statement of ideas which is generally literal, and which is generally clarified, rather than made obscure by figurative language but it has figurative language in it, you must interpret the figurative language ϕ in the light of the environment, and we can't always tell whether something is figurative or literal, but we say this, it means something definite, it is not just a vague, general expression. The amillennial type of approach is one which // reduces so much of the Old Testament to utter vagary that you can get rid of just about anything, and it is vital to know that while there are many figures, yet there is meaning, and you should to try to get into the figure and see what it means. And try to see whether it really is a figure at all. Well, if the trees clap their hands, we certainly don't believe the trees have hands, and so we don't believe that this is a literal clapping of hands, but it is an expression of joy. It is an expression of joy

in which nature either participates or seems to participate, that is verse 12. The mountains and the hills break forth before you into singing and all the trees of the field shall clap their hands. Those who take this as a return from Babylon say yes, on the way, everything is comfortable, everything is wonderful, just all nature seems to rejoice in the marvelous event that is taking place. Well maybe to some of the returning exiles, it just seemed that way, but I'm afraid to a great many of them it was a toilsome and difficult trip where they were enduring much for the sake of their faith, and they were struggling to get back and reestablish their homeland, they were not simply going out on a marvelous triumphal procession in which all nature was rejoicing. But verse 12 is rejoicing, it is marvelous rejoicing taking place, joy over what is going to happen, but when you come to 13 it seems to go beyond joy, seems to express an actual change, there's a great increase in the size of what God provides, instead of a little thorn, is a big fir tree. Instead of a little briar or nettle ~~of some kind~~ ^{as some translate it,} there comes up a beautiful large myrtle tree, there is a great increase in size, of what God provides, but much more important than the increase in size, of course, in substitution of trees for herbs, is the substitution of that which is pleasant and attractive for that which is the sign of the curse. Thorns and thistles the earth will bring forth, unto you because of man's sin. God has offered man a complete forgiveness for his sins as a result of what has occurred in Isa. 53. He offered him this marvelous forgiveness and this marvelous forgiveness having been given to him, we can have the expectation that sometime the signs of the curse will be removed, and instead of the thorns and the thistles which came as a result of sin, ⁱⁿ order to make life hard, make him realize the reality of the sinful condition of the world, instead of that, there comes the lovely trees that are substituted for them. So one cannot say that it is necessary to interpret verse 13 in literal fashion. One cannot say that is necessary, but one cannot say that it is impossible. It is at least a possibility that this expresses a change in nature, involving a removal of the curse, and if we find such a change

clearly taught elsewhere, then we~~are~~ are justified in saying that we have an anticipation of it here. I don't think we could build upon this but I think we can find here a marvelous anticipation of it, if we find it clearly taught elsewhere, ~~as~~ we do for instance in Romans 8. Certainly it shows a removal of that which is injurious and harmful in nature and ~~sub~~stitution of that which is pleasant and attractive and then it's going to be the Lord, to remain for an everlasting sign that it shall~~not~~ be cut off. So we see wonderful far-reaching results of God's marvelous offer of salvation, results of what was done on Calvary's cross, marvelous results which go beyond probably even the time when the invitation is still being given. Suggested in these words, And so this is a marvelous climax to the whole chapter, starting with the wonderful invitation, ending with this wonderful promise of the removal of the curse and the establishment of millennial conditions on the earth, which will be for an everlasting sign ~~and~~ ^{that} shall not be cut off. It is a marvelous climax to the chapter, and you say, of course, when you reach a great climax that must be the end of the chapter, mustn't it? We certainly find many chapters that have that marvelous climax and then have a verse that seems almost like an anti-climax. We've had a few of them here, ^{You have} in Isaiah. ~~we had~~ a great many of them in the epistles of John. You have a great climax and then you have a little incidental thought thrown in at the end. Should the chapter division, well, chapter is an artificial concept, should the division of a section, a division of a passage dealing with a specific thought, should it be where it is, or ~~it~~ should it be earlier or ~~it~~ should it be later? Anybody here think it should be earlier? We have a section starting at the beginning of 55. I have not gone into 54 yet, to show that, but I think even a few ~~glances~~ glances at what precedes makes it fairly obvious, that what precedes is quite different from what is here, that the beginning of 55 is a logical break in thought. Not a major break in the book of Isaiah by any means, but a reasonable place ~~to~~ put a chapter.

Now we have a section here and we notice that verses 1 to 5 form a definite

is this a division

section, and yet 6 to 9 is so closely related it hardly seems like a main division. And we notice in the middle of 1 to 5 an important subdivision. Then we notice 6 to 9, 10 to 11, and 12 to 13. Do you think all 13 verses belong together or does possibly the latter part of it go with what follows, and make a new subdivision? Well, I doubt if anybody would think that. I think we would pretty well agree that these thoughts, though the verses often sound quite different, they deal with different things, that they're closely related, that there is a progress of thought. And now we saw that we come to a marvelous climax in verses 12 to 13, but I said we can't always say that every chapter, every section (10 3/4) always ends at the climax, sometimes there is an echo left, after the climax. Sometimes there is a subsidiary idea presented later beyond the climax, and we have had some interesting examples of that before. Now would such a thing as that be the case here, or does it end with the climax? Let's look back, for instance, chapter 48. Here you have a chapter 49, is certainly a proper thought division: Listen, O isles, unto me, and hearken, ye people, from far; --the Servant of God is speaking. This is the natural beginning of a division, chapter 49, even though not a major division, because it is closely tied to 48. But now in 48, verse 20: Go ye forth of Babylon, flee from the Chaldeans, 21, the wonderful promise, they thirsted not when he led them through the deserts, he clave the rock and the waters gushed out. Marvelous climax, 20 and 21, shouldn't that be the end. But no, we have verse 22, there's no peace, saith the Lord, to the wicked. Does verse 22 go with what precedes or with what follows? Well, it is pretty hard to connect it up as part of what follows, so it seems much more reasonable to tie it on to what precedes, doesn't it?

So now I'm saying that where we are now, at the end of 55 is a great climactic statement, 12 and 13, and you certainly can't blame the archbishop for saying here is a logical place to make a chapter, but if you have then a section afterwards that goes on continuously with one continuous thought, or one continuous development of thought, and you say between the continuous developed thought of 56 and the continuous devel-

55, 4, 56
 1, 2
 1

 oped thought of 55, there is a natural break which comes right where the chapter division is. That is an important help in understanding the thought of the passage, to see where the logical break comes. Well, ask yourself first, before that, if you want, before that, should there be any break at the end of 55, does 56 just naturally follow on? Do you think that verse 56.12 is the part of the same thought as 55, and no break between? Come ye, say they, I will fetch wine--and we just had wine, buy wine and milk without money and without price--come ye say they, I will fetch wine and we will fill ourselves with strong drink and to morrow shall be as this day, and much more abundant. Do you think that belongs with 55? Well, it sounds a little as if it might, and yet there is considerable question, but when you look at the verse before, certainly you won't think it belongs. 11, Yes, they are greedy dogs which can never have enough. Come buy wine and milk without money and without price. Yes, they are greedy dogs that can never have enough and they are shepherds that can't understand. It doesn't fit with it, does it? Certainly there should be a major break somewhere before that. Look at verse 9, all ye beasts of the field, come to devour, yea, all ye beasts in the forest. Does that fit with 55? Is that part of 55? Well, look at verse 4, for thus saith the Lord, unto the eunuchs that keep my sabbaths, and choose the things that please me, and take hold of my covenant. Even unto them will I give in mine house and within my walls a place and a name better than of sons and of daughters. Does that go with 55 or with the last part of 56, what do you think? ...

C.73. (1/2)

...very interesting that the end of verse 5 has an echo at the end of verse 13. That doesn't prove they go there, but certainly suggests it, and if you look further at the general agreement in thought you may say it goes with it. Yes? (3/4) Well, if you look at chapter 56, what is the theme of chapter 56? ...line following are strong rebukes more than anything we had in chapters 40 to 55, strong rebukes, not simply of

poignant regret at sin, not simply a statement that the reason you're in exile is on account of your sin, but a direct rebuke of those who are sinning. And it seems to be out of harmony with--that is, I don't mean it contradicts but I mean it is a different line of thought, from anything we've had from chapter 40 on, until now. That at verse 9, at the end of verse 8, and the beginning of verse 9, there is a sharp break which is one of the major breaks of the book of Isaiah. The last part of the chapter goes very closely with what follows in 57. There is no reason for a chapter division at verse 12. It goes right on, and what precedes is related to what we had in the previous chapters. There is one of the major breaks of the book of Isaiah here. I would say at the end of verse 8, some would say at the end of verse 9, and say, all ye beasts of the field, come and eat, yes, all ye beasts in the forest--is a continuation of every one come to the water, come buy wine and milk without money and without price. But if that is the case, you certainly shouldn't translate it (2 1/4) the beasts of the field and beasts ⁱⁿ ~~of~~ the forest might be a figure for the people outside, the Gentiles, ^{and so on,} to come in and ^{eat} ~~feast~~ and devour (2 1/2) --I don't think so, I think the break is after 8, but we can say at least that you cannot continue it into 10, but starting with 10, or I think more likely at 9, beginning a new major section of the book of Isaiah. We are certainly getting near to that now because our semester is coming near its end, but we have only I think about 70 more minutes left, so that it is good we're getting near to it, but if we take then, a ~~major~~ major break at the end of verse 8, then what precedes is related to what was in 55 as Mr. Roczy said, there is a universal call of salvation, and you certainly would seem to have a universal call of salvation in verse 8, wouldn't you? Verse 8, I will gather others beside those who are gathered. Verse 7, my house will be ~~house~~ house of prayer for all people a universal offer of salvation. Verse 6, the sons of the stranger, God will bless them, verse 5, I will give them a name better than the sons and daughters. Verse 3, let not the son of the stranger feel that the Lord has cut him off. The universal call for

40:8-9 a major break

salvation, as Mr. Roczey pointed out, is the great theme in these verses, but do you really find that theme in verses 1 and 2? Well, it is related to it yes, but is it actually it? You have the salvation call in chapter 55, verses 1, 2, and 3, and you have the note of universality in verse 5, a nation thou knowest not, a nation that knew not thee. You have the note of universality touched on in chapter 55 but not stressed there, it is not the major theme of 55, it is a wonderful invitation that is the theme of 55, so the fact that it is universal is contained but not stressed. But over here, in these verses you have tremendous stress on the universality of the call, on its extending far beyond the borders of Israel, but you don't particularly find either of those thoughts in verses 1 and 2, don't verses 1 and 2 sort of get along by themselves. Thus says the Lord, keep ye judgment and do justice, were we supposed to do that back in 55? No, we were told, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price, it doesn't say anything about doing justice or keeping judgment there. Thus it is the man that does this, that keep the sabbath from polluting it, and keeps his hand from doing any evil. Well, we find that in many places in the Old Testament, but we don't find that in chapter 55. 55 says let the wicked forsake his way and the unrighteous man his thoughts, yes, but let him come and God will pardon him. It is a free pardon, a free grace, but here is a note of works, in verses 1 and 2, here is a note of carrying out God's commands, keeping His sabbath from polluting it, keeping judgments and justice, there is a note in 1 and 2 that seems different from what is stressed in verses 5 to 8 and different from what is stressed in 55.1-13, and therefore you could say here is a division, 55.1-13, here is another division: 56.1,2, and here is another division: 56.3-8, but one or two verses hardly seem enough for a major division, they seem more to go with one or the other, so my question is which one do they go with? Do they go with what follows as the chapter is here, or do they go with what precedes? And we notice what precedes comes to its marvelous climax in verse 13, you might think it reached its climax, now let's stop and start again, but you don't always do that,

sometimes there is sort of an afterthought, after the climax. I think even in chapter 13 we have sort of an afterthought, ~~after~~ the climax. In chapter 53 I mean. There we have the marvelous thought in verse 11, he sees the travail of his soul and shall be satisfied, He will bear their iniquities, and the beginning of 12, He'll divide a portion with the strong and He'll divide the spoil with the great. Then the reason, to bear the sin of many. But then you have that final afterthought of Isaiah, and He is going to make intercession for the transgressors, right on through the whole time between the two advents. Now here we have the thought of these two verses, is it related to what precedes and what follows, and if so, with which of the two would it seem more definitely related? Well, I am inclined toward the idea that it is connected more with what precedes than with what follows. Because I think there is no question that in three to eight that the theme is exactly what Mr. Roczy has pointed out, the universality ~~ea~~ of God's call, the universal nature of that which He is bringing to existence as a result of the death of Christ, not the universal in the sense that everyone is included in it, not at all. But the universal in the sense that it reaches out to every tongue and nation and tribe of people, and that there are no obstacles on account of that sort of thing, to this work of God. God called Israel for a specific purpose. God wished to keep the little light from being blown out, to keep it protected, to keep it off by itself, to give the Word of God to the prophets, to prepare the way for the coming of Christ, but when the Atonement is made, it is then He will send the message out to all the world. So we have the marvelous invitation in chapter 55, an invitation in which we have nothing specifically limiting it in any way, but very little that definitely says it is not. But in 56 we have it definitely brought out that it is not limited, that it stands out.

Now, starting then with the 3rd verse there, let not the son of the stranger who joins himself to the Lord, say the Lord has utterly separated me from his people. Now those who want to take verse 12 of 55 as being definitely a reference to the exile, return from exile, insist that here what he is talking about is Babylonian, people in the

land of captivity who were impressed by the Israelites' religion, impressed by the great truth about the one actually who might be God and who came to the services and listened and was interested, and now God is ~~take~~ taking His people back to Palestine and they are left, so ~~some~~ the son of the stranger who joined himself to the Lord says the Lord has utterly separated him from His people. Well, that is an interesting idea, but it seems to me that it doubtless has more general application, that while that might perhaps to some extent be included in it, that what he is saying is, look at the command given in the Pentateuch that a Moabite shall not enter the congregation until is it the 9th generation, the Israel is an exclusive group, in order to keep the Word of God alive from contamination from outside, but that now that Israel has accomplished this great purpose and brought forth the Messiah who makes the means of salvation available, then there is no longer any such separation from others. The son of the stranger is not to say I am cut off from God's people because of my birth, and neither let the eunuch say behold I am a dry tree, and we read in the Pentateuch that no eunuch is to come into the temple, no eunuch is to be received into the people of God, no one who mutilates himself, but here in exile, many of the people were mutilated by their oppressors, mutilated in order to be workers in the palace, some even suggest that Daniel and his friends had been made eunuchs, I don't believe that is true, but have heard it suggested, and whether they were or not at least there were many who were, and the eunuch would seem to be cut off, according to the command of God that His people were to be a holy people, and nothing that was unclean or defiled was to come in to the people of God. But now we have that no physical disability, no disability of birth, is going to keep someone from being able to accept the wonderful offer of salvation. The theme is the universality of the offer, of the invitation. And let not the eunuch say I am a dry tree, there is not future for me, I can have no posterity, can't amount to anything, can't enter in to the people of God. Let not the eunuch say

this. Thus says the Lord to the eunuchs that keep my sabbaths and choose the things that please me, and take hold of my covenant, those who accept the marvelous invitation given in the New Testament. Those who take hold of his covenant, even to them will I give in mine house and within my walls a place and a name better than ^{they could get through having} ~~of sons and daughters~~ daughters. So it is better than that which someone has who has it simply by heredity, to have it merely because he is a son or a daughter. Two possibilities, I don't know as you can decide between them, but they both are true. ~~///~~ I mean what either of them may say, they both are true in any case. He will give them an everlasting name that shall not be cut off. Perhaps the everlasting name suggests suggests the idea of their having (12 1/4) but not necessarily. Also the sons of the stranger, that join themselves to the Lord, to serve him... every one that keeps the sabbath from polluting it, and takes hold of my covenant, even them will I bring to my holy mountain and make them joyful in my house of prayer, their burnt offerings and their sacrifices shall be accepted on my altar, for my house shall be called a house of prayer for all people. Chapter 53 is the marvelous work of the Atonement, the Redemption, making intercession for the transgressors. 55 is the wonderful invitation based this work in 53, and 56, and we are told there, His word won't return void but will accomplish the purpose for which He sent it, now we are assured that the purpose for which He sent it is not limited to those of a certain birth, to those of certain heredity, to those of certain physical condition, but that it is a universal offer, his house is going to be a house of prayer, for all people. The Lord that gathers the outcasts of Israel says, I'm going to gather still more outcasts than other people, reaching out into the highways and byways, and to bring them in, not based on heredity or upon advantages, or upon anything of that sort. The universal application of the call, so that after all, I would imagine that every verse in chapter 55 is read by Christians a dozen times to every once any verse in 56 is ever ~~re~~ read by them. It is not one of the

passages that gets much stress in our churches or among our people, but it is a glorious ending to the whole section, the ending on this great theme of the universality of the work of God, and of the call of God. So that it is a marvelous end to the passage but we haven't answered the question, what about verses 1 and 2? Do they properly form an introduction to 3-8 or do they properly form a conclusion to 55? Now of course it is not a subject of tremendous importance, because after all, 3-8 is a continuation of the thought of 55:1-13. There is the invitation with the certainty of fulfillment. Here is the universality of the invitation, of its work. But what about verses 1 and 2? How do they fit in there? That is a thing we have to look at a little more, and of course we also have to look at 54, which we have to study some, and we skip over, because I thought it was good to get the general sweep of this before going specifically into the problem of 54. So we continue there then with the Graduate group, an hour from now, and the full class again tomorrow for our last meeting...

C.74. (1/2)

...yesterday we finished our examination of Isa.55, reviewing the first part of it and knowing the various emphases during the chapter, as we see the wonderful Gospel call resulting from the work of the servant in Isa.53. And then looking off into the assurance of the certainty of the results of the invitation, which will reach those whom the Lord had determined shall be reached by it. It will not return to Him void, and then the great joy of all nature, verses 12 and 13. We notice the interesting situation about chapter 56:1,2 and the question as to whether it really belongs with 56 or with 55, and then we saw verses 3-8, the concluding section of our major portion of the book of Isa. We noticed the evidence that it does conclude here, the evidence of the break and then we saw the stress here is on the universality of the call. No longer the line of partition on the basis of nation or the other things that are required in the Old Testament. God built up this racial, national group to keep alive, ^{the knowledge} ~~and now~~ of Himself and prepare the way for the coming of Messiah, but after the Atonement was made, then the going

out of the message to all the earth, ~~the~~ universality of the invitation, as shown in verses 3-8. Now we have ~~s~~skipped over chapter 54. We have two things we want to do today, one is to go over 54 and one is to go back and look at 40 again. I mentioned when we looked at 40, that we looked at it from the ~~v~~iewpoint of someone in Isaiah's day, coming to this chapter and finding in it the Prologue or overture to the whole section, and we tried to see what he would see in it there, and to see ~~how~~ it makes a perfectly fitting prelude to the whole section, as one starts ~~the~~ section with no knowledge of anything but the Babylonian captivity, and sees God's answer to that problem. But then I mentioned that it is like the overture to a ~~great~~ opera, it makes a wonderful introduction to the beginning of this matter, but it contains all sorts of anticipations of matters that you get further on, so that when you finish, then you can go back and hear the overture again and see in it all sorts of things that you did not see when you started.

Well, now before looking at 40 from this viewpoint we want to look at chapter 54. We have seen what 53 deals with, have seen what 55 and 56 deal with, now 54 is not something that is just inserted in the middle of it, ~~w~~ithout relation, it is a continuation of the thought of 53 and leading on to what follows. ~~And~~ so we want to find out what 54 is really about, and in this case, ~~as~~ in many cases, ~~y~~ou get the real

(3 3/4) by looking at the end instead of looking at the beginning, and so we find the conclusion of chapter 54 in the words of the last half of verse 17:

This is the heritage of the servants of the Lord, and their righteousness is of me, saith ~~the~~ the Lord. That is the summary of the chapter. Now really that should be verse 18.

I don't know why on earth they have that as one verse, it is two sentences, and it is a sentence which summarizes the whole chapter, the heritage of the servants of the Lord, and their righteousness is of me, saith the Lord. Now we notice ~~th~~at starting with chapter 41, and going on through 53, we have many references to the Servant of the Lord. We have that ~~m~~arvelous teaching about the coming Servant of the Lord, who is to accomplish the great work that God has called upon Him to do, until it reaches

this great climax in 53, and that is the end of the discussion of the Servant of the Lord in the book of Isaiah, but after that we have the servants of the Lord, those who are the followers of the Servant of the Lord, those who are saved through what He did, as described in 53, and those who follow Him and receive His blessing. These are the servants of the Lord. So before we have the marvelous invitation of 55, and 56, to all people everywhere to accept the invitation, to avail themselves of the work of the Servant of the Lord and to become one of His followers, we have this statement of God's blessing upon the Servant of the Lord. This is the heritage of the Servant of the Lord, and their righteousness is of me, saith the Lord. That is the characteristic feature of the Servant of the Lord, that is, of the followers of the Servant of the Lord. They are people whose righteousness is of the Lord, they are not people who are coming in their own righteousness, coming with any claim of their own to God's merit, but they are people who are coming because they have been justified through the Lord, and it is He who has provided their righteousness, it is from Him procured by Him through the death of the Servant of the Lord, described in 53, they are robed in the robe of righteousness that He provides, they are the servants of the Lord. And so this chapter looks forward to the great blessings that God is going to give to the servants of the Lord, it is a summary of these blessings, touching upon different aspects of it. And you immediately say well who are these servants of the Lord? Well, immediately, naturally, we think first about Israel, because Israel has been in the forefront of consideration from chapter 40 on. Israel is the people that God called apart to Himself, to keep the knowledge of God alive, and to prepare the way for the coming of Christ, they are the servants of the Lord, it was Israel who was expected to bring forth the Messiah, it is Israel who is to have the duty of doing the work of the servant of the Lord, a work which is done by one who is from Israel, one who represents Israel, but one who is an individual and does the work for Israel as well as for others. So naturally we think of Israel when we think of servants of the Lord. But then we don't merely think

of the city~~s~~ that pictures Israel in a particular way, apt to think ~~of~~ that city, the city of Jerusalem, which is used as a symbol of Israel and as a symbol ~~of~~^{for} God's grace in general. In Galatians, Paul speaks of Jerusalem which is the mother of us all, he speaks of that Jerusalem which is of the earth, by which he means Jerusalem thought of merely as a symbol for a nation, but it speaks of Jerusalem which is the mother of us all, which is Jerusalem as the representative of God's people and God's grace to His people. And of course the city of Jerusalem had been destroyed at the beginning of the exile, the great desire of the exiles was to go back and build Jerusalem, so we may well think of God's ultimate blessing for Jerusalem, and then of course, all through, starting with 42, the statement that He is going to be a light to the Gentiles and is going to bring judgment to the nation, we know that the servants of the Lord are going to include many who are not of Israel and that He is going to reach far out beyond Israel, that is stressed in 56, touched upon in 55, had been stressed in many earlier passages. So we notice at the very end here, verse 17, the very last part, the summary of the chapter, the heritage of the servants of the Lord, now as we look back before that, in the chapter, we find a natural division point at verse 11. Verses 9 and 10 stand by themselves, apart from the rest, verses 9 and 10 are a specific statement of God's continuing mercies to the servants of the Lord. They separate the chapter into different sections. Verses 9 and 10 tell how God is never going to turn away from those who are saved through the Servant of the Lord. The mountains shall ~~be~~ depart, and the hills be ~~removed~~ removed, but my kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the covenant of my peace be removed, saith the Lord that hath mercy on thee. Verses 9 and 10 are the statements of the eternal salvation, the absolute security of those who are the servants of the Lord, the guarantee that God will be with them and will never leave them nor forsake them. That is verses 9 and 10. Now after verses 9 and 10 we have Jerusalem described. It does not say so, but as you read the words, it is quite clear it is the city he is thinking of. And whether the city here is the symbol of the nation, is the city here the

symbol of the people of God, or is the city here a reference to the united followers of the Lord in some future time? Well, see what He says. Verse 11, O thou afflicted, tossed with tempest, and not comforted. If this is the city, and as we look on a little further ^{we'll see} / it is, we think of Jerusalem destroyed, ravished, people driven into exile, or we think of the people of God, in the midst of a world full of turmoil and confusion, a world in which sin is found on every hand, in a situation like that, afflicted, tossed with tempest and tormented, is God's heritage always to remain like that, will sin always be a prominent feature in this world? Will that which stands for Him always be subject to destruction by the enemies of the faith, or will there be a time when it shall be securely established forever? Well, He says, O thou afflicted, tossed with tempest, and not comforted, behold I will lay thy stones with fair colours, and lay thy foundations with sapphires, make thy windows of agates, and thy gates of carbuncles, and all thy borders of pleasant stones. Here is a promise which is not fulfilled literally with the return of the Israelites to Jerusalem, as they came back from exile, it is not a picture of a natural human situation, you don't make the gates of great jewels, of a city, not in this age at least. It pictures a time of a city, whether you're thinking of a city or whether you're thinking of it ^{as representative of the people of God}, it is going to be entirely made up of that which is precious, going to be founded on that which is rare and precious, and ^{it} / ~~you~~ finds a parallel at the end of revelation, in the picture that John saw of the city of God coming down from heaven. And of this city, ^{we are told} / all ^{thy} ~~my~~ children shall be taught of the Lord, and great shall be the prosperity, the well-being, the peace of thy children. All thy children shall be taught of the Lord. This is not a picture of Jerusalem right after the exile. That is very clear. There were children there who were very loyal to God and children who were very forgetful of God. But this is of a far later day which is here pictured, a time when there will be established that wonderful situation of Jerusalem, when all their children will be ~~taught~~ taught of the Lord, and great will be the peace of thy children. In righteousness shalt thou be established, thou shalt be far from oppression, for thou

shalt not fear, and from terror, for it shall not come near thee. A period when peace is universal, when war is entirely removed from the city of the people of God. Behold, they shall surely gather together but not by me; ~~who~~ whoever shall gather together against thee shall fall for thy sake. We find the city of the people of God described in Rev.20. And we do not find God sending a people against them like the Babylonians came, to attack Jerusalem, and to destroy it, but we find instead that when there is an attack made on the Holy City, as described in Rev.20, those who come are not sent by God, but are considered as the enemies of God, as well as the enemies of the city. Let's look at the end of Rev.20 just for a second. . . .

C.75. (1/2)

. . .there in the end of Rev.20 we find that it says in verse 7, and when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison, and shall go out to ~~the~~ deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, ~~and~~ to gather them together to battle, the number of which is as the sand of the sea. And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, ~~and~~ and the beloved city, and fire came down from God out of heaven, and devoured them. And so we find that Isaiah says that they shall surely gather together but not by me. Whosoever shall gather together against thee shall fall, for thy sake. The time of the Babylonian captivity, and the subsequent time which should occur, during this present age, include many times when God uses the wrath of wicked men to praise Him, and God sent the forces of evil as His instruments to chastise and to punish his children. But the time is coming when that will no more occur, when they gather together it will not be by me, but whosoever shall gather together against thee shall fall for thy sake. It says, behold, I have created the smith that bloweth the coals in the fire, and that bringeth forth an instrument for his work, and I have created the waster to destroy. God has his instruments as He had the Babylonians, for the chastisement of His people then. He has His instruments for this age, but they all are under His thumb, and He

will not determine them to be successful. No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper. Every tongue that shall rise against thee in judgment thou shalt condemn. And right after the account of the unsuccessful gathering together of the saints, against the holy city described in Rev.20, we have that great white throne judgment, the destruction to condemnation ~~and so~~ of those ^{who have} ~~He has~~ raised up against God. ~~So~~ we have the heritage of the Servant of the Lord. Right before it in this chapter, we have this description of the Holy City, which represents all of the true followers of the Lord, in a climactic ultimate time, ~~the~~ rather than something that will take place immediately. And verses 9 and 10 just before that were telling of the permanence of God's grace, with those who are ~~saw~~ saved through the servant, through His work described in 53. Then before that, in the chapter, we have a section starting with verse 4 and running through verse 8, a section which is as you look into it, quite definitely addressed to Israel, addressed to the people of God through whom He was to bring His son into the world, these whom He is now bringing back from exile, God has given them great blessing, in His deliverance from exile, and He is going to ~~give~~ give them great blessing, through the work of the servant, but they have a very special place, He says, verse 4: Fear not, for thou shalt not be ashamed, neither shalt thou be confounded, for thou shalt not be put to shame, thou shalt forget the shame of thy youth, and shalt not remember the reproach of thy widowhood any more. And there are those who would say the shame of thy youth is the Egyptian captivity, and the reproach of thy widowhood is the Assyrian Babylonian captivity. I don't think we can make it specifically that, I think rather it is that the shame of the youth is the failure to accept Moses and accept God's Word and follow as they should have, and the many rebellions that occurred at that time, and the reproach of the widowhood is again after God had taken them to be His own, given them a special place, with the law of God and the leadership of God, that they turned against Him and acted as if He was no longer their king, their leader, the reproach of thy widowhood. They say of them in the Babylonian captivity, well, what can they do, their God

is destroyed, He doesn't amount to anything, their temple is just ruins, they're like a widow. Actually God says they weren't, He says, where is the paper of your divorce-ment. He says I haven't put Israel aside, I'm going to continue to bless Israel. They will forget this misery that they have gone through, that is, those of them will forget who are saved through the ~~w~~ork of the Servant, the work that was predicted by the sacrifice from the very beginning of the dealing with Israel. It continues, For thy Maker is thine husband. They are not a widow, not one that is divorced, their maker, the creator of the world, is their husband, the Lord of Hosts is His name, and thy Redeemer the Holy One of Israel. The God of the whole earth shall he be called. Here we find how He is the God of Israel, He is their Redeemer, but He is the God of the whole earth, His blessing is for the whole earth, not just for Israel. Yes? (6) It is pretty hard to say in that specific sense. I would say this, that when we speak of Israel, we are usually speaking of ~~t~~he elect Israel, we are usually speaking of the godly in Israel, but then when we speak of God's judgment upon Israel, we are speaking of the whole nation, with perhaps particular stress on the ungodly in the nation. Certainly there are blessings which the nation as a nation enjoys, but these ~~b~~lessings are enjoyed to the full ~~e~~xtent only by those who are true followers of the Servant. But it is the nation Israel, though it is the nation thought of as the godly nation, which is here considered, that is, it would be the elect Israel, and certainly the individual blessings mentioned are very specifically for those individuals who believe the message of Isaiah and follow it. They didn't have to wait until after Christ had come, they could look forward in faith to what He was going to do. But He says then in verse 6, For the Lord has called thee as a woman forsaken and grieved in spirit, and a wife of youth, when thou wast refused, saith thy God. Israel had been the wife of the Lord. She was His people whom He treated as wife, and whom He blessed so abundantly, but she had turned against Him and He had sent her into exile, but He is calling her back, as a wife of youth, one who had been forsaken, grieved in spirit, because of what she had done to Him.

And verse 7, He says: For a small moment have I forsaken thee, --for 70 years He had left them in Babylonian captivity. For a small moment have I forsaken thee, but with great mercies will I gather thee. In a little wrath I hid my face from thee for a moment, but with everlasting kindness will I have mercy on thee, saith the Lord thy Redeemer. So here then we have Israel, the wife of the Lord, Israel the people whom He set apart for His name, addressed specifically in verses 4 through 8, and then we have of course in verses 11 through 16, the city Jerusalem, but it is Jerusalem which is the mother of us all, and it is Jerusalem as it will be in that distant time at the very end of the age. Then we have still three verses at which we have not looked, and those three verses are the very beginning of the chapter, and those three verses ^{are} at the very beginning of the chapter, as being tied ~~to~~ perhaps more closely to chapter 53 than any part of this. It is all tied closely to it but these are tied even more closely to it, the first three verses, than what follows. And these three verses are verses which must have ~~caused~~ ^{caused} real difficulty to the interpreter in the time of Isaiah, and for many centuries. The Lord says the prophets inquired diligently to know what and what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify. When He predicted the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow. And so here is the sufferings of Christ in chapter 53, which the Holy Spirit gave and the prophets tried to figure exactly what it meant, tried to understand it, but then they come to 54, the glory that shall follow, and they're trying to understand it, and I don't think they'll have much difficulty in understanding it, except for the first three verses. Now the last part about Jerusalem, they might misunderstand, they might think it was going to be fulfilled immediately on return from exile, whereas as a matter of fact it is looking way off to the distant future, instead of what was immediately after exile. But when they looked at the first three verses, they would find themselves in great difficulty over certain phrases, certain phrases, which have a very definite relationship to what is described in 53, in fact, to the whole work of the Servant, certain phrases there which when the whole matter of

its outworking is understood, ~~when~~ we no longer look through a ~~glass~~ darkly, but we can see it face to face, because Christ has come and the thing has happened and we know how it happened, then we're able to understand it, in a way that was difficult to understand when those facts and those data were not yet known to them. So we find these three verses and the first one starts out; Sing, O barren, thou that didst not bear; break forth into singing, and cry aloud, thou that didst not travail with child. Now who is it that did not bear, who is it that did not travail with child? Well, surely Israel had had a long history of faithful service to the Lord. Israel had had many children of grace in that long period. How can this refer to ~~Israel~~? Well, you may say, this refers to Israel at the time of the captivity. During the captivity they were barren, they did not accomplish for God. Well, is that so? Did they have no children who were true to Him? No children who were ~~children~~ of grace? They must've had many to take part in the return from exile? ~~Does~~ Was their spiritual accomplishment nil during the exile? Well, the usual commentator says, yes, this is a picture comparing ~~Israel~~ during the exile that was called desolate and barren, ~~with~~ Israel before who was called the married wife. But it isn't satisfactory. It does not give us satisfactory interpretation. Here is the great suffering of the Servant of the Lord. Here is His work accomplished. He has borne the ~~s~~ n of many. Sing, O barren, thou that didst not bear; break forth into singing, and cry aloud, thou that didst not travail with child, for more are the children of the desolate than the children of the married wife, saith the Lord. What is the ~~comparisoh~~? Most commentaries say, He is comparing Israel in exile, which is ~~desolate~~, with Israel before, which ~~is~~ the married wife. Well, if Israel in exile ~~was~~ desolate and had no children in this sense of ~~spiritual~~ accomplishment, then she is not having children while she is desolate, and if she goes back to the land again, she is again the ~~married~~ wife, as she was before, so how can you say more are the children of ~~he~~ desolate than of the married wife? It just doesn't work out. And then you read the next verse: Enlarge the place of thy tent, let them stretch forth the curtains of thy habitations,--

there is an extension, there is an enlargement. Yes, that's all right, they're coming back and then there will be an enlargement, you might say. Well, there wasn't any great enlargement for a long time after they came back, but the first part would seem to be something else than that, and when you find that things actually worked out as they did, and that Israel as a whole, ^{though} ~~so~~ there were many Israelites who accepted the Lord and became very loyal followers of Him, yet Israel as a whole did not accept Christ, and Paul saw the great mystery that Israel which had sought to follow the Lord did not find the truth, and that the Gentiles who did not seek, were found of the Lord, and He found Isa. 65 ^{and other} ~~another~~ places making predictions of this and suggestions of it in advance. Here is the very clear suggestion of that same fact. Who as the barren one, the one that has not borne, the one that is desolate, it is the Gentile that is outside the fold, it is those ~~who~~ know nothing of God, strangers to the covenant of grace, they are not bringing spiritual food into the world, how can they, they know nothing of the true God, they are worshipping idols. Their moral condition is far lower in every way than that of Israel. How can they accomplish anything in a ~~spiritual~~ spiritual way....

C.76. (1/2)

...than was said about them. More are the children of the desolate than the children of the married wife, saith the Lord. That is the strange thing that took place, that no human being could have predicted, but that the Holy Spirit led Isaiah to suggest and to interpret, ~~as~~ He finished telling about the sacrifice of Christ, He goes right on to say, more are the children of the desolate than the children of the married wife, and the Gospel though it reaches many in Israel, reaches a far larger number among the Gentiles. And ~~more~~ are the children of the desolate than the children of the married wife, saith the Lord, and so the center of the work of the Servant moves away from Jerusalem to various Gentile centers, and 1800 years, 1750 years pass by and in England you see a cobbler sitting at his cobbler's bench doing his work on shoes, and as he works he reads the Bible, he is not a man of much formal education, but he has learned

to read German, French, Italian, Spanish, and Dutch, and reads modern works in these languages. He is reading the ancient Greek and Hebrew, and as he sits there and reads this in the Hebrew and he looks at the map of the world in front of him, he reads verse 2, He says enlarge the place of thy tent, and let them stretch forth the curtains of thine habitations, spare not, lengthen thy cords, and strengthen thy stakes, --so he goes to a meeting and preaches on this verse and with his sermon on this verse, there begins a great modern missionary movement. And William Carey in 1799 found his Baptist Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in the Orient and in the next year there is founded a similar society by the non-Baptists of Great Britain, and these two societies proceed to begin a great work. Carey himself goes to India, and there he learns many languages of India, and translates the Bible into them, and other follow his footsteps, with both of these societies and many others, the great missionary work begins, of modern times. On this verse 2, here, enlarge the place of thy tent, let them stretch forth the curtains of thy habitations, spare not, lengthen thy cords, and strengthen thy stakes. Now is Carey just picking a verse out of the Bible at random, that sounds like extension and using it for extension, or is it really talking about what he says? When you look at it you find that Carey was not a man who grabbed a verse superficially but he is taking it right in line with context. It is a result of the work of the Lord on Calvary, if we believe that and accept what He did at Calvary for our sins, then we know that God will divide Him a portion with the great, He will divide the spoil with the strong, more will be the children of the desolate, than the children of the married wife. Not that there will not be children of the married wife, not at all, not that the Gentiles are saved and the Jews are lost, nothing of the king, but that more are the children of the desolate than the children of the married wife, Paul and others turned to the Gentiles and say they will hear and they do hear. And through both of these groups, God carries on and builds up this great work which He has carried on through the ages, and so we find the enlargement then, verses 2 and 3, we find Acts here immediately following

the Gospels. The Gospels, 53; the Book of Acts, 54.1, 2, 3: For thou shalt break forth on thy right hand and on the left and thy seed shall inherit the nations, and make the desolate cities to be inhabited. The cities throughout the world that knew nothing of God, the cities that were utterly desolate as far as spiritual benefit was concerned, are to receive the word, ^{so} that there is not a place in the world where there is not some ^{witness} ~~reference~~ to the truth of the message of salvation through Christ. So we have these first three verses looking at the immediate development after Calvary. The turning to the Gentiles and the great extension of the Gospel among the Gentiles, and then in verse 4 we turn back to Israel again, and we see in verses 4 to 8, God's continuing mercy and blessing upon His people Israel. In verses 9 and 10 His assurance of the permanent blessing to all those who are His true servants whether Jews or Gentiles. Then in verses 11 to 16 a look forward to heavenly Jerusalem, the reestablished Jerusalem which is described at the end of Revelation and then the conclusion this was the heritage of the servants of the Lord and their righteousness is of Him.

So that chapter 54 is actually, if you look closely at the wording of it to see exactly what it says, it is not so difficult to interpret but we really need the solid points from which to begin the interpretation: 53 and 55, which it stands between and to which it is related. Now I think we should go back to chapter 40, because we notice that chapter 40 is different from the rest of our book of comfort, book of Consolation. The book of Consolation is mostly very specific, it is talking about specific things, it talked about Cyrus the one who will bring them back from exile, it talks about the Servant of the Lord who will bear our sins and who will make intercession for us. It talks about specific situations in specific ways. One verse deals with this, one verse deals with that. It is not a ~~ve~~ passage that you just grab a verse out, and apply it to anything that is (6 1/.2) It is a specific treatment of specific themes from chapter 41 through 56, but chapter 40 is not specific, it is the introduction to the whole. Chapter 40 is not specific prediction of specific events

so much as it is a general presentation of the themes and the emotions which will be dealt with as we go through the marvelous developments from chapter 41 right up through the end of our section, at the middle of 56. So we noticed before that we can think of the people in Babylon, in exile, in suffering, and the Lord says, comfort ye, comfort ye, my people, speak to Jerusalem, her warfare is accomplished, her iniquity is pardoned. He tells them that God is going to deliver them, that He is going to feed His flock like a shepherd, that He is greater than all the idols, greater than all the ~~idols~~ ^{forces of the} heathen, that He can deliver them and will deliver and that He will give them the strength to make the long trip back from Babylon. Even the youths shall faint and be weary and the young men shall utterly fall, but they that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength, they shall mount up with wings as eagles, they shall run and not be weary and they shall walk and not faint. It all fits exactly as a presentation of the emotion involved in the deliverance from Babylon, but it is not a specific prediction of that, but rather lays the basis for the emotions involved in the specific predictions given later, and later as we see those situations develop, the Lord as we saw, step by step, ~~brings~~ ^{gradually} out the fact that if He delivers them from Babylon, that is not going to accomplish. It is utter deliverance as being necessary, He is going to deliver from Babylon but that is not the main thing. They went in--why did they get to Babylon, He gradually leads into it, over and over--they got to Babylon because of their sin, because of their turning against God. And if He brings them out of Babylon, there are going to be other exiles, they will again fall into captivity, and go into Babylonian captivity, and suffering again, unless the sin question is dealt with. Gradually He leads us up to ~~at~~ the conclusion that, important as deliverance from Babylon is, even more important is deliverance from sin. And how can we get that deliverance? The Servant of the Lord is going to bring it, The Servant of the Lord is going to bring light to the Gentiles, the Servant of the Lord is going to give His life a ransom for all who believe on Him. He lays the foundation of the universal invitation ^{with} ~~which~~ ~~is~~ our section ends. And consequently, having read

the whole thing, then we come back and see the chapter 40 is so constructed as to give the introduction to the emotions involved in deliverance from Babylon, but that it goes way beyond that, and lays the foundation for the emotions involved in deliverance from sin, in the coming of the One, the Servant of the Lord, who will give deliverance from the problem of sin, and so He says, speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, she is going to be brought back but right here in verse 2, He brings in, "double for all her sins," her iniquity is pardoned. And then how is her iniquity to be pardoned, how is sin to be dealt with? Prepare the way of the Lord. ~~Mark~~ ^{Make} straight in the desert a highway for our God, the voice of him that cries in the wilderness. So we have God sending John the Baptist to cry in the wilderness, prepare the way of the Lord. ~~To declare~~ ^{To declare} To declare the coming of that which is described in chapters 42 and 48 and 49 and 53: prepare the way for the coming of the One who is the true Servant of the Lord. So the true Servant of the Lord comes and it is pointed out that the grass withers and the flower fades, but the Word of the Lord will endure forever. Then we have a stress on the greatness of the Lord and also His ~~desert~~ gentleness. He shall feed His flock like a shepherd, He shall carry the lambs in His arms and gently lead those that are with young. The gentleness of the grace of God, the grace that comes through Him who makes intercession for our sins. And then the power of the Lord who measures the waters in the hollow of His hand, and this One who is the second person of the trinity, can cause the waters to be quiet and say to the storm be still, can walk on the very waters, because He has made them and controls them. Then we have shown the folly of the idolatry, the greatness of God, the great stress in this chapter, until we come to the end of the chapter, and there we find those ~~people~~ who were the followers of the servant of the Lord, starting out, not simply to go back from Babylon to Jerusalem, back to an earthly city, to again undertake, to carry on as they were before but with sin still in their midst, but those who are stepping forth to do the work of the Lord all ^{through} this age, and as they step out, those who have been saved through the work of the Servant, He gives power to the

faint, to them that have no might, He increaseth strength. It is Christ in us the hope of glory. Even the youths shall faint and be weary and the young men shall utterly fall, but they that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength. They shall mount up with wings as eagles, they shall run and not be weary, they shall walk and not faint. Chapter 40 is the start of the whole thing, but it is also the recapitulation of it, and it is the new start, to read it through again, and see in it what we did not see at first. Because God gives us the development and then all through there are allusions, there are anticipations which we see again as we look through it. So as the people study it through, they get a certain amount from 40 but as ~~you~~^{they} study it through again, they get more of it, and they see it is wider (12 3/4)

And that of course is true of our method of studying anything that God has given--that we can't expect to take three verses of Scripture and start in and study them till we know everything about them and then take the next three, but we take a book and see everything we can get out of it, and then we come back and get that much more out of it, we lay a foundation, we come back and go through the Bible and find much that is clear and become aware of many problems, we did not previously know existed. The next time we go through, in the light of our previous knowledge, we get the answer to many of our problems, but we become aware of new problems. And so we are constantly getting the answer to old problems, and getting new problems as we delve deeper into God's wonderful truth and into His great mind of wisdom, into His great source of that which is vital for us. So we have looked, tried to draw together the different sections of this Isa.40-56, and to see how it all fits together and how it builds up, starting from where they are, and going on to lead them to where God wants them to be. And I think that one way that 40-56 could be studied, that would be very worthwhile, would be as an example of the pedagogy that God wants us to have. He wants us to take His word and to bring it to people where they are, and to take them and to show them the answer ~~the answer~~ to their needs and lead them on, till they know about needs they didn't even know existed before, that are

more important than the needs that they are aware of. He wants us to take people where they are and lead them over to where God wants them to be. Not simply to draw a line against them because of where they are and leave them there, to draw a line against those who would tear down God's work, but those who should be the recipients of God's work, He wants us to lead them and bring them by such means as He uses here, gradually over, until they stand also exactly where He wants them to stand, and as we lead them to that point, we also see where we need to stop forward further, in our understanding of the Word, and in our loyalty to His truth. Well, I guess that closes our discussion this semester. Mr. Oliver?

C.77 (1/2)

...(stu) Yes, they certainly were saved through it, they looked forward to it, they were saved through it. It was God's provision to save them exactly the same as ours, but they did not actually see it happen, they saw through a glass darkly. We can see it face to face. Yes, Mr. Grauley? (stu.) Now I wouldn't use that particular verse, because I think that particular verse is looking forward to the New Testament Church. I think that is looking ~~✓~~ forward to what is to happen after the events described in Isa.53, ~~after~~ actually take place, so I would not think that would be ~~improved~~ a proof text of that, but I would think that there are others. Well, of course, it is a matter of terminology. The Church surely is those who were saved through Christ and no one was ever saved except through Christ, so that all who are ever saved are members of the true Church of God. But of course there is the sense in which we could speak of the Christian Church as that which began with the fuller knowledge of these things, began in the present (1 3/4)

We can speak of that, and in that sense, the Church did not exist before, but in that sense, the Church certainly did not start at Pentecost. There is not a word in Acts 2 about any beginning of the Church at Pentecost. Pentecost was an empowering of the Church for service, and those men who were there at Pentecost certainly were a Church as soon as they knew Christ and were

saved through Him. They certainly were a Christian Church in the truest sense, before, they were empowered for service at Pentecost, but they did not become a church at Pentecost. I would say then, that, in the one sense of the word that the Church, all those who were saved through Christ, that would include all in all ages who believed on Him, but that you can use the word in a narrower sense, to indicate those who know more specifically about Him, who know the name of Christ. Now of course there are many mysteries that we don't know fully. It is very easy for us to grab something and try to take a stand on some terminology and then fit everything into it, but the great facts are certainly abundantly clear, that the people of God are one, that they without us should not be made perfect, without us. It doesn't say that we should be made perfect and they shouldn't, no. They were not made perfect without us, but they and we together are made perfect in Christ. But this particular verse, I would think was rather a looking forward than the immediate future. Yes. Mr. Cohen? (stu.) I don't like the word "dispensationalist" myself, because I think that it is used in so many many different senses. I don't think there is any Christian who is not a dispensationalist, in the sense that there is a difference between the situation before the coming of Christ and after. There are dispensations, there is no question about it. ~~God~~ Hodge speaks of it in his theology, and everyone is a dispensationalist in a sense, and then there are those who are dispensationalists in the sense of (4) who divide up the New Testament into sections and only I think the prison epistles have any validity for us in this particular dispensation, and there are all gradations, so I don't particularly like the word, but I would say that as far as taking the word Church and saying that it must be future, the word build does not necessarily mean (4 1/4)

You read in the Old Testament about their building a city, it may mean to enlarge, to extent. It does not mean, like our word, if we build a house, we start from nothing and build a house, but if you take a house and build an annex onto it, that is building a house in the sense of 'build' in the Scripture. It is building up or en-

larging, whether from nothing into something, or from something small into something big, so certainly upon the confession that Peter gave, the building onto the church, and enlarging the church at this time, but to say that that means the church did not exist before is building an awful lot on a very little. Yes? (stu)--5) Yes, the Holy Spirit came in a very special way for service at Pentecost, but the Holy Spirit certainly was on Bezeleel for the tabernacle. David prayed take not thy Spirit from me, the Spirit was active with the prophets and with the leaders of the Old Testament, and certainly anyone who was ever saved was saved through the activity of the Holy Spirit, He came at Pentecost in a special sense for service. It doesn't mean the Holy Spirit wasn't here before and He was here then. The Holy Spirit is God, He is every place. He is always everywhere, but He manifests Himself in particular ways, and when you say the Spirit comes into you, He is always everywhere, but ^{we mean} when He begins to manifest Himself in a special way in and through you, that is what we would call the Holy Spirit's coming into you. We have only about three minutes left, maybe we can stop right now, unless there are some other questions someone has. Yes? No, the final examination always covers the whole course. Everything that has been discussed in class or that is discussed between Isa.41-56...

END OF FIRST SEMESTER '61-'62