

Our course this semester is concerned with a certain section of the book of Isa. I'm going to give a rather general introduction. We are going to study a certain portion of Isaiah, two portions of it which the average person would not think of as having much relation to each other. One of these portions contains some of the very best known sections of the Bible; the other, while it contains a great deal of very beautiful language and many individual phrases we've all heard is probably as little known as any section of the OT. But the two sections are very closely interrelated, and without understanding the first it is pretty difficult to get much idea of the second.

I'm going to arrange our material under headings and I'll make Roman numeral number I

I Introduction

A. Purpose of the course. For the purpose, I'm going to narrow it down. I'm going to start with number one

1. Why study the Bible? Three principal reasons I will mention.

a. It is God's instrument to tell us the vital truths of life. Some years ago in one of my classes, someone said, What's the use of our going into all of these details of trying to understand this complicated material? We know John 3:16, isn't that enough? I'd say, if you take John 3:16 and all other passages that give the same truth as John 3:16 and put them over here, and all the rest of the Bible here and you have to choose between them, certainly I'd choose John 3:16 and the related passages. But that's not all the Lord gave us. The Lord gave us a complete book which He wants us to understand in order to tell us the vital truths of life. In fact I doubt if you fully understand John 3:16 by itself. We need other passages to throw light

upon it. It is all interrelated. The Bible is God's instrument to tell us the vital truths of life.

2. The Bible is God's revelation to us. I don't think the average person understands at all what we mean by revelation. He thinks of it as some rather strange, brizzar, mideaval concept; or as something that is purely a religious matter when actually rev. is actually one of the commonest things in life. You look at me here and if you never read anything about me, you ask yourself, What state was this fellow born in? You can look at my hair, my eyes, my beard, listen to my voice, but I doubt if any of you would know what state I was born in unless you received a revelation. That is, I can reveal it to you, or you can read it somewhere in some statement by somebody to whom I have revealed the fact I was born in the state of Michigan. Most of what any of us knows comes to us by revelation. So the entire Bible is God's revelation to us and from it we learn truths we could not possibly learn in any other way. Just as we learn by revelation from one another truth about them that we could not possibly learn in any other way. The average teacher of biology, nine tenths of what he knows about evolution he has learned by revelation -- it's been given him by somebody else. Maybe one tenth of it is what he has observed himself. The high school teacher who teaches evolution, 99% of what he has at least he has received by revelation from somebody else who got it by revelation from somebody else. Revelation is the very best method of getting truth provided the person from whom you get the revelation knows the facts, and of course the vital facts of life no one but God knows. Therefore there is no way you can possibly learn these truths except by getting a revelation from God.

c. God has promised to use His word to accomplish His purposes. This is brought out in many places in the Scripture. One of the best v. is Is. 55:11 - So shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth; it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereunto I sent it.

God has promised He will use His word to accomplish His purpose. I don't believe we should learn ~~by~~ what God's will is for us by just opening the Bible at random and selecting a verse. I think God wants us to study the Bible carefully and to learn its principles. But we must recognize that there are many times in the life of almost any Christian when he seemly happens upon a verse, or it happens it seems that herecalls a verse perhaps that is completely out of context that just gives him the answer to his particular problem. God uses His word in many different ways. It is His food for our lives. The study we make of philosophy or any other area of thought, when it comes to the great issues of life is not nearly as important as what we can get from careful study of God's Word. He gave His word for all ages and for all times. That means there many be many things in the word of God that people in the 10th cent. A.D. could read and say that ~~is~~ exactly fits my need that today you might read and wonder what it means. And it might take considerable study to see what it is talking about. When you do find out you may find it has a great lesson for you. But there may be other passages that exactly fit your need at this particular moment in the world's history that people in the 10th century would have found hard to understand. All of God's Word is for all of God's people in all times. There is much in His Word that has particular relevance and importance ~~x~~ for God's people at particular times. So these -- this is just is a very brief summary why it is important we study the Bible. That's No. 1.

2. Why study the OT? I passed a church once that had a big sign in front of it - "No creed but the NT." I question whether a church is a Christian church that puts up a sign like that, because Christian is not build upon the NT, it is build upon the whole Bible. The OT is 3/4 of the Bible. The Bible is all ~~of~~ God's Word. ~~The~~ Many Christians find in the OT only a few stories to use as illustrations. Well, there are stories valuable for illustrations for many things. These stories we learn in S.S. are of great importance but the person who goes to S.S. faithfully in a good Christian church for a number of years, gets only a slight knowledge as a rule of the OT. The NT takes the attitude toward the OT that this proves many of the things given in the OT. This is what was spoken by the prophet. This is what was taught to His people in days of old and from it we find truth for today. Now of course we find the NT has settled it for us if we are Bible-believing Christians. But the writers of the NT, what they found in the OT settled things for them, and shows that there is much more that they did not bring out in the NT that is very vital for us.

One thing I was greatly impressed with when I was a student in seminary was that when you take up the many problems of the relation of Christian teaching to human life and try to get the answer to them in the NT, you find over and over that the problem roots back into the OT. There is much in the NT I believe we fail to properly understand because we do not see its roots and background in the OT. So much for No. 2.

3. Why study the OT prophets? The average Christian knows a little bit about a few of the incidents described in the OT prophetic books, but there is much more of importance to us than that. The most important reason, of course, I have called small a. under 3 -

a. They tell of Christ. Jesus started with Moses and all the prophets, showing the disciples on the road to Emmaus what they taught about Him. Many of the great passages from the OT we read at Christmas time and at other times, and we see their importance in relation to Christ. But if we are fully to understand them we must see them in relation to their context and background. Then

b. There is a special approach(s) that are vital in the understanding of the OT prophecies. They are a special type of literature, a type that is not written today. Naturally there are particular principles, there are special matters that we look for as we study them that help us to understand them that we can't possibly do without. We pick a verse here, a verse there; a chapter here, a chapter there, and we don't get a fraction of the meaning that we have if we study the prophetic book- as a whole. So it is important to study the OT prophets to learn particular approaches that are vital in connection with them.

c. The OT prophetic books have important examples for us today. We see in them how the prophet looked to God for His answer to particular situations. It is interesting to see as we will notice in this course that God told the Israelites through Isaiah that He was going to deliver Jerusalem. The powerful king Sennacherib came with his great force and it looked as if nothing could stop him from capturing and destroying Jerusalem. But God said to Isaiah, "Do not fear him. Till the people of Jerusalem they will be safe. This year they will have to eat just what they are able to rush out of the city and take quickly and bring in before the Assyrian bands happen to show up. Next year it will be the same way. But the next year, they will be able to get out of the city and plant their fields and have abundant harvest. God told them they need not fear the Assyrians. He told them that through Isaiah.

150 years later the prophet Jeremiah declared to the people, God is going to destroy the city. He said God is going to send the people into captivity and the city will be destroyed. We have a very interesting account in Jer. 28 of how the people received this word from Jeremiah. We read in 28:1 that Hannaniah . . . spoke in the house of the Lord in the presence of all the people saying, Thus speaketh the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel saying, I have ~~XXXXXX~~^{broken} the yoke of the king of Babylon. Within two full years will I bring again into this place all the vessels of the Lord's house that Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon took away from this place. In v.5 we find that the prophet Jeremiah said to Hannaniah in the presence of all the priests . . . Jeremiah said (v.7), Hear the word I speak now in your ears and in the ears of all the people: the prophet when he prophesies of peace when the word of the prophet shall come to pass then shall the prophet be known that the Lord hath truly sent him. (In other words Hannaniah said, God's going to deliver and bring the people back who have gone into captivity. Jeremiah said, God is going to destroy Jerusalem.) Well, then. v 10 Hananiah took the yoke from off the prophet Jeremiah's neck and broke it and Hananiah said in the presence of all the people, Even so says the Lord will I break the yoke of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon from all nations in the space of two full years." Then the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah (v.) Thus says the Lord, I have put a yoke of iron on the neck of all these nations that they may serve Neb. king of Babylon. Then said the prophet Jeremiah unto Hananiah Hear now Hananiah, the Lord has not sent you, but you made this people to trust a lie. Therefore thus says the Lord, Behold I have cast you out from the face of the earth. This year you shall die because you have taught rebellion against the Lord."

You see how the situations looked so ~~EXACTLY~~ similar. Here's Isaiah - God's going to deliver Jerusalem. Here's Jeremiah - God's going to destroy it! When Hananiah gave the same message Isaiah gave before, Jeremiah says, 'You're not speaking from God, and you will die this ~~year~~ year as proof you have not spoken (right.) You have spoken claiming to be from God. We could not tell, ~~why~~ why it was God's will in one situation one time and one the other. We study the background; we learn some principles of it. But we see from this how important is is that God spoke directly to these prophets. It was not their clever thinking, it was not their understanding of situations, but God's revelation that told them what His will was.

4. Why study Isaiah? Isa. is one of the most quoted g books in the NT. There is hardly another book in the OT that you find so many echos of, or so many specific quotations from as you find from Isaiah. Time and again a NT writer says: This is proved by what the prophet said and he quotes three words, five words, and you look at it and you say, How does that prove it? Very often the words he quotes does not prove the thing he said at all. But you look at the context and you find that the words are not saying, These two words prove this. But what the prophets said of which these two words remind you prove this. And you look at the context and you find it exactly fits, and it relates directly to what the NT writer said. That is very important in connection with all the OT books, but particularly with Isaiah. Over and over Is. is quoted in the NT, and when the NT says this is what the prophet Is. says and it proves so and so, that we should take as helping us to understand Isaiah and helping us to know how to draw from Isaiah. Not only is Isaiah one of the most quoted books in the NT., it is one of the greatest literary works in the world's history. You take someone who

has never read anything of the Bible, and you read to him almost any 5 chs. of Isa, Then you read a ch. to him, or say 15 or 20 vv. from some part of the OT, and he will be able to tell you whether it is from Isaiah or elsewhere. The only other book that he might confuse with Is. might be Micah which is very similar, and yet has very definite differences.

People talk about varying styles within the bk. of Isa. The diff. between every part of the bk. of Is. and just about any other part of the OT is far greater than the diff. in style between any two parts of Isaiah. The critics who divided Isa. into many different sections thought a great deal about the differences in style between the two sections, but these differences are related to the subject matter. And you take any of us that when we write on one subject our style is a little different than when we write on another subject. But all portions of Is. have a great similarity of literary style. If you want to enjoy reading Heb. don't start with Isaiah. Because Is. has the biggest vocabulary of any book of its size in the Bible. It has a tremendous vocabulary. It has beautiful poetry; it is one of the great masterpieces of the world's literature.

Another important reason for studying Is. is that so much of it is so little known to Christians as a whole despite its great importance. I hope before the end of this course that chs. 28 - 35 will be very meaningful to all of us. But I fear that most Christians have very little idea of that section of Is. and if I was to read to you from ch. 28 now I fear most of you would have no idea what I was reading about because you have to have the background of the other subject we are going to study (ch.7-12) to understand it. But in the light of that background it just opens right up. It's like bringing the light into a dark room. And you see so much that is clear and important for all.

Then it is important to study Isaiah because it contains principles. We learn principles that apply to the study of all the prophetic books. This of course is important in the study of any part of the Bible ---not just what we get from that portion but the principles that we learn. That, of course, is one of the troubles of the proof text method of dealing with theology or with any subject. Somebody has said a text without a context is only a pretext. And it is true that a v. alone ~~may~~ may be a fine summary of a passage, or it may be only a portion of a passage that is not meaningful except in relation to the rest of the passage. But learning the principles of different sections, makes it easier to interpret others.

5. The Importance of this portion of Isaiah. This portion is divided into two parts. First, (a) Is. 7-12. This is one of the best known sections of Isaiah and that is for the reason

(1) that it contains so many important prophecies of Christ. Is. 53 has the greatest prediction of the atonement of Christ, and there are sections in it that are very imp. in relation to Christ's work. But probably they are not as much quoted in our churches and used in our songs as some of the passages between Is. 7 and 12. One v. we are familiar with is 7:14 (virgin birth) where Is. says: The Lord Himself shall give you a sign: Behold a virgin shall conceive --- now that is a mistranslation. I don't know why they translated "a virgin". Both in the Heb. here and in the Gk. in the NT. the article is used - "Behold the virgin . . ." And call his name Immanuel. The Heb. form can be either "she shall call" or "you shall call." It really does not affect the sense. The same form can have both meanings. Shall call His Name Immanuel. The wonderful prophecy of the virgin birth of ch. 7. You turn over to ch. 9 and you have that wonderful prophecy in vv. 6-7 (quoting). You pick up

You pick up the Jewish version of the OT and when it comes to this v. it says, His name shall be called Pele-joez-el-gibhor-Abiad-sar-shalom. They just put the Heb. into English letters! It is such a very specific, definite prediction of the diety of Christ, that there is no way to get around it except to say, Oh it is just a name with just a lot of sounds. But such a long name is hardly to be paralleled in ordinary use. It is a wonderful prediction of Christ which we all hear at Christmas time.

Then in ch. 11 you have that wonderful picture of Christ's reign where the wolf shall dwell with the lion and the leopard shall lie down with the kid, and the calf and the young lion and fating together and a little child shall lead them. That whole wonderful 11th ch. Chs. 7,9,11 particular verses of them --- very important in relation to our Christian faith and very widely quoted. In between them are other passages which are rarely referred to but which are essential to the understanding of these passages. That is to a full understanding of them in their contexts.

Now I want to look at the NT use of the virgin birth prediction. There is I must say, I like the KJV of the end of Mat. I much better than any other trans. I have seen. The reason I do is because it is archaic. That may sound strange, but I'll explain. In the days of KJ in their trans. of the Bible they put in no quot marks. The Heb. has no quotation marks. But today it is natural to put in quotation marks. All our modern translations put in quotation marks but I believe they put them in the wrong place. Ch. 1 of Mat. tells about the birth of Jesus Christ. It tells how Joseph, her husband being a just man and not wishing to make her a public example was minded to put her waay privily. But while he thought on these things behold the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream saying, Joseph thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife,

for that which is conceived in here is of the Holy Ghost. She shall bring forth a son and thou shalt call his name Jesus for He shall save His people from their sins." Every modern trans. I've seen put the end of a quotemark after that word "sin" and I do not believe it belongs there. It goes on ~~XX~~ in the KJV, "Now all this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet saying, Behold a virgin shall be with child and shall bring forth a son and they shall call his name Immanuel which being interpreted is God with us. Then Joseph being raised from sleep did as the angel of the Lord had bidden him and took unto him his wife and knew her not till she had brought forth her firstborn son . . .

Now if as the recent translations all seem to think, verses 22 and 23 are simply Matthew's remark; you get that impression also from the particular words used in the KJV - it would be logical to have them at the end of the chapter, rather than in between what the angel said and what Joseph did. It would be much more logical to with Matthews statement to put them at the end of the ch. To my mind there is no doubt that these two vv. are part of what the angel said. The, of course, it would be better instead of saying, All this was done, to say "All this has occurred." --which would be just as accurate a translation. "All this has occurred which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet Isaiah." Joseph had a dream and in the dream an angel said, Don't think that this is simply a wicked woman that you should put away, and not marry. That is not true, it would be true in any other case. The angel said "This is what was predicted by Isaiah." That to Joseph would be the clinching argument. That would be the reason why Joseph ^{would} ~~XXXXX~~ continue to recognize her as his betrothed and would make her his wife, and would take care of the infant Jesus because ~~W~~ he knew that it was God's Word that was being fulfilled.

So it seems to me that the quotation marks should be a little further on. I was disappointed in the RSV that has the quotation mark before it, and I was not surprised at that in the RSV at all. I thought it was very definitely wrong. But I was disappointed in looking into the NASB which is on the whole a very accurate translation, and while it does not have quite the beauty of the KJV it is a very accurate translation; I was disappointed to find that it also puts a quote at the end of the word "sin". Then, however, it says, now all this took place that all that was spoken by the Lord through the prophet might be fulfilled; and they have a marginal note after "all this took place" which says "or has taken place." That would seem to show that some of the members of the committee that made this translation felt that this was definitely part of what the angel says. "Now all this has taken place" is exactly what the angel said. "All this took place" might be what the angel said or it might be a comment by Matthew. That illustrates one of the great difficulties in translation.

(Question: At the end of v. 23, "us", would that be one reason why the more modern translators felt that it was Matthew's comment rather than the angels? "us" meaning men?)

No, because it is a direct quotation from Isaiah. Isa. said his name shall be called Immanuel, God with us. Just directly quoting Isaiah. The angels is saying This is the one predicted by Isaiah.

By the way, anything I don't make clear in class, I wish you would call attention to -- anybody ~~xxxxxxx~~ at any time, please. Now it is a rather large class and if there may some points on which there is difference of opinion, it may take quite a while to discuss, I wish you would write out your question in this latter case and

that may be of great importance for everyone in class to hear about. I will fit it in its proper place. Or it might be something I did not think should take the class time. But anything I have not made clear as in this case, don't hesitate to interrupt at any moment.

(Question: V. 23 is behold a virgin, is that in the Greek?) The Greek has the article "the virgin." The article is in Gk. and Heb.

(Question: Does NASB trans. it "the virgin"?) Yes.

On that point let me say something about translation. I don't care what translation you use in connection with this course. I hope you read passages carefully and study them. If you use one of the modern translations, one perhaps that is not particularly accurate, it may raise questions that would be of value in this class. The KJV is a very accurate trans. on the whole. There are a few cases where it misses rather badly, but they are comparatively few. On the whole it is a very excellent translation but it is lang. of 300 yrs. ago. When you say, "I do you to wit" you don't know what is being talked about unless you go on "I do you to wit of the grace of God." When you read that "he prevented the dawning of the morning with his prayers" you don't think he was a jagician, you don't know what the meaning is unless you look at context and see he prayed before the dawning of the morning. But I don't think those cases where the KJV words are unintelligible to us are the most important problem. The most important problem is case after case where the Eng. word of 300 yrs. ago has slightly changed its meaning; changed perhaps just enough that you get the wrong idea because you are not familiar with it. For that reason I feel it is very impt. that people in our day get a translation in their own language. Now the NASB is a very accurate translation and on the whole quite dependable, though there are cases where the committee differs and uses one and I think the other would have been the better (translation), and it does not have the

beautiful style of the KJV. The NIV which I did some help for, in the NT which has been published has received great acclaim as being very accurate and good English. Well received by many. The OT will not be out for another 3 years. But in the committees I have met with in the OT section I find them constantly struggling with the effort to be as accurate as possible and yet really good English. That is difficult. Sometimes it is this way, sometimes that. Sometimes I am hopeful it will be as good for our day as the KJV was for its time; sometimes I am fearful that the effort to get clear English will result in not being as accurate as I would like to see it. I can't tell till it comes out, but I have to say the parts I have worked on are largely parts that are difficult anyway. There are many places I think are very good and others where I still have questions. But it will not be available for another 3 yrs. So use any version you want. . .

Here then I believe that this was the angel's word to Joseph, the clinching argument, the vital reason why he should recognize that this situation is absolutely something unique in history. It is something which God has wrought. It is something He predicted through Isaiah and with which all godly Jews were familiar. We will look in detail later at the passage in Is. 7 and see exactly how it fits in. The average modernist commentator who says this has nothing to do with Christ says, What comfort would it be to Ahaz to tell him that 700 yrs later Christ would be born. They say this must be comfort for Ahaz! Well I would like in our study of ch. 7 to see how much there is in it that is trying to bring comfort to Ahaz. In fact as you look at the OT, its prophetic books, --- one method of approach I have found very useful is to note what is the purpose of a verse, and perhaps 50% of the content of the prophetic books has for its

purpose rebuke of sin. In his rebuking someone for his sin, his wrong attitude we have a tendency to just pass over these quickly and get on to the blessing passages. But God wants us to receive their message to. They are vital for us as they were for people them. But it is very helpful to look at a verse and ask, Is this a verse of rebuke? Is it a verse of blessing? Or is it a verse that has rebuke for certain people and blessing for certain others? What is the ~~next~~ purpose of this verse? I would like you all to before our next meeting to very carefully go through ch. 7 and notex how many verses in it are verses of rebuke; how many are verses of blessing. How many are part one or the other. Now if it says, God said to Isaiah - God out and meet Ahaz then you don't have to say whether that is rebuke or blessing, but if you get down to the next verse and find out what he was to say to him, and there the ==/we are interested in your conclusion on that.

This part from Is. 7-12 is important

1. For its very important prophecies of Christ
2. Because of the importance of seeing these in context.
3. Because it has many clear teachings that are helpful for us today. Ch. 7-11 is one of the best known sections of Isaiah and yet mostly only isolated verses known, and there is much more in it we need to know than the little that is ordinarily referred to in our services.

Small a. was Isa. 7-12. There will be another problem in ch. 7-12 that we will go over hastily that we could spend 2 or 3 hrs. discussing with profit, but because I am very anxious to have time to look carefully carefully into

b. Isa. 28-35. This is a section that is very beautiful and has many wonderful predictions in it but is --

The reason it is little known is because it does not contain within itself all the clues necessary for its understanding. And the ~~K~~JV made one of its worst errors I've ever found anywhere in ch. 29, a place where they simply miss the import of the passage. Clearly missed it because they made a mistranslation that they never would have made if they'd seen the importance of that particular passage. I don't blame them for it. If you don't study ch. 7-12 first/^{its} pretty hard to get much sense out of ch. 28. But when you get ch. 7-12 first ch. 28 just opens right up, and ch. 29 and the following.

That was I Introduction - A. The Importance of what we are going to do.

B. The Method of Importance? (of Study)

Our method in this particular course is a careful study of context and interrelation of material. There are many good commentaries on Is. but almost every one of them is so interested in particular words or verses that it fails to see many important matters of the interrelation of the verses. ~~IN~~ this course I am particularly interested in the interrelation of the material. In seeing not merely what a particular word mean but what is the purpose of the verse; what the purpose of the context. What light does this throw on it? This has to be done with care. It has to be done with definite care because it is easy to have some preconceived idea and go to some book and read with those ideas in mind. And we don't want to do that. We don't want to draw anything out of it but what is there. But we want to draw out of it what we reasonably can by comparison of ~~XXXXXXXX~~ ^{passages} and that is a phase of the study that is tremendously important and has not been carried through in most of the commentators to the extent it needs to be. So that is the principle thing in our method in this particular course -- our careful study of context and of ~~the~~

interrelation of material.

2. Careful study of background. The background of 7-12 which is also the background of 28-35 is to some extent brought out in chs. 7-8. We have certain clear references, but we understand it much better when we see their related material in Kings and Chron. In this period there is much of the background we don't know, but particularly from the story of Ahaz in 2 Kings we get very important facts that are extremely important for understanding Isaiah 7. And for understanding the whole of the material we are going to study. A certain amount of careful study of background is vital in this course.

3. We shall give a certain amount of attention to study of particular words or phrases. We won't be so interested in this course where it does not make a great deal of diff. whether you translate it this way or that way. But wherever it makes any difference to the interpretation we are drawing, or wherever there are different ideas on interp. of a verse or phrase that might affect in an important way the meaning of the passage we will look very carefully at them. (Those who wish to use Heb. that is perfectly satisfactory but we have many who have not had Heb. yet; I have not required it for this course. Where I refer to Heb. I will try to do it in such a way that it will be perfectly clear to one without knowledge of Heb. Some points at which this will be vital in interpretation).

4. It will be our desire to emphasize what is clear rather than what is uncertain. A great mistake made by interpreters is to take a difficult v. and concentrate on that verse; they have to get exactly everything that is in this verse instead of taking of taking the verses that are clear. To my mind instead of spending a great deal of time on particular verses, it is better to study the Bible

seeing what is clear and then go through it again in the light of that fact and you become aware of problems. Then you go back again and in the light of what you have already become aware of as problems you become aware of answers to these problems you would never have known otherwise when you are not aware of the problems. So that this time as you go through you find ans. to the problems, and you become aware of new problems. Thus you increase in your Bible knowledge, not necessarily by spending a great deal of time on the small passages but even more important is getting the whole picture and seeing how it all interrelates. I think it is very important to emphasize what is clear. To me one of the saddest things in the Christian world is the fact we have whole denominations taking a strong stand on points resting on the uncertain or at least arguable interpretation of two or three words of Scripture. If God wants Christian people to separate from other Christian people over a point of doctrine, I believe He will make that so clear that any honest person will find what is taught there. It is a natural tendency of fallen human nature to take a few verses and stand on them and let the others go. If we stand on what is clear the unclear will gradually become clear but if we stand on our particular interp. of what is not clear we will find the clear become unclear.

5. I wish to avoid oversystemitization. I think that is a very great danger in going to Scripture. We have a system of interp. in mind and we try to fit everything into our system. When we find things from certain passages we want to see how they fit with other passages. But often we are so anxious to find further proof of this thing we have found clearly taught in one place in the Bible, that when we find something that seems to differ with it, we explain it away instead of going into it and seeing what it really teaches.

It might lead to a modification of our understanding on certain points, or it might be it actually gives us something entirely different from it on some other phases of it which we overlook but our == by our effort to fit everything into a definite system. We must build our system from the Scripture, not fasted our system on the Scripture. You might say there is a contradiction between our first point andz of making our emphasis upon interrelation of passages and the last one of avoiding oversystemization but getting what's there. There is a danger of going to one extreme or the other and we want to avoid it. We waa want to see what's there, what's clear and we want to stand on it. But we don't want to read from one passage into another or from a general overview of what we have into a passage without being sure that that is what is really taught there.

I think I've covered Roman Numeral I. We go into Roman Numeral II - Specific study of ch. 7 next time. This only one hour a week so I don't expect a lot of ourside work from you but I would appreciate if you'd go through ch. 7 noting what is rebuke, what is blessing, what there is that might be partly one, partly the other. Get as clear an idea as you can of the whole meaning of Is. 7, and if you have time read in 2 Ki. the account of the reign of King Ahaz.

I trust that each of you has a copy of Isaiah before you because we will be discussing in it. I don't care whether you have the Hebrew, a Greek translation, Latin translation, French, Korean, or any other language, or the language of 300 years ago . . . the English of King James, or one of the more recent translations. In fact, the more variety we have the better, because you may come across something in a translation that suggests an idea. It does not mean it occurs there; and it may suggest an idea that is in fact in the original and we can check and see if it is. It may be an idea that isn't there; we ^(can) check and note that fact also. So I'd like you to raise any questions that occur to you as we compare any of these particular versions. It is absolutely impossible to make an exact translation from any language into any other. You cannot expect any English translation to give us exactly what is in the original. But the KJV for the language of 300 yrs. ago was a very excellent translation, very carefully made, though, with some, I think, very bad errors. But on the whole very excellent.

And this NASB has a very accurate translation into present-day English. Again with a few very bad errors, I believe, but on the whole a very excellent translation; not nearly the beauty to it that the KJV has, but a very excellent study Bible. Now other translations, some are excellent, some are not so good. But even the poorest translation can hit on an idea that is in the original in some particular verse that we might not know ~~== not notice in one of the common~~ English translations, or as we read the Hebrew and can suggest something that we can check and find is perhaps actually there, and we overlooked it. So anything that you come across that is of interest, I wish you would call attention to it. If it's important you might raise your hand

and if it's not quite so important you might give me a note, and as I said last time anytime I don't make myself clear -- it's very easy to fail to be clear; it's very easy to mispeak. I don't think there is anybody who has ever spoken a whole hour without making some foolish twisting of words that wasn't what he meant to say at all. So if you think I have done that, or what I say isn't clear, please raise your hand.

If you have a question of disagreement on some point, or a question related that you would like to look into, I wish you would give me a note because it might fit in exactly in some way at a later place and it might be an interruption at this place. Any note I am given with a question I will look into and will either fit into the lecture at sometime or else see you personally and speak to you about it.

Now we talked last time about No. 1 with out general introduction to the whole material.

II The Background of Isa. 7-12. This begins with Is. 7 with some actions Is. made in response to God's commands and some words that he said as God led him, at about 733 B.D. They have great relation to their immediate situation. So we will want to look into the background rather fully. For the Christian the most important verse by far in this ch. is v. 14. The angel said to Joseph that the birth of Christ was what was predicted when Isa. said, A virgin shall conceive and bring forth a son and you shall call his name Immanuel. It is a wonderful prediction of Christ. It's relation to the situation and its relation particularly to the verses that immediately follow is somewhat complicated. We will look at the ch. as a whole, before we look at specific details at this particular question. So^{if} a question comes

up in your mind about this matter don't take class time for it until we look at the chapter as a whole. If you think of something interesting in connection with it and you feel like it I wish you would write it out and hand it to me at the end of class or put it in my box.

A. The Prophetic View of the Future. Here is a thing that is very important and frequently misunderstood.

1. The prophets were not mere predictors of distant events. The idea of the average uneducated person about prophecy is that somebody simply had a ~~dream~~ dream or imagined things or had words they did not understand said something that would be very useful for people centuries later. The prophets did do that. They had visions of what was going to happen centuries later and God directed their words so that they would even say things that had meaning that they did not understand. That is brought out in 1 Peter where he says that the prophets were seeking what time or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify when it (he) testified before hand of the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow. In other words the prophets tried to understand the meaning of some of the things they said. I think they understood most of what they said. But there was that which they said, they did not understand because God led them and caused them to give messages for their own day and for future days, including some matters that would not be understood till much later. So the prophets were predictors of distant events, but this is only a small part of their work. It is an important part but it is far from the principle thing of prophecy -- properly understood is not simply prediction. Prophecy is speaking for God, giving a message that God has given to be passed on. That's what prophecy really is, and that includes prediction, but we've come

In modern English to say prophecy means simply what's going to happen in the future, and that's only a part of it.

2. The Prophets Had a Great Interest in Their Contemporaries. We immediately think of Elijah, one of the greatest of the prophets. We read a great deal about what Elijah did. We find he made many predictions. I believe that most students of the prophets make the mistake of beginning with difficult statements by the writing prophets, and trying to decide exactly what they mean instead of taking what is simplest and clearest. The ~~XXXXXXXX~~^{simplest} and clearest approach is to see what Elijah did because we would know more of the background (of Elijah) than of any of the prophets. You find God gave Elijah a message and Elijah said something, then you find something happened, and usually you can see exactly how Elijah's predictions were fulfilled and you can see how God dealt with Elijah. As James says, He was a man of like passions with ourselves and yet he was a man through whom God spoke, and whom God wonderfully used. But in Elijah's ~~day~~ day we know how tremendously important was the great crises that occurred, and those in Isaiah's day are equally important. Isaiah was tremendously interested in the people of his own day, and his first effort, his immediate effort was to give them messages that God intended to mean a lot to them. But God also intended that certain of His messages would be written down and preserved as part of the Bible because they were of interest not only to his contemporaries but also to people in future ages. You can't understand the fut. messages -- that is many of them, there are many you can't understand fully - unless -- if you do not see the situation in relation to the time when they were immediately given. So the great interest in contemporary problems of the prophets is a vital matter. Here I

Here I recommend the study of Jeremiah. Jeremiah has the background much more fully given than Isaiah does. There are some chs. in Jer. that are very hard to understand, but there are other chs. of Jer. in which the background is so clearly brought out that it gives you an understanding of the prophet and the situation, that is hard to get from most of the prophetic books.

3. While the prophetic view may reach far into the fut. it is usually related to the immediate situation. The p = This does not mean that any prophet had a whole idea of what was going to ~~approx~~ happen in the whole history of the future, or that any prophet had an ideax of all the events in the life of Christ, or of all the events in our own day or in time yet to come. ¶ But God enabled the prophets to look into the future and to see certain things there that were important and to describe what he saw. And he was also looking at the nearer things - the things that were of great importance to his own day, and the matter in the future that God enabled him to see usually have a very definite relation to the things in his own day that he saw. Some of the prophets would look ahead only 50 yrs, or a hundred years, as far as their writings is concerned. Others looked way ahead, way beyond the present day. God enabled them to do what he desired for two reasons: for the immediate situation, and for that which in his words would be of guidance and direction to us and to people through all future days. This will be made a little clearer with

4. Brief discussion of perspective of prophet. I say brief because we could take an hour on this subject and we have not time for that. This is very important background that I want you to have in mind. I don't know how many of you have been in mountain areas

much. If you have been in western mountain areas it will be very easy to give you a picture of looking at the mountains and of seeing one range and then another behind it and another behind it and another behind that. Probably in most regions where there are very many mountains you would have the picture of what I want to give you. It is the picture of seeing a mountain range which has high peaks and then lower areas, high peaks, etc. and back of it you see another range, etc. You may see at some times as many as four gaz rangers, one back of the other. As you look at these you see something near and you see something back of it. You might compare that with what is related to it in the prophet's mind in the situation. Something that has a relation, you see in back of that.

Now as he looks, very often you cannot tell how much space there is between one range and the next. Very often you will see one range and the second back of it, and the third, and at certain places you look at the first and you see the third right back of it, and the second is lower at that point and you don't see it at all and you're not sure if it is part of the second range or the third. You are not sure how far it is between the ranges. So the prophet does not start in and give you a linear picture describing everything that happens next you and next year and the centuries and centuries after. But he speaks of the subject and then looks beyond that to some future event that is related to that subject. He may have an idea how much later it is and he may have no idea how much later it is. But the relation is often a logical relation, between the near thing and the more distant thing, that is mentioned and then he may mention another layer of things and a distant thing related to it, without telling you whether these two distant things are about the same time or whether one is much later

than the other. We, of course, are in a much better position to understand such predictions than any of the contemporaries of the prophets because we know so much of what has happened in history since. And so much about great events that happened within the next century or two and that happened at the time of Christ, or even that have happened since that time. Of course we have other prophecies that point even further beyond our day and we can bring them into relation to them.

But this concept of perspective in prophecy, I believe is very important for understanding the prophetic books. Now, I wish we had an hour to discuss everything ^{under} ~~under~~ A. If you can get those main concepts it will be very helpful in understanding these parts of Isaiah.

B. Isaiah's Glimpses of the Future.

1. Relates to a situation that occurred in Isaiah's time. We'll call No. 1 The Danger from Israel and Syria. I mentioned last time 2 Kings 16 which tells about events in the time of Isa. If you have your Bibles before you please turn to 2 Ki. 16. First glance at 2 Ki. 15:23-25, we read: 'In the 50th yr. of Azariah, k. of Judah, Pekahiah, the s. of Menahem, began to reign over Israel in Sam., and reigned two yrs. Then we'll skip reading v. 24. Verse 25 continues, But Pekah, the son of Remaliah -- now these are two names that will be very important in connection with ch. 7 of Isa. -- a captain of his, conspired against him, and smote him in Samaria in the palace of the king's house -- and it tells then who was with him and says, and he killed him and reigned in his room (Old Eng. is "in his room") Today we say "in his place." I don't know if place is any more sensible to express this than room but it's what we say today. If you said today and he reigned in his room, it wouldn't make much sense. But he reigned in his place.

I don't know if he used the same room or a different room! He did succeed him. Now this Pekah was a murderer and a usurper, man who killed the previous king and became king of Israel.

I trust all of you are aware of these main facts about the history of the ancient Israelites, that at the death of Solomon which if I recall correctly was in 931 B.C., c. 200 yrs. before the time of Isaiah, the kingdom of Israel was divided into two parts. When Jeroboam rebelled against Solomon's son Rehoboam. So it was divided into two parts, and the southern part came to be spoken of as the kingdom of Judah because the tribe of Judah was the greater part of it. The name Israel properly belongs to both of ~~XXXX~~ them, but for the succeeding years ~~the~~ we speak of the kingdom of Israel as the northern kingdom because it was much larger than the southern kingdom. It was maybe twice as large in size and population. But economically it was maybe 50% greater than the southern kingdom. The southern kingdom had some definite advantages but was definitely smaller, and many times the southern kingdom tried to fight the northern kingdom and they were practically always defeated in it, because while for the northern kingdom to conquer the southern kingdom would be very hard, but for the southern kingdom to conquer the northern kingdom would be impossible since the northern was so much larger and stronger. That is larger and stronger so as to be a great advantage, but not larger and stronger so as to give ~~x~~ it an absolute decisive advantage. So we have the northern k. called Israel, and the southern k. called Judah, and here we have this man Pekah killing a king of the northern k. and making himself king. That's the background of ch. 16 which tells us about the southern kingdom. It says in the seventeenth year of Pekah the son of Remaliah Ahaz, the son of Jothan king of Judah began to reign. Twenty years old was Ahaz when he began to

reign and he reigned 16 yrs in Jerusalem and did not that which was right in the sight of the Lord his God as did David his father.

That is Bible language which does not make sense to present day English (readers). How was David the father of Ahaz? David was his great, great, great, great grandfather. In modern English the word father means your immediate predecessor in the male line. But in Hebrew the word ab means any male ancestor. It does not necessarily mean immediate father. So David was the father of all those who were his descendants. So Ahaz was his descendant but he did not live a good life like David had; he did not follow the Lord like David had. Verse 3 says, He walked in the ways of the kings of Israel and made his sons pass through the fire. . . according to the abominations of the heathen whom the Lord cast out from before the children of Israel.

Verse 5 says, And Rezin king of Syria, and Pekah son of Remaliah king of Israel came up to Jerusalem to war, and they besieged Ahaz but could not overcome him. This translation 'Rezin king of Syria' is a very bad translation, but it's so well established in English I don't think you can change it. We must recognize what it is. The Hebrew is Aram. The Arameans the people of Aram were a large group of people who had their principal center at Damascus 250 miles north and a little east of Jerusalem. These Arameans were a great commercial people and eventually their language through peaceful spread eventually supplanted Babylonian and Babylon and supplanted ^{Hebrew} people in Israel. So ~~ARAMEAN~~ Aramean because the language of all that area, eventually. But there was a kingdom of the Arameans centering in Damascus. Eventually the Arameans were conquered by the Assyrians, the followers of their god Asshur. The Assyrians, after they conquered ~~ARAMEAN~~ the Arameans, incorporated into their area and when the Greeks came to that area of the Assyrian empire, the first part they

came into was what had formerly been the kingdom of the Arameans. So they called that A-Syria, and it got shortened to Syria. So we find in Greek translations as early as 200 B.C. we find this area called Syria but it's confusion; it's not the original name at all. It's a later name. It is actually Aram. But these people of Aram -- we can call them Syrians as long as we understand what we mean by Syrian, we mean Aramaic and these Arameans were ~~the~~ the capital of Damascus (?) You read ~~the~~ the books of 1 and 2 Kings and you find that the Northern kingdom is always fighting with the people of Syria. They were the people of Aram. There was constant conflict back and forth. Very important they were in the days of Elijah.

Here is the Southern Kingdom and Judah. The Northern kingdom north of it may be 50% stronger than Judah, and then quite a little further away from that is this large kingdom of the Arameans which is quite a bit stronger than the kingdom of Israel.

Now in the == in v. 5 and Rezin King of Syria and Pekah son of Remaliah king of Israel came up to Jerusalem to war and they defeated Ahaz but could not overcome him. They could not overcome him. In other words if they had mobilized their entire force they certainly could have conquered Judah because they would have had four times the strength of Judah, but it was quite a distance in those days of no airplanes, no autos, no decent roads. It was quite a distance. They evidently made a ~~quite~~ quick attack against Jerusalem thinking they could easily conquer, but they failed. So they failed to conquer Judah. They made a quick attack at Jerusalem, and then they drove back and the people of Judah expected them to attack again. So we read in v. 7 that Ahaz, king of Judah thought of a clever way to protect himself from the people of Israel and Aramea. There was Israel stronger than Judah. Beyond Israel was Syria, or Aram -

properly speaking, stronger than Israel, but quite a distance away. And way beyond them across the desert was the land of Assyria from which the name of Syria later came, erroneously to be derived. But Assyria which had as its capitol a city named ~~XXXXX~~ Asshur, and had as its leading god the god Asshur, at this time had as its capitol the city of Ninevah. Assyria had for many centuries been occasionally making conquests, and they had conquered and made forays and attacks reaching sometimes way up into Asia Minor. It ~~was~~ was a very war-like people, but to the people of Judah they seemed far far off.

And King Ahaz said: If I can get the Assyrians to come and attack Syria and Israel, from that side they won't be able to gather forces to attack me. ~~XXXXXX~~ In that way I'll be safe. A very clever human idea, but a very ungodly idea as we shall see as we note what Isaiah has to say about it.

So v. 7 says, Ahaz sent messengers to Tiglath Pilezer king of Assyria, ^{saying} /I am your servant and your son. Come up and save me out of the hand of the king of ^{Syria} ~~XXXXXX~~. You notice I'm reading the KJV but I changed "thy" to "your" because very few people ^{today} have any idea what "thy" means. Some people think it means God and certainly He's not calling Tiglath Pilezer God! Nothing divine about the use of the words "thou" and "thy" -- just Old English for the singular of "you". In today's language we'd say, I am your servant; your son. Come up and save me out of the hands of the king of Syria and out of the hands of the king of Israel. And v. 8 says, And Ahaz took the silver and gold that was found in the house of the Lord and the treasures of the king's house and sent it for a present to the king of Syria (?) -- Assyria. It's exactly what the U.S. did about 25 yrs. ago when facing Hitler and his force in Germany which they

thought might overcome all Europe, they sent to Stalin who was every bit as bad as Hitler if not a good deal worse and they said to him We will join with you and work with you to overcome Hitler. So when Hitler was destroyed we just gave Stalin just about everything he wanted and as a result we have a far greater danger in the world today than Hitler ever was.

Now that is what Ahaz was doing. Ahaz sent beyond them over ^{if} across the desert to Tiglath Pilezer. He said that/they'll attack from the other side, ~~they~~ then he said we will be safe from them. So he sent messengers and he sent a lot of money with him. He paid tribute to them promising a certain amount of fealty to them and v. 9 says: The king of Assyria hearkened to him; and the king of Assyria went up against Damascus and took it, and carried the people of it captive and slew Rezin. And king Ahaz went to Damascus to meet Tiglath Pilezer, king of Assyria and saw an altar that was at Damascus and king Ahaz sent to Urijah the priest the fashion of the altar and pattern of it. And Urijah built an altar according to all king Ahaz had sent ~~to~~ to him from Damascus and he simply kept the altar of the Lord to divine by and he put up this heathen altar right in the temple. It shows how far we went with his human schemes to try to protect his land.

Now so No. 1 is the Danger from Israel and Syria, which we find out about largely by looking at 2 Kings. Isa. refers to it but does not fully explain it.

2. Assyrian Conquests and Threats. (Question: indistinct) Yes 2 Chron. tells a little about the beginning of Ahaz' and a little about the end of it and doesn't help us about this which occurs about the middle of it. So there is no contradiction ~~between~~ between the two but they deal with different aspects of Ahaz' reign.

But they both represent him as being a thoroughly ungodly man. ~~28~~
This particular thing that is so vital to the background of Isaiah is not given in Chron. but is given in Kings. If you have further questions about that please give me a note because I'd be glad to look into these details but they are not of importance for this thing in Isaiah. But this is of tremendous importance for the background of Isaiah.

So No. 2 is Assyrian Conquests and Threats. To the people of Judah Assyria seemed way way off. It seemed like a very distant thing -- something that they would never have to worry about. But Assyria had been conquering different areas for many years, and when the Assyrians would sent to a city and say, Give us ~~the~~ booty; give us heavy tribute and the city would refuse, then the Assyrians would attack and conquer it and say you must give this booty regularly. If the city decided they could not keep up that heavy taxation and topped, the Assyrian army would come and they might take all the men of the city. The Assyrian kings boasted about how they would capture a city and cut off all the heads of the men and pile them up in a great heap, or they would impale men on stakes around. They boasted about the frightful methods they used against anybody that ~~revolted~~ ^{revolted} against them in order to terrify others so they would not revolt. So Assyrian got a name for being the most terrible destructive force in the near east. But I don't know how much of this penetrated into Judah. Judah had Israel next to them; then they had Syria and Assyria seemed way off. To Israel Assyria was much more a known factor, but to Syria it was a very real known factor. Now these Assyrian conquests them and Assyrian threats are very important to the background. Eventually it was thought the king of Assyria conquered

Damascus and took the people of Syria and led them off captive, carried them way off to a distant land so that they would have no power to revolt against him again. They would bring in these people and scatter them through different areas where they could not understand the language and the people looked on them as someone the Assyrians brought in and looked on them with hostility. They were in constant danger from the people of the arda area to which they came. So that was the end to the kingdom of Aram. The King of Assyria was only too glad to have an excuse to make this attack. But Ahaz gave ~~th~~ him the excuse and gave him a lot of money to help ~~it~~ him in doing it. That's no. 2.

Now we'll say, Isaiah looks and he sees this immediate tremendous danger from Israel and Syria. Then God permitted him to look beyond where few people from Judah could look probably and see this great Assyrian menace behind. See the Assyrian conquest that came to Damascus. Ten years later it came to the Northern kingdom, the kingdom of Israel. Eventually all but destroyed Judah. It was only God's intervention that prevented the Assyrians from taking Judah. God intervened when king Sennacherib came and conquered everything in the area except Judah, and would have conquered it except God worked a miracle and protected them and saved them, and that's one of the big things in the background of Isaiah.

3. God allows Isaiah also in many parts of his book to look dear forward to eventual exile, to the fact that though God did not enable the Assyrians to conquer Judah he did enable the B. bylonians to do it. But this is 150 yrs. after the time of Isaiah, but Isaiah has many glimpses of the certainty of this fact of exile.

4. God's Promises to David. We have it told in 2 Sam. We have the promise God gave to David that He would always have a son to sit

to sit upon his throne. The word son is as you know in Hebrew the same as our English word Descendant. When it says in one of the Gospels the story of --- ~~XINXXXXXXX~~ that Jesus Christ is the son of David, the son of Abraham . Nobody today would call you the son of somebody who lived 400 years ago who was the son of somebody who lived 500 yrs. ago before that. It is the same as our word descendant. But God promised David a line -- a continuing line and the kingdom of Judah which lasted from 931 when there was a destruction right up to 587 -- that's a period of maybe 400 years, all the ^{Judean kings} /kings, good men, wonderful pious men, bad men, wicked men, all of them were descendants of David up to that time.

But the Northern kingdom which revolted from Rehoboam and of Solomon, the Northern kingdom had Jeroboam and his son and then they had a revolt by Baasha who killed Jeroboam's son, and when his son was reigning there was a general who killed him, and another general succeeded in overcoming him and they established a dynasty that lasted about a century and then their descendants were killed and another dynasty was established. You have one after another-- about four dynasties in the Northern kingdom. Then you have one of the last of these dynasties killed by Pekah who is now king. So you see the continuous line of the descendants of David which God had promised, and the various Dynasties in the Northern kingdom. God promises to David are very important in Isaiah's vision and understanding.

5. Ultimate Blessings for God's Faithful People. Isaiah could look sometimes way into the future and see particular great blessings for God's faithful people, but whether he could tell how far out (ahead) they are, some blessings he described might be a century off, some might be four centuries off, some might be 4000 years off for all we know.

know. But he got glimpses of these great distant blessings and we try to fit them together into our picture of the future. At some points we can be absolutely confident and there are many other points we won't know until the time comes. But this just gives an idea of glimpses of the future as God used Isaiah in dealing with the people of his day.

C. The Character of Ahaz. I don't think I need to say more to you about that than what I have already read to you in the Scripture. He was a wicked, ungodly man. He was a man who was willing in order to get the help of the Assyrians to take a heathen altar and put it right up in the Temple! What do you think then of his relation ~~axzfxto~~ to Isaiah? Do you think he ever invited Isaiah to hold a service in his palace? Do you think he cared much what Isaiah said? Well, he cared about the attitude of the people. He was interested to have the people support him, and he knew that many of the people considered Isaiah a great prophet. Ahaz' son, Hezekiah, the godly man who succeeded him, had Isaiah come to the palace and asked him questions and discussed things with him, and revered him as God's prophet. But Ahaz looked on Isaiah as a man that these poor ignorant superstitious people think of as a prophet, and therefore we can't be too antagonistic to him but the less we have to bother with him the happier we are. This is the character of Ahaz and is very important in understanding Isaiah⁷ even in understanding the prophecy of the virgin birth.

III Isaiah 7. The first 6 chs. of Isa. form a unit by themselves. Seven through twelve is a definite unit we are going to study the first half of this semester, and ch. 7 we are going to discuss now as III, and under that

A. Survey of the chapter. From our Christian viewpoint c. 14 is the most important verse in the chapter. But we will not

discuss v.14 and its relation to the verses at length, until we have surveyed the ch. as a whole. We want to get a good idea of the whole situation before we are in a position properly to study this particular verse and its relation here. To us that is more important than most other things in the ch., but it is not the matter to take up next. So if you have questions about this, I wish you would reserve them until a little later and we will give great attention to them but especially we must look at the ch. as a whole.

So we start in at v. 1. So it came to pass in the days of Ahaz the son of Jothan the son of Uzziah king of Judah that Rezin, king of Syria and Pekah son of Remaliah, king of ~~ISRAEL~~ Israel went up against Jerusalem to war against it but could not prevail against it. That's what we read in 2 Kings. They made a quick attack thinking we'll capture the city quickly and put in a puppet king who will be friendly to us and do what we want, but they were driven back. And now that they have been driven back, the people of Judah expect a new attack. They expect that having gone back they will gather a larger assistance and Israel alone is stronger than Judah, Aram is stronger than Israel, and the two of them together what can we do against them? We've got to do something important to resist them? What can we do?

V. 2 So it was told the house of David saying, Syria is confederate with Ephraim, and his heart was moved and the heart of his people as the trees of the wood are moved with the wind. They were greatly frightened; the people as a whole were terrified, and Ahaz particularly because Ahaz suspected that they would try to do away with him and put in a puppet king, a relative of his who would do what they wanted him to do. So we do not have it explained here in Isaiah, but we have it explained in what I read from 2 Kings, immediately, very secretly Ahaz gathered a group of his nobles, and said to them, I have a clever

idea which will protect you. We will get a lot of gold and silver together from the Temple, but we will do it quietly so that people will not know what we are doing. We will send messengers way over across the desert to that distant land of Assyria and take this tribute to them and say, We will be subject to you; we will do what you say. You protect us then from these people around us who are attacking us. And know that great as the power of Israel and Syria is compared to us, the power of Assyria is far greater and they will attack from the outside and keep Israel and Syria too busy to bother us. What he did not realize was that when they would attack they would conquer them, and then they would be face to face with a terrible power of Assyria. And instead of having a menace, they would have a far greater menace right next to them. It was a scheme that would backfire that would result in harm for them even though it might for the immediate future be helpful.

But the immediate problem, they had figured this would settle the ultimate problem but the immediate problem is if there comes another quick attack from Israel, or there comes an attack before Assyria moves against them, for us to hold out till the Assyrian forces. So immediately he starts in to reinforce these fortifications around Jerusalem. He starts to reinforce them to make himself safe from an attack by Israel and by Aram. The Lord says to Isaiah, v.3, Go forth to meet Ahaz. In other words if Isa. comes to the palace and says, I have a message for Ahaz, Ahaz will say, I'm too busy to talk to him! He won't bother with him. But here is Ahaz out there with a great force of people, strengthening the fortifications and here comes God's prophet and most of these people believe he is God's prophet and they are interested in what he has to say and he starts talking to them there and Ahaz can't just brush him aside. Ahaz

has got to be courteous to him. So the Lord said, Go forth to meet Ahaz, thou and Shear-jashub thy son at the end of the conduit of the upper pool in the highway of the fuller's field. Now why do they tell us exactly where he was to meet Ahaz? It is because when you read in chs. 36,37 of the attack by the Assyrians 30 years later, the Assyrian king who came with tremendous force and humanly speaking was absolutely certain to destroy Jerusalem, he ~~sent~~ sent his emissaries and they spoke to king Hezekiah at that very spot at the end of the conduit of the upper pool in the highway of the fuller's field. So people of that day could look back and say this is the very spot ^{where} ~~is~~ Isaiah warned about what would happen from Ahaz' wicked scheme. Now we see it has happened! Here are the representatives of the king of Assyria! So you see that this mention is not just a little interesting archaeological point to know what place it was they met; (It is mentioned in chs. 36 of Isaiah and gives the whole account of what happened at that time 30 yrs. later.)

So he said, Go up there and meet Ahaz, and say, Take heed, and be quiet; fear not, neither be fainthearted for the two tails of these smoking firebrands, for the fierce anger of Rezin with Syria, and of the son of Remaliah. Because Syria, Ephraim, and the son of Remaliah ~~have~~ have taken evil counsel against thee, saying, Let us go up against Judah and vex it, and let us conquer it for ourselves, and set a king in the midst of it, even the son of Tabeel." It's not certain who the son of Tabeel is, but there is good reason to think that this was a relative of Ahaz who might have a certain amount of claim to the throne, and who would be subject to the whims and desires of the kingdoms of Israel and Aram.

So they said, We are going to do this and Isaiah says, Thus

saith the Lord God, It shall not stand, neither shall it come to pass. For the head of Syria is Damascus, and the head of Damascus is Rezin; and within 65 years shall Ephraim be broken, ~~an~~ that it be not a people. And the head of Ephraim is Samaria and the head of Samaria is Remaliah's son. If ye will not believe, surely ye shall not be established."

Well, now what does Ahaz need to worry about? God says, You are going to be safe. God says Damascus is going to be overthrown. He says even Ephraim (Ephraim is another name for the kingdom of Israel) is going to be destroyed so it is no longer a people. What does Ahaz do? Does he say, Oh isn't this wonderful! God is going to protect us. We don't need to worry any more. No, Ahaz says, This old fool Isaiah here comes with these crazy things. The people won't work. They won't hurry up and build these defences. We want to get them built up quick so we can be safe against immediate attack, and we know that what he says is right. We don't need to worry yet because Assyria is coming. Of course Isaiah doesn't know that! We've sent this secret message to Assyria and he's going to attack from the other side and we'll be safe but we need to be protected for the present; we need to keep them aroused to keep the people pulled strongly to the present (emergency). We want to be polite to Isaiah. We don't want to arouse any opposition, but we want to get rid of him as quickly as we can. So evidently we can infer properly from what follows that on Ahaz' face there was a look of incredulity and contempt; a desire to get rid of Isaiah as quickly as possible. So Isaiah gave this promise: He says, Damascus is going to be overcome; Ephraim 65 years from now won't even be a people! Ahaz says, What do I care what happens 65 years from now? I'll be dead and gone before

that time. If we don't get some help sooner than that, he says, they will take over, destroy me and take over the kingdom. We've got to do something much better than that in 65 years. So Isa. said, Moreover, the Lord spoke again unto Ahaz saying. -- I would take this that God gave Isaiah a new message. Isaiah had come and had given the message God gave him; now as he sat stands there and speaks to this unbelieving king, God gives him a further message. The Lord speaks to Ahaz through Isaiah and says, Ask a sign of the Lord. You've got this look of incredulity on your face! You don't believe God will protect His people. You don't think He is able. Ahaz says, I know we'll be safe in the end because we've got this secret arrangement with the king of Assyria, he says to himself. But he says to himself, Isaiah doesn't know anything about that. We've got to protect the land in the meantime. Let's get rid of this fellow Isaiah and go on with our building of the fortifications. He's got that look on his face, and Isaiah says to him, Ask a sign of the Lord. Ask it either in the depths or in the height above. And Ahaz said, I will not ask, neither will I tempt the Lord. Isn't that a wonderful, godly, pious attitude! I won't ask for a sign. No, we'll go ahead and build our fortifications and we know we've made a secret alliance with the king of Assyria that will protect us, so we want to get rid of you. How can we get rid of you quickly enough? No, we'll look pious and say, No, I won't tempt the Lord. I won't ask for a sign! Beautiful attitude isn't it!

Now Isaiah proceeds to bring comfort to Ahaz doesn't he? Why would Isaiah want to bring comfort to Ahaz.? Isaiah is not interested in bringing comfort to Ahaz. Isaiah is not interested in giving Ahaz some evidence. Isaiah is interested in giving the message God has of rebuke for Ahaz but the message for the people.

So he says, Isaiah says, Hear ye now O house of David - he won't even address Ahaz directly. He addresses the wholehouse of David. "Is it a small things for you to weary men? But will you weary my God also? Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign." God is going to replace you. God is going to --- not to put up for- even with having a man, an unbelieving, ungodly man like Ahaz as head of the house of David. He's going to provide a man after His own choice, a real representative of God's People. "Behold the virgin shall conceive and bear a son and shall call his name Immanuel." God is going to provide a real head of thehouse of David to replace this ungodly fellow Ahaz. "Butter and honey shall he eat that he may know to refuse the evil and choose the good." "For before the child shall know to refuse the evil and choose the good, the land thou abhorest shall be forsaken of both her kings."

You are going to be replaced. God is going to appoint one were who is going to be a proper head of the house of David, but we're not telling you when He's coming. He may come 100 yrs. from now. He may come in 700 yrs. from now. God is not saying when he's coming. But now suppose He were to come right now. Suppose we take Immanuel as a measuring stick for time and we say if the child were to be born now, before the child was old enough to reach for the warm milk instead of the hot poker - to refuse the evil and choose the good - Within two or three years before the child would reach an age of much knowledge the land you abhore would be forsaken of both her kings. And within the next two years after this the king of Assyria came, conquered Damascus and killed Rezin, and also killed Pekah and made the northern kingdom of Israel subject to him. It was made as an independent kingdom for another 10 years. Yes? (Question: Would you repeat what you said about knowing good and evil . . . ?) No, our time is short. I

will have to leave that till next time. But I want to make this point clear now that here the coming Immanuel is used as a measuring stick. If a child was born right soon, before he would grow up to reach for what is good instead of for what is bad, before he would be old enough to make simple choices the land you abhor will be forsaken of both her kings. Rezin will be gone. Pekah will be gone within a very few years. God gives this as comfort, not to Ahaz but to the godly people there who looked to Isaiah as a prophet. While he rebukes Ahaz by saying God is going to provide His own Immanuel who is going to be the true king of the house of David. Verses 17-18 say that the Lord is going to bring on you and your people days that are worse than anything that has been since the disruption of the kingdom. There are going to come the people from Assyria. Verse 20 he calls it a razor that is hired, that is, Ahaz is paying all this money to get the king of Assyria to help him. But he says they are going to come and they are not going to stop with Israel they are going to go on into Judah. So this is the immediate meaning of the chapter --- it is Ahaz's clever scheme is not going to work; it is going to miscarry. The Assyrians he thinks are going to protect him are actually going to overcome the area around Judah too and become a new ^{enemy} menace, and this is going to come in a very short time.

Now we will proceed^s from that point next time. Please read over the ch. very carefully with these things in mind, and also glance over the first half of the next chapter. Think about this problem of Immanuel. If you have time to listen/^{to}(read) any commentary, especially an ungodly commentary that might try to explain it away, see what method they use. We will look at that another time.

Copy #2

(Announcement re "The Church Around the World" Leaflet)

We were speaking about ch. 7 of Isaiah and made that Roman III
Isaiah 7. Under that A. Survey of the Chapter.

Before we got into that survey we had looked at "Glimpses of the
Future" and had noticed that sometimes he looked a little ways into the
future; sometimes a long distance. You can't always tell; he doesn't
always make it clear. Another thing is that very often in the Bible and
particularly in the Prophetic Books, something is introduced simply by
a word without any explanation, then the explanation comes later. If
you stop when you first come to it, and ask, What is this and try to
figure it all out, you may find you are getting into all kinds of
erroneous tangents, because the explanation may come later on. So for
that reason, I am not going in the survey to stop more than very briefly
on vv. 14-16. We will glance at them and go on through the rest of the
ch. and in fact make a survey of ch. 8 and then come back to vv. 14-16.
There are many matters about those 3 important vv. that become crystal
clear when when you have noticed similar statements later on. But if
you stop and try to determine right then what they mean, you'll find
yourself arguing about all sorts of things. If you'd go a little further
it would make this quite unnecessary. The == In the interpretation of
the Bible you will find many statements that are actually clear. You'll
find other statements that may be interpreted in one of two ways. You
have to interpret them in the light of context. Then you will find some
statements, espec. in prophetic works, that have to be taken in the light
of the whole context. In this case the historic background is not ex-
plained. It is explained a little, and most chs. in the prophetic books
don't do that! But here we have at the beginning of ch. 7 the == a little
bit about the historic situation. Later on we'll find chs. that become

crystal clear when you find what the historic situation is but it's not mentioned in the ch. Here it is, but briefly. So we had to get information from Kings. Now Chron. also has an account of events in the life of Ahaz that probably occur before the time we are dealing with now, and which are not particularly important in dealing with this ch. But in Kings there are things of great importance for interp. of this ch. We ran over the first part of the ch. quite rapidly at the end of the last hour. I'm going to look at again the early part of the ch, and then go on through the ch.

There are people who talk about what in this ch. would give hope to Ahaz. I think if you look at the ch. as a whole, you'll find that the ~~Abat~~ thing Is. is interested in is giving any comfort or hope to Ahaz. Ahaz was an apostate king who was opposing the work of God. Most of the people were professedly following the Lord, but the great many were in their hearts not following the Lord. So there is a great deal of rebuke to the wicked people of the land who nominally were following the Lord; a great deal of rebuke to Ahaz who was not interested at all in the Lord and there is a certain amount of comfort to the godly who were following Isaiah. That's not the main thing in this ch., tho perhaps the most impor

So let's begin at the first verse. The first v. has an historic situation. Rezin king of Syria and Pekah son of P~~am~~maliah king of Israel have made an attack on Jerusalem. They have been unsuccessful. They have ~~ith~~drawn, but it is expected they will return with greater force. So v.2 "And it was told the house of David saying, Syria is confederate with Eph~~raim~~raim. Some translate that Syria is encamp~~ed~~ed in Ephraim. Lit. Syria is resting on Ephraim. I think either interp. is possible. Wheter it actually means Syria had come far with her troops as Israel yet so as to be camp~~ing~~ing there or whether they == this difficulty was piling on

the other that they had Syria to face as well as Israel, that is the important thing. In this situation Ahaz is making this plan with a few of his nobles to get the Assyrian king to come to his aid. He sent, I believe, he has sent before this a great sum of money mentioned in Kings. Sent it off secretly to the King of Assyria to get him to come. That I have not found in any of the commentaries. They take it for granted that this event occurs before Ahaz makes the confederacy, with Assyria. I believe it is an important key to unlock the passage is to understand this fact, and not only this fact but Isa. 28 when we get there-- that Ahaz has made this plan so he is interested now not in fighting Israel and Syria to win victory over them, but he is interested in protecting Jerusalem until the king of Assyria comes and conquers with his force. But he is and his whole group are certainly frightened as v. 2 describes.

Then v. 3, Then the Lord said unto Isa., Go forth now to meet Ahaz, thou, and Shear-jashub thy son." The commentaries make a great many guesses as to how old Shear-jashub was at this time. One commentary said he must have been a stripling of 16 or 18 years! I don't know what on earth they base that on! I have no idea how to decide whether Shear-jashub was an infant in arms, or whether he was a young fellow along in his teens. One commentary says, The boy's presence would be a sign of hope to Ahaz and probably prepare Ahaz for a prophecy from the Lord. I think that's utter nonsense. I don't see how the boy's presence would have that effect on Ahaz. It might have the effect on Ahaz of making him ready to say, Let's get this fellow out of here so we can get on with the defense work. It would get the sympathy of the people maybe -- seeing the young child with him, having not only Isaiah kicked out but also the child. Now there

is no doubt of course that the name of the child has a meaning. I doubt if anyone else in history ever named a child Shear-jashub. The name means "a remnant will return." Would that name bring hope or despair? It depends on who it is that hears it. I would think that for most people that name would give a threat -- a remnant will return. Well how can they return unless they have first gone into exile. It conveys the implication they are going to be sent into exile, and there is going to be misery ahead. In ch. 8 we get the name of Isaiah's second son which the Lord tells him to give -- Mahershalahashbaz, another name I'm sure no child ever bore except this one. "Hurry the booty; hasten the spoil." In other words, terrible times are ahead! Misery is ahead. That's the second son - tells of misery. But the first son is a name which would convey hope, but hope of something after the coming misery. So it's threat of exile. Of course anyone who reads the first ch. of Is. finds threats of exile all through ch. 1, so that was not a new thing for Is. Exile is coming, he names his son, there will be a remnant that will return afterward. There is hope in it for the godly. There is misery in it for everybody including the godly because it means they all have a terrible thing to go through first before this is fulfilled.

So he takes the son with him. Now whether Ahaz would have any idea what Isaiah's son's name was; whether it would mean anything to Ahaz, I don't know. But it certainly would (have meaning) to some of the people there. It would to those people who considered Is. a true prophet and were interested in what he said. Then God tells him to go and meet Ahaz. He told Elijah to go meet Ahab earlier because Ahab was the enemy he had to go out to meet. It wasn't like when later on Is. goes to see Hezekiah the godly king who succeeded Ahaz; Goes to see him in the

palace and brings him a message of hope from the Lord. This is going out and meeting him at a place outside because he wasn't interested in seeing the prophet. Also he is meeting him out there because the messages are not just for him or primarily for him, but for the people as a whole. I believe we are justified in inferring that Ahaz was out there directing the building of fortifications to protect the city, in order to hold the city against the forces of Syria. It was a time when Ahaz wanted the people to work energetically to protect them against the nations. He wanted them to feel the danger and be ready to fight vigorously to protect the city but Ahaz knew if they could only hold out for a while they would be safe because the Assyrians with their tremendous force would come and attack them (these nations) from the other side.

It is interesting that the very spot which was selected for his communication with Ahaz is the place named in 36:2 as the place where later the representatives of the Assyrian kings comes to call on the people of Israel to surrender and we find the results of Ahaz' cleverness in the Assyrians being right there threatening Judah a decade later as described in 36:2. So he says to Ahaz, God tells him to tell Ahaz who is wanting the people to be busy working hard and preparing to protect the city: Take heed and be quiet; fear not neither be fainthearted for the two tails of these smoking firebrands, for the fierce anger of Rezin with Syria and of the son of Remaliah. Ahaz, the last thing he wants is a message, make it easy, don't worry, you're safe. Ahaz wants them to work hard to protect the city and he expects an attack soon and protect the city until the Assyrian force comes. But Is. says, Take heed and be quiet, because Syria, Ephraim, and the son of Remaliah have taken evil counsel against thee, saying, Let us go up against Judah and ~~we will~~^{vex} it, and let us make a breach therein for us and set a king in the midst of it, even the son of Tabeel (a puppet king.) Thus says the Lord, It shall not stand, neither

shall it come to pass. Well; Ahaz says, I know it won't stand. I don't need a prophet of the Lord to tell me that! The Assyrian king is going to come and deliver me. We're going to be saved. The only thing is we've got to fight vigorously in the mean time till the Assyrians getziz here. So we don't want to tell the people, Take it easy, don't worry; we want to tell them, Get busy and work and protect the city. So he doesn't like the message particularly but Isiah is popular and the people consider him a servant of the Lord. It won't any for Ahaz to be brusque with him in public; in private he can be brusque if he wants, but in public here he ~~adzmahz~~ had better make a good impression while he is trying to urge the people to work hard.

So he says, Thus saith the Lord, It shall not ~~stand~~, ~~neither~~ stand neither ~~stand~~, ~~neither~~ shall it come to pass. The head of Syria is Damascus, the head of Damascus is Rezin and within 65 yrs. shall Ephraim be broken, that it be not a people. Think what Ahaz felt. Sixty-five years from now Ephraim will be broken! Boy in 65 years they can attack Jerusalem, they can destroy it, they can take Ahaz captive; they can reduce the whole thing under their power --- what do we care about what happens 65 years from now! Somebody said, Why should we do anything for posterity; posterity never did anything for us! That probably was Ahaz' feeling right now. Talk about what is going to happen in 65 years! So Ahaz has a rather disgusted look on his face wishing he had some polite way he could get rid of this obnoxious fellow. Isaiah says, If you will not believe, surely ye shall not be established. If you don't put your trust in the Lord, you are going to have real difficulty. If you go ahead with this scheme you've got in your mind that you're not telling anybody about except a few nobles that are waiting on you, you're not going to be established; you're going to have difficulty. Then v. 10: Moreover, the Lord spoke again unto Ahaz. This evidently means God gave Isaiah a further message to give. So Isaiah goes on talking and says: Ask a sign of the Lord. I see the incredulous

look on your face. I see you are not interested in talking with me. You are only interested in going with your work, defending the city, preparing for the attack. That's what you want. You don't want to bother with these things. Now God says, He will protect the city. You don't need to do all this. Ask a sign, ask it in the depths and in the height above. Tremendous offer to Ahaz. Ahaz wants to get rid of him. So Ahaz says, I won't ask neither will I tempt the Lord. We notice it is a beautiful statement! Beautiful statement! If it is said with a godly purpose. but a miserable thing to say under the circumstances. Often we have to examine the circumstances in understanding the meaning of passages. It is perfectly obvious that God considered it a miserable thing (to say) and not a godly thing to say from the next verse.

Hear ye now, O house of David: Is it a small thing for you to weary men, but will ye weary my God also? This is not bringing hope and comfort. This is rebuke! Is it a small thing to weary men, but will ye weary my God also? Rebuke! Therefore the Lord will give you a sign. It is not a sign of hope, of comfort, except to the godly remnant. It is a sign of rebuke to Ahaz. The Lord himself shall give you a sign, Behold the virgin. I see the virgin as present, I see her bearing a son, I see her calling his name Immanuel. Now ordinarily the father names the child. Here we see her calling her son, God with us. Then he goes on, Butter and honey shall he eat, that he may know "That he may know" is a very poor translation. The Hebrew is it could not have been that way "to know". How will butter and honey make him to know the good and refuse the evil? It is a phrase which is often used to indicate time. "To the time of his coming" or at the time he comes. For before the child shall know to refuse the evil and choose the good, before he knows enough to reach

for the warm mild instead of putting his hand on the hot stove, before he knows enough to make simple choices of what's good and what's harmful. "Evil" today means morally bad, but evil in KJ's day is often used of that which is physically evil. Like we have good cows and evil cows. We have evil figs. The word evil is used of all kinds of things, that is the Heb. word. Sometimes it means evil and sometimes naughty. Like Jeremiah speaks about the "naughty figs." Naughty today can't be applied to figs, but it means something bad, corrupt, spoiled. Before he knows about it, to make these simple choices, the land you abhor will be forsaken of both her kings. In other words 65 years from now Ephraim is broken. That's wonderful, but that does not affect Ahaz much. But within the time when a child reaches the point of making simple choices, Rezin and Pekah will be gone. They -- God knows the future and God knows that the thing to worry about is not Rezin and Pekah, but Rezin's wickedness. So he goes on and says, The Lord will bring on you and on your people and on your father's house, days that have not come from the day that Ephraim departed from Judah, even the king of Assyria. That is the disruption of the kingdom, the worst thing that ever happened when the kingdom was broken and two thirds left ^{its} ~~AAA/AAA~~ allegiance to the house of David -- nothing quite so bad since that time has occurred as what is going to occur, what is going to come even the king of Assyria. And Ahaz ~~HEIN~~ said, How on earth does he know about my plan to get the king of Assyria? Who is the spy in my counsel that passed this word on to Isaiah? Well he says, and maybe nobody will catch it. (Question asked: inaudible)

Yes 65 years is mentioned as the time when Ephraim will be no longer a people. He hears the time mentioned ~~when~~ when the king of Ephraim who was there then, and the king of Syria will be gone.

Within five years after this happened the Assyrians attacked Damascus; they destroyed Damascus and carried the people off into captivity and they carried away the spoils of Damascus. They also attacked Samaria. They killed Pekah; they put an end to his dynasty when they put another man as king who was supposed to be subject to the king of Assyria, and they took a lot of spoil. So that there's another 10 yrs. that Israel, the northern kingdom, continues as a kingdom. After the Assyrians come and take a great many away into captivity. But within 65 years the people as a people have been assimilated by or taken off into captivity.

(Question: The NASB translates v. 16 as saying that in that certain time the land which will be forsaken. And you read it I guess out of the King James.) Yes, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken. (Question: Of their kings. Now which one is right?) They are both possible interpretations of the Heb. word. But the fact is that within the next few years both kingdoms were gone. But one ^{land} line remains still nominally independent. So you could say the land was forsaken by the king, but I think that the meaning in this particular case of the KJV is a little closer to the situation.

(Question: How long was it between this time and the prophecy of that Messiah did come?) 700 years. This was probably around 734 B.C. We cannot tell exactly.

We continue. "And it shall come to pass in that day that the Lord shall hiss for the fly that is in the uttermost part of the rivers of Egypt, and for the bee that is in the land of Assyria." Now you meet people occasionally who say they take everything in the Bible literally. Does this mean that flies are going to come from Egypt and bees are going to come from Assyria. Maybe some did, but I don't think that is what he is talking about. You are to take the fly here

as a figure for the Egyptian army, and the bee as the figure for the Assyrian army, and he is saying that as I look toward the future I see Egyptian armies coming, marching across the land. I see Assyrian armies coming marching across the land. He does not say how soon that is going to be. But it is a fact that the Assyrian army had two bumper states between them and Judah. Those bumper states are removed and the excuse for removing them is Ahaz paying this money to the king of Assyria.

So he continues: They shall come, and shall rest, all of them, in the desolate valleys" -- you see no hope in it, no comfort. It is rebuke. "They will rest in the desolate valleys, and in the clefts of the rocks, and upon all thorns, and upon all bushes. In the same day shall the Lord shave with a razor that is hired, namely by them beyond the river, by the king of Assyria." Now the land of ~~Assyria~~ is often spoken of as the land between two rivers. So the land beyond the rivers is the people beyond the Euphrates river, and he makes it specific by "the king of Assyria". The Lord will shave the head, and the hair of the feet, and also consume the beard. In other words the house of David is going to suffer misery as a result of Ahaz' clever planning. The Lord is going to do this with a razor that is hired. What is a razor that is hired? It is a figure of speech. We are not taking it literally. But the fact that something isn't literal, does not mean it isn't clear. Figurative language can be even clearer than literal language. This is perfectly clear that what he means is that tremendous misery for the house of David. The Lord will bring by a razor which is a natural figure to use in cutting off the beard which was a terrible insult to any many in those days, to cut off his beard. It is going to be done with a razor that is hired. I think this is

very evidently a reference to the fact that Ahaz in sending this great sum of money over to the king of Ahaz, he is ^{hiring} ~~hiring~~ the king of Assyria to come and deliver him from the king of Syria (Aram properly) and the king of Israel. The razor that is hired. But God says your plan is going to backfire on you. The razor you are hiring to protect you is actually going to injure you Judah.

It shall come to pass in that day, that a man shall nourish a young cow and two sheep. Well, it is nice to have a young cow and two sheep, isn't it? But is this great hope or is it rebuke? What is it? The verse alone won't tell you. But when you look at the next verse, "IT shall come to pass, for the abundance of milk that they shall give he shall eat butter; for butter and honey shall every one eat that is left in the land." Curds is perhaps a better translation than butter. It's a product from the milk. The meaning is that there is to be a tremendous depopulation. Many, many people are going to be killed in war. Many are going to be carried into captivity. So there will be -- = the few people left will have plenty of the products of the sheep and cows that are there. What about the crops they are going to raise? The next verse ^{speaks of} teaches that. "It shall come to pass that every place shall be, where there were a thousand vines that were worth a thousand talents of silver, it will be for briars and thorns. There is going to be such a depopulation that great parts of the land are going to be completely uncultivated. "With arrows and bows shall men come thither because all the land shall become briars and thorns. All this land which is now cultivated in which they are growing crops all that will be briars and thorns. Well, the sheep and cows they can go in there and eat. For the few people left in the land there will be plenty to eat of what they get from the sheep and cows, but there won't

be enough to take care of planting and harvesting and that land will all go back into just barren land with briars and thorns. "And on all hills that shall be digged" -- I think it would be much better translated "that are digged with the mattock". All the hills that now people are so busy working with their hoes and rakes and growing crops on, you will not even be able to go into there because there will be so many briars and thorns, but it will be for the sending forth of oxen, and for the treading of lesser cattle. Lesser cattle means sheep and goats. There will be such a depopulation in the land -- now he doesn't say how soon this is going to come looking to the future. He sees tremendous depopulation, tremendous misery for the land as the result of Ahaz' very clever scheme. So you see the ch. as a whole is not comfort for Ahaz. it is comfort for the really godly people, the really spiritual people that are looking for God's blessing, that are looking for somebody to head the house of David that is a real godly person instead of this ungodly man Ahaz. But for the mass of people and particularly Ahaz it is ~~very~~ despair and misery.

Before looking more precisely at vv. 14-16, I want to look on B. A Glance at ch. 8. In other words I want us to see how the thought continues in ch. 8. Ch. 8 does not continue with what happened out there where Ahaz was conducting his defense work. "Moreover, the Lord said unto me, Take a great roll and write in it with a man's pen concerning Mahershalalhashbaz. Isa. is to write something involving Mahershalalhashbaz - hurry the booty, hasten the spoil! War, desolation, misery ahead. Ahaz thinks he is protecting the land, protecting his own flesh by getting rid of Syria and of Israel. Actually he is bringing the Assyrians right next to him, doing away with the buffer state in between. What before was something distant that they didn't

think of is now something that is a constant menace. "And I took unto me a faithful witness to record, Uriah, the priest, and Zechariah, the son of Jeberechiah, and I went unto the prophetess." Wherever used elsewhere in the OT "prophetess" means an instrument for bringing God's messages to His people. It means a woman who was a prophet in every other case in the OT. Now in this case the context makes it clear he is talking about his wife. Was she also a prophet like he was? This is entirely possible. Or is she simply called a prophetess because she is the wife of a prophet? In our usage today in America when we use a term like this we are apt to use it to mean the person themselves. We would not think of calling the wife of an editor an editress! or the wife of the President, a presidentess or something like that. But in Germany at least prior to the war it was always the custom that every wife was addressed by the title of her husband. Mrs. Dr. So and So. Mrs. Professor So and So. Mrs. Editor So and So. This is a matter of custom that varies from place to place. We can't necessarily say their custom was like ours. If it was, and it very well may be because in every other case in the OT ~~the~~ where the word prophet is used in the feminine, it means a woman who actually gave the Word of God, like Huldah who verified the fact that it was actually the book that Moses had written. Like Deborah who was the leader of the people in one time of great deliverance. There were women who had this quality. But ~~we have~~ no other evidence that Isaiah's wife was. So we don't know. Was she his wife? Or was she a prophet in her own right? We don't know. The Lord said, Call his name Mahershalal-hashbaz for before the child shall have knowledge to cry Daddy and Mommie the riches of Damascus and the spoil of Samaria shall be taken away before the king of Assyria. It is exactly the same prediction as was given before, except the time space is shorter~~er~~. In the other case

before the child knows to distinguish between what's good and what's harmful, to make simple choices, This one is, Before he can even say, Daddy and Mommie. That is a shorter space of time, but it is a little later event. The birth of this child Mahershalalhashbaz.

"The Lord spoke also unto me again, saying, Forasmuch as this people refuseth the waters of Shiloah, that go softly" - that was a little stream next to Jerusalem "and rejoice in Rezin and Remaliah's son" -- that is they feel happy because they are getting the better of these two kings that are next to them. He says, Now therefore the Lord brings up on them the waters of the river". This is the way they often speak of the great rivers of Mesopotamia. "Strong and mighty, even the king of Assyria." The waters of the river is a figurative expression. He does not mean that the Euphrates R. several hundred miles away will overflow its banks and come to Judah. But he means that == he uses it as a figure of speech of the Assyrian army. The king of Assyria and all his glory shall come up over all its channels, and go over all its banks. He still keeps the figure of the river.

"And he shall pass through Judah; he shall overflow and go over, he shall reach even to the neck; and the stretching out of his wings shall fill the breadth of thy land, O Immanuel." Here the land is spoken of as Immanuel's land. He == the Assyrian is going to fill the breadth of Immanuel's land.

"Associate yourselves, O ye peoples, and ye shall be broken in pieces; give ear, all ye of far countries: gird yourselves and ye shall be broken in peices . . . Take counsel together and it shall come to nought; speak the word, and it shall not stand; for Immanuel." Now it is interesting that in the KJV they have "Immanuel" at the end of v. 8 and they have "God is with us" at the end of v. 10. In ~~both~~ ^{both} cases it says Immanuel, but Immanuel means God is with us.

end

Now in the second case you can say that in the/Assyrians will not accomplish all he wants, because God is with us. That makes good sense. It doesn't make sense in the first part, so the KJV takes it in the first place at the end of v. 8 as a proper name. Well, if it valid to take it as a proper name in the first place, it is at least possible to take it as a proper name in v. 10. Speak the word and it shall not stand. Why? Because of Immanuel. This is Immanuel's land. God has a purpose in this land. This is the land that is going to Immanuel. This is the land from which God's

is going to pass out through all the world. God has a very special interest in this land. It is Immanuel's land. "For the Lord spoke thus unto me with a strong hand, and instructed me that I should not walk in the way of this people, saying, Say ye not, A confederacy, to all them to whom this people shall say, A confederacy; neither fear we their fear, nor be afraid." Sanctify the Lord of hosts himself, and let him be your fear, and let him be your dread." He is saying here what he wishes all the people would do, but what he is advising the godly certainly to do. "He will be for a sanctuary; but for a stone of stumbling and for a rock of offense to both the houses of Israel . . ." And he goes on and tells of the misery that is coming as a result of Ahaz' arrangement of looking to the Assyrians for help instead of looking to God for help. So we come to vv. 21 and 22 and read of this terrible climax, "And they shall pass through it, greatly distressed and hungry; and it shall come to pass, that when they shall be hungry, they shall fret themselves, and curse their king and their God, and look upward . . . (v.22).

So chs. 7 and 8 are primarily addressed to telling of the terrible results that are going to follow Ahaz' clever, worldly scheme of making

alliance with the ungodly. When I used to deal with this passage in the days back in 1941 and 1942, it was very effective because it so exactly fit our present situation when we were making common cause with Stalin in order to overcome Hitler. The result is today the German people are perhaps as well off as any people in the world, but we have the Russian forces right next to us with them having the atom and hydrogen bombs and who knows when they are going to use them. If we had simply stood for the Lord and not thrown in our lot with Stalin and let Stalin and Hitler kill each other off maybe we'd have a peaceful world today, instead of a world in which you never know when the communist forces may break out against us. Of course today all that seems very distant and we hope it will seem distant for the next 40 years, but you never know. If the friends of Russia succeed in immobilizing our CIA and our FBI and giving them absolute freedom to do what they want in this country, it might come in a very few years. We don't know. But an awful lot of the troubles we are facing are due to the fact that we did not ~~did~~ stand for righteousness in those days but we said whoever is the enemy of our enemy must be our friend! Therefore we gave all this help to Stalin, which was certainly no help to the Russian people who are in utter misery and slavery today and all the world is in danger from it. That's very parallel to the situation Ahaz faced. When in order to get deliverance from these two small nations that were next to him, he brought in these powerful Assyrians from a distance and ~~they~~ made common cause with them and eventually went up to the fact that after the Assyrians had conquered it and there he took the molle of an altar the Assyrian king wanted him to put right in the temple of Jerusalem as evidence of his loyalty and subserviance to the Assyrians. So that is the situation of these two chapters.

A. Was our Survey of Ch. 7 and B. was our glance at ch. 8. We certainly looked a little more in detail at some parts of it that are introductory to the statements in ch. 9.

C. Careful Examination of Is. ~~IX~~ 7:14-16.

Verse 14 is by far the best known verse among Christians in the ch. As we noted ^{two weeks ago} the angel ~~speitffically~~ specifically said that this was ~~MMI~~ a prophecy of the virgin birth of Christ! The angel specifically said that. The ~~modernists~~ modernists today try to make it that it was only Mat. who said it, and some fundamentalists are I believe misled by that. But Mat. was right, even if it was only Matt., he was right ^{writing} under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. So we don't need to make great conflict over whether it was Mat. or the angel. In either case it is the NT saying that this verse is a prediction of the birth of Christ. It calls him Immanuel and predicts his virgin birth.

Now there is much argument about that word almah which is trans. "a virgin" here. In the RSV it says "a young woman," instead. Somebody told Martin Luther that all this meant was a youngwoman; it did not mean a virgin. M. Luther said, I will give 100 cronins to anybody who will show me any case in the OT where almah is used for a married woman. And they said he never had to pay his 100 cronins. Because of course there isn't any such. The thing that people use as an argueent against it meaning a virgin, is that there is a different word in Heb. which seems to be the specific ~~MMXN~~ term for the word, ~~het~~ word bethulah which literally means "the one withheld." That is the word which is often used ~~to?simply~~ specifically as a virgin. I will say that this word almah which is trans. in the LXX maybe 200 B.C. as a virgin, the word certainly can mean a virgin. There is no proof that it has been ever used in Heb. to represent anyone who is not a virgin. The only case that is alleged as a possibility is in Prov. where it speaks

of the way of a man with a maid. In that case some say this is the way of a man with a prostitute and therefore she was not a virgin. But there is no proof of that in that case. And there is no other case where even that can be alledged. Now it is not a common word in the OT though it is used about 10 times in the OT. I would say that the word rather than being a specific word with emphasis on her being a virgin, is a word which means a young woman, one of whose characteristics or qualities is that she is a virgin. It is never used of a married woman. It is a young woman who is not married and it would seem to be a good young woman. A woman who is a virgin.

Now our English word maid, I think, used to have that meaning in some writings in the days of Q. Elizabeth. It speaks of someone whose == who married a young woman and found that she was no maid; she was not a maid. In ~~XXXXX~~ ^{other} words the word maid did not mean a virgin, but as used then it was a woman one of whose qualities was that she was a virgin. We don't have any word exactly like that today and perhaps they did back in those days. But in the Greek (LXX) trans. a couple hundred yrs. before the time of Christ, it is trans. parthenos which is the regular word for a virgin in the Greek. This == The introduction to the RSV has one member of the committee who was not a Christian, who was a professor in a Jewish college. In the article by him in the introduction to it he puts great emphasis on the LXX and he says the LXX is dependable in most cases. He says except where it has been altered in order to fit with Christian teachings. Of course that is entirely theoretical. It is a fact that all copies of the LXX that have been preserved have been preserved in Christian hands. While it was made by Jews and used by Jews for many decades before the time of Christ, within the next few centuries when Greek ceased to be a very common language they ceased altogether to use the LXX.

All the copies we have of the LXX were made by Christians. But there is absolutely no proof that the translation of this as virgin was a change. We can't prove it was in the original but we can say most likely that it was. I was talking to a young woman who was taking a course at one of our women's colleges which was founded by true Christian people who required that all the students take courses in Bible. But thou they all had to take Bible the course were all taught by unbelievers today. They would be better off without a course in Bible than with that sort of course. She said in the class, ~~XXX~~^{they} said the idea of the virgin is not in the Hebrew, it is copied from the LXX. Well you see there is just enough truth to that to make it effective. Because you cannot prove this word means virgin~~x~~ in the Hebrew, but it is never used of one who wasn't a virgin. But the LXX translates it virgin, and Matthew quoted the LXX and he uses it in certain tense (?) to explain why the mother of Jesus could be a virgin, and have a child, and it satisfied Joseph (?).

(Question: Are there materials other than those in the OT that would shed further light on the two words? Almah and bethulah?)

No. All the ancient Heb. we have is in the OT. We have a very little bit on inscriptions that have been found. But altogether it would not make more than a few pages. All our ancient Hebrew is Biblical. Of course in the Middle Ages there was some Hebrew written but it was not a living language; it was written by scholars. But all our Heb. is the OT except these few inscriptions that have been found by archaeologists. So that as far as the word is concerned it is a word that certainly suggests virginity and it was thought by the LXX translators that it necessarily involved it to such an extent that they translated it a virgin. Well, it says the virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and

his name she will call God with us. Now of course that isn't the Name Jesus was specifically called, but it was the name which we often apply to Him. He is our God with us. The name as you notice is used in ^{8:8} ~~XXIX~~ referring to the land. This is Immanuel's land. So this is a prediction to Ahaz that the house of David -- you'll notice it isn't addressed to Ahaz. Verse 13 it says is addressed to the house of David. The house of David will not always have to put up with such leadership as it has now with an ungodly man like Ahaz! God is going to provide a new leadership for the house of David who will be God with us, Immanuel.

Now the next verse: butter and honey shall he eat when he knows to refuse the evil and choose the good. And many a commentator says this is royal food, while others say this represents the pastoral life of our Lord, His early life, etc. All such statements are written because they don't want us to look to the end of the ch. What is the meaning of this butter and honey or curds and honey? Just look further on in the ch. and you'll find that that at v. 22:" And it shall come to pass for the abundance of milk that they shall give he shall eat butter; for butter and honey shall every one eat that is left in the land. It is not a royal food; it is not representing the pastoral life of our Lord. It is a reference to the coming depopulation. You have that already in v. 16, as you see from the use of the word also used in an explicit sense later on in the ch. Verse 16 says "For before the child shall know to refuse the evil and choose the good, --- before he can make these simple choices both of these kings will be gone. And that's what happened within the next few years. The king of Syria was gone and Syria was incorporated into the Assyrian realm. The king of Israel was gone and another king was put into his place who was supposed to be subject to Assyria and who a few years later rebelled against Assyria and _w the Assyrians come with great force and destroyed

Samaria in 721 and took his people captive. So this was literally fulfilled within that length of time.

There are some who try to get around the difficulty by saying that it refers to two sons: there is a son born at that time who is Immanuel Christ, and there is and there is/the son that is born before that time ~~???~~/ before he reaches this age both these kings will be gone and also there's is a reference to a son born later. This idea of trying to get two different meanings in a term which is singular is in my opinion very very dangers unless there is evidence that it represents a succession of some sort. When a specific prediction is given, I would say it should refer to one individual. So to my mind the only solution is that v. 14 refers to one child, and in vv. 15 and 16 he refers to the immediate situation. Most commentaries that go into it take the view that I believe is right that the child referred to is Immanuel simply used as a measure of time. That is to say, he doesn't say when Immanuel is coming. For all Ahaz knows Immanuel might be born right now. If he was before he reached this age these things would happen. That I think is the most satisfactory interpretation. But the other suggestion made is that it is Shear-jashub, and that he talks about Immanuel and then he says that before the child, and he points to his boy Shear-jashub who in that case would have to be an infant in arms and not a stripling of 16 years certainly. I think that is not an impossible interpretation, but I think the other is the much more likely. I think I must stop because most of you are due in another class, but if you have any questions as to making clear what I said, please raise them at the beginning of the next hour. If you have any matters, alternative suggestions, etc., I wish you'd write a note and leave it in the office.

Next week I'm going to give just a brief quiz, just for 10 or 15 minutes at the beginning of the hour next week, and it will cover some of the matters we have discussed in class in these four sessions including today.

We are still on No. 2 Isa. 7, and we've noted in Is. 7 how the background of it requires recognition of other parts of the Scriptures of the situation where Ahaz where Ahaz had a very clever scheme of bringing in the distant Assyrian to rescue him by doing away with the menace he has from the two smaller nations to the north of him. Isaiah had been sent to rebuke Ahaz for his wickedness, for looking to human help, the help of the ungodly rather than God's help, and to assure Ahaz that God is not going to put up forever with this sort of leadership of the house of David. We noticed how that at the end of ch. 7, the last part of the ch. tells what the results are going to be ~~with~~ when the Assyrians come. Verse 20 spoke of them as a "razor that is hired." The king of Assyria who is going to do great injury to Judah. In v. 22 "and it shall come to pass for the abundance of milk that they shall == he shall eat butter, everyone left in the land; for butter and honey shall everyone eat that is left in the land," and it goes right on to describe what is meant by that. There will be a great depopulation; thousands of people will be taken off into captivity. Many others will be killed. There will not be enough (people) left to keep the land from reverting to thorns and thistles and weeds but there will be abundant land for cattle and sheep. So they will have plenty of the products of the animals for the comparatively small number of people left in the land, but there == much of the land will go into ruin because there is no one to take care of it. So he says, For the abundance of this situation that everyone who is left in the land will eat curds and honey, or butter and honey. It is

certainly not exactly our butter today, nor is it oleomargarine! It is some product of the cow which would be taken care of ^{by} the best method they had available at that time..

Then we glanced very quickly at ch. 8 and we noticed that in ch. 8 we have again a prediction of the coming of the king of 'Assyria and this time we are told that depopulation and difficulty will come before Isaiah's second son is able to say Abbi . In other words in ch. 7 we had the length of time until a child can make just simple choices. Now we have the length of time till they can make very very simple words. So we have a little later time, we have an interval given for that brief period of time before the end of the menace from Syria and from Ephraim, but which means that the Assyrians will be right next to them and the Assyrian army will often (?) go right through the land wrecking Israel and making great devastation to Judah. That was a quick summary we made in ch. 8. At that point, and then I wanted to return to look in detail at vv. 14,15,16 of ch. 7. The greater part of what I need to say has already been touched on, but I want to put it together in good form so I wonder if Mr. A and Mr. D could pass these out. . . . The number you can make on this ditto machine is limited but I think there are enough.

On this sheet I have comments regarding Is. 7:14-16. It would take an unnecessary amount of time for me to dictate these and for you to write them down. So I thought I would type them out this way and give you these copies.

1. Verse 14 is a definite prediction of the virgin birth of Christ. I think that is extremely important to recognize. Under that (a) The NT clearly settles this question by quoting v. 14 as a prediction of His birth and specifically of the fact that He would be virgin-born. We looked at that at the very beginning of our course. That should settle

for the Christian. (b) The Hebrew word *almah* is never used of a married woman. It has a very strong implication that this woman will be a virgin. It is not a precise, technical term for virgin, but it's a term for young woman of whom it would seem to be understood that one of her qualities is that she is a virgin. So the LXX 200 yrs. before Christ was not in error by translating it by the specific Greek word for virgin, parthenos. That word is quoted in the NT. (c) The verse is not a promise of comfort to Ahaz; it is a rebuke to this unworthy head of the house of David and an assurance to the godly that God will provide One worthy to carry out the promises given to David. (d) Verse 14 has no direct reference to anything that occurred in the time of Isaiah. There is no evidence of any virgin birth in the time of Isaiah; there is no evidence of any other birth right at this time that could be considered to be a fulfillment of this. Some have tried to make out that it points to Ahaz' son, Hezekiah, who succeeded him, and who was a godly ruler and one who was on very friendly terms with Isaiah. But it is easy to show from the chronology that at this time Hezekiah was already in his teens and therefore would not fit the situation at all. You could not speak of him as one who will be born when he was already in his teens. Now of course there were many many children born in the land at that time, but there is no reason to connect any one of them with this prophecy. It is a prediction of the birth of Christ.

2. Sudden transitions are not at all infrequent in the prophetic books. Now that is one thing that as one studies the prophetic books for the first time strikes him as very strange -- the number of sudden transitions that occur. One reason why we can have a sudden transition in a way we would not understand or expect, is that this was material originally spoken rather than written. It was spoken, then written down.

I can speak to somebody over here, and then I can turn and speak to somebody over here, and if we are writing today we would say, then he turned and spoke to this, talked to this. But in simply recording it, it often does not tell when one turns his gaze from one direction to another, or when one after looking at something near then looks at something distant. Looks at something in the prophetic vision and then sees something related to it further away. So that sudden transitions are common in the prophetic books. There is usually a logical relationship between them; there is usually some sort of a connection. Some kind of subject in the immediate forefront is changed rather suddenly. Here the prophet's vision shifts from the coming Immanuel to the immediate situation.

(a) The meaning of the words "butter and honey" in v.15 is shown by their occurrence in ~~ZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZ~~ v. 21; they are an indication of a condition of depopulation. It is amazing how many commentaries there are that after reading v. 14 then they will say v. 15 says describes the simple life of our Lord! as a child! It looks forward to something like that in connection with his actual life, or some say "butter and honey" represents royal food. Well now it would be pretty hard to prove that this term might now be royal food; I don't know any proof that it does. But certainly there is clear proof in the ch. that in this ch. the term is used to show a situation that is going to result from Ahaz' scheme; a situation that is the exact opposite from what Ahaz desired. So we have this term explained in the latter part of the ch. in its usage there. It is only reasonable here to interpret it as having the same meaning here. Very often in the prophetic books we have a term used without an explanation and then later we have the explanation. Then we go back and understand it. Then of course we can't put ourselves in the position of those people there and say what they would necessarily mean by a term like this the first time they would hear it, because their whole manner of life is something we are

are not familiar with, anymore than it would be of people who lived here 100 years from now. But the ch. makes it very clear. Mr. Lowell?

(Question: Is it possible that in v.15 you ~~could~~ ^{could} translate that as a subjunctive? He would eat curds and honey?) Yes, that would be entirely possible. Yes. That is you are assuming ~~XXXX~~ a clause "if he were to be born now he would be." That is to say our sharp distinction in English between subjunctive and indicative is not present in Hebrew, and we very often have to tell on the basis of context whether a statement is subjunctive or not. We do not have that specific difference as you have in many languages. That is a very good suggestion.

(b) The phrase in v.15 that the OJV translates "that he may know" is better rendered "when he shall know." Verse 15 says "butter and honey shall he eat that he may know . . ." Just how will eating butter and honey enable you to know to make simple choice? Well, I suppose baby food would be useful in helping one to mature and progress. Anything that is added for development. That is an entirely possible translation. In the Heb. it is the ~~XXXX~~ prep. le which often means to followed by the infinitive -- "to the knowing of." You can take the "to" -- it is possible -- as purpose. But you can just as well take the "to" as showing that limit toward which you are looking. Our English word "to" can have either meaning, perfectly well. So can this Heb. preposition le. So it can be "butter and honey will he eat in order to his knowing the difference between good things and things harmful" or you can take it "to the time when he knows". This infin. in Heb. is very commonly used to express time. Usually when it does it has the prep. "in" == "in his knowing", but in this case it is looking forward to the point where he will be able to do this and so "to" is very ? Butter and honey will he eat to this time, as you look forward to this time, and you will see that by that time there will be an abundance of these things available,

even though there will be very little available then of things people have to work to produce. So it can be rendered either way. The translation "when he shall know" is ~~equally~~ equally possible and fits with v.16 while the other hardly fits with v.16.

(c) The period of time before a child will reach the age of making simple choices is given here as the interval within which both kings would disappear from the scene of history. "Simple choices". and by the way when we say "to know good and evil", in English today "evil" usually means something that is wrong, morally wrong. But in the English of 300 yrs. ago "evil" was broader than that. Just like our word "good" now. You can say this is a good man and mean he is a man who is morally good, or you can say, he is a good cross-country runner, he is a good baseball player. He did a good job of pulling the wool over their eyes! in selling little things for more than they are worth! In other words "good" can mean successful, or effective just as well as it can mean morally good. We have tended in recent years to restrict "evil" to the moral aspect, but "evil" in Old English covers that which is physically harmful just as well as that which is morally harmful. That would seem to be the main thing in mind here of the child being able to know good and evil, that it mean able to make simple choices; able to reach for something that is helpful to him instead of something that is injurious to him. I got a bottle of pills the other day and on the top it said, Keep out of the reach of children. Those pills are good, they are useful. But we know enough to take them one at a time. You put them where a child can get hold of them, and he may swallow the whole bottle and die! The child does not know enough to make simple decisions till he reaches a certain age. He probably reaches a pretty good age before he know that particular one. I think this refers to simpler decisions than that. But this period of time is given as the interval within which both kings would disappear from the scene of history.

(d) This actually occurred; both Rezin and Pekah were killed (2 Ki. 15:30 and 16:9) -- give the definite reference to the fact that one of them was killed by his own people, possibly thinking they would that way get favor from the Assyrians who were attacking them. The other was killed by the king of Assyria when he conquered Sam Damascus and incorporated Syria into his empire.

(e) The use of the age of a child as a measure of time refers specifically to the time of Isaiah and has no relevance to the time of Christ. Someone has tried to get around this by saying there was a child in Isaiah's time, then there was Christ 700 years ^{later} KIMEX. There is an interval in Isaiah's time and also an interval later. Now we have no evidence of a child in Isaiah's time who could possibly be a fulfillment of v. 14. We have no evidence of an interval in the time of Christ which could be a fulfillment of vv. 15-16. There is rather a transition.

(f) The exact nature of the transition between vv. 14 and 15 is not indicated. In Scripture as in just about any book there are transitions that are not always indicated. Often we have to gather them; we have to tell from context or from other parts of the book. We have to be very careful about that. We must not read into the Scripture what is not there, but we must search out what is there and what is there is sometimes implied rather than expressed. Here there is definitely a transition, but the exact nature of the transition is not indicated. Since no statement is given as to when Immanuel will be born, people at the time could not know whether His birth would come immediately or whether it might be more than 350 yrs. later. It was about 730 years approx. later. People could not know. They could know that God was sending His Immanuel. Is this Immanuel being sent out in the wilderness somewhere where we won't know about it till he'll mature

and take over away from Ahaz? Or does this happen later on in God's economy? Jesus Christ told the disciples many times that we are not to know when the Lord is coming back. The Father has kept that in His own power. Christ, as far as we know, might come today or tomorrow and take His own to Himself. He wants us to be ready at all times in case He comes now to take us to Himself and to prepare for His taking over control of the entire world. He wants us to always be ready, but we are not to know when it will happen.

There are many signs that make many people think it may come very soon. And it might. But we are just as wrong when we say it must come soon as we are if we say it can't come soon. He might come today. He might come tomorrow. He might not come for many many years. We don't know. But He wants us always to be ready. Cocceius one of the great theologians of the 17th cent.. wrote a book which on the basis of Biblical prophecy he showed that the events of the 30 yrs. war in which Germany, Sweden and France and those other countries that were involved was fulfilling the predictions made in Revelation and Daniel, and the coming of the Lord must be within the next few years! Cocceius is dead and most people have forgotten all about his predictions. As far as the Scripture goes he could have been ~~xxx~~right. Christ could have come then. We don't know when he's coming, but we should always be ready. That was the way the Lord wanted us to be toward Jesus' first coming. He warned Ahaz, God is going to send His own Immanuel, and He gave comfort to the godly. God is going to send His own Immanuel. They could not know whether He was going to be born right soon, or whether it would be quite a distance in the future. So since no statement is given as to when Immanuel will be born, people at the time could not know whether His birth would come immediately or whether it might be more than 300 yrs. later. Think-

ing of it as if it might occur immediately it could be taken as a measure of time, to indicate the outworking of Ahaz' ungodly alliance, by showing how soon the two kings whom he feared so greatly would disappear from the scene.

(g) A less likely but not impossible suggestion has been advanced, that the prophet, after making the prediction in v.14, pointed to his own tiny infant and said that before this infant would reach the age of making simple choices both kings would disappear. If that is the case. 14 tells of the coming of Immanuel, and then he says "butter and honey shall he eat" and points to his little boy. Shall he eat and before he knows == or shall he eat when he reaches the time when he knows to choose the evil and choose the good, for before the child shall know to refuse the evil and choose the good, the land thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings. This is not an impossible interpretation. Personally I think the other is the better. But I believe that it is very important in Biblical study that we see what is definitely in the Scripture and stand on it, and that we see where there are various possibilities and do not make differences among Christians over matter where the Scripture is not clear. Here the Scripture is very clear, I think, that there is a transition and that the age of the child is used as a measure of time, and that these two kings were to disappear and the result of course was that they were right next to the forces of the Assyrians kings, so the danger was tremendously increased. Yes?

(Question: vv. 15 and 16 do not refer to isaiah's child ?) It will be Immanuel's ? ? That's what I meant to say under (f) Imagining Immanuel to be born now before he would reach that age, this would be the situation in that case. Now that might be another possibility -- if the child. But it seems to me there is some definite child in mind. I think it is Immanuel that's

imagined, but it could be that the child - - - after all the ch. begins with God ordering him to take the child with him. Did he just take him so that these people who knew the child's name would see that Isaiah was predicting destruction and also the fact that God's mercy would continue after the destruction and a remnant would return? Or was there some additional reason to have him there and to point to it at this time? We can't be dogmatic. Yes?

(Question: | If butter and honey was to be the of the Jews (?) | during the exile why would a child born at that time eat butter and honey?) By the time he reaches this age there will be a great depopulation in the land. Now of course you may that this was not carried out to the full until after the exile of Judah, but the exile of Israel took place within these next few years. What he's bringing out here is that the king of Assyria is going to come and sweep over the land of Israel and also over the land of Judah. So that even though Judah was not conquered, that is its principal cities were not, the Assyrian armies came through at various times and did tremendous damage. In the reign of Hezekiah there was a period when for three years people of Jerusalem could hardly go out from the city of Jerusalem because of roving Assyrian bands, and they expected to be attacked and annihilated as they tried in Is. 36 and 37. So he is looking to the results of this coming right next to Assyria. Now how much of this is for right away and how much is for further off, we are not told. But enough of it is going to happen fairly soon that this can be said about it.

So much for the paper which relieves you of writing down all that stuff. Now you can start writing again. We will go on to III.

III Is. 8 - 9:7. At 9:7,8 there is an important break. I don't know why the Archbishop when he put the ch. divisions into his Latin Bible

in the 13th century, did not make a break after ch. 9:7. It may be he had already made one before he did, and he was probably in a hurry on horseback to get to one of his pastoral calls and he had to put it in ~~hand~~ here and then so soon he just went on! But that was -- would have been a far better ch. division than the place where he made it! The ch. divisions should never interfere with out understanding of the Scripture, because they were put in by this ARchbishop in the 13th Cent. in his Latin Bible. Some people say he put most of them in on horseback and whenever the road was rough and the horse tripped or something he put it in the wrong place. That is rather imaginary. We don't know exactly how the circumstances were. But the noted English expositor, G. Campbell Morgan once said in my hearing that in 9 cases out of 10 the ch. divisions are in the wrong place! I believe that it's quite exaggerated. I believe that in 3 cases out of 4 they are well placed if you are going to have ch. divisions. But there are many places where they are not. And it is always good when you are going to study any ch. in Scripture to look at what precedes and at what follows, and see if you are missing an important connection.

We will look at this section from 8 to 9:7 and we will only --- we won't have time to go into it in as much detail as we would like, but we will notice first

A. Isaiah's second Son. We mentioned him already last time. Maher-shalhashbaz. I understand that we shall call His Name. His name means hurry the booty, hasten the spoil. We would think it was an inversion of order -- The first son says, There is going to be a remnant coming back. The second son says, There is going to be great trouble and despoiliation. Now the despoiliation comes before they can possibly come back. The first son gave hope to the godly. You see how conditions were getting worse in the land? You see how God cannot hold back His judgment forever.

But you can know it is not the end. A remnant will return.

(Question about meaning of the name). The name: Hasten the booty, hurry the spoil. There's no "the". Hasten booty; hurry spoil. It shows misery ahead as result of the coming of the Assyrian and Babylonians. Of course the child brought a note of hope. After this misery there's going to be a remnant returning, but it also includes in it the implication that there is going to be something they have to return from. So that the first child implies the calamity; the ^{second} ~~XXXXXXXX~~ one definitely asserts the calamity. So, No. 1 - His Name.

No. 2. The New Indication of time. We've heard that a few minutes ago. This child is evidently younger than the measure of time we have just previously been looking at. Because he ~~==~~ before he can make just the simplest sounds a child can learn to make, the riches of Damascus and the spoils of Samaria will be taken away before the king of Assyria.

No. 3. The Results of Ahaz Plan --- are what are stressed in a great part of this chapter. We ran over this ch. hastily last time. We won't take much time on it now as far as this particular v. is concerned. Verse 7 == 6 and 7 bring that out very clearly. "Forasmuch as this people refuses the waters of Shiloah and that goes softly and rejoice over Rezin and Remiliah's son --- these people are not listening for the still small voice of God. They are not looking to Him for help. But they are using their human schemes to get the advantage over these kings of these neighboring countries. Instead of looking to God for help. And he puts the divine help under the figure of waters that were in the stream of Shiloah. In contrast to that then, the Lord will bring on them the waters of the great rivers i.e. the rivers of Mesopotamia, used as a figure of course because there was no food that reached all the way

from Mesopotamia to there. It is a figurative expression for the coming of the great hordes of the Assyrian army. He says specifically "even the king of Assyria and all his glory, he shall come up over all his channels and go over all his banks and he shall pass through Judah, and he shall overflow and go over, he shall reach even unto the neck and the stretching forth of his wings shall fill the breadth of thy land, O Immanuel." Then he continues however, with assurance that God nevertheless will be with His people.

Small a was the coming of the Assyrian power; small

b is Yet God will intervene. God is going to allow the Assyrian force to bring great damage to His chosen people, but He is not going to allow them to destroy them. He will not even allow them to take Jerusalem for another 150 years. So he says in vv.9-10, "Associate yourselves, O ye people and you will be broken in pieces. Give you, all ye of far countries. Gird yourselves and you shall be broken in pieces. Take counsel together and it shall come to nought, speak the word and it shall not stand, for Immanuel." For God will intervene. Here we have twice that word Immanuel. In the KJV, the first time it is transliterated. The second time it is translated, for God is with us.

B. Immanuel's Land. He says this is Immanuel's land. He does not simply give you a declaration to that effect. He is assuming it. But the fact he assumes it is very clear. You cannot take this land, you wicked people! Because Immanuel. Because this is Immanuel's land. This isn't Ahaz' land. This isn't the land that these unworthy descendants of David have really the control over. This land belongs to Immanuel and no one can take it until and unless Immanuel chooses to let them take it for a time. But He will take it back again in His own time. So it is Immanuel's land. That connects the two chapters as you see rather closely together.

C. The Only Security is to be Found in God and in His Plan.

That is one of the big points of this chapter 8. These clever schemes like Ahaz scheme of pitting off one power against another and thinking we're going to work out these human plans and through it all we're going to succeed. He says, It won't make any difference. God is going to punish you, but God will not allow complete victory to the enemy unless and until He decides it is necessary as part of His plan. So for the immediate future, you have terrible times right near. The northern kingdom taken by the Assyrians, made a puppet kingdom for 10 years, and then conquered and most of its people taken off into exile. The armies of the Assyrians coming through the southern region, taking many people captive. Others having to hide in the cities. You have difficult times, but God will not allow at this time them to take Jerusalem. It will be another 150 years before He allows that to happen. The only security is not in human plans and schemes, not in pitting off one wicked force against another as Ahaz was trying to do, but in God and His plan.

1. Immanuel - the name Immanuel used as indicating the continuing presence of God. God is with us. This is Immanuel's land. These are Immanuel's people. God's plan will be carried out. All very well for the world to make their alliances and their schemes and plots, but for those who are God's people they can find safely/only in God and there ^{ultimately} == their human schemes are apt to backfire as this plan of Ahaz is sure to backfire.

2. Isaiah and His Followers as a Sign. We find this idea expressed starting in v.16. "Bind up the testimony and the law among my disciples and I will wait upon the Lord who hides His face from the house of Jacob, and I will look for Him. Behold I and the children whom

God hath given me are for signs and for wonders in Israel from the Lord of hosts who dwells in Mt. Zion." So he says, Isa. had a group of people following him, believing he is a true prophet. These people are standing for the Lord. Isaiah's physical sons are given names that have a meaning to carry the idea to the people. There is terrible misery ahead because of the wickedness of the land, but God is not through with His people. A remnant shall return. So in the midst of a wicked world, Isaiah, his children, and his followers, stand as a sign and beacon light to the world of God's presence, representing the unseen ^{Immanuel} command (?). The same is true in our day ~~is~~ that those who follow Immanuel today, we are a beacon light in a wicked world. God wants us to hold that light high, and to reach as many as possible to come to know Christ. He wants us to do all the good we can along the way, but He wants us to remember that we never will establish a perfect society on this earth. Only God can do that. And He will do that in His own time. The purpose of the church is not to establish justice on earth. As long as there are wicked people upon earth, there will not be justice. But it is to be for signs to attract ~~signs~~ attention to the truth, to spread the knowledge of salvation and show people how they can be saved out of the wicked world just as was true of Isaiah and his people then.

3. This ch. then has a very definite warning against the occult. In v.18 he spoke of the fact that he and the children whom the Lord had given him are for signs and for wonders to bring God's truth to their attention. Now, he says, v.19, "Behold when they shall say to you, seek unto them that have familiar spirits and unto wizzards that mutter. Should not a people seek unto their God. Should they seek for the living to the dead? To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."

It is a warning against apostasy.

4. We must test everything by God's Word (as is brought out ~~to~~ so clearly in v. 20.

D. Trouble Ahead for Both Parts of Israel. You notice in v.14: "He shall be for a sanctuary, that is He will be protection and defence for the godly, but He will be a stone of stumbling and rock of offence to both the house of Israel for a gin and for a snare for the inhabitants of Jerusalem. The northern kingdom is to be overrun by the Assyrians very soon. The southern kingdom will be overrun by them, but not conquered by them now. They will be sent into captivity later on. Trouble ahead for both houses of Israel. So we find trouble that is coming stressed after v. 20. Verses 21 and 22 show the terrible troubles coming humanly speaking as the result of Ahaz' scheme that backfired. "They shall pass through it hardly bestead and hungry and it shall come to pass when they shall be hungry, they shall fret themselves and curse their king to their god, and look upward and look to the earth. No matter where they look they behold trouble and sorrow. ~~Then~~ Dimness and anguish and they shall be driven into darkness.

The trouble ahead for both houses of Israel. Isaiah is not merely interested in Judah, and in Jerusalem. He is interested in the whole of the land of Israel, though the north is the province in view (?) than the rest. But he is thinking of both of them. That is brought out very clearly in the next verse. The first verse of ch. 9, the way the archbishop divides it this is one of the places about manbe one in twenty where the Jews in the Hebrew Bible put in the ch. division a little different from what the archbishop did. Here this next verse is v. 23 in the Heb. Bible. In our English Bibles, we call it v. 1.

"Nevertheless the dimness shall not be such as was in her vexation when at the first he lightly afflicted the land of Zebulun and the land

of Naphtali, and after he more grievously afflicted her by the way of the sea beyond Jordan in Galilee of the nations." In other words here is the great trouble that is coming. It is coming first to the northern kingdom. These are parts of the northern kingdom. These areas mentioned here are the north eastern parts of the northern kingdom. They are the parts the Assyrian armies enter first. There is where the trouble in actual physical form of attack from outside come first. It is in these regions of Zebulun, Naphtali, up by the Sea of Galilee beyond Jordan in Galilee of the nations. That is the region were == where they first come into the land.

E. The Promised Deliverance Through Christ. Yes. Mr. Howell.

(Question: . . . why you say that vv.21-22 refer to both houses of Israel?) Verse 14 specifically mentions both houses of Israel. Verse 1 of ch. 9 mentions places that were in the northern kingdom. That's a good question. Whenever there is anything I don't make clear, please ask. I want everyone to have it in mind. The fact we have both houses specifically mentioned in v. 14. Then in 9:1 he mentions these places that were not in the kingdom of Judah but were in the northern kingdom. So he is looking at the whole land, not just at the kingdom of Judah. He is seeing the misery that is going to come to the whole land, even though his interest centers much more in the southern part than in the north. Yes?

Question: I don't know whether you want to comment on this, but I have a question. "Behold I and the children which thou hast given me.") Yes, I did comment on that. I did refer to == I didn't refer to these, but I pointed out the comparison of Christ and His followers in our age, to Isaiah and his followers in that age. That is --- the --- in Hebrews it is specifically quoted. Not only that verse, but the verse right before it. I pointed out the reason for the quotation.

I did not mention - -it. Out time is short, and I did not . . . (?) But those of you who are particularly familiar with that will find that of interest there.

Verse 2(ch.9) in the Heb. Bible is v. 1. "The people who walked in darkness have seen a great light; they that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined." Now in Isaiah's time you might say, What is this looking to? When are the people who walked in darkness going to see a great light? Does this look beyond the exile? Does this show a return from exile? Isaiah often does that. Often Isaiah talks about going into exile and then he looks beyond and sees the return from exile. Does it look at our present difficulties and then look way ahead into the millennium? That Isaiah often does. But in this case it is quite clear that Is. looked at the present difficulty in the section of the land first entered by the Assyrian army, and then he said this section is the section where light is going to come first. Upon these people the light shined. The Jewish people who did not think it looked forward to Christ, they moved the ch. so that they make a new start here. But it goes right straight along here -- no ch. divisions in the early versions. I think those who moved the ch. divisions here did it purposely, because Matthew quotes the ~~7/15~~ two verses, and when Mat. describes how Jesus began to preach he then goes on to say that this preaching Jesus began up there in Galilee, this preachings is a fulfillment of a prophecy that the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali, the way of the sea beyond Jordan, Galilee of nations, the people who walked in darkness have seen a great light! It is looking forward to the preaching of Christ. Here again you have a suggestion. This is going to come, light is going to first come to this region where the darkness first began to hold forth because of the coming of the Assyrian army. Here's where the light is going to

begin. Here's where Jesus is going to begin His preaching spreading the light of His gospel. Well, you say, He looks forward to the long distant future, way beyond return from exile. He doesn't look clear over to the very end of the age. But in between he stops with the first coming of Christ. Now how do we know that's what He is doing? We know it because Matthew says it was. We know it because he points to the very place where Jesus began His preaching, and we know it because he goes right on in the next verses to say in v.6, "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be on his shoulder, and his name shall be called, Wonderful, Counsellor, The Mighty, God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace. So under E. The Promised Deliverance through Christ, we have

1. The Light begins where the Darkness began. There we compare Mat. 4:15-16. There Matthew says, Jesus went into this region and began His preaching there that it might be fulfilled that was spoken by Isa. the prophet saying, The Land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali. . . (quoting verse) . . . light is sprung up." Verses in Matthew that Christian people read over and over but usually do not get the full import of it because they do not have the context of Is. in mind, that this is where the Assyrian army came. This was where this wicked ~~man~~^{plan of the} this unworthy head of the house of David resulted in the entrance of this terribly misery of the attack of the Assyrian army and right in that place light is going to come as Immanuel begins His preaching in that area. Mat. goes right on and gives the Sermon on the Mount and the beginning of the Light that came through Jesus Christ.

2. Lasting Peace Can Come Only Through God's Plan. The succeeding verses here tell about the coming of lasting peace. First peace in the heart, then external peace. They both can come only through God's plan. "For thou hast broken the yoke of his burden, the staff of his shoulder,

the rod of his oppressor . . . for every battle of the warrior is with confused noise and garments rolled in blood. But all these things will be for burning and for fuel of fire." God is going to bring complete peace to this world. First He will bring peace to the hearts of those who believe in His Son, through the first coming of Christ. Second, He will bring universal peace through the second coming of Christ.

3. This Plan Involves a Divine Child, 9:6,7

We'll have to continue there next time, after we've had a 10 or 15 minute quiz on material covered thus far. Just a brief quiz. I don't want to take much time -- we've got a lot of ground to get over.

(Instructions regarding the 15 minute quiz) Giving two sets of questions. If you have an odd number (the seat) you have one set of questions; if it is even you have another set. If it is odd numbered you have two questions:

1. Name five important features of Isaiah 8. Simply name them. The even numbers have only one question. Their question is: As fully as time permits discuss Is.7:16. (Question: Use Bibles?) Yes, no notes of course. The second question for the odds is:
2. Discuss one or more of these as far as time permits. Use your own judgment which of them you want to discuss. (Question: Can odds have Bibles too?) Oh, yes. Hebrew, English, any kind, any version. I will give you two minutes notice before you finish.

* * * * *

I believe it has become quite apparent from our study thus far, that in studying a section of the Scripture such as these parts of the prophetic books, it is necessary to get a general idea of the subject before you can interpret each verse individually. There are some verses that are absolutely clear; no question of what they mean. There are others that have to be interpreted in relation to context. Most verses have some relation to context, and consequently it was necessary for us to get the general historical situation in mind first. That is in the background of much of it. There are many things we come across that are very difficult to understand without the background of Ahaz' conspiracy, plan, or scheme to get the Assyrians to come and rescue him; instead of looking to God for help he is looking to the ungodly Assyrian king. As Isaiah points out, this means that actually

he does harm to his nation, great harm, rather than good. Only in trusting God could his nation find deliverance. That is the great background matter of it all. Of course the prophet looks to the future and to us many of his insights into the future are much more interesting and much more important. But this is the background that we have to have in mind to understand it.

Then we have seen that in each ch., you have to look at the ch. as a whole before you can understand some of the verses. Some of the verses are immediately clear. For others, you have to see the ch. as a whole. For that reason, I went through ch.7 fairly rapidly noticing its relation. Then I looked at ch. 8 because you see some things in ch. 7 are much easier to understand if you have at least a preview of ch. 8. Then I went back to ch. 7:14-16 which are the most difficult verses in the ch. Similarly we took up as No. IV - Isa.8:1-9:7--- I see on the tape I misspoke myself and said III. Of course this was IV

IV Is.8:1-9:7. (Of that section I gave you 5 main heads -- A,B,C,D,E, but E related only to ch. 9 so I trust you did not give that as an answer to the question that related only to ch.8. You would give the four, I trust, main heads I gave and one of the subheads which I might seem to you particularly important. But under these heads we looked at ch.8 rather hurriedly, noticing the main features. Now I believe it is necessary, or possible, ~~XXXXXX~~ now having done that, to go through it a bit more carefully now. We won't be able to take time with the time we have in this course to look at every detail of it. But there are some very important matters in ch.8 which we need to view as a whole before we can look at (it) properly. So I will look again now at these

sections of ch.8.

A. Isaiah's Second Son. I don't know if there is more to say about that now than we did. He is told to have a second son whose name will be "Hasten the booty, hurry the spoil." This is not a sign of God's mercy; this is a sign of coming judgment. The first sign he gave was a sign both of coming judgment and of God's mercy. He gave the view of the mercy first, but the fact a remnant will return implies there is going to be an exile; implies there's misery first. I won't spend more time of A. But

B. This is Immanuel's Land. Immanuel is a very real character here in our whole account. His birth is ^{predicted} ~~predicted~~ in ch. 7. He is however spoken of as if this is already His land. He is a vital factor in the present situation even though He is not yet born! Of course the people didn't know. For all they knew He might have been born in some obscure place and be revealed to Israel years later. They didn't know when He would be born. He might be born off in the desert some where. Only the immediate friends would know he was born. But ~~even~~ then everybody could know that if he was born then, by the time he reached the age to make simple choices of what's good and what's harmful, the two kings would be gone, both of them killed, Pekah and Rezin. They would see that happen within that length of time.

Suggestion has been made that this was Maher-shalal-hash-baz, Isaiah's second son in this verse. I think it is quite clear that ^{this} e isn't because he could not be spoken of as his land. The term Immanuel is a term of God's blessing. Maher-shalal-hash-baz means misery ahead. He was merely an ordinary human being. But this was One of whom it can be said, This is His land! And of course Jesus

Christ was present at the creation of the world. Jesus Christ appeared at various times in the OT. Jesus Christ was a vital factor in the universe even though He was not yet incarnated in human flesh. This is Immanuel's land, so nothing can happen to it except as Immanuel chooses to permit it. Before this second child, Maher-shalal-hash-baz was a certain age, the riches of Damascus and the spoil of Samaria will be taken away before the king of Assyria. The kingdom Damascus was capitol of was completely subjugated. The kingdom Samaria was capitol of was forced to give very heavy tribute, much of its spoil was taken away. A puppet king was put in over it for the next ten years. You have a question?

(Question: Is he referring to any ^{land} ~~man~~ in specific ^{land} or just man in general??) He is referring to the land in which

At that time it certainly was the land of Israel, the whole land of Israel - northern and southern kingdoms. He is referring to that as Immanuel's land. Nothing can happen to that except as God permits. Of course nothing can happen anywhere in the world except as God permits, but God has taken a very special interest in the place where He is to Himself. B. was Immanuel's land. It was mentioned twice -- at the end of v.8 and at the end of v.10. One not knowing Heb. or not having a Bible with a footnote mentioning it would not realize it. This v. 10 ends with the words, O Immanuel or God is with us. You can't represent it in English. You have to put it one way or the other. We really need a note.

C. The only security is to be found in God and in His plan. Under this I gave you four heads. Any one of them might be important enough to have made a main head. Any one of them would be entirely

satisfactory as one of the five principal feature I ask for. The first of these 1/ or C ?

1. Evidence that the only security is to be found in God and in His plan is the same as our Capital B. Immanuel the sign of God's presence. It is only as they recognize God that true security can be found.

2. Isaiah and his followers have a sign. That is the impression you get from this passage as you read it in the light of context -- that Is. and his followers or his sons are signs. Certainly as Isaiah's sons are as signs. They are given specific names/in the case of a sign. Isaiah in the days of darkness ahead as the people turn away from God, Isaiah and his followers whom the Lord can truly call His children, they are also a part of the keeping alive of the They are for signs and for wonders in Israel. Yet as we read this passage in the light of the NT, we begin to wonder whether this really is speaking of Isa. and his children, or his followers, or whether it is speaking about something else. We find when we look at v.13: Sanctify the Lord of hosts, let Him be your fear, and let him be your dread. Verse 14 says, He shall be for a sanctuary but for a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence to both the houses of Israel." Certainly God was that. But it is told in the ~~NT~~ NT how Jesus Christ is that stone of stumbling. He is that rock of offence! So there is here a reference to God, and Jesus Christ is God. Jesus Christ is a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence. Very definitely we are told in the NT. When you get to vv.16-17, the question comes up, Is it here speaking of the prophet or is he here looking forward as he did in the case of this child who was to be born. Is he here looking forward to the

coming the coming to earth of this God who will be a stone of rock stumbling and ~~MMMM~~ of offence. He says, I will wait upon the Lord that hides His face from the house of Jacob, I will look for Him. This phrase, I will look for Him, can be translated, I will put my trust in Him. What does it mean to wait upon the Lord? We read in Is.40 that they that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength. It means to put your trust in Him. It means to look to him with confidence. Now we look in confidence to the Lord, we trust in Him. The one who says that goes on in v.18 to say, Behold I and the children whom the Lord has given me are for signs and wonders in Israel from the Lord of hosts."

We find in Heb.2 that both of these statements are quoted. Verse 12 quotes from the 22nd Psalm - "I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the church will I sing praises unto thee. Heb. 2:13, the next verse says, And again I will put my trust in Him which seems to be a quotation of v.17 - "I will wait upon the Lord, I will look for Him." The LXX uses this very word that the NT uses - I will put my trust. Then it says in Hebrews "And again, Behold I and the children whom God has given me. And Is.8: v.18 says "Behold I and the children whom the Lord has given me."

The question comes up, Are these 3 verses here like Is.7:14, a specific prediction of the Lord Jesus Christ and what He will say? Are they that? And it is foreshadowed by the situation of Isaiah. That is to say today we have the Lord Jesus Christ active in the world. We have those whom God has permitted to believe on Him as Saviour, who can truly be spoken of as His children. We are a sign in the world of rebuke to sin ~~and~~ in the world, a sign that people should turn to Christ, a sign of our trust that He is going

to change the condition of this world and do away with sin in it. A sign of the continuing presence of God's power through Christ in a wicked world. Is this a specific prediction as some commentators very topically (?) properly (?) take it of the Lord Jesus Christ, and Isaiah a prefiguration of it? Or is this a description of Isa. in his situation there which presents a type of what the Lord Jesus Christ and His followers will be now. You can take it either way, and I don't see how we can be dogmatic as between them. The fact is that it is true of both things. Now that is not a double interpretation. One thing I am very wary of is double interpretation! It is taking something that specifically means one thing and relating it to something entirely different. It is definitely not that. These things are very closely related, and either one of them is what is spoken of and prefigured by the other. Or the other is what is spoken of and it is also a type of something that will later come. I hope I have made that distinction clear.

(Question: Did you say vv.16,17,18 as referring to v.14?????)

Verse 14 here showed the situation of God in relation to the people. But in the NT it is quoted that Jesus Christ is the stone

I would say that it is definitely referring to the immediate situation, but the reference we have Christ so clearly as Immanuel. The NT says He is that stone at which they stumbled. That is Jesus Christ is the second person of the trinity. He is the stone of stumbling one meaning, but a meaning that applies at various That is v.14. I simply referred to v.14 here to show that Christ is very definitely in the situation. But v.16 and 17 are they Isaiah speaking, or are they Isaiah picturing Immanuel as speaking? as Jesus Christ?

(Question: indistinct) I don't know that we can tell which of the two it is because both are definitely involved. It is either definitely a prediction of what Christ will say which is symbolized by Isaiah in advance, or it is a picture of what Isaiah can say which is a type of what Christ will do (at a future time?).

So we have Immanuel very very strongly in this ch. Very very much in the background of it and in the foreground. If that is clear, no. 2 here. We go on to

3. The Ch. has a strong warning against the occult. That is in vv.19-20. "When they shall say to you, Seek to them that have familiar spirits, and unto wizards that peep and mutter. Should not a people seek unto their God." Now the KJV goes on and says "for the living to the dead." What does that mean? I think we should imply the "should" as in the first three Should a people seek for the living to the dead? Should you try to get a message from someone who has passed on? No, look to the living God. Don't look to the dead for light for the living. It is an attack against spiritism. It is an attack against the occult. It is an attack against looking for the truth from some mysterious source other than God Himself. It is very brief, but very definite and clear on that point.

When my mother's sister -- my aunt, was with us in Los Angeles and was very ill, her sister in law who was living in Helmuth, Mont. went to a spiritist meeting and asked == went to her to see if she could get any information. She immediately pointed to the part of her body in which my aunt had a malignant cancer and she pointed to that part of her own body and said, Oh, Oh, and gave the sign that this person would come to see her was looking for information about

was looking for information about someone who was in that situation. How she could possibly know that by human means, about the sister-in-law who was in Los Angeles, I cannot imagine. There may be some sort of telepathy of some sort that may have enabled her to get information about someone 1500 miles away. There may be. But I don't believe there was any human means. I don't believe anybody told her that this woman was going to inquire about the relative who was dying of cancer in ? Washington?. I don't think there was. But she went on. I also think it is entirely possible it was an evil spirit representing the dead, pretending to represent the spirits of the dead convey this information. But she went on, she said, But I don't see any dead; I don't see any dead! Well, two months later my aunt died. So that as far as predicting the future is concerned there was no prediction of the future involved whatever, but there was a realization involved of a present situation. Now an evil spirit could not predict the future, but an evil spirit could tell what is present somewhere else in the world. Whether it was an evil spirit, whether it was some kind of telepathy I don't know. But it is forbidden here in this verse - "seeking for the living to the dead." Looking to spirits and the occult and to methods of astrology and any of these things. He goes right on to say, To the law and to the testimony. God's word is our only source of truth. If they speak not according to this word it is because there is no light in them.

I was in the bookstore of Union Theological Seminary about 40 years ago and I noticed a book by Prof. Kauffman, professor of philosophy at Princeton University - A Critique of Philosophy and Religion.. I purchased it. I found it most fascinating the way he

handles philosophy, but what he does with religion -- he shows utter ignorance. He says what do you mean by God. You say there is a God. What do you mean by God. You can't find God therefore. Therefore there is none. It seemed to be utter purile (?) on religion. The book was fascinating in many of its discussions particularly on philosophy. So when I saw a book on the religion of a heretic by the same author later on, I purchased it. In this book he gives a very fine picture of the kind of qualities that a person ought to develop in himself. Very useful, but what reasons does he give? to try to develop these wonderful characteristics? From his viewpoint there is no reason. He enjoys trying to develop good qualities, yes. But if there is no God what is the objective? If somebody enjoys living in sinful pleasures then that is all there is to life for him. Why should he try to develop the kind of characteristics that professor Kauffmann describes? There is no reason if there is not a God, who has given meaning to this universe and who has given us His Word. To the law and to the testimony, he says. If they walk not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them. So much then for the warning against the occult.

4. We must test everything by the Word of God, v.20. It is closely related to the occult but much broader, extending much further. Oh, how ready we are to believe something because our parents have said it, or because we have heard it said, or because it is the general attitude among the people with whom we have been associated. To me a most amazing ^{thing} ~~thing~~ is how much of the ^{consciousness} Scripture hardly enters into the conscience of the average Christian.

A few matters of what he has heard from others is what he goes by. And if he goes to a sound Christian church most of these are good matters. I'm happy for that, but I believe God wants us to study His Word as a whole, to go to the law and to the testimony for His answer to all the matters of life. I think this is extremely important.

I gave E. last time -- Trouble Ahead for Both Parts of Israel. I don't think we need spend more time on that because this is very clear in v.14 where he speaks of he'll be a rock of offence to both the houses of Israel. In v.21ff., espec. 9:1 he mentions specific places which are in the NW part of the Northern kingdom. He shows that he has all of Israel in mind, not just the kingdom of Judah! Trouble Ahead for both parts of Israel.

Capital E (?) I mentioned last time, The Promised Deliverance Through Christ. Under that I mentioned No. 1

1. The Light Begins Where the Darkness Began. These verses we read in the NT -- the land of Zebulun, the land of Naphtali, the way of the sea beyond Jordan, Galilee of the nations, the people that walk in darkness have seen a great light. But I don't think many Christians realize why these particular places are named in Isaiah. They are the places where the Assyrian army first comes in. They are the places where the darkness comes, where the warrior comes with confused noise and ~~dark~~ garments rolled in blood. At that very place where the darkness began, there Jesus began His preaching ministry. There the light began. The prophets looked forward into the future and he something quite a distance off and something else much further off and in between these two. He sees these different things in the future, but he doesn't necessarily

tells us the order in which these things will occur. He may not even know the order himself, as Peter said the prophets tried to find out what time or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify when He testified of the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow. But he looks in the future and he sees this section here in NW Israel where the Assyrian army first came in with the garments rolled in blood, with the confused noise of the lories (?), where darkness first came up, fight in that section Christ begins His preaching bringing the light to that area. So No.

1. Light Begins where the darkness ends.

Then a second matter that is made very clear in these verses:

2. Lasting Peace Can Come only through God's Plan. We'll speak more of that lasting peace later so I won't more than mention it at this moment.

3. This Plan Involves a Divine Child. That is very clear in ch. 7 where it was first predicted; very clear in ch.8 from the mention of Immanuel, but here it is stressed ~~in~~ in 9:6, "For unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder and His name shall be called . . . these various characteristics are mentioned which we'll look at a little later.

F. A Further Look at the Transition from Darkness to Light. It's a little hard to know just how much time to spend on this.

(Question: On v.14, you said it predicts hard times (in-distinct ? ?) Are these verses referring to the Messiah and His coming?) Verses 17 and 18 are definitely, but v.14 is referring to the immediate situation and the hard times that

coming. God is going to be a stone of stumbling and rock of offence; we know in the NT that Jesus is the rock of offence, He is the rock that followed in the wilderness. He is the rock here that is the stone of stumbling then. He was God long before He became man also.

(Question: So you are saying this is referring to the present situation, but is a type of Christ? Or does it refer to Christ?) I say that v.14 refers to Christ, the Second Person of the Trinity, it refers to God, specifically to Christ. Verse 15 is simply the immediate situation. "Many shall stumble, and fall and be broken and be snared, and be taken." That is true of these who oppose ^{work} the Word of God at any time, but very especially (indistinct???)

Then v.17 and 18, I don't know whether they are describing ~~and~~ Isaiah and are a type of Christ, or whether they are describing Christ and are symbolized by Isaiah. They fit both.

Let's return now to F. The Transition from Darkness to Light. In v. 21 there is darkness as a result of the Assyrian ^{invasion} ~~invasion~~. There is misery in v.21. In v.2 of the next ch. there is light and joy. Where is the transition? There have been interpreters who read v.21 this ~~xxx~~ way: "And they shall pass through it, greatly distressed and hungry; and it shall come to pass, that when they shall be hungry, they shall fret themselves, and curse their king and their God, and then they'll look upward." You see the verse ends: "they will look upward." Whoever put the verse division in I think must have had that in mind. Tht this verse is misery ending with joy -- then they'll lookupward. Most interpreters think that that is a wrong interpretation. They think that the two verses should not have been separated. That is, they will look upward and

look to the earth, and whatever direction they look they find only trouble and anguish. Now you can't be dogmatic between them. Is the transition in v.21 -- misery and then they look upward? Or is it that there is misery and they look upward? Or is ~~it~~ it that there is misery and they upward and they look to the earth and wherever they look ~~y~~ they find no hope so long as they turn away from God, they are not looking to Him. Wherever else they look upward or downward is misery. I think most interpreters take it this way. I don't think whoever put the verse division in did or he certainly would not have separated their looking up from their looking down. So I think the transition was misunderstood by the ones who put in the verse division. But "they shall look to the earth, and behold, trouble and darkness, dimness of anguish; and then" if you have the KJV, they shall be *is* in italics i.e. they shall be driven to darkness. The words are "driven to darkness" and some take it, 'they look to the earth and behold trouble and darkness, dimness of anguish, but the darkness will be driven away.'" So they get the transition at the end of this verse. There is misery, but the darkness is driven away. Now you cannot be dogmatic between them.

(Question: You mean they will be driven away into darkness?) Yes, then misery. You can take it that way - ~~w==~~ they will be driven into darkness; or you can take it the darkness is driven away. There is no way to decide. What we know is that in v.21 you have misery. In v. 2 you have joy. Do you look at the misery and look at the joy, look at the

misery and look at the joy, or do you keep looking the misery and then look at the joy? You cannot say! You cannot be dogmatic between them. Now, of course when you make a translation you have to pick one or the other! That's the sad thing about it. You have to pick one. And there are many points at which you are absolutely sure your translation is exactly what it says, but there are other cases where different interpretations are possible. Here we have 3 or 4 verses in a row where different translations are possible, but it does not affect the meaning of the passage as a whole which you take. So it really does not make any difference. I think it is important to bring that out. That there are cases where it is tremendously important which translation you take; there are other points where it does not affect the meaning of the passage. And here you have a definite transition, but exactly where it comes, you could put it any one of several places.

I see that clock moving faster than I expected. So I'm afraid we'll have to defer this subject till next time.

Last time under IV we were discussing F - The Transition from Darkness to Light. We noted that you cannot tell exactly where the transition is. It is absolutely definite that there is a transition. We have utter darkness; a few verses later you have absolute light, and you have a continuous passage. But there are several verses in which there is a certain ambiguity. That is nothing strange about Hebrew. Every language has ambiguities. In every language sentences may have various possibilities of interpretation. To my mind one of the most important in Scripture studies is to determine what is definite and clear in Scripture and stand on it, and not to fuss and argue about matters Scripture does not make clear. I think there is nothing Satan is more happy to do than to get Christians to fighting over things Scripture does not make clear.

That does not mean we should not study the things that are not clear. Where it is not clear to us on first reading it may become clear on second reading. Where it is not clear as we study it one time we may when we have the problem in mind find ^{something} ~~XXXXXXXX~~ else in Scripture that clarifies it, and gives us the answer that we would never have know if we did not have the problem in mind. I believe it is very important that we try to keep that attitude of standing on the things that are definite and not dividing over things that are not clear and definite in Scripture.

We are not exactly sure where this transition occurs, but we are absolutely sure it does occur.

G. The Promised Son of David. That is the subject of the rest of this section that runs from 8:1-9:7 where the ch. division really should have come. The promised child has been a vital matter at various points

all through this part of Isaiah. It is not at all inaccurate that we should call it the Book of Immanuel because Immanuel is introduced in ch.7. One verse is unquestionably about Immanuel. Two verses that I believe are also about Him - there might be differences of opinion on those two but there can be none on v.14. Then in ch.8 we have two verses that are definitely about Immanuel. Then we have a group of passages of about three verses on -- that may point specifically to Immanuel, at least it foreshadows if not point to Him.

Ch. 9, the first part entirely deals with Immanuel, the promised Son of David. The great purpose of ch. 7 is not to bring comfort to Ahaz, but to rebuke Ahaz for his worldly peace, for his worldly effort to play off the great powers against each other and make his nation safe instead of trusting God. And he points to the fact that God is going to provide a worthy son of David in the place of this unworthy son. He does not tell just when Immanuel would be born. We were not told that in ch.7 or in ch.8 or in ch. 9. He never reveals when Immanuel would come, but he reveals very definitely that He will come. So we have the promised Son of David that covers these chs. And I did want to look briefly at a matter which I'll place first though it refers to a verse further on in the chapter.

1. His ~~Two~~ Natures. I'm not sure we could deduce these two natures from this verse alone. But since the two natures of Christ are clearly taught in the NT, we are, I believe, entirely justified in finding them in the beginning of v.6. "For unto us a child is born; unto us a Son is given." It can be suggested that this is just Heb. parallelism, saying the same thing in two different ways. But when you look closely at it you find there is a real difference between the two statements.

One is born; one is given. One is spoken of as a child; one as a son. As I say you could not know about the two natures of Christ from this verse in advance, but looking back you can see it is definitely taught here. That here is a human beings here is a child, he is born just as other human beings are born. But that also here is a son who is given, not here, but who is given. Who exists from all eternity. One who is now given to be the answer to all our problems.

(Question: What two natures are you referring to there?) Yes, I'm referring to the fact that He is a human being and that He is God Himself. He is a child as a human being; he is a Son as God the Son.

(Question: Aren't children sometimes spoken of as a gift from God?) Yes. As I say you could take this as Heb. parallelism. You could not know from this in advance the two natures of Christ. But when you have the fact taught in the NT, you find here that it is a very unusual and that it fits exactly with the facts. He would not know in advance about the two natures of Christ, but knowing about them we find here that it was actually present here even though one would not be justified in developing the doctrine (? ?) A child is indeed a gift from God, everything we have is a gift. But He is a gift in a very special sense. So I would not say that someone in Isaiah's day would know the truth here. Whether Isaiah did or not, I would not say. Peter says that the prophets tried to figure out what or what manner of time the spirit of Christ which was in them did signify. Of course God has revealed this to Isa. and Isa. may have wondered exactly what it meant. He may even have understood it. But he does not bring it out anywhere else in the passage. We cannot say.

Work
2. His kingly work . We have already noted His work as a prophet.

His work of bringing light (v.2) We already looked at that and we noticed how that passage is quoted in Mat.4:15,16 where it says that these things were done that it might be fulfilled. Jesus began His preaching at a certain ~~part~~ place in order to fulfill the prediction that Isaiah gave about the coming of light. That the coming of light through the preaching of Christ would begin in the very same place where the terrible darkness began with the onrush of the Assyrian army which entered from the NE part of Palestine.

So we have these words in v. 1, "the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali, and . . . the way of the sea beyond Jordan, in Galilee of the nations." This is quoted in Matthew.

The archbishop very reasonably put his ch. division where he did here though I think it would have been much better to put it after v.7. Certainly v.1 is tightly connected with what precedes, but more tightly united to what follows. When the ch. divisions were taken from the Latin Bible and placed in the printed copies of the Heb. Bible, the Jews/^{who}did it moved the ch. divisions ahead a verse, because if you do not see Christ here it is logical to think that you finish one subject with the coming of the Assyrians and you start a new one with the coming of light. So they started a verse later, which is quite logical from their viewpoint. But the fact remains that the logical division is after v.7, that the transition is made gradually here and that there is a close connection between v. 1 and v. 2, the exact meaning of which would not be very clear to any reader unless God gave him a very special revelation, until Jesus began to preach right in that area, and fulfill that specific quotation. That these people living in that area where the darkness had begun where the Assyrian army had first come in, that upon them at His first coming, the

light of the marvellous preaching of Christ. Now that we have already looked at as the beginning of His great prophetic work and Jesus is prophet, priest and king.

As Christians we tend to think particularly of His priestly work. Certainly as Hebrews shows He was our great high priest who made the sacrifice and He Himself was the sacrifice which He offered. His priestly work is what makes our salvation possible. It is tremendously important, his priestly work described in Is.53 and prefigured in all the sacrifices of the OT. But this particular passage here does not speak of His priestly work. His prophet work is a ministry that evangelical Christians tend to neglect. I don't know about the modernists today but 30 yrs. ago there were many modernists who spent a great deal of time discussing the teachings of Jesus, and they brought out many great truths from them and many ideas that I don't think were in them at all. But the thing I was disturbed about at that time was that so many Christians tend to neglect feeling anything of the depth of the riches of the prophetic teaching of Christ. I don't mean by the prophetic teaching what's going to happen in the future necessarily. That is a part of it. But His teaching about the meaning of life and the way we should live it, etc. The Gospels represent a great and important part of His work, his work as an interpreter and an explainer to us of what life means. That is the phase that is stressed here in v.2.

But His kingly work is also stressed in this section. I mention that then as No. 2 -- His Kingly Work. This is particularly stressed in v.7. In v.7 we have the statement "of the increase of his government and peace no end." The KJV has in italics "there shall be", and as you know in the UJV italics means an insertion in order to make it easier to understand. The Heb. has no verb. "There is no end!" to the end of the increase of His government and peace upon the throne of David and upon

His kingdom to further it and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even forever." What does that mean? - "from henceforth?" Does that mean from the time He ~~x~~ returns to this earth to set up an absolute visible control over the earth? Does it mean from the time when He began to give light through His preaching and reach individuals and they reached out and touched other~~s~~ individuals and they carried the message of salvation through Christ? Does it mean from the time when Isa. spoke?

Certainly Jesus has ruled the world from the very beginning. John tells us that by Him all things were created. He was the instant of the creation of the world. He had been active from the very beginning in the physical control and He has been governing all along. But His government has become clearer in the hearts of His people since the events described in v.2 - since He began to spread light in people's hearts. We believe the time will come when His government will be physical ~~ph~~ visible as all men will at least outwardly give allegiance and obedience to Him and whatever He commands. His great kindly work is here stressed. That leads us to

3. His Divine Titles. "For unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given and the government shall be upon His shoulder." The government of the universe is on His shoulder. The government of all the nations will be on His shoulder. But His government now over His people He leaves the responsibility with each of us to place more of it upon His shoulder. He wants to bear us upon His shoulders. He says, Come unto me.. . and take my yoke upon you. He tries to take our government upon His shoulder, but He leaves us in this age with the necessity of voluntarily transferring more and more of the control of our lives to Him, so that the term "of the increase" is a very real term in

the life of the Christian. Are we increasingly turning over the government of our lives to Him?

(Question: Is the government there His personal rule over our lives?) It covers all of it. His government over the universe, it is hard to say how far that ^{may} has increased because that is complete. His government over people in a visible way will certainly tremendously increase (indistinct ? ?) But His government over the hearts of His people this verse particularly applies, because it says "of the increase." And the true Christian is one who is constantly coming more and more under the government of Christ in the voluntary (?) aspect of his life. It is sad how much worry and anxiety there is among Christians. For logically there is no reason for worry and anxiety because the government of our lives should be upon His shoulder. It actually is, He controls everything that happens to us, but when something which with the best effort we have to prevent it, yet something bad happens we can know it is part of His will. The government is upon His shoulder and it is for our good, or He would not permit it. As Paul says, we can rejoice in adversities, as long as it is not adversity brought in as a result of our own foolishness. We can rejoice in adversity because He has a purpose in it for us. Yet we are better off with it than we would be without it. There is in every true Christian an increase of His government seen. In the universe His government is constant.

That word "peace" is a word which in the Heb. means much more than our English word peace. Sometimes it is translated "wellbeing" which sounds rather weak to us, and yet "wellbeing" if you think about it is a little nearer the meaning of it than peace. It includes the cessation of war but it is much more than that. Peace with God, peace our hearts,

We use the word "peace" in different contexts to express much more than the word peace alone seems to mean to us. Peace here certainly does not mean lying down and letting evil crush you. That certainly is not what ~~MY~~ peace means at all. It certainly was Christ's to oppose evil in every possible way. But the Heb. greeting is shalom, peace. And that does not just mean, I hope you're not engaged in a war! It means, May things go well with you; may your life be on the best possible plane. It means wellbeing. (Indistinct / / ? ? ? ?) But it's much more than just the idea of cessation of war.

These terms are very interesting. His Name. His Name shall be called. The word name as we noted in connection with Immanuel, name does not simply mean a ~~CEEE~~.label. His Name is a label. A name is a way that you identify someone but in Heb. "name" is used with much deeper meaning than that. It is used to signify something in one's character. It is used to indicate what one really is. So Jesus was not called Immanuel. That was not the handle by which people would call Him or refer to Him, but Immanuel indicated His character. He was God with us, not merely in the sense of indicating that God was with us but actually He was God who was with us. So Immanuel describes His character. Jesus . . . ? ..describes one particular aspect of His work, His work of salvation. That aspect which was most conspicuous to us in the purpose of His earthly life was to give His life on the cross for the sins of all who would believe on Him, His Name. Jesus means the Lord saves. Immanuel describes another aspect of His character, a very important one. Here we have another which describes His character.

His name shall be called Wonderful Counsellor. Now in the KJV there

is a comma between Wonderful and Counsellor. In many more recent versions there is not a comma between them. The reason for that is that we have the term the Mighty God which is one unit composed of two words; the Everlasting Father is a unit of two words; the Prince of Peace is a unit of two words. Therefore it seems to some to be more reasonable to take Wonderful and Counsellor together i.e. a Wonderful of a counsellor, or therefore a Wonderful Counsellor. Actually in the Hebrew arrangement it would be just as sensible to call Him a Counselling Wonder as a Wonderful Counsellor. When He appeared in one place in the OT and they asked what His name was, He asked, Why do you ask what my name is? The KJV translates it "seeing it is wonderful." The word used there is exactly the same as the word used here. His Name is Wonderful. He is indeed wonderful beyond any human being, in a different area altogether. He is not just a wonderful counsellor, One who can give us good advice; He is wonderful in every sense of the word. So I incline to follow the KJV approach here of taking this as two different names rather than as only one, though one cannot be dogmatic. He is indeed wonderful and we have this other evidence that it was far beyond simply being a wonderful counsellor. As for the other suggestion I just made i.e. a counselling wonder might be perhaps better because He/wonderful far beyond ^{is one who is} can reach or even imagine; He is so wonderful and yet is willing to condescend to us, to give us His counsel in His great teachings in the gospel, to give us His counsel today in His Holy Spirit, through the study of His Word. He is a wonderful one who is already to counsel His people.

The next phrase, the Mighty God, is literally a God of a Mighty One. The word here translated mighty is often translated "hero".

It is a strong and powerful man; one who is able to accomplish great things. (Indistinct ? ? ?) Most translators render this "the Mighty God." That's a tremendous thing to say about this One who is going to be born, and whom he predicts that His name will be Mighty God.

(Question: Is there any possibility of translating that "Wonderful counsellor of the mighty God"?) A wonder of a counsellor of the mighty God. It is not impossible. I don't think anybody has ? ?

(Comment: That was a Jewish argument that I heard.) The Jewish version of the OT which was published c. 70 years ago now (1917) in Philadelphia, it just transliterates; it says: His name is called Pele-joez-el-gibbor-Abi-ad-sar-shalom. Then it has a footnote that says this means, "The mighty God the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace is counselling a wonderful thing." ((What it actually says is: "That is, Wonderful in counsel is God the Mighty, the Everlasting Father, the Ruler of peace."))

Now it would be possible to take it that way. I think that would be a much more reasonable way to take it than the way some suggest. It's possible to take it that way, but most interpreters think it extremely unlikely that such a name so long such a long series of names as that. It is much more nature that it be (an exceptional series of statements (? ? ?))

(Question: Could this possibly be "a god of the mighty one"_)
 ? ? indistinct ? is looking forward to His coming. I would not bade any proof on this, but I would say this fits with it, very well. A God of a Mighty One. No, there is no ~~ZIESE~~ "the" before Mighty One. It is a Mighty God, or a God of a Mighty One.

That is possible. It is not the common term for god; that is
 elohim. not impossible, but ? ? ?

You cannot prove all the NT teachings from Isaiah but you find
 wonderful intimations looking forward. And this is certainly
 evidence that God gave Isaiah a glimpse of the fact of the deity
 of Christ. But I would not say this is an absolute proof of

(Question: Could we insert the word "be" - Wonderful,
 Counsellor, Mighty God, etc., etc. so as Messianic force?)

It is possible. The verb "to be" as we use it in English can mean
 to make a change: it was light and it was dark. There is a change.
 Or "to be" can mean it is light i.e. a condition. Now this latter
 is usually not expressed in Hebrew. It has to be inserted; it has
 to be understood. You say, The morning is beautiful. In Hebrew you'd
 say, Beautiful the morning. You understand the insertion. Now it is
 not impossible, (indistinct) but it is unlikely. Un-
 likely but not impossible.

The Mighty God is a tremendous thing to say about this One who
 will be born. If one is not convinced from the NT of the character
 of Christ and His deity, it is natural to try to interpret it in some
 other way. I would not say this verse proves it, but I would say it
 is an amazing thing that here in Isaiah there should be this suggestion
 of it very very strong. It is certainly the most natural way to take
 it, but it is such an astonishing thing that it is no wonder some try
 to take it some other way.

The next phrase, the Everlasting Father. About 40 years ago practically
 all the modernists took the word ^{ad} ~~et~~ there which means long, very long
 period, which we translated as "everlasting". There is another word
 which means booty. The modernists were insisting a few years ago that

and bring an end to the results of all of Satan's wickedness, and establish wellbeing for all . He is truly the Prince of

Peace. And at that point I would like to go back a few verses and

4. Look at the three verses that we skipped over without examining them closely, vv.3-5, because the term peace relates so definitely to them. This whole ch. is read in S.S. and churches everywhere at Christmastime (espec. these verses), and we are very familiar with vv.1,2,6,7. But vv.3-5 we read but don't pay much attention to. We sort of slip over them. It is ^{fairly} very easy to see what the specific details in them mean, but as to exactly what they are pointing to, I don't think it is possible to be dogmatic. This is one thing on which we cannot be dogmatic. What exactly is he speaking about in vv.3-5?

He is speaking there of something that Christ is going to do for His people. Does that mean ~~XXX~~ that vv.3-5 are necessarily something Christ is going to do after He comes to earth? Well, in ch.8 we saw that the land of God's people could not be conquered except as God chose to permit them because it is Immanuel's land. He was active before. So I don't think you can insist that a time of vv.3-5 is necessarily after the time of v.2. I don't think you can do that. There is -- I saw a note someone wrote c. 60 yrs. ago. He said in v.3 Isaiah complained that despite the wickedness of the Northern Kingdom, her afflictions are light, her prosperity great. That interpreter very evidently took v.3 as referring to the Northern Kingdom which was destroyed in 721 B.C. and therefore as not referring to something after the coming of Christ. I believe that God is tremendously interested in these attitudes that all of us are to have. He is interested in our having understanding of the future, in so far

as it affects our attitudes. But I believe we can make a great mistake if we think that prophecy is history written in advance so that we can tell exactly what is going to happen in the future. I don't believe that anybody at the time of the first coming of Christ could have told in advance a great many of the things which became perfectly clear when they saw them happen. And when they saw them happen, and stillmore when Jesus explained the Scriptures to them and showed them how the OT was fulfilled, ~~and~~ they saw how exactly He fulfilled the predictions of the OT. But these predictions sometimes jump from one subject to another rather rapidly. The prophet, in other words, looked at the immediate situation; he saw what was in front of him, he saw the needs of his people. He saw the message God wanted him to give these people, and then he saw things along in the future that had a relationship to these people here and now, and he might look at one thing in the future and he might look at another thing in the future, and he might look at a third thing in the future, and when we try to get a precise chronological progress in a passage we ~~often~~ often are pushing something into it that isn't necessarily there. I believe that we make great mistake in doing that with the OT, and I believe there are many who make a great mistake in trying to do that in the NT. I think it is very important - the attitude He wants us to have, but when we come to dividing up among ourselves over our interpretation of details of the future of His promises we want to be very careful we are not reading into Scripture.

Now vv.3-5 could be taken as referring to something that is going to happen to Christ in the distant future. Certainly vv.4-5 could be taken that way. Verse 5: "For every battle of the warrior is with

confused noise, and garments rolled in blood; but this shall be with burning and fuel of fire." The "with" in KJV is a bit confusing there. What it means is that all the paraphernalia of war, the boots and the garments rolled in blood, all this is going to be brought to an end. It is the same prediction that we find where it says (Is.2:4) "they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks". Is it however, a prediction, of a complete cessation of war, or is it a prediction of a temporary relief from war? You cannot be dogmatic on that, regarding v.5. We would like to think v.5 looks forward to the time when our Lord will bring the end to all wars as He certainly will do. But vv.3-4 look against that. "Thou hast multiplied the nation, and not increased the joy (the KJV says; most more recent translations say, "and have increased the joy". If you look in a recent translation it says, "You have multiplied the nation and have increased the joy," they will nearly always have a marginal note saying "another reading is, you have not increased the joy." It is the difference of one letter in the Hebrew. Whether it is lamedh aleph "not", or lamedh waw "to him". But the actual text of the Hebrew is "not". And why do you have to say increased the joy to him? Why not just say increased the joy? So there are some who say that the text is better than the marginal note that the ~~text~~ that really this is with the waw, "increased the joy to him." We have no way to be sure whether it is increased the joy, or have not increased the joy.) It is easy to interpret it either way: You have multiplied the nation and didn't increase their joy, but ~~there~~ then there comes something that makes them joyous before you like the joy in harvest. You can take it that way. Or

you can make the transition earlier, "You have multiplied the nation and you have increased the joy, they joy before thee like the joy in harvest . . ." But vv.3,4, and 5 point to a great deliverance, and in view of the fact that chs.7 and 8 have been dealing with the terrible menace ~~x~~ when the ~~Assyrians~~ ^{Syria} and Israel were attacking Judah and Ahaz brought in the Assyrian force in order to deliver them, and by this clever political scheme did far more harm than good, in view of the fact that that is the great stress there on the terrible misery that is going to come to Israel and to Judah through the Assyrians, but in view of the fact that Isaiah also predicts that the ~~Assyrians~~ Assyrians though they shall conquer the Northern Kingdom and will do terrible damage to most of the people and cause this terrible depopulation, that they will not be able to conquer Jerusalem. But that Jerusalem will be delivered from them by a very great and wonderful deliverance, such a great deliverance that it is described three times in the OT. It's described in Kings; in Chronicles; in Isaiah. This tremendous deliverance when the Assyrians came and conquered practically all of Judah, held it in their possession, were going to take Jerusalem and it looked absolutely hopeless and yet God caused that thousands of them (the Assyrians) should be killed not by any human instrumentality and the king had to turn around and go back home. This deliverance from Sennacherib is one of the great themes of this part of Iwaiah, and these three verses fit exactly with that. "You have broken the yoke of his burden, and the staff of his shoulder, the rod of his oppressor, as in the day of Midian." The day of Midian is, of course, the time when Gideon led the people against the Midianites who had held the Israelites in

subjection for many years, and suddenly a little band under Gideon's leadership followed God's command and routed the great force of the Midianites. Now this is a reference to that. There is to be a great deliverance like that. Of course this against Sennacherib was very similar because the tremendous host of Sennacherib held most of Judah and Jerusalem was shut in for nearly three years. People hardly dared to leave the city because of the possibility of roving Assyrian bands. The Assyrian king calling on them to surrender, telling them that their situation was absolutely hopeless, and in that situation God caused that one morning they would wake up and find thousands of their soldiers dead, and the result was Sennacherib had no choice but to go back to his own land.

Now we have the Assyrian record that tells us that Sennacherib that great boastful Assyrian king tells how he came and made an attack against Judah and he says he shut up Hezekiah king of Judah like a bird in a cage in Jerusalem. He says that Hezekiah says that the fury of his onslaughts was terrifying to Hezekiah, and Hezekiah gave him a large amount of gold, a large amount of silver, and went back to his own land. He boasts of shutting him up like a bird in a cage which sounds very very small when you compare what he says about the other cities how he conquered them and led out their people captive, and killed many of them, how terribly he treated them, and all he can boast about Jerusalem is that he shut Hezekiah up in Jerusalem like a bird in a cage. I believe all scholars recognize that even though Sennacherib does not admit it, that his boasting about shutting Hezekiah up like a bird in a cage means that he did not succeed in taking Jerusalem. The second largest city of Judah was conquered by Sennacherib after a great siege. People were taken captive

(was this)

from it but it was much inferior to Jerusalem, the city of Lachish. But in Sennacherib's capitol, in his palace there has been found a great picture which says underneath: the conquest of Lachish in Judah. It shows people behind the great walls of Lachish and the Assyrian army coming (against them) bringing their battering rams, and attacking the city, and then it shows them taking it and carrying the people off captive. I call that Sennacherib's consolation prize. Because of all the great cities he conquered and the tremendous victories he had here and there, he picked the second largest city in Judah to put up this great picture in his palace celebrating his conquests in order to comfort himself that he did not take Jerusalem. God slew the great number of his soldiers and left him helpless and he had to return. That is described in full in Kings, Chronicles, and Isaiah 36 and 37. 2 Chron. 32 tells about it. 2 Ki. 18:13-19:37. It is told at length as one of the great deliverances that God gave. It was the deliverance of Ahaz' son Hezekiah from Sennacherib the mighty Assyrian ruler. There is a long and full account of it in each of these places. So these, particularly vv. 4-5, in the light of the whole context can very possibly be a prediction that Immanuel is going to deliver the land from this terrible Assyrian menace that Ahaz opened it up to. Now it can very possibly, I said. We cannot dogmatically state that that is what it is speaking about because it doesn't mention Hezekiah and it doesn't mention Sennacherib. It doesn't mention the Assyrians. It is not impossible that it is looking forward to the complete end of war with the return of Christ to this earth, but it certainly is difficult to relate to anything in the life of Christ in His first advent. It is very difficult to relate to anything at that time.

Now there have been some who have. They have said when he broke the yoke of his burden and the staff of his shoulder, the one of these is the ceremonial law and the other is the sacrificial system which has a hold on people and this was ~~broken~~ broken and they were freed from it and we are free in Christ. All that is true, but I don't think it is in these verses. I think these verses look forward either to what Christ will do at ~~the~~ ^{His} second coming which in that case is described here between the description of the beginning of His preaching and the description of His birth, or else it is looking forward to the fact that Immanuel is going to protect Jerusalem ~~from~~ from this great Assyrian menace which Ahaz has open up by his wicked scheme but which he thought very clever scheme.

So those are the two possibilities of vv.4 and 5. That I called No.4 Examination of vv.3-5.

5. All this is Due to God's Zeal. Notice the end of v.7: "The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this." He is the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace, and yet as the NT tells us God the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world. It is the Triune God from which we receive our salvation; not one member of the Trinity. So the passage ends with the statement, "the zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this." These tremendous predictions of these first seven verses here, these are to ~~be~~ brought to pass in spite of Ahaz clever scheme, in spite of the wickedness of the situation God is going to bring this about. I thought I'd get further today than this but we'll continue there next time. I wish you would look at these passages in Kings and Chronicles/^{and Isaiah} that I mentioned and have this deliverance from Sennacherib in mind when we meet next time.

Copy #2

I want to say a couple more words about No.4 and briefly mention No.5. I asked you for today to look at the references to the account of Sennacherib's invasion. This is a generation later than when we began in ch. 7. In ch.7, Ahaz was king. About 30 yrs. later his son Hezekiah was king. In the time of Is.7 it was Tiglath-Pilezer of Assyria who came against the Northern Kingdom and against the Kingdom of Damascus. During succeeding years he died and there were a number of successors. The time this occurred in connection with Hezekiah, it was a century later and Sennacherib was king. His father Sargon was the one who had conquered Samaria. So that at this later time what Is. had predicted had come to pass that the Assyrians being right next to Judah, the bumper state Israel and Syria having been removed was a tremendous danger to Judah.

And did you notice in those passages in the account of it it says that Sennacherib conquered 46 walled cities of Judah. That's a tremendous number. He ravished most of the land of Judah, but Hezekiah was left in Jerusalem with its strong walls and Sennacherib did not immediately attack him. Instead he paid his ^{attention} ~~attention~~ to the possibility of conquering Egypt, and he delayed some time in attacking Jerusalem and contented himself with getting messengers to appeal to the people of Jerusalem to surrender and tell them what terrible things would happen to them if they did not surrender. For nearly 3 yrs. Jerusalem was about all there was left of Judah. The people of Jerusalem could rush out into the surrounding countries and pick up what grew of itself but they did not dare go out long enough to plant and harvest because Sennacherib's roving bands were coming into the country. They were especially at any time a terrible

attack from Sennacherib and then as we read in all three of these places suddenly Sennacherib had a great catastrophe in which thousands of his soldiers were killed. He found it necessary to give up his idea of conquering Jerusalem and to return.

As I mentioned under No.4, verses 3-5 may very well point to that catastrophe, particularly 4 and 5, that catastrophe for Sennacherib. "For thou hast broken the yoke of his burden and the staff of his shoulder, the rod of his oppressor, as in the day of Midian. For every battle of the warrior is with confused noise, and garments rolled in blood" -- this was a well-known fact to the people of Judah. Doubtless many refugees had crowded into Jerusalem. They knew what the Assyrian was doing ~~and~~ in their own land, and it was Ahaz' fault! His fault that they now had no buffer states to protect them. But he said that this shall be for burning and for fuel of fire. It is possible in these verses that Isaiah looked forward to that wonderful intervention of God to deliver them from Assyria. In the light of the great emphasis in these chs. on the Assyrian danger, I incline to think that that is what is here spoken of. I would not be dogmatic about it. It is possible that instead of that he is looking forward to the complete end of war in the world through Christ. That is also a possibility, of these verses. We have noticed the perspective in these verses. In any case it does not move forward in direct chronological way, because we have Jesus preaching in v.2. Then if this is the Assyrian we return having noticed how Jesus will begin to preach in the very area where the Assyrian army first entered the land of Israel. Then we return to the deliverance from the Assyrian in vv.4,5 and then we go on to the birth of Christ in v.6. Now if

you take it the other way, you have Jesus preaching in v.3, then you look forward to the complete end of way which has not yet come, looking even beyond the present. Then you look back again to the birth of Christ. So in either case it showed the great danger of assuming a chronological step by step progress in the ^{chronology(?)} ?? If they say after this will come that, when there are terms like that then we have statements on which to say there is chronological progress. But very often the progress is logical rather than chronological. And if this is about the Assyrians he speaks of the Assyrians coming in and then notices how that is the very place where Jesus will begin to preach the word; the light will begin to come. Then he shows how the Assyrians are going to be destroyed; God will deliver from them and then he shows that all this is going to happen through the wonderful birth.

Those are two possibilities of interpretation of this. Now this is one of the great deliverances God wrought for His people. It was so important in the eyes of the Israelites that it is told three times in the Bible. Byron wrote a great poem celebrating it and vividly describing it the way God delivered the people from this great Assyrian army. Sennacherib himself in his annals tells how he conquered 46 cities and ~~22~~ had these great victories in the land and then he says, Hezekiah I shut up like a bird in a cage. Then he goes on to say that the brilliance of my great majesty overwhelmed Hezekiah so he sent emissaries to me carrying a certain large amount of gold and 800 talents of silver to my captive city of Ninevah. You notice he does not make any claims to have conquered Jerusalem or to have overthrown Hezekiah but made Hezekiah subject to him.

I have here this book, Archaeology and the OT by Jas. B. Pritchard. which is a selection from the two large volumes that he

published or the ancient texts related to the OT and ancient texts related to the OT. The title is not very accurate. Two big volumes. They give a selection of the literature of the ancient near east and articles in it were written by experts in the different fields. Pritchard simply asked them to go and gather the material together into those two big volumes when the one of them on Texts has now gone through three editions. In this book Pritchard has made selections of two big volumes to give particulars related to the OT. In it he gives quotes Sennacherib's words, and he also gives pictures in here of the great volumes (?) columns(?) that Sennacherib put up in his great palace showing his conquest of Lachish - the second most important city of It is hard to think of any reason why he'd put up great pictures of his conquest of Lachish if he had taken Jerusalem.

As I mentioned last time I call that Sennacherib's consolation prize. Now when it comes to the precise history of that time we are in a position where it is difficult to know a great many of the precise details. That's true of the history of almost any period. But of course in the last few centuries, the last 3 or 4 centuries, we have a great deal of written material that has been preserved. Back in those days we have the accounts in the Bible, and as far as Assyria is concerned we have a great many contracts by individuals that have been preserved but that does not tell us much about Israel. We have lists of the kings with the number of years they reigned, and we have at the time of Sennacherib these annals which you might say are propaganda documents. He had his court scribes draw up these accounts and the great events of his reign. These were circulated in his kingdom. But just how dependable they are as history can

be questioned because there is no way we can check them at all. We do know he was not above boasting in any way he could. I was greatly pleased when I read his annals in the original Babylonian at the University of Berlin and as we read them we came to this place where he describes this and he said Sennacherib had sent him 800 talents of silver and a certain amount of gold, to have the professor there point out that the amount of gold is the same as the Bible describes. In the Bible it says 300 talents of silver ~~when~~ while Sennacherib says 800 talents of silver. Well it pleased me to hear this professor of Assyriology who as far as I know had no particular interest in the Bible say, Oh, well, it's quite obvious Sennacherib simply lied and augmented the figure. It's the attitude of so many so called ~~xxx~~ Bible students today in the liberal schools in wherever the Bible and some statement of an ancient writer differ to say the Bible is wrong. This man knowing Sennacherib's boastful habits and those ~~xxx~~ accepted in this particular statement that Sennacherib had lied!

He doubtless lied in another way. The Bible says that when he started to attack Judah that Hezekiah sent to him these 300 talents of silver and this amount of gold and tried to make peace with him, but Sennacherib was not willing to make peace without having Jerusalem surrender to him. That being the case Hezekiah simply shut up the gates of Jerusalem and awaited a seige. A seige would have been a big undertaking. You see the pictures he put up in his ~~xxx~~ palace ⁱⁿ and those conquests of Lachish - that was a big undertaking. He said Jerusalem would be a bigger undertaking but with the tremendous power of Sennacherib he could have done it, but he was not in a hurry to start. It was a large undertaking. He could doubtless have ~~sud~~ succeeded in it but before the time came God

marvellously delivered, and Sennacherib had to go back home. Now Sennacherib, after he went home, Hezekiah Ninevah. Doubtless the is correct that Hezekiah gave him this and made this effort to and when he found he did not succeed then he shut up the walls of Jerusalem, but everything else in Judah was taken. Judah suffered tremendously from the Assyrian conquest when ended with Sennacherib going back home and Hezekiah again to establish his authority in Judah.

I thought I would read you this from Sennacherib's Annals, and also read to you Byrons poem, but I am not going to take the time, because we have quite a bit we want to get over. I'll just mention that what I gave you here as No. 5 last time, I told you I want to change to No.6 because I passed over with the end of the hour coming on a little more suddenly than I expected, I passed over v.7 which must be mentioned here. Call that No.5 - The Divine Child's Everlasting Government. We had looked at His Divine Titles, v.6.

No. in v.7 it says "Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end". Notice it does not just say His peace shall be very great, very tremendous. It says of the increase of it there shall be no end. Our God is not a static God. There is a foolish idea that one sometimes comes across in books of theology that God is absolutely timeless, everything is now to him, there is no past and no future. There is absolutely no Biblical basis for anything like that. God is a dynamic God who feels sorrow for the sin of his people; feels joy when men are converted. Jesus Christ, the Second Person of the Trinity became man at a certain time in history. Before that time He did not have a human body. Since that time he does have a human body. God is dynamic, not static. This v. says, "Of the increase of his govt."

there shall be no end. There is a progress. God exercised a certain government through these kind of Judah, through His presence with the people of Israel. We have noticed repeatedly in previous chs. references to this divine child as being already a reality, tho he is not yet born as a human being, He is the Second Person of the Trinity. This is Immanuel's Land. I pointed out in ch.7, one v. that very definitely refers to Him, and two more that may. I think it is very likely on a final exam I will ask some of you the question, Point out vv. in ^{certain} chs. that refer definitely or possibly to ~~the~~ Immanuel. We had in ch.7 one that is definite, two that perhaps. In ch.8 we have two that are definite, tho one ⁱⁿ ~~is~~/the English translation you would not realize that. We have also a passage of three verses which either refer specifically to Him or it is describing Isa. as a type of Him. In either case I would say that these three verses He is very possibly that. Now in ch.5 we have a good many verses referring to this divine child. So the increase of His govt. was present in those days, but the great part of the world wanted the evil one. But through those who like Isaiah knew the Lord, and who looked to the sacrifices that God had ordained as representing the way God would provide a propitiation for their sins, through them the Lord exercised a govt. among His people. Of course the universe God controls all the time. There is nothing that can stop His control of the physical universe. But in the universe of men He has given men a large amount of autonomy, but of the increase of His government and peace became much richer after Jesus Christ came, as the knowledge of Christ was spread through many nations, and many people accepted Him as their Lord, and He wants in the person of each one of us the increase of His government to be constantly going on so that we are more and more subject to His will, and less and less working ^{things} in accordance with our

own selfish desires. Then, of course, we know that when He returns He will then establish His government over the world in a far(greater) way than at any previous time. (Yes?) You answered my question just as you finished your sentence.)

So that this statement, "Of the increase of His government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom," Here, of course, the chronology (?) He is going to maintain the control of the throne of David, and He will make it visible upon His return. "Upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom, to order it and to establish it with judgment and justice from henceforth even for ever." And it is a strange thing that when they ~~did~~ divided this into verses they left in v.7 two complete sentences. You would think "the zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this" would be another verse. Many verses are as short or shorter than that! But it is included in this v. and we mentioned that as point 5 at the end of the hour last time, and I'd like you to change it to No.6

6. All is Due to God's Zeal. Sometime if you'd like to make an interesting study of the Hebrew word take this word "zeal" which is often translated "jealousy". The Lord's zeal, jealousy, burning determination to work that which is right and just. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform it - all it's due, is God's zeal (?)

This finishes section 4 which was this wonderful presentation in ch.9.

V 9:8-10:34. As we mentioned before after v.7 there certainly should be a ch. division. It is one of the places there is no question that there should be a ch. division. I'm going to put all of ^{that} ~~that~~ and all of the next ch. together into one chapter == one division of our lecture. There should not be a ch. division where it is at the beginning of ch.10.

That was a very poor ch. division. Now these ch. divisions as you know were made by an English Archbishop. At least they are generally attributed to him. In the 13th cent. he made ch. ~~divisions~~ ^{divisions} in his Latin Bible. They say he did it as he rode horseback. We don't know. But he made the divisions. Some are excellent, some are very poor. Three centuries later when they first published the first Hebrew Bible in printed form, the man who did it, the Jew who prepared a printed copy of the Hebrew Bible, took the Latin Bible and transferred its ch. divisions into the Heb. Bible. He transferred them exactly as they were in about ¹⁹ 20 cases out of 20. About one in twenty he changed! We noted that the beginning of ch.9 he changed to move the division one verse later.

I take it that the beginning of ch. 10 is one of the poorest ch. divisions in the Bible. The reason for that, we made clear under Capital A. I called Capital

A The Four Stanzas of Judgment. 9:8-10:4. There is a poem, a poem in four stanzas and each stanza ends in a refrain. 9:12 ends with the words "for all this his anger is not turned away but His hand is stretched out still." The next stanza ends in v.17 with the words, "For all this His anger is not turned away, but His hand is stretched out still." Verse 21 ends the next stanza with the words, "For all this His anger is not turned away but His hand is stretched out still." And 10:4 ends again with these same words. 10:5 starts a new subject. That's where the division/come^{should} is at v.4.

These four stanzas are beautiful stanzas with great truth about God's dealings with His people. I'm going to rush over them though because we have other matters I want to spend much more time on. So I will rush over them and simply mention

1. Ephraim's Pride 9:8-12. I call it Ephraim's Pride because

9:9 says "All the people shall know, even Ephraim . ." I trust you know Ephraim is the largest of the tribes in the N. Kingdom.

So the term Ephraim is sometimes used for the whole Northern Kingdom as in this case. "The Lord sent a word into Jacob, and it has lighted upon Israel." Jacob we use to mean the man; Israel we use to mean the nation. But in the OT each of them may be used either for the man or for the nation. So here it does not ~~sp~~ mean a man and then the nation; they both refer to the nation. It's a parallel usage which is a characteristic of Hebrew poetry.

Then it says, All the people shall know even Ephraim which refers to its largest tribe, and the inhabitant of Samaria which is the capitol of the northern kingdom. This stanza describes Ephraim's pride and how God is going to destroy the northern kingdom. But he says for all this His anger is not turned away, but his hand is stretched out still. Because God still intended to reek His punishment upon the Southern Kingdom. So v.13 is trans. "For the people turned not unto him that smiteth them." I think it might be better to translate it "but". The Heb. word ki can be taken either way. Since it begins a stanza, I would suggest that though I would not be dogmatic on that.

2. I'm just simply going to call ~~Disaster~~ Disaster, 13-17.

Here He speaks of the different people in Israel. The prominent people who speak lies, the people who are leading them astray. They are going to be destroyed. Probably he is still talking about the northern kingdom, though Israel may cover the whole or just the Northern kingdom. Verse 17 ends that stanza.

3. I'm going to call Wickedness Leads to Famine. 9:18-21. He tells in it about the wickedness of the people is going to result in

famine and you think particularly of the wickedness of Ahaz in making this deal with the king of Assyria and as a result the people are going to have a very difficult time having enough. Butter and honey shall they eat, for everyone that is left in the land. There'll be so few left eventually that they will have plenty of pastoral products but very little of anything that needs cultivation. This describes the period before that, before the great depopulation.

4. I'll call, Selfishness Leads to Devestation 10:1-4. "Woe unto them that decree unrighteous decrees, and that write grievousness which they have prescribed; to turn aside the needy from judgment . . . v.3 What will you do in the day of visitation . . .? This word visitation is an Old English word which I doubt if many of us use today unless we say, Oh I guess you would not say visitation, you would say visit now. But visitation in the Old English represents a day of sudden great change, which can be a day of change for the worse or a change for the better. The Heb. which is often trans. visit in the OT is never used to make a call, but always means to make a great forceful change. We don't use visit in that sense at all today.

"The day of visitation and the desolation which shall come from far? to whom will ye flee for help? and where will ye leave your glory? Without me they shall bow down under the prisoners, and they shall fall under the slaim, For all this his anger is not turned away, but his hand is stretched out still."

Now I'm going to go on to B -- Assyria's Success and Failure, 10:5-35. This should be one ch., starting here with v. 4. It has in it some very interesting and important thoughts. Notice Assyria is specifically mentioned in v.5, "O Assyria, the rod of mine anger." In v.12, he speaks of the king of Assyria at the end of the verse.

And in v.24 he says "O my people that dwell in Zion, be not afraid of the Assyrians." The Assyrian is the subject of the rest of this ch. There are certain very important thoughts in this ch.

1. Assyria is =od's Instrument to Punish His People. Ahaz had thought that the great power of this mighty aggressor of the Assyrian would be something he could play off against Israel and Syria to protect himself. God says the Assyrian is God's instrument. He says the staff in thier hands in my indignation. I will send him against a hypocritical nation." God is using the Assyrian for His+~~propo~~+ purposes. That is an important thought there of manythings in might(?) light (?) many things in international affairs. God uses great wicked forces ofæen. He uses the anger of wicked men to accomplish His purposes in the world. Here He is using the Assyrian to punaish His people.

2. Assyria's Pride. 10:7-11. "Howbeit he meaneth not so, neither doth his heart think so; but it is in his heart to destory and cut off nations not a few. For he saith, Are not my princes altogether kings? Is not Calno as Carchemish: is not Hamath as Arpad: is not Samaria as Damascus?" In other words all these cpitals of other countries and he could conquer them ~~of~~ destory them or make them entirely subject to him. "Shall I not, as I have done unto Samaria and her idols, so do to Jerusalem and her idols?" The boastfulness of the Assyrian king is brought out here, and is very similarly protrayed in Is.36 where it tells about the ambassy he sent to get the people to surrender to him, and in ch.36:6-20 we have a picture of the words that the representatives of Sennacherib gave boasting; he called upon in v.9 the Israelites to surrender. He said, Surrender and my kings will provide you with 2000 horses if you are able to put ridees on them! See how he is belittaling them, and then when the representatives asked him to speak to them, in the Aramaic language instead of Hebrew so the people on

the walls would not understand. They are standing at this time out at that place described in v.2 by the conduit of the Upper Pool in the highway of the Fuller's Field, the very place where Isaiah meet Ahaz. The representative of Sennacherib said, I've not come here just to talk to you folks; I'm come to talk to the people on the wall. He yells out to the people on the wall. He says, Hear the words of the great king, the king of Assyria. Don't let Hezekiah deceive you. Come out and surrender to the king of Assyria and I'll take you away to a land like your Jown, a land of corn and wine, a land of bread and vineyards. Beware lest Hezekiah persuade you saying, The Lord will deliver us. Have any of the gods of the nations delivered his land out of the hand of the king of Assyria? Where are the gods of Hamath and Arphad? where are the gods of Sepharvaim? and have they delivered Samaria out of my hand? Who are they among all the gods of these lands, that have delivered their land out of my hand, that the Lord should deliver Jerusalem out of my hand?"

The great cry that the king of Assyria is pictured here in ch. 10. God used the Assyrian as His instruemnt. But the Assyrian had a tremendous pride. That's in 10:13, "By the strength of my hand I have done it, and by my wisdom; . . . I have removed the bounds of the people and robbed their treasures . . ." The Assyrian thinks that he is able to do all this by his power.

3. God will Punish Assyria, 10:12-19. Verse 15 says, Shall the axe boast itself against him that heweth therewith? or shall the saw magnify itself against hūm that shaketh it? / . . . Verse 16, Therefore shall the Lord, the Lord of hosts, send among ~~thexfx~~ his fat ones leanness; and under his blory he shall kindle a burning like the burning of a fire." You notice the figure of a forest in v.18. "He shall consume the glory of his forest, and of his ~~fuixfx~~

fruitful field . . ." Verse 19, "The trees of his forest shall be few, that a child may write them."

4. Ultimate Deliverance for God's True People 10:20-23. Here he looks forward - we don't know how far. "It shall come to pass in that day." This phrase "in that day" in present day English means the day I've just been speaking about. We had a student once that came from Czechoslovakia, and he had been here quite a while and spoke English very well but he had one idiom that I don't know whether it came from his linguistic background or not. All I know is that he frequently said, "Well it will be that way" and he'd go on. We in English usually say, "It will be that way" and we mean the way we have just said. He used it for the way he was about to say it. This phrase "in that day" as used in Isaiah, normally means in the day I am about to speak of. It may mean the day you have just spoken of; it may not. It may continue the same day; it may be a distant day. In this case he's been saying, I think we can idiomatically represent v.20 as saying, "There will be a day in which this will happen!" It will come to pass in that day - not the day when the Assyrian empire is destroyed, but some day in the future, he now speaks of. It will come to pass in that day that the remnant of Israel, and such as are escaped of the house of Jacob, shall no more again stay upon him that smote them; but shall stay upon the Lord, the Holy One of Israel in truth. The remnant shall return, even the remnant of Jacob, unto the mighty God. For though thy people Israel be as the sand of the sea, yet a remnant of them shall return: the consumption decreed shall overflow with righteousness." God predicts in these verses ultimate deliverance for God's true people, but the time of it is not here stated. In Rom. 9:27-28 the Lord promises after showing how many branches of

of the olive tree are torn out of it in order that branches of a wild olive tree may be grafted in, then he says the time will come when the original branches will be grafted in again, and so all Israel will be saved. That does not mean all Israelites through the ages, but it means that the nation of Israel as a nation is entirely to be saved. There will be a great remnant that will be a part of God's true people in that ~~day~~ wonderful event predicted in Rom.9. The ultimate deliverance of God's true people but the time not stated. Now we come back after looking ~~a~~ way forward:

5. A Promise of Complete Deliverance from Assyria 10:24-34.

"Therefore thus saith the Lord God of hosts, O my people that dwell in Zion, be not afraid of the Assyrian: he shall smite thee with a rod, and shall lift up his staff against thee, after the manner of Egypt. For yet a very little while, and the indignation shall cease, and mine anger in their destruction. And the Lord of hosts shall stir up a scourge for him according to the slaughter of Midian at the rock of Oreb: and as his rod was upon the sea, so shall he lift it up ^{after} ~~after~~ the manner of Egypt. For yet a very little while, and the indignation shall cease, and mine anger in their destruction." "And the Lord of hosts shall stir up a scrouge for him according to the slaughter of Midian at ~~at~~ the rock of Oreb: ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ and as his rod was upon the sea, so shall he lift it up after the manner of Egypt. And it shall come to pass in that day, that his burden shall be taken away from off thy shoulder, and his yoke from off thy neck, and the yoke shall be destroyed because of the anointing." Now that anointing is a translation; the Hebrew simply says "because of the oil." The word is shemah(/); it is not the word maschiak. The word shema, oil. But it refers to the oil that was used in anointing, so the word anointing

while not a literal translation is not an incorrect translation here. "Because of the anointing" i.e because of Immanuel. Because Immanuel God's Messiah is going to bring this about even before He comes to earth in human form.

(Question: The NASB has an interesting translation: "because of fatness.") Well, it doesn't say fatness; it says oil. It is the oil regularly used in anointing. If you say "because of the oil" it does not make much sense. We have to interpret and that is a possible interpretation "because of fatness." But I think the other because we have the Messiah so constantly presented in these passages I think the other is more likely. Yes?

((Question: Darby's translation has "anointing" with a footnote under it Lit. oil. Some translate this metaphore fatness.))
 Yes, you can say oil represents fatness; you can say oil ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~^{represents} anointing if you want to. If we did not have the Messiah anywhere in the context I would say you are dragging it in to get Messiah here. But when we have it in verse after verse before and after it seems to me it is most reasonable to see it here. But it is just a little tiny on the idea, and you certainly couldnot bring it in here if you did not have it so clearly in previous and subsequent contexts. Two references to Immanuel in v. 8 as you noticed (??) and the many other references to the divine child. I would not be dogmatic and say "fatness" is wrong, but I would say "the anointing" impresses me as far more likely.

(Question: You mean anointing in the sense that a king is anointed?) Yes. It was customary that kings and priests, rarely prophets, were anointed. So Jesus is called Christ which is the Greek translation of the Hebrew Messiach which means an Anointed One.

(Question: Is this the oil that was used, the temple oil, the ceremonial oil? or is it referring to olive oil?)

Well, it doesn't say; you can take it either way. The word can be used either way. If you just want to say "because of oil" that is a literal translation, but that would not mean anything (to us).

It is one of two things: It is either "because of fatness" and then you have to supply that it means that the Assyrian ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ got too fat and boastful and therefore God destroyed him; or you have to take it that it means the oil with which the divine child was anointed. The Jewish interpreters often took this definitely as a reference to the Messiah. I don't know if they were unanimous in that but many at least did take it that way.

That was 5. A Promise of Complete Deliverance from Assyria. Now under that small a

a. The General Picture of Deliverance (which I just read to you, ~~vs.~~ 10:24-27).

b. A Vivid Picture of the Danger, 10:28-32. These verses would not mean much to you if you were not quite familiar with the geography of Palestine. But it names towns north of Jerusalem and pictures an invading army coming from the north. "He comes to Aith, he is passed to Migron; at Michmash he has laid up his carriages: They have gone over the passage: they have taken up their lodging at Geba; Ramah is afraid; Gibeah of Saul is fled. Lift up your voice, O Daughter of Gallim; cause it to be heard unto Laish, O poor Anathoth. Madmenah is removed; the inhabitants of Gebim gather themselves to flee. As yet shall he remain at Nob that day: he shall shake his hand against the mount of the daughter of Zion, the hill of Jerusalem." Now if you were there and saw these places and saw them come down that

that hill country north of Jerusalem nearer and nearer comes the armies. This is not necessarily a picture of something that has actually occurred. It is a picture of what would be expected from the Assyrians, that he ~~they~~ would come and conquer Jerusalem and it imagines the people imagining him coming down from the north, the natural direction to come from Assyria.

Now when Sennacherib sent his representatives he came up from over west of him, all the territory west of ~~Jerusalem~~ ^{Israel} was taken by the Assyrian and all of Judah so there was no way to know what direction his troops will come. But it is a vivid picture of the terror of the people as he gets nearer and nearer and nearer ~~and~~ in vv. 28-32 and then comes ~~see the downfall of Assyria.~~ Verse 33-34, "~~BBBBBBB~~ Behold the Lord, the Lord of hosts shall lop the bough with terror, and the high ~~wines~~ ^{wines} of stature shall be hewn down, and the haughty shall be humbled. And he shall cut down the thickets of the forest with iron, and Lebanon shall fall by a mighty one." Now the first part of this would be an excellent picture of the destruction of Sennacherib's army. But it seems to go beyond the destruction of Sennacherib's army. It gives the historical account elsewhere (of that) elsewhere in the Bible. It says Sennacherib's army was destroyed and he returned to Assyria and there two of his sons, as he was worshipping in the house of his god, attacked him and killed him. We do not have adequate knowledge of the chronology, but it is most likely that this was about 20 yrs. later when he was killed in this conspiracy by two of his sons, and the younger son Esarhaddon became king, in place of those who had been fired (?) against him and fled. But this picture may go beyond the destruction of Sennacherib's army. It may look forward to his

destruction, and when you get to ~~XX~~.v.34 it certainly looks still further to the entire destruction of the Assyrian force which came nearly a century later. Nearly a century later when the Assyrian seemed to be at the very height of its power under Sennacherib's grandson Ashurbanipal, there was an attack made by two nations: the Babylonians who had been subject to Assyria and had gained their freedom, and the Medes. The two together attacked Assyria, destroyed the great capitol of Nineveh, one of the great cities of the world so completely that the very place it had been was forgotten for well over 1000 yrs., and the Assyrians fled to another city, the city of Haran where Abram had gone before he went into Canaan, and there they made their last stand and they were destroyed and the full Assyrian empire came to a complete end. It was a fall like is described here - he cut down the thickets of the forest with iron, and Lebanon shall fall by (like) a mighty one, and here there is a chapter division, and it is quite a reasonable place for a h.c division, but it is not a major division, because the next verse should be taken right in connection with this verse, but I will make it a separate head, I will call it chapter (??)

6. Immanuel's Kingdom

(Question: (Indistinct) Is that word used for Assyria?)

Yes. Lebanon was the great forest and here it is used as a figure for Assyria.

(Question: Did you say vv.28-32 that these were actual places that fell to Assyria?) No, we do not know whether they fell or not. But this is a picture of an invading army coming down from the north to places you might expect them to. Now the Assyrians fanned out and attackdd a lot of places, and never (indistinct) But this is

more a picture of what they would do, than a ^{fear} description of one particular (activity??).

(Question: (INdistinct??) Yes.

(Question: In vv.28-32 is that describing would take place?) They did invade Palestine, and took most of it. Nobody knew from which direction Sennacherib would come, and naturally God intervened (indistinct? ?)

(Question: And then you say when Assyria is destroyed in vv. 33-34 that'snot necessarily at the same time?) No. I would say it is a foreshortened perspective. The prophet looks forward and sees the immediate deliverance of Judah, but before the Assyrians actually ever come to conquer Judah they completely ~~is~~ and that was nearly a century later, and it is the Babylonians who eventually take Judah. So here we have

VI Immanuel's Kingdom 11:1-10. Under that

A. His Character 11:1-5. and under that

1. The transition. I want to bring out the transition here. In 10:34 the great forest of Lebanon, this great forest that represents the mighty Assyrian empire falls. Then 11:1 there comes forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch grows out of his roots. In other words it thinks of David's ^{kingdom} coming as going down as it did later under the Babylonians, disappearing, seeming to be gone, ~~and~~ this little tree of Jesse. The great Assyrian empire falls and that's the end. There is never a rebuilding of the Assyrian empire. But out of this smaller tree that falls, of the house of Jesse, a branch comes up out of its roots. So we have here the coming of Christ again, in verse 1 here again in contrast to the downfall of the great Assyrian empire.

This next passage telling about Christ's character and about the establishment of His kingdom is a very important passage. We won't have time to look at it today. Particularly I want to mention an assignment.

(Question: Would you repeat those headings again under VI?)

A. His Character. 1 The Transition.

I want to mention an ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ assignment. I have not given you much by way of specific assignments, and I want to mention one for next Wed. Wednesday. This will not be a long ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ assignment. If you do it as a brief ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ assignment it will be satisfactory; if you do more I wish so you would/indicate on the ~~paper~~ pages.

Here's what I want you to do: read Isa.28 without using notes, anybody's comments or commentary or a discussion by anybody else, simply on the basis of what you find there divide it into sections, not less than 3 sections, not more than 6. Divide it into sections. Give a brief statement of what title for each section just as it occurs to you from looking at the text. A brief statement. Then make a brief statement what you think the chapter is about, what you think it says. I'd like to have your paper next time at the beginning of the hour. If there is something in it you don't make sense of, if you have difficulty understanding it don't worry about it. I'd like to have what you find. That is all the assignment for ~~the~~ next time. Please do that without looking at any commentary.

If you wish to go further then on the paper you can say No.2 I have looked at this commentary, this discussion, whatever it is and I find that ~~it~~ it says thus. Anybody who would like to go further and do some study in commentaries or discussions of ch.28, I will be glad to have on your paper what you've done & approx. amt. of time you've put on it, but that is not part of the assignment.

For next time I have a rather short assignment: Look at Is. 28 again; quite briefly. Notice in the ch. what matters are particularly rebuked. Don't name over 6, I don't want a lot of detail. A smaller number is alright, whatever you think are the important matters rebuked. State them and list the vv. where they occur. In relation to them what if any is the punishment God declares. Not more than 4 statements under that. List the verses. This should take very little time.

So I wish you would go on and look at ch. 29. It will take me almost longer to give you the assignment than it will for you to write it down. I'd like you to note the main divisions. I don't want you to get them from any Bible notes or commentaries, just from your own examination of the ch. A general statement about each. What does ch. 29 tell you about the Northern Kingdom? What if anything does it tell you about the Southern Kingdom? Does it predict any special specific situations that you could identify? This is quite a brief assignment. It takes me almost longer to tell it than it will for you to write it down, though it will take you a little while to examine it. The assignment does not include consulting commentaries or other helps. Free to do so but is not required. Do this first without consulting any helps. (Questions asked: indistinct)

I'd like you to do this just from reading the Bible yourself and seeing what you get. If you don't get a great deal don't worry about it. I have the papers here on ch. 28. Very briefly I'd like to look at the obviously important divisions in ch. 28.

Ch. 28 begins talking about Ephraim. You have no specific references to Ephraim after the first few verses, but the first few vv. are all condemnatory until v.5. Verses 1-4 are obviously together, and separate from vv.5,6 which are altogether different. Vv.5-6 are praising something or telling about something wonderful God is going to do. Everything before that is condemned. What follows that is condemned, for quite a distance. It would not be quite so obvious how you would divide what follows until you get to v.23. From vv.23-29 is dealing agriculture and quite obviously belongs together separate from what precedes. Now we will turn to ch. 11. In ch. 11 we began last time looking at

VI Immanuel's Kingdom. §§ 11:1-10.

A. His Character 11:1-5.

1. The Transition. That does not properly belong under character but rather than make a separate heading for just one verse, I include it

with what follows. We mentioned last time the transition from the previous chapter, the great forest falling, the overwhelming disaster to the great empire of Assyria. In contrast to this the little stump of Jesse, the little stump that's left after the kingdom of David seems to come to an end. The Assyrian empire ends but out of this stump of Jesse there comes out a -- up a little stool, and this rod jumps up and develops tremendously. There you have No. 1 the Transition. The ch. is sharply distinct from what precedes and yet closely connected with it. Very definite relationship.

2. His Spiritual Likeness 11:2 "And the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and fear of the Lord." Here is a description of the Spirit of the Lord which rests upon Him. Here we get into the mystery of the trinity, a mystery which we cannot understand, but which we can definitely learn a considerable number of facts about. We learn from the NT that Jesus Christ was fully God. He always was God. There never was an instant when He was not God, and was not conscious of the fact that He was God. When he was a babe lying in the manger he was at the same time directing the stars in their orbits and controlling the universe. He was fully God. There is only one God, yet Jesus is distinct from the Father. Just how we do not understand. We use the word person which is a very poor way to say it. I don't know a better way. He is distinct from the Father. He is equal with the Father. There is only One God. But there is also the Holy Spirit. Here we find that Jesus Christ, the Son of David, had the Spirit resting upon Him and he did things in the power of the Spirit. Jesus was fully God when He was here on earth and yet He gave us an illustration of how we can live in the Spirit by the way he lived in close contact with the Spirit of God at every point in His history.

The Spirit rested upon Him without measure. There are these descriptions of the Spirit - His wisdom and understanding, counsel and might, knowledge and the fear of the Lord, which Prov. tells us is the beginning of wisdom.

3. His wise judgments. Here the v. division does not seem to fit exactly. I'm going to call this 3-4a, His wise judgments. "And shall make him of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord. He shall not judge after the sight of His eyes neither reprove after the hearing of his ears, but with . . ." These verses about His character are not a description of Jesus' first coming; they are not a description of His second coming. They are a description of His character. Therefore anything stated about Him in it can refer to either period, or to the time in between. It describes His character. But there is much ^{has} thus far that is very definite application to His life on earth as described in the Gospels.

When however, you say with righteousness He will judge the poor and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth, you can think of instances in His earthly life when they come under these categories but it would seem likely there are still more in the future, that will definitely also come under this category. It is a description of His character and of His method of acting rather than of a specific event. Then you come to

4. His Forceful Intervention. If we did not have the Apostle Paul as an interpreter of Isaiah, one might feel that the whole of v.4 was a unit and that the last part like the first part was simply a description of the character and general activities of the Son of David. But Paul says here we have a very specific prediction of ~~the~~ a very specific event. The last part of v.4 says, "He shall smite the earth with the rod of His mouth and with the breath of His lips shall He slay the wicked."

Paul in 2 Thess. refers to this verse as something that will be familiar to those whom he has taught Christian things. In one of his very earliest letters, writing to a Gentile church where the people were == would have had no knowledge of the OT probably until he began to teach them, he refers to this as something with which they would be familiar. He is talking about something else, and he says in v.7: "The mystery of iniquity already works, only he who now hinders will hinder (old Eng.) until he be taken out of the way. Then shall that Wicked (old English - you would not say that wicked; you'd say that wicked One if we meant an individual characterized by wickedness) one be revealed ("that Wicked" seems to imply someone with whom they were already quite familiar - that is that they knew about from his teaching). --- whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of His mouth and shall destroy with the brightness of His coming." It is too bad in a way they had about six different companies in connection with the KJV, each making a different part of it, and while in the end they were all supposed to look over the whole thing, yet they did not try to make it consistent. thus in the Gospels, Isaiah is called by the Greek form of the name - Esaias. While when you get to James you find that it uses the Hebrew form (Elijah). Both of them are of course the same Greek word, but in one case they transliterate the Greek and in the other case they represent the Hebrew. This Heb. word can mean "breath, or wind, or spirit". It in v.4 of ch. 11 says, "With the breath of His lips shall He slay the wicked." But in 2 Thess. he says with the spirit of His mouth He shall destroy the Wicked One. Well, the word could mean Spirit in either case, or breath in either case. Both the Greek and the Hebrew words have both possibilities. Perhaps for one who knows the original it is helpful to see it in two possible

ways. For one who does not know the original it looks like a different sort of thing. The reference is 2 Thess. 2:3.

So here Paul is saying, After he that is hindering is taken out of the way, then that wicked one will be revealed. That wicked one whom the Lord will consume with the breath(or spirit) of his mouth and destroy by the brightness of His coming." So Paul is saying here that he is interpreting Is. 11:4 as describing a specific event, something that the Lord is going to do, after the hinderer is taken out of the way the wicked one will be revealed with eventually Jesus will destroy with the breath of his mouth and the brightness of His coming. So we have this definite act described in the last half of this verse.

5. His Equipment. We have been describing His character, though under that heading we included the transition; and the relation to the Spirit. Now this v. mentions His equipment -- righteousness shall be the girdle of His loins and faithfulness the girdle of His kidneys. The Old Eng. word 'reins' is translated kidneys. It means nothing to us today. The heart was just about the ~~MIN~~ only part of the physiology that we now use to represent a part of the character. But in the Scripture various parts of the body are used to represent parts of the character. So you take the loins and the kidneys together, it means all of his powers ^{subsumed} ~~AAAAA~~ under these two typical parts of the body that these are all to be gathered together and controlled by righteousness and faithfulness. This word ~~taedeq~~ translated 'righteousness' is translated that way 79 times in the KJV. It is translated justice 10 times. Some trying to make modern translations have taken the attitude that nobody today understands what you mean by righteousness, and they try to substitute a justice for it. But justice just doesn't fit! a great many cases. It means much more than justice! It means that which is in accordance

with God's holy law. It means that which should be in this world apart from sin. There is no other word. The people of the world don't know what this word means; we have to teach them what it means. We can't substitute any other words that I know of. But righteousness and faithfulness characterize His activities.

B. The Character of His Kingdom. 11:6-10. After telling these things about Him, it goes on to describe certain things that will happen; certain attitudes that will be characteristic that would seem in some way to relate to His activity and His character as described before. It is definitely related to it when you get to the end of the passage in v.10 where it says, In that day there shall be a root of Jesse which will stand as an ensign of the people to it shall the Gentiles seek and the place where He is shall be glorious. At the end we find a definite tie with what precedes, that this is a description of His rule. So we look at these vv. together rather than one by one right now. We note:

1. It is an earthly kingdom. V.9 "They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea." This is a picture of an earthly situation; it is not a picture of heaven, nor of some other state ^{than} a condition that is to exist on this earth. The earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord and it is described as characterized by the mention of various activities of various animals. Now we could think of the animals as figurative, representing something in heaven. But it certainly seems more natural to think of them as representing a changed situation upon earth. In Amos 4 we have a passage we won't have time to examine - I don't mean Amos 4 but Micah 4 -- we have a situation which is clearly a description of the kingdom of the Lord, and it begins with the words, "And in the last days it will come to pass that the mountain of the house of the Lord will be established at the head of the mountains

and exalted above the hills and people will flow to it." You notice how that parallels the statement in v.10. "There will be a root of Jesse which will stand as an ensign to the people, to it shall the nations seek." In Micah, the ch. before ends with a description of the destruction of Jerusalem. "Therefore for your sakes shall Zion be plowed as a field and Jerusalem shall become heaps, and the mountain of the . . . high places of the forest." In three places mentioned in the last verses of the preceding ch., are the three mentioned in the first c. of ch. 4 that are going to be thus exalted. It goes on giving the details at the time of peace. It parallels that described in ch. 11. I think we can say positively that what is described here is an earthly kingdom.

2. It is an Universal Kingdom. That is made very positive in v.9. "They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mt. for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea." There is not bit of the sea that is not covered by water, and there is ~~of~~ no bit of the earth that shall not be covered with the knowledge of the Lord. It is a universal kingdom.

3. It is a time of freedom from external danger. Here is the point at which many interpreters completely misunderstand the passage. This is the same point that is brought out clearly in Amos (you mean Micah) 4. But that is the main point that is stressed here in vv6-8 - an end of external danger. Many take it as meaning that the character of a Christian is so changed that instead of being a wolf as he might have been before, he is now a lamb! But there is no mention here of a wolf being changed into a lamb. It says the wolf also shall dwell with the lamb. There is still a wolf, and there is still a lamb, and they dwell together. And they don't dwell together by the lamb sleeping

inside of the wolf! But they dwell together evidently without any injury coming to the lamb. "And the leopard shall lie down with the kid, and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together, and a little child shall lead them. And the cow and the bear shall feed, and their young ones shall lie down together, and the lion shall eat straw like the ox, and the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the conatrice's den." Well, what is wonderful about prediction a little child will put his hand of a conatrice's den! You take a little child that does not know anything ^{out} yet ~~off~~ to a place where there are dangerous animals and the chances are he will walk right up to them and think nothing of it. It is not saying that a child will do something like this; he is saying there=will come no harm to the child, that there will be freedom from external danger.

After my first year in seminary, I went out to Mexico to do some mission work in the desert there. One night I talked with a man who had told me of an experience he had had when he lived in a little cabin on the desert. He said he was sitting in the back room of the cabin. His wife was away on business somewhere so the little child was in the front room, and he was sitting in the back room of this little two room cabin. As he sat there reading he began to hear a sound of great mirth from the front room. He could hear a sound as of something slapping against something, and then there was a louder slap, and then he would hear the little child just roar with laughter. Then he would hear another slap and a louder slap and then the child would roar with laughter. He wondered what the child was having so much fun about! So he stepped to the door and glanced in and his blood nearly froze when he glanced in, because there was the screen door, and outside the screen door was a big beautiful rattlesnake, and the child would lift his hand and hit the screen door and the door would fly half way

open toward the snake, then the snake would jump and hit the screen door and the door would slam shut and the child would laugh. Then the child would hit the door again and then the serpent would jump at the door and try to get at the child and that little thin screen would be all that was protecting the child. So he grabbed his gun and ran around outside the cabin and shot the snake. The child did not hesitate to put his hand on the cockatrice's den, but what this is saying is that there will be a situation in which there will be nothing wrong in the child doing this, in which the child will be perfectly safe because the serpent will no longer be dangerous. It is a time of freedom from external danger.

(Question: Would you ~~like~~ tell us what time that refers to when these events take place?) A later time, we'll get to that. I want to get the qualities first and then we'll see **WHEN** it might be.

First I'd like to say about two words about ~~two~~ words that are very important in Bible interpretation. One is figurative language; the other is spiritualization. I've heard people say, I take everything in the Bible literally. I wonder if they have ever read it. The Bible

like everything else that ever was written contains figurative speech. There is figurative language in every book. It is just about impossible to present things without using figurative speech. But there is a term that has come to be used - spiritualization. I've heard people speak of it as raising something to a higher level, and as far as I can see what is meant by this term spiritualization is taking everything as figurative, interpreting a whole matter as figurative. Like one

says that everything in ~~Revelation~~ Revelation is symbolical,

it never presents the thing it has in mind; it is the symbol that is described, never actually the thing. You take a principle like that and you can make anything mean anything at all. I look at figurative language

as being like a little pinch of salt, that is put onto a dish of soup. You pour a little bit of salt in it and you have greatly increased its value; but you pour a whole bucket of salt on it and you ruin it. Spiritualization is taking things as figurative to the extent that anything can mean anything.

At this point we do not wish to prejudge the question: Are these animals figures or human beings? Do they represent a change in the character of human beings, or do they actually mean animals? Well, they can be taken as figuratively as a figure for the doing away of war and fighting and injury of one human being by another. It can be taken that way - as a figure. But to spiritualize it is to take it as meaning something very different from what it obviously means. What it clearly means is freedom from external danger! Not the changing of the animals so that they are all identical, but the doing away with a situation in which nature is red with tooth and claw as the poet said.

Out at the Grand Canyon, I heard the naturalist there giving a talk and he described the balance of nature and how important this was. Now he said there was an animal in the Canyon that is a disagreeable sort of thing, just a scavenger, and they said let's hunt it down and get rid of it. And he said, I said, Wait a minute, we musn't upset the balance of nature! Let's investigate and see what will happen. So he investigated and he said if you destroy this animal, it will mean that you will have no more century plant. The century plant is a very beautiful thing in the Canyon that has little shoots going out in all directions that are very sharp. Not once in a century, but in a number of years, a shoot comes up out of the middle of it to a height of about 8 or 10 feet and has very beautiful flowers on it that last just a few weeks, and then they disappear and there is just this sharp spine again. But when they are in flower they are one of the beautiful features

of the landscape. Now, he said, there is an animal that is able to jump up into the middle of this over these spines and destroy the center and enjoy eating the central part of the century plant, and this keeps the century plant from spreading all over. But this animal is kept down by this other animal you are thinking of destroying. It kills a certain number of animals and keeps them down so that they don't entirely destroy the century plant. He said, one time they tried to get rid of mountain lions in the ~~White~~ National Forest just north of the Grand Canyon, and they brought in hunters and they killed a great many mountain lions. The result was there was sickly deer falling ~~dead~~ dead all over the road and causing all kinds of nuisance. He said the mountain lions kept the deer population down, and this (killing of the lions) upset the balance of nature. But the balance of nature today consists in fighting and destroying of one type of animal by another type of animal. It is a characteristic of a world today. This is something that will no longer be characteristic in this time right here, if this is literal. If it is describing people it means that people will not attack one another or injure one another, that there will be no such thing any more in the world. It is a time of freedom from external danger, and that is the primary meaning of this description of all these animals.

4. It Seems to be a Time when the Curse will have been Removed.

The natural way to take it with all these different animals described here is not take them literally. If you take them literally, it is a time when the curse will have been removed. Now we just cannot take for granted that it is to be taken literally. There is the possibility to be considered of taking it figuratively, but if they are taken literally it will be a time when the curse will have been removed.

Gen. 3 tells us that after the fall of man, God made a change in the creation so that the ground brought forth thorns and thistles instead of the flowers and the fine plants naturally growing the weeds grow now and the good plants have to be cultivated. Man has to work. Nature is red with tooth and claw. This is a characteristic of our present age. Our bodies are subject to decay and misery and sickness. It is all a result of the fall of man. This is described in Gen. 3 and reading this description in Is. 11 one would tend to say it must be that God is going to remove that curse from the creation, not just from man's body, yes, but from the creation also. But that would be too tremendous a thing to simply just tie up this passage alone. If we had not/ other evidence for it, I would hesitate very much about drawing it from this passage alone. But here ~~zag~~ again we find Paul throwing light on a situation. In Rom. 8:18ff. He says for the earnest expectation of the creation (the word can be taken either as creature or as creation) --the creation (that would include man's body; if you take it as creature you would seem to limit it perhaps to his body; the creation would include his body and also the rest of creation) waits for the manifestation of the sons of God. For the creation was made subject of vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope, because the creation itself shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God." In all these cases where I've read the "creation" the bJV says "creature" but in the next verse it translates the same word as creation. "Verse 22: For we know that the whole creation groans and travails in pain together until now. . ." So here Paul says there is going to be a removal of the curse from the world. Paul says it and that fits exactly with the natural literal interpretation of this passage in Is. 11.

It is interesting that Keil and Delitzsch (in this case it's Delitzsch) in his comment on this passage, takes it literally, but he says that the Reformers - Calvin, Luther and all the Reformers have taken all these figures from the animals world as symbolical. Modern rationalists on the other hand understand them literally but regard them all as a beautiful dream, and wish." That is his statement which is not quite accurate, because I have here Calvin's Commentary on this passage, and when Calvin describes the passage if you took the latter part of what he said you'd get exactly the impression that Delitzsch gives of him, that he takes it ~~XXXXXXXX~~ as symbolical. Well he does that, but he doesn't stop with that. He says, here on p.383 of Vol I of his Commentary on Isaiah:

The Prophet's discourse . . . amounts to a promise that there will be a blessed restoration of the world. He describes the order which was at the beginning, before man's apostasy produced the unhappy and melancholy change under which we groan. When comes the cruelty of frutes, which prompts the stronger to seize and rend and devour with dreadful violence the weaker animals? There would certainly have been no discord among the creatures of God, if they had remained in their first and original condition. When they exercise cruelty towards each other, and the weak need to be protected against the strong, it is an evidence of the disorder . . . which has sprung from the sinfulness of man. Christ having come, in order to reconcile the world to God by the removal of the curse, it is not without reason that the restoration of a perfect state is ascribed to him; as if the Prophets had said that the golden age will return which perfect happiness existed, before the fall of man and the shock and ruin of the world which followed it. Thus, God speaks by Hosea: I will make a covenant with the beasts of the field, with the fowl of the heaven, and with the creeping things (Hos.2:18). As if he had said, 'When God shall have been reconciled to the world in Christ, he will also give tokens of fatherly kindness, so that all the corruptions which have arisen from the sinfulness of man will cease.'

And he goes on by saying how this means that there is to be a removal of the curse and the restoration of original conditions, but then he says, however, it chiefly means that Christians will have ~~their~~ their character changed so that they will no longer fight and tear, etc. Then he goes on and lays great stress on that very vital teaching in

in the Gospels that the character of the Christian is changed, but that is not what is being presented in this passage. And he comes out quite clearly in the first part of his statement of the fact that the passage does teach the coming of a time when the curse will be removed.

5. A Question as to When this Situation will Exist. Has it happened yet? I do not see how anybody could think that it has. When will it happen? There are three views. People often think of these views as if it were like you speak of Christianity you have a dozen major doctrines perhaps, maybe 20 doctrines that everyone who holds to the name of Christian will agree on. We have these great systems of belief; we have a great many things involved in it. But here are three terms that should probably only refer to this one question: When will this time be that is described in Is. 11. These three terms are Premillennialism, Postmillennialism, and A-millennialism.

We'll mention Postmillennialism first. The term Postmillennialism is derived from Rev. 20. The word millennium means thousand, and Rev. 20 six times refers to a period which is called a period of 1000 yrs. The term though is not generally taken as meaning a specific length of time, a 1000 yrs., but rather taken as a time in which there will be a complete end of war, a time in which there will be peace and universal joy and happiness. As the term is used it expresses == the stress is not on its exact length, but on its nature. Now postmillennialism says that such a time as is described in Is. 11, taking it as figurative and not as referring to animals, but as referring to human beings, is to occur ~~in~~ before the time of the coming of Christ. Therefore the term postmillennial means the return of Christ will be after the millennium. This is a view which many have held. Hengstenberg, the great German defender of the faith, ~~was~~ who wrote some very excellent books many of which have been reprinted recently, but it is very interesting how he

says the 1000 years described in Rev.20:20 began with the conversion of the Germans in about a little after I 800 A.D., and that was the beginning of the millennium, and when he was writing at about 1850 he says already in our day we can see the beginning ^{of} ~~fo~~ that rising of troubles and chaos described in Rev. 20 where it says that Gog and Magog will rise up and there will be difficulty at the end of the millennium. Now I don't know many people that would agree with Hengstenberg/^{in thinking} that the millennium was from about 850 to about 1850 particularly since we've had about another 100 years since that time, and we've haven't had universal peace yet! In fact there has been no century in which there has not been thousands of people killed through war. Very few would agree with Hengstenberg.

Warfield who did not work extensively in eschatology, did very excellent work in many other fields of theology and wrote many excellent things on other things in other branches of theology, went into eschatology comparatively little. But he took the position that the 1000 years is not necessarily a long period of time, though it may be a long period of time, but that it means that every man, woman, and child in the world will have been converted and thus war and difficulty and trouble ~~and~~ that comes from human wickedness will have been entirely ~~o~~ done away with before Christ comes back. There are people who erroneously think that Dr. J. Gresham Machen was a Amillennialist. Actually, he was a postmillennialist. I ~~ear~~ heard him say in classroom, he said, I do not necessarily ~~o~~ agree with Dr. Warfield, that every man woman and child will be converted before Christ comes back, but he said, I cannot believe that the Holy Spirit will be unable to cause at least the overwhelming people of the world to be Christians. Of course the question is, Is that the purpose of the Holy Spirit? Does the Bible anywhere say that He is going to convert

the world, the whole world to Christianity? A century ago there were many who felt that everything had been (?) and we are going to have this great millennial period soon. I don't think there are many people who hold it nowadays; there's been such a turning for the worse in many ways. Postmillennialism is not advanced by many, at least not by name by a great many people now. But postmillennialism, I think can easily be shown not to fit with the NT teaching. But as far as the OT teaching is ~~concerned~~ concerned, this passage in Is. 9 does not say WHEN this is going to be. And if you take these animals figuratively you could think of it as a description of a long period of time to come before Christ returns!

Now Premillennialism holds that this is a description of a literal removal of the curse. That there is a change in the ^{animal} animal creation, that there is a change in the bodies of all on the world and particularly of course of human beings, and that the time of this is after the return of Christ and it is brought about by His presence here ruling in righteousness. Of course the term as we mentioned is derived from Rev. 20. At one time I was teaching the OT in a seminary and presenting the teaching of Is. and these various passages, and then some of the students came to me and told me that in another class in that seminary there was a course in the Book of Revelation in which premillennialism was being very strongly attacked. And that the professor who was giving that course said that these OT passages which seemed to describe a golden age are one thing, but there is no connection between them and Rev. 20. There is nothing to show a tie up, to show that Rev. 20 is necessarily related. That struck me as a very interesting argument. I wondered just what the answer would be. Just how do you show that Rev. 20 is definitely connected with these passages in Is. 11, Micah 4, Isaiah 2 and many other places in the OT. Then I noticed what I have

already pointed out to you that Paul says that the Wicked One whom the Lord will destroy with the breath of His mouth who is described here in Is. 11 points to someone after Paul's time, something still future. Then I noticed that the same figures are used in Rev. 19. In Rev. 19 you have a description of heaven being opened and a white house and He that sat upon him was called Faithful and True and with righteousness does He judge and make war. Verse 13, He is clothed with a vesture dipped in blood, His name is called the Word of God. There would seem to be no question that this ~~is~~ ^{Christ} description of the coming of ~~Christ~~ in ch. 19 here. Verse 15 says, Out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword that with it he should smite the nations and he should rule them with a rod of iron. There is that figure of smiting the earth with the sword that procedes out of His mouth. We find the same figure given in v.21, "And the ~~remnant~~ remnant ~~of~~ were slain with the sword of him that sat upon the horse, which sword proceded out of His mouth. Then it immediately procedes to describe the binding of Satan for 1000 yrs. that he should deceive the nations no more. So it seems to me we have here a very definite tie up between the passage in Issiah which describes the One who destroys that Wicked One with the breath of His mouth and the description and statement by Paul which shows that it definitely refers to something yet future. And the figures used in the two places, in Rkvelation using the same figure of the coming of Christ just before the ~~description~~ description of the millennium in Rev. 20. There are those of course, who interpret this in Rev. 20 that the sword proceding out of His mouth with which He will smite the nations as being the preaching of the gospel -- is going to be the instrument, and Warfield says that the whole emphasis here is on the completeness of the victory of the gospel. That before

at the millennium everyone will have been won by the sword that proceeds out of His mouth, in other words everyone will have been converted!

That is the postmillennial view.

Third, there is the amillennial view. I will not say view, I will say amillennialism because there is no such thing as an amillennial view. Postmillennialism means the return of Christ is after the millennium. Premillennialism means the return of Christ is before and precedes the millennium. Amillenniumism means the return of Christ has no relation to the millennium; it means there is no millennium. A - millennialism means there is no such thing. Well, if there is no such thing, to what is it that these passages refer? You will find about as many different views on that as there are amillennialists who have given much study to it. For instance Warfield says, though Warfield definitely takes a postmillennial view, he gives the interpretation of Rev. 20 that it is a description of the saints in heaven in the intermediate state. At the present time the saints in heaven. Satan is bound that he should deceive the nations no more means that Satan cannot injure the saints in heaven. Warfield says in his book Biblical Doctrines in the ch. The Millennium and the Apocalypse and when it comes to the 1000 yrs. he says that "the sacred number seven in combination with the equally sacred number three forms the number of holy perfection ten, and when this ten is cubed into a thousand the seer has said all he could say to convey to our minds the idea of absolute completeness!" He says it has nothing to do with time; it simply means the completeness of the joy of the saints in heaven. The fact that it says that Satan will be so bound that he cannot deceive the nations anymore. Dr. Buswell says, In reading Warfield's chapter on this one has the impression of a great mind pre-occupied with other things trying to dismiss an unfamiliar subject with as little attention as possible! Warfield wrote so many fine things, I

hate to this article of his on the millennium because it is the sort of interpretation that can make anything mean anything. As Dean Alford says in his excellent commentaries, he says on Rev. 20 that if you can make it mean other than the millennium you can make anything mean anything!

(Question: Amillennialists interpret the millennium from the ascension of Christ up until the return, is that true ? ? ? indistinct? ?) No, the amillennialist is one who simply believes there is no millennium. Some postmillennialists like Warfield believe it is the condition of the saints in heaven now. Some take it as being a general picture of the church. Some take it as referring to something else. Dozens of (indistinct) It is not a view, it is a denial. But there are these three areas of approach to the subject.

(Question: I read recently about this in and Review by a man who does not happen to be a theologian that it was very hotly contested the name amillennialism calling it the gospel millennium) Well, there might be a position which is called gospel millennialism, but the term amillennialism includes that and a dozen other positions.

We won't have time to discuss this now, but if you have any ideas or questions bring them in with you next week and we'll go on to ch. 28 (indistinct ? ? ?)

VI B. The Character of His Kingdom. Under that we were looking at No.5, The question as to When this Situation would exist. That question is not ans. in the book of Is. but I find a certain connection between it and certain NT books which seem to make this very clear that it is after the return of Christ.

This a.m. I spoke on this general theme in chapel in response to a very intelligent question I was asked after class last time. I omitted mentioning this a.m. one thing I think is very clear, I don't like the term pretrib, posttrib, or midtrib because the Lord says we are not to know the times or seasons. So whether it will be in a period of tribulation in the world, or a period of absolute peace and safety seemingly, or a time when half the world is in trib. and the other half not, the Lord says, You don't know when it's going to be, but whenever it is be ready! Of course that is not dealt with in Is. 11. So we go on to No.6

6. Examination of verse 11--- verse 10 it is. This is arabic 5 is the question as to when this situation will exist. Arabic 6 is Examination of v.10. Verse 10 seems to be closely connected with what precedes. I do not say it is connected because it begins with the word "and in that day," because I believe there are many times in Scripture when the phrase "in that day" means the day I am now about the speak.of. In our presentday English most of us when we say "in that day" we mean the day we just finished speaking of. But there are a number of cases in Scripture where it seems to be "the day I am now going to speak of", so I don't think we can draw from that anything as to the connection between vv.9 and 10. But I do believe that from its context that v. 10 is closely connected with what precedes. "In that day" there

will be a root of Jesse. That certainly ties it up with v.1 when it is said "there will come a rod out of the stem of Jesse." There will be a root of Jesse which will stand as an ensign of the people, to it shall the Gentiles seek, and the place where He is shall be glorious. To trans. here "his rest shall be glorious" (KJV) is a possible translation, but the Heb. verb nuach has two different meanings, closely related meanings. One is to lie down and rest yourself, "there remains a rest for the people of God." That is a very important thought. But the same word is also used as if I would say, "I rest the book on the table." It is used simply for occupying a position. It is used in both ways. Either interp. could be taken here. The RC's have generally taken this statement: "his rest shall be glorious" as being the sepulchre. The fact is the Vulg. translation is "his sepulchre shall be glorious." And there is a place in Jerusalem today in the middle of the church has been since 300 A.D. considered by a great many people to be the actual sepulchre in which Jesus was buried. Special services are held there by the Greek Orthodox and by the RC's and by some other groups. That may be the place, it may not. We don't know. I believe this verse looks forward to the millennium like the preceding verses and that it ties right in with Is.2 where we read: "It will come to pass in the last days that the mountain of the Lord's house will be established in the head of the mountains and shall be exalted above the hills" === that certainly is figurative language; it does not mean that the hill where the temple is is going to become thousands of feet higher than the others; it does not mean it is going to become the highest mountain in the world, but it means == and if it did how would people flow to it? You don't flow up hill, you flow down hill! It's figurative language describing its exaltation, a statement of tremendous importance, to which nations will be drawn, not physically though they

will go there physically, but drawn there because of their desire to learn the truth. It will be exalted and many nations will flow unto it and many nations will say, Come let us go up to the mountain of the Lord to the house of the God of Jacob. . . .for out of Zion shall go forth the law and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." Some have interpreted this verse as describing the present age with the Gospel going out from Jerusalem and leading many people to come to the Lord! This v. could be interpreted that way. But when you continue with the next verse: He shall judge among the nations and shall rebuke many people and they shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks. Of course that is what happened right after the world war == U.S. puts its battle ships into mothballs, and destroyed a great deal of armaments and sold many of its munitions at very cheap rates and then discovered very soon that Russia was building up its W army to the extent that we would be in terrible danger if we destroyed ours and so they turned around and bought back the at five times what they had sold before, a great deal of that equipment and build a larger army than we had ever done before and if we had not done so we probably would have been conquered by this time. The age of universal peace has not yet come. But it is predicted here in v.4 of ch.2. That period then when the nations come to the root of Jesse and His place of His abode is glorious is predicted in 11:10 and also described in ch.2 and also in Amos (you mean Micah).

VII (On which I had expected to spend a fifth as much time on as I have on every Roman numeral before because we have considerable ground I want to get over. So I will run rapidly over VII The Remainder of the Book of Immanuel. This consists of two parts:

A. Blessings for Israel. .B. A Song of Praise. 12:1-6

A. Blessings for Israel 11:11-16 The last verse in ch. 11

"There shall be a highway for the remnant of the people which shall be left from Assyria like it was with Israel in the days when they came up out of the land of Egypt." There are great changes described here - blessings God will give His people but it is not said whether this continues a description of what will happen in the millennium or whether it describes something that will happen previous to it. I do not believe we can be sure enough about it. I think the obvious meaning is very clear. I don't think there is any point in taking our time to go into details of it with the other important things we have to cover this term. I'll say the same thing about ch. 12. Ch. 12 is a Son of Praise. You will receive real blessing from studying it, and applying it to your life and heart. But I don't think we'd gain much by taking time on it in this class, at this time.

(Question: What relation, if any does ch.11:11-16 have with ch. 40, the first part about the highway in the wilderness being made straight?) I don't think it has any connection. It's just a (indistinct words). It's interesting to find a word in one part and find it in another, and very often it gives you a clue to something important, but in others it is merely that the same word happens to be there. I think that is true in this case.

(Question: "It shall come to pass in that day that the Lord will put forth his hand a second time to recover the remnant of the people" What is the second time? Is that referring to the now or did it happen later on?) We don't know. I don't think it means the second specifically any more than another time. You see this is written before they went into the first exile and He has brought them back from Egypt. Whether this refers to the return from Babylonia which is described in chs. 40-50, or whether this refers to recent great movements or to something yet future, I don't know.

(Question: You used the expression, the Book of Immanuel. I don't seem to recall that heading unless it's an early heading) Yes, I have used that heading, it did not originate with me; it is very commonly used as a heading for chs. 7-12. It is the book of Immanuel because all through this section there is the wonderful child, Immanuel, which is in the background of the picture. This is Immanuel's land. God is controlling it; he has special interest in it. Eventually Immanuel Himself will reign there. He reigned from heaven there before He came to earth; He gave His wonderful teaching there; He will eventually reign again there when He reigns over the whole world. So this was called the Book of Immanuel.

VIII Is. 28 :

We have skipped in this ~~28798~~ class from ch. 12 to ch. 28 because because the section from ch. 28-35 is very closely related to the book of Immanuel. This relationship is not specifically stated, but as one studies into it one more and more sees the close relationship. I asked you last week to give me an outline of it simply based on the English text. If you wanted to do any study of commentaries, that's fine, but I wanted you to make your outline first just of what you would find in the English text. I have read all of those papers. It is not my intention to return them, but if there are any of you who would like them back, please leave a note for me in the office and I will get it to you. I'll be glad to return them to anyone who wants them, but it was in no sense a test. I wanted to your interest in the chapter by seeing what you would ~~find~~ find going to it simply without any preparation, and secondly it would be helpful to me in letting me know what I needed to make clear by going over your papers and seeing the different way it impressed different people. I asked you today to make an outline of ch. 29.

(Pass in assignment for today) In assigning this ch. 28 I did not assign it in the Hebrew, but there is a very important matter connected with the Heb. of it which is very important for its interpretation. Those of you who knew Heb. would have noticed it but I did not assign it (in Heb.) and I wanted all of you to be on a level for this assignment. But for our interpretation of it it is important I call your attention to it. This is v.7 which begins: "And they also have erred through wine and through strong drink are out of the way." As you read that in English in this translation it does not seem to make a sharp distinction from what preceded. But in the Heb. it is customary it is customary to say that they have done something, they will, I will, you will -- simply to use a verb with that particular form. It is not customary in Heb. to express the pronoun separately. The Heb. verb means "they have done", "we have done", "I have done", etc. But in Heb. you can use the pronoun to emphasize, ^{the person,} and in that case it is quite common in English translation to say, "I even I have done it; or as for me I have done it, or some such thing. Because we have nothing in English that exactly corresponds with the fact that the verb including the pronoun and then adding the pronoun. Now this v. goes one step beyond that. It starts with the Hebrew word which literally could be translated "and also these." You see what a sharp break that makes! "And also these" --- indicates a sharp change here.

There were a number of your papers that spoke about the full ch. or most of it as dealing with God's relation to Ephraim. I'd say that maybe a quarter of the class at least spoke of the whole ch. as God's relation to Ephraim. You'll notice the name Ephraim occurs only in vv. 1 and 3. In v.14 he says, "Hear the word of the

Lord you scornful men who rule this people . . . in Jerusalem."

One paper suggested a very novel idea that the people of Ephraim had conquered Jerusalem and therefore were the people that ruled at Jerusalem. That was only one paper that made that particular suggestion. But from our study of ch. 7-12 we mentioned the fact that the northern kingdom has as its principal tribe Ephraim and is often called Ephraim, and that Isa. did most of his work in the southern kingdom. So it is not naturally to be expected that he will spend a lot of time dealing with the northern kingdom unless it specifically so states. He is definitely speaking about it in v.1 and in v.3. The northern kingdom with threatened Judah with conquering it as described in the beginning of /? / ? seven. This northern kingdom was defeated by Assyria and the kingdom of Syria was overthrown and the northern kingdom was allowed to continue for a period of another a little over 10 yrs. Then Assyria attacked the northern kingdom and conquered it so very early in Isaiah's ministry, as least not later than the middle of his ministry, the northern kingdom of Ephraim was taken off into exile. Now actually only the first part deals with Ephraim. The rest of it is talking about the people of Judah.

To understand this ch. particularly it is necessary to have the situation in mind. So

A. The Situation. How do we determine the situation? in which a prophet gave a message? In ch. 7, the Book of Immanuel began with a specific statement of the situation where we were told about the attack by Assyria and Ephraim and about Ahaz' == Isaiah's going out to Ahaz to get == give him God's message.

We learn from Kings and Chronicles ~~a~~ that Ahaz made this deal with Assyria in order to protect himself from Assyria, and from Ephraim -- that Assyria would attack them and he would pay large sums of money to Assyria and Is. pointed out that that would end in Assyria also coming into Judah taking most of the cities of Judah, only Jerusalem was left, and then God miraculously would intervene and saved Jerusalem from being taken.

Thus in the six chs. we have looked at, Is. starting with rebuke to Ahaz for this wicked scheme, telling him that God would in his own time replace him with a true head of the house of David, the Messiah, that Immanuel. Starting with that he looks forward to these events of the next few years - the next 50 yrs.

Now we have exactly the same situation here. It is not stated but is quite easily gathered from the statements in ch. 28-29. It is exactly the same situation with one factor changed. I call it 1. under A.

1. The General Situation in Is. 28 and following ~~a~~ is the same as that in ~~h~~ ch. 7-12 with one factor changed.

2. That one factor is that Is. addresses nobles instead of ^{the} addressing/king. Ch. 7 he went out there when Ahaz was on a defence inspection, observing the fortifications to protect them against Israel and Syria, and there he spoke to him in a situation where Ahaz could not make him stop for fear of offending the people. So he wanted to get to work vigorously to protect the city. In this case he is not speaking to the king but to the nobles, perhaps a little later when it is evident that the plan has succeeded. Syria has been taken captive by the Assyrians. Israel has been greatly weakened, and now the nobles are holding a great banquet to celebrate, and he is speaking in these chs. to the

leaders of the people, to the nobility which was standing with the king.

(Question: The nobles were celebrating what?) They were celebrating the success of Ahaz' scheme of getting the Assyrians to deliver them from Israel and Syria.

(Question: But he's not talking to those nobles is he in v. 1?) No, but the section of 28-35.

3. Resume of the General Situation. I don't know as I need to repeat the details of that. I'll just rapidly mention ~~it~~ under this:

- a. The fear of Israel and Syria
- b. The Secret treaty with Assyria
- c. The predicted results - great injury done to Judah by Assyria. And yet God will not allow Assyria to conquer Jerusalem.

We took a little time looking at Sennacherib's attack and how God delivered Jerusalem from it although Sennacherib had conquered all the rest of Judah and carried away quite a few people.

(Question: What was the third of those you mentioned?) I think I'd better not take the time to repeat now. They were a repetition of what I had already said. (Indistinct)

The fact that in 7:12 and here Is. has glimpses of the distant future, in Is. 7 he looks forward to the virgin birth of Christ; in ch. 9 he looks forward to his birth, his preaching; in ch. 11 he looks forward to his rule over the whole earth.

4. The Specific Situation: Is. has to use unusual means to get a hearing. We noticed this in ch. 7. If Hezekiah had been king, Is. would have gone to the palace and given him God's message. Hezekiah was always glad to hear God's message. He was anxious to do what God wanted him to do. But Ahaz did not want to hear God's message, and ~~Isaiah~~ ^{Isaiah} had to catch him at a place where

you could not shut him up, where he had to listen or else it would hurt the morale of the people whom he was trying to hold together until the Assyrians came.

In this case he was speaking to the nobles who were very close to the king and do not want to bother with him, do not ~~want~~ want to listen. So he looks for a chance to make them hear him. And he finds an opportunity. They are having a banquet. They are celebrating the alliance with Assyria and the fact that Syria is no longer a danger and Ephraim has greatly (been) weakened in structure (?). So as they are celebrating this in the banquet,, Isa. walks in and faces the people there. Evidently these banquets were held with the nobles celebrating and having lots of food and drink. Other people could come and go rather freely so long as they did not make a nuisance of themselves. If Isa. made a nuisance of himself they would throw him out quite quickly. But Isa. faces them and say: "Woe to the crown of pride of the drunkards of Ephraim." And the nobles think that exactly fits the spirit of the banquet. "Woe to the drunkards of Ephraim." Look at these people up in Ephraim who thought they were going to overcome us. Look at them! God says woe to them, these drunkards of Ephraim. The Assyrians have come and taken away Syria and Ephraim and they are reduced in strength. "Whose glorious beauty is a fading flower, which are in the head of the fat valleys of them that are overcome with wine." You see these Judaeans nobles kind of half gone themselves, thinking those drunken Ephraimite nobles up there; isn't it wonderful we don't have to fear them anymore! He goes on: "Behold the Lord has a mighty and a strong one which crown of pride, the drunkards of Ephraim shall be trodden under feet." Isn't that wonderful! Ephraim is greatly weakened. God says they are brought under foot. God says

that the Assyrians are not going to be content with weakening them; they are actually going to take them off into bondage about 10 yrs. later. "And the glory of Judah which is on the head of the fat valleys shall be . . . eats it up." And can't you just see these Judean nobles turning to one another and saying, I was a little worried when that fellow Isaiah stepped in, He might sort of upset the pleasure of our banquet! But he's just fitting in with the spirit of the occasion! He putting woes on Ephraim and we're celebrating the fact that we don't have to fear Ephraim any more. Let's hear what he has to say! Let's let him go on a little further. Let's hope he does not start getting on that religious line though.

But Is. goes on in vv.5 and 6: "In that day shall the Lord of Hosts be for a crown of glory and for a diadem of beauty unto what's left of the people, and for a spirit of judgment to him that sits in judgment and for strength for them that turn the battle at the gate." And the nobles say, Well, he's getting on his religious line now; I don't know. Maybe, we'll have to kick him out before long but maybe he'll get back to the spirit of the occasion! So they don't get any concerted feeling to throw him out though some of them are getting to wonder a little by this time.

In v.7 it is "but these also" == the KJV just has "but they also" which doesn't really carry (the meaning). "But these also" -- he probably points to some of the nobles here sitting and gloating about how the Ephraimite nobles are going to be wrecked. "But these also" he said, "have erred through wine and through strong drink and have gone out of the way. The xppriest and the prophet have erred through strong drink; they are swallowed up with wine, they are out of the way through strong drink. They have erred . . . for all tables are full of vomit

vomit and filthiness so there is no place clean." That's probably exaggeration; it probably wasn't all that way - part of the banquet may have been that way." As he says they are not enough stirred to kick him out but they are beginning to murmur and complain.

B. Isaiah's Tactful Beginning. He makes a prediction which was fulfilled 10 yrs. later, a prediction of God's destruction of Ephraim, but he gives it to these Judean nobles and thus is giving God's truth but is giving it in a way that will get a hearing for the further message. Now he turns to rebuke these he is talking to, and now they begin to complain.

C. Isaiah's Message Continued.

1. God the only source of true strength vv.5-6.
2. The direct criticism of the nobles vv.7-8'
3. The murmurers dissent vv.9-10

In vv.9-10 Isaiah is not speaking. The nobles are speaking. The people there in the banquet are talking. Now it does not say, but practically all interpreters agree on this point. It's the only way to make a understanding of the ch. is to understand that vv.9,10 are these nobles objecting, whispering but loud enough so that Isa. can hear to one another complaining about what Isaiah is doing. They say, Who is he going to teach knowledge to? Who is he going to make understand doctrine? Those that are weaned from the milk drawn from the breasts -- in other words they say, What does he think we are? A bunch of little children, that he comes in here and criticizes our drinking! We're all of age. We're all adults! What right has he to talk that way? Maybe we ought to think about throwing him out. He goes precept on precept, line on line, here a little there a little." Isaiah thinks we're a bunch of children and he's come in and going to give his religious teaching step by step by step by step, and now he gives us this temperance lesson and starts preaching and starts criticizing us!

Well they are murmuring these things.

4. Isaiah's Rejoinder vv.11-13. He answers: "They say, for precept must be on precept. He says, For with stammering tongues =lips and another tongue will he speak." What does that mean? God has been trying to give them His message. He's been giving them His truth, His word. He's been giving it in clear simple language so they can get it and they won't listen. So he's going to speak with stammering lips and with another tongue. That is looking forward to the results of Ahaz' plan to deliver them from Israel and Syria. This plan means that the buffer states are removed; the scheme backfires. Assyria is brought right next to Judah; the Assyrian army will come right into the land; they will overrun the land. The terrible situation described at the end of ch.7 is going to take place. The great danger described in connection with Sennacherib's invasion is going to occur. You won't listen to the gentle words of the prophet, to the teaching he presents! Alright, God will speak with stammering lips and another tongue. You'll hear these Assyrians talking in words that are about as similar to Hebrew sayings as say French is to Italian. A person who knows a lot of French can figure out a lot of Italian, but it's difficult to understand. It sounds sort of as if he stutters, stammers. In another tongue it sounds like stammering. God is going to use the means of the Assyrian invasion to force you to listen to His word, if you won't listen to the gentle teaching that you're criticizing. So he says, With stammering lips and another tongue will he speak to this people to whom he said, This is the rest wherewith he caused the weary to rest and this is the refreshing, yet they would not hear! But the word of the Lord would come to him, precept upon precept, here ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ he repeats their own ~~XX~~ phrase you'll notice. "Precept upon precept, line upon line, here a little and there a little that they may go and

fall backward and be broken and snared and taken. Ysu have refused to listed and He gave it to you this way to thatsthe way to talk to children, we're adults, we don't need that! we're going about in our own way; we've got our clever scheme of making this alliance with Assyria, we'll protect ourselves. God says, He will speak to you through the Assyrians. You would not listen when He gave it; he'll give it to your differently.

(Question: Who is the referred to in v.13? "The word of the word was unto them', is he referring back to the nobles?) He is referring to thenobles. You see the previous v.12 says, "to whom" he says; it is this people. It's the nobles, it's the leaders of the nation who have turned away from God. Very good question.

(Question: The NASB . . . there's a little note here that says, "these Heb. monosyllables the babblings of a child Is that the same idea?) Yes. They said, Who is he going to talk to, v.19. Does he think we are children taking precept on precept, etc. . . . They are immitating the way the prophet and the others have been giving this religious teaching that they don't want to be bothered with . . so they can plan their own way and handle things the way they want. So they immitating . . . its the gentle general manner of the x teaching that tries to drive home the truth of God. So he says, You won't listen to the simple teaching; God will speak to you . . . the stammering lips of the Assyrian army.

(Question: Are these still these words used in v.10 by the nobles, are they chosen by the nobles because they sound like that or because of the meaning, or both?) Both. That is they are making this simple thing that is good for the children (indistinct) but why should we hve to bother with this kind of thing? We are adults and run our own lives. We're in control and will make our deal with

the Assyrians and (indistinct) It sounds like a child by

It's like a few years ago I went up and spoke for Mr. Ecklemann in his church and in a couple other meetings in Cornell and in the University he introduced me to one of the instructors in his department; we chatted and before we were going to leave he turned to this fellow and this fellow turned to me and said, Inspire your kids kidneys (???) which of course showed what he thought of Christianity. He thought it was all for children. Inspire your kids, he said. That's the attitude the world wants to take.

So Isaiah says, If you won't listen to the simple teaching, God will teach you by acts in place of it.

(Question: Will you speak of how v. 11 relates to 1 Cor. 14 on tongues?) I think I'd better not right now, but get over the main things of the chapter. So then,

5. The Assyrian Arrangement Condemned. vv. 14-22. He is telling how Ahaz' clever plan which the nobles are celebrating and rejoicing over is going to backfire, it won't work. "Hear the word of the Lord you scornful men who rule this people which is in Jerusalem, because you have said, we have made a covenant with death and with hell are we at agreement. We've made a deal with the Assyrians. You say that they are terrible and so brutal to the cities they conquer, etc. Well, we're able to handle things and balance one thing off against another. We can deal with Russia and with China, and we'll balance them off against each other and then we'll be perfectly safe. We'll make good arrangements with this one, and good arrangements with that one! We know they won't unite against us. At least we think we're clever enough to prevent it. This is the attitude that the nobles would take. Isaiah says, Listen to the word of God, you scornful men; you say we've made a covenant with death and with hell are we in agreement. You say when

the overflowing scourge shall pass through it shall not come unto us for we've made lies our refuge and under falsehoods have we hid ourselves. Therefore thus says the Lord God (now he look way into the future), behold I have laid in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious stone a sure foundation. He that believeth shall not make haste. God says, I've called Israel out in order to preserve the knowledge of God in a world that wanted to forget me. In order to prepare the way for the coming of Immanuel, here is to be the tried stone the precious corner stone, the One coming into the world through Zion, God is going to work His will there and protect it. You can trust Him. You don't need to use these human schemes and clever plots in order to protect yourselves. He that believeth shall not make haste. Put your trust in God. Ahaz can't protect you from the Syrians by getting his == by getting the Assyrian help and then protect you against the Assyrians by trying to get the Egyptians to help. It just won't work.

He goes on: Judgment will I lay to the line, and righteousness to the plummet and the hail will sweep away the refuge of lies and water will overflow the hiding place and your covenant with death will be disannuled and your agreement with hell shall not stand. When the overflowing scourge shall pass through then you shall be trodden down."They had rejoiced before that Ephraim was going to be trodden down! by Assyrian. Isn't that wonderful' Well Ephraim will be trodden down, but you won't be excepted. Your clever schemes are not going to work. You will be trodden down. "From the time it goes forth it will take you, from morning . . . by day and by night, and it will be a vexation even to hear what's happening." Here's an interesting figure of speech that shows how their plan won't work, v. 20: "For the bed is shorter than that a man can stretch himself on, and the covering narrower than he can wrap himself in." A figure of speech to show that their clever

scheme of alliance with Assyria is not able to protect them. It is insufficient; it is only by faith in God they can find safety and looking to Immanuel whom God is going to provide. "The bed is shorter than a man can stretch himself on, and the covering narrower than he can wrap himself in. For the Lord shall rise up and in Mt. Perizim he shall be wroth and in the valley of Gibeon that he may do his work his ^{strange} ~~strange~~ work and bring to pass his act, his strange act. Now therefore be not mockers lest your bands be made strong for I have heard from the Lord God of hosts a consumption determined even upon the whole earth." Isa. says your plans are not going to work; your land is going to be overrun by these folks you think you are going to use to protect yourselves but it won't work. That No. 5, The Assyrian arrangement condemned, vv. 14-22. (Question: "He that believeth shall not make haste" in the ASV it says "shall not be disturbed". Is it figurative?) The Heb. is possible of being interpreted either way. "Make haste" is perhaps a little more literal. The one who trusts in the Lord can know whatever happens he can be safe, but the one who trusts in the Lord does not need to get all excited and ~~a~~ rattled because he knows what God is going to ^{work} ~~work~~ out and nothing can injure him except it be God's plan for him eventually for his good, though he does not see how now. It's a great verse. In the midst of these things dealing with the immediate situation there are many verses which have many general applications and ^{great} ~~which~~ ^{which} can be a real blessing to us in our own lives, not merely to see how God acts then but to see how the verses apply today.

(Question: In placing this cornerstone in Zion, is he saying that everyone who does not measure up to that standard is going to be swept away?) No. (I don't quite understand) He is saying here that God has a purpose in Zion. God has raised up Israel for a definite purpose and that purpose is to bring Immanuel into the world. (Indistinct)

So you can interpret it, If you don't yet know about Christ, God is the foundation stone. Of course Jesus is God. But you in the light of what we know actually ~~it~~ happened we can look back at it and say this is a definite prediction of the reason (indistinct) ~~that~~ Christ, the Cornerstone of God's plan should come into the world, and that the atonement should be accomplished there. He says, I have a purpose in Zion and he who puts his trust in God can know His purpose will ~~be~~ worked out. You don't need to go into these worldly clever schemes. They'll not work anyhow.

6. God Will Wisely Carry out His Purpose. I imagine that by this point either they had kicked Isa. out of the banquet hall and he is talking to a group of his followers who went out with him, or that he changes his tone and they don't interfere (indistinct). Maybe they felt with will be useful and increase our crops to let him give this agricultural material. But you have to examine it to see the relation to the agricultural material that occupies the rest of the ch. to the whole situation. It's figurative, but it has important lessons in it for them and for us, and most of you got the idea of the last pretty well from here on.

"Hearken hear my speech, Doth the plowman plow all day to sow? Doth he open and break the ~~the~~ clods of his ground?" The farmer does not just scatter his grain anywhere. He prepares the ground first. God is preparing, God is working out His plan. "When he hath made plain the face of it . . . appointed farley and the ~~the~~ spelt in their place?" The farmer arranges things according to a definite pattern and plan. You can trust that God is working out His plan in spite of the hardness of your hearts, in spite of the difficulties we put in the way God ~~s~~ is working it out and will work it out. "For his God doth instruct him to discretion, and doth teach him. For the dill is not threshed with a

threshing instrument". No these are things you have to handle gently. You can't take a big machine and rush through the stuff. You have to handle it gently, and individually. "Neither is a cartwheel turned about upon the cummin." There is a particular way of dealing with each type of produce. "Bread grain is ground because he will not ever be threshing it, nor break it with the wheel of his cart," God will have His plan, he deals differently with different people, differently with different situations but it's all done in such a way that it produces the ~~the~~ fruit that God intends. In spite of their plans God is going to work His will.

Now ch. 29 continues directly on. If Isa. had left the banquet hall and is talking to the people to his followers by that time, he continued talking to them. Perhaps he still continued in the banquet hall. Perhaps he simply wrote it later. But the situation that he deals with continues exactly. "Woe to Ariel, to Ariel, the city where David dwelt!" What's Ariel? Jerusalem. Yes, that's perfectly obvious because he says, "the city where David dwelt!" So he tells about a terrible situation in vv.1-4, the situation we've already looked at when Sennacherib invaded it 20 or more years ~~later~~ later. This terrible thing is going to ~~happen~~ happen. Now the KJV of v.5 has a very bad interpretation at the beginning of the verse: "Moreover, the multitude..." The word they translate "moreover" is the same word they translate "and" in the previous two verses. It can also mean "but", and the difference between v. 5 and what precedes is/ ^{sufficient to show} ? . it means "but" You have a situation described in the first four verses which is the direct result of this plan of Ahaz, and that the nobles are so happy about. It looks hopeless, but God will intervene as described from v. 5 on.

If you look at ch. 30 it starts "Woe to the rebellious children" v. 2 says "who walk to go down to Egypt." Ch. 31 says, "Woe to them that

go down to Egypt for help . . ." Ch. 30 ends with the words: "For Topheth is ordained of old; yea, for the king it is prepared; he hath made it deep and large. The pole of it is fire and much wood." Ch. 31 ends: "And he shall pass over to his stronghold for fear, and his princes shall be afraid of the ensign, saith the Lord, whose fire is in Zion, and his furnace in Jerusalem."

For next time I wish you would run through chs. 30 and 31 and note the parallels; ^{make} ~~an~~ an outline of just a few main points (do not go into details) a few main points of the outline of ch. 30 and the outline of ch. 31 and see if you can see how he gives substantially the same message in the two of them; how there is a repetition of the same main heads in the ~~x~~ two chs. Bring that ^{paper} ~~it~~. next time please. I don't think you'll need to take very long to do that. Well stop for now.

I'm not giving an assignment for next week because we'll have another test, about 15 min. Give you chance to review. Last week we were speaking about Is. 28, and I was anxious to finish it and show the connection with ch. 29 so I did not take time to stop for two matters that did not seem to affect the theme of the passage as a whole. I want now to go back and look at two matters. The first of them in 28:11. I discussed the meaning of this v. in context last time. It was important for our understanding of ch. 28 and 29. "For with stammering lips and another tongue will he speak to this people." God is here rebuking the people for the fact that they were unwilling to listen to the quiet, steady, careful presentation of God's word described in the verses shortly before this, so He said He was going to speak to them thro a conquering army, a language that was similar enough to Hebrew that they could get many words but different enough to sound like stammering. "With stammering lips and another tongue God will speak to this people." Now I just heard last night what I had never realized before that there are people today who quote this verse as evidence that tongues speaking is a Christian activity ((Some use this verse to give evidence against tongues speaking as a Christian activity)) Now I was amazed, but then I should not be amazed at it. I remember there was a great parade 150 years ago of Christian people, a temperance parade, and they had banners: "Touch not, taste not, handle not!" And I feel very strongly that temperance is what we should all support, but to use that as a evidence for it when the statement of the Apostle is "Be not subject to ordinances, touch not, taste not, handle not . . ." you would think that anyone could immediately see from the context that that was taking those words out of context and making those words mean something they did not mean. That is certainly true of

of this here. It is God's punishment of his people when they won't listen to the simple clear teaching that they will have to listen to stammering lips and a foreign tongue.

A problem arises when we note that Paul quoted this verse in 1 Cor. 14. To fully study the teaching of 1 Cor. 14 would be outside the province of this course, even if you were competent to do so we would not have time to do it and cover the material in Isaiah that we must. But we could briefly look at it. In v. 19 ~~xx~~ the Apostle said, Yet in the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding ^{that} ~~than~~ by my voice I may teach others also than 10,000 words in an unknown tongue. Brethren be not children in understanding, howbeit in malice be children but in understanding be men. In the law it is written, with men of other tongues and other lips will I speak unto this people and yet for all that will they not hear me saith the Lord. Wherefore tongues are a sign not for them that believe but for them that believe not, but prophecy . . . for them that believe." Now a careful exegesis of these four verses would not be an extremely easy task and we are not going to attempt that today. But we note certain things that are clear. Paul is saying that the Christian should be ready to get ^{his} this truth by the simple sort of teaching, prophesying, presenting the truth in clear language such as Isa. said that the people there refused to listen to. Paul said tongues are a sign not for them that believe but to them that believe not. At Pentecost all these many people heard them speaking in their own languages. This was a sign to these various outsiders, a sign which under those circumstances would attract them to the Gospel. Whether it would be attractive to outsiders under ordinary circumstances or not is a matter that might be discussed pro and con, but Paul said that as far as believers are concerned the important thing is getting a clear presentation of the truth which he calls prophesying rather than any sort of

ecstatic experience, which might give one a thrill and which God might use in a certain way but is not the means God has provided for teaching believers His truth. That's about all we can say on this passage just to note the relationship between the two. I think we might also mention that the OT passages often have truths in them we don't see at first, and the NT quotes them and as we read the NT and study them we get a greater understanding of the OT passages than we had before.

The other thing I did not take time on last time, when I was trying to get a unified ^{picture of} relationship ~~between~~ ch. 28 and the relation to ch. 29, is in v. 21 it says: The Lord will rise up as in Mt. Perazim; he will be angry as in the valley of Gibeon that he may do his work, his strange work, etc. This reference to Mt. Perazim would immediately have been clear to any Israelite who was listening to Is. because in 2 Sam. 5:20 we read about a great victory that David had, and the account of this victory says: And David came to Baal-perazim and David smote them there, and said the Lord has broken forth upon my enemies as a breach of waters, therefore he called the name of that place Baal-perazim." In the v. immediately before it says God had said to David, Rise up because I will deliver the Philistines into your hands. As you go in the v. 25 it says David did as the Lord commanded and smote the Philistines from Geba until you come to Gaza. You have Baal-perazim mentioned here and you also have not Gibeon but Geba. However, in 1 Chron 14:16 you have a parallel with this, almost the same wording except there instead of saying Geba it says Gibeon. The only difference is one extra letter. In Heb. the two words are the same except for the one extra letter. So it may be he is referring merely to this passage. But most commentators, particularly those Samuel says Geba, note the fact that in the book of Joshua we have the account of a great victory, which we usually think of because it says that on that day God

made the sun stand still. That was only one feature of that day. On that particular day (described in Josh. 10) Josh. was fighting to defend the people of Gibeon who were in league with the Israelites, and God gave a great victory over the Canaanites, and God caused great hail stones to come down, and there were more people killed by the ~~sz~~ hail-stones than by the Israelites. So it is possible Is. is referring to David's great victory as an example of the ~~sz~~ way God is ~~sz~~ ^{going} to bring against the Israelites a great disaster similar ~~sz~~ in v. 21 the Lord is going to rebuke ~~sz~~ their plans with the Assyrians by bringing the Assyrians in and reducing the Israelites under them, just as He gave victory to David back then. But the fact of Gibeon being used instead of Geba, and that Gibeon is so important in the battle in Joshua's day may simple be that He is referring also to the great victory God gave there, and that would be particularly appropriate because we read in this context here in v.17 that thezhhail will sweep away the refuge of lies, and in that victory in Joshua there was a great hail storm that helped bring the victory. We can't be dogmatic - we can say it refers to David's victory at Baal-perazim; whether it also refers to the great overwhelming viction God provided there in near Gibeon we can't be dogmatic, but the ~~sz~~ ^{mention} menton of thehail makes it an interesting conjecture.

It's an example of those many points in the Bible or in any other book where there is much we can say positively this is it, but there is also that about which you must say perhaps it is this, perhaps that. Here we knew it refers to David's victory at Baal-perazim, perhaps it also refers to Joshua's victory at Gibeon. A good argument can be made . . . but no conclusive proof can be given of it. I believe one of the most important things in honoring the Lord in our interpretation of Scripture is to stand firm on that which is clear in Scripture, but to recognize the points in the Bible as in anything else where it may be this way or it may be that way.

We can't have convincing evidence of which it is.

Now I go on again to Is. 29 which we barely started last time.

IX Isaiah 29. In some ways (it) is one of the most interesting chs. in the OT. A ch. ~~ix~~ which just at a casual reading you would not get the meaning of any more than you would of ch. 28, but on careful examination you find in ~~ix~~^{it} some tremendous truth, when you look carefully at it that are clearly taught there.

A. Relation to previous section.

1. It is a continuation of ch. 28. There are cases where two chs. are quite distinguished, one subj. is discussed in one and another subj. in the next. There are other cases where there may be something like a real paragraph division, but yet it is a definite continuation of the same subject, and there is no question of that here. This is a continuation of the same discussion. Does that mean Isa. was able to keep going this long to give ch. 29 also, there at the banquet? Or does it mean he had to leave the banquet hall and a number of his followers went with him outdoors and he gave the rest of it to them there? We do not know. It makes no difference to the interpretation. It is a continuation of the same message.

(Question: Regarding ch. 28, being held in this actual banquet hall, does that help us at all with the idea of two Isaiahs later on) No, I don't think that would affect that. If one believes that God can and may choose to reveal events 200 yrs. in advance there is no problem about the idea that Isaiah wrote the whole book! If one does not believe that, it is impossible to believe Isa. wrote the whole book because no ordinary human being could predict the name of Cyrus 200 yrs. in advance any more than someone would have been able to have predicted the name of Hitler 200 years in advance. He might have predicted the rise of a dictator like that -- like Hitler, that sort of thing occurs frequently, but to call him by Name 200 years in advance that's what Isaiah did with

who
 Cyrus. That is the fact that makes it impossible for one who does not believe that ~~that~~ God might choose to predict the future specifically to believe in Isaiah being the author of it all. Now the other argument and there are many are fairly easily disposed of when you examine the facts. But this is the one which requires faith in God to ~~accept.~~ accept.

But we want to concern ourselves mainly with the interpretation in this class rather than with question of introduction important as they are. Ch. 29 then continues ch. 28 and I think it is very important to note that.

2. Relation to Is~~7712?~~ ch. 7 to 12. In this course we are looking at 7 - 12 and then this because they are closely related.

a. The same situation, a little bit later, the same plan to deliver them from Israel and Syria, a plan with human scheming and phenangling and making an alliance with wicked powers which God condemned then is condemned here in ch. 28. The Assyrian invasion which was strongly declared there is strongly declared here. A deliverance ~~which~~ from the Assyrian invasion which may have been predicted in ch.9 -- the deliverance of Jerusalem from it, is a vital background factor of ch. 29 in the prediction given here. So we have the same situation but a little later, and you cannot understand ch. 29 without being familiar with the history of Sennacherib's invasion in which he overran all of Judah, took all of the great cities, overran all the land except Jerusalem, but Jerusalem behind its strong walls expected an attack which would have taken them too and then God delivered them. You might say it took the whole ~~at~~ at Jerusalem, what great thing was it to deliver Jerusalem? Well it was of tremendous importance. If he had taken the whole land including Jerusalem that would be the end of the kingdom of Judah, which happened 150 yrs. later. But as long as Jerusalem was untouched, and Jerusalem maintained its independence when the Assyrian went back home they could go out and resettle the rest

of the land, help the refugees that got back and the kingdom could continue another 150 yrs. So it was a tremendous deliverance God gave there even though He allowed Sennacherib to overrun both/the ^{of} kingdom of Judah (?) That's a. Now b. This section, 28 following, is mainly dealing not with the king as those chs., but mainly with the leaders of the people. It is the leaders of the people who are in the forefront of attention rather than the king. You noticed that in ch.28. In ch. 28, no specific mention of Ahaz. Evidently he was not present at the banquet. This was a group of the leaders. In ch. 28 we had specific ref. to the leaders of the people. In v.7, "And these also have erred through wine and strong drink are out of the way, the priests and the prophets (two of the great leaders of the people) have erred through strong drink." Then in v.14: "Hear the word of the Lord, you scornful men who rule this people which is in Jerusalem. Addressed not to Ahaz as in ch. 7 but to the leaders of the nation. In ch. 29 again we find evidence of the leaders of the nation again being involved. In 29:10: "For the Lord has poured out upon you the spirit of deep sleep and has closed your eyes, the prophets and your rulers the seers" referring there to the various groups of leaders of the people. Then in v.14 he refers to the nation as a whole but particularly to the leaders: "Therefore I will procede to do a marvelous work among this people, even a marvelous work and a wonder for the wisdom of their wise men shall perish and the understanding of their purdent men shall be hid." So we are thinking here of the rulers of the nation, rather than having the king in the forefront of attention.

c. Immanuel is still in the Background. Immanuel was very much in the forefront in parts of chs. 7-12. In other parts he was in the background. We have noticed in various parts of those chs. many various specific references to the divine child. But we have also noticed other passages which probably have a reference to Him. As "for God is with us"

which is literally "for Immanuel" and saying they have overrun thy land O Immanuel! We have these -- Immanuel in the background of part of chs 7-12 and in the forefront of parts. Here He is not in the foreground, but ~~his~~ he is definitely in the background. We probably have a reference to Him in ch. 28 where He says in v.16: "Behold I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a . . . precious corner stone, a sure foundation." One does not immediately know this refers to Immanuel, but with other references to Immanuel in ch. 7 following and in chs after this we are quite justified in considering this a reference to Jesus Christ who is the cornerstone, the stone the builders had rejected.

So Immanuel is still in the background.

B. The Assyrian Overthrow of Jerusalem is Immanent. He has said that the bed is shorter than a man can lie on and the covers are narrower than can cover a man. His scheme is not going to work. It is going to backfire; now we see how it did backfire.

1. Verses 1-3. "Woe to Ariel, to Ariel, the city where David dwelt. add ye year to year; let them kill sacrifices." Number 1 under B, It is the City of David; it is speaking of Jerusalem. ~~That~~ that is where the banquet was. That is where these people who were rulers of Jerusalem now look forward to the result of their clever and wicked schemes and see that Jerusalem has a very difficult time ahead. What's this Ariel mean?

2. Ariel. That's not another name ~~of~~ for Jerusalem! Jerusalem is never called Ariel. But you can make up a name and apply it to a place if you want. That is a rather common custom, to make up new names and use them to describe the character of a person or a situation. Now what character does Ariel describe? Here we strike a problem that cannot be answered dogmatically. That is there are two possibilities that you cannot dogmatically choose between them, but I believe that to the hearer both were present. I don't believe the hearer even had to choose between

them. That is to say there is a word Ariem that means "a lion." So Ariel means the lion of God. The lion of the tribe of Judah! The city that is the center of the rule of Judah. Now that is what you would naturally expect him to say, the city where David dwelt, the lion of God! But there is == it is not at all impossible to consider this word arim as meaning a hearth. The word there is pronounced the same way which means a hearth, a fireplace, a place where you cook. There is much reason to think that that is what is involved here. We look at the rest of the verse: he says, "add ye year to year; let them kill sacrifices." You think of the burning of the sacrifices. There are references that suggest that he means Jerusalem is not merely the place of the lion of Judah, but it is the place where God works out His great workings, a place of fire in a figurative sense, a place of fierce activity and occurrences. It is the place where the burnt sacrifices were offered. Thus the hearth of God is a very proper term to use for Jerusalem.

(Question: At the end of v. 2 it says "and it shall be unto me as Ariel." Does that mean the city shall really be hot around there?) It could very well be. That is it could mean, You shall be to me like the lion of God, ^{a place} ~~which~~ I'm going to protect like a lion. But it could mean it will be the place where the great tension will come, the great heat will come, the place where great issues will be decided. Of course it was the place where our Lord offered Himself as the sacrifice, for our sins. And it was the place where people ~~x~~ from all over the land brought their sacrifices. So the hearth of God, I think is the correct idea here but I think there is a suggestion of the other idea in it. And we'll see other suggestions == evidences further on. In Ezekiel 43:16 this word in our KJV is translated "altar", the hearth of God, Ariel. The fact that ariel would be used in Ezek. 43:16 in a way that would seem in the context to require that it mean an altar which could very well be

the hearth of God, suggests that that is its primary interior (??) does not prove it but suggests it strongly. There will be some other evidences later that fit with it being a hearth.

3. This passage describes great distress and fear, exactly the situation when Sennacherib's army had been overrunning most of Judea and was threatening Jerusalem. "Yet I will distress Ariel and there shall be heaviness and sorrow; and it shall be unto me as Ariel (as a hearth of God.) And I will camp against thee round about, and will lay siege against thee with a mount, and I will raise forts against thee." He does not say the Assyrians; He says I will. So this may mean He will put them into a situation similar to that which it would actually be if the enemy had actually raised a mount and had actually come forward with their siege. Actually He prevented the Assyrians from actually coming against Jerusalem, but for nearly 3 yrs. they expected the attack to come at any time. So he continues: "Thou shalt be brought down, and shalt speak out of the ground . . . and thy speech shall whisper out of the dust." This word hath a familiar spirit" The NASB translates "shall be like a ghost," which perhaps is not bad but the word is more commonly used of one who claims to be able to have relations with a ghost! The spiritist leader rather than the actual ghost itself. But either once conveys the general idea. The situation they will be in where they are hardly whispering. They've reduced Jerusalem so that the people are unable to go any distance from the walls, expecting an attack and destruction at almost any minute.

C. The Miraculous Deliverance. vv.5-8. In the ~~Z355~~ KJV it begins "Moreover the multitude of they strangers shall be like small dust . . ." It ~~Z355~~ sounds as if it means, Well they will have all sorts of foreigners attacking them, but that "moreover" is not a good translation. The NASB is much better here: it translates it "but." The Heb. here is actually the

little word waw, which in 9 cases out of 10 is translated "and" but in Heb. they string phrases together. In some of the good recent translations they leave out a great many of these "ands". Even in the KJV the "and" is translated in various ways. Like at the beginning of v.2 the KJV says "yet"; the NASB just makes it "and". In the beginning of v.4 "And thou shalt be brought down" (KJV); the NASB translates it "then". In the middle of v.4 where the KJV says "and", the NASB translates it "also". Here at the beginning of v.5 the KJV says "moreover"; the NASB says "but". In v. 5 you find toward the end "yeait shall be . . ." That "yea" is simply waw again; the NASB translates it "and". In v.8 the first word "It shall be even as" == so you see how many different ways the waw can be translated. Well, our and can mean many different things too! But this is a little broader than our and and has a wider reference.

(Question: When you say v.3 of ch. 29 that Sennacherib never did actually set up a siege?) Yes, never actually did. (Question: What is Isaiah saying there?) Isa. does not say Sennacherib, he says I will.... I will put you in a situation where you will be as if there was the enemy coming in for this attack. God says I will camp against thee...." He does not say I will let the Assyrians raise a mound against you. The Assyrians could have raised a mound against them any time within this 2 and 1/2 years but they were ~~occupied~~ occupied with other parts of the land and did not get around to it, and just as they were going to get around to it the Lord killed thousands of them and stopped them. So when the time actually came, God said through Isaiah they will not come to the city; he will not raise a mound against you. He will not make a definite attack. So it's interesting he says I will, he does not say the enemy will. There's a break then between vv.4 and 5 and the ~~NASB~~ NASB is far superior in its translation at this particular point.

in saying "but" instead of saying "moreover".

This was vv.4-8 then. In these vv. we have an account of a change. "The multitude of your strangers will become like small dust; the multitude of ~~the~~ terrible ones will become as chaff that passes away; yes, it will be at an instant, suddenly. You will be visited of the Lord of hosts with thunder and with earthquake, and great noise, with storm and tempest and the flame of devouring fire. (I'm getting worried about getting finished with this ch. today so I will very hurriedly mention that this word "visited" (v.6) is old English; we have no word to represent it today. The NASB recognized that/old English ⁱⁿ it means today to make a call, a visit. That's certainly not what it means here. So they have translated it, "You will be punished by the Lord of Hosts" but in the context it does not mean punish at all. The Assyrians were punished. This Heb. word paqad means for a higher authority to come in with a forcible change on some one who is subordinate. It is used in levying an army, when you ordered men to join the army, when you raised the army. It is used of God delivering a group ^{in Ruth} where they heard in the land of Moab that God had visited his people and given them relief from this famine. It is used also of punishment and destruction. It does not in itself say whether it is good or bad. "Punish" is evidently very wrong in the context, because he is saying you will be delivered by the Lord with a great intervention similar to thunder and earthquake and a great noise. He is not speaking about their being punished but about their being delivered. "And the mult. of all the nations that fight against Ariel, even all that fight against her and her munition" (the NASB uses bulwarks or something like that) -- munitions means anything used for war, but here it clearly does not mean what we mean by munitions today; it means more like a fort or fortifications, etc. " And they that distress her shall be as a dream of a night vision." They will say I can

hardly realize how terrible it was; something that's passed away and gone. Verse 8 is a very interesting verse because it is looking from Sennacherib's viewpoint; not from the viewpoint of the Israelites but from the viewpoint of Sennacherib. It will be even as when a hungry man dreams and

here's Sennacherib in his tent; tomorrow I'm going to go up and conquer Jerusalem! He dreams, he gets what he wants. But he awakes and his soul is empty. There is no food there.

Once I was up in the mountains of California and I came to a place where there should be a spring and there wasn't any there; it was the end of a long day, so I camped there even though I had nothing to drink. I could not cook; I did not eat anything. That night I dreamt of a stream of water flowing over me. And I opened my mouth and none of it would come; it just went right ~~passed~~ past. Well that's the situation here. He dreams though that he has water; anyway it's up there isn't it? He dreams he is going to get up in the a.m. and lead the army to take Jerusalem and in the a.m. thousands of his troops are dead! The KJV translates it a little funny there it says and when they arose they were all dead men! And when Sennacherib and the leaders awake all of them were dead.

"He awakes and his soul hath appetite; so shall the multitude of all the nations be, that fight against mount Zion." So much then for the miraculous deliverance that came maybe 20 or 30 yrs. after Isaiah made this prediction.

D. The Leaders of Israel Rebuked for Their Attitude. 29:9-13. Immediately after telling them they are going to be delivered by God's marvelous interposition, Jerusalem will not be taken by the Assyrians, he then goes on to rebuke these leaders again. He says, Stay yourselves, and wonder; cry ye out, and cry: they are drunken but not with wine".

In the ch. before he said all the tables were filled with filth; he said

all these people were drunk, but now he says there is something much worse than their drunkenness from wine. There is a far worse condition. He says they are drunken but not with wine, they stagger but not just with strong drink. They are staggering because they've turned away from the Lord. For the Lord has poured out upon you the spirit of deep sleep, and has closed your eyes; the prophets and your rulers, the seers hath he covered. And the vision of all is become unto you as the words of a book that is sealed . . . and he says, read this and he says, I can't for it is sealed. And then it is delivered to one that is not learned, saying, Read this . . . and he says, I am not learned. I can't read. In other words everybody has a different excuse. It's just like where the Lord says, John the Baptist came not eating or drinking wine and you criticize him; now the Lord comes entering into social festivities and you criticize Him. You are looking for an excuse. Here people are looking for an excuse now to read, not to study and accept the Word of God.

"Wherefore the Lord said, Forasmuch as this people draw near me with their mouth and with their lips do honor me but have removed thier heart far from me and their fear toward me is taught by the precept of men:" Then he goes on to tell what he's going to do. So I'm making a break there,

E. The Divine Overturning, vv. 14-23. The break here is a gentle transition. It does not sharply turn from criticism of them to telling how God is going to punish them. Up till 13 he has been criticizing them for their refusal to study His word and follow Him; v.14 tells what he is going to do; v. 15 goes back to tell why it is done, and v.16 goes on to tell again what he is going to do. "Therefore, behold, I will proceed to do a marvellous work among this people, even a marvellous work and a wonder; for the wisdom of their wise men shall perish and the understanding of their prudent men shall be hid. Woe unto them that seek deep to hide their counsel from the Lord, and their words are in the dark, and they say, Who seeth us? . . .

"Surely your turning of things upside down shall be esteemed as the potter's clay" You're trying to make your scheme to win your safety instead of looking to God for help. You're putting yourself in the place of God! You're trying to do what no man can do instead of looking to God to deliver you. So, he says, you're turning things upside down will be esteemed as the potter's clay: for shall the work say to him that made it, He made me not: or shall the thing framed say to him that framed it, He had no understanding. Is it not yet a very little while, and Lebanon shall be turned into a fruitful field, and the fruitful field shall be esteemed as a forest?" Now what does this verse mean?

Lebanon -- we all think of the forest of Lebanon, don't we? Lebanon, there are two aspects of that. Lebanon is the great forest. But Lebanon is outside the land of Israel. He's thinking here of a foreign land, a great forest in a foreign land. Not a fruitful field but a forest to which he could go and cut wood, but not a place that they would think of as part of what God is blessing. Now, he says, Lebanon, is going to be turned into a fruitful field. But then he looks at them here in Jerusalem who should be studying the Word of God and presenting its teaching and standing by what it says, and this is a fruitful field, and he says it will be considered as a forest. In other words he is going to turn things upside down! He is going to give His favor to a group that has formerly been considered outside the pale. And he is going to cause many of those who were recipients of His favor to now be ~~esteemed~~ just as a forest. just as though they were outside the pale. This is the Divine Overturning, vv.14-23. This is the overturning that is going to happen. These who could read and refused to; these who had the Word of God and didn't listen to it; these who did have the marvelous opportunities and did not take advantage of them. The time is coming when the wisdom of their wise men is going to become foolishness, when instead of sending

sending the

sacrifices and seeing how they prefigure the way

God will deliver them from sin, they study little details of the law and argue about this little detail and that little detail and the other little detail, and as Christ said, You make the Word of God of no effect through your traditions. That is what He is criticizing them for here, and he says that your turning of things is not going to last. You are turning things upside down; God is really going to turn things upside down!. All the world is like the potter's clay -- He does what He chooses for His own purposes, and it will be only a little while, only a few centuries before a tremendous change will take place and Lebanon will be turned into a fruitful field. And God's blessing which has been confined to this little group here, which has been the only nation in the world which has known the true God, the only nation. There have been individuals in other nations, but this is the one nation where He has been showing His mercy; this nation is going to be for a time -- many parts of it cast out, going to be/forest, while that which is outside there is going to be turned into a fruitful field. Then he speaks of those outside who really were deaf, who really were blind, who knew nothing about the true God. He says in that day the deaf will hear the words of the Lord, and the eyes of the blind will see out of obscurity and out of darkness. The meek also shall increase their joy in the Lord. This word "meek" could also mean affliction. The meek, or afflicted will increase their joy in the Lord, and the poor among men --- but this word translated men here, there are two Heb. words that mean men, one means man in the masculine sense; the other means humanity. This is the one that means humanity. The poor among mankind. These who are outside the pale; there who are looked down upon, and knew nothing of the true God, they are going to rejoice in the Holy One of Israel! The turning upsidedown is here clearly predicted. He says, "For the terrible one is brought to nought, and

God who broke them off is able to graft them in again into the olive tree, and so all Israel shall be saved. All Israel as a nation is to come to the knowledge of the Lord, Paul says, but not immediately. And to every generation since that time there have been Israelites who have come to believe in Messiah, many of whom have become great leaders in Christianity but the bulk of the followers of Messiah during these centuries have come from Gentile backgrounds. But he goes on, v.24, "They also that erred in spirit shall come to understanding," you notice above ^{we} he had the ones that were deaf, the ones that were blind, the poor of mankind, the ones outside the pale - they are going to become a fruitful field, they who were formerly a forest outside, but now he says that they who have erred in spirit shall come to understanding, and they that murmured (the descendants of these who were making fun of him and who are turning away from the Word of God) their descendants are also eventually to come to understanding and learn doctrine and so the branches of the olive tree that were broken out as Paul says are going to be grafted in again.

This 29th ch. is to me one of the most thrilling chs. in the OT. As Isa. looks forward for a period of maybe 30 yrs. and sees the marvellous deliverance from Sennacherib, but still even tho they are delivered he still sees a spirit and an attitude of criticising and he rebukes it and we see that eventually it will result in an overturning, a complete change in which the forest of Lebanon will become a fruitful field and the fruitful field will be esteemed as a forest, but then eventually they also that erred in spirit shall come to understanding and ^{they} ~~that~~ that murmured shall know doctrine. (Collect papers immediately)

(Question: Verse 23 are the Gentiles? and v. 24 brings us back to the house of Jacob?) I would think so. (Bring papers up and next time a quiz)

(Quiz at beginning of class for 15 minutes.)

We were speaking last time about No.9 which was Isaiah 29. We noticed the last v. of it "they also that erred in spirit shall come to understanding and they that murmured shall learn doctrine." I said that I believe this points to the eventual conversion of all Jews living at the time when our Lord returns. I would not wish to be dogmatic on that but it appear to me that is highly probable that is what is taught in that verse. Previously he had spoken about the deaf and blind - those who were outside the pale and would know nothing of God's truth - this is those who erred in spirit and those who murmured. Those are criticisms He has been making very strongly of the Israelites in the earlier part of the ch. I believe, especially in parallel 2 with Paul's description of the olive tree from which certain branches were grafted out and wild branches were grafted in, and eventually they would be grafted into their own olive tree. I believe this points to that, but I don't think we can be 100% dogmatic.

(Question: How do you believe this will be accomplished? By . . . natural means or after they have received Jesus when He returns from glory? ? ?) Probably partly one way and partly the other. I would think both would enter into it. It is true, there has never been a generation since the time of Christ when there have not been a considerable number of Jews converted; many of them have become leaders in the Christian church. It's amazing how many instances you come across in Church history of that. God has always been leading some of them to the knowledge of Christ in every generation. But Paul says (and other references Make it quite certain) that eventually there will be a complete national conversion. Whether as a somewhat gradual process, but probably largely when then actually see the Lord and mourn for Him as they have pierced as

described in Zechariah.

Y Isaiah 30. In Is.30 the first 7 vv. are clearly related, while between the 7th and the 9th there is quite a sharp difference in emphasis. I believe there is no question the first 7 form a unit. We'll call that A. Warning Against Looking to Egypt for Help.

Whether this was still spoken by Is. in the banquet hall; whether it was something he spoke to his followers outside the banquet hall or whether it was something later on spoken to his followers, we have no way of knowing. But it forms a definite unit with what precedes in any case. It is as if those who were listening to him saying, We've got this wonderful plan, we're going to get an alliance with Assyria and that means we will be ^{rescued} rescued from Syria and Israel; we'll be perfectly safe -- Isaiah says, the bed is too short for a man to lie on it and the covers are too narrow to go over him. Your scheme won't work; Assyria will turn against you and will do you far more damage than these other countries could ever do to you. Then they say, If Assyria turns against us, we'll look to Egypt for help! That, of course, is what history tells us they did. After Assyria had turned against them within the next few years, they then tried to play off the great powers against each other and looked to Egypt for help. Egypt had been a very great power in earlier centuries. In Egyptian history we distinguish three great powers (periods?) of Egyptian greatness: the early kingdom, the middle kingdom and the late kingdom which is often spoken of as the empire. But the empire period was at about the time of Moses; after that Egypt was in a gradual decline. The reputation of all that Egypt had accomplished before remained in the minds of people all through the near east. When Rehoboam, the son of Solomon was king, King Shishak of Egypt made a raid into Palestine and took away the golden shields out of the temple, but it was only a raid. It was not like the great conquests

of an earlier period. But it was enough along with a recollection of the previous history of Egyptian greatness to revive ^{again} again in the minds of the people of Egypt as a very great power.

Now at this time, the time of Isaiah, the actual condition within Egypt had declined to a very great extent. There were actually various factions there fighting for control and occasionally one or another gained control. So these people are looking to something that can't help them against Assyrian. Eventually a century later Assyria actually conquered Egypt, but of course these people don't realize this as yet. You might say, it's in a way like the situation in this country about 80 years ago when the little United States which people looked upon as a little country way up on the edges of civilization, attacked the mighty Spanish empire. Most of the people in Europe thought it would not be long before Spain would completely overturn the U.S.A. Actually the great Spanish empire had been in a tremendous decline for a century and a half. And it was a very simple job for the U.S.A. to take away the Spanish possessions in the West Indies, and also to take away the Philippines from them. But people did not realize that. To many people in Europe that was the first idea many top people had that there was a country of much importance over here on this side of the ocean was when the mighty Spanish empire collapsed before it.

Here these nobles are saying, We'll look to Egypt! We don't need to look to the Lord. After all all this hocus pocus about religion is good to keep the masses happy but we want to figure out the way we can work things according to the best plans we can make. So Isa. says, Woe to the rebellious children, says the Lord, that take counsel, but not of me; and that cover with a covering but not of my spirit, that they may add sin to sin Therefore shall the strength of Egypt be your shame, and the trust in the shadow of Egypt your confusion. For

his princes were at Zoan, and his ambassadors came to Hanes." These are two towns in Egypt that came to be of importance in this period and had not previously been. People thought of Egypt and they thought of the great centers of Memphis and Thebes, but at this time the capitol/~~and~~ had been moved to two ^{lesser} cities further south, and he is pointing out the changes that are occurring in Egypt. It's not the power it used to be.

(Question: Zoan and Hanes are major cities now, or at the time of Isaiah?) At the time of Isa. they were major cities; their precise location is not certain now actually. The great centers of previous Egypt had been Memphis where the great pyramids are, which location is of course well known today, and Thebes several hundred miles further south, which is today the greatest outdoor museum in the world where you have great obelisks, high pillars, great statues. There was a whole row of maybe 50 great statues there. I had my picture taken in front of one of them and my head came only up to one of the knees. It gives you an idea of the colossal structure in ancient ~~Egypt~~ Thebes. These were the great ancient capitals. Now at this time, they are in two towns of considerable importance. But far inferior to the previous capitals, and there is even dispute today as to the exact location of these two places. He simply mentions it to show that Egypt is not what it used to be. It's not the same great centers they used to have.

He goes on: "They were all ashamed of a people . . . v.5

Verse 6 begins in a way that can easily be confusing. It begins "The burden of the beasts of the south." If a person begins at the beginning of Isaiah and starts going through and studying the different chs., you find in 111, "the burden of Babylon which Isa. the son of Amos saw"; 15:1, "the burden of Moab," Ch. 17, "the burden of Damascus." Ch. 19 "the burden of Egypt." Ch. 23, "the burden of Tyre." All these are headings describing the message the prophet brought against them. If you had

read all those chs. and studied them, when you got to v.6, "the burden of the beasts of the south" you would probably say, "What's the prophetic message against the beasts of the south?" But it is a further evidence of the fact that we must not because a word is used in one sense in the Scripture assume that it will necessarily be used in exactly the same sense wherever else it occurs. When you have a word used only 3 or 4 times in Scripture, there is always a possibility of the sense being quite different. When you have a word used 20 or 30 times, it is possible that ~~there~~ there are different shades of meaning. You will want to go very slow about attributing to a word a meaning that has no parallel elsewhere, but we don't want to assume that a word is a technical word for some particular thing without real evidence.

In this case the phrase "the burden of" is used as a sort of technical phrase for God's word of reproof, His message given to the prophets ~~ga~~ against something or other, ~~but~~ in those chs., but here it is just the ordinary common word i.e. the burden, the thing lifted. "The burden of the beasts of the south." Into the land of trouble and anguish from whence come the young and old lion (these various animals), they will carry their riches upon the shoulders of young asses, and their treasures upon the bunches of camels, to a people that shall not profit them.

He describes the people of Judah thinking they will get help from Egypt and sending great amount of material down there in order to win the support of the Egyptians. He ends with the phrase "to a people that shall not profit them." All of this they are sending for that is going to be useless to them.

That finishes v.7. Verse 8 could be taken with v.7, but it seems much more reasonable to take it with v.8 as the punctuation is made in the KJV. So after this warning against looking to Egypt for help, we go on to B. Secularism Rebuked and coming Judgment Predicted.

Great portions of the OT are directed against the worship of false gods, against worshipping idols. Those are matters found today in the world. Those are passages having a real meaning for us today, but here is a passage that comes even closer to our present situation because he is dealing with the attitude of the people which is so similar to the attitude of great numbers of people, particularly leaders, political leaders and others today.

(Question: Asks for a definition of idols?) In the proper sense, the narrow sense, the word an idol is a statue which is put up to represent the deity and therefore is worshipped. There is the possibility a person may think that idol is the deity; there's also the possibility he thinks it merely represents the idea. The Mohammedans were so afraid that people would worship the representation that according to Islamic law they are not supposed to have any representation, either of a person nor even of an animal. The RC church on the other hand had so many representations that many people came to worship the representation and make an idols of that. The official teaching of the ch. would not consider them an idol but merely a representation.

Idols are very important in Scripture but not in this particular ch. Here it is secularism that is rebuked. Here it is the attitude of thinking it is their own wisdom, their own clever planning is going to give them all they need. This section runs from vv.8-17. That is a unified section. It might possibly be subdivided but it certainly belongs closely together. I believe there is a rather sharp break between it and what precedes and between it and what follows.

Verse *8 says, Now go write it on a tablet and note it in a book, that this is a rebellious people, lying children, children that will not hear the law of the Lord, which say to the seers See not, and to the prophets, Prophecy nnt unto us right things, speak unto us smooth

things, prophesy deceits." It represents exactly the attitude of the nobles when Isa. came into the banquet. As long as he would give them smooth things, tell them how God was going to overcome Ephraim, how he was going to bring the people (out of) this present ~~menace~~ menace, they would say yes, He can say God is, we can say it is our clever scheme is going to do it, but it helps to encourage the morale of the people -- say smooth things, but they don't want the truth given. It's an attitude very common today.

Verse 11, Get you out of the way, turn aside out of the path, cause the Holy One of Israel to cease from before us." Don't bother with this religious business they say. I don't think that attitude is near as common in our western world today as it was c. 30 yrs. ago. At that time there was a tremendous secular attitude and in our universities mostly a person would be ridiculed for believing most anything supernatural. Whereas today in the universities there is a tendency to go after all kinds of occult, mysterious things. It is more along the trend of the idol worship again.

(Question: In vv. 9-11 is it ? ? content of what is written out of the scrolls ? ? ?) That is a matter for judgment, the whole thing was written on a scroll? It simply is emphasizing it. I would say if we are to guess what he is saying particularly ^{Write} ~~right~~ on the scrolls it would run through v. 10 17 because v.17 is a sort of a climax of it.

Verse 12: "Wherefore thus says the Holy One of Israel, Because you despise this word, and trust in oppression and perverseness, Therefore this iniquity shall be to you as a breach ready to fall, swelling out in a high wall, whose breaking cometh suddenly at an instant." He says, Your schemes are not going to work; you'll suddenly find yourselves in trouble. Verse 14: He shall break it as the breaking of the potters' vessel that is broken in pieces; he shall not spare." Now here

you think of a potter's vessel as being like a pitcher would be. This pitcher is broken; there won't be found in it the bursting of it a sherd to take fire from the hearth, or to take water out of the pit." I don't know why the KJV translates :out of the pit. I think "out of the well" would make a lot more sense. You don't get water out of a pit you get it out of a well. The same word could represent either one. It's a matter of custom which one is used, but the word means a hole in the ground, like you would get your water out of and you would need something to carry it with. There will not be even anything you can carry even a little bit of water with. Of course this is all figurative.

Verse 15: "For thus saith the Lord God, the Holy One of Israel; In returning and rest shall ye be saved; in quietness and in confidence shall be your strength," What a wonderful motto! A wonderful lesson for all of us up to that point, but you see how the v. ends, "and ye would not." He's referring back to the message he has given them. Put your trust in the Lord and the Lord will either protect you from the evil or he will develop you through the evil. He may have a purpose in it for you. You don't know that He will deliver you from it, but you know that if you are trusting Him He will do what is best for you. Here he has promised He will deliver them from it == from Israel and Syria. He has promised He will deliver Jerusalem from the Assyrian, but "ye would not." They would not put their trust in Him, and what did they answer?

They said, If everything comes to worst, if they overcome the land we'll flee on horses (v.16), He says, Therefore you will flee! And they say, We'll ride on swift animals. Well, he says, they that pursue you shall be swift. Then He continues, 1000 shall flee at the rebuke of one. Just the opposite of the promise that one shall chase 1000 and two shall put 10,000 to flight! when they are really serving the Lord. But here they say, We'll flee if worse comes to worst. We'll you are

going to flee and you'll get so scared that you'll flee when there is nothing to flee from. One thousand shall flee at the rebuke of one, and at the rebuke of five shall ye flee." The end of this v. is very very interesting. "Till you be left as a beacon upon the top of a mountain and as an ensign on a hill." He might have said, Till there will be hardly anybody left. Till there are only a few stragglers left. But why did he say, Till you be left like a beacon on top of a mountain. You'll be left like an ensign on a hill. Here there is just one little pole sticking up there on top of a mountain! There is a flag on the hill! You'll be left like that. There is an idea introduced here, an extra idea. Just barely touched upon, but very clearly touched upon. You for your refusal to follow the Lord are going to be cut to pieces, you are going to be scattered. You're going to be so that there will be hardly anything left of you, and all that will be left will be left like a little stick lying down on the ground somewhere? No! Like a beacon upon a hill. Like one high pole - the word sometimes used for the mast of a ship. There is just one, but there it is. You can see it. It's on top of a hill. You can see it a long ways away. Or like a flag on top of a hill. Sometimes you can see a flag at a very long distance. It maybe a small thing but it is very very visible. How can anybody escape from the conclusion that that this very strange language used here is a prediction of the fact, that though the Israelites would have ^{their} ~~their~~ temple and area destroyed and would be scattered over the earth, that they would be reduced greatly in numbers, that they would not only not disappear, but that their presence would be very easily seen. That is something that is without parallel in history. Other nations have been conquered, overwhelmed, and assimilated. But by the middle ages you had Jews scattered in just about every nation of the world. When Frederick the Great, the great Prussian general, and conqueror, who was a very

- - a man with no religion, a scoffer in every way, but his country was a very pious country on the whole and they carried out the ceremonies of the church, of the bctheran ch., and he turned to his chaplain one day when there were not many around, and said, Give me in one word some proof that Christianity is true. The chaplain turned to him and said, "The Jew!" In other words here is this people from ancient times which all over the world people are ~~the~~ conscious of ~~their~~ ^{their} existence, and no other ancient people has been like that. An ancient people has either continued in its own area through many bhanges or has been assimilated with other people, has been scattered ~~XXXXX~~ abroad and completely assimilated, but the Jew has remained as a beacon on a hill, as an ensign on a hill, visible ot the world as an == a sign of God's having called them in the first place and of God's having punished them for thier ~~XXXXX~~ unbelief.

(Question: The Egyptians are still around?) The ancient Egyptians were conquered by the Greeks first, and the Greeks took on Egyptian forms and all the leaders became Greeks and the Greek language was the primary language; then the Romans took them over and how much of ancient Egyptian civilization or even blood remains is hard to tell during the period the Greeks, and the Romans, and the Byzantine period. But then the Arabs took them over ~~x~~ and then the Egyptian language completely disappeared and they are an Arab nation today. Now how much of the ancient Egyptian blood is in it it is hard to say; there may be a great deal. But there is also a great coming in of Arab blood mixed together and the language completely changed, the customs and background == ancient Egypt is only sort of an interesting thing to see around you. Not at all today like it was.

(Question: Could this be referring to ? ? ?) No. I would say this is looking forward to after the time of Christ. But it is a picture of

glancing forward into the future. All these things happened to some extent in earlier times, but to become like a beacon on a hill is looking way forward into the future yet many centuries.

(Question: refer to Sennacherib conquering everything but Jerusalem?) That's still coming but not in this, no. Somebody might interpret it that way, but I don't believe that's what it means. They did no fleeing then. They were shut in Jerusalem. There was no way they could get away.

(Question: Does this relate to Is. 11:10-12 where he describes the root of Jesse as an ensign). No I don't believe so because that is pointing definitely to Christ. Christ there is the ensign to which the people will come. Here he is pointing to the descendants of these who rejected their opportunity and who will be greatly cut ^{down} ~~down~~ in number but who will remain as an evidence of the truth of God's ~~Word~~ Word through the ages.

(Question: Is there an OT prophecy that says there won't be an Egyptian to sit on the throne again ever?) But that word ever does not mean ever in our present sense; it means a long long time and of course that was true that the Egypt was conquered by the ^{Assyrians} ~~Greeks?~~ then by the Babylonians, then by the Greeks and then by the Romans and then by the Arabs, so that a native Egyptian did not sit on the throne until King Farouk in recent years. He was only on it a brief time before he was put out of it, and he was an ~~an~~ Arab or a Turk, I'm not sure which, in background.

~~XXX~~ This part then ends at this point I would say. I believe there is a very definite break between v. 17 and what follows, which I am giving a very general title.

C. Eventual Blessing. After this tremendous rebuke from v.8-18 a rebuke that ends with this statement in v.17 that looks way ^{into} ~~into~~ the future. then the Lord declares that His mercy to Israel is not at an end.

There is great blessing yet for Israel. As he looks on into the distant future it is not easy in parts of it to tell what the time is to which he is looking forward, but I don't see any way to get away from the idea that he is looking forward to time still future from today. He looks way into the future. He says, God's mercy is not leaving Israel. He is going to continue His blessing despite so much of the nation has turned away from its its loyalty to Him and from fairly studying His word as He desires it.

So he says, Therefore will the Lord wait that He may be ^{gracious} ~~merciful~~ unto you. . ." That "therefore" looks forward rather than back; well it could look back too. In part of God's plan there will be this beacon on a hill; there will be this ensign. And the Lord is going to wait but he is not going to destroy Israel. He is going to bless Israel, but He is going to bless the world through Israel, and one way He is going to bless the world through Israel is by preserving Israel as a sign, as an indication of the truth of His word.

"Therefore will the Lord wait that He may be gracious unto you, and therefore will he be exalted that he may have mercy upon you: for the Lord is a God of judgment (this does not mean a God of condemnation here; it means a God who deals fairly), blessed are all they that wait for Him." (19) For the people shall dwell in Zion at Jerusalem; thou shalt weep no more: he will be very gracious unto thee at the voice of thy cry; when he shall hear it, he will answer thee. (20) And though the Lord give you the bread of adversity . . . but thine eyes shall see thy teachers.' (21) And thine ~~eyes~~ ears shall hear a word behind thee saying, This is the way, walk ye in it, when ye turn to the right hand, and when ye turn to the left." He promises a time when the people will be very close to Him and He will lead them very definitely. (22) Ye shall defile also the covering of your graven

images of silver, and the ornament of your molten images of gold." He here predicts that the time is coming when Israel will no more be led into idolatry. And of course that was fulfilled comparatively soon. Since the exile Israel turned very strongly against idolatry. Israel has fallen into many sins, and many errors. But that which before the exile was a constant source of leading them astray ceased to be.

We will have to stop here. Next time please look into ch. 32, and make a brief outline of it if you can. It is much more difficult to outline than chs. 30 and 31. Glance through ch. 32 and turn in just a brief outline of it next time.

As I announced before any of you who would like to have your assignment papers back, I'll be glad to give them back. Though I won't promise to do it immediately. I've marked about half of the papers from the quiz last week and they vary quite a bit. One thing I stressed was I wanted the questions answered in order, and if one was skipped I would count off from the total. Were a few who skipped quite a number. I was anxious to have them answered right in order and would like you to be sure to do that next time. Also I asked you to be sure to get your right number whether odd or even. I make that arrangement for the sake of the honest students. I think most or all of you are wanting to be honest, but it is very difficult if the one next to you is answering the same question to keep from seeing something on his paper, and if you already know it but might not have thought of it, you conscientiously hesitate about putting it down. So I always try to have people next to each other have different questions. That's one reason why I arranged so you would be in a different part of Isaiah as far as possible. Anxious to have them answered in order and am taking off very materially for questions skipped.

(Question: What happened to our first quiz?) I'm not sure whether I'll give them back or not, the second is much easier to mark than the first. The first is quite easy to know whether a paper is good medium or poor but to give an exact mark is much harder with those questions than with the last quiz. Not sure I'll give them back, but am hoping I'll give the last one back.

(Prayer for Mrs. C. Mason who fell and broke her hip and is now to be operated on.)

Last time we were speaking about Is. 30, and one thing I've stressed early in this course is the fact that it is very important in approaching the Bible that we don't read into it our previous ideas. In fact it is good not to read into one passage something from another. Compare passages and see what you learn from it, but to take what you've learned from one section and read it into another without being absolutely sure that it is there can cause you to miss important teaching that the Lord has for you. Now in these passages of Isa. he is always starting with a situation of his day. He is dealing immediately with the needs of the people, but then he goes on from there and touches on future events that have an importance in relation to the needs of those people and of course also to the needs of God's people in future times. His vision, as we saw, is not

like somebody writing a history book, that says 100 yrs. from now this is going to happen; 200 yrs. from now this is going to happen; 250 that, etc. He sees something there related to something here and then he may come back and deal with something here and then go on to something which is not so far away as the thing he was from or which is much further away. And in order to learn the time to which he refers when he looks at the future, there we have to compare Scripture with Scripture and sometimes it is very clear and very easy to get the answer, and other times it is very difficult. And when it is difficult it is very simply for us to just grab a hold of something we just got from some other part of Scripture and say, This is what it is! And when we do this we run the risk of losing something there, something different that is important that we should get out of it. So I think it is very important that we reserve judgment where we are not sure, but that we try to see how many things there are of which we can be sure as the prophet looks forward.

Now we looked last time at Is.30 and we looked at

A. Warning Against Looking to Egypt for Help

B. Secularism Rebuked and Coming Judgment Predicted 30:8-17

Then we began to look at the section which I called

q C. ^{Eventual} ~~Avengeable~~ Blessings 30:18-26. This is a long section immediately following after the prophetic statements in v.17 that the people as a result of their sin were going to glee and be fugitives for a long period, but still would not be out of sight, they would not have disappeared. They would be like a beacon on the top of a mountain; like a flag on a hill.

In v.18 we looked beyond the misery that is to come for their sin and looked at the blessing that God promises. "Therefore will the

wait
 Lord/that He may be gracious; and therefore will He be exalted that He may have mercy upon you." In other words, all the Lord's chastisement of His people is in the end for their good, and in the end will lead to that which is highly desirable. "For the Lord is a God of judgment; blessed are all they that wait for Him." The v. can apply to any of us who are in ~~EEEEEE~~ positions of difficulty and trouble in our lives.

"For the people shall dwell in Zion at Jerusalem: thou shalt weep no more: he will be very gracious unto thee at the voice of they cry, when he shall hear it, he will answer thee. And thought the Lord give you the bread of adversity, and the water of affliction, yet shall not thy teachers be removed into a corner any more, but thine eyes shall see thy teachers: and thine ears shall hear a word behind thee, saying, This is the way, walk ye in it, when ye turn to the right hand, and when ye turn to the left." Here are some gracious promises of His future blessings to His people, some of which may have been fulfilled ~~MMW~~ but most of which would seem to look to a condition or a situation which has not yet come.

Verse 22 however, seem to have been already fulfilled. In fact at the time of the exile, the Israelites seem to have been pretty well delivered from what had been a tremendous difficulty for them in all previous periods -- the constant trouble of falling into idolatry. After the exile there were comparatively few instances where ~~MMW~~ Israelites fell into that particular sin of idolatry. And they have been known through the ages for ~~XXXXXX~~ their opposition to idolatry. Verse 22 speaks of their doing away with the graven images and the molten images.

Then v.23 continues this looking to a distant time, of very great blessedness. "Then shall he give the rain of thy seed, that

thou shalt sow the ground withal; and bread of the increase of the earth, and it shall be fat and plenteous; in that day shall thy cattle feed in large pastures. The oxen likewise and the young asses that ear the ground," = = = This old English word "ear", I believe is "plow" in modern English. "That plow the ground shall eat clean provender which has been winnowed with the shovel and with the fan. And there shall be upon every high mountain, and upon every high hill, rivers and streams of waters." One of the great problems in the land of Israel was the problem of the lack of water. There was insufficient water in ancient times. When I travelled there on horseback some time before the State of Israel was founded, we always had to be careful to find a spring, otherwise we bought all of our water. Water in that whole area is often in very short supply. Here/is promised a time when there shall be an abundance of water. These promises here of material blessings, blessings in relation to agriculture - abundant food and abundant water would certainly not seem to be a prediction of heaven. Not a prediction of future blessing of somewhere other than on this earth, but would seem to look to a period that had not yet come.

Then we come^{find a} to a very remarkable ending to this 25th verse. There will be all this plentiful supply of water "in the day of the great slaughter when the towers fall." That phrase seems quite different from anything immediately before or immediately after. The best interpretation of it seems to me to be that it is a statement that this glorious period to which He looks forward is not going to come into existence through gradual development. It is not going to come into existence through a time of peace and ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~^{prosperity} in which the world will gradually get better, but it is going to come immediately following a great divine judgment, following a great divine interposition. Therefore it seems to me that the

great Divine interposition and judgment upon evil. And the next verse fits very definitely with that idea that this is a future thing:

"Moreover the light of the moon shall be as the light of the sun, and the light of the sun shall be sevenfold, as the light of seven days, in the day that the Lord binds up the breach of His people, and heals the stroke of their wound." It points forward to a time when after a time of testing, and trouble, and of great divine interposition there will come a healing, a binding up of their wounds, and a great increase in light! Just how much of this about the sun and the moon is literal and how much is figurative expression for the great increase in the divine light and in divine understanding, we would not wish to be dogmatic about it. But then, so much for C.

D. The Overthrow of Assyria.

You notice he started by warning against looking to Egypt for help, against Assyria, and then after showing how they will not be able by their human schemes to protect themselves. Their human schemes of getting aid from these wicked foreign nations, is not going to be effective. But God says the Assyrians is not going to destroy Judah. He is going to greatly ravage Judah; he is going to think he ~~is~~ can take Jerusalem, but ~~he~~ he is not going to succeed in taking Jerusalem or in putting an end to the kingdom of Judah. This is the specific promise of God's will in relation to Assyria. When the exile came it came from another nation that had first conquered Assyria -- the nation of Babylon which at this time was subject of Assyria.

So from vv.27-33 he has returned right to his immediate situation dealing with the Assyrian attack, and using a considerable amount of figurative language he gives a picture of the Lord coming to deliver them from the Assyrians.

Now vv.27-30 have no very specific statements in them; one could suggest that they are referring to what preceded to a very distant time, but v.31 seems to make it definite that the strong figures in those previous vv. were describing a divine interposition to rescue them from the Assyrians. For v.31 says: "For through the voice of the Lord shall the Assyrian be beaten down" --- not by their getting help from Egypt. Not by any alliances such as Ahaz tried to make. Not by any human scheme but through the "voice of the Lord." And someone in Isaiah's day was wondering exactly what does that mean? How is this great tremendous aggressive force of Assyria going to be beaten down by the voice of the Lord? And of course it was 20 yrs. after this time, after the time of this banquet at which Isaiah spoke in previous chs. and perhaps as far as this too, it was perhaps 20 yrs after that that Sennacherib made his great attack and overran all of Judah except Jerusalem, and it looked as if he could just procede to conquer Jerusalem whenever he got around to it, but just before he was ready to get around to it, the Lord smote a great multitude of his soldiers and it was impossible for him to do anything but return clear across the desert to his headquarters in Ninevah. So "through the voice of the Lord shall the Assyrian be beaten down." "And every place where the grounded staff shall pass, which the Lord shall lay upon him," - it is the Lord that lays it upon him, it is not the force or power of the Israelites or of any alliance he made; "it shall be with tabrets and harps: and in battles of shaking will he fight with it. For Tophet is ordained of old:" Tophet was the place right outside the walls of Jkrusalem where they burned the refuse, and it is a figurative statement, "Tophet is ordained of old, yea, for the king it is prepared; he hath made it deep and large: the pile thereof is

the fire and much wood; the breath of the Lord, like a stream of brimstone, doth kindle it." A figurative expression for the complete destruction of the Assyrian attack, the complete foiling of the Assyrian effort to conquer Jerusalem and to put an end to the kingdom of Judah. Not long after that, less than 100 yrs. after it, the complete destruction of the Assyrian empire, as completely destroyed as **IX** any empire in all history.

Ninevah the great city, a city of three days journey, was attacked by the Babylonians and Medes and it was devastated and became such a heap of ruins that a couple of hundred years later the people did not even know where the city of Ninevah had been! Its ruins were rediscovered c. 150 yrs. ago now.

XI Chapter 31.

I asked you in the assignments you brought in last week to compare chs. 30 and 31. It's interesting how they start the same and end the same. Ch. 31 you might say is repetition in the main. If you are going to drive thoughts home to people, it is necessary often to repeat. If you repeat the same words over and over it becomes very boring, but if you repeat the same idea in different language it drives the thought home. Sometimes a speaker takes one thought and he expresses it repeatedly in various ways; at other times he will take a progress of thought. He will go through it and come back and go through it again. This latter is what Isaiah did in this particular case. Ch. 31 is one of those chs. in the Bible where the chapter divisions are very properly made because it is a definite unit. So is ch. 30. Chs. 28 and 29 are together a unit and it is more or less accidental where the break is made in those two. But here chs. 30 and 31 are definitely parallel. Is. goes back and recapitulates in different language but stressing the

same idea so far as the immediate situation is concerned. So under XI we start again with

A. Warning Against Looking to Egypt for Aid. Here we have 3 verses which do not repeat hardly a phrase that is in the beginning of ch. 30 but repeats the same idea very definitely. 'Woe to them that go down to Egypt for help and rely on horses and trust in chariots'. There were comparatively few horses in Palestine in most periods of its history while Egypt became known as the great land of the horses. The land where the best horses came from -- Solomon sent to Egypt to get horses. The Egyptians had once been conquered by a people from Asia who rode on swift horses and were able to overcome it by this means, and the Egyptians saw to it that they were never again in that particular danger. They saw to it that they mastered the art of handling and training horses. So trust in Egypt was to quite an extent trust in horses and chariots because they are many and in horsemen because they are very strong. Now the Egyptian horses were not quite so many as in the past at this time, nor were their horsemen quite as strong as they had been in previous years. But the reputation established was --- reputations last and Egypt was considered as a great powerful force. If they could only play off the Assyrians against Egypt they would be perfectly safe (they thought). Actually within the next century ^{clear} the Assyrians went way down into Egypt and conquered Egypt for a brief time. Eventually the Persians conquered it and held it for a century. But here he says you think the Egyptians are so strong. Woe to you if you put your faith in them and don't look to the Holy One of Israel or seek the Lord. "Yet he also is wise, and will bring evil, and will not call back his words: but will arise against the house of the evildoers, and against the help of them that work iniquity." You notice this phrase "God will bring evil." This is

old English. Today we say "bring calamity", "bring injury", "bring what is harmful." The word "evil" today has a moral connotation. The word evil in old English simply meant what is destructive. It might be used with a moral idea but it does not have to be. And that is true of the Heb. word rash which is translated evil in these cases. Elsewhere in the KJV it is translated other ways, ~~like~~ like when Jeremiah brought some figs that were very rotten figs, the KJV says they were very naughty figs. The word naughty simply means a thing of naught, of no value. But of course in modern English we have restructured it to the sort of wrong behaviour that a child may have. To us today it seems rather silly to apply it to figs. But if they said evil figs it would be just as bad to us today as naughty figs.

Verse 3 says: "Now the Egyptians are men, and not God." The plain implication is that if you are going to be safe, trust in God rather than in any man. Any man may fail. Any man can fail you. Any man can turn against you. It is only God whom you can safely trust.

I used to hear the noted evangelist R. A. Torrey quite frequently. He was a great big, heavy set man. He used to say, "Every time I have put my confidence in some man, he has failed me. But every time I have put my confidence in God He has never failed me." I could just see that big man stepping off the platform stepping on to the promises of God and being held up by them, because as he said you can always trust in the promises of God. The promises of men may work out and may not. All men are fallible. So he says, "The Egyptians are men and not God. And their horses are flesh and not spirit. A very interesting thing. Their horses are flesh and not spirit. Their horses are created things; they are material things, very wonderfully made, very marvellous beyond any machine man has ever

invented are the many different parts that enter into the structure of a horse, and yet it is only flesh; it is not spirit. To put your trust in the Egyptians is foolish and to put your trust in their horses is foolish. "When the Lord shall stretch out his hand, both he that helps shall fall, and he that is helped shall fall down, and they all shall fail together." So the Lord says here that trust in Egypt will not give them deliverance they need.

B. He then points out that though they cannot get the protection Jerusalem needs from the Egyptians, God is going to give Jerusalem protection. I call B. Jerusalem Temporarily Protected. Samaria was conquered in 721 B.C. But Jerusalem was not conquered and destroyed until 586, nearly 150 yrs. later. So temporarily ~~was~~ here means quite a long time, but as we look back at it from the perspective of history it seems short.

So vv. 4, 5 like the latter part of ch. 30 promises that Jerusalem will be protected from the Assyrians. "For thus has the Lord spoken unto me, Like as the lion and the young lion roaring on his prey, when a multitude of shepherds is called forth against him, he will not be afraid of their voice, nor abase himself himself for the noise of them." Like a big powerful lion with men who did not have guns in those days coming out to him with sticks and trying to meet him, and he had no fear of them at all. So, he says, the Lord of hosts comes down to fight for mount Zion, and for the hill thereof." As he said in a precious ch., with the voice of the Lord the Assyrian will be beaten down. The Lord of hosts is going to come to them. It is not going to be by any act of theirs that they will be protected.

Verse 5 is very interesting. "As birds flying so will the Lord of hosts defend Jerusalem." As birds flying. That does not mean so

much to us today when we have been able to invent machines that can fly. But it was not many years ago that it would convey exactly the meaning it would convey in Isaiah's time. IN fact I read that as recently as 1910, when the Wright Brothers were still experimenting that in the very town ^{near} ~~in~~ which they lived in Ohio someone wrote an editorial in the paper in which he said that the rumours that someone could invent a machine that ~~w~~ could fly was absolutely ridiculous. A man would never be able to fly through the air! They say that as the editor of that paper would go into town he would pass the very place where the Wright Brothers were experimenting and managing to fly sometimes as far as half a mile at one stretch. But he was convinced it could not happen he did not even bother to look to see whether the Wright Brothers were making a start in that direction.

Now of course flying today is something that is very common, but through all the centuries until recently this would be a figure ~~XXX~~ for something that a man simply could not do. Like birds flying. Like the birds flying overhead and you could not take hold of them. You could not stop them from flying. They pass over through the air. So the angels of the Lord would pass over through the air destroying the hosts of Zennacherib. As birds flying so will the Lord of hosts defend Jerusalem; defending also he will deliver it; and passing over he will preserve it."

So these ^{two} ~~two~~ verses give you the promise Jerusalem will be temporarily protected(vv.4-5). Then the prophet returns to exhortation.

C. Exhortation in View of Future Purges, 31:6,7. "Turn you unto him from whom the children of Israel have deeply revolted. For in that day." We mentioned once previously this phrase "in that day" is not in the Heb. what it would mean to most of us. I don't know about all of you. I know some who use the phrase much the way it's used in

the Bible. But my experience has been that if I say "in that day" I usually mean in the day I have just spoken of. It is my impression that most of the people I have known - but not all by any means - when you say "in that day" mean the day we have just been taking about. Or the day we have some way just been referring to just recently.

In the Scripture the phrase is used a good many times to mean "in that day of which I am now going to speak" rather than "in that day of which I have just spoken." Now ~~in~~ an attempt has been made by a number of Bible students to take this phrase "that day" as a technical expression. They say "that day" is a particular time in history or a particular point in God's plan for the ages. It is always possible that in Scripture a certain combination of words, a certain statement may be used as a technical term to indicate a certain precise period or a certain exact part of God's dealing with the world. But we have to go slow about reaching any such conclusion and examine all the cases. When you examine any sizeable number of cases where this phrase occurs in Scripture ("in that day") you find it is used of many different periods. So it is quite easy to show that this particular phrase is not a technical term, and that it may mean in the day we have just been speaking of, but it is more apt to mean in the day we are now about to speak of. So in modern English it seems to me that the idea of it is best expressed by saying there will be a day when -- in that day such a thing will happen: there will be a day when such and such a thing will happen. The day I am now going to speak about such a thing will happen. So v.7 says for there will be^a day. Just before he says, "Turn unto the one from whom the children of Israel have revolted against, for there will be a day when every man will cast away his idols of silver, and his idols of gold, which your own hands have made unto you for a sin." It was another couple

of centuries before that ~~day~~ came, but that has been true of the Israelites during most of their history since the time of the exile; that they have turned away from idolatry. Then in

D. The remaining two verses returns to the situation spoken of in B. but with the emphasis on the Assyrians. So I thought I might entitle it: Assyrian to be Overthrown. As you see here there are these two ~~groups~~ ^{groups} of two verses paralleling the latter part of ch.30 30:8 - "Then shall the Assyrian fall with the ~~the~~ sword." The KJV says "not of a mighty man; and the sword not of a mean man, shall devour him." The ~~NSRB~~ ^{NSRB} has changed that to: "with a sword not of a man, and ~~the~~ sword not of a man shall devour him." It puts in the margin what the KJV has: "a mighty man, and a mean man." The fact of the matter is that two different Heb. ~~words~~ words for "man" are used here. But one of them does not mean mighty and the other mean mean or small. In fact the first of the two words simply means man, a man in general. The second one is used more commonly for mankind in general. It is the word Adam from which Adam is taken. So we have two words here which are not exactly the same but are so similar that it would be as in in English you would say "no man will ~~succeed~~ ^{succeed} in doing this ~~no human being~~ will be able to do it." "Mighty" and "mean" carry the idea of all kinds of men, so you might say the whole phrase is properly expressed with "mighty" and "mean" but it certainly does not exactly express the Heb. because the Heb. does not ~~refer~~ ^{refer} to men under these two particular categories. The two are pretty close to being very close synonyms. The Assyrian will fall, but he will fall not because some man ~~attacks~~ attacked him with physical weapons. He will be devoured by not by any human means. He will flee from the sword. The word sword here you see is used in a somewhat figurative way in v.8 i.e. the sword for a means of destruction, a method of overcoming. He will flee from this danger, and his young men will be

discomfited. (9) And he shall pass over to his strong hold for fear." This is a picture of what happened in the Assyrian camp, when as we are told in ch.37 and also in Kings and Chronicles in the morning when king Sennacherib ~~was~~ woke up he found thousands of his soldiers had died during the night. And his force was so weakened that the thing to do was to get out of the area before the enemies in the neighborhood caught on to what had happened and gather about him and destroy what was left. So as we are told elsewhere in Scripture, Sennacherib returned to his homeland and when he was worshipping in the house of his god two of his sons attacked him and killed him and they escaped into the land of Armenia.

Now there is probably a period of c. 20 yrs. between the time when he fled back and the time when he was killed in this conspiracy by two of his sons. But he never again made an attack in the direction of Palestine. So the impression is a correct impression but it is easy to read into it the idea that this happened/^{as}soon as he got back (home) which is not the case.

(Question: The NASB says "he will not escape the sword." Is it the same idea? One says he will flee, this one that he shall not escape.) Instead of "he shall ~~flee~~" NASB has "he shall not escape." I won't take time now to look at the exact Heb. on that. That would fit very well with what happened. That would be even more literal because when ~~==~~ it was the sword of his son that killed him. But whether the Heb. requires that, or whether that is an alternative that would be possible - - - if it is I am inclined to think that it would be a good alternative to take because we know that that is what actually happened. The next statement "his princes shall be afraid of the ensign" is a little hard to interpret. Whether it means that~~XX~~ his supporters, his leaders knowing what had happened in Palestine, fear against undertaking any further campaigns in that direction ---

that of course is what doubtless happened. He did not attack in that direction again. His son did ~~XXX~~ years later, but he did not attack Judea; he went on down and attacked Egypt.

But the end of this verse is very interesting: "Says the Lord whose fire is in Zion, and his furnace in Jerusalem." This idea of fire you notice ended ch. 30 and again ends ch. 31 here. The fire is in Zion and his furnace in Jerusalem. But ch. 29 began, you remember, "Woe unto Ariel." And we had two possibilities of the beaming of that word -- Ariel, whether it meant the lion of God, or the hearth of God. We noticed that in view of its being a description of a seige and of trouble and difficulty, the idea of hearth ~~BBB~~ would seem to fit better than that of lion. The two being equally possible as interpretations of the word. Now with this account of the end of the Assyrian attack the reference to Jerusalem, it's the Lord whose fire is in Zion and his furnace in Jerusalem, seems to fit exactly with that idea of hearth. I think it is an added evidence for considering that Ariel means the hearth of God, the place where God works out His great design, the place where the sacrifices were made, the place where the prefiguration was given of what Christ would do there at Jerusalem but the place where the great forces would meet and consequently could be described as the hearth of God.

It reminds me of a few yrs. ago when I was in Berlin and I was looking about for a change to hear a good lecture in German and I saw an add that there would be a meeting at which a man would give a lecture on Berlin, the burning point of Europe, and using this same figure. Of course with Berlin being enclosed by East German where the Russian forces all around, it ~~x~~ was at that time perhaps a crucial point in the political situation in Europe. We've moved on in the last 10 yrs. till other points have quite overshadowed it. But it is interesting that the same figure was used in that connection!

XII. Isaiah 32. (Bring in your papers on ch. 32)

(Question: In 31:8. Could that just be the Assyrians in general or could that possibly be Sennacherib?) The Heb. word there is Asshur which can mean Assyria or can mean Asshur the god of Assyria or it can mean an individual Assyrian. Here it is referring to the leadership of the nation so the Assyrian seems like a reasonable translation. But it could be any one of the three as far as the word is concerned.

(Question: You say there are two words for man? Adam and ?) Ish is the other one. Ish is the commonest word for man. Adam means mankind usually, but the two are very important.

A. The King as a Shelter. Here we have a very interesting parallel. Well first another repetition, a reminder to you of the parallel between this whole section and ch.7-12. Chs.7-12, the Book of Immanuel, tells how King Ahaz who is supposed to be the leader of the house of David has proved to be utterly unworthy and is looking to his human aides instead of to God for help. God says I will replace you by another king, a proper descendant, a proper leader of the House of David -- Immanuel. So the divine child, the king who is to replace Ahaz eventually, He is the central figure in chs. 7-12. Now in chs. 28 ff. you notice he is dealing not with the king but with the nation, and particularly with its ~~IN~~ leader. And up to this point he has been mostly speaking about them and saying that they would be replaced for a time with another people because of their sin, because of their turning away from God, God was going to make the ~~XXXXX~~ forest outside be like a fruitful field and the fruitful field be like a forest. God was going to punish them for a time by changing the leadership of his people for a time and then eventually bring them all back as in the case

of the figure of the olive tree that Paul gives in Rom. 11.

Now in ch. 10, at the end of ch. 10 you recall we had the downfall of Assyria. We had a series of pictures, of Lebanon falling like a mighty one and Assyria at the end of ch. 10 and the beginning of ch. 11 was there shall be a branch out of the Root of Jesse that shall come up, and Assyria was going down, but Israel would seem to be practically destroyed but out of the house of Jesse would come this root, this wonderful prediction of Christ the Divine Son of David.

Now here we have at the end of ch. XX 31 the destruction of Assyria, and then it goes right on to say, "Behold, a king shall reign in righteousness, and princes shall rule in judgment." The theme of this XXXIX section as compared with chs. 7-12 is the princes rather than the king, and we had hardly anything about Immanuel or the king in chs. 28 to 31. But Immanuel is still in background as much as before and here he comes to the foreground. So exactly as in chs. 10 to 11 you pass from the downfall of Assyria to the rise of God's kingdom of the stem of Jesse, here you pass from the downfall of Assyria to the king who reigns in righteousness. So we read: "Behold a king shall reign in righteousness, and princes shall rule in judgment, and a man shall be as an hiding place from the wind the ~~XXXXXXXX~~, and a covert from the tempest; as rivers of water in a dry place, ~~as~~ as xi the shadow of a great rock in a weary land." A marvelous picture of what this king is to be to all who put their faith in Him. One of the grand verses of the Bible in describing Christ and what He is to His people. A man - the God-Man is going to be such a hiding place, such a shelter, he is going to be like rivers of water and the shadow of a great rock.

Now we have had a number of passages which most probably are

pointing to the Millennium. We've had a number of such passages. But this particular verse is not in that category. Because the Millennium is a time of freedom from external danger, external danger is removed. But here in v.2 external danger is still there but He is protecting you from it. So this is not a picture of the Millennium, but a period before. It is a picture of a King who is to reign in righteousness, but who is as a Man, as the God-Man, to be a KING hiding place and a rock, and a protection for all who put their trust in Him. So these two verses, while v. 1 is one that will not find its full outworking until the time of the Millennium, both verses are verses that can apply very definitely to our own situation today.

(Question: Would you comment on the view that those verses there are a prediction of Hezekiah rather/^{than} of Messiah?) Yes. The later Jews interpreting the Messianic passages, there were a number of them in the early Christian centuries, there were a number of them who tried to apply all the Messianic passages to Hezekiah. But there were others who pointed out that that could not work out. Hezekiah was a wonderful change from Ahaz; he was a very godly king, but he was just a brief interval inbetween ungodly kings before and after. He was a brief interval, you might say he was a picture of what Immanuel would be, but he definitely was not Immanuel. He definitely was not a hiding place from the wind, or the shadow of a great rock.

(Question: The NASB the way it reads seems to imply that the princes will be the shelter, and the KJV that the King himself. Would you clarify which of those is right.) I would say that it is definitely the King, but in Heb. singular words are very often used as collectives. So that you could not translate a plural word as 'a man', but you could translate the singular "man" as a group of men. Collectives

occur every now and then so it is not a mistranslation, but I would say it is not the best translation, that the other is more literal. (the KJV)
It is the King who is the hiding place rather than the princes.
The king -- an actual physical king, may exert his power through princes very often, but it is the king here who is the hiding place.

(Question: Would it be possible to translate this as ? ? ?) includes it (?)

Well princes in quotes. It's definitely plural. So this would not be the same. The princes are brought in here because we are dealing with the princes mostly in this section, but in this immediate section our stress is on the king.

Now then Section B. is vv. 3-8 -- Clarification Promised.

This could be a very difficult section.)vv.3-8). I think that title gives a clue to it. I think another clue to it is furnished by looking at Is.5:20 (where you will find) the prophet saying: "Woe unto them that call evil good and good evil, that put darkness for light and light for darkness, EEZ that put bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter; woe unto them that are wise in their own eyes, and prudent in their own sight." He is pointing out there the attitude of those who switch things around like they do in Pennsylvania politics where the statement was made on all the radios the day after election LEHIGH COUNTY IS THE FIRST COUNTY IN THE STATE TO ADOPT HOME RULE. And when you look at it, What/you NN mean by home rule? Do you mean that some things that used to be done way off the Washington and Harrisburgh are now done near us? No! It means that what the communities and towns of Lehigh county used to do will now all be centralized in this County Government, so it will be the exact opposite of home rule. It will be greater centralization. But a term is used so often, just as the communists are constantly calling their countries democratic republics and there is nothing

less democratic in the world than a communist government. But it is a common thing particularly in these days to call good evil and evil good, light dark and dark light, and mix everything all up. Here there is a passage in which it follows that in the light of this king, in the light of His righteousness and His judgment, His people will be able to look at things correctly and see them in their right perspective.

Now one unfortunate thing in the KJV is that the word "liberal" occurs a good many times in it, and the word "liberal" in recent years has adopted a very special significance it ~~did not formerly~~ have, that it did not have in the days of King James. Yet it still keeps the ^{generous} ? If someone is ~~XXXXXX~~ to you, if someone interprets a promise in a ^{bread} way instead of in a narrow way you'll say, He's very liberal. Now that's not the usual sense of the word today, but it still is I believe an accepted use of the word liberal. It is better on account of the way the word has come to be used in another sense now where it speaks of liberal to say generous, or magnanimous and with that change in mind this passage is not too difficult to understand (vv.3-8).

Next time please look at chs. 33,34,35. I'm not asking you to go into them in detail, but look at the three chs. in general and see what you note of relationship between them and bring me in a brief statement on it. I'm not asking you to spend a long time on it; they are not long chs. but to get a general idea of the content of those three chs. We'll continue there next time. (The inter-relation of the chs., not detailed). Get it yourself from the Scriptures not from what someone else says.

(Comments on the last exam . . . and announcement of next exam. Will be similar type exam. Example: Mention the verses that deal with Immanuel; the passages that deal with N. Israel; with Sennacherib's invasion. Open unmarked Bible. Know what my view is.

One of the main things I've been giving in the course is to stress the fact that the basis of our understanding is Biblical. It is much more interesting to take the study of a certain doctrine, or a certain matter of contemporary life. These are vital practical matters we have to deal with but I believe that the Lord has put in the Bible a great deal of truth that applied to a particular time and has never been seen before those times. There may be a great deal of truth in the Bible that nobody has noticed yet. In order to understand it we have to understand the parts that refer to the time of their contemporaries and see how they relate to our time. Parts directly relating to the contemporaries are important to us as we get into similar situations; by analogy they have tremendous importance, to us. But parts which look forward to future events, if they are already fulfilled they are tremendous help to us in understanding the NT, in understanding different phases of Christian truth. If they have ~~not~~ not yet been fulfilled we can derive great spiritual blessing from it, but I believe we should go slow and be careful about being dogmatic as to exactly what is meant by a prediction about events that are not yet fulfilled.

The predictions about the life of our Lord would have been very difficult for anyone before He was born to say ~~any~~ exactly how these predictions were going to be fulfilled. The main purpose of predictions about the future is not to tell us what is going to happen, but to tell us that when events do happen we can see that they fit with what the Bible says, and therefore our confidence in the Bible is strengthened by it and also we learn more about how to interpret the Bible. So I have not been dogmatic about statements about things that are still

futu_re/ But I think it is very important that we learn to distinguish between what has already been fulfilled and what is still future, as far as we can tell with certainty.

I believe a very important aspect of approach to the Scripture is not to do like professors do in many an area, in many a field of study a professor takes a thing that is so plain he thinks everybody knows it, and well it's just so and so. Then he takes something that he alone believes in and he pounds the table and says this means this -- he is so anxious to get it across a person could get the idea that that is what is clear and definite. That's a danger we can all easily run into.

But I believe it is very very vital we say here are matters that are absolutely clear and definite. Here are other matters that probably mean this; here are matters on which we can't be quite sure, we must keep an open mind so that when we find truths from other parts of the Scripture it will enable us to understand that -- them, and we won't overlook them because we have read into them something which may be ~~of~~ a great truth taught somewhere else in Scripture but which may not be taught in that particular passage.

Most of our courses are 2 hrs., and this is only 1 hr. credit; it's a bit hard with 6 hours required for graduation to fit one hour course into it. I will give another 1 hr. course a year from now, and any who may want to take that and combine it with this that will be two one hour courses that will be equivalent to one two hour course, and at that time I will take up Is.1-6 and Is.56-66.. These two passages are not related like the two we are taking now. Each of them is a different problem, but each of them has some fascinating and tremendously important material. These two we have taken this year are closely related. I don't think anyone really understands ch. 23ff

unless they have an idea of ch.7-12 and see how the two fit together. They deal with two different aspects of the same general truth.

One thing we want to recognize is the Christological approach to Scripture. The fact that Christ is the center of Scripture. Now a century to a century and a half ago, all Bible students were ready to find Christ in just about every v. of Scripture. They found in just about everything they interpreted in a way referring to Christ or His work. Then there came a big reaction against that, particularly in the German scholarship. It brought out the important fact that much of Scripture deals with immediate situations. That's important and we try to stress that in this class. Much you cannot understand without understanding the immediate situation. But this was carried to such an extreme that in just about any place 30 yrs. ago where you could get a doctor's degree in understanding the Scripture, just about any place in the world where you could at that time, all the Christological interpretations were explained away so that they just were not in the Scriptures. You could explain just about everything to mean something different, and get rid of any prediction of Christ in the OT and of most of His claims in the NT.

In the last 20 to 30 yrs. there has developed a much larger group of evangelical Christian scholarship than existed 30 to 40 yrs. ago when the modernists pretty much had their own way. But just about everybody who has had an advanced degree in Semetic or Biblical studies, just about everyone except for one or two institutions, has had to study under men who were thoroughly convinced that it was purely mythological, the idea that the OT had anything to say about Christ. So they had explained away the OT statements referring to Christ, almost entirely. Now those who had studied under them, who were thoroughly evangelical, rejected this as far as the main passages were

concerned, but most of them were influenced by that approach. Now the NASB is on the whole a very excellent translation and very accurate. I don't think the NT has anything like the smooth flow of style that the NIV has, but I hope the OT when it comes out will have == be thoroughly accurate and also have a fine flowing style. There is always the problem of going a little too much to one direction or the other, if you don't have the necessary amount of time to do the amount of work necessary to meet both goals on a verse. But in the NASB on the whole it is very dependable. But there are a few places where it has unfortunately been affected by this bias, I'm sure unconsciously on the part of those who composed it. There are a few bad errors in the KJV. No trans. is altogether accurate. There are a few very bad errors in the KJV, though it was made by thoroughly godly scholars, and on the whole it leans a little more toward increasing that which refers to Christ rather than doing away with. In the NASB you don't find much of that bias, but you do once and a while. There are a couple of cases in Isaiah which I think are very unfortunate. I referred to one of them at our last meeting. Where we spoke about Is. 33. There 33:1, "Behold a king shall reign righteously." The NASB says that kings shall reign righteously. The KJV says "Behold a king shall reign in righetousness and princes shall rule in justice (in judgment - old English), in justice is in the NSRB. "Rule justly" is NASB. Then the next v. is lit. trans. in KJV, "And a man shall be like a hiding place from the wind and a covert from the tempest like rivers of water in a dry place; like the shadow of a great rock in a weary land." And most of these statements are statements you can find somewhere in the Psalms about God, and of course Jesus Christ is God. They refer to the triune God, but they also fit Christ; and during the time between Christ's first coming and his second when there is misery and danger in the world. when there is suffering. this is one of the great

verses that a Christian has a right to claim, that a man shall be like a hiding place from the wind, a covert from the tempest, like rivers of water in a dry place, like the shadow of a great rock in a weary land. Now the anti-Christian scholars of 50 yrs. ago, or 100 yrs. ago, were naturally anxious to remove any ideas of a Man, the God-Man being this, which God is of course, but for the God-Man to be it it is a wonderful verse if you take it as the KJV has it. They were anxious to remove that. And the word ish which hundreds of times in Scripture means a man is used a few times, very few, where it can correctly be translated as "each."

Those cases are like this were you say, "And they fought each against his companion." There it would be a man against his companion. There are cases like that where the word is used after a plural verb immediately preceding. It is used to mean each of these. So instead of trans. this literally, "a man shall be", these scholars not believing you could find the God-Man in the OT, trans. it "each shall be" and they make it the princes. Well, if it's wrong to say that Jesus Christ is all these things, it is utterly ludicrous to say that the princes will be a shadow of a great rock in a weary land and a covert from the tempest! It is utterly ludicrous. But many of the translations that you find in the RSV which get away from the Christological teaching are utterly ludicrous! Like where it speaks in Micah of His goings forth from eternity, which is the literally rendering/ of the Heb. The KJV says of Christ. The Heb. says His goings forth have been from eternity. The .SV says, His lineage is from ancient times; -- his descendants are from ancient times! Well all of us are descendant from ancient times. This would be nothing wonderful to say about Him! The Heb. is literally "his goings forth", plu of the vb. to go forth and describes Jesus Christ going forth to create the world, going forth to represent God as He spoke to Abraham and to others in OT times.

The activity of Christ before He became the God-Man is referred to. But the RSV translates it his lineage. And where it says, "kiss the Son" (Ps.) they say, "kiss his feet" and then they put a footnote "Heb. is obscure." Of course there is nothing obscure about it. It is the word bar which they transl son in another place. But here they get rid of it. Now it is unfortunate that in the NASB in most cases they have correctly translated, but in Is. 32:2 they have trans. it the modernist way "each shall be a refuge from the wind." I don't say that is impossible, not impossible to say "each." But literally it is 'a man'. The reading 'a man' fits with the NT teaching ~~XXXXXXXX~~ about the God-Man. "A man" is in line with the wonderful teaching about the God-Man and the statements made about him are perfectly ridiculous to apply to ~~all~~ all these princes! To apply to ~~any~~ any man in fact except the God-Man. No other man is a refuge from the wind, a shelter from the storm, etc. It is one of the very few unfortunate trans. in the NASB.

There are also some unfortunate trans. in the KJV but they are not unfortunate for that particular reason. In that case it was not the bias of the men translating it, but the bias of men under whom they had studied, in their advanced word. It is very difficult to take advanced work under unbelievers and not be affected by it. Very difficult. I have found in ~~a~~ connection with my work with the NIV OT men who want to stand loyal to the Scriptures, but men who have taken their advanced degree under utter unbelievers. I have found ~~that~~ that at point after point the bias comes out, that they have been exposed to.

I went into the mother ch. of Christian Science in Boston, Mass. and it is utterly blasphemous they way they have up here a quotation

from Peter; they will then have Mary Baker Eddy over here what she says; and then they will have over here something from Christ; and then over here another from Mary Baker Eddy. They will have all around the room quotations from the Bible with something from Mary Baker Eddy next to it, but I was struck by one of the statements by Mary Baker Eddy which struck me as very good. She said, Never go into a place of moral or spiritual defilement except for the definite purpose of bringing somebody out." I think that is an important thing. When we go into the midst of defilement it is almost impossible to escape being defiled oneself. It is necessary to do it if we have a definite Christian purpose in doing it, but we should be very careful about doing it.

I praise God for the NASB which is on the whole a very good translation and dependable in most cases, but I was shocked in this place and one other which I will mention next year, because it comes between ch. 56 and 66, that I happened to notice this morning, I was greatly shocked at that second one, at the translation which has no basis in the original whatever but which is so widely taught as accepted facts by those who do not believe in predictive prophecy that somehow it got into this translation. But such are rare in the translation.

I asked you today to run over chs. ~~XX~~ 33,34,35. My guess is that you had no difficulty in getting the general idea of chs. 34 and 35, but great difficulty in getting the idea of ch. 33. (Collect papers right now.)

As we mentioned at the beginning of the year we must realize that ~~MM~~ God gave the prophet glimpses into the future, and the prophet could not tell often how far these glimpses into the future go. In ch. 7-12 as you get toward the end of the section the vision goes

further into the future than before. Consequently you get more toward the end of these than toward the beginning the difficulty because it is not yet fulfilled. Sometimes it is not clear as to the precise time involved.

Chs. 34 and 35 are very beautiful chapters, and they are parallel chs. giving you visions of the wonderful things that God is going to do upon this earth. He starts with the condemnation (in ch. 34) of wickedness and he speaks particularly of Edom which became a great enemy of Israel and which they would have expected to be more friendly because they claimed descent from the brother of Jacob and in ch. 34 he gives a terrible picture of the misery which will come to the enemies of God. Just when will this period be?

The land of Edom for many centuries was an area that was desert and very much undeveloped and fits to a large extent the description of this ch. The wild beasts of the desert and the wild goats and screech owls, none of them lacking their mate; dwelling from generation to generation, all of that fits them. Lately there has been more development there as the people from Palestine fled. When the Zionists took over and some of them settled in that area and there has been some development. So I don't know how literally that describes that area now. Whether there will be a section of the world during the millennium in which the evidence of God's wrath will be evident as described in ch. 34 here or whether more of it is to be taken as figurative representation of His wrath upon the wicked through eternity it is hard to say. But many of the figures are very hard to think of as applying to anything that is other than earthly.

Now in ch. 35 you have the companion picture. In ch. 35 you have the wilderness, the solitary place, and the desert rejoicing and

blossoming like a rose; you have the wonderful picture of the lame man leaping as an hart and God's blessing. In v.8 ~~is~~ the highway, the way of holiness, the wayfaring man though a fool shall not err therein. That phrase at the end of v.8 can be trans. differently. I prefer the KJV there to what the NASB has - "the unclean will not travel on it, but it will ~~be~~ for him that walks that way and fools will not wander on it." It seems to me it makes a little more sense to translate it as the KJV, "the wayfaring man though a fool shall not err therein." I have often used it figuratively for the *Scripture* plain for the fact that the great basic things of Scripture are so ~~plain~~ that a wayfaring man though a fool need not err therein, though when you get deeper into the Scripture it requires deep and careful thought. That, of course, is a figurative use of it. The words are a bit obscure, so I don't say the NASB is impossible there, but they have put a good bit in italics. They say, "fools will not wander." This says, the wayfaring man though a fool will not err. It is a description of the wonders of something God is going to establish and to me it sounds like an earthly condition, not like a picture of eternity.

I don't think the Lord has told us much about eternity. People talk about the eternal state. I find very little in Scripture that I think gives us any warrant for saying this gives us a description of the eternal state. I think we have wonderful description of what God is going to do on this earth after our Lord comes back. In Rev. we are told that after 1000 yrs. there will be an uprising which will be put down, and then comes the judgment of the wicked. What happens after that I don't think Scripture has told. I don't know whether after putting down that uprising God as all in all will continue to reign on this earth or whether He will move us somewhere else, just what he'll do, I don't know and I don't think the Scripture makes clear, but I ~~do~~ do think we'll have a marvellous time similar to the

description of ch. 35 that is to be upon this earth after our Lord comes back.

Now I skipped over ch. 33 because ch. 33, as you look at it, you find it very difficult at first to get hold of. There is not much to get hold of in ch. 33. If it was not for our previous context, for the background that we have, I believe we would find ch. 33 a very difficult ch. to interpret coherently. But in view of the background we've had in these chs. I believe that ch. 33 falls into line very reasonably if we take it as a picture of that which looms so large in chs. 7-12, and particularly in chs. 28-31, the coming of Sennacherib. This great invasion by the Assyrians in which they overran all of the lands of Judah except Jerusalem, and if they had taken Jerusalem Israel would have been sunned out at that time, but God wishes to continue another century and so He miraculously delivered Jerusalem from them by slaying this multitude of troops of Sennacherib's army and Sennacherib had to return to his home. I believe ch. 33 is entirely a description of that situation. I believe it will be helpful to us to glance at it more in detail than we have done in chs. 34 and 35, wonderful as those chs. are because those chs. don't have the same problems that this does.

Ch. 33 starts: "Woe to thee that spoilest, and thou wast not spoiled; and dealest treacherously, and they dealt not treacherously with thee! when thou shalt cease to spoil . . . they shall deal treacherously with thee." Now that of course taken by itself does not tell us what ^{to apply it to} ??? You could easily apply it to Hitler who attacked other nations that had done nothing against him, and tried to overcome and plunder them and then was overcome himself and completely despoiled. That could easily apply to what has happened in our day. I don't think it does. I think it has a specific reference to something.

(Question: Are you going to finish ch. 32 for us?) Yes. What it before ch. 33? . . . I'll go back to it.

In ch. 33 we have a unit as much as any ch. in Isaiah. Ch.33:1 does not tell you who it applies to but it can fit the Assyrian very well because Assyria was the first great aggressor in history. They started in making a regular practice of attacking neighboring lands and conquering them one after another, countries that had never done anything against them, and they dealt very ~~ferociously~~ ^{ferociously} with them, and in the end the enemies of Assyria gathered themselves together against the Assyrians and overcame them and completely destroyed ~~their~~ ^{their} capitol city of Ninevah so that it never again was inhabited and people even completely forgot where it had been, one fo the greatest cities in the world! The Assyrians fled from Ninevah and made a last stand at the city of Haran where Abraham had lived for many years, and then 8 yrs. later they were defeated in a great battle and you hear nothing more about the Assyrians. The Assyrian empire was completely demolished as completely as any nation in all of history. So v. 1 can fit ~~a~~ very well with the Assyrians and the Assyrians have been in the background of the material in these chs.

In 33:3, "At the moise of the tummult the people fled; at the lifting up of thyself the nations were scattered." The nations had ~~h~~ fled before Assyria; now Assyria fled when their army had been so destroyed by the Lord to whom the prayer is addressedin v.2. In v.4, "And your spoil shall be gathered like the gathering of the caterpillar" and of course the spoiling of Sennacherib's army was there for the Israelites to take when Sennacherib and the few that were left fled back to Ninevah, and of course when Ninevah was destroyed there was spoil for those who conquered it nearly a century later.

(Vv.5,6) "The Lord is exalted" -- quite clear.

Verse 7 is describing the situation when Sennacherib was there.

33:7, "Behold their valiant ones shall cry without: the ambassadors of peace shall weep bitterly." The situation when Hezekiah was trying to make terms with Sennacherib, but Sennacherib was ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ ^{determined} to destroy him.

33:8, "The highways lie waste, the wayfaring man ceaseth: he hath broken the covenant, he hath despised the cities, he regarded not an ~~m~~ The earth mourneth and languisheth: . . ." This is the situation for three years while the Assyrian bands were going back and forth through the land of Israel and Jerusalem alone remained and expected to be taken soon.

33:10, "Now will I rise, saith the Lord; now will I be exalted;" and He says to Sennacherib, "You shall conceive chaff, you shall bring forth stubble, your breath like fire shall devour you, " a very apt figurative description of how Sennacherib slept and ~~XXXX~~ dreamed that he was eating and he woke up and he was hungry!

33:12 And the people shall be as the burnings of lime: as ~~XXXXXX~~ ^{thorns} cut up shall they be burned in the fire."

33:14 "The sinners in Zion are afraid; fearfulness hath surprised the hypocrites. Who among us shall dwell with the devouring fire? who among us shall dwell with everlasting burnings?" Here in vv. 14, 15 you have the picture of people in Jerusalem coming to the temple who had not come for years, in terrible fear of the Assyrians and trying to make up for their previous wickedness in the hope that God would do something to protect them.

33:17, "Thine eyes shall see the king in his beauty/?" They saw King Hezekiah during the three years dressed largely in sackcloth, rushing around trying to see to the strengthening of the walls but knowing that against the great Assyrian force they could hold out for some time but they could not hold out permanently once the Assyrians attacked, etc. Now that Sennacherib has gone you could see

Hezekiah really in splendor now that he was safe again and they were all celebrating. "Thine eyes shall see the king in his beauty; they shall behold the land that is very far off." During the time when the three years when Sennacherib's troops were going back and forth into the land of Judah, the Israelites as we are told in chs. 36 and 37, the people of Jerusalem could rush out just a brief distance outside of Jerusalem to try to pick what grew of itself, but they could not do any real planting or harvesting, and they could not go far from the strong walls of the city, but now they could go out through the land and they could see areas that were completely closed to them during the 3 years. "Thine eyes shall behold the land that is very far off."

33:18, "Thine heart shall meditate terror." That is to say you will think of the terror that you went through. You will remember that, and now it will be like a dream - the terror of those 3 years. "Where is the scribe: where is the receiver? where is he that counted the towers?"

(Question: My translation has "King" capitalized and I suppose that is referring to Christ. You said it refers to Hezekiah.) I would think it would probably refer to Hezekiah. Now it is true we can take it as an example of the fact that after the miseries of this life we shall see Christ in His beauty. We can take it as an example definitely. But as to its meaning in context I would think it would refer to Hezekiah. Of course there are no capitals in the Hebrew. That's the tough thing in a translation; you have to put in punctuation, and capitalization, and when you do you have to make a decision as to what you think it means. If you take the verse by itself as a figurative description of what we look forward to after the miseries of this life - we will be just in the situation they were ~~in~~ after Sennacherib was defeated. But in the immediate context I would think this refers to Hezekiah in this verse.

Particularly you take v. 19, "You will not see a fierce people, a people of a deeper speech than you can perceive; of a stammering tongue, that you cannot understand." God declares to them back in an earlier ch. we looked at, how He was going to punish them through a stammering tongue; through a people they could not understand. The Assyrians came in, went through the land and took everything but Jerusalem. This describes the great relief there was when these men had gone back to N'nevah and Jerusalem was not in further danger.

(Question: Were you going to tell about v.18?) V.18, yes I did. Or I will mention it. "Your heart will meditate terror." I take "meditate" as think about rather than ? ? ? You meditate on something that is not right in front of you as a rule. Here they recall the terror. They are not facing it any more. They look back to what they had been in. They look back on this and they say, Where is the scribe? Where is the receiver? Where is the people that were coming up here from the Assyrian army counting the towers and figuring where they would put their seige guns and where they would break their way through these strong walls? They are gone!

33:19, You don't any longer see these fierce people. They have either died by the Lord's intervention or gone back. "Look upon Zion, the city of solemnities: thine eyes shall see Jerusalem a quiet habitation, a tabernacle that shall not be taken down; not one of the stakes thereof shall ever be removed . . ." Now this word "ever" we think it means this building here is going to stand forever. It will never disappear. But we know no building is going to stand forever in that sense! There is a modern concept of something going on and on and on and there is never any stop. I don't believe there is any such concept in the Bible.

A very fine Christian leader sent me a letter - a book and magazine, and said would you

and said, Would you please look this over and make any suggestions you'd like, and if you like it write an introduction to it. I looked it over and the book was an argument for eternal suffering of the lost, on the basis of the Heb. word "olam" which was used for the suffering of the lost. It goes on and on, it's eternal. He said there is no other word for eternity. How often, aside from Christian mentions, do you use the word eternal? What do you ever see that is eternal. I mean eternal is a purely philosophical concept. Is there a word for it? He said, There must be because there is no other word for it.

That was his first argument. The second was, this word is used of the joy of the saved. The same word is used of the eternal suffering of the lost. Well I wrote back to him, and said I do not think it is safe to build such an argument upon this word. This word, as far as I could see means, as far as you could see! in one direction or the other. Add this word is used for things that go on and on and on but it is also used for things that are way back in the past. And there are considerable number of cases of this. Like, These are the men of old(olam). There were giants in the days before the flood; these were the men of olam. This does not mean these were eternal men. It means these men were so far back in time, you could just hardly imagine them. It is looking on and on in the future, or it is looking on and on in the past. But the idea of endlessness is not included in that particular word. So here we have that particular word used -- "not one of the stakes thereof shall ever be removed." We know that Jerusalem has been destroyed at least twice since Isaiah wrote. This is a description of the fact that as everything else/^{around them} is being taken by the Assyrians, they were going to continue for a long long time in the future. It was their grandchildren and their great grand children who were taken off into Babylonian captivity. But

But (v.21) "there the glorious LORD will be unto us a place of broad rivers and streams;" Well, one of the one of the great lacks of Jerusalem was it had no rivers. It is way up in the hills. You land there from the sea and you have a long trip overland to get up there. Whereas Ninevah and Babylon were right on great rivers. The ships went up and down. The great cities of Egypt were on great rivers. Wouldn't it be wonderful to be on a great river like they are?

Well the Lord will be to you like a place of great rivers and streams. You will have the blessings they have. But with the blessings they have they also have a curse. The great river that flows by Ninevah and by Babylon and that flows by the great cities of Egypt was something that warships could come right up and attack. They were open to attack, whereas anyone attacking Jerusalem has got to come up over those steep hills and it is much harder travelling up by land like that than it is for warships travelling by water and attacking. So that is the evil of having a great river. So here the glorious Lord is unto us a place of broad rivers and streams, but where these rivers and streams are good to us but not to our enemies! Where gallant warships don't come up and attack up. So you see the two parts of the verse, clear in the context but not unless you think of the situation of those other cities.

33:22, For the Lord is our judge, the Lord is our lawgiver, the Lord is our king; he will save us." Then he turns his attention to Sennacherib,

33:23, "Thy takings are loosed; they could not well strengthen ~~XXXX~~ ^{their} mast, they could not spread the sail; then is the prey of a great spoil divided; the lame ~~XXXX~~ take the prey." Even the weak and the lame from Jerusalem could go down there to the camp of Sennacherib and could take plunder because the Lord had destroyed so many of the people there. It means the inhabitants, the people living in the land, ~~XXXX~~ would not say

"I am sick," They would not be in a situation of misery, ~~They would~~ that they were in before. The people that dwell in it shall be forgiven their iniquity. That, you see how this ch. 33 everything in it fits together with its being a specific picture of this situation. We've had so much of it in previous chs. that I feel we are thoroughly justified in interpreting it that way.

In chs. 34 and 35 we look forward to the future, to devastations and destruction of that which is evil, and to the great blessing that God is going to bring upon the earth. Ch. 35 I believe looks forward to the time after our Lord's return.

We'll have a couple of minutes to glance at ch. 32. We noticed A. The King and the Shelter, vv.1-2. We had to have a mention of princes there because our section is mainly dealing with princes. You remember ch. 7-12 is telling about the coming great king. Chs. 28 on is referring to the nation which is not bringing forth the fruits of righteousness, and God will take away his blessing and give it to a nation that will bring forth the fruits thereof. That is the nobles he is speaking of, the leaders of the people, (many of them in these chs.?) but Immanuel never completely disappears from sight. We've noticed brief? (three?) references to him in this section.

32:3-8, I give the title: Clarification Promised. I bring that in in connection with Is. 5:20. In Is.5:20: "Woe unto them that call evil good and good evil, that put darkness for light and light for darkness, who put bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter." Here he is promising that the time is coming when people will see things clearly. You will see who is wicked, you will see who is good, you will see who is standing for the Lord, you will see who is opposing Him. He is describing a period of clarification of people's stand and of people's character (that is vv.3-8). The vile person ~~XXXX~~ shall no more be

called noble. I don't think noble fits it very well, but it is much better than liberal, for liberal now is used in of a particular philosophy of governmental control. In its general sense of meaning generous and kindly attitude would have fit well 100 years ago. "The vile person will speak villany, and his heart will work iniquity . . ." "The instruments also of the churl are evil." The heart determines the attitude of the person, and the time is coming when it will be easier to see what people really are, when there won't be so much hypocrisy.

32:9-14, Devestation Prediction. This is I think a prediction of the exile. "Rise up ye women that are at ^{ease.} ease. He describes the women who were living in luxury and forgetfulness of God. We have a similar passage earlier in Isaiah -- ch. 3 deals particularly with the women of Israel, women who are forgetful of God who have misery ahead.

Verse 13, Upon the land of my people shall come up thorns and briars; yea, upon all the houses of joy in the joyous city. Because the palaces shall be forsaken; the multitude of the city shall be left; the forts and towers shall be for dens for ever == for a long, long time == a joy of wild asses, a pasture of flocks." This is what happened ^{when} ~~when~~ the exile came.

(Question:NASN of v.10 has "in a year and a few days" - do you think this is referring to a specific time? specific event?) Oh, within a year and a few days, no, I think this is referring to the time of the exile. I think this is looking forward to the century afterwards; I don't think within a year, a year long. There you have to -- it is not actually clear in the Hebrew which of the two. I think the KJV fits the context better in that case.

Then this devestation of the exile predicted, vv.9-14.

Then vv.15-20 describes a time coming of protection. The king who

reigns in righteousness will give protection, "Until the spirit be poured upon us from on high." The wilderness be a fruitful field and the fruitful field be counted for a forest but justice shall dwell in both of them - justice in the wilderness and righteousness in the fruitful field. And the work of righteousness shall be peace; and the effect of righteousness quietness and assurance forever. But there will be external difficulties. It will hail coming down on the forest and the city shall be made low. This is a time of trouble. A time of difficulty outside, but a time when God is in the hearts of his people. A time when He is giving peace in the heart, when the Spirit is poured upon His true people. I believe this is a picture of a period when God is giving particular blessing in the midst of difficulty round about.

Verse 20 is one about which there is a difference of interpretation. I don't particularly like the translation of the NASB in v.20. How blessed will you who sow beside all waters who let out freely the ox and the donkey (NASB). There is a note which says literally, send out the foot. Blessed are you who sow beside all waters that send forth there the feet of the ox and the ass. I believe that is a call to those who have this peace of God in their hearts to send out those who will carry the message to others, who will carry the blessing of God to others who need it. I believe it is a great missionary verse.

They had a great conference in the Philippines recently: Love China. The declaration was made there that the leaders in China have been killed, the Christian leaders. But that the followers through the cultural ~~XXXXXX~~ revolution have been scattered, so they say there are believers now in just about every village in China! who are quietly spreading the word of God, and I think this verse is a call to -- not to let the ox and donkey go, but to send them out, to send out those carrying the message, those carrying the blessings of Christ as described in the previous verses.

K

Lecture # 1 9/10/75

- 1) Introduction
 - Purpose of course
 - Why study the Bible?
- 2) God's revelation to us
- 3) Accomplishes God's purpose
- 4) Why study the OT?
 - Why study the Prophets?
- 5) They tell of Christ
 - Important examples to us
 - Sennacherib's defeat
- 6) Jeremiah's prophecy, ch. 28
- 7) Why study Isaiah
 - N. T. Quotations
- 8) So little known
- 9) Contains principles
 - Importance of this section 7-12
 - Contains important prophecies of Christ
 - 7:14; 9:6-7
- 10) Isa. 11
 - NT Use of Virgin Birth
 - Mat. 1:22-23
- 11) Isaiah's prophecy a part of what the angel said
- 13) Translations
- 15) Importance of Isa. 7-12
- 16) Method of study
 - Interrelation of material
- 17) Careful study of Background
 - Study of Particular words and phrases
- 18) Avoidance of oversystemization

Lecture # 2 9/17/75

- 1) Translations
- 2) Background of chs. 7-12
- 3) Prophetic View of the Future
 - Prophets not mere predictors of future events
- 4) Prophets interest in contemporaries
- 5) Prophetic perspective
- 7) Isaiah's glimpse of the future
 - Relation to events in Isaiah's time
- 9) Isa. 7:3,5,7
 - Arameans
- 10) Danger from Israel and Syria
- 11) Isa. 7:7,8
- 12) Ahaz facing Syria like U.S. facing Hitler & asking Stalin for aid

Lecture # 2 9/17/75 (cont'd)

- 12) Assyrian Conquest and Threats
- 14) Isaiah sees eventual exile
God's Promise to David
- 15) Ultimate blessing for God's faithful people
- 16) Character of Ahaz
Survey of Isa. 7
- 17) 7:2
- 18) 7:3
- 19) Importance of conduit of upper pool in later history(chs.36-37)
7:4
- 20) 7:7-9
- 21) 7:11
- 22) 7:15-16
- 23) Immanuel's coming used as a measuring stick
7:17-20

Lecture # 3 9/24/75

- 2) 8:1,2
- 3) 8:3 Shear-jashub
- 4) Maher-shalahasbaz
- 5) Same place of meeting as in 36:2
- 6) 7:8-10
- 7) 7:11-15
- 8) "evil" in KJV
in another 65 years
- 9) 7:18
- 10) 7:19-20
- 11) 7:21-25
- 12) Glance at ch. 8
- 13) Isaiah's wife
- 14) 8:6-10
- 15) Immanuel's land. 8:12-14, 21-22
- 16) Making common cause with Stalin to overcome Hitler
- 17) Careful examination of 7:14-16
Almah
Luther - 100 cronins
- 18) parthenos (LXX)
- 20) 7:13,15-16,22
- 21) Immanuel used as a measure of time

Lecture # 4 10/1/75

- 1) 7:20-22
- 2) 7:14 Virgin birth
- 3) Sudden transitions common in prophetic books
- 4) "butter and honey" v. 15
- 5) Heb. infin. to express time - "when he shall know"
- 6) "evil" (KJV usage)
simple choices
- 7) Age of child used as measure of time
Transition between v. 14 and v. 15
- 8) Cocceius' false prediction
Not stated when Immanuel would be born
- 9) Is Isaiah pointing to his own child?
- 10) Break at 9:7,8
- 11) The Archbishop
GCM on church divisions
Isaiah's second son
- 12) New Indication of time
Results of Ahaz' plan
8:6-7
- 13) God will intervene
Immanuel's land
- 14) The only Security is to be found in God's Plan
The Name Immanuel
Isaiah and his followers as a sign 8:16-18
- 15) Warnings against the occult 8:18-19
- 16) Trouble ahead for both Israel and Judah 8:20-23(9:1)
- 17) Promised deliverance through Christ
- 18) 9:2
- 19) The light begins where darkness began
cf. Mat. 4:15-16

Lecture # 5 10/8/75

- 3) Isaiah's second son
Immanuel's land
- 4) Nothing can happen to it except as He permits it
No security outside God's Plan
- 5) Isaiah and his followers a sign
8:18
- 7) 8:14
- 8) Warning against occult
Persons who went to spiritist meeting
- 10) Kauffman's book on Critique of Philosophy and Religion
Test everything by Word of God
- 11) The promised Deliverance through Christ
Light begins where darkness began

Lecture # 5 10/8/75 (cont'd)

- 12) Lasting Peace only through God's plan
transition from darkness to light
- 13) 8:21-23(9:1-2)

Lecture # 6 ~~20228222~~ 10/15/75

- 1) David's Promised Son
- 2) His Two Natures
- 3) Children as a gift of God
- 4) His Kingly Work
9:1
- 5) (His Prophetic Word)
His Kingly Work 9:7
- 6) His Divine Titles
- 7) The Increase of His Government
Shalom
- 9) Wonderful/ Counsellor
Counselling Wonder
Mighty God
- 10) Jewish Version of OT
Mighty God
- 11) Everlasting Father
- 12) Prince of Peace
- 13) 9:3-5
- 14) Prophecy not history written in advance
Mistake of seeking chronological precision
- 15) 9:3-5
- 17) Sennacherib's boast re Hezekiah
- 19) Possibilities of 9:4-5
God's Zeal 9:7

Lecture # 7 10/22/75

- 1) Sennacherib
- 2) 9:4-5 May point to Sennacherib's catastrophe
- 3) Progress logical rather than chronological
Possibilities of interpretation
Pritchard's Archaeology of the OT
- 4) Sennacherib's Consolation Prize
- 6) 9:7 The Divine Child's Everlasting Government
God Not Static
- 7) The Increase of His Government and Peace
- 8) All Due to God's Zeal
9:8-10:34

Lecture # 7 10/22/75 (cont'd)

- 9) Four Stanzas of Judgment 9:8-10:4
Ephraim's Pride
Disaster 9:13-17
- 10) Wickedness Leads to Famine 9:18-21
- 11) Selfishness leads to devastation 10:1-4
Assyrian successes and failure 10:5-35
- 12) The Assyrian - God's Instrument to Punish His People
Assyrian Pride 10:7-11
- 13) God Will Punish Assyrian 10:12-19
- 14) Ultimate deliverance for God's true people 10:20-23
- 15) Promise of complete deliverance from Assyrian
10:27 "because of the anointing"
- 16) Reference to Messiah?
- 17) Promise of deliverance from Assyria 10:24-27
Picture of Danger 10:28-32
- 20) Immanuel's Kingdom 11:1-10
Transition
- 21) His Character

Lecture # 8 10/29/75

- 1) Isa .28 - Ephraim
11:1-5
- 2) His spiritual likeness 11:2
- 3) His Wise judgments 11:3-4
His forceful intervention
- 4) KJV translation of "wicked"
breath(spirit) of his lips
- 5) 2 Thess. 2:7 interprets 11:4
His equipment
- 6) The character of His kingdom 11:6-10
An earthly kingdom 11:9
Micah 4
- 7) Universal kingdom 11:9
Freedom from external danger
- 8) Child playing with serpent
- 9) Figurative lang. and spiritualization
- 10) Century Plant in Grand Canyon
- 11) Balance in nature
Curse to be removed
- 13) Calvin on Isa. 11
- 14) Post-mil view
Hengstenberg
- 15) Warfield - Machen
- 16) Premil view
- 17) Premil view

Lecture # 9 11/5/75

- 1) The character of the kingdom
Examination of 11:10 - "in that day"
- 2) His rest shall be glorious
- 4) Isa. 11:16 in relation to 40:3 (none)
11:11 - "the second time"
- 5) Why call it Book of Immanuel?
Isa. 28:7
- 6) The Name Ephraim
- 7) Isa. 28:14
The situation in ch. 28
Same as in chs. 7-112
- 9) The fear of Israel and Syria
The secret treaty with Assyria
The predicted results
- 10) The banquet scene
- 11) 28:5-7
- 12) Isaiah's tactful beginning
- 13) Isaiah's rejoinder vs. 11-13
- 15) "Inspire your kids" remark
Assyrian ~~agg~~ arrangement condemned vv.14-22
- 16) 28:14-20
- 18) God will carry out His wise purpose
28:23-27
- 19) 28:28-29
29:1-5

Lecture #10 11/12/75

- 1) 28:11 tongues activity?
- 2) 1 Cor. 14:19
- 3) Isa. 28:21 Mt. Perazim
- 5) Isa. 29 relation to ch. 28
- 6) relation to chs.7-12
- 7) Immanuel* in background
- 8) Assyrian overthrow of Jerusalem is immanent
XXXX Ariel
- 9) 29:2 cf. Ezek. 43:16
- 10) 29:2-4
The miraculous deliverance 29:5-8
- 11) 29:5 "moreover" = "but"
29:3
- 12) 29:4-8
29:6 "visited"(paqad)

Lecture # 10 11/12/75 (cont'd)

- 13) Dreamed of water but none on waking
Attitude of Israel's leaders rebuked
29:9-13
- 14) The Divine Overturning 29:14-23
- 15) 29:16-17
- 16) 29:18-20
29:22
Wild branches grafted into Olive Tree
- 17) 29:24

Lecture # ~~11~~ 11/19/75

- 1) Isa. 29:24
- 2) Isa. 30:1-7
Warning against looking to Egypt for help
- 3) Memphis and Thebes
30:6
- 5) Meaning of "burden" 30:7
- 6) Secularism rebuked and judgment predicted
Idols
30:8
- 7) 30:11-14
- 8) 30:15-16
- 9) 30:17
Frederick the Great and His Chaplain
- 10) Question re the Egyptians
- 11) Questions answered
Eventual blessing
- 12) 30:18-22

Lecture # 12 11/26/75

- 2) Eventual blessings 30:18-26
- 3) 30:22-23
- 4) 30:24
"ear" - Old English for "plow"
30:25 water problem
- 5) 30:26
The overthrow of Assyria
- 6) 30:27-33
- 7) ch. 31
- 8) Warning against looking to Egypt for aid
31:1-3

Lecture # 12 11/26/75 (cont'd)

- 9) God bringing "evil" 31:2
R. A. Torrey: Human confidence fails
- 10) 31:3-5
- 11) "as birds flying"
The Wright brothers
31:6-7
- 12) "In that day" phrase
- 13) 31:8-9 Assyrian to be overthrown
Mighty man . . . mean man
- 14) 31:9
31:8 cf. NASB
- 15) 31:9 fire . . . furnace in Jerusalem
Lecture on the Burning Point of Europe
- 16) Question on 31:8
~~TRAINING~~ The King as a shelter
- 17) 32:1-2
- 18) Hezekiah or Messiah in 32:1-2?
NASB = "princes" vs "Man"(KJV)
- 19) 32:3-8 clarification promised
Home Rule misnomer
- 20) 32:5 "liberal: in KJV usage

Lecture #13 12/3/75

- 2) Distinguish between what is fulfilled and what is future
Danger of undue emphasis on the unclear
- 3) Reaction to Christological approach to Scripture
- 4) Translations
32:1 (discussion about)
- 6) Statement in Christian Science Church in Boston
- 8) chs. 34-35
- 9) 35:8
The eternal state(?)
- 10) ch. 33
- 11) 33:3-7
- 12) 33:7-17
- 13) 33:18
32:1 Hezekiah or Christ?
- 14) ~~32~~:19
33:19
- 15) Meaning of 'olam
- 16) ~~32~~:21-23
- 17) 32:1-8
- 18) ~~32~~9-14
- 19) 32:15-20
32:20 a great vs for missionary activity