

ISAIAH 8:16-33:3
000817

Then in 16 we went on to look at the godly and what they were supposed to do, but 21 takes us back again to the nation as a whole, and now we see the nation as a whole in the situation in which they are to be placed because of their failure to follow God's word, their turning away from it, their ignoring it, and because of the outworking of that in this plan of Ahaz, which has brought in the Assyrians presumably to help but actually by removing the buffer state, has put them into a much more serious situation than they were before, and in the result of all this, now Isaiah takes a glance forward through many centuries and he sees a general picture of the situation of the ungodly or of the nation as a whole, looking through centuries ahead but including a period rather near, when the Assyrian armies begin to march into the land of Israel. So he says in verse 21, And they shall pass through it--these are the people who have refused to follow the Lord,--hardly bestead 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.. Up to this point, utter desolation, utter darkness, utter misery, nothing else. But then ^{they look upward;} they curse their king and their God, and look upward. There we have the beginning of a little light. It is not all darkness. It is not all misery. It is not all desolation. There is the coming of light. They will look upward. That is just a little suggestion of improvement in the situation, a little light coming amidst the darkness. That's if you take the verse alone, and whoever made the verse division thought you should take it alone, and the fact, it doesn't say they look up, look down, look all around, and don't find any help, it doesn't say that, it says, look upward, and then it says and they shall look to the earth, and it is a different word used for look. First one is they face upward, which could very well show the beginning of a turning to God. They face upward, a new light. But then it says, they shall look steadily (4) it is more of a hunting for something, unto the earth. They don't look up very long. They look to the earth. Or if you run the two verses together, you can say, they curse their king and their

God, and they look up, and they look to the earth. In other words, they look in all directions, ~~to make sure~~ ^{and they see} nothing but darkness and misery. So if you run the two verses together, and ignore the fact that you have two verses instead of one, which (4 1/2)

could be used in such a case, you have just a continuous picture of darkness, but as it stands there is a possibility that there is a suggestion of a coming of light, just this little bit at the end of verse 21. Now we go on to 22, we still have darkness, yes, but they look to the earth, and behold trouble and darkness, dimness of anguish, and they shall be driven to darkness, still darkness, gloom, misery, the nation has turned away from God. But ~~is~~ ^{His} God going to allow them to continue forever in darkness? Is ~~He~~ going to do that or will He bring them light out of the darkness? Will He give them deliverance/ as part of His election of grace, for His own purpose of preparing the way for the coming of His ~~son~~ ^{son} into the world? Well, the last phrase in this, in the KJV, "they shall be" is in italics. It is not there. darkness, dimness of anguish, driven to darkness. Well the participle in it can be past, present or future. ~~But~~ What they behold is trouble and darkness, dimness of anguish, driven to darkness. Do they behold driven to darkness? Are they driven to darkness? The word/ actually, however, does not mean driven, it means "driven away," to darkness. Well, there is no "to" in it, it is actually "darkness driven away." But you can take that darkness as an accusative of direction, you can take it, it does not have an ending on which would indicate direction, but you don't have to have that on necessarily. In fact, this particular form being a feminine already, it would be difficult to put ~~is~~ on. So it may be that they're driven to darkness, but it is not altogether satisfactory. Maybe it means the darkness is driven away, and if it does again you have--here you have all this darkness, gloom and anguish, and the darkness is driven away. A/ suggestion at the end of this verse of light coming, a better suggestion than the one that ends the verse before. A look upward.

Now these are suggestions here. Are they real? Is there a beginning of a piercing of the clouds, a beginning of the coming of light? We can't be sure. I think the words are intentionally used. This is not a mathematical formula, this is a literary formula. They are intentionally used to create a certain impression. To create in us the impression as we read that maybe in the midst of all this darkness, God is starting to bring light. Maybe, we can't be quite sure, but we have a suggestion that perhaps He is. Well, what about the next verse?

Well, according to the KJV, the next verse is all darkness too. By the way, the Hebrew, you know, calls the next verse #23, starts with the following verse as the first of the new chapter, and actually there is no reason in the world for a chapter division here. It is better to have it one verse later, ~~or~~ like the Hebrew does, or still better to have it two verses earlier, the beginning of a paragraph. Nevertheless the dimness shall not be such as was in her vexation--oh, does that mean it is going to be a little lighter, the dimness won't be such as it was. Such as it was when? "When at the first he lightly afflicted the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali, and afterward did more grievously afflict her by the way of the sea, beyond Jordan, in ~~the~~ Galilee of the nations." This is how the King James renders it. The King James states it, this is then showing the coming of the Assyrian army. First they enter through Zebulun and Naphtali and perhaps they're rather courteous at first when they come in, they don't meet much opposition, they just come in, but then they take over and the people begin to realize what ~~is~~ is happening, and as they go further and come to the way of the sea, beyond Jordan, Galilee of the nations, they afflict them more severely. At any rate, it is all darkness, the way the King James Version has it, but 60 years ago a new translation was made, the American Standard Version. In some regards it is an improvement over the KJV, in other regards it isn't as good, but it was made on the whole by godly men, who sincerely tried to figure out what the Hebrew meant, and to put it into English. And I have known very godly Bible teachers

who have felt ~~felt~~ the ASV was the best translation into English. They have been very devoted to it. It doesn't have quite the literary value the KJ does, unfortunately. I used to think, well, maybe they're right, maybe I should turn to the ~~g~~ ASV instead of the KJV. Because I knew so many godly men who always seemed to prefer it. But Then I was in a class teaching Hebrew, and we read in Judges, about Abimelech, and I looked it up in the ASV and it said, he gat him up to the top of a hill, and I thought the Hebrew is just "he went up." Well, I thought, in the KJV made 300 years ago, if they say he gat him up it is understandable, but for something made 60 years ago when nobody used such language, to put it "he gat him up," I thought if they can't do any better than that, I'm going to stick to the KJV. So I have not made so much use, since that experience, of the ASV as I tended to before.

But where the ASV differs from the KJV you can take it that there is some pretty good grounds for considering another possibility of interpretation. And it may even be that it is a ~~more~~ ^{correct} rendering. I don't take it. If the ASV has it I take it rather than the KJ note, but I say if the ASV differs it is worth your looking in the Hebrew, and seeing which of the two you feel is right, and knowin g that the chances are there are good grounds for both. There are a few cases where the KJ has departed from the Hebrew, in ~~view~~ view of their understanding or of some New Testament quotation, where the ASV is a ~~l~~ little more literal. But in this case it is amazing to see the difference. I hope that you have your KJ before you now with the verse I just read you: chapter 9.1. If you have, follow it as I read you what the ASV has. The ASV says: But there shall be no gloom to her that was in anguish. Isn't that different? But there shall be no gloom. That is real light. Nothing like that in KJ. There it says: in the former time he brought into contempt the land of Zebulon and the ~~land~~ land of Naphtali, but in the latter time hath he made a glory. Quite different from: he did more grievously afflict her, as the KJ says. In the latter time he made his glory, by the way of the sea, beyond the Jordan, Galilee of the nations.

And the fact of the matter is that it can be translated the way the AV has, or the way the β AS has. Both are possible from the Hebrew. So you see, we have verse 21 ending with perhaps the suggestion of light. Maybe not. Maybe so. Verse 22 ending, perhaps the darkness driven away, the suggestion of light. Perhaps not. We can't be sure. Verse 23, or 9.1, perhaps it is all gloom like the KJ but perhaps instead of its being, of (11 3/4) being "more grievously^{afflict}" perhaps it is "he made his glory," ~~sent over~~ it could be translated either way, and actually if you're going to build a whole theology on this verse, you better not do it, because it is too uncertain what it means. But if you're going to interpret the context and find that he used language which again shows continuation of the darkness and gloom, and yet suggests that perhaps it does mean glory is coming, that glory is coming in Galilee, in Zebulun, in Naphtali, in the place where the Assyrian armies first entered and brought darkness and misery to the land, you have a background there for going on to the next verse where the light shines in fully and the people that 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.

I believe that we have here a case, not of sudden sharp transition but of a gradual transition from the terrible darkness of verse 21, showing that this darkness is not the end, God has for His people, purposes of blessing and of glory, and as you go on you think you see light begin to come, you're not quite sure, you think you see glory, is it glory, or is it greater affliction, you're not quite sure, and then all of a sudden the light bursts in full intensity upon you, the people that walked in darkness, the people in this area where the Assyrian army came marching in and brought the beginning of the times of the Gentiles to Israel, the beginning of the gloom and misery that lasted so many centuries--right in that very region light is going to begin to be seen in (13 1/2)

So that I feel that you could make an argument for following the Hebrew

Bible and saying a new chapter starts. Light. Everything before is darkness, ^{until} ~~and~~ the new chapter starts. But I don't think the argument would be conclusive. I think it is much more reasonable to say here is the transition between the present darkness, which Isaiah described, to the great outpouring of light which is to come in that very region, and when in that very region, there the light began to shine in the form of Jesus going about there and giving His great term, bringing the light of the world to the people, Matthew says these things were done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, and then he does not read the full meaning of 9.1, he just indicates the geographical places: Zebulon, Naphtali, Galilee of the nations, and then he says, upon these people, the light has shined, ^{the people} ~~people~~ that walked in darkness have seen a great light. Yes? (14 1/2)...

M.29a. (3/4)

...that's the ASV translation of . The Authorized says "nevertheless the dimness shall not be such as was in her vexation." The ASV says, "but there shall be no gloom to her that was in anguish." To take the phrase just alone it is rather hard to be sure what to get out of it. I incline toward it, yes. It is a picture of darkness, gloom and misery, not as bad as it was when the Assyrian army first came in, but still it is a region of darkness, a region where they suffered from the Assyrian invasion, and perhaps the very region where all subsequent invasions first enter the land, and where they suffer from that, but in this very region the light first begins to shine. There is no organic connection between the fact of the darkness beginning there, which (13 3/4) and of the light beginning there, but it is just an interesting thing--you might say, almost a coincidence, that the Lord points out 700 years in advance, so that it's just an added indication that that is the one He is referring to, when it actually happens. Well, it is a very interesting chapter and the transition between 8 and 9 I feel is intensely interesting, leading us up to the future life that is coming, the

darkness comes from Ahaz, but the light comes when the true Emmanuel comes, the one of whom we have spoken earlier in chapter 8 and in 7, the great light comes when he comes and His coming and its effect are described in those next few verses in the wonderful section which I'd better leave till next time.

M.30. (3/4)

...great difficulty to Jewish interpreters 50 years ago. I have recently heard quite a bit of the new translation that the Jews are making this year. They have been working on it several years, the new translation of the Old Testament. They've been working about 4 or 5 years on it, have finished the Pentateuch, except that they have to go over it all again, once more, and they are really doing some excellent work and getting some fine interpretations at many points, but when it comes to the Christian predictions ^{in it, they} ~~that are~~ have got some very clever new ways of evading them, pushing them aside, some very clever ways, so I wouldn't be a bit surprised that if when they come to Isaiah they find some kind of a new clever way to evade this one.

But certainly Professor Margolis of Dropsie College, when he made what is today the standard Jewish translation of the Bible, when he did it, he did not see any very satisfactory way of evading it, so what he did was simply to transliterate, so the Jews who have the holy Scriptures, open it up to this version to read: 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 (1 3/4)

and , and shar Salom. And there is that long combination of sounds that would mean nothing to him, that's His name. His name was (2)

now His name is

But he does have a footnote which says something like this, "or, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the prince of Peace, ~~the~~ is counselling a wonderful thing. Now of course that evades it too. The translation in the footnote, but as it stands His name shall be called, and then we have a list of names which is very evidently

not a name in the sense of a designation, to be used as a handle in calling a person, but rather a descriptive name, a name which describes His character and His attributes.

I have just received with a request that I should review it, a new translation of the last half of the Old Testament, called the Amplified Old Testament, Job to Malachi, and ~~there~~ they're issuing the second part first, they say the first part will follow. And in that I noticed that instead of having as it is here, wonderful, counsellor, it says wonderful counsellor. Well, now, that of course simply shows the utter ignorance of Hebrew of those who were responsible for that ~~the~~ particular paragraph. Because the, as it stands in the Hebrew, as you all know, ^{if you use an} ~~it gives you the~~ adjective in Hebrew, and ~~an~~ attributive adjective always follows the term, and consequently to say wonderful counsellor you'd have to say counsellor wonderful in Hebrew, but the order of this is wonderful, counsellor, that is the order. It might seem to us more logical, you've got four names, each of them with two parts, so the first one would be wonderful counsellor, but that is not what the Hebrew has. The Hebrew has (4) wonderful, or wonder, and then a counsellor, not a counsellor wonderful, which we would translate a wonderful counsellor. So that that lack of a comma is quite incorrect as far as its being in any sense a translation of the Hebrew is concerned. Well, some have tried to take it as a conflux, say, a wonder of a counsel, and that's not quite so bad, thought it doesn't seem quite right to me. I think the best way is undoubtedly to do as our KJV has and consider that here you have ~~not~~ four ~~large~~ names with two parts in each, but five names, the first two having one word, and the last three having two. Yes? (4 1/2) We were saying that this name is ~~not~~ I believe considered as having five elements instead of four, and He is wonderful, not just that He is a wonderful counsellor, not just that this coming child is a very fine counsellor, but that He is wonderful, He is a wonder. Isaiah said I and my children are for signs and wonders. He is one who is wonderful in every way, one who is transcendent.

He is one who goes beyond all other s who ever lived. It is not just a wonderful counsellor, it is wonderful He is. And then of course He is a counsellor. Here is a very great part of His activities, Jesus Christ as prophet, His words, His advice, He is counsellor par excellence. And His teaching such as no other man has ever had. He is indeed a great counsellor, and this is very fitting, to have some reference to that stage of his activity, because that is what we have back in verse 2, the great light that comes is His preaching, it is not yet His death, it looks forward to His death, but is not yet there when He preaches in Galilee. And then it calls Him the mighty God, and that is a tremendous thing to call a child. No wonder that Margolis says in a footnote, the mighty God, the everlasting father, the prince of Peace is counselling a wonderful thing. But such--I don't know of anyone else in there who got a name quite that long. It certainly is not just a series of attributes, the way he takes it, as we have it-- His ~~nature~~ nature, because that wouldn't be describing anybody's character to say that the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the prince of Peace is counselling a wonderful thing. There are many gods, many names in Babylonian and other sources from the old times, that such a god is helping or has done a great thing, or has given a great gift, or something like that, but they none of them have the god named in three long phrases like this. And the name of the god would naturally come first rather than last. It is quite without parallel as a long name like that, and certainly not the order in which you would expect to find anything like that. So it is an attempted evasion. The fact is that quite (7) that this one is going to be born who will actually be wonderful, a counsellor, and the mighty god, (7 1/4) the word is often used for a very strong man, sometimes translated "a hero," so some a god, a hero, but that doesn't make much sense, a god of a hero, (7 1/4) but it doesn't mean the mighty God, the powerful God, is nearer to the natural interpretation of those words. Of course that is a tremendous thing to call a man, it is surprising the

people in Isaiah's day to read such a thing. They might have thought well surely there is some mistake in text. How can a child be called the mighty God? But they preserved it and it lasted and is in all the manuscripts. Yes? (7 3/4) To make a sentence of the thing you'd want to put the whole thing into one sentence but to take one of the four sections of it and make a sentence would be pretty hard to fit into this as a whole. He is god of a hero, or better, he is the mighty God, He is the

(8) God, the God that is powerful. Yes? (8) I have not paid a great deal of attention to those accents because the accents are quite late anyway, they come from the Massoretic time. We believe that the vowel points were handed on by tradition, and being handed on by tradition, some errors have come in but we think it wonderful, how accurate the vowel points are on the whole. The consonants were written, the vowels simply remembered. We think they are wonderfully accurate on the whole, though occasionally errors have come in, in the vowels. But when it comes to the accents, that would be the way they pronounced it, or the way they thought it ought to be, it would be pretty hard to keep the accent purely from generation to generation that way. So we note where they put in end of a verse sign, or where they put the note which they think indicates the principle break within the verse, but, and the other, the system is quite complex, there are many of these different accents, and we usually don't pay a lot of attention to them. That would show what they thought. But some particular man, we don't know who, ~~was~~ thought. But we don't know how far back that tradition might have gone, it certainly wouldn't necessarily go to Isaiah's time, but then, the next phrase: the everlasting Father, there it is literally the Father of (8 1/2) . That would surely be a . The Father of

and I'm not sure that everlasting is quite so good for that, because, while he is everlasting, of course, I'm not sure the word necessarily goes that far. It shows a long, long, long time. It shows that. But the philosophical idea of endlessness, I am not sure is included in the word. I heard people say, well, it

must be, what other word have they got for endless? Well, you ~~think~~^{take} an ordinary person, you go through five years ~~and~~ take all the different things he says, how often do you find the word "endless,"? Unless you have the theological concept of eternity. It is nothing that would occur in daily speech, so why would there necessarily be a word for it? The ordinary word, of course, is ola, which expresses a long, long period. And the fact the olam does not express endlessness is proven by the fact that sometimes they say (10 1/2) That is, the age of eternity. Eternity of eternity. You take this long, long stretch, far ~~as~~ as you can see, and then you say, just as many as there are of that, that many more stretch as long as this. Well, it still doesn't say endless. I believe it teaches that, but I don't think it is necessarily right within the particular word. But here, he is the Father of eternity, and that doubtless means that he is the one who characterized by the Father of eternity, not that ~~he~~^{it suggests} ~~just~~ here the creation of eternity, but the one who has no beginning or no end, or at least as far as you can possibly look in either direction you don't see any beginning or any end. Now there is another word that means booty that has this same sound, and so some take it ~~part~~ Father of booty, but of course that is going pretty far from the whole thought of the passage as a whole, to get Father of booty into it. There you get back into the mythological realm very clearly, any kind of a spiritual interpretation, Jewish or Christian, ~~would~~ certainly not be satisfied with calling ~~this~~ this word, Father of booty. But of course it is a tremendous name to give to a youngster. This is one of the verses that for Jewish evangelism is just very, very hard to evade. Here it is, in Isaiah, in all the Jewish Scriptures. Of course, the average Jew knows nothing about the Bible. The orthodox Jew pays great attention to the Talmud and very little actually to the Bible. Jesus said you have made the word of God of no effect by your tradition. Well, the tradition is supposed to be based on Scripture, but it puts a tremendous lot over it and around it, and puts the attention on that rather than on the Scripture. Mr. Golin? (12 1/4)

The construct is very often used to indicate that the ~~ew~~ word is followed by a characterizing word, like a ~~stak~~ of gold, a chair of wood, that it is something which characterizes ^{one who is coming, is} the ~~word itself~~. And it usually takes ~~it~~ exactly as the KJ takes it, that the Father of, entirely, or very, very often, is the father, the one who is distinguished by it, so the everlasting Father is quite a good name.

Now of course in modern Arabic, ~~Fater~~ is very often used for possessor, possessor of eternity, for instance. I read about one Arab, ~~fof~~ instance, who was very, very excellent at sitting at his desk for long hours doing very fine work, but he had what the Germans call (3 1/4) sitzfleisch, result he could sit and work for long hours, so the Arabs just called him by two Arab words which meant "the father of the two brothers." In other words a man who ~~were~~ was characterized by his ability to sit long times without getting tired, but Arabic uses the word Father very frequently that way to indicate some quality, or some attribute.

Now one might suggest that there was a similarity here, that the Father of eternity meant the eternal one, but I don't think there is a parallel use to any great extent in Hebrew, but I would incline to think that it rather means actually, the eternal Father. Of course it is very hard when you just have two words together like this to build a tremendous lot on them. They can--you don't have much contact with this idea (14)

You might say like a bolt out of the sky, here is what this one is going to be. And you say what a tremendous thing, how can this ever fit any child that is going to be born. But the verses before show very clearly that it is a wonderful child, something tremendous, it is not just any ordinary thing that is going to happen. But this goes beyond the wonderful, this goes into the realm of the transcendent. And of course when we get to the New Testament we find that is exactly what did happen...

...last meeting together we had finished chapter 8 and we were just starting chapter 9. We noticed a gradual transition between 8 and 9. The Bible is not a book of mathematical formula. It is not an attempt to put things in ABC proposition in such a way that they cannot possibly be misunderstood. It is a great literary work in the course of which God endeavors to get through to our hearts, not merely intellectually, but also emotionally, and He tries to drive home thoughts to us and to give them in ~~wast~~ such a way that they will reach many different kinds of people at many different times, in many different situations, and the result is that there are many things that are crystal clear in Scripture, there are other things that we may not know until we get to glory, and then there are other things in which there are all sorts of percentages of certainty as to what the meaning is, and sometimes I have no doubt there is an intentional impression created rather than simply a series of logical theories. And so here we have the description of the misery that is to come, to these people who are following human expedients ϕ instead of seeking the Lord for their help, and these --we see them going ~~th~~ in darkness and gloom but gradually we see suggestions of light breaking through. And eventually in verse 2 of chapter 9 in our English arrangement, 1 in the Hebrew arrangement, we have the light there, tremendous force, tremendous power. But the verse just before that is very difficult to know whether it is all darkness or whether there is the beginning of light, already, and in the two previous ones there is a suggestion which maybe the coming of light and may not. If we only had these three to go on, we could not be dogmatic at all, but when we have verse 2, a tremendous light, we are justified in saying that there is a gradually becoming aware of the light, until suddenly one realizes it has broken upon him in full force. And of course that is true with every great advance in civilization. It is true of every new idea, it is true of every great presentation of God's will, that it comes gradually to different people at different times. One man has a great idea. He thinks it's wonderful and it may be completely wrong. And he gets a lot of people

to follow him, but it ~~does~~ out. ~~And then~~ Another person has a great idea that is exactly what the Lord wants people to have, but he has a hard time getting people to follow him, but gradually understanding comes, gradually it is spreading, and then when everybody has accepted it they don't know how people could have been such fools as not to see it before. That is always the way. When we get to understand something, then we just don't see why everybody couldn't understand it before. But here in verse 2, the light, there is no question, the light is there, in great power. The people that walk in darkness have seen a great light. Who are these people? The people of Zebulon and Naphtali. People beyond Jordan, Galilee of the nations. The people in the area where the Assyrian armies first entered, where the darkness of the turning over of Israel to the Barbarian control, those people where the darkness first entered, those are the people where the great new life first began to shine, and Matthew said that Jesus Christ began His preaching in that very area in order that this passage here might be fulfilled. The coming of the light there was the preaching of our Lord in that area, and ~~that~~ it was poured out there exactly as Isaiah had predicted. Matthew said these things were done in order that ~~it~~ it might be fulfilled. Well, that is true, but ^{other hand,} ~~one~~ it is even more true to say these things were written in Isaiah because God knew that's what He was going to do later, and therefore He predicted it in advance, and it gave an ~~of~~ incidental inorganic prophecy, a little certification that Jesus Christ was the ~~of~~ one who was predicted, that it began right in that place here mentioned, something that would have been very hard to predict in advance, ~~of~~ but when you see it, you ~~of~~ see how it fulfills this fact. Where the darkness first came, there the light comes, first begins to shine in its fullness. And so in verse 3 we have a statement which is read in two different ways, one version says, thou hast multiplied the nation ~~and~~ not increased the joy, the other says thou hast multiplied the nation and hast increased his joy. The two are exactly opposite, and nobody on earth can tell which is right. Absolutely no way to prove it. It is my

impression that the ASV has increased its joy, the KJV says has not increased the joy. The thing is that the word "lo" can mean the joy to him, or it can mean not increase. It depends whether it should be written with an aleph or with a wau, and as to that position fitting. We don't know which actually was in the original manuscript, the aleph, or the wau, the pronunciation is exactly the same and one could spend a long time trying to decide, but it does not affect the passage as a whole very greatly. As you continue, this verse 3 is all joy, just as verse 2, verse 3 is all joy. they joy before thee according to the joy in harvest, and as men rejoice when they divide the spoil. ~~For~~ Thou has multiplied the nation. We ~~kind~~ of wonder why we should say, has not increased the joy. If this verse was back before verse 2, it might be quite reasonable. The nation has multiplied but with the multiplication has come misery rather than joy. They need the light that He will bring. But this comes after the mention of the light, the last half of the verse is full of the expressions of joy, I don't--if there is no proof one way or the other, it seems more reasonable to think that it is an expression of joy, the second phrase, than that it is an expression of the lack of it. So I would incline ^{to think} that in this case, perhaps, "increase his joy" would be more probable, but it does not affect the teaching of the fact of the whole actually, whether we have here again a little flyback to the darkness that preceded, or whether you are now entirely in the realm of light and joy. They rejoiced. Why did they so rejoice? Verse 4; 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.

I think that one writer has said that the "staff of the shoulder" is the ceremonial law, and the "rod of the oppressor" is the civil law, and I think it quite unnecessary to read that into the passage at all. It would seem to me that actually he is referring to what he has been referring to right along, to the war, the tumult, the misery that comes when Ahaz turns away from God's plan and tries to use his human expedients in order to deliver his land from the attacks, attacks more on him than on the land,

and this constant difficulty has continued from that time right up to the time of the Roman conquest, and of course that is continued through this present day, but when the preaching ~~time~~ comes, the preaching of the Prince of Peace, there is presented that ~~which~~ in principle which will eventually, in actuality, put an end to war, and bring the universal realm of peace, a realm which will come with the Lord's actual return, and so verse 4 I think we are justified in saying is referring specifically to human war and physical injury ~~and~~ rather than to anything specifically ~~good~~ ^{spiritual}. Now Thou has broken this "as in the day of Midian." What is the "day of Midian"? I am sure every Bible student says immediately that is Gideon, that refers to the way that, in the time of Gideon, there was a sudden tremendous destruction of the enemy through God's power. God had the army cut down to only 300 and with these 300, in a very special way, he won the tremendous victory. And God is going to bring in universal peace, not by ~~universal~~ great human plans of the United Nations, or League of Nations, or Disarmament Conferences, or that sort of thing, but by divine intervention, he is going to accomplish it in a sudden drastic way, much as He gave Gideon the victory. He is going to bring that then in a sudden drastic way which man has nothing to do with, and when this preaching comes, described in verses 1 and 2, this preaching is presenting the declaring, the ultimate complete reality of the end of war, but it is presenting that war, all that is wicked is in principle ~~are~~ soon to be destroyed through the action of the Prince of Peace, the one who destroyed the power of the devil. So that I am quite certain is the reason for verse 4, not a declaration of freedom from the ceremonial law or anything of the kind. And then verse 5, certainly backs up this interpretation of verse 4, very strongly, for verse 5 goes right on to refer specifically to physical human war, "for every battle of the warrior is with confused noise, and garments rolled in blood." The terrible misery of human warfare. The confused noise, the garments rolled in blood, the frightful things that exist in every war, you can read about them today in Viet Nam, the terrible tortures that are being done, that sort of thing,

you can read about Algeria, how just today, or yesterday I suppose it was, the French Secret Army// threw bombs on a French army barracks. I don't know what they ever thought they'd gain by that. They certainly couldn't destroy the French Army and if they did it wouldn't give them the ability to destroy ten times their number in Moslems. Utterly confused, as it says here "with confused noise," but it's typical of the anarchy and war and misery which is the result of sin in this world. But the deliverance from war, deliverance from all this, is to come in the first instance not through a great conqueror coming, that is to be a part of it, but a later stage, not the first stage. So we have that surprising verse 6, a surprising verse and yet a verse which can take us right back to chapter 7,14, Immanuel is to be born, a child who is to be born is the answer to the problem, and of course up in verse 1 and 2, we read of the great light that comes, the light comes because of the preaching of this child, but it is not because of his wonderful teachings, wonderful as they are, or of his great ideas, but because of who He is, and what He is eventually going to do, so we read:

"For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given" and of course this phrase, "unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given" is typical Hebrew parallelism, and very frequently in Hebrew parallelism you have the same thing said in two different ways, two parallel phrases and the difference between the two has no particular meaning, it is the central fact emphasized and stressed by the parallel. But there are cases when the parallel shows two different sides of one truth, and I don't believe there is any doubt of that here. I don't think that would be obvious enough that a person reading this for the first time would necessarily see it, or that a person could prove it from this. But once we have proven from other facts that this child who is born has two very contrasting aspects to His nature, then we can see how this verse very definitely points forward to that. Well, unto us a child is born. Here is a human being, a child born under normal processes, a true man in every way. But unto us a son is given. He is not merely born, He is given, He is the gift of God,

the Gift of His own Son, the One who is indeed fully man and who is fully God.

~~As I~~ ~~They~~ say you cannot prove the doctrine of the person of ~~of~~ Christ from ~~this~~ verse.

Nor would a person in Isaiah's time be expected to understand that from this verse.

But when he sees what happens he should be able to say why ~~w~~ that exactly fits with what was predicted, the land which is to be taken, even more literally than I ever would have dreamed of before, exactly suggests the two aspects of His nature...

M.32. (3/4)

...by these tremendous things, you might say, metaphysics. He is the one who has the being that's eternal, He is the one that (1)

tremendously important, but we end with the practical, and the Bible is always

practical. He is the Prince of Peace. He is the one who establishes peace, He is

the one who controls peace, He is the one from whom and from Him~~alone~~, peace can

be secured. And of course peace is right in our whole context. The darkness that

was from the Assyrian invasion, at the beginning of this chapter, the wars described

in ~~verse~~ 5, the end of wars described in ~~verse~~ 4, He is the Prince of Peace, He is the

one who does not merely talk but He acts. He is the one who does not merely say ~~He be~~

~~is~~-peaceful, like these students that are picketing the White House, let's throw

away all our atom bombs, cause if we have an atom bomb why everybody is going

to be killed so let's throw them away, let's let the Russians walk in and take us.

As Bertrand Russel says, better to be red than be dead. ~~The~~ thing they forget when

they say that is that they will all be dead if they're red, because the reds will kill

off everybody that is of capitalistic background, that is to say have a father who owns as much as a cow, why he was a capitalist and they will be killed off, so that the

slogan, "better red than dead," is a slogan that only the poorer type of laborer could

possibly use, and in Russia they did kill off the whole class of the ~~of~~ Czarist days,

all of those who in those days had anything. Of course they were a comparatively small

percent of the population but still they were at least ^{a few} ~~2~~ million people, they just killed

them off entirely, or if they didn't kill them off they told the children you cannot get any education, you cannot have any opportunity to do anything except the poorest type of menial labor, and it ended all future whatever, for them, and that's what they would do here, if they got control, but the Prince of Peace is not the one who ever takes peace by surrender. Peace by giving into what is evil, but the one who will establish peace by doing away with what is evil, and bringing it under control, so it is fitting that the practical aims that apply to the problems that are here in view, as Ahaz is trying to get peace by his wicked ~~ways~~ methods, and God says you can get peace only through trusting God and through the true method that He gives, that it is to come and is to come through a child that is to be born, who will be indeed the Prince of Peace. Then we have this statement of the increase of His government and peace, there shall be no end, and that of course would be a wonderful post-millennial verse. Take it by itself and say that there is a gradual increase as His government spreads over all the world, and there will be no end to it, but it does not have to be interpreted that way. It fits perfectly with the postmillennial interpretation, but it does not require postmillennial interpretation. Calvin had excellent commentaries on the Bible, they vary tremendously in quality because some of them are commentaries that he worked over and over, revised, studied, and tried to make excellent commentaries, while others are just his expository lectures that he gave with very little special effort as he went through the Bible and they were taken down in shorthand by somebody who heard them and some of them heard it without his even getting time to look them over, so that you have tremendous variations among the different volumes of his commentaries. ^{Those that} ~~some of~~ he worked over thoroughly are of course extremely fine. The others vary greatly, but even Calvin was sometimes affected by what is called the Rabbinic method of interpretation and here is the verse where he was. Because in your Hebrew Bible, where it says increase of His

government and peace, the word "increase" is written with a final name at the beginning of the word. If I recall correctly it is the only case in the Bible where we have a final name at the beginning of a word, so in his commentary he asks why do we have a final name at the beginning of the word, and he says the answer is because the name has a hole in it, the name as you write it is open, while the final name is closed, and consequently this is closed to show the absolutely final nature of the increase of His government and peace which nothing can stop. Well, that is what we speak of as the Rabbinic method of interpretation. We don't find much of it in Calvin. We don't find many people who use that sort of an interpretation today, but it's interesting that you do have this one instance of it in his commentary. "Of the increase of His government and peace there shall be no end." Now the fact that there is no end to it does not mean it just keeps on increasing through all eternity, because certainly He is going to control all the world and it couldn't go any further. There shall be no end. Surely nothing can stop it. Nothing can stop it until it has succeeded in taking everything under its thumb. So of the increase of His government and peace there shall be no end upon the throne of David, and this ties right back to chapter 7, where he told the whole house of David of ~~the~~ Immanuel who was coming, Yes? (6 1/4) I would incline to think that somebody felt sleepy when he was copying, wrote a final a in the wrong place. That is, I do not feel that we have a Bible which God has given us these letters precisely as they are today, they've gone through a long period of copying. The vital thing is the ideas in it, the ideas that are expressed in words, the words have been kept remarkably free from error, but yet some errors have crept in. Well, now of the errors that have crept in, I think a comparatively minor one is to get final name in the place where an ordinary name occurs, and the fact that it might have happened very, very early, but the fact that they kept it absolutely the same, they preserved it, they copied it, they find a final name there, it doesn't belong there, but they copy it. That is a wonderful evidence

to us of the care they took in copying. ~~What~~ they found in their manuscripts they tried to copy, but my guess would be it's an error in a case like that. I don't think the Lord intended to give us a meaning by the fact that a particular letter was written in a special way. Yes? (7 1/4) We don't know how far back the final names go. We don't know just when they were introduced. There is one case in Candlee where a sentence just doesn't make any sense, and where, on the assumption that the name that should be at the end of a word has been by a wrong ~~division~~^{division} of letters, has been copied at the beginning of the next verse. You get perfect sense out of it, and also get what the Septuagint has. So that whether the final names go back extremely far, I don't believe we know, and also, ~~yes-no~~^{if you ever} do any writing for publication, you'll be amazed how easy to overlook matters that are much more striking than that. Oh, it's the hardest thing to get rid of errors.

That little article 30 pages on Archeology and the Bible, that was in the ASA publication that I wrote in 1948, the VanKampen Press sent me the stuff for proof-reading and they evidently hadn't done any proof-reading, and I must have averaged two mistakes to a line, for the whole thing, that I found, and I read it through probably 15 times and every time I found two or three errors in the setting. Every single time, and even the last time. It is amazing how you can overlook.

I was editor of our college paper for a year and I had to read proof every week on it, and at the end of a year I could look at a paper like ~~that~~^{this} and spot a typographical error like an ink spot on the table, but it's amazing how the average person never notices it. You see a word, you recognize the word, you don't notice that the word is actually spelled quite wrong, you don't notice it. ~~I'm not so sure~~

I'm not so sure people would have noticed it necessarily until it has been there a while and then they think it is part of it. Well, ~~that~~ is not a vital point of exegesis of Isaiah, but it is an interesting one here, that there'll be no end of the increase of His government and peace. That is, that it cannot be destroyed, we

read about the kingdom of Christ, it cannot be destroyed. No one will be able to destroy it. Now some people say how can there be a millennial kingdom, a *millennial* kingdom has an end by definition. It has a thousand years, it has an end, and yet, of His kingdom there is to be no end. I don't take this to be no end, this means there won't be changes in administration, or end of one stage and beginning of another phase, or even turning over everything to God the Father, that God may be all in all, but that nothing is going to be able to destroy it, to bring an end to it, and upon His kingdom, to order it and to establish it, with judgment and with justice, from henceforth, even forever, again the word "forever" I don't think in itself means with no end, on and on and on, but it does mean on and on, as far as you can see, and probably involves that there is ending, but I don't think it is specifically stated. And then the zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this, this is something which God's power will establish, it is God's doing, nothing that men can do. War is going to come to an end, peace is coming, it is not going to come by these clever human schemes, all of which in the end backfire, get twisted up, each foolish situation, it is going to come because God intervenes with His own marvelous power. And here is a break that is far more important than the break at the beginning of 9 or at the beginning of 10. Surely right here is where you should start a new important section. But I incline to think that very likely this is the main division in the middle of our book ^{of} ~~the~~ Immanuel, is right here. Everything has moved along very smoothly from the beginning of 7 through this point. But now here we have a rather sharp start again, that looks forward to the wonderful climax of it all, now we go back again and look at the beginning of it, the Lord will send a word to ~~Jacob~~, to Jacob and it lighted on Israel. There again you see the use of terms, you see the two names, simply parallel, there is no difference here between Jacob and Israel. It is not that one document has "a word to Jacob;" and the other document had "it lighted on Israel," it simply is a (12) in having two that mean substantially

the same thing in parallel. And all the people shall know, even Ephraim and the inhabitants of Samaria, --you see, we have looked forward into the future, up to the time of the coming of the Prince of Peace, Now we come back right to the time of Ahaz, and because it was during Ahaz' time that Samaria was destroyed, it couldn't be after that. But right during his time, we look again at Samaria, and they say in the pride and stoutness of heart, the bricks are fallen down,, we'll build with hewn stones, the sycomores are cut down, we will change them into cedars. Wonderful statement, you admire the pluck who when they're down they're not out. They lose a lot, they start and rebuild and go ahead. Verse 10 would be a wonderful motto for most anybody to take in life. It is something which is very, very commendable, but the thing here which makes it not commendable, but deserving of ~~condemnation~~ ^{condemnation} is that this wonderful thing is said in pride and stoutness of heart, because the catastrophe that comes to them is not a natural catastrophe which is wonderfully plucky of them to ~~not~~ be downed by, but lift up and go forward, but it is a catastrophe which God has sent because of their turning away from Him, therefore, they're saying that here, instead of turning to Him in contrition and seeking His forgiveness and His leadership makes this thing which would otherwise be wonderful be a matter of pride and stoutheartedness. So it is too bad that we can't lift the wonderful verse out of there and use it because it is such a wonderful verse, but it is with the wrong background and purpose, and therefore becomes bad. It is in the pride and stoutness of their heart that Ephraim says we are going to go on and pick up where we are, and carry on, continuing to forget God in the future as we have been doing in the recent past. Therefore the Lord is going to send enemies against them and they will devour Israel with open mouth, for all this His anger is not turned away, but his hand is stretched out still. I guess we have to stop there until tomorrow...

...we have here then this series of stanzas of this poem, and you notice that the poem starts--we look at those wonderful verses last time about the coming of the wonderful child, which is described at the beginning of chapter 9, and then we notice that at the end of verse 7, there is one of the major changes in the chapter, one of the major turning points. We have gone up from starting with Ahaz, we have gone ^{right} up to that great climax which we reach, "in the increase of His government and peace there shall be no end." Looking way forward into the future, into the complete victory of Christ. Then we come back again into the immediate situation. And now we have four stanzas, we have a stanza from verse 8 to 11, another from 13 to 17, another from 18 to 21, and another ⁱⁿ ~~from~~ chapter 10.1-4, and why on earth a chapter division is ever put after three stanzas and before the fourth, as if in one of our hymns they have the first three verses on one page and the fourth verse on the next page. It just doesn't seem to make any sense at all. But here are these four stanzas and every one of the four ends with this declaration, that for all this His anger is not turned away, but His hand is stretched out still, and so in the first of them, as we mentioned at the end of the hour last time, we have in the first of them, that wonderful verse showing real determination, verse 10. The bricks are fallen, but we'll build with hewn stone. The sycamores are cut down but we will put cedars in their place. We've lost all our good things, we're going to make better ones. It is a wonderful determination but it is expressed in the wrong situation. The previous verse says in pride and stoutness of heart they did it. So the Lord is going to bring enemies against ^{Israel} ~~them~~ who will devour them with open mouths, and perhaps, "in spite of" here would seem to fit perfectly, wouldn't it? It could be because of, and go back to verse 9 and 10, because of their pride and stoutness of heart, the Lord's anger is not turned away, His hand is still stretched out, or with what immediately preceded, in spite of all they're going through in this, with these enemies attacking and devouring them with open mouth, in spite of that, it is God's

anger still . Then the second of these describes the condition in Israel, the wickedness within Israel, the people have not turned unto Him that smote them. Neither have they ~~smote~~ ^{sought} the Lord of hosts. He has brought this punishment on Israel, and Judah sees what is happening to Israel, he has brought chastisement upon them, they have not sought Him, not turned to God, when He has chastised them. Therefore, the Lord will cut off from Israel, head and tail, palm branch and rush in ~~o~~ one day. The elder and honourable is the head, and the prophet that teaches lies, he is the tail. I don't know just what the figure really means, altogether. The head of course is the honorable man, the elder, the leader, but what does it mean that the prophet that teaches lies, is the tail. Certainly there is ~~a~~ condemnation of a prophet that speaks lies, but how is he at the opposite extreme from the other? I don't quite know, am quite curious, any suggestions any of you have about it. But, verse 16 is a great verse, they that leave this people cause them to err. The people are at fault, they that are led ~~of~~ them are destroyed, the people are coming into terrible results, but it is due to they that lead. And of course ~~(that is exactly our situation~~ ^{condition} in America) today. You go into the bulk of our churches, and the people ~~who~~ believe that the Bible is true, most of them wouldn't go to church if they didn't believe that, they think the Bible is true, they think Christ is God, they ~~g~~ think Christianity is vital, and important, but their leaders have mostly today been trained in schools that have taught them that social improvement is all that matters and we can't be sure about these religious things anyway and after all the Bible is ~~g~~ full of error, and so on, and the leaders, the ministers, the heads of churches, they may not say this, but it is implied in an awful lot they say, and it is gradually influencing the people, half of them drift out of the church, and don't come back any more, except in times of calamity, the other half becomes attached to this unChristian teaching, and the people as a whole, you can say, are not responsible. It is not they who did it, it is the leaders, but it is having an effect upon the people, and the people will inevitably

suffer for it, and that's exactly the condition he describes here, he puts the blame where it belongs, on the prophet that teaches lies, on they that cause His people to err. Therefore, he says, the Lord will not rejoice over their young men, neither will he have compassion on their fatherless and widows, for every one is profane and an evildoer, and every mouth speaks folly. That is pretty strong language, every one. It certainly the great bulk, it certainly does not mean every religion. Mr. Cohen?

(5 2/4) An interesting suggestion that the prophet who speaks lies here isn't simply a prophet who likes to say what is false for the sake of saying false things, but a prophet who is winning his position, his money, his approval by doing what the people in established leadership will be pleased by. That is a very interesting suggestion. Very interesting. I can't quite feel that the prophet is saying that the prophet who tells lies is bad but the leaders and the elders are good. If the leaders were good I don't think God would be punishing the nation. I think they are included in the wickedness, in fact, they are to quite an extent responsible for it, they that cause this people to err wouldn't just be the prophets, but surely the particular leaders. But this idea that Mr. ^{Tourville} ~~Cohen~~ has suggested, that maybe the prophets are time servers, as it were, trying to get the leaders approval, and therefore he speaks of them like the tail that wags, that is a very interesting suggestion. Yes? (7)

I would incline at the moment toward that interpretation, it is a little hard to be sure, but it is true that the next verse does suggest it very strongly. The leaders, the honorable men and the elders, they are leading them wrongly, ~~they~~ Ahaz, for instance, is making this wicked alliance with Syria, they are leading the people wrongly, and the prophet is one of those who is led wrongly and not only led wrongly but he is giving aid and comfort to it, he is helping to mislead the people, but doing it in the direction that the leaders want it. So that that, I think, has a lot to be said for it. Well, the Lord says, ~~all~~ the people are going to suffer, even the fatherless and the ~~and~~ widow,

even the ones who would say, you would say, these poor people, what can they do, up against ~~us~~ it completely, won't you have compassion on them? He says, *no*, the whole nation is going to suffer, as a result of this evil leadership, which has been permitted to gain control over it. And so he says, here is certainly the cause of it fits very well, wouldn't it, because of all this, his anger is not turned away but He is keeping on, his hand is still outstretched, or it could be in spite perhaps, but it doesn't seem to be much to suggest "in spite" in this particular sense, does it? Mr. Gregory, what were you going to say? (8 1/2) It is hard to say, because the word Israel means all the descendants of Jacob, so that all of both kingdoms are Israelites, but the northern kingdom being the larger kingdom, the northern kingdom is often called Israel, in distinction to the southern kingdom named after its principal tribe, called Judah. However very frequently when they call the southern kingdom after its principal tribe Judah, they call the northern kingdom after its principal tribe Ephraim, and they refer to them as Ephraim and Judah, and then once the northern kingdom has gone into exile, the southern kingdom takes over the title Israel, which really belongs to it just as much as to the northern, except that it's smaller, once the northern is done, it is the Israel, so it calls itself Israel, after that. So under the circumstances, our first stanza speaks very specifically about the northern kingdom, doesn't it, speaks of Ephraim, and Samaria, the first one, so that would seem to suggest that it is the northern kingdom in the first stanza, but in this second stanza here there is nothing that would tie it necessarily just to the northern kingdom and it, as far as the terminology is concerned, I think it could fit either one equally, and as far as the fact is concerned, the northern kingdom had its wicked leadership which was leading it to disaster, and Ahaz represents the same thing in this other kingdom, so whether the second stanza is supposed to be restricted to the north ~~and~~ or restricted to the south, or to cover both, is hard to be dogmatic. I would incline a bit toward that it covers

both. (10 1/4) Yes but in the first stanza it is the ~~Assyrians~~ Syrians that are before and the Philistines that are behind. Well, now I am not quite, of course the Syrians were next to Ephraim, not next to Judah. But ~~were~~ the Philistines next to Ephraim? Were they not ^{more} next to Judah? Not quite sure about that. My inclination ~~is~~ — they were certainly very definitely next to Judah. They were in the southern region. Now whether they also were against Israel ~~is not~~ ^{enough} to warrant binding that to Israel, I don't know. But of course then you take the next verse, yet the people have not turned to him that smote them. Does that mean that the people of the northern kingdom who have had these effects, will not, have not turned to God who sent these, or does it mean the people of the southern kingdom, seeing the northern kingdom go through all this misery have not turned to him that has smitten the northern kingdom. The pronouns like that are rather definite to say must be one or the other. We don't use a noun, just use a pronoun. Therefore the Lord will cut off from Israel all this in one day. Well, as a matter of ~~fact~~ ^{effect}, he did that to the northern kingdom and he did it to the southern kingdom later, a hundred years later. So what you can confine to the northern kingdom, I think it is very doubtful, particularly when it fits the southern kingdom so very excellently. Now in the third, you have the northern kingdom involved again.

The third stanza, wickedness burns as a fire, it ~~is~~ devours the briars and thorns, kindle in the thickets of the forest, and they roll up together in a column of smoke, through the wrath of the Lord of hosts is the land burned up, people are as a fuel of the fire, no man spares his brother. What is he talking about? Northern or southern kingdom? One shall snatch on the right hand, and be hungry, he shall eat on the left hand, and they shall not be satisfied, they shall eat every man the flesh of his own arm. Manasseh, Ephraim, Ephraim, Manasseh, they're in the northern kingdom. But, and they together shall be against Judah. For all this his anger is not turned away, but his hand is stretched out still. Is he here--he is certainly here deal-

ing with the northern kingdom, but is he thinking of the south, or is he thinking of the two, under the one, people of Israel, the people of God. Yes, Mr. Vannoy?

(12 1/2) I do not ~~g~~ think there is any suggestion here of mercy in this verse. His anger is not turned away but (12 3/4)

Could be, but I think you'd have to have more to make it bring in a different idea like that, I don't think the word would do it alone. He asked for mercy, fine. It expresses that the stretched-out line usually expresses power, using of force, rather than-- I stretched out--all day/^{long}have I stretched out my hand, unto a people that would not accept. The stretching out of the hand is a picture often of mercy. But the stretching out of the arm is a picture of power, perhaps of destruction. We read that God brought the people out of Egypt with an outstretched arm, so the beating of the Egyptians, forcing them to let them go, I think it is more a picture of power than of compassion.

Now that again is the ~~g~~ sort of a matter you have to look at cases. I give~~s~~ you my impression I had of it, added them up...

M.34. (3/4(

...well the third stanza then, and it shows confusion and turmoik in the land, and when you get tot he fourth stanza, there you have the social unrighteousness, which is inthe land. Woe unto them. Maybe instead of starting like the others, the Lord send a word to Jacob, yet the people have not turned to him that smote them, for which (1)

It starts differently. Woe unto them. Well, the archbishop thought this must be a chapter division, but the refrain shows it is a continuation of the same line. Woe to them that decree unrighteous decrees, and to the writers that write perversely. I don't think that in the light of the whole context, ^{you can say} he is simply talking about the northern kingdom. I think his emphasis is on Judah, he is talking to Judah, he is living in Judah, he is dealing with the people of Judah,

he can very well some times, showing God's wrath against the northern kingdom but I incline to think that when He does He is going to make it absolutely clear, that otherwise it is His own people mainly that He is talking about, and He says these ~~are~~ that write perverseness and turn aside the needy from judgment, rob the poor of my people, of their rights, that widows may be their spoil, and the fatherless their prey--he says , woe to them. What will ye do in the day of visitation, --what is the day of visitation? Is that the day when the committee comes to investigate, or just when somebody comes to make a call? What is the day of visitation? That's an old English phrase, I don't believe we use it much any more. Visitation, here, the day of a powerful change, the day of a strong (2 1/4) coming in, historically, not merely investigation (2 1/4)

Question? (2 1/2) I think, it doesn't have to be. Now let's look at the Hebrew of that. That is chapter 10.3. This noun here in verse 3 translated visitation is derived from the verb (2 3/4) which verb is translated visit, I don't think it ever means visit without a modifier. It is an intervention by a higher power, and when a government (3)

an intervention of a higher power over a lower. It represents the activity of a government (3 1/4) a ruler, a prince, a leader, over those under him, controlling, or as gods over those who in comparison to him are very weak. They say, that the Lord has visited His people. Now that doesn't mean that He has made a call on His people and forced the people into (3 1/2)
~~It is a word that~~

It is a word that is heard a good many times. In Isa.24 it is and in the new Amplified Old Testament, in Isa.24, the last verse, the word here translated, visited punishment, is a different word from the word (4)

and it is an intervention of a higher power for the purpose of either making a change in condition either for the

better or for the worse, it can be either. In Isa.24 I'm sure it means for the better, rather than for the worse (4 1/2)

Well, the day of visitation. What will you do in the day of visitation, very clearly means an intervention, a change for the worse. And ⁱⁿ the desolation which shall come from far? to whom will ye flee or help? and where will ye leave your glory? They shall bow down under the prisoners, and shall fall under the slain. For all this--what does for all this mean--for all this mentioned in verses 1 and 2, and for all their wickedness? On account of all their wickedness His anger is not turned away? His hand is stretched out still? Or in spite of all this, this is going to happen, His anger is still there? ^{Things that} ~~it fits~~ with the "in spite of", ~~it seems~~ to be nearer in the third and first, than the things that fit with "because of." In the second it is "because of." I'm not at all sure how you get the "in spite of" out of (5 1/2) unless you can find a parallel, which I doubt. I would incline to think (5 1/2)

Then those four stanzas are this little poem, and certainly ought to have been a chapter by itself. Surely it is long enough to be a chapter, 18 verses, representing one definite poem, ^{but} ~~with~~ the last half of one chapter and the first verse of another, is a very queer unsatisfactory combination. Yes? (6 1/4) I would incline to think that here the wrath indicated God's continual purpose in judgment, and that this judgment is not satisfied by anything that has yet happened, this judgment has to continue because the greatness of sin (6 1/2) and these were things you see, which you feel very sorry about, they are not --they do not ~~atone~~ for sin, sin is too great to be forgotten about, (6 3/4)

And of course Judah, after Assyria comes into Israel and takes Israel captive and takes thousands out of Judah captive, Judah is still nominally independent but subject to Assyria. So we go on now to a new

chapter which begins here with verse 5 of this chapter, and it is a new subject, it should be the start of a chapter, and it runs either to 11.10, a natural place for it to run to, because that is quite unified. There is a progress and a contrast, and a further progress, it could run to 11.10, but it is a pretty/^{good}stopping place, where the 11th chapter begins, because there certainly is a vital contrast between what precedes and what follows, but I think they surely should be understood together.

Now verse 5 which begins a very definite section is a theodacy(?). It is a section in which the ways of God are justified to men. It is a section which studies the dealings of God with His people, and explains them. There are the people of Israel, they are sinners; there are the people of Judah, they are sinners. But if you compare ~~the~~ the people of Israel and the people of Judah, with the people of the other nations round about, you say what wonderful people, what pure people, what people of lofty character, what people of fine benevolence, what people of splendid antecedents. Now their attitudes were abominable when compared with the divine will, and they were abominable in comparison to the standards which God had set down, but they were an awful lot nearer those standards ~~than~~ the attitude of the heathen round about them. And so the Lord is dealing with His people, who have greatly benefited by His law, His instruction, in fact, the people as a whole are definitely affected by it. Now you take the United States here, look at our sin, look at our wickedness, look at our turning away from God, you wonder how God judges such character, but then you compare on the average the moral life, on the average, the decency of the average American with most other countries, and you will find it very definitely superior. The word of God has had its influence upon people's character, upon people's general attitude. You take the way people here are talking about how we should throw away our bombs and just make ourselves just be nice for fear you'll hurt anybody else, no matter what danger it puts us in. You won't find many nations where they'd even tolerate anybody talking that way. England comes the nearest

to it of any nation, and of course they also have much the same background as we have. But most nations wouldn't even tolerate a thing like that for a minute, the people wouldn't even think of it. There is a lot of liberal, humanitarianism which is illogical and not Biblical faith, but which does show an attitude which is a by-product of true Christian character, which you will hardly find in other places.

You do have a real effect of the gospel, but the Lord doesn't deal with us on an absolute basis, He deals with us on a relative basis. And He deals with us in relation with the opportunities we have, to what we should come up to. In a way, you might say the difference between one of us and another, is like the boy that stood up on a chair and said to his brother, "I'm nearer the moon than you are." Well, he was, but in comparison with the great distance which he stands from God's standard, there is not much difference between them. And so the Israel and Judah, from an absolute standpoint, they were very much better than the nations round about, but in comparison with God's standard, they were way down below^{it} and they were more culpable than the others because they had more light, more opportunity, and so he is going to cause them to go into punishment, into misery, and immediately as in the prophet Habbakuk, He says--the prophet Habbakuk starts in with, look at the sin, the wickedness of His people, what is going to happen? Why the Lord says, I'm going to send the Chaldeans, a wicked people, to destroy them. Oh, but Habbakuk says, the Chaldeans, these wicked people, they're much worse, how can they win in a war, how can a wicked people win against the godly, how can they? How can God's enemies win against God's people, it is impossible. Well, the Lord answers it in this passage here.

What is the Assyrian? Is the Assyrian the great wicked enemy of the people of God? Is the Assyrian the great aggressor that destroys everything that gets in his way? Is the Assyrian the one that we just ought to sweep off from the face of the earth,

because of his terrible attitude and action? God said, O Assyrian, *the rod of mine anger*, the staff in whose hand is my indignation. In other words, God says, these Assyrians may be very wicked, they may be very disgusting, they may be harmful people, but He says they are my instrument, they are the staff in my hand, the rod of my anger. So we read elsewhere in the Scripture that God makes the wrath of wicked men to praise Him. God uses that which is wrong as His instrument, and here is this great and wicked Assyrian empire, and God is using it as His instrument. So He introduces this theology, this explanation of the ways of God to men, with the words, Ho, Assyrian, the rod of my anger, the staff in whose hand is my indignation, (13 1/4) Ahaz things he has brought the Assyrian in by paying ^{them} a big tribute in order to deliver them from Israel and Syria, but God says, no, Assyria is my instrument which I'm going to use for my purposes.

So He says I will send against you a profane nation, against the people of my wrath, that's Old English, in Hebrew, you wouldn't say in modern English, the people of my wrath, in modern English you would say the people whom I am angry with, the people of my wrath. Will I give him a charge, to take the spoil, and to take the prey, to tread them down like the mire of the streets. But here, verse 7, shows us the attitude of the Assyrian. He says, howbeit he meaneth not so. The Assyrian is God's instrument, but the Assyrian does not think that he is going to serve the Lord. He thinks ~~is~~ he is serving himself. So here we have a situation with the Assyrians, God's instrument, used of God for God's purpose, but the Assyrian thinking that he is the end in itself, he is doing what he wants to do, for his own purpose, and so you have a confused and involved situation. They are God's instrument to do His will, therefore God's will will be done even though a wicked instrument be used, but they are not God's willing or voluntary instrument, God uses them but not because they place themselves in His hands to use. He uses them without

their knowing about it, even in spite of what their desires would be, therefore, the wicked thing they do deserves no favor on account of his being in line with God's purpose. They accomplish what He wants, but they don't deserve any credit, in fact they are just as culpable as if they were doing what was contrary to God's will...

M. 35. (3/4)

...chapter 9, and we were looking at that form which ends with the refrain that in all this, His anger does not come to an end, His arm is still stretched out for judgment, and we notice that this poem runs through four stanzas of which the last one ends with verse 4, and then we started where chapter 10 really should start, with verse 5, and here we have the justification of the ways of God, it is in some way parallel to the book of Habbakuk, because in the book of Habbakuk we have the prophet mourning at the sin of the nations and what can be done about this, and the Lord says I'm going to bring the Chaldeans, a terrible people who will destroy and do all kinds of injury, and then that's the answer to the first problem, but now the problem comes to Habbakuk, how can the Chaldeans, a wicked people, far more wicked than Israel, be God's instrument to punish the Israelites, and the book of Habbakuk is directed to the consideration of that problem and God's answer. One of the books much quoted in the New Testament (1 3/4)

Now here we have the statement of God's attitude toward the Assyrians, and in this statement here of His attitude toward the Assyrians, He starts out with a definite statement of the purpose of the Assyrians and of God's purpose in relation to them. O Assyrian, the rod of mine anger, and the staff in their hand is mine indignation. In other words, you are entirely wrong when you think that God is the God of Israel, Jehovah is the God of Israel, Asshur is the God of Assyrian, there is a contest between the two to see which can protect his people, and in the contest you will find which is the strongest, which of the two can protect his people best.

The Assyrians are enemies of Jehovah, therefore God will naturally give support to His own people and will hold back the Assyrian attack. No, He says, Assyria is the rod of my anger, the rod of my anger of course means the rod that is used by my anger. The rod that is available as an instrument for the expression of my anger. Not the one I'm angry against but the one I use to exert my anger, and the staff in their hands, the hand of the Assyrian, is my indignation, so that God says I'm not simply the God of the little country of Judah, or the somewhat larger country of Judah and the northern kingdom together, I'm not simply a god of this little area that has to meet enemies from greater regions, I actually control Assyria, this great brutal aggressive world force is actually an instrument for the accomplishment of my purpose. So that is a ~~transcendent~~ claim made in that third verse, a claim which the critics will agree, you would hardly find anybody holding until the time of the second Isaiah. The second Isaiah, you come to the great understanding of Monotheism, the claim that God is the creator of the universe, that God controls all things. But the first Isaiah thinks of God simply as the majestic king of His own people, and had not reached the point of believing that the other gods do not exist. He would hold that they should only worship Jehovah, but that the other gods ~~also~~ exist and if they worship Jehovah enough maybe He can try to protect them from the other gods. Well, you can't get that out of this, so of course that is very easy for the critics to answer, all they have to do is to leave this verse in the chapter, and put it over to the time of the second Isaiah. Of course that is what they do. They put all the passages of what seem to them a primitive idea of God together, and all the passages that seem to have an advanced idea of God together, and then the passages of the primitive idea of God are early and the passages of the advanced idea of God are late, and then having dated them and arranged them, then you see the development of the idea of God right from the primitive to the more advanced. It is arguing in circles actually.

Because the dating is done to quite an extent in view of the idea, and then you claim you see an evolution of ideas from the date that has thus been given to them, but we do not have anything in the Bible actually that has what we're entitled to call a primitive idea, but we have many statements which have fuller expression of God's character, than others. We have--the critics say that in the J document that God breathed, He talked, He moved His arms, He takes the dust of the earth and He fashions a man, that's all very low and anthropomorphic, while in P you have the great abstract advance (5 3/4) Well, of

course we don't admit that one was more advanced than the other, but we take it

one shows one aspect ^{of God's activity,} ~~and the~~ (6) the other shows under a different figure, a different aspect.

When you say that God is the God of Israel, you are not saying God is the God of the whole world, but you're certainly not saying He isn't, so if you speak of God as the God of Israel, you can say there is God as God of a small section, God as creator of the universe is a loftier conception of God, but the difference is you are looking at a different part of the account. If you said He is only the God of Israel, He did not create the worlds, that would be a lower conception, but you don't find that. You find partial statements which they say claim to mean that there is nothing more to it. Well, here is one of the most tremendous use of God's (6 1/2)

that even this greatest force of the time, this tremendous world-shaking empire of Assyria, was simply a rod in God's hand, which God could use (6 3/4)

And the next verse refers to the people of Judah and Israel, and says that Assyria is going to come against them, that He is going to use Assyria to take spoil, to take prey, to tread them down like the mire of the street, the Assyrian is going to do terrible damage to God's own people, because it is God's purpose to use them in that way. But then verse 7 you get to the other phase of the problem.

"Howbeit he meaneth not so, neither doth his heart think so;" ~~the~~ the Assyrian

does not recognize that he is God's instrument at all, in fact, he does not recognize God at all. He does not think of himself as God's instrument, he thinks that he is the great powerful one who can destroy and devastate as he chooses. It is in his heart to destroy and cut off nations not a few. He says, are not my princes altogether kings? Are not my leading ones the greatest of kings of these nations, opposing ^{thee?} ~~me?~~ Is not Calno as Carchemish? Is not Hamath as Arpad? Is not Samaria as Damascus? Are not these places I haven't yet conquered in the same category with those I have? As my hand has found the kingdom of the idols whose graven images were far greater than those of Jerusalem and of Samaria, shall I not, as I have done to Samaria and her idols, so do to Jerusalem and her idols? What had he done to Samaria and her idols? Well, of course, the correct answer to that question depends upon when this was stated. If this chapter is written at the time when Isaiah went and spoke to Ahaz, the time of chapter 7, then the Assyrian had not yet done anything to Samaria and her idols. He does that in the very near future, after, so this might conceivably be two or three years after (9) but I don't think it is necessary to think so, it can be that it is looking forward and picturing the Assyrian over succeeding years, after he overwhelms. He overwhelms Damascus at the time of Ahaz, and Samaria he has practically in his hand, but he allows Hoshea to continue as a puppet king and then 9 years later he destroys Samaria, and this can be looking forward to what the Assyrians said. The Assyrians conquered Damascus, they conquered Samaria. Is not Samaria as Damascus? Then he says, as I conquer Samaria, I'm going to conquer Jerusalem too, same way. So he is looking as at a picture over the future, not necessarily a picture right at the time of chapter 7. I don't think we have to say that the passage is written later on, but it is looking forward over the procession of years. Now the Assyrian is going to do away with these two kings of whom Ahaz is afraid, the king of Damascus, the King of Samaria. The king of Samaria is succeeded by another who is a puppet king under the Assyrians. Nine

years later he does away with him, destroys Samaria, so that the Assyrians would naturally say, shall I not, as I have done to Samaria and her idols, so do to Jerusalem and her idols? Picturing the on-moving of the Assyrian power which people could see coming forward, irresistible, settled, taking section after section, and as it comes the next in line after Samaria is going to be Jerusalem. May be they won't take it right away but eventually they certainly would plan to take it. Shall I not, as I have done to Samaria and her idols, do to Jerusalem? But the Lord said, Wherefore it'll come to pass that when the Lord has performed his whole work on mount Zion and on ~~Jer~~ Jerusalem, I will punish the fruit of the stout heart of the king of Assyria, and the glory of his high looks.

God is going to use the Assyrian to punish Samaria and destroy the northern kingdom, God is going to use the Assyrian to punish, to do God's work on mount Zion and on Jerusalem, to put the people into a state of panic, seeing what they face, and to take great parts of Judah captive, but the whole work that God is going to do now is far short of the work He is going to do eventually, when He brings a different people altogether from Assyria, the people from Babylonia, and when they come, and conquer the southern kingdom, 150 years later, but now He says, the Assyrians think they're going to take Jerusalem, but the Lord says, I will punish the fruit of the stout heart of the king of Assyria, and the glory of his high looks. For he says,-- now who is speaking in verse 14, Mr. Abbott? (12) In our English manner of printing the Bible, as in the Hebrew from which it is translated, there is no indication of the change of person, change of speaker, and the Lord of course is speaking in verse 5. The Lord says, Assyrian, the rod of mine anger, and the Lord continues to speak in 5-7, but then the Lord quotes the king of Assyria, vs 9-11. Then in 12, the Lord is speaking specifically. I will punish the fruit of the stout heart of the king of Assyria--you notice how He speaks of Himself in the third person and in the first person in the same verse.

When the Lord has performed His holy work I will punish the fruit of the stout heart of the king of Assyria, That I of course is not the prophet, that is the Lord. The prophet of course does not claim to be the king of Assyria, but the Lord speaks of Himself ~~as~~ in the third person and in the first person, both in one verse. But then verse 13, For he says, --so here is the Assyrian quoted by the Lord again, showing the Assyrian's attitude in verse 13 and 14, but in 15 it is not the Assyrian talking any more because it doesn't fit the Assyrian at all. It is very evident that the Lord's quotation from the Assyrian ends at the end of 14, and that 15 continues the Lord's declaration. Now that is the sort of thing that you have to notice in reading or it doesn't make sense. A person reading this right straight through, it just doesn't make any sense, and it is all the harder for the ordinary person to read, because in our English we use quotation marks and other indications like that, to make clear ~~ng~~ the transition, but it makes a tremendous difference to the sense here.

But vs.13-14 then is again the Lord continuing to speak, and , or rather the Assyrian continuing to be quoted by the Lord. The Lord says, the Assyrian is the rod of my anger, I am using him for my purpose, but the Assyrian said, by the strength of my hand I have done it, and by my wisdom...

M.36. (3/4)

...for I am very skilful, and I have removed the bounds of the people, and have robbed their treasures, and put down the inhabitants like a valiant man. The Assyrian tells what he has done. He has conquered nation after nation, he has done it with his valiant ^{his great strength}power, ^{wisdom,} ~~his great strength~~ And my hand ^{--this is part of} ~~will punish~~ the fruit of the stout heart of the king of Assyria (1 1/4) and as one gathers, my hand has found as a nest the riches of the people--there is a figure of speech, as if a man goes out and finds a nest somewhere in the woods, my hand has found the riches of the people, there is nothing to stop me when I come to it,

and as one gathers eggs that are left, drive the bird away from the nest and take the eggs, so I have gathered all the earth, and there was none that moved the wing, or opened the mouth, or peeped. The figures are used, the figure of expression doesn't mean no person moved wings, isn't referring to the wing of the airforce, it is a reference to the animal, it is a figure of speech to show that the Assyrian (2)

Just like a person goes into a flock of birds and takes what he wants, so the Assyrian is conquering the nations one after another, and if you read the Assyrian annals (2 1/4)

But then after this most of the tone was criticizing v.12, the stout heart of the king of Assyria has been illustrated here, then the Lord gives His judgment upon it. God is going to use the Assyrian as the instrument to punish Israel, but that does not mean that He is not going to punish the Assyrian also. Shall the axe boast itself against him that heweth therewith? or shall the saw magnify itself against him that shakes it? as if the rod should shake itself against them that lift it up, or as if the staff should lift itself up, as it it were not something simply made of wood? God says it is ridiculous for the Assyrian to boast when it is simply God who permits it for God's own purpose, like the New Testament says, what hast thou that thou hast not received? A Christian, if he works hard, and studies hard, and prays much, may be used greatly of the Lord, but when he tends to think that he is such a wonderful, that he has done it and accomplished things, that it's his will, his cleverness, and his ability, pretty soon the Lord throws away that particular one and uses this instrument. And so this picture applies to all instruments that the Lord uses, the staff is not to boast itself against the one that uses it.

Therefore, shall the Lord, the Lord of hosts, send among his fat ones leanness; and under his glory he shall kindle a burning like the burning of a fire. And the light of Israel shall be for a fire, and His Holy One for a flame: and it shall

burn and devour his thorns and his briars in one day. There is a figure, a picture, of the sudden calamitous destruction of the Assyrians force. This picture is given, a sudden calamitous destruction of Assyrian force, and since it is tied up before with the statement that the Assyrian thinks he can conquer Jerusalem, as he has Samaria, God says, shall the axe boast himself against him that uses it. I'm going to destroy it in one day, you think of the sudden destruction and you look for an instance where this suddenness of God's intervention against the Assyrian~~and~~ was fulfilled, and to your surprise you find two of them, you find there was a beginning of destruction, of manifestation of destructive power against the Assyrians, in the failure of Sennacherib to take Jerusalem, and God suddenly killed thousands of the Assyrian troops in the night, left the Assyrians helpless. So if we're thinking simply of whether the Assyrians can conquer Jerusalem, the end of it, the fulfillment of this would be in the destruction of Sennacherib's force, which happened maybe 20 years after Isaiah, or if he is thinking of the ultimate destiny of the Assyrian empire, he can be thinking of a century later, when not in one day exactly, but in a very short interval, here was a destruction of the greatest empire of the time, and its absolute end, to where people two or three hundred years^{later} didn't even know where its capital was, Ninevah completely disappeared from sight, one of the greatest cities, and the empire lingered on another 7 or 8 years, and then it was defeated at the battle of Carchemish and never amounted to anything again in all of history, so that here it does seem as if the fulfillment is more exact to the failure of the Assyrians to conquer Jerusalem, rather than to the ultimate end of the Assyrian empire, but that both of them share in this one quality of a sudden tremendous overwhelming destruction. God doesn't say here precisely (6 1/2)

That the light of Israel will be a fire and it will burn and devour his thorns and his briars in one day. Of course that could mean any action of the Lord, so it could

refer to the attack of the Medes and the Babylonians together a century later than this, but probably in view of the previous references to Jerusalem, the immediate reference is to the destruction of Sennacherib's (7)

But then he goes on and says, and shall consume the glory of his forest, and of his fruitful field, both soul and body, and they shall be as when a standardbearer faints. Well that probably could still describe the destruction of Sennacherib's hosts, or it could be that between ~~vs~~ 17 and 18 it jumps forward from the destruction of Sennacherib's hosts, but looks to a century the destruction of the whole empire. V.19 and the rest of the trees of his forest shall be few, that a child may write them.

Well, that could fit either one but perhaps it fits the immediate one best, because thousands of the army were destroyed, Sennacherib found such a small number left, there was nothing for him to do but leave Judah and go back to Nineveh. And the rest of the trees of his forest were few--it's a figure of speech, but the figure is very clear. The trees of the forest mean the forces over which he had control. The empire is spoken of as the forest, and the trees of the forest would refer to his power of control. So few that a child shall write them. And it shall come to pass in that day. Now again we have the phrase in that day, and again I suggest that the best ~~correct~~ interpretation of it is that there will be a day coming, it will come to pass in the day which I am now about to see. In our ordinary English we think the most natural way of taking it would seem to be, in the day of which we have just been speaking. But if that is so, it certainly was not fulfilled, because in the day when Sennacherib's host was destroyed, Judah was tremendously relieved, ^{but} ~~so~~ I don't think you could say this verse was fulfilled then, and also in the day when the Assyrian empire fell, you certainly couldn't say it then because within a very few years ~~as~~ after that, God sent the Babylonians to conquer Judah and to take them ~~off~~ into exile. So that this verse 20 must refer not to the day just spoken of but to a day to which the Lord is going to refer. Many say, in that day, is a specific technical term meaning

"the day of the Lord." I think the evidence is too small to make a definite statement like that, that it is a specific term for "the day of the Lord." I feel that it is much better, in view of all the uses of it, to consider it as a general reference to some time that is sure to come, a time as I described. So that it will come to pass that there will be a day when the remnant of Israel, and such as are escaped of the house of Jacob, shall not more again stay upon him that smote them, but shall stay upon the Lord, the Holy One of Israel, in truth. This is a strong rebuke to Ahaz.

You notice how exactly this refers back to the situation that we had in chapter 7. Ahaz, instead of trusting God is trusting in the Assyrian to deliver him from Israel and from Syria, and those the Assyrian will come and smite Israel, and Syria, but will also smite Judah, and eventually will try to smite Judah very hard, and instead of trying to play off human powers one against the other, and to try to work clever human schemes, instead of that the time is coming when they will put their trust entirely in the Lord the Holy One of Israel. (11 1/4)

that they

turn away from this sort of human scheme of fighting fire with fire, thinking, like we did, in the last war, when we thought we could destroy Hitler by making alliance with Russia, and then we would be absolutely safe from Hitler, and we would stand together with Russia, and Roosevelt thought he could jolly Stalin into being a good boy, and after that the Russians would be democratic and everything would be wonderful. And what it amounted to was to remove the buffer state and put us face to face with Russia, with nothing in between, and it did exactly as in this case what it did to Judah when it put them face to face with Assyria, with nothing in between.

And if we would stand on principle instead of on these clever schemes, we would be further along in the end, they generally backfire as they did in that case. But He says a day is coming when they won't do that anymore. Now is he speaking of Israel? Well, Israel certainly has not yet reached that point. Is He speaking of the

church? I don't see any evidence in the passage of the church He is speaking of, but I ~~don't~~ certainly don't think you can truly say it is of the church either, because the church up to the present time has been full of elements relying on clever human schemes. I remember hearing a story 30 years ago.

Dr. Barnhouse down here was accused by the Modernists of the Presbytery. They were accusing him that he was interfering with their crowds and with their people, because he would go out to Darby and speak in a theatre on Sunday night. And they said that hurt the attendance of their churches, and some of their churches that had 20 people in ordinarily it may cut down to 10, and he was there and he'd have 800 or 1000 in the theatre, and he would speak, and they had all kinds of charges which they were bringing against him in the Presbytery. And these charges, they were threatening him with, and finally they scared him so that he completely capitulated, but at this time he was standing rather strongly against them, and it looked as if the thing would go to the presbytery and then to the synod, and that would take place in the next few months, and then ^ayear and a quarter or a year and a half, the matter would be before the General Assembly. So it came to the election of the representatives of the Presbytery, to the General Assembly, and there was a modernist elder in one of the modernist churches of the Presbytery, and that church had not been represented in the Assembly at all, for several years. The fundamentalists had been electing ~~their~~ their representatives to the Assembly, so Dr. Barnhouse said to a few of his friends, let's all vote for this man as representative this year, then he'll go to the Assembly this year when things aren't so serious, there is nothing important coming up, that we know of, and then he says, next year he'll be out of the way and we'll have a fundamentalist elected to the assembly that considers my case (14 1/2)

So that's what they did and they elected this man to the Assembly to get him out of the way. What happened when he went to the Assembly was that he was there elected

church? I don't see any evidence in the passage of the church He is speaking of, but I ~~don't~~ certainly don't think you can truly say it is of the church either, because the church up to the present time has been full of elements relying on clever human schemes. I remember hearing a story 30 years ago.

Dr. Barnhouse down here was accused by the Modernists of the Presbytery. They were accusing him that he was interfering with their crowds and with their people, because he would go out to Darby and speak in a theatre on Sunday night. And they said that hurt the attendance of their churches, and some of their churches that had 20 people in ordinarily it may cut down to 10, and he was there and he'd have 800 or 1000 in the theatre, and he would speak, and they had all kinds of charges which they were bringing against him in the Presbytery. And these charges, they were threatening him with, and finally they scared him so that he completely capitulated, but at this time he was standing rather strongly against them, and it looked as if the thing would go to the presbytery and then to the synod, and that would take place in the next few months, and then ^ayears and a quarter or a year and a half, the matter would be before the General Assembly. So it came to the election of the representatives of the Presbytery, to the General Assembly, and there was a modernist elder in one of the modernist churches of the Presbytery, and that church had not been represented in the Assembly at all, for several years. The fundamentalists had been elected ~~by~~ their representatives to the Assembly, so Dr. Barnhouse said to a few of his friends, let's all vote for this man as representative this year, then he'll go to the Assembly this year when things aren't so serious, there is nothing important coming up, that we know of, and then he says, next year he'll be out of the way and we'll have a fundamentalist elected to the assembly that considers my case (14 1/2)

So that's what they did and they elected this man to the Assembly to get him out of the way. What happened when he went to the Assembly was that he was there elected

to the permanent judicial committee, so that if the case had gone to the Assembly he would have been one of the ones to act upon it. ...

M.37. (3/4)

...Dr. Machen. I remember Dr. Machen was very much upset at that time. He said that he couldn't vote for a modernist on principle, that to vote for a modernist to get him out of the way he thought was wrong. Dr. Barnhouse thought he would accomplish his ends by this but in the end it would have had the exact opposite result. So often that happens. The Lord said the time is coming when we will not do that. 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, ~~even the~~ That doesn't make very good sense, does it? ...yet only a remnant. Though thy people be as the sand of the sea, yet only a remnant, or is the figure the sand of the sea, of the sand being overwhelmed, means it won't be completely so, there will still be a remnant left. At any rate, that is the idea of it, there will be a great destruction, but there will be a remnant delivered. The consumption decreed shall overflow with righteousness. The destruction, the chastisement that God is sending is going to be very complete, but is going to go just exactly as far as God desires. (2 1/4)

As Jesus said, the very ~~hairs~~ hairs of your head are numbered, every detail is under the Lord's control. (2 1/4)

There is to be then a great calamity in Israel and Judah, there is to be a tremendous catastrophe before the time when these wonderful promises take place, a complete loyalty to Himself, a complete turning away from (2 3/4)

There is going to be a great calamity but the calamity is not going to be complete, there is a remnant to be delivered, and the Assyrian is God's instrument but the Assyrian himself is going to be punished. We have a lot of thought in this chapter, some rather involved complex thoughts interlaced together in this chapter. So there

he expresses , he summarizes this with giving an exhortation to his people, therefore, thus says the Lord of hosts, O my people that dwell in Zion, be not afraid of the Assyrian. Put your trust in God and make your fear of doing what God does not want, rather than fear of the Assyrian, because the Assyrian can go just as far as God permits him and no further. Yes? (3 1/2) But here is the exhortation, v.24, be not afraid of the Assyrian. The Assyrian was a force at that time. Of course the Assyrian was such a great aggressor, such a terrible enemy, cruel, that it could come to be used as a figure for any such great enemy of future time. It could be used today properly as a figure of speech for any great enemy. But I think that the effort should be made to take it literally first, before you decide to take it as a figure (4 1/4)

that the people there in Ahaz's time, when they see the Assyrian come down and destroy Israel, destroy Syria and Israel, they are right next to them then, and see that Ahaz's clever scheme had the opposite result from what Ahaz intended, made them more (4 3/4)

that then they realized that now they should be filled with terror at the Assyrians, but that they should put their trust in God. Don't be afraid of the Assyrian. He says, the Assyrian is the rod in my hand, an instrument for my purposes. He is making a consumption but it is a consumption in righteousness, that is, in exact direct control by God, so that it goes exactly as far as God intends it to go, not a bit further. (5 1/4)

So it seems to me that it fits perfectly with the immediate situation. I see no reason to think that he is speaking of another at a later time. Not in this particular passage. He says, for yet a very little while and the indignation shall cease and mine anger in their destruction. And this 25th verse, like the verses 17 -19 , was literally fulfilled, that when the Assyrians came and attacked under Sennacherib, called on the people to surrender and said there was nothing they could do against him, it was a

very little while, within a period of four years, that the Lord destroyed Sennacherib's hosts to where there was nothing he could do about it. The indignation ceased, my anger in their destruction. And in another century the Assyrian ceased to be a force at all, was entirely destroyed by a sudden destruction.

So therefore thus says the Lord, verse 24, be not afraid of the Assyrian, he shall smite thee with a rod, shall lift up his staff against thee, after the manner of Egypt. As the Egyptian seemed such a terrible danger when the Israelites were fleeing them, then God opened up the Red Sea and allowed them to escape, similarly the Assyrian seemed a danger from which there was absolutely no escape, but God is going is going to, in His own wonderful way, give (6 3/4) , give deliverance. For yet a very little while and the indignation will cease, and my 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. Now this of course refers back to Gideon. To the time of the great hosts of ^{the Midianites} ~~Gideon~~ was in one night suddenly overwhelmed. And the whole situation changed, after many years of being subject to them, they were completely powerless, completely destroyed and in a very brief time, and again it is a good figure of what was to happen 20 years later when the Assyrian danger reached its height in Sennacherib's attack which seemed certain to take Jerusalem and God gave the marvelous deliverance in one night. The wonderful deliverance there parallels the deliverance from the Midianites under Gideon. (7 3/4) According to the slaughter of Midian at the rock of ~~Oreb~~ ~~Oreb~~, and as his rod was upon the sea, so shall he lift it up after the manner of Egypt. Again pointing back to the other sudden deliverance of which we spoke a minute ago, when the great Egyptian force came against the Israelites, and God opened up a way for them through the Red Sea and the Wilderness, and His rod was on the Sea then, so shall it be now. And it shall come to pass in that day, again there is a day, there will be a time, not necessarily the precise time (8 1/4)

but there is a day coming when his burden shall be taken from

your shoulder and his yoke from your neck, the yoke shall be destroyed because of the anointing. (8 1/2)

God is going to deliver the land from the Assyrians. The deliverance took place under Sennacherib, but though the Assyrian empire lasted another century, the Assyrians never did (8 3/4) and it is only after the destruction of the Assyrian empire that Jerusalem was taken first by Pharaoh Neccho of Egypt, and then by the Babylonians. So that we have another sharp break between v.27 and v.28. And the passage of 28-32 is a difficult passage, it is very similar in detail, but difficult in its overall presentation. And I have an interpretation of it which I believe to be the correct one, but which has certain difficulties. I think there are worse difficulties in any other interpretation that I know of, but I think there are still difficulties in the view I present. It may seem to some of you insuperable, but here is the passage, we have the passage--and what does the passage say? There are certain things that are absolutely clear in the passage. Well this is clear of course, that there is not a complete change of subject between v.27 and what follows. That is very clear. 27his burden shall be taken away from off they shoulder, and his yoke from off they neck. V.33, the Lord, the Lord of hosts, shall lop the bough with terror, the high ones of stature shall be hewn down, the haughty shall be humbled. Wouldn't 33 seem to parallel 27? Wouldn't that suggest that what goes from 28 to 33 is a parallel to what goes, to what is described in 25-27? It seems to me that it does/. But that may not appear to some of you quite so clearly.

However, whether it does or not, at least the similarity is sufficient that you can't say, well with v.27 we finished our discussion of ~~the~~ Assyria, now we're on a brand new subject. That hardly seems reasonable. But we do start a brand new paragraph, because in 27 we have the taking off of the yoke and in 28 we have victory on the part of a foreign conqueror. That is quite plain. You look at these places mentioned from 28 to 31 and they are all places which can be identified, and they are

places just north of Jerusalem. There is no question that what is described here is the triumphal progress of an army down the central ridge of Palestine, from the north toward Jerusalem, through the towns that are quite near to Jerusalem, that is what is pictured. It is a very vivid picture that is given. He has come to Aiath, he is passed over to Migron, at Michmash he has laid up his carriages, --remember Michmash where Saul was, just north of Gibeah, where he had a great victory. They are gone over the passage, they have taken up their lodging at Geba, Ramah is afraid, Gibeah of Saul is fled. Lift up thy voice, O daughter of Gallim, cause it to be heard unto Laish, O poor Anathoth. Now Anathoth is a town of Jeremiah. You remember that when the Babylonians were besieging Jerusalem, and their armies were almost to the edge of Jerusalem, that Jeremiah went and purchased a piece of land in Anathoth his own village, the town from which he came, which was only a brief distance north of Jerusalem, and he did this to show his confidence that the time would come when they would again be buying and selling land, in the territory which was now controlled, by the Babylonians who were threatening to conquer Jerusalem and did a short time thereafter, as Jeremiah said they would, the Babylonians were going to conquer Jerusalem, but that is not the end, God has a purpose, He has a remnant of grace, this region of Anathoth is still going to be worth something, and so he did not simply --you know, if the Russians were holding New York in their hand, and a man comes up to you and says look at here, I own the Empire State Bldg, and I'll sell it to you for \$100,000, if you had the hundred thousand dollars to buy, you'd say a hundred thousand! I'll give you \$5,000 for it, what good is it to you, the Russians have got it, you'll never (13 1/4)

But when Jeremiah goes and buys something that is in the hands of the enemy it is the evidence of his faith that it is going to be worth something in the future, that it is not going to remain in enemy hands forever. And that of course is the picture there in Jeremiah, but the town is mentioned here, as he mentions these towns, one after another.

I came riding on horseback down through there with Prof. Albright on ~~fe~~, and he pointed out these different towns, the different tells which represented where the different towns had been. As you came down toward Jerusalem over this route.

Well, the picture here then is a very vivid picture of an army coming down. They lay up their baggage at this place, they cross over the path here, the people of Gibeah flee, Anathoth is taken, they're in subjection. 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. And here you see the people of Jerusalem, looking out over the walls and seeing the army of the enemy coming almost to them. Well, now, I don't say it is impossible that this is a picture of something that is going to take place in the last days, but if it is, it hardly seems to me proper to say it is a picture of going to Armageddon, because Armageddon is way north and west of this. Armageddon is way up near Mt. Carmel, a long ways from Jerusalem. And this is a progress away from the direction of Armageddon, heading down toward Jerusalem, coming right through the edge of Jerusalem, a vivid picture of the progress of an army in that direction, and this army comes right to the edge of Jerusalem, and then he shakes his hand against the mount of the daughter of Zion, the hill of Jerusalem. Behold, the Lord, the Lord of hosts, shall lop the bough with terror, and the high ones 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.

Surely this is a picture of a victorious coming of a great...

M.38. (3/4)

...well, I think that, thus far, is speaking of what is certain. It is a progress of an army toward Jerusalem, an army that seems to carry everything *before it*, an army that looks as if it is going to take Jerusalem, it gets right to Jerusalem, and the Lord lops the bough with terror, and the high ones of stature are hewn down.

Well now if this is a literal picture--the only situation that I know of that would exactly fit it is the coming of the Babylonians who came down that northern part, took Anathoth--remember, Jeremiah was in Jerusalem at the time, and came out and then took Jerusalem, so that it ended not as (1 1/2) so that it can't be a picture of the Babylonian attack on Jerusalem because that ended in Jerusalem being taken. The whole context there is about Assyria, and my personal inclination, which I arrived at after a good bit of cogitation, is to think that we have here a picture not of what happened, but of what the people feared and thought would happen. In other words that the coming of an army along the line from which we would naturally expect a hostile army to come was exactly what the Israelites expected would happen during those three years when they were shut in with Sennacherib's army down in the Philistine plain, to the west and a little south of them. And Sennacherib's representatives coming up and standing outside the wall and speaking to Hezekiah and to the people on the wall, telling them they'd better surrender, that the Assyrians would utterly destroy them, and they'd better give up. Hezekiah give up to them. How can he possibly resist them. That this is a figurative presentation of the attack on Jerusalem which they expect to take place. Since the army was down in the Philistine Plain I'd sort of expect them, if they attacked, that they'd come directly up from there, rather than go way to the north and come down again from the north, but if you're coming direct from Mesopotamia that's the way you come, because you can't cross the desert straight across, you go up to the north along the edge of the desert and then you come down from the north and you would come down this very route as the Babylonians did. But they are expecting to be taken, they vividly imagine what is going to happen, ^{as} one time ~~right~~ after another falls, he gets right to the edge of it, but then just at the last minute God intervenes and destroys the Assyrian forces, and of course He actually did intervene and destroy the Assyrian forces, but He destroyed them down in the Philistine Plain. And there He caused that Sennacherib's

should be stricken in the night and as the borders of Lebanon toppled he was left with only a few (3 3/4)

(break in record beginning again ^{at} with 4 1/2)... yesterday we were looking at the 10th chapter of Isaiah and we noticed the great picture of the oncoming of the Assyrian toward Jerusalem. Whether this is a picture of an actual march of the Assyrians that proceeded down and stopped just short of Jerusalem, or whether it pictures what the people of Jerusalem thought was about to take place at any time but which God stopped, as described in ~~v.~~ 33-34, we have no historical evidence upon which to know the certainty. The fact that in Isa. 37, 36, the Lord says that they will not come to the city nor raise a battlement against it, and that there is no statement in any of those three places that tell us about Sennacherib's defeat, telling of his army actually moving toward Jerusalem, but a good many telling about his threatening to do so, leads me to incline to think the latter rather than the former. But we have no way of

(5 1/2)

We do know this though, that the Assyrians were in the position where destruction by them of Jerusalem seemed certain, humanly speaking. Humanly speaking, nothing can stop them, and we know that God intervened with His mighty power and destroyed the great body of the Assyrian army to where they were helpless and Sennacherib had to go back, and then we noticed that Sennacherib never again came to harass them and that his successor did not make an attempt to conquer Jerusalem, during the next century, but Assyria itself fell before the ~~M~~ Medes and the Babylonians, and it was Babylon, not Assyria, that finally conquered. So we have vv. 33 and 34 which can be taken as covering two areas, first, the Lord lopped the bough. The high ones of stature He brought down, the ~~ha~~ughty were humbled. He humbled Sennacherib. He brought down his force, he made him unable to take Jerusalem. Then, not only did He humble Sennacherib, but a century later He, as described in v. 34, completely destroyed the Assyrian empire, so that Lebanon fell by a mighty one. The thickets of the forest were cut down with

iron, the Assyrian empire fell to the ground, never again to rise. This had been one of the greatest factors in the near east for two thousand years, and which for nearly 500 years had been the great empire, the great forest, where for a far longer time than the British empire was of any importance in the modern world, this fell with a sudden crash, and never rose again, so 33 describes exactly what the Lord did to Sennacherib's army, 34 describes what happened to the Assyrian empire a century later. It crashed, it did not destroy Jerusalem, but it crashed itself and never was rebuilt.

How would 33 and 34 be fulfilled? Well, the bough, high ones, the forest of Lebanon, what does that stand for. It could stand for many things. In the context, just speaking about a great army, in the further context, in a few chapters further, where the Assyrian empire is the great force, it is a reasonable guess that the forest stands for the Assyrian force, that is, this is the great forest outside the land of Palestine, it is ⁱⁿ the foreign area and a tremendous force, and it is a natural figure for great world empire, which is a great factor at the time. Now it wouldn't have to be, but in the light of the context that would seem to be the most likely interpretation, in fact, there is no other suggestion that would have anything that would be even probable in comparison to this one, for what that stands for. Now what we're told is that that's going to fall, by the Lord's action, with a great destruction. Now how it's going to happen, when, all that, we're not told, but we learn ten years later, what did happen, and then a century later what happened, and when we found out what happened, we considered back, and say that fits exactly with the Isaiah prediction. You wouldn't know that but there are many other predictions all pointing to that thing. You get them all together, you could (8 3/4) (stu)

Isaiah had said, the Assyrian army is going to march down the central hill country of Palestine, going to come down, going to make an attack, come right up to the gates of Jerusalem, but then God is going to bring it to defeat, if it says ^{that} then it would be a

false prediction if the Assyrian army did not come down, but he does not say that, he doesn't say anything. He does not ~~w~~ say who is coming, he gives us a vivid picture rather than a specific prediction. There is a vivid picture of an army marching down, and coming nearer and nearer with all this, a vivid picture of that occurring and then a vivid picture of its suddenly coming to destruction, and you say, what does this mean? Does this describe the event that is going to happen to the ~~β~~ Assyrian army, or does this describe the danger which the people of Jerusalem are going to find themselves in, the situation in which they expect at any minute that this attack is going to start, from any one of several directions but most likely from that direction. It is a message to assure the people first of the fact that Ahaz' clever scheme has put them into terrible danger, and ~~that~~ that they are to face a period of very great danger. To assure them in the second place that this great danger which is coming is one which will not reach its climax but which God will bring to an end, and in the third place that this great force with which they're dealing up to this, is one which God is going to completely destroy, in His own time. That is definitely taught, but as to specific statements, if he says the Assyrian army will come, so-and-so, I would say it certainly had to be fulfilled (10 3/4)

but we have no evidence that it did, and the indication, it looks as if, while the emotional situation is exactly (11) the people of Jerusalem, faced with this tremendous menace which is threatening to destroy Jerusalem, and it looks as if any minute it is going to attack and take Jerusalem, holds them in that suspense for nearly three years and then suddenly (11 1/4)

Well, these last two verses then are very figurative, we find about trees cut down, the great forest, but in the situation, in that time, knowing nothing about the future specifically, we could quite definitely say, this seems to ^{me to} be the Lord's provision,

that this great Assyrian menace that Ahaz has brought in, which after all, God is using as His instrument to accomplish His purpose there, this Assyrian force, God is going to bring to an end. They are very proud, He is going to punish them for their pride, punish them for thinking themselves ~~the~~^{so} great, punish them for their cruelty, and carrying out the things He desired to be done, but certainly not in the cruel ~~way~~^{way} they did them. He is going to punish them for it, and He is going to destroy them utterly, and you wouldn't know whether it is going to happen next week, next month, a year from now, twenty years from now, a century from now. Actually, it happened suddenly.

Now of course it could conceivably ~~have~~^{have} been put off by 100 years, but we do find things that happen twenty years hence that exactly fit with 33, things that happened a century hence that exactly fit what is said in v.34. Mr. Golin? (12 1/2) The city of Nineveh, the great capital of the Assyrian empire was the capital from which Sargon, ~~king~~^{came,} who conquered the northern kingdom, and from which Sennacherib came, who made the attack on the southern kingdom. This city of Nineveh was attacked by its enemies in 612 B.C., and destroyed. They used to say it was 606 till about 30 or 35 years ago new tablets were found which proved it was 612 when it happened. Then after the city of Nineveh fell, the remnant of the Assyrian empire established a new capital at Haran on the Euphrates, the place where Abraham had lived centuries before. And there in Haran they were able to maintain a capital until 604, then in 604 Pharaoh Neccho of Egypt came up to help the Assyrians, that is, he came up two or three years before this, but he was trying to help them in 604. The Medes and the Babylonians were attacking, and the Assyrian-Egyptian coalition was completely defeated at the battle of Charchemish in 604, and as a result of that battle, the Egyptians went ~~for~~ fleeing pell mell down the coastal valley of Palestine toward Egypt, and Jeremiah in Jer.46 has a vivid (14 1/4) over the Egyptians as they had this defeat and as they fled. That gives that date and you see, it is 721 B.C. when the northern

kingdom fell, so about 730 B.C. is the time when Pekah died, so this prediction would be about 735, somewhere between $\$$ 735 and 730. Yes? (14 3/4) Well, I would say that there is no question that is a poetical setting forth, of that there is no question. It is a very high quality of poetry, a vivid poetical picture, not given as a simple straightforward prediction of an event, but as a poetical description, highly figurative, like this about the boughs and the forest and all, of the situation as given then.

Well now you might say it is undoubtedly describing an enemy of Israel because they're coming down against Jerusalem, there is no question of that, so there is no question there is a poetical restriction of the enemies of Israel attacking and God intervenes to deliver them. But as to what enemy it is referring to, I think there is no question that it is specifically referring to the Assyrian enemy, and that it is in...

M.39. (3/4)

... some people take it as something that is a mere bit of poetry and that means that it can mean anything or nothing, just like some people think of something as figurative, well, what does that mean, figurative? Revelation is just a symbolic book, you can't believe Revelation, it is just a symbolic book. Well, that is nonsense. You can express truth in symbols, you can express truth in figures, you can express truth in poetry. Only that in the types of presentation, you do not use as precise language, you are giving an emotional picture, rather than so much as a specific statement of technical fact, but your poetical picture has definite ideas to present and study of the (1 1/2) study of the background, study of the situation, gives you the basis on which to discern. It is quite difficult to tell just what is meant. One thing that I feel ~~is~~ is tremendously important in approaching the Bible, or any verse, is not to say, does the Bible teach it this way or that way. I think that is one reason why a great amount of error ~~has~~ has come into existence, and a great amount of

unnecessary Some people
 think, well, does the Bible teach that Christ was crucified on Friday or on Wednesday?
 Which does it teach? Well, if it teaches Friday, and you believe Wednesday, you
 can't be in our church. If it teaches Wednesday and you believe Friday, you can't
 be in our church. Well, if the Bible explicitly said Christ was crucified on Friday,
 it would be ridiculous to say Wednesday, but it doesn't say it. The question
 is, does it say this, does it say that, or does it actually settle this particular question?
 Because there are thousands of questions ~~of~~ you could ask that would take hundreds
 of books to even give a brief answer. And the question is, does God intend to give
 us an answer to this specific question. And we may not know (2 3/4) on examination
 whether God is going (2 3/4) or not, but let's, as we look at any
 question, ask three questions. Does it say yes, does it say no, or
 to say that the Bible does answer this specific question. Maybe it does, but let's
 not say it does till we find sufficient answer.

Well, Isaiah then shows the downfall of the Assyrian empire and I think a
 serious question could be raised as to whether a chapter division should occur where
 chapter 11 begins. A very serious question can be raised about that for this reason.
 That it is tightly tied to what precedes it. He does not give chapter 10 and then,
 now we're going to start again and discuss another chapter and give chapter 11.
 There are places where that occurs, sometimes in the middle (3 1/2)
 We finish a subject and we start a new chapter. At the end of chapter 11, we are
 dealing with prediction, with prophetic statement, and then chapter 12 is a song of
 praise to God. There is a sharp transition between 11 and 12, a sort of a benediction
 at the end of the book of Immanuel. It would be the proper place for chapter division.
 The archbishop was entirely right in making a whole chapter out of just six verses in
 chapter 12. And back in chapter 10 in v.5 we have an end of the poem, the repetition
 of its refrain, the last of its stanzas, we have a new start, that would be a reason

for a new chapter. You could start right there, you don't need what has preceded, but with the beginning of chapter 11, there is an implied relationship, important connection to what has preceded. We have a picture of a great forest, and this forest falls. A mighty empire topples and is destroyed forever. But chapter 11 shows a new beginning. And the new beginning is not from the forest of Lebanon, but it is from a different reason altogether, and there shall come forth a rod, a little shoot, a little branch that comes out of a tree, that appears to have completely disappeared. There is a tree that has fallen like the forest of Lebanon, fallen, the tree is ended, but you can't tell (5)

whether it is ended or not. If you watch it over a period of time, nothing goes up, it is decaying, the tree was dead. But now the tree can be destroyed and yet there can be real life in the root, and from those roots a new shoot can spring up and a new tree can grow, out of those roots, and here we have exactly that picture. There shall come forth a rod, a little shoot, out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of this root. ^{Is this showing} ~~this shall~~ a rebirth of the forest which toppled in the previous two verses? Is it a reestablishment of the tree which God lopped off in 33? Quite clearly not, because that was definitely stated of Lebanon, that was outside the area of God's dealing. That was an external thing, a great powerful force, a mighty tree which fell. Here is a much smaller tree. This one is called the stem of Jesse, and that makes absolutely clear what we are talking about now. We are not now talking about any great heathen power, about any great world empire of that time, we are talking about the house of David, which (6 1/4)

and we are implying that the realm of the house of David falls, and of course it did fall (6 1/2)

but more than a century later the house of David fell and there has not been again since that time a king reigning visibly upon this earth from the house of David.

So that there is an implication in the first verse of chapter 11 that the house of Jesse is also going to fall, like the forest of Lebanon. It is going to be reduced to what

it seems to be dead, and after the destruction of Jerusalem in 586, hundreds of years went by and there was no man of the house of David ruling, you might say the stem of Jesse was absolutely dead. But then we are surprised by finding that a little shoot comes up from that stem, that a branch comes up from the roots, and this branch that comes up from the roots there, proves that there is continuance to it, there is life to it, and that of course is what we would expect being familiar with God's promises to David, the house of David is to have a continuous line, and of course back in chapter 7 we read that the house of David is told that Immanuel is coming, there is coming this one whose land this is, chapter 9 tells us, this one whose name is the mighty father, the everlasting God, the prince of peace, that one is coming, you don't know when he is coming. V.I tells us nothing about his coming, we know that there will be quite a fall first because it was like the Lebanon before only it is not dead, there is life there.

And so this one comes, so we are now in the realm of empire. Now of course it is possible in comparison with an empire to bring something else of somewhat different nature, but at least the first expectation that it will probably be something is somewhat related to that with which it is (8 1/.2)

The great Assyrian empire falls and dies, the end. The little kingdom of Jesse falls, but a new shoot comes up, the branch grows out of the tree. And this word Branch, then, in the connection, is capitalized in my copy of the Bible here and very properly, because it would seem quite definite that it is a figure of speech, figurative language. / I just got a letter asking from a man in Swarthmore College asking me to tell how to relate the literal interpretation of the Bible to the findings of evolution. (9 1/4)

Well, I'd say the literal interpretation is a rather unfortunate phrase. I mean that the Bible is true, not that it is literal. But it is true and we have to find what the meaning is, and as in any other book, if you're going to get meaning instead of confus-

ion out of it, you have to recognize that it is overwhelmingly literal, that the great bulk of it is literal, but in the literal there can be figures of speech, and here we have them in this verse, this is a tree represented, it stands for a family, there is a branch growing up which stands for a man. That is quite obvious. This branch means a man, a man from the house of David. It is a reasonable thing to think this will be the same Immanuel described in chapter 7, and that this will be the same wonderful child described at the beginning of chapter 9. So we have this man, and what about Him. V.2 makes it very clear that it's not a tree we're talking about, because there we have more literal language. V.1 is very figurative, but the meaning of it is very clear. Figures^{ative} of language doesn't necessarily mean obscurity or lack of clarity, but it may mean equal or greater clarity with a beauty which literal language cannot have. The Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon Him, and now six characterizations of this Spirit are given: the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord. These six characterizations are given to the Spirit of the Lord, certainly not separate spirits, the spirit of the Lord is described with six types of description. And this Spirit is going to rest upon them. Now if He is Immanuel, He is God with us, why does he need this Spirit of the Lord. We find in the New Testament that Jesus, though He was God, lived His life in the power of the Spirit. The Spirit rested upon Him, without measure, the Spirit entered Him like a dove, rested upon Him. Mr. Golin? (11 1/2) Knowledge, wisdom, and understanding are quite similar. Counsel is quite similar, but might is quite different, and then knowledge again is quite similar to wisdom and understanding, but the fear of the Lord is very different. So that we have of these six, we have four that represent different aspects of intellectual ability, but we have one which represents power and one which represents the relationship to God, so that I would say that they are six distinct aspects, but four of them are

closely related to one another, and it would be very interesting to take those four words and look at, not the English, but the Hebrew, and see how those Hebrew words are used elsewhere and what further light it gives them, on the nature of the Spirit of God and upon His activities in relation to Immanuel. And then we read in verse 3 that this Spirit is going to make him of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord, and you notice how the understanding now and the fear of the Lord are tied together. Proverbs tells us that the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom, so the fear of the Lord is closely related to wisdom but yet a distinct quality.

Shall make him of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord and he shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, neither reprove after the hearing of his ears. Here is one man who has an ability to understand things in a way that is beyond what you can get from your mere human sense. We read in the gospels that Jesus did not need anyone to tell Him what was in man because He knew what was in man. He said behold an Israelite in whom is no guile. Nathaneal said, whence knowest thou me, he said. When the Lord saw him under the fig tree like that, he said, thou art the Son of God, thou art the king of Israel. He said, do you say that just because I knew this about you, because you'll see greater things than that. But He spoke not like the Scribes and Pharisees, He spoke with authority, because He knew what you would not guess by ordinary processes of gaining knowledge...

M.40 (3/4)

...so then we have this one who has far more ability to think things through after Him, to understand things, to deal with them correctly. Now someone will say, are these three verses a picture of the first advent of Christ. And the answer is no, these are not the picture of an advent, these are a picture of an individual. These are, it is Himself that is described thus, not what He does. It says He won't judge Israel, He won't reprove Israel. It doesn't say what He will do, but it says what He can do. It is a picture of His character, it is a picture of His spiritual

power. We do not have a picture of particular events as yet but a picture of an individual. This Immanuel is going to be like this. We are told, in verses 1 and 2 and 3, what He is going to be like. He will not do these things according to purely human knowledge, judge after the sight of his eyes, nor reprove after the hearing of his ears, but what will He do? He will judge poor with righteousness and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth. Well, now is that a picture of His first coming? Well, He certainly spoke not like the Scribes and the Pharisees. He gave wonderful teaching such as no man had ever given. He did marvelous things in His first coming, but are they properly to be expressed by this language--to judge the poor, and reprove for the meek of the earth? The language sounds more like a king who is active with power than like the teacher who is going about with wonderful messages. It sounds more like, it doesn't quite seem to fit what Jesus did at His first coming. It suggests that something more is involved. I don't think we can prove (2 3/4)

Yes, Mr. Golin? (2 3/4) As the natural interpretation of these words would seem to be a situation like, let us say that you are here in Philadelphia and you are a poor man, you have a little bit of land here, you are working on this land, getting support for yourself and your family, and there is a powerful man who owns a hundred times as much land as you do right next to you, and he is putting up a building, and his building, in order to build it the shape he wants he takes over half of your land, which leaves you with insufficient. What can you do? I come walking along. You say, will you judge for me? I say, sure, that man has no right to do that. I tell him, you shouldn't do that. Well, he says, that's what you think but I don't care what you think. I could judge the poor, and I could reprove with equity for the meek of the earth, but nothing would be done about it. The implication is that it is one who steps in and says look at here, this man, even if he doesn't have power, he has rights, he has right to just treatment, and you have to give him the just treatment to which he is entitled. It seemsto imply action with power behind it and with authority, rather

than simply be the expression of beautiful truths, no matter how beautiful and how wonderful they may be. That seems to be the implication of this part of the verse, but then we go on to the next part of the verse and we find even more a suggestion of power, and He shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked. Shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked. Is that what Christ did on His first advent? Well, Grossius, in his commentary, says, this describes, this the breath of his mouth smiting the earth, the ~~breath~~ rod of his mouth, the breath of his lips slaying the wicked, this describes how Hezekiah prayed with the breath of his mouth, and as a result Sennacherib's army was destroyed. So Hezekiah with the breath of his lips smote the earth and slew the wicked. Well, that was taken quite figuratively, and of course, if you're convinced that the rod that comes out of the stem of Jesse is Hezekiah, maybe that is what it means, but we note that it does mean power (5) and perhaps the breath of his lips might express prayer. It is a figure for something, certainly. We don't (5 1/4) if somebody falls over, you don't smite the wicked with the breath of your lips in that sense. There is something, exactly what this figure means might be difficult to say, and commentaries have various statements about it, but the strange thing is that the bulk of ~~the~~ the commentaries look for Scriptural evidence. If you want to interpret Scripture the best way to interpret Scripture is by Scripture. Scripture is its own best interpreter. So we take this phrase and say what does this phrase mean: to smite the earth with the rod of his mouth and slay the wicked with the breath of his lips? Well, do you find a similar statement anywhere in the Old Testament. // I don't know of any. However, we know, that as Augustine said, "The New is in the Old contained, the Old is by the New explained." We can look at the New Testament and see if it says that throws

and very naturally we come to Rev.19. There we read of one of whom it says in v.15 that out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations and he shall rule them with a rod of iron, and then you look on to v.21 and you read after the great battle that he had that the remnant were slain with the sword of him that sat upon the horse, a sword proceeded out of his mouth and all the fowls were filled with their flesh. Well, here is a similar figure, does the figure here throw light on the figure there? Well, the danger is, you have two figures and you don't know what either of them mean, you can explain one by the other and you just make the ignorance worse, that's the danger. So we want to see if we can tell what this figure means. Well, who is this one we read of in Rev.19? This section of Revelation starts with v.19, chapter 19. I saw heaven open, behold a white horse, he that sat upon it was called faithful and true, his eyes were as a flame of fire, on his head were many crowns. He was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood, and his name is called The Word of God. V.16, and he has on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS. Well, there is no question then that that is the Lord Jesus Christ described. It is impossible for a Christian or even for a non-Christian who ~~sees~~^{reads} Revelation as a whole and sees what it talks about, to say that this one who comes on the white horse, and is described by these terms, can be any one other than Jesus Christ, the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Lamb that was slain before the foundation of the world. Well, now, if this is Jesus Christ, then, John sees heaven open and sees Christ come on a white horse, and He leads His army and calls on them to beat the armies of the beast and the false prophet, and defeat them, and v.21 says, and the remnant were slain with the sword of him that ~~sat~~ sat upon the horse, which sword proceeded out of his mouth, and all the fowls were filled with their flesh. If we can tell what the sword proceeding out of his mouth, with which he smites the nations, means here, surely it will be a help in understanding what Isaiah means, that is, the figures--you can say, you have a tree

used somewhere in the Bible, that doesn't prove what a tree means somewhere else. But when you have as an unusual figure, it would seem quite likely, I ~~would say~~ ~~would~~ say a hundred percent likely, we must not be dogmatic, unless you have evidence on which to be dogmatic. But it would seem quite probably this throws light on that, and especially that talking about Immanuel's coming, this is talking about the Lord Jesus Christ, another coming back. Well, Warfield, who has written many very wonderful things on systematic theology, occasionally got outside of his field, and then his language was still beautiful but his thoughts were sometimes turgid. And he wrote an essay on this portion of the book of Revelation, and he did not write a commentary on it as a whole, just dealt with this book, and there we turn to him to see if we can learn something from it about what this means, and we find that Warfield says in his article which is reprinted in the book called "Biblical Doctrine," which I was unable to lay my hands on my copy, my books of that type have that grey painting cover over them, and we can't get at them, and I went up to the Library and the book seems to be out there. Otherwise I would have brought the book to read to you from it. But to briefly summarize, Warfield ~~w~~ says that this one is the Lord Jesus Christ, and he ~~says~~ when it describes Him leading an army and conquering and destroying it, why he says that everything in Revelation is symbolic so he says you don't expect to find actual direct statements, everything is symbolic, and nothing is what it says it is, it's all a symbol for something else. Well, then, why isn't the Lord Jesus Christ here a symbol for something else? He takes it as actually the Lord Jesus Christ. But he says Christ here is symbolized as having a great victory. Now how does Christ gain a great victory. He wins the victory through the preaching of the gospel, therefore, the sword proceeding out of His mouth is a picture of the gospel. And it shows that Christ's word goes forth with the preaching of the gospel, and the gospel ~~says~~ spreads through the world, and conquers the whole world, and he says that in the passage the most important thing in the passage is the last verse in which it says that the remnant ~~w~~

were slain with the sword of him that sat upon the horse, which sword proceeded out of his mouth, and all the fowls were filled with their flesh. He says the important thing is the completeness of the victory. Therefore, from this passage in Revelation, we know that the gospel is going to conquer the whole world, and every man, woman, and child on this earth, is going to be converted. By the gospel. Well, that is the interpretation, a thoroughly post-millennial interpretation which Warfield brings out of this last part of chapter 19, and it is a wonderful hope, if the Lord has really given the (11 1/2) on which to rest that hope, but it is a very discouraging hope if we look at the condition of the world today and see that today there are more non-Christians in it than there were a century ago, before the great outspreading of the modern missionary movement, that there are more non-Christians in the world today than there were then, partly due to the tremendous population increase, but even among the real Christians, apostasy has spread to such an extent that great wonderful churches founded by the most godly people you'd ever know, in which the gospel was preached with power, are today under the control of leaders who deny the gospel, deny the Scripture, and the people are like sheep without a shepherd, wanting the truth, and thinking they're getting it and getting a stone, and in a situation like that, you say, well, the gospel is going to conquer the whole world. If the Lord definitely promises it will, fine, we can trust Him to know that what He promises will be done, but does He promise it? Well, we can't build that promise just on this very figurative, according to Warfield, section at the end of chapter 19 of Rev. But let's not let our observation of conditions of the world decide our interpretation of the Bible, let's look at the Bible itself to determine what it means, and so we ask ourselves does this figure appear anywhere else in the Bible? And immediately we find that not only does the figure appear but the figure appears in a form even more like what we have in Isaiah than what we find in Revelation, and not only is it a form more like what we

find in Isaiah, but it specifically refers to it as something already past. Revelation doesn't do that, Revelation might conceivably be entirely unrelated to Isaiah, the same figure is ~~used~~ used but that doesn't prove the two are the same thing, but this other passage, 2 Thess., is a passage which we cannot leave out of consideration because the figure is so strikingly similar and not only that but the apostle specifically says this is something already known, and now referred to. And so we find that in chapter 2 of 2 Thess., that the apostle says, 2.7 or looking back a little further, to the end of 3 and 4, describes that man of sin, and the son of perdition, who Paul says is still future, and now he says, in v.6 now ye know what withholds it that he might be revealed in his time, that is this man of perdition. There is something that is not yet revealed in Paul's day, something that is still future. And who is this one? Well, v.7, the mystery of iniquity already works, although he who now hinders will hinder until he be taken out of the way. Who is that? The Berkeley Version has a footnote that says that's the Roman Empire. He that now hinders will hinder. He says that is the Roman Empire which is spoken of elsewhere as the son of perdition, that raises himself up against God. Well, how does the son of perdition that raises himself against God hinder the revelation of the son of perdition that raises himself against God? I think Dr. Verkuyl got his figures a little mixed when he put in that particular footnote. There are various interpretations of he who hinders will hinder...

M.41. (3/4)

... ^{my own personal} interpretation of it is that he who hinders the coming

is not simply the Holy Spirit, but the Holy Spirit acting through the church, that the Holy Spirit is God, the Holy Spirit is everywhere, the Holy Spirit can't be taken away, He is always there, but the particular influence of the Holy Spirit can be taken away, just as the Holy Spirit didn't come on Pentecost as if He wasn't here before. He is God, He is everywhere, He was always there, but at Pentecost He manifested Himself in a particular way. When a person is converted the Holy Spirit exerts a special

control over their life, he exerts Himself in a particular way. So he who hinders will hinder until he is taken out of the way, the effect, holding back the force of wickedness, which would reduce the whole world to utter (1 3/4) the greatest force holding it back is the effect of the Holy Spirit's work as shown in the church, shown through those individuals who have the Holy Spirit controlling their lives, and when that is taken away, then wickedness can reveal itself in a way that never ~~would~~ was possible before, and when that is taken away, the son of perdition can be revealed, the man of sin. And so we find that Paul says, in the next verse, then, when that one is taken out of the way, then shall that wicked be revealed. Now that's old English, "that wicked," notice Wicked is capitalized here, then shall that Wicked be revealed. You don't say in modern English, then shall that Tall be revealed, then shall that Short be revealed, it would then become that Short one, that small one. So this is that wicked one, that wicked individual, that wicked one, will be revealed, that wicked one whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth. What is the spirit of his mouth? Well, the Greek word could just as well be translated "the breath." It is a word that could be translated spirit or breath and I would think "the breath of ~~the~~ his mouth" would make more sense, than spirit of his mouth, but it is interesting that the Hebrew word used in Isaiah 11 can also be the breath of his lips, it can also be "the spirit of his lips." So that is an exact parallel, he shall smite the earth ~~of~~ with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked. Then shall that wicked one be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of His mouth and shall destroy with the brightness of His glory. So Paul said, there is one who is not yet revealed, and who cannot be revealed until he that hinders is taken out of the way, but after that he can be revealed, and he is the wicked one, whom we have already been told about, that wicked one whom the Lord is going to destroy with the breath of his lips, at His coming. So Paul, very specifically says, that Isaiah prediction of what he is

going to do is a prediction of something that Immanuel will do in connection with His second coming. Not something that He did in connection with His first coming.

Paul makes that absolutely clear, but it is amazing how commentaries overlook it.

(4 1/4)

Perhaps in New Testament commentaries on Thessalonians you would find it clearly stated. I don't see how they could avoid it. But commentaries on Isaiah, some of them overlook it. But Paul said, this prediction in Isaiah 4 is still future, it is yet to come, it is coming in connection with a certain sign, it cannot happen until after that which now hinders is taken out of the way. And then when Paul had specifically said that, then surely you have a basis on which to interpret more accurately Revelation that the one who comes on a white horse, conquering, and conquers, and who is called THE LORD OF LORDS AND KING OF KINGS, is Jesus, not (4 3/4)

So that it seems to me that if we thus let Scripture interpret Scripture, explain Scripture by Scripture, we can find what it really means, and so we are now speaking in the last half of verse 4 about the second coming of Christ and the first part, as we noticed, doesn't seem to describe the meek and lowly Jesus going about giving wonderful teaching, but rather describes One who is going to come with power, and authority, at the second coming. That is what is there found, and we have a further description of Him in verse 5, and righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins and faithfulness the girdle of his reins. The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid, and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together. What a clear, clear selection of verses. Doesn't it seem that the archbishop made the chapter division at the wrong place, he should have made it at the end of 5? Righteousness will be the girdle of his loins, faithfulness the girdle of his reins, end of a chapter, we start a new discussion, talk about animals. What have animals got to do with the stem that comes up out of Jesse? It is a complete change as far as words are

concerned. It talks about something entirely different, and is it a brand new start of a new section, perhaps a new book, or is it properly interpreted as related to what precedes? Well, if it is interpreted as related to what precedes, there would seem to be only one way to interpret it, and that would be that the result of what was done is the establishment of the situation which is described in (6 3/4)

So either we have a complete break in a brand new section starting, which seems rather unusual, or else we are now told what is going to be the result of the activity of this wonderful one, as a result of his activity, the wolf will dwell with the lamb, after the wolf eats up the lamb they naturally are dwelling together, but the lamb is dwelling inside of the wolf. The wolf will dwell with the lamb. The leopard will lie down with the kid inside of him, they lie down together. The calf and the young lion and the fatling together, the young lion is going to get a lot to eat, both the calf and the fatling. But then a little child shall lead them, how does that get in there? How can a little child lead them? Well, perhaps because the lion has got all he can eat already ~~and then~~, having eaten the calf and the fatling, so he won't bother with the child. (stu.7 3/4) The lion is galloping after, and the little child is leading. And the cow and the bear shall feed, and their young ones shall lie down together, and the lion will eat straw like the ox. Why will the lion eat straw, like the ox? What do we care what the lion eats. Well, what it means is the lion isn't eating the ox. They're both eating straw. The way the world is now, the ox eats the straw, and then the lion eats the ox, but then, the lion will (8 1/4)

There is going to be a change, a biological change. Well what do we care about that? What is the point of all that? That is a question we have to face and try to see if there is a reasonable answer to it. Well, we continue then, the sucking child plays on the hole of the asp, and the weaned--well what is strange about that? I was out in New Mexico and a man told me, he said I was out in the desert and he said there in a little cabin there in the desert, I was sitting in the back room reading, and he said

in the front room of this little cabin my little child was sitting there on the floor, in the front room, and he said I heard a sound of something hitting, and then I heard a sound of something harder hitting, and then he said the little child would laugh with glee, having lots of fun, and he said then again there was a sound of hitting, and then something twice as heavy hitting. And the little child just laughed in delight, he said that kid is having a real good time, but he says out here in the desert you don't know what is around, I'd like to find out what it is all about. So he came up very quietly in back of the child and looked in and he said his blood nearly froze, because outside of that door there was a great big rattlesnake and the little child saw the rattlesnake and the door was just a screen door, and the child would look at the rattlesnake and then take his hand and hit the screen door and it would fly open and the rattlesnake would give a swing and hit the screen door and the door would shut with a bang and the child would laugh with glee. So if anybody says that this is a prediction for the distant future, that the sucking child can play on the hole of the asp and the weaned child put his ~~finger~~ hand on the top of his den, there was one right there that wasn't a bit afraid of the rattlesnake but ~~was~~ was having a good time playing with the rattlesnake. But some way the father wasn't happy about it, you know, he said he grabbed his gun, he rushed out the back door and went around to the front, and shot that snake, just hoping to get there quickly before that screen broke and the snake came through and struck the child, or maybe the child would hit the screen door and it would fly open too far and this time the screen door wouldn't be in the way when the snake struck. It would seem that the meaning of this goes beyond the English words. Not just that the child played with the dangerous poisonous serpent, but that it can play with it without involving danger. You just take the words in their simple literal sense, they mean nothing. But if you take the words in the reasonable implication, it means the removal of danger, and that is what the whole passage means, the removal of external danger. Well, we have to stop there now, we continue next Tuesday

...we have been looking at Isa. 11, a very important chapter in the development of the book and its presentation of future events, but we have just about finished the section that was clear, when you examine it carefully. That was the great section which begins the chapter running from verse 1 through verse 9. We had just a very little more that we might say about verse 9, where we read that the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea. What does this mean? The waters cover the sea? There must be some meaning to the phrase, the sea is made up of water, but the sea has water in it, well that is not saying anything, it wouldn't be a sea if it didn't have water in it. So what do you mean when you say the waters cover the sea? The only interpretation of it that makes much sense is to think the sea here as meaning the bottom of the sea. By the bottom of the sea you mean any area, extensive area that is covered with water. So you mean just as the large areas of the earth's surface that are covered with water, are covered with water. In other words they are completely covered. It is not thinking of islands, which is not considered as part of the sea. It is thinking of the sea simply as a watery section, great bodies of water, but there are not little parts of the bottom of it which are free from water and other parts that are covered. Not like a marsh, where you have a little wet and a little dry, a little wet and a little dry, it all varies, this is a continuous body that is similar and homogeneous in some special regard. And that surely is what this means, that the knowledge of the Lord will cover the earth as the waters cover the sea. It is not at all a picture of Christianity having Christians in every nation on earth, with individuals in every country you want to enter, who know the Lord and who are interested in His law. It is a situation in which the law of the Lord is an active vital force, very strong in the consciousness of every individual, within the area. And in that sense, this passage cannot possibly be said to have been fulfilled up to this time. If someone wants to say this means that people are changed from being wolves to being lambs, they're no longer lions, they're cows, they're harmless, they don't

injure others, well, it wouldn't fulfill the passage unless everyone were thus changed. They will not hurt or destroy in all my holy mountain, does not mean that a few individuals, or even many individuals who used to be very destructive are no longer so. It means that destructiveness will no longer be a danger, it is speaking of the removal of all external danger, because every individual there will be affected by the knowledge of the law of God, and so under these circumstances there has never been a city in the world's history of which this could be said. The passage has never been fulfilled at all, ~~and~~ There may be certain similarities to certain parts of the passage, but never has there been a real fulfillment of this passage at all. It must be definitely future. Well, that ends the section, v.1-9, and the fact that we have a new section is indicated by the phrase "in that day." The phrase "in that day" I think you can quite clearly say is ~~that~~ not meaning in the day of which we have just been speaking. It could mean that perhaps, but is more apt to mean "in that day" in the Hebrew usage, in the day of which I am about to say.

There is going to be a day which will be as follows. It seems to me to be the meaning of "in that day." We might before the semester is ~~we~~ over give an assignment to look up the uses of the phrase "inthat day" and see how many we find clearly fit the idea of in the day we have just been speaking of. And how many there are which could not fit that and therefore would have to have the interpretation I just gave. The interpretation I have just ~~given~~ could fit any of them. But the question is are there instances where the other interpretation would not fit, thus proving the necessity of this one. I think you would find quite a number. But in this particular case, it is hard to be sure whether verse 10 is saying in the time we have just described, the time when the earth was full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the Sea, there will be a root of Jesse which will stand for an ensign of the people, that is a banner, something that attracts their attention, and to~~o~~ this the nations will come, and his rest, the place where He is, will be glorious.

Whether this means that this is connected with the days just described, and it fits with the description of the Millennium, chapter 2, where we found the people going up to the mountain of the Lord, with the Lord's house established on the top of the mountain, whether that is what is here described, whether it is describing that period or whether it is referring to an earlier period, when people are attracted by this root of Jesse from many nations, is hard to prove. The only way you could prove it is that the Millennial period is, if the phrase "in that day" means the day we've just been speaking of, but I don't think that it necessarily means that. Now in this phrase, in this verse, the last statement that is of interest to us ~~his~~ rest shall be glorious. What is a rest? The word nuaph in Hebrew is used in two senses. It means to rest in the sense of regaining strength, cessation of labor in order that the body may be refreshed, rebuilt. That is one sense of rest. And we extend it to a person who is dead, often saying he has gone to his rest. Whether rest really belongs in that sense at all is a question, because rest ^{if rest} is simply ceasing labor, stopping, you might say any cessation is rest, but if rest means stopping in order that you can get built up again, in order to do more effort, then we would hardly think of death as being a rest. ~~At~~ rest from their labors, they cease from their labors, they no longer get weary, but ordinarily rest has that idea of becoming refreshed. Well, in this case, there are translations which translate it, his resting place, it has the name, they translate it "his sepulchre." His sepulchre shall be glorious, and of course the Roman Catholic Church makes a great deal of the holy sepulchre in Jerusalem, one of the most holy places, according to them, and the great purpose of the Crusades was to recover the Holy Sepulchre ~~of~~ from the Infidels, and so they sometimes make something of this verse, this sepulchre will be glorious. But I don't think it has ^{to} mean rest in any such sense at all. I question whether sepulchre really is rest in the proper sense, such as rest, and anyway the Hebrew word nuaph has the two senses, to rest in the sense that you rest from your labors, and in the sense that the pencil rests on the book.

And there are two different forms of the hithphael, one of which is used to indicate to rest in the sense of being refreshed, the other used in the sense of causing to rest, the hithphael, in the sense of placing, causing it to be there. I would incline to think that this "his rest~~ful~~ shall be glorious," means the place where he is, the place at which he places his headquarters, I would think, rather than the place where he rests. That is a comparatively minor thing in the interpretation of the passage but a rather important thing in relation to the Roman Catholic Church. Now again we have a new start in verse 11, and if you're going to divide the chapter in two parts, the question might be raised, should the new paragraph begin as indicated in this Bible here with verse 10, or should it begin with verse 11? Verse 10 begins, "in that day," but verse 11 says, "it shall come to pass in that day." As far as a start is concerned, it might be either one.

Verse 10 may be something that is not so much the millennium as the period that precedes the millennium, and yet it certainly has a close affinity to the statements in chapter 2 which definitely refer to the millennium, and so that makes one wonder whether perhaps it really goes with precedes. But verse 11 is more of a place than 10, not just "in that day" there shall be, but "and it shall come to pass in that day." Well, now, I haven't checked those right now in the Hebrew, they may be identical, perhaps it would be good to take a second to check that. It is very interesting that the Hebrew is identical in verse 10 and verse 11, but the KJV translates it "and in that day there shall be," and then, "and it shall come to pass in that day." Which would lead me to think that the KJ translators thought the first one went with what preceded it, and that the second was a new start. It ^{indicates} ~~is a case~~ more of a break, I think, what they have here in 11 than the way they start 10, but of course the Hebrew is identical. We have a picture, verses 1-9, then we say there is going to be a day when something happens, maybe that is the same day as what preceded, but another aspect of it, maybe it is describing what has preceded it. But it would certainly seem to me that

verse 11 precedes the passage from 1 to 9, it certainly seems to me to be the case, so ~~it just repeats~~ verse 10: ~~And in that day there~~ ^{it will come to pass in that day--there is to be a} day when it will come to pass-- that the Lord will set His hand again the second time to recover the remnant of his people, from all these various sections of the world. Is that going to come after the millennium, or does that precede the millennium? And he shall set up an ensign for the nations and assemble the outcasts of Israel, gather together the dispersed of Judah. Here they have three groups, the nations, the outcasts of Israel and the dispersed of Judah. They're all to come from the four corners of the earth. Is that a description of the millennium, or of something that precedes the millennium? Verse 13 speaks of a situation within God's people, the envy of Ephraim shall depart, and the adversaries of Judah shall be cut off, and Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim. Doing away with the division in the divided kingdom, doing away with the disagreements between different parts of the people of Israel.

Well, you can say, if you take this literally, verse 13 shows the ending of disparate groups hating one another among the Jewish people, if you take it literally. If you take it in a general rough way, it certainly could be a figure for all of God's people, reaching a stage where there no longer are groups among them that are at sword points with other groups. I don't know whether the ecumenicists have taken this as an important verse for their movement, or not. Chances are, two or three of them are familiar with it, particular sections, more or less, to mean much to them, but this verse taken alone could certainly fit in with that very well. But look at verse 14:

And they shall fly upon the shoulders of the shoulders of the Philistines, they shall spoil them of the east together, they shall lay their hand upon Edom and Moab, the children of Ammon shall obey them. Does that sound like the millennium? Or does that rather sound like a picture of something before the millennium? That might

perhaps the present situation where the people of Israel, 3 or 4 years ago, captured the Gaza strip and went with their armies down into Suez and seized all this territory to the west and -- or it might refer to the present situation where they're attacking Syria, I don't know ~~y~~how far that has gone but it began at least, was it yesterday-- it might become something big, it might be just a small skirmish, but it might describe something that would develop out of a local situation there, I don't know, but is it a description of a situation in the millennium? ~~It~~ It hardly seems to fit into the millennium, it seems surely as if verse 14 describes something previous to the millennium, rather than anything that is described in the Bible as happening during the millennium. Now verse 15, the Lord shall utterly destroy the tongue of the Egyptian sea, with his mighty wind shall he shake his hand over the river, and I believe that this is speaking of the two directions, Egypt and Assyria. People were taken captive into Egypt, taken captive into Mesopotamia, now we find the Lord destroying the difficulties in both these directions. It refers back to the crossing of the Red Sea, it reminds us of that, that picture of future event of similar nature, whereby God reveals the obstacles in the way of the return of his people, and verse 16 looks forward from Isaiah's day to the going into exile. It would not be literally true, a highway from Assyria, because Assyria was destroyed before Judah was taken, but in the time when Isaiah was living, the northern kingdom was taken to Assyria in captivity, later Assyria was destroyed, the southern kingdom was destroyed, the southern kingdom was taken by Babylonia but Assyria being the first conqueror, taking the northern kingdom, the words could be used to cover all the eastern conquerors, that if this could refer to the return from the exile, quite satisfactorily, it wouldn't be a case of a precise statement pointing to the fact that they've come back from Babylon rather than from Assyria, but a general statement pointing to the fact that they will return from the oppression, from the exile which was begun by the Assyrians. It could be that, and therefore, it could be looking simply to the return from the exile, or it

could be looking beyond that to some greater return, but it does seem as if from verse 11 to 16, is before the millennium, rather than being the millennium itself...

2 (3/4)

...it is often said that the prophets looked forward and see the two advents as one. I am rather skeptical. I think that they look forward, like in the beginning of chapter 11 here, he is seeing the person of Christ rather than an advent, the first two verses. And what is said about His character could fit either advent, but certainly what is described, all of this from verse 5 on, certainly is describing the condition after the second, there is no specific relation to the first except insofar as ^{His} ~~the~~ character is the character which could be seen at any time, but as to the precise thing here described, it surely is the second coming, rather than the first coming, and I would incline to feel, I rather incline to think it is a picture which may not mean much to those of you who have not lived in a region with any high mountains, but it may not even mean anything to somebody who lived in Los Angeles in recent years when there was lots of smog, but in the days when I was there when there was no smog, you would look up and you would see a range of mountains and then there was another range right behind it, and there is a big valley between the two, but if you look from a distance you see the mountains in the front range and you see the mountains in the back range and it often was difficult to tell which mountain was in the front range and which was in the back range. So if you were to describe what you saw there you would describe this mountain range, this one, this one, you'd go along, and you wouldn't necessarily be always able to tell which was in the front range, which was in the second range, which was in the third range, ~~now~~ the highest ones would stand out if you were some distance away, so it seems to me that often the prophet looked forward from a logical rather than from a chronological statement, that is, they're taking some subjects and looking forward and seeing what is going to happen in relation to this subject in the future, and relationship to that they might describe something

in connection with the first coming, something in connection with the second coming. But that the first and second would be so blended that the same words would refer to both, or that the picture would be ~~just~~ just a composite picture, I am rather skeptical. I incline rather to think that they deal a little with something in one and then they deal a little with something in the other. (stu.2 3/4) But there are those who think they are so blended you can't distinguish them. I don't think that is so, although I do think that there may be places where he deals with one and then with the other and where you wouldn't be able to tell where the transition came, if you didn't have your New Testament evidence as to what one of them was like, and then you could see how far it fit that and where it ceased to fit. The fitting goes back and forth rapidly, there are so many right in the one picture (3 1/4)

Well, the picture then in chapter 11, the first 9 verses are tremendously important in our whole understanding of Christ and of His work and of His future plans, they are tremendously important, the first 9 verses. The 10th verse is not quite so clear but rather clear, and certainly fits in with New Testament teaching very well, when you come to the 11th through the 15th I would incline to think that they are a description of events that would take place shortly before the return of Christ, rather likely. But I feel that way particularly because of verse 14. Verse 15 could describe a change which would take place rapidly but it wouldn't necessarily be a figure of the picture of the removal of obstacles against the return of people to Palestine. You might, somebody might have said 15 years ago, well, how would the Jews in Yemen ever get back to Israel, how would they ever get up there, they're way down in southern Arabia, they have a tremendous desert area in between them, very difficult to cross, filled with hostile marauding tribes, how could the Yemenites ever get back to Israel? And of course after Israel became a nation they hired the American Flying Tigers, an American airline, to bring the Yemenites up to there, they had been kept,

held under by the Arabs of Yemen, they were very oppressed by them, they were in very bad condition than, and they had never seen a wheeled vehicle, the first wheeled vehicle they ever saw, were airplanes. In fact, they were so unaccustomed to wheeled vehicles completely, that they say they put them in these flying Elger airplanes and flew them over into Israel and there occasionally this would happen, that a man would be in a (5 1/4) he would simply walk to the door and open the door and step out, because he wasn't familiar with a wheeled vehicle, he didn't realize the danger of this situation at all, they had only donkeys down there (5 1/2) no wheeled vehicles at all. They jumped from a very primitive situation right into the middle of the 20th century, but the difficulty in the way of getting back from Yemen up to Israel, were removed in a way nobody could have predicted in the time of Isaiah. A marvelous way which could be a fulfillment of what the Lord said here that he would utterly destroy the tongue of the Egyptian Sea and with his mighty wind shake his hand over the river and smite in in the seven streams, make men go over dryshod. There shall be a highway for the remnant of his people which shall be left. It describes the removal of all difficulties in the way to their getting back, and it is marvelous when you think that today there are people here in Philadelphia who will go over to Israel for a week or so at a time, it just was unimaginable even 30 years ago to think of going for a weekend, in Israel, or to go just for a week. Now that--it may be that there are specific geographical changes here, which would take place at the beginning of the millennium, making specific movements which would correspond in more features of the literal relation to them, but the central idea is the return to Israel and the returning with God removing obstacles which formerly seemed almost impossible. Yes, Mr. Cohen

(7) Of course they didn't actually go on eagles' wings at any rate, but the getting on an eagle and being flown back with an eagle is something which the Lord could bring to pass but which ~~is~~ ^{is} seems an extremely unlikely ~~thing~~ ^{that He} would choose to do.

The figure, Flown back on eagles' wings, shows a removal of obstacles in the way, taking them back with an ease never before dreamed of, and he gets nearer to it by the going by plane than anything else you're apt to think of but (7 1/2)

But doubtless a fulfillment in a most remarkable way. Well, that section then, I don't know how much more meaning we can get out of it, this last part, than we have. I don't know how much more specifically we can understand it than we've noticed yet. It does seem to be a prediction of events probably including the return of the Jews to Palestine, but describing events I would think before the millennium rather than during it.

Now ~~the~~ the passage of course continues, chapter 12 is one of the shortest chapters in the Bible. We actually clearly saw that chapter 13 begins a new section, the burden of Babylon, you have a series of burdens--it starts with the word burden of such-and-such. So, we saw there should be a break at the beginning of 13. Well, he could have made 11 and 12 one chapter and that wouldn't have been an overly long chapter, but it was quite obvious to them that 12 is quite different from what preceded. It is a song of praise and before there had been specific predictions of future events, and so it seemed to him appropriate to make a chapter out of these few verses. But they surely are closely connected with what precedes. We had in that day what's going to happen in verse 10, again it shall come to pass in that day, verse 11, and then in chapter 12.1 we read in that day thou shalt say. And what is the day that is now spoken of? I don't think you can say this is the same day as verse 11 on, and that is the same day as verse 10, and that's the same day as here. I believe all we can get out of the statement is, there is going to be a day when He will say. And what will they say--now that day may be the one spoken of, but I don't think it follows from (9 1/2)

What will they say? O Lord, I will praise thee, though thou are angry with me, thine anger is turned away and thou comfortedst me. Surely that is a picture of salvation. It is a picture of one who was under God's wrath and now the wrath has

been taken away. God has changed his sorrow into joy. He will praise God because of this tremendous change in relation to God, and this theme of salvation continues in verse 2, behold, God is my salvation, I will trust and not be afraid. For the LORD JEHOVAH--one of the four places I believe where the authorized version takes the word Jehovah, usually this combination they translate as the Lord God, GOD in capital letters, to stand for the (10 1/4) For the LORD JEHOVAH is my strength and my song, he also is become my salvation, surely the stress is on the salvation of those with whom God was angry. Now He has His anger turned away from them. He is their salvation and they are trusting in Him. And it begins with, thou shalt say, surely an expression of the personal relationship to God which can be attained through the root of Jesse, which is to be an ensign of the people and to which the nations are to seek. In Him they are to find relief from the anger of God, in Him they are to find the salvation, in Him they are to find One in whom they can put complete trust. Surely salvation by faith is very clearly in this chapter. Therefore, with joy shall ye draw the water out of the wells of salvation, certainly not a usual way of saying, therefore you're going to overcome the Philistines and no longer be subject to them. There is much more to it than that, (11 1/4) to draw water out of the wells of salvation, surely this chapter is stressing what the son of Jesse is going to do as he makes salvation available to all who will trust in His name. And in that day shall ye say, you notice the great word of verse 3 again, repeated. Does that start a new section with verses 4-6, which is different from what precedes? Or is it simply another section of it? Well, it is the continuation of the song of praise, so it would seem most likely it is the same time, though you can't prove that simply from the phrase. And in that day shall ye say, praise the Lord, call upon his name, declare his doings among the people, make mention that his name is exalted. Certainly the thing for one to do who is trusting in Him, who has had His anger turned away from him, is to praise the Lord and declare His doings, to witness to Him among the people.

And to make mention about His exalted name. Sing to the Lord, for he has done excellent things. Now what about the last part of that? Let's look at the word (12 1/2) in the Hebrew, what was the form of it? 12.5. In other words, when the Massorete puts vowel marks in the Hebrew Bible they stuck to the consonants that they found in the majority of their manuscripts, but in some cases they thought the consonants they found in the minority of their manuscripts were the correct consonants, and in that case while the majority of the manuscripts had what they didn't think were the correct ones, they kept them in the text, they put in the margin the (13 1/4) what they found in the minority of manuscripts, what they thought was correct, they put in the margin, and then in the main text, where they put the vowels in, they put the vowels that go with the text they put in the margin, the (13 1/2) instead of what is written, which is the consonants. And so that dotⁱⁿ and the jod makes absolutely no sense, it cannot be a doubling of the jod because it has no vowels preceding, they're all following, you can't double a vowel without a full vowel preceding and a full or half vowel following. So that the dot there is not a doubling of the jod but is a (13 3/4) it is a dot over a wau, and you look in the margin, it says suray, and then it has name wau, there...

3 (3/4)

...the real reason I wanted to call your attention to this in Hebrew there is is to note the fact that there is no expression of time in connection with the participle, it doesn't say this has been made known, it doesn't say this is being made known, it doesn't say this is going to be made known, it does not indicate which it is, and every participle is, a participle does not express time itself, you have to either have something with it, to tell what the time is--I was living, I am living, I will be living--you have to have something with it to tell the time in English, or in Hebrew, or else in Hebrew it may not express the time, then you have to infer from the situation of the verse from context. In other words you are left free to consider various possibilities of time.

So it could be this has been made known, this is being made known, this will be made known. Now there is added feature. This is not a niphal, this is a hophel, but there is a peculiarity of the niphal participle which occasionally is also found in the hophel participle, and that is that the niphal participle on quite a number of cases corresponds to a lack of (2 1/4) in other words, a form which says not what is but what ought to be, what is going to be, what there is some compulsion about its being, and in Gesenius' grammar, when he discusses that, he gives one instance where it is a hophel which carries that (2 1/2) And you find one instance of it where Joab goes to this town in northern Palestine where the people are protecting the man who made a rebellion against David, you remember, after Absalom's rebellion, and the city was shut in and Joab came with his army and besieged the city, was going to destroy it, and this woman, ^{it} says a wise woman, called out from the wall, and she said to Joab, why are you going to destroy a mother in Israel. Well a mother in Israel is the same as our present ~~way~~ phrase, a metropolis, a large, a mother city, a big town that has a lot of stuff in it. Why are you going to destroy a mother in Israel, why are you going to destroy one of the big cities of Israel? And Joab said we haven't got anything against this city, we don't want to destroy it, but he says it's this man here who is being protected in the city, we have ~~come~~ to get him, and then the woman, his head--I think it's a niphal participle, it's either that or hophal, I think it's niphal--throw from the wall. Well, it's the gerondum, this is what the solution ought to be, that his head should be thrown from the wall--the gerundum idea.

Now there is another instance that he gives where Joash was a boy, and Athaliah his grandmother decided to kill all the seed royal when she heard that her son was dead, but a nurse stole away Joash the little baby from among the children--either niphal or hophel participle--being killed, among the being killed ones. Not from among the children that were killed, she stole away him, but from among the children that were to be killed, of whom there was a certain compulsion, a necessity, a

determination to kill. He was stolen away before they got him, and so that gerundum idea may be in the hophel or the niphal. Now in this particular case it seems to be that that gerundum idea would fit very well. Because it says, sing to the Lord for he has done excellent things, known this to be in all the earth. This shall be made known, this is the message which must be brought to all the earth. Not simply that all the earth knows about it, but that all the earth must be informed--it can't be dogmatic, but it has to be apathetic, certainly a strong possibility. Now of course if it should be that the Hebrew has been incorrectly transmitted here and that the Greek was correct, (5 1/4)

that would be a very good parallel to what precedes. Sing unto the Lord, He has done excellent things. Make this known in all the earth. That would make a good parallel. There seems to be quite a bit of change in the letters as they stand, so I incline to think that the other is more accurate. This is to be made known in all the earth. Or else this has been (5 3/4)--we cannot be dogmatic which.

But then it continues with the imperative: Cry out and shout, thou inhabitant of Zion, for great is the Holy One of Israel in the midst of thee. Is this a song of praise given in the millennium to the Lord, or is this the song of God's true people prior to the millennium, as a great climax to this section of Immanuel's showing the joy of those who trust Him and who receive salvation through Him. A song of praise like this, it is pretty hard to be dogmatic, but either is according to true facts of scriptural teaching, but I incline at the moment toward the feeling that this is a description of the joy of those who see the root of Jesse standing as an ensign for all the nations who have found salvation through Him.

Well, that completes this section, and I was very sorry today to have to hold the class for an hour when two members can't be here. I think Mr. Vannoy is probably working on his thesis, the first draft has to be in by this week, and I know he is pretty jammed with it, but there were two members of the class who have another class at this hour, and I was very sorry for their sakes, to move it from 1:30 to 2:30, though I

did feel that it was important that I should get to a meeting that was held I thought I would get some information very much worth having, and since this hour was the Graduate Hour I thought it wouldn't hurt this time to have the undergraduates have that hour. I'm sorry that those two had to miss it, but I didn't feel that this section was near as important as what preceded it, the first part of 11, which I particularly wouldn't want them to miss. But now we have to go on and probably not spend more time just at the moment on the book of Immanuel, unless you have some particular question about it, but to go on to the other section that we're dealing with in this course, and that other section starts with chapter 28.

Now if I just give a few minutes introduction--we have only five minutes more-- if I give a few minutes to chapter 28, I hope it is possible for Mr. Gregory and Mr. Golin to get this rapid introduction from some of you before the next meeting, because we want to get into this new section. Someone might say, why in this course do we jump around, take 36 and 39 first, then we jump back to 7-12 and then we jump up to 28-35. Well, it's not quite as jumpy as it looks, because 28-35 comes immediately before 36-39. Nevertheless we are making a big jump from 12 up to 28. Well, first place, why did we start with 36-39? Because it gives us an idea of historical background which is very important for considering 7-12.

But you remember that we noticed in connection with it some passages in 28, 29, 30, 31, we pointed to quite a number of passages in the beginning of the course in these four chapters. In other words, section 7-12 and section 28-35 deal with the same general situation. They both are affected by what follows. Now I think we can safely go beyond that, we can say that chapters 28-35 are dealing with exactly the same situation, as 7-12, and you notice it is a rather complex situation.

7-12 we start in ~~with~~ with the situation in 7 where Ahaz in order to defend his nation from the Syro-Ephraimitic attack is calling in the Assyrians. And then we look forward and see the results of that, the results of that will mean an Assyrian

attack with the buffer state removed, with great danger to Israel, and we see that God will for a time deliver them from this attack by a most miraculous means. Now that is another complex situation which is involved in background of 7-12 and you can't really understand 7-12 without having that in mind. Well, exactly the same background is there in 28-35. There is this difference. That in 7-12 enough of the background is stated that you might be able to figure it out fairly well for yourself from 7-12 without knowing a lot about the 36-39. But I'm not sure you could in 28-35. 28-31 you would be in a maze of difficulty, a lot of isolated verses difficult to understand, if you don't have that historic background clearly in mind. With that in mind, you find even more here that is explained by the background than you found in 7-12, but it is ^{pointed out,} not ~~assumed~~, it simply is assumed, and so for that reason these chapters and 7-12 belong together, deal with the same historic situation, the same great lesson, general spiritual lessons are contained in both sections.

Now there is a difference between them, there is a difference of emphasis, in chapters 7-12 there is constant emphasis on the coming king. Immanuel in chapter 7, the wonderful child in chapter 9, the root of Jesse who is going to bring in the millennium in chapter 11, constant emphasis on the wonderful coming king who is the answer to the problem of God's dissatisfaction with the present unsatisfactory king. Ahaz. Now Ahaz does not figure in chapter 28-35, but in 28-35 our attention is not upon Ahaz the head of the nation, but upon the men just below Ahaz, the trusted counselors. It is upon the trusted counselors, upon the leaders, and upon the nation insofar as it reflects the character of these leaders, and that is what our attention is now focussing. In the same situation, the same spiritual lessons, the same general development, but a focussing on a different portion of the people (12 1/2)

That is, I think, the vital introduction to this section and if you could pass that on to Mr. Golin and Mr. Gregory, before tomorrow, I'd appreciate it greatly, and we'll get on into this material tomorrow...

...I had to switch yesterday the other class to the other hour because that meant that two of them had another class at that time. I would not have done it if we had been on one of the most important sections, that previous material on 11, I would have skipped ~~that~~ ^{class} altogether rather than to have two of them have to miss that, but the latter part of 11 is not nearly as important as that earlier part, and ~~what~~ ^{while} I hated to have you miss it I thought it was well worth it in order that (1)

So though I'm sorry you missed that I think you can get some idea from some others of what we generally covered, and while it's an interesting section it's not nearly as important as the section we had just before. Now I'd like to ask the Graduate students to return to their time (1 1/2)

and then I'd like to mention about the assignment for our next meeting. You have the rest of this week to get the assignment, there is no need

but since we meet the first day after vacation why I thought I should mention it now.

The assignment for next time, for the undergraduates, the four, if you read over chapter 29 very carefully, make an outline of it, and state as well as you can what it is talking about in this section. Try to have as good an idea as you can. Now you may have some pretty tough problems but don't worry about them. I'm not asking you to make extensive investigation, but to get a good idea of the general content, a general outline, and of the problems involved in it, and turn it in, ready at the beginning of the hour please.

That is for the undergraduates. Now for the Graduates--you have a much larger amount of required work to do, so your next assignment will not deal with 29 but with 30 and 31.

And I would like you to compare 30 and 31, that is to make an outline of 30, and then make an outline of 31, and see if you can find a parallel between the two chapters, if you can see whether they fall in more or less the same line of thought, and if so, which verses of one correspond to which verses of another, and what are *each* of them talking about? Study that as fully as you can in the time available, looking into commentaries, whatever amount you think would be helpful or necessary in connection

with it. That is the assignment then for our next meeting.

Now the last five minutes of our last meeting were particularly important because in that time I mentioned the fact that we were now leaving the book of Immanuel, 7-12, and skipping over to chapter 28, the material from 13-27 is of quite a different nature. ~~The~~ In fact, one rather wonders why it is arranged the way it is. This material is of a different nature, probably was written, some of it, at the same time, but much of it at a different time. Possibly it was to avoid a certain monotony in the book, that it was arranged this way, because 7-12 handles a certain definite subject, and then 28-35 handles a very closely related subject, retracing a fair amount of the material of 7-12, though with much change and related to quite a number of facts that are quite different, but the same general viewpoint, I would think, written at just about the same time, but instead of going through the same thing twice, perhaps it seemed better to put in something of quite a different nature, and then come back to this again, I don't know. But for purposes of study and of careful understanding of it, it is much better to study the two together, and each of them throws light upon the other subject. Particularly the 36-39 and 7-12 throw light on 28-35. In 7-12 he is speaking in the situation which involves a number of elements. First, with the Syro-Ephraimitic invasion, with the frightful fear that it engenders. Second, the clever scheme of Ahaz and his nobles to get safety from this. Third, Isaiah's assurance to Ahaz that this scheme is a something that is absolutely contrary to God's will and is going to backfire and bring harm to the land rather than good, because it does away with the buffer state, brings them right back to the Assyrian empire, places them in tremendous danger, which is going to result in great catastrophe for Judah. That is the third feature of it, is his assurance to them of that. Then the fourth feature of it is, that assuring them it is going to bring tremendous danger so that Jerusalem will get to where it seems certain to be destroyed, yet that God is going to protect His city, and the Assyrian is not going to be able to take it, but God will wonderfully protect it.

Now that is quite an involved historical course but all that is included, as you noticed, in 7-12, in the promise that God gives ~~to~~ ^{through} Isaiah to the people, promise and rebuke, mingled together, given to the people in the time of King Ahaz, looking forward into the future as far as the deliverance from Sennacherib, and then with occasional glimpses here and there, far beyond that time, into the much more distant future, as he makes wonderful promises to the people of God. Now that is a summary of 7-12, which also is a summary of 28-35. They each make a new start and then go through this. There is of course a great difference between 7-12 and 28-35. 7-12 has its central feature, the King Ahaz. Ahaz is an unworthy sion of the house of David. Ahaz has proven utterly unworthy. God is going, in His own time, to replace Ahaz by His Son Immanuel, God with us, and so the big figure in 7-12 is Immanuel, God coming King, the Sion of the house of David, who is going to do what is needed for this whole world. That is not in 28-35 to any great extent. That is the great central figure of 7-12, lacking in the main in 28-35, but the historical situation is all the same.

Now what takes the place of the central figure of King Ahaz who is rebuked and assures that God is going to deal with the kingship of the son of Jesse, replacing it with His own son of Jesse, the great Immanuel. What takes the place of that in 28-35? I don't think you study very far into 28-35 before you become aware of that which is nowhere plainly stated but I think it is clearly involved in it, that what is dealt with here is not the king, but the nobles. It is the nobles, the leaders of the people. It is the nation rather than the king that is in mind. It is the people of God rather than the king over God's people that is now in mind. So he is dealing with the people rather than the king. Now of course he is dealing with them about the same thing, in relation to the same thing, and consequently there is much in common. But the emphasis is different. And yet there are many ways in which the message is strikingly similar. And you will be amazed to go through, once you get this key, and to see how they

correspond. Now to get this key you have to study into it quite a bit. We can't take time this minute to have you folks study into ~~it~~ it with no guidance, and work into it and try to find the evidence that points to this key, but the best we can do is for me to give you the material that I have found, giving you the key, showing you how it fits, having you see it fits and work out further details yourselves, but also of course checking constantly that this is the correct key because I don't want anyone to take my view for anything. The Bible is the standard, not what I say or what any other man says. And I may be wrong on anything I say and I want you to check. For purposes of marking it is necessary that you know what I hold and why I hold it, it is not necessary for you to agree at all, but to know what it is, and to know what the reasons are why I hold them. If you feel these reasons are insufficient, don't hesitate to say so. But particularly I'd be happy to have you say so if you have a substitute idea that is definite. I don't think you will have on the major things, but on some of the minor things you might have very helpful improvements to what I ~~am~~ give. And if it should be that in the major things I have some strikingly wrong interpretations, I would be much happier to have the class find them than to have some more hostile people find them later on, if I put them in print. So don't hesitate to mention anything you think is weak or not sufficiently substantiated.

So now we are going into an area here which is much harder to interpret, 28-35, than 7-12, and that's why we take a section. We take the other first and learn much of methods of interpretation, learn much of the progress of thought, learn much of the relation to the historic background, learn much of the way in which the ultimate future is brought in and related to immediate situations. So that it is, with what we learn from 7-12, not so much of matter, perhaps, as of method and general approach. We are in a position to look at 28-35 and get out of it what we would not expect to otherwise.

I remember one year going through this, with a fellow, and he said chapter 28, he first read it, it was just a mess. He says, "it's just a mess, just a lot of confusion."

No idea of what any of it tells us. But when we open it up and have the key, it is most logical, most clear presentation, once you have the key. Now the key is not clearly stated, there are certain things we have to figure out, but I believe we have figured them out on the basis entirely of evidences in the chapter. I'm going to give you these matters of background, you will see how the words come to life, when you have these in mind. But if you go on you will see the evidences for them, and I believe you will feel that you could yourself, with sufficient time, have looked into the chapters and seen these evidences, which give meaning to the chapter, the key that fits.

Now the first aspect of the key to 28 is one which I got from a commentary by George Adam Smith, who has all sorts of critical ideas on Isaiah, and many things that I don't agree with at all, but who occasionally has very clear insight, and whether he is original in this or whether he took it from others, I don't know. But the more I look into it the clearer it seems to be, ~~that~~ the beginning of chapter 28 is a Banquet Scene, ~~that~~ there is a banquet there of the nobles, and that Isaiah has come for this banquet, and there in this banquet he is speaking to these nobles and they are not anxious to have him speak. He comes in there and speaks to them more or less against their desire, but it is difficult for them to keep ~~it~~ from permitting him to speak. So the chapter begins with a situation where I think we are warranted to imagine it, the nobles of Judah, having been with Ahaz in the council, in the determination of the plan, know that he has sent tribute off to Tiglath-pileser, and they are convinced that Tiglath-pileser will come, in payment for the tribute and deliver them from Ephraim and from Syria. They're quite convinced they are coming, they're definitely expecting him to come. And in that situation, expecting them to come, they of course are facing the grave danger, the Syro-Ephraimitic invasion, they want the people to fight valiantly, to ^{protect} ~~take~~ the city ^{until} ~~and~~ the rescue comes, but they have no doubt the rescue is coming. And so they're holding a banquet rejoicing, but the people don't know what ~~w~~ they're rejoicing for, but they know. They're rejoicing in Ahaz' clever scheme with which they

have joined. And as they rejoice in this they are at the same time in their banquet trying to raise up the morale of the people so they will fight well in order to hold off the Syrians and the Israelites until Tigath-pileser gets there. So that the chapter starts with Isaiah, uninvited, walking into the banquet hall and beginning to speak. And it was customary for the prophet to stop at a street corner or anywhere they felt like and start to talk. And this is not simply a little group of friends, the banquets which the nobles liked to give were more or less open to the general public to step in and enjoy some of their bounty. They could step in and make themselves free with some of the food and wine that was there offered. They were entertaining the city to some extent. But the nobles are sitting there with their rejoicing and their big celebration. Without having told the people what they're celebrating. So Isaiah steps in and he looks at the nobles and says, Woe to the crown of pride, to the drunkards of Ephraim, whose glorious beauty is a fading flower, which are on the head of the fat valleys of them that are overcome with wine? Behold, the Lord has a mighty and strong one, which as a tempest of hail and a destroying storm, as a flood of mighty waters overflowing, shall cast down to the earth with the hand. The crown of pride, the drunkards of Ephraim, shall be trodden under feet.

And you can imagine Isaiah came inside...

7 (3/4)

going to be a situation where
 ...one rumor comes after another, and you don't know to think, the result of Ahaz' clever scheme, and verse 20 is an interesting figure of speech, thoroughly a figure of speech. Take v.20 alone, what has it got to do with the rest of the chapter, what has it got to do with the book of Isaiah? For the bed is shorter than that a man can stretch himself on it. What's that? And the covering is narrower than that he can wrap himself in it. Somebody says I take all the Bible literally, every word of it I take literally. How does he take this word literally? What is it talking about? You should have longer beds so he can be comfortable. That's certainly not the message of the book here.

The message is the figure of speech for the way that these people are trying to protect themselves from Syria-Ephraim, and thinking they're going to be safe from the waves of the future sea. He says your scheme is insufficient to accomplish it, it's like a bed that's so short you can't stretch yourself in it, it's like a covering that's so narrow that you can't cover yourself. It is a vivid figure of speech which would mean much to people in those days when it was difficult always to get proper accommodations.

Mr. Miller, you had a question? (1 3/4) That's not a terminology. The word literal as usually expressed means that when you say a bed you mean a bed, you don't mean a scheme. When you say a sun, you ~~mean~~ mean a sun that's in the heavens, you don't mean some kind of a prince, and of course we do have those who allegorize the Bible to where you don't know what anything means. And that is utterly wrong, and produces nothing but confusion, and in reaction against this figurative interpretation that reduces it to nonsense, many good people go to the other extreme, and say I take the Bible literally, every word literally. But it simply doesn't make sense. And when we go, going away from an evil position, when we go in the opposite direction, and go to a (2 3/4) position, even though it's not immoral, not wrong like the evil position is, from which we're fleeing, it is not efficient, it's not safe. It puts us in a position where we're easily destroyed. Yes? (3) My guess is that he walked in, that's my guess. And my guess is that there is a possibility that he continued and gave the whole of the 7 chapters, but I think there is a bigger possibility that at some point in it it was interrupted, and he went out and continued it outside, to those who followed him.

I think that the whole thing is what ~~he~~ would have given in there if not interfered with. The whole thing, from this to 35, but my guess is that he only gave a part of it, and that he gave the rest outside to those who were interested with possibly some who were (3 3/4)

That's my guess, that's a very good question. We don't know for certain. It is not impossible Isaiah just sat in a room imagining ^{he was at} what the banquet, and made it

all up, but I think that is very unlikely. (break in record, starting again at 4 3/4)
 ...now I believe I asked you to have some work ready for today, that is, really you had plenty of time before vacation, I gave it nearly a week before vacation. How many have it ready? Only Mr. Gregory? Mr. Abbot, do you have it? Yes. That was the butline of which. We weren't quite through with 28. Let's take 28 and then let's discuss that together as soon as we finish 28.

We noticed that chapter 28 is the start of a new section and that it parallels chapter 7, that it is the same historical situation exactly as that in 7 but he is dealing with a different group, he is dealing with the leaders, the nobles, rather than with the king, specifically. And he tells them that this plan is not going to be sufficient to accomplish the objective they had. Because v.20, for the bed is shorter than that a man can stretch himself on, and the covering narrower than that he can wrap himself in it. In other words, making an alliance with Tiglath-pileser and thinking that under Assyrian alliance they can be safe from Assyrian aggression is the sort of a thing that just won't work. In the end they'll be worse off than they would have been before. And of course, we had exactly this brought out in chapter 7, and there he said the result of it is to destroy the buffer states, to bring Assyria right next to you, to put you in such a grave situation that there'll be no human escape for you, you will be on the verge of being utterly destroyed, but then he says, when the great attack comes, God will deliver you by His own power, to show His great power, He will deliver from Sennacherib, and then he says the Assyrian empire will fall, and Israel also will fall but from the seed of Jesse will come forth a new branch. That was the wonderful promise in chapter 11.

Now here in chapter 28, after being told that this will not work, v.21 says, for the Lord shall rise up as in mount Perazim, he shall be wroth as in the valley of Gibeon, that he may do his work, his strange work, and bring to pass his act, his strange act. That is very strange language in v.21, and I doubt very much if it could be fully understood by anybody at the time at which they heard it said. The Lord will rise up as on mount

Perazim and be wroth as in the valley of Gibeon. Do you recall what these would be apt to refer to, these references. Mr. Cohen? (7 1/4) Don't think that was Gibeon. (stu) Let's look at that. I remember Ajalon but not Gibeon. ^{Joshua} 10.12 says, sun, stand still upon Gibeon. Now the suggestion made here in Ellicott's commentary, is that Gibeon, 1 Chr. 14.16, and they smote the host of the Philistines from Gibeon even to Gazer, when David was king. You notice at this particular that you have also a reference to that perazim, because here you have in 1 Chr. 14.8, how the Philistines heard David was anointed king ~~marrying~~ over Israel and they went up to seek David, and David inquired of God, shall I go against the Philistines, wilt thou deliver them into mine hand, and the Lord said, go up, for I will deliver them, so they came up to Baal-perazim and David smote them there, and then we read further on, that they smote the host of the Philistines from Gibeon even to Gazer. Now there we have both the words together, Perazim and Gibeon, which which are mentioned here in Isa. 28.21. Now you have one of the two words, Gibeon, in the case where the people were pursuing in the time of Joshua, and when the Lord caused the sun to stand over Gibeon. Both would be alike in that it would be a marvelous intervention of God. God intervening on behalf of His people and giving them victory. But it certainly doesn't sound like just any ordinary activity, and you notice it says the Lord will rise up in mount Perazim, He will be wroth as in the valley of Gibeon, that he may do his work, his strange work, bring to pass his act, his strange act.

The people would gather, I think, that the Lord is going to deliver, but what would be so strange in the Lord's delivering. It surely is a suggestion that there is going to be something very unusual. Something extremely different from the ordinary. And it seems to me that it probably is a hint ahead of the deliverance from Sennacherib. Here they are told just before, that your scheme won't protect, if the Assyrian comes they'll flood through, the waters will overflow the hiding place, but he says, the Lord will rise and he will wroth and do his strange work. I question whether for the Lord will rise up is the correct translation here. The bed is shorter than that you can stretch

ance, in the time of Sennacherib. He is going to give them another chance by a purely divine miraculous intervention. And then comes a very peculiar section here of this chapter, vv.23-29, Give ye ear, and hear my voice; hearken, and hear my speech. Four full repetitions, you could get four different documents there, couldn't you? And he says, does the plowman plow all day to sow? does he open and break the clods of his ground? When he has made plain the face thereof, does he not cast abroad the fitches, scatter the cummin, and cast in the principal wheat and the appointed barley and these in their place? What do you think about vv.24 and 24, what is the meaning of these two verses? Just above this we have the judgment (14) we have the overflowing scourge pass through, but then we have the Lord delivering, and then we have a consumption after that. We have changes in God's manner of dealing, and he says, now I want you to think for a minute, how is it agriculture. Is it just the same thing done over and over, no, it's a purpose, there's something accomplished by it...

8 (3/4)

...here we have the claim that the human being who was in agriculture got some divinely given wisdom. He has a purpose, an objective, in what he does, for the fitches are not threshed with a threshing instrument. Here is a cartwheel turned about upon the cummin, but ^{for} the fitches they use a staff, for the cummin you use a rod. Bread corn is bruised, you don't want to thresh it, you don't want to break it with the wheel of a cart, or bruise it with the horses, you have different methods, to deal with different agricultural things. That which is very excellent in one case would be utterly destructive in another case, and what the farmer does is adapted to the purpose that he has in mind. God says this also comes from the Lord of hosts, who is wonderful in counsel and excellent in working. You don't need to think that things are just going to go the way whatever you decide to do, that your method is going to be worked out and whatever you think is going to happen is going to happen. God has a purpose,

ance, in the time of Sennacherib. He is going to give them another chance by a purely divine miraculous intervention. And then comes a very peculiar section here of this chapter, vv.23-29, Give ye ear, and hear my voice; hearken, and hear my speech. Four full repetitions, you could get four different documents there, couldn't you? And he says, does the plowman plow all day to sow? does he open and break the clods of his ground? When he has made plain the face thereof, does he not cast abroad the fitches, scatter the cummin, and cast in the principal wheat and the appointed barley and the spelt in their place? What do you think about vv.24 and 25, what is the meaning of these two verses? Just above this we have the judgment (14) we have the overflowing scourge pass through, but then we have the Lord delivering, and then we have a consumption after that. We have changes in God's manner of dealing, and he says, now I want you to think for a minute, how is it agriculture. Is it just the same thing done over and over, no, it's a purpose, there's something accomplished by it...

8 (3/4)

...here we have the claim that the human being who was in agriculture got some divinely given wisdom. He has a purpose, an objective, in what he does, for the fitches are not threshed with a threshing instrument. Here is a cartwheel turned about upon the cummin, but ^{for} the fitches they use a staff, for the cummin you use a rod. Bread corn is bruised, you don't want to thresh it, you don't want to break it with the wheel of a cart, or bruise it with the horses, you have different methods, to deal with different agricultural things. That which is very excellent in one case would be utterly destructive in another case, and what the farmer does is adapted to the purpose that he has in mind. God says this also comes from the Lord of hosts, who is wonderful in counsel and excellent in working. You don't need to think that things are just going to go the way whatever you decide to do, that your method is going to be worked out and whatever you think is going to happen is going to happen. God has a purpose,

God is like a farmer who is trying to accomplish something, God has a purpose in Israel, and therefore for this purpose He is not going to just destroy Israel, He is not going to tear it up, on the other hand He is not going to let you go ahead and do what you feel like, and feel that He is going to protect you in order that you can enjoy yourself, that you can have a good time, and you can get what you want, He has a purpose in Israel, He is going to accomplish His purpose, and He will send chastisement, He will send a bruising, He'll send a crushing if necessary, to make the good grain. This has to be ground, has to go through these processes, you might say He's just going to wreck it, well, no//, He is not going to use a method that just wrecks it, but the method that fits it for the purpose He has in mind, and therefore He ends this chapter with the statement that all this is going to happen. You think you have your schemes of how to carry on your life, and you're going to make this, --fight fire with fire--and make your deal with Tiglath-pileser whereby you gain your purpose, but God says if you're going to succeed in life, the only way to do is to trust Him, and follow Him and do His will and that way you will be much better off than any other way, and He is going to accomplish His purpose, and if you won't fall in line with it voluntarily, if you are essential to this purpose as ~~H~~ Israel is, He will force you into this, to accomplish His purpose. He will send the chastisement, He will send the judgment, He will deliver before they are destroyed, ~~and~~ He will do that which will accomplish the purpose that He has in mind. So I think the meaning of these verses when we once begin to look into them and see what they are talking about and compare // it with the situation, it becomes quite obvious. But simply the way it is given, you pick out two or three of these verses and ask somebody what they're talking about, you wouldn't have any idea. And the average person who just reads 28 and 29, you say what a sharp transition. The transition is not a sharp transition, it is a further development of the same thing. But the exact inferences are not stated, the thing is so given that the inferences can be easily gathered from it,

but they're not spelled out in ABC language. So the chapter division between 28 and 29 is purely a matter of indicating place. You have a definite paragraph division, the agricultural just given and the picture of the hearth of God that follows, are two distinct paragraphs, but they are not two distinct sections that follow, it continues straight on. God has a purpose and God will accomplish this purpose. His purpose is not destruction, His purpose is purification. His purpose is cleansing His own, fitting them to do the purpose that He has in mind. So He continues:

Woe to Ariel, Ariel--and what does Ariel mean, do you know, Mr. Gregory?

(5) ^{as we continue} ~~in the context~~ it becomes very clear, from what follows, that Jerusalem is what he is talking about. But why does He call Jerusalem Ariel? I think I went into that but I didn't discuss it. Do you recall that? Ari, in Hebrew, there are two words that are pronounced and spelled Ari, one of them means a hearth, a place where you burn things, where you warm your place, or where you cook your food, the other ari is ^{a lion.} ~~a lion.~~ So the word can either mean the lion of God or the hearth of God, either one. And you think of the lion of the tribe of David, you think of the lion of Judah. Ariel as the lion of God would seem quite appropriate, and perhaps a little of that is in the mind of the person speaking, as they think of the lion of God, Jerusalem. The lion of God, but as they go on you find that the figure he has in mind is not the lion but, as we have pointed out, it is the hearth. We find that clearly because that is brought out in the next few words here, the reference to it is as the place where they kill sacrifices, the place where there is the fire, the place where the Lord performs His great work. Now right here, I asked the undergraduates who are taking it for undergraduate credit to give us an outline of the chapter, and do two of you have it, or three? All right, Mr. Gregory, give us...kind of thing, simply on the ground of content, that we would say that vv.1-8 is specifically speaking of a situation, something that is going to occur in the future, something that is going to occur to Ariel.

Woe to Ariel, v.1. Ariel, v.2, and continues talking about it, v.7: and the multitude

of all the nations that fight against Ariel, ^{it shall} even be as--and then he stops his speaking in the third person about Ariel, and starts talking, addressing people in v.9. I would think that from 1-8 is a future event which is going to happen in connection with Ariel, 1-8.

Then you come to 9 and the suggestion was made that you have a dealing with people's spiritual condition, which would seem to be in 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13, wouldn't it? That's in those verses. Now whether you'd find anything that would go under that same head later might be questioned, but certainly the bulk of what there is after verse 13 deals more with what God is going to do than with what the people's attitude is. So that it would seem to me you have three main divisions from the viewpoint of content. 1-8, something is going to happen to Jerusalem. 9-13, the spiritual condition of those whom he has just criticized, and then 15-24, what he is going to do to the people whom he has criticized.

Now that's not so different, a little different in words, but the division points are pretty much the same, as were given by the different ones. Now we want to go more into detail though and I think we will notice in the detail ~~quite~~ quite a bit that isn't on the surface, but it's quite important, particularly when we have in mind the comparison with what we have in chapter 7. Now in the beginning here, the first section, 1-8, we looked at the beginning of that section 1-8, and we read that, Woe to Ariel, add year to year, let them kill sacrifices. Yet I will distress Ariel. What have the sacrifices got to do with this, Mr. Grauley? (8 3/4) That's it, exactly. He says, go on year after year, make a lot of sacrifices, do a lot of forms, and yet I will distress Ariel. All your formal religion, all your sacrifices, all this, if that's all there is to it, what good is it going to do. As long as you're trusting Tiglath-pileser instead of trusting God. You're not going to get saved through all these sacrifices. What is the good of all the forms of religion, if there is no meaning to

it, if you're not trusting God, if you're trusting Tiglath-pileser? What good is it going to do you, yet I will distress Ariel. Make all the sacrifices you want, it won't do you any good. You're going to be distressed. So he says, in spite of anything you can do in this way, of formal religion, Ariel will be distressed and there will be heaviness and sorrow, and it will be as unto me as Ariel, that is, it won't be just a place where they're making sacrifices, it will be a place where there is real burning. A place where there is real destruction, a place where there is real upheaval, not just a place that includes hearths, but a place that is on the whole one great hearth.

Mr. Abbot? (10) Very good, v.13 is expressing in specific relationship to the people's spiritual condition, the very thing that is implied in v.22. It is a formal external thing rather than a real relation of the heart. So you do all the sacrifices you want, yet that won't win God's favor, you have turned against Him in ~~speaking~~ ^{seeking} human earthly means of advancing yourselves, instead of in the face of something you can't possibly overcome, in your own power, looking to God as your source of deliverance. So he says, yet I will distress Ariel, there will be heaviness and sorrow, it shall be unto me like just a hearth of God, a place where there is real burning, real tension, real turmoil, real difficulty, And that is shown in v.3 of course, and I will camp against thee round about, and will lay siege against thee and I will raise forts against thee. Whether that literally is ever fulfilled, I mean fulfilled in the time of which he is now speaking, or whether it is fulfilled in the sense that the land is filled with an enemy which may at any time come and erect forts against Jerusalem and destroy it, at any rate, it shows Jerusalem getting into terrible danger, as a result of their plot, of their alliance with Tiglath-pileser. It shows them getting into terrible danger as a result of it, of being in a situation where destruction appears imminent.

Yes? (11 1/2) I'd say that where there is a prediction of a specific event, and the specific event occurs which fits the prediction, I would say that that is the fulfillment of the prediction, Now if you were going to say you are going to have experiences

like this, then the first can be an example, but I see no reason to say that something which has been fulfilled once is to be fulfilled again, unless you find clear, specific evidence to that effect. I mean in the specific case, I don't think you have a right to assume as a general rule that everything is going to be fulfilled twice. God said to Isaac that there are two children in the womb of Rebecca, there are two striving and the older will serve the younger. Well the children were born and the younger, Jacob, assumed eventually the preeminence, and eventually the Edomites the descendants of Esau came to be subject to Jacob. The elder was inferior to the younger. Does that mean that ever after, whenever ~~after~~ there are twins, or wherever there are two children the elder is going to serve the younger? Does it look forward to the last days and show something that is going to happen then ~~that~~ which will be fulfilled in the sense of the elder serving the younger. I know of nothing to which it could refer. It is very easy if you know something about a distant thing, you know something about a near thing, you find a similarity, to say there is a relationship. Well, there may and may not be. But I say let's not assume it unless we have definite evidence. Now if we have something given as a prediction of something to occur, and we cannot see that it has yet happened, then we are justified in saying it is yet to happen, but if it has already happened, there is going to be the virgin will bring forth a child, Jesus will be born, there is fulfillment of first coming. Is that a prediction also of second coming. Is something in connection with the second coming revealed here? I see no warrant. I think every prophecy has to be looked at to see what is prophesied. Is it describing a series of events, or is it a prediction of a specific event? If it is a specific event, it either has been fulfilled, or it is yet to be fulfilled. I don't think we can say it is both, has and to be, past and future. That is, if it is an event. Now if it is the movement, something like that--God says I will pour out my spirit, does He mean once He will pour out his spirit, or does He mean over the different ages, there are going to be various times when He will

pour out his spirit? With perhaps one of them being the greatest up to that time, the one at Pentecost, and there being a still greater one perhaps in the millennium. That
(14 1/2)

I will pour out my *spirit*, could refer to a series of pouring out, or it could be a specific event, but if you say Jerusalem is going to be defeated and God is going to deliver it, well, if you say this is going to happen over and over, fine, but if you give it as one specific prediction, I don't see any reason to look for more than one fulfillment. I think you just introduce confusion. What right do you have to say that about this and not about the elder serving the younger, not about the virgin birth, not about His preaching in Galilee, ...

9 (3/4)

... the Scofield Bible like any other human work has got a little that's good, or much that's good, or a great deal that's good, but no human work has everything that's good. Any human work is going to have flaws and weaknesses, and the easiest way for flaws to come into any human work is when we get a good idea which is very excellent to bring out, and then we carry it to an extreme and apply it not only to many places where it excellently works but to others where it doesn't fit. That is the human failing that occurs in almost everything, but we have to make allowance for it, in other people's work and try to avoid it in our own.

Well, now, this then in v.3 says, a ~~siege~~ is coming, you might say this siege is going to be the result of human people's attitudes like that of these nobles in the time of Tiglath-pileser, you might say that. A person can make an argument that way. I don't personally feel any such argument is necessary here. I feel that here it is specifically dealing with this particular attitude. Now if you find evidence later, somebody, when you get a similar attitude, similar results come, yes. But this now, I think it is talking about this attitude at this time and showing the result that is going to come from this attitude at this time. And that result I believe is the specific attack of Sennacherib. The culmination of the Assyrian, the result of the

Assyrians being placed right next to Judah by the added action of Ahaz and the nobles in destroying the buffer state, by inciting Tiglath-pileser to conquer what's between, and get right next. So that as a result there is going to be a time when Jerusalem will be in tremendous danger, which he describes here as if there was actually a siege. Well, they are just much in danger as if the siege had actually come, and the siege ~~may~~ come as far as anyone can see, at any time, and v.4 shows what is going to happen to them, and thou shalt be brought down, and shalt speak out of the ground, and thy speech shall be low out of the dust, and thy voice shall be, as of one that has a familiar spirit, out of the ground, and thy speech shall whisper out of the dust. Crushed, down, whispering, on the verge of utter destruction, that is the situation they come into as a result of Sennacherib's attack. That is certainly an exact prediction of what's going to happen, and he continues the terrible prediction of the situation they're going to get into, moreover, the multitude of thy strangers will be like small dust, and the multitude of the terrible ones as chaff that passes away, yea, it shall be at an instant suddenly. Is this 5th verse a good description of the further details of the further misery of the scene? How many think that it is, would you raise your hand? How many think it isn't a great description? How many don't think? When you say are there other possibilities, you imply that this is a possibility, and that is something that I would like explained to me, is how this can be possibly a description of the horrors of the siege, what does it mean? Verse 5. Really I am perplexed as to what the authorized translators were thinking of, when they translated it this way, there is just one word that I think they should have translated utterly differently than they did. One word. I have no objection to anything else they translated in the verse, except this one word, but I feel that most readers just see the one word, and as a result of the one word interpret the whole verse utterly fantastically. Like ~~X~~ if I would say, some baseball team is going to

go down and down, they're going to be defeated by this one and to be defeated by this one and defeated by this one, and they're going to play with this other one, and when they're playing with this other one, they're going to make ten home runs and to end with a score twice as great as that of the one they're playing with. Well, the and would be quite out of place because I'm giving a series of going down and then I go on in the same tone of voice but actually say the exact opposite. ^{I've had} ~~that's~~ a rather silly attitude for the last 30 or 40 years of rather enjoying saying a thing in a tone of voice ~~of~~ that said the exact opposite of what the words meant, just to notice how often people say yes, yes, isn't that right, when your words say the exact opposite. It is amazing how often they will do that. Well, I tried to do it just now with this verse, because I want you to look at the words and see what they're really saying, what is involved here. What is the terrible state of siege, which, suppose you were to say the people of what city in the last war was besieged for quite a while. Well, take when MacArthur was in Bataan, and you say you were in Bataan, and you are going to get so hard up for food you're going to have to eat mice and rats and going to be so near out of shells that for every ten shells the ~~en-~~ enemy shoots against you, you can only shoot one in return, it's going to look absolutely hopeless, and those who are attacking you are going to just be exploded to pieces and utterly destroyed until you find there is nothing left of your attackers at all. Now you see it wouldn't make any sense at all. Now who is he talking about in the next verse? Moreover, the multitude of thy strangers--what are your strangers, when you're besieged? What is the multitude of your strangers? Isn't that the enemy, the people that are strange to you, the people that aren't part of you, but are part of your enemy, the multitude of your strangers, well, they will be like small dust. You might say that shows how many there are, like small dust--small dust is numerous. Why is small dust particularly numerous? You can have a little small dust or a lot of small dust. I don't think that small dust necessarily means it is numerous, it would be more apt to show something

else about it, but ^{let} that pass and go on to the next point: and the multitude of the terrible ones, what is the multitude of the terrible ones? Is that the ones you're afraid of, the ones that are all around you, what's going to happen to them, they will be like chaff that passes away, yes, at an instant, suddenly. Is not the whole point of v.5 that the enemy that is around you and seems as if it is utterly going to destroy you, will be annihilated and disappear? All of sudden, and if the way that begins v.5 instead of being translated "moreover" would be translated "but" which it could just as well be, the next step after the terribleness of the siege you were in, is that the siege just ends, all of a sudden, the enemy disappears, your siege is over, your danger is over, at an instant, suddenly. That's the only change I feel is necessary in the verse is the change "moreover" to "but." Of course in our English it is immediately obvious that strangers means enemy, because it certainly doesn't mean friends, and it isn't immediately obvious that the multitude of the terrible ones means the attackers, but when you're in a siege you don't think of yourself as the terrible ones, you're more apt to think of the people attacking you ^{--that is} ~~as~~ surely what is meant here. But at least when they say that like chaff it passes away, and in an instant suddenly, if they would say, moreover, the multitude of your friends are going to be like small dust, and all of the leaders of your community are going to be like chaff that passes away suddenly, that would mean your siege was going to end suddenly with your total destruction. But the terms used here seem to refer to the one who is attacking, rather than to yourself, so that I would feel that while verses 1-8 form one section, a future event related to Jerusalem, that between 4 and 5 there is an extremely important division in it. This Bible I have in front of me here has a paragraph division at v.7, which I think certainly ought to be at v.5 instead of v.7. Verse 7 says the same thing in plain language. The multitude of all the nations that fight against Ariel shall be as a dream of a night's vision.

I went over this briefly last fall in --no, last February, in the beginning of our discussion about the historic background, and showed how this was Sennacherib's attack and God's deliverance. And in the ~~gest~~ I asked you to name passages that described the deliverance, remember, but of course it is quite a while ago we've had it, it's not surprising that it didn't stick. ~~But~~ I want it to stick from now~~on~~, I want to make it emphatic, because it is a very vital part of this section of the book is God's deliverance of the people, of Jerusalem, from the attack of Sennacherib, and it is vv.4-8. Now we noticed v.5 and 7, v.7 is almost identical with v.5, except that it is in clearer language, but v.6 says that it is God who is going to do it. Thou shalt be visited of the Lord of hosts, with thunder and with earthquake, a great noise, with storm and tempest, and flame of devouring fire. This is figurative language. It means an intervention by forces which you could not bring and you could not prevent. It is an intervention with forces which only God could control, and of course the sending of the pestilence when thousands of Sennacherib's army died in the night, that is described very clearly in vv.5-7, though v.6 I think is undoubtedly a stressing of the supernatural aspect of the deliverance that is coming from the attack, that it is God's miraculous intervention that will deliver. Yes, Mr. Gregory? (11 1/4)

The question here~~s~~ that you've asked goes partly back to how much of this wording is Isaiah's and how much of this wording is dictated? Isaiah is inspired, kept from error, but more than that, he is an instrument of God's revelation, he is God's prophet, God said in v.7, go to meet Ahaz and say this to Ahaz, and then God said, when Ahaz answered and tried ~~a~~ to get rid of him, God said to him, say this, O house of David, you do this men, will you do it to my God also. Therefore, God will give you a sign, a virgin shall conceive and bare a son, thou shalt call his name Immanuel. How much did Isaiah know? Did Isaiah know that 700 years later there would be a virgin-born Messiah? Did Isaiah think that perhaps this was going to happen in the next 50 years? We don't know how fully Isaiah understood it, but we know that there was more to the

prophets' words than they themselves understood because 1 Peter 1 tells us that the prophets when they spoke of the sufferings of Christ and the glories that should follow, were searching out and trying to understand what and what manner of time the spirit of Christ that was in them did signify. So we know that God put into the words of prophets, often, meaning beyond what the prophet understood, but how much and how far we don't his own understanding of it went, we don't know, but the words were so different, that the people hearing the words would get a message from God, but the people later on reading the words would get this message the people got before plus added insight that would not be available before (13 1/4)

And so I would think, I can't say what Isaiah would have done, but I would say that a person listening to Isaiah's voice would know this, that Jerusalem is going to go through a time of terrible danger when it looks as if destruction is absolutely certain but that this is going to come to an end with a sudden divine intervention which will destroy the enemy so that they will just seem like a dream, as if they had never been there, and it will come when the Lord will send thunder and earthquake and great noise and storm and tempest and devouring fire. You might say, well now is that figurative language or all these different kinds of calamities mentioned are all going to happen at once, or when he uses all these, thus it seems that perhaps it isn't actually any one, but that they are a figure for the fact that it is divine intervention by superhuman power, which no man possibly could have produced in a way which only God could do. We don't know for sure which. Perhaps there is going to be an earthquake and thunder and a storm and a tempest and a devouring fire, all coming at once, perhaps, but perhaps it is a figure for something of which it can possibly be a figure, but he wouldn't know. But then when the event occurred, I think it would be made absolutely clear that it was a figure for the (14 1/2) a figure for divine power that man could not be given, you could tell us about this storm that was coming in New Jersey, you could have warned us two months before, but there was nothing

we could have done to prevent it. We could have gotten the people out of the way, so they wouldn't be injured, ahead of time. We could have tried to strengthen the houses, it probably would've been impossible to strengthen them to such an extent there wouldn't be at least half as much damage done. It was power beyond what man could resist, and I think we must say, in view of what happened, that that is what is meant. But those are very good questions? Let's try to figure exactly what these words mean because I think there is a lot of teaching there, a lot of teaching, not only about the immediate ^{situation} ~~figure~~, but about God's manners of dealing with men in general and also about principles of interpreting...

10 (3/4)

...he said your strangers, he said your terrible ones, now he says the nations that fight against Ariel, so it is pretty clear here that it is the strangers and the terrible ones, they're not saying themselves who are in such danger, but the people who are attacking them, and making them be in such danger. He says that these people are going to be just like a dream in a night vision, and it will be as when a hungry man dreams and he is eating, he wakes and his soul is empty. Or a thirsty man dreams and behold he drinks, but he wakes and he is faint and his soul has appetite. So shall the multitude of all the nations be that fight against Mount Zion, they're going to just seem like a dream that fades. Israel, does it seem like they're eating and drinking, when they're in this terrible calamity? Well, the answer is that probably the one having the dream isn't the people of Israel but it is king Sennacherib. He is just about to reach out and take Jerusalem, and this force is gone, can't do it, he was going to eat and drink, has to flee back to home before people realize how weak his army has become and come and attack him, just like he is dreaming. Of course, it is in a way, like a dream to them too, the calamity seems almost unbelievable to have been, to have even been there, once it is gone. You go down to N. J. today, you look out there at the peaceful quiet shore, can it be there was such a storm, water

up this high and all that? It just doesn't seem possible until you see the houses there in their wrecked condition, and then you admit that it must have been. Yes?

(2 1/4) I think that the thing is that the Assyrian empire had already conquered a dozen or more nations and these nations were incorporated into the empire and their forces were utilized, and so that it was actually an attack, not of one country being attacked by another, but one country being attacked by another which has in its army a dozen nations which it has conquered, so that "the nations" is not out of place.

Well, I guess we have to continue there tomorrow then. Look over the rest of the chapter and think a little more about its contents and try if you can to see the progress of thought in line with what we have already been talking of. Does it go back again to the siege of Jerusalem now described, or does it look on to the future beyond that? Does it have any similarity to what has been said about King Ahaz? Back in 7? We are not talking about Ahaz now, we're talking about the nobles, but does it have anything to do with them? This must be a very sleepy hour., .(3 1/2)

(starting again at 4 1/4) ...a development of thought which once you see how it is moving impresses me as one of the most interesting to be found anywhere in the entire book of Isaiah, yet one which is comparatively little known. We have noticed how the chapter proceeds directly on from chapter 28. Ahaz' scheme in 28 is not going to be effective, it is going to fail to accomplish what Ahaz wants to, it is going to backfire against him, and yet God is going to rise up in His wrath, and to work His perfect will. Neither is the scheme going to result in good, it's going to do harm, but neither will the harm work out as it naturally would, because God is going to intervene and prevent it. So we start at chapter 29 and have a chapter which divides rather naturally into three parts, and the first of them, vv.1-8, describes an event which is to occur at Jerusalem and the first half of that tells how Jerusalem comes into terrible danger, it seems to be just about to be absolutely destroyed, and then the last four

verses of it show how God is going to intervene and to rescue by a marvelous, miraculous intervention of God, how He is going to rescue Jerusalem from this so that it will not be destroyed but be delivered there from the terrible danger that faces it. This is the specific thing he is going to do about 20 years after the time at which Isaiah makes the prediction. Then as the rest of the book, of the chapter rather, can be considered as being summarized in two verses, vv.13, and 14. V.13 says, Wherefore the Lord said, Forasmuch as this people draw near me with their mouth and with their lips do honor me, but have removed their heart far from me, and their fear toward me is taught by the precept of men; 14 says: therefore, behold, I proceed to do a marvellous work among this people, for the wisdom of their wise men shall perish and the understanding of their prudent men shall be hid.

Now we have then two verses here, the first of which describes the condition, the second shows the result, what God is going to do on account of this danger. V.13 describes the spiritual condition of the leaders of Israel, that is of the southern kingdom. V.14 describes what God is going to do about it, we are reminded of the book of Immanuel, chapter 7 and 8 where God rebuked Ahaz for his wickedness, showed how he was an unworthy sign of the house of David, God was going to replace him in His own time, with His mighty Immanuel, the true representative of the house of David. Here we have the nobles, the leaders of the people, people who are showing, going through lip service toward the Lord, honoring Him with their lips, but remove their hearts from Him, God is going to do certain things as a result. How much is the parallel in this to what was said about Ahaz? Well before we come to seeing how much of a parallel there may be in that, we want first to look at the first section, the description of the spiritual condition of the people, that runs as we've noticed from 8 to 13. ~~complete to~~ With v.13 summarizing what precedes it and 14 summarizes what is going to follow. So we say what is ^{this} that is here summarized here in 13? Well, v.9, he turns directly to the nobles again, and says, Stay yourselves, and wonder, cry ye out,

and cry, they are drunken, and immediately we remember how in the previous chapter he faced the nobles and said in v.7 of chapter 28, but these also have erred through wine and through strong drink, are out of the way. The priest and the prophet have erred through strong drink. They are swallowed up with wine, they are out of the way through strong drink, they err in vision and stumble in judgment. Isaiah points there to the table filled with filthiness, he points to the nobles who have made their clever plans of delivering their land from the attack of Ephraim and Syria by bringing in the Assyrians, he points to them and here they are with ~~the~~ this great crisis facing the nation and they're sitting there in drunkenness, sitting there and gazing in this drunkenness and ignoring the word of God. That's what he said then but now he goes a step further, he says there they erred through wine and ~~w~~ strong drink, instead of humbling themselves before the Lord, instead of praying the Lord to give them the best possible wisdom to ~~ga~~ face the emergency, praying the Lord to give them a sober spirit and handle the difficult ~~s~~ situation, they are giving way to celebration of the wonderful victory that they think they've secured through their clever scheme then, but now he says, they are drunken but not from wine, they stagger but not from strong drink. Does he here contradict what he said a chapter earlier. No, verbally, it is a contradiction. Anybody says the Bible doesn't contradict itself has never read the Bible. Every book ever written contains numerous contradictions, but the contradictions in an intelligently written book are contradictions verbally rather than in inner thought. A cleverly written book may have very few verbal contradictions, but be full of contradictions of real thought, but one which is really intelligently written goes into things and there are all sorts of contradictions in life, contradictions because we don't see the whole story, we see one side and then we see the other side, they seem to be opposite. Actually it's like Gen.1 which starts with a watery chaos, and Gen.2 which starts with a dry wilderness. They start at different points, at one point one is true, at one the other. It's just the opposite. No contradiction if

you see the real significance. So also here. They have erred through strong drink. Instead of being seriously given over to the great task to which as leaders of the nation they should be devoting their time and attention, they are giving themselves up to a wicked type of relaxation, celebrating the victory they think they've had. But now he says it is not strong drink and wine that is producing the trouble. They are drunken not with wine, they stagger not with strong drink, these are merely symptoms, they are not the cause, they give themselves to this strong drink and to the wine because there is already something spiritually wrong with them which leads them to do this. This is a minor symptom rather than a major cause. The major cause of their staggering, of their drunkenness is not that they use a drug which puts them in that shape but it is that they refuse to pay the proper attention to God and His commands and they are in a spiritual condition which is the real cause of their plight.

So he goes ahead here and describes the spiritual condition which has led to their clever scheme to get Ahaz, the spiritual condition which leads to the drunkenness, the spiritual condition which eventually will get them into a situation where Sennacherib seems on the point of utterly destroying them, and that spiritual condition he describes, but before giving details about it he says in v.10 For the Lord has poured on you the spirit of deep sleep, and has closed your eyes, the prophets and your rulers, the seers he has covered.

Well, what do they have to do with it then, how can you blame them if the Lord comes. The Lord has poured out these griefs upon them, the Lord has covered the prophets and the rulers and the seers, the Lord has sent them this spirit, how can you blame them for it? That's the old argument. Well, I can't help it, it's the way I was made, the way I was brought up, it's my environment, my heredity, my unfortunate situation, not my fault. And the answer is that there are many things that people can't help, but nobody is ever in a situation where he can't help some things. There is a-- the person who has the greatest possible opportunity of environment and heredity and

everything, can utterly fail to take advantage of his opportunities and go bad, and the person who has the poorest possible heredity can strive and do his best to rise above his background, and so the argument is, people are--they can't help themselves, they're pawns in God's hands. Well, God says, the person that rejects the truth, God gives over to believe a lie. The person that goes against God He permits to go further into sin, He sends strong delusion upon those who refuse to accept the truth. There is a definite hardening activity of the Spirit of God, as well as a blessing activity. Somebody said wherever Paul went there was either a riot ~~or~~ or a revival, there was one effect or the other, it was impossible to remain neutral. So the word of God which brings joy and help to some, brings misery to others when the indifference, the easy sensation of just sliding with the current is no longer possible. And here it recognizes the fact ^{of} ~~that~~ God's sovereignty, the fact that no one stands still, the fact that ^{those} ~~no one~~ who reject the word of God will inevitably go into that which is far worse. They have rejected God and now the Lord permits them to further on in the direction in which they have deliberately gone. So we have that very interesting description in v.11 and 12...

11. (3/4)

...in verses 11 and 12 we read that they are like children, or no, not yet, they are like people to whom a book is read, and here is a sealed book which is handed to some one who can read, and they say to the man who can read, read that. He says I can't read it, it's sealed. Well, if it were sealed and the people that gave it to them had no right to break the seal, and he didn't either, very proper not to read a private communication, but the fact that they go to him and ask him to read it, shows that they are supposed to have the right to break that seal, and when they come and say here read this, he is expected to open up the envelope and read it. And he says, I can't read it, it's sealed. So then they go to another man who can't read and they say read

this, and he says I can't read it, I can't read. In other words, everybody will give any kind of an excuse rather than pay attention to the word of God. The person who is ready to keep the word of God can find it. The person who is ready to give heed to the light that he has, God will give more light to him. It is the spirit of the indifferent, the spirit of honoring Him with their lips, but their heart far from Him, that do not bother, they always have an excuse why they should follow along to know the Lord. So he gives the very interesting comparison of them, people making any kind of an excuse rather than to study your word. Learn to read if you can't read, learn how to break the seal if you don't know, but get into the word and see what it means. So he concludes in v.13, therefore, the Lord said this people draws nigh with their mouth and with their lips they honor me, but they have removed their heart far from me, and their reverence toward me, their ceremonies, their attitude is following men's commands rather than following God's way. They do it this way because their ancestors did it, they do it just the way people say, rather than because this is what they find in God's word, and what He wants. Yes, Mr. Miller? (2 3/4) Yes, you've raised a very interesting question of hermeneutics. You take a verse by itself, and very frequently there are many ways in which it could be interpreted. It is true in almost any sense, in almost any discussion. You take a sentence by itself and there are different ways of understanding it, some sentences, there is a great deal in it, but it is so clear, there is no question about it. In others, there is quite a variety of possibilities of interpretation. But just about every sentence has to be interpreted in the light of context, and you have to see what is the basic idea in the context, and then see, does this fit into that, does it represent a departure from it, does it represent a change of thought, does it add to the understanding, does it illustrate, what is its relation toward the central thought in the context? Now the central thought in the context here is v.13, and the previous expression is vv.9 and 10.

And in those the whole note is denunciation of people because their heart is far from God. And therefore the vision is become to them, he says, like this, this we will expect then, will be an illustration of that which is stated in plain language before and after. Now if we find that it isn't then we have to investigate and see whether this represents a change in thought from what precedes and follows, or whether we have perhaps misinterpreted what precedes and follows, there are always those possibilities. And it is true that as you look at the excuses which are given there, it would— they sound very plausible, they sound very plausible, and it might very well be that instead of 9 and 10 and 13 being like this, you might say, these people are in a very unfortunate situation, they have no access to the word of God. The word of God in their country is in such a situation that the king and the church have forbidden people to read, and therefore the people who are learned, the Bible is a closed book to them, they are unable to read it because it is sealed, they are forbidden to look at it. On the other hand, in this country there are people who have access to the Bible, but these people are unfortunately people who can't read, and therefore, ^{though} they can look at the pages, it means nothing to them, they can't read it. That is to say, these two verses could fit very well into that type of context, because each of them can be interpreted as a valid excuse, but since what is before and after describes a people whose eyes are closed and their ears are covered, they're in a deep sleep, they're staggering but not with strong drink, and then the Lord condemns them for it and says, they draw near with their mouth, but their heart is far from me, it seems to be necessary then to put the stress in what is--in the middle, not on their being valid excuses, but on their being hunting around for something for an excuse, and it impresses me that therefore we are required to say, well, these people who say they can't read it because it is sealed, there is some way they could get it unsealed, it is an excuse rather than a reason, and these people who can't read it because they can't read,

well they could get someone else to read it, or they could learn to read. In the context it seems to be required that the excuses are not valid excuses. It could be, those two alone, I think, very readily, could be a picture of people in a condition where they have no appetite for the word, they're cut off from it, but with the denunciation after, it seems rather to be a picture of people who are taking their disability and being satisfied with their disability and not trying to remedy it, but making them an excuse for not following the words of the Lord. Mr. Abbott? (6 3/4)

A new start and a brand new subject in 13. If the chapter ended there it certainly would not be impossible, but v.13 says wherefore the Lord says, and he denounces them. It would seem to require that the thing that he is denouncing them for is what has immediately preceded, and what has immediately preceded is a description, an example of that which he is here generalizing. It is a matter of interpretation in relation to context. Now of course if you leave out vv.11 and 12, you take 10 followed right by 13 and say the Lord has poured out upon you the spirit of deep sleep, and has closed your eyes. 13, wherefore the Lord said, Forasmuch as they draw near with their mouth, with their lips do honor me, but have removed their heart far from me,-- then you are faced with a problem. God has done it, and yet he rebukes them. But you are faced with that problem any way you read it. There is an element in it of a situation which multiplies, and which God Himself contributes to, but there is also a definite denunciation, which implies that the people ^{are} ~~has~~ deliberately taking an attitude of indifference, and failure to follow on. Mr. Miller? (8) We have to assume that from the context, this 13, that shows that this is a picture of a wrong heart condition, that the excuses, though they have a great measure of apparent validity are yet insufficient to account for the failure to read~~y~~ the book that the Lord has given. That reminds me of an English official, his name slips me, he was an English governor of Jerusalem, and then Governor of Judea, then they transferred him to Cypress and he was governor-general of Cypress, and he told how when he got to

Cypress, he found that the people in the government offices were working 6 hours a day. He said that he said they should do two more hours work, so he said some of them came to him and said well we can't, we can't start earlier than 10 in the morning, it is absolutely impossible, we can't get in from our places where we live, into the offices, before 10 in the morning. He went to others and they said we can't possibly work more than 6 hours in a day because we have to leave at 4 in the afternoon for our golf courses, it would be impossible. And then we found they were having a long lunch hour he says how about cutting down on the lunch hour, and they said that's impossible, absolutely. In this hot climate we have to have the relaxation of the lunch hour, and so he said they all had reasons why they couldn't work more than so many hours. So he says, all right, let's forget the reasons, we won't argue about it any more, we just say that you put in 8 hours. So they put in 8 hours. They all had excuses and they were good excuses, and he couldn't answer them all. Nevertheless the object had to be met and it was up to them to find some way around, and that was the way he expressed it, and I think that is what the Lord is saying here. If we really put Him first, we can find a way to serve Him. We can. We have valid excuses, we have valid reasons for not putting the Lord first, but ^{their validity} ~~there~~ ~~that~~ is not of account when you compare it with the magnitude of the obligation. It is sufficient validity for many ordinary things, but for the obligation to follow the Lord with your heart and make your ^{life} ~~heart~~ count for Him, the excuses given are not sufficient. So his conclusion is that we draw near with our mouth, and with our lips we honor Him, but our heart is far from Him. Like the salesman I heard of who said that he was in a very hospitable area and he would come through there every week and stop at the different places, and there was one place he always stopped at 12 o'clock and got their order and every time they'd say well now won't you stay to lunch? Please stay to lunch, and he ~~has~~ said they were so very hospitable but he always had to hurry on. So he said oh I am so sorry I can't, and he went on, but he said one time

I thought, I guess I will, so when they said, won't you stay to lunch, he said, why I guess I will, thank you. Oh, they said, we didn't mean today. Their hospitality was a hospitality of the lips, not of the heart. It was a beautiful gesture.

A man was in Cuba, was it, and ~~lived~~^{visited} in a Spanish house, and he saw a picture, a beautiful picture. My, he said, I love that picture, it is so lovely. Take it, Senor, it is yours, take it. So he sent the porter over from the hotel the next day, to get the picture, and they were quite indignant, they never dreamed of giving him the picture. It was just good Spanish politeness to say take it, it's yours, when you admire anything. There is a lot of that that is understood to be politeness and nobody ever thinks of taking it seriously, but God doesn't want to be treated that way. He wants us to draw near, not with our lips, but with our heart. Yes? (12) There is in the immediate statement no evidence of drawing near with the lips but I think it is implied that they are. (stu.) Well you have to assume the situation. He says, Forasmuch as this people--he is describing their whole situation, and before he has been simply illustrating one aspect of the situation. Their not drawing near with the heart, but we can assume they say an awful lot more than (12 1/2)

Although of course, even 11 and 12

can (12 1/2) they're drawing near with their lips. You say, read this, please read it. Oh, he says, I'd so like to read it, ~~but~~ Here is this man highly educated, knows several languages, Oh, I'd be just tickled to read it through, I'd just love to, but you see, it is sealed. I couldn't do that, I couldn't break the seal. I'd just love to do it. They're very, very polite in their language, and then you come up to this other man and you say, will you please read this to me, and oh, he says, sure, he says, unfasten it. No obstacle. I'd be very glad to read it, I'd like to do anything I could to help, but I'm just so sorry, I just never learned to read, can't do it. They've always got an excuse, in other words, rather than seeking to find ~~another~~ a way around the excuse, and I think there's an implication when you say, read it,

and he says I can't, for this reason, ~~no matter~~ ^{that} how much he ^{'d} like to, how very happy he is to help you. It isn't expressed, but I think it is implied...

12 (3/4)

...so we have here then an attitude which is similar to that of Ahaz. Ahaz says I will not tempt the Lord. Beautiful. What kind ^a of /ovlier expression of piety can you ask? Isaiah says ask a sign of the Lord, ask it in the heights above or the depths below, ask a sign of the Lord. Ahaz says, I won't tempt the Lord. He is a beautiful pious man, very, very loyal to the Lord, except that he won't do anything to serve the Lord, he just has beautiful language, that's all. So Isaiah turns on him and says, oh, house of David, is it not enough that you weary men, but will you weary my God also? Now here he turns to these nobles and says, this people draws near to me with their lips, but with their heart far from me, therefore, I will proceed to do a marvelous work among them. A marvelous work, a marvelous work and a wonder. Something that is most unexpected, surely this language means. This isn't just an ordinary thing, why look at this boy here that I've asked to chop some wood and to clean out the porch and so on, and he has done nothing about it, I'm going to paddle him good. All right, you say, but you wouldn't say, I'm going to do a marvelous work and a wonder. You don't use those terms, there is something very unusual. He is not simply going to chastise, He is going to chastise in a very unusual way. There is something very remarkable when there is a marvelous work among these people, even a marvelous work and a wonder, something very unusual. Well, we had the same thing back with Ahaz.

God will give you a sign, a virgin will have a child, this is a marvelous thing that is going to happen. Ahaz, the unworthy sign of the house of David is going to be replaced by a worthy one to sit on his throne, who is indeed to be *Immanuel*. Now what's going to happen to this people? Well, it's a marvelous work, what is it? The wisdom of their wise men will perish and the understanding of their prudent will

be hid. What is so marvelous about that? What is so wonderful about that? What is so out of the ordinary about that? Well, the implication is , there is something that is very unusual, very unexpected, something strange. What is the strange thing that is going to happen? Well, a portion of it is that the wisdom of their wise men ~~perishes~~, a portion of it is that the understanding of their prudent men shall be hidden. We have been told that in v.10, the Lord has poured a spirit of a deep sleep on them, the Lord has closed their eyes, but now we're told a remarkable thing is going to happen, the wisdom of their wise men will perish. What is it that's going to happen?

Well v.15, Woe to them that seek deep to hide their counsel from the Lord and their works are in the dark. Who seeks to hide counsel from the Lord? The nobles are making the clever scheme along with Ahaz, not telling the people about it, not telling the ecclesiastical leaders of the nation about it, but they are going around, behind everybody's back, to hire Tiglath-pileser to come in and thinking that is going to protect their nation. They are trying to hide their counsel from the Lord and are putting human wisdom ahead of God's Revelation and of the protection that God can give. Well, what's going to happen about this, what's ~~god~~ going to do?

V.16, surely ~~your~~ turning of things upside down, you turned things upside down, you put human wisdom on top and used God's wisdom merely as an excuse, you're reversing the true order, instead of coming in prayer and in careful study of the Word, to know what God wants you to do, you make your plans then you ask God to bless your ~~plans~~, you make the decision and then you look to Him to bless it and to enable you to carry out what you think is wise, instead of seeking the divine wisdom contained in the Word, to find out what you should do, ~~you're~~ ^{your} turning things upside down shall be esteemed as the potter's clay--unusual phrase, what is the potter's clay? The potter's clay, as Jeremiah tells us, the potter takes the clay and he makes the vessel, and then the vessel is marred in his hands, and he changes it and makes a different kind of a vessel. The potter has complete control over the clay, to make out

of it what he wants, but these people are trying to use God as a sort of a magical thing to carry out their devices, instead of God's being the Lord and their being His servants, they are ordering God what He is to do, and we try to do that so much in our prayers today, such a tendency that way. We want to do this, we may think this is the greatest thing for the glory of God, but we're going to do it the way we think it ought to be, and so we turn things upside down. Isaiah says that is wrong. Shall the word say of him that made it, he made me not, or shall the things framed, say of him that framed it, he hath no understanding? No instead of making these clever human schemes we should look to the Lord and trust Him and try to find out what His will is and get ourselves in line with it. They say, during the Civil War, somebody said to Lincoln, Lincoln, do you think that God is on our side? Lincoln said I'm not half so interested to know whether God is on our side as to know whether we're on God's side. And that's what Isaiah says here, if we are on the Lord's side, if we are following what He says, His word, then we can be sure that He will carry things out according to His will, and it is a much more important question, are we on God's side? Because if we are on God's side, then we know He is on our side, and if we're not on God's side we have no right to ask Him to bless our clever schemes, and our plans, and our wisdom, so He says what He is going to do. What is He going to do? Is ~~the~~^{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? This is what He is going to do, what God is going to do? What is He going to do? He is going to turn Lebanon into a fruitful field. And He is going to make the fruitful field be esteemed as a forest. Well, somebody says here is an improvement in both. God is going to make Lebanon become a fruitful field, going to make the fruitful field become a forest. Everything is going to improve. That is good post-millennial doctrine, but I don't find it in this verse. It seems as if the verse, Lebanon certainly is the forest of Lebanon, there is no question of that, there is a parallel here, of two things in one order and then in the

reverse order in the next. One is changed and the other is changed. That which was wild country becomes a fruitful field, that which was a fruitful field becomes wild country. Now what is Lebanon? What does Lebanon stand for? Well, we had Lebanon just back in chapter 10, and you remember that there in chapter 10 we found that he spoke about the Assyrians, and the Assyrian, the great enemy, he said, would be cut down and v. 34 says he shall cut down the thickets of the forest with iron, and Lebanon shall fall by a mighty one. The forest there was not a figure there for that which is uncultivated, but for that which is strong and powerful, but more important, which is outside. It was that which was outside of the land of promise. It was the great forest outside the area of ~~the~~ Israel which God had promised ~~at last~~ (8 1/2) this is going to fall. But from Israel, the stem of Jesse, the kingdom of David which has fallen, out of that a branch is going to grow up out of his root, so Lebanon there stands for that which is outside of the area of God's blessing, of God's people, of God's message.

Well, now here surely in v. 16 we read of your turning things upside down, certainly they have turned things upside down, now God is going to turn things upside down. How? He is going to take Lebanon which is outside the area of God's promise, Lebanon which is the untilled forest, the uncultivated forest, the region where the trees grew up wild and he is going to make that like a field that has been carefully cultivated and is producing fruit, and you remember how we read in the New Testament about Jesus said that he had a vineyard and he let it out to husbandmen, and he came to them and asked whether the vineyard was producing, and you remember the fig tree he said is not producing figs as it should be, and he cursed it, his fruitful field is supposed to be producing, and when he finds that it isn't, it is apt to be cursed. But here that which is outside and is not cultivated, and is not expected to be producing, is going to become a fruitful field, and that which is inside, which has been

cultivated, and which one would expect would be the place which was producing, it is going to be considered as if it were a forest, as if it were something outside the area of God's plan. Well, this is the marvelous thing that he is going to do, the marvelous work among His people, the marvelous work and the wonder which involves the perishing of the wisdom of their wise men, and the hiding of the understanding of their prudent men, and in Isaiah's day, I'm sure people would read this and say what is the marvelous work that is going to come? Are these Assyrians going to become God's people? Are they going to become the ones whom He teaches His word to and are the Israelites going to become like the Assyrians? Is that what it means? And they wonder and nobody knew for sure exactly what it meant, so they pondered over it until the apostle Paul said, here is what was predicted, here we see it, that Israel who has been following God and saying the words He gave, and performing the ceremonies, they have not attained to their (11 1/4) that they should have attained, because they have been seeking it, not with faith, but with forms and ceremonies, while the Gentiles who have not been seeking, to them He has brought the message of salvation and among the Gentiles, a sizeable group which would become larger than the group from among the Jews who had accepted it, who were receiving the message of salvation, and so we had in Isa. 7 the prediction of the removal of the unworthy leader, the unworthy sign of the house of David, and the substitute for him of God's own appointed One. And here we have, speaking to the nobles the declaration of the removal of the grace of God from the nobles and the leaders who should have been the leaders of God's people, but who had been following Him with their lips instead of with their heart, and the substitution of others who by God's marvelous grace, are selected from among those who had not had the same equal opportunities. Of course, neither one is complete, it doesn't mean that all of one is rejected, or all of one accepted by any means, there are many Gentiles, innumerable ones who are not elect and there are innumerable Israelites who are

elect, but it means a change of the leadership of God's people, a change in it from these who have proven themselves unworthy to a different group, and so this is the marvelous work that he is going to produce. Marvelous means not just something that you can't imagine how it will be done, but something that is very strange, very different from what you would expect would be done. Something that you wonder at because it is not what would normally seem would be the natural thing to occur, and so He continues, He speaks about these who have been outside the pale completely, these who have not known the truth, He calls them the deaf in v.18. He says the day is coming when the deaf will hear the words of the book, and the eyes of the blind will see out of obscurity, and out of darkness. Ye who were quite outside of the family of Israel...

13. (3/4)

...knew nothing of God's Word, ye who were blind and deaf, they are going to speak of salvation, and many of them are going to rejoice. The meat offering, those who seem to be, those who were not proud of taking their places as leaders yet, but those who are humbly desiring to know the Will of God, they will increase their joy in the Lord, and the poor among them will rejoice in the Holy One of Israel. For the terrible one is brought to nought, and the scorner is consumed, and all that watch for iniquity are cut off, that make a man an offender for a word and lay a snare for him that reproves in the gate, and turn aside the just for a thing of nought. Therefore thus saith the Lord, --who is the Lord?--the Lord is the one who redeemed Israel. Why did He redeem Israel? Redeemed Abraham? You might say, why does God redeem the people of Judah. Because they're children of Israel, they're descendants of the one whom God has blessed, they are the ones who deserve it, because they're His descendants, then why did He bless Jacob or Israel? Because He was Isaac's son. Why did He bless Isaac? Because he was the son of Abraham, the friend of God.

But He doesn't allow any of those answers, because He calls Himself, very unusual, not the God who has redeemed Jacob, but the God who has redeemed Abraham, and there is absolutely nothing in ancestry to account for the redemption of Israel. Abraham is one who is grabbed from out of the miscellaneous mass of ~~them~~^{heathen}, and who is the recipient of God's wonderful sovereign grace. He is the one whom God calls out from the wicked city of Ur and brings Him His blessing, so this is stressing the sovereignty of God in redemption. Not the one who is fulfilling the promises he makes to the fathers which He will fulfill, blessings to thousands of generations that follow Him and that do His will. No, this is the sovereign grace of God receiving ^{the} one who who could have no possible claim upon him, the one who redeemed Abraham. What does He say about the house of Jacob? Jacob will not now be ashamed, neither will his face wax pale. Well, why won't it wax pale? Jacob is God's, the head of God's people, he looks at his descendants, they should be the leaders of God's people, he sees them turning into this clever scheme of alliance with the wicked Tiglath-pileser, using their human schemes in order to advance their ideas, and thinking they get deliverance and peace in that way, Jacob is ashamed, his face waxes pale, but he says, he will not now be ashamed, nor will his face wax pale. Why? He sees them turning off into paths of wickedness, he sees them headed for destruction, naturally he would wax pale, but he is going to see something else, he is going to see his children, the work of my hand. He is going to see the true Israel of God, that is the Israel who are the work of God's hands, those who have enjoyed the wonderful blessing of God's sovereign election, those who have had the redemption that God has given them, those whom He has selected whether Jew or Gentile, He sees them in the midst of him, He sees them in a great number of the Israel of God, so Jacob no longer waxes pale but he sees what God has made. Remember, Jesus said, that God can of these stones make those to praise Him. Well, ever one that is a true believer is a stone made into a child of Abraham, because it is only God's

sovereign grace that made anyone, Jew or Gentile, to be a true believer, a member of the family of God, so ~~we~~ sees his children, the work of mine hands, in the midst of him, he sees the greatly increased multitude of his descendants but the multitude was enlarged, because the true Israel had been enlarged by those whom God had brought in. It is as the olive tree in Romans, a picture of the olive tree, when you say, in which the wild branches have been grafted in. He sees these and they shall sanctify my name and sanctify the Holy One of Israel, and fear the God of Israel. So we have here a marvelous picture in these verses of God's future plan, just as Isa. 7 gave us His marvelous future plans in substituting for the leadership of the house of David His own Immanuel. This shows us His marvelous future plan in substituting for the leadership of His people simply those who thought they had a hereditary claim, in moving for a time the center of His blessing to a people who are drawn from outside, from Lebanon, the forest outside, but who are the work of His hands, and graft it in to the Olive Tree, His true revelation. And I see, and it would be possible to interpret v. 24 as a continuation of what has preceded, but I feel that in line with the teachings of Paul about the Olive Tree, and in line with the previous whole picture where man goes so far and then God intervenes, I feel that v. 24 represents a new idea, a different idea than has been given before. In v. 18 we have the dead and the blind, those who can't help themselves, they're outside the ~~pane~~, but God in His marvelous grace, permits them to see and to hear and to learn His word, and to become as the children of Jacob, the work of His hands, but now we have not those who were blind, not those who ~~were~~ ^{are} deaf, not those who are outside the family of God, but those who have erred in spirit, but those who have erred in spirit, those who have wandered astray, those who were physically Israel but who have wandered astray, they are going to come to understand, and they that murmured shall learn doctrine, and that it seems to me is a parallel to the last part of Paul's picture of the olive tree where Paul

says that if the casting aside of the natural olive tree branch and the grafting in of ~~the~~ wild branches, if that had been salvation and blessing for the world, what will be the re-grafting in of the natural branches but resurrection from the dead, so here we have, I believe, the grafting back into their own olive tree of Israel as a nation born in a day, at the end of the age, as so described in Romans where Paul says, and so all Israel shall be saved, and Christian interpreters through the ages until recently ^{have practically} ~~all understood~~ that as meaning that all of Israel is going to be a nation, born in a day, brought into the kingdom at the end of this age by a marvelous act of God's wonderful grace. There are in these recent days certain amillennialists who write books in which they say it doesn't mean anything like that at all. When Paul says, So all Israel shall be saved, he means that this is the way that any of Israel who ~~will~~ were saved, will be saved. So, so all Israel will be saved means no Israelites are saved except those who are saved through accepting Christ, but in the context, Christians have through the ages accepted it to mean that a great outpouring of God's grace upon Israel as a whole at the end of the age, and if you take it that way, that most Christian interpreters till recently, and I think the bulk today, have interpreted, it seems to me that this parallels to them. So that in this last verse we have that final step in the process as God permits Isaiah to glance forward into the distant future, as to His dealing with the people of God ^{through the distant ages.} So you see why (8 3/4)

look at this 29 th chapter is a very wonderful chapter with its picture of God's dealing with His people, in His plan of the coming of Christ and through the whole of the present age and on through the future. Mr. Vannoy? (9) Yes, I feel that generalized dictates as to what you can or can't do are simply false method of reasoning. I feel that you have to take the facts and see in the light of context what is taught, and I would say that Israel as a nation of individuals of a certain blood, and Israel as the true believers in God, have to be distinguished as to which is in mind in any particular passage, but the two overlap to a very great extent, and they cannot be distinguished in the sense of

being completely separated. There are times when they overlap very largely, and there are times when they overlap to a very considerable extent, and there are times when they overlap only a very little. But to put them in two categories, I see no warrant for that anywhere in Scripture. But I've heard people say, that there are God's earthly people who were promised land, and there are God's heavenly people who were promised salvation. Well, what good would land be to anybody without salvation? I think that is ridiculous nonsense. God called a people to be the medium for giving of His word, and preparing the way for the coming of His son, the purpose was spiritual, the land was a minor but important feature of the spiritual purposes, but the vital thing is the spiritual purpose, not the land, and in the original calling to Abraham there is nothing said about the land part, the land as time goes ^{on} / is stressed a little more than before, but that's not the major thing at all, and as to just what distinctions there may be in the millennium, why we can't tell a lot about it, there will be distinctions of certain types, of course, there is specialization in the Lord's work, inevitably, but to get it right down into very simple divisions, why you just don't have the data, and those lines don't usually work out like that anyway. I would feel that there are those who explain away the millennium, all through the Scripture. They say it is simply the preaching of the gospel, that's all. Well, I think that is entirely wrong, and then there are others who want to find the millennium in every verse. I think that is equally wrong. And I think we have to take each passage and see what it is talking about, and decide. And where I used to teach, before I was here, you had a great task to persuade people that Isaiah 2 was talking about the millennium. I think it is very clear, there is no question it is the millennium, but then when I began teaching prophets in this seminary, I found people were aghast when I pointed out that Isaiah 4 was not a picture of the millennium but a picture of the present age, the picture is antithetical to that in 2. There are two different pictures, different situation altogether. One is a time when there is no external danger, the other is a time when

there is protection from the external danger that is all around. They are utterly different pictures, and the people who say there is nothing about the present age in the Old Testament. Well, you show me one place in the New Testament where it says there is nothing about the present ^{church} age in the Old Testament, and I will say if that is God's Word of course it is true, but until you find such a statement it is purely imagination. And this passage and quite a few other passages make perfect sense when you see them as pictures of God's plan for the ages, and if not why you're almost as bad off trying to interpret them as you are trying to interpret the millennial passages from an amillennial viewpoint, where you get into other matters. (stu.13) I don't think the linear figure quite fits. If you use the word dispensationalism in a harmful sense, in a sense of making false divisions which just don't exist, I think amillennialism is the most dispensational view there is, in that sense, that's my criticism. I think the word is an unfortunate word, because it stresses certain very wonderful things and can be interpreted in such a way as to stress certain misinterpretations. It can be used in a good way or a bad way, I think it is an unfortunate word. I think the same way with covenant theology, it is used in a bout 50 different senses, some of which are excellent, and some of which are terrible, and the two of them have to be defined, but I think the thing is to see what is in the word and stand on whatever you find there, wherever you find it. And I believe we find the millennium very, very clearly and I think we find the course of this present age depicted as the prophet glances

(14 1/2)

I think God gave marvelous ~~hints~~ glimpses

and this chapter I think is one of the finest of the

I think this interpretation I've given, everything falls in line, it just words straight out, it is very clear, and otherwise you've got a lot of words, a lot of rather unrelated sentences. ...

...at that place I think that particular note is in error, I don't think this is a description
(3/4) and

I think v.24 is the very end of this section. Yes? (1) Yes, thank you very much. It is better to give it to you now than to put it on the board Friday because you have much more time to work on it, and you can do a much better job. The assignment has 3 parts to it. The first part is this, please write it down rapidly, I meant to give it to you at the beginning of the hour. The first part: briefly examine Isa.13.1, 15.1, 17.1 and 19.1. Just see what those verses mean and what do they have in common. Very quickly done, nothing to write. Number 2: write a brief discussion of Isa.30.6, just brief, with emphasis on that which is like the verses you've looked at before under #1. That brief discussion I'd like turned in. Isa.30.6. Number 3: write a full--this is not brief, 3 is as much as 1 and 2 put together and multiplied by 10--write a full outline and discussion of the progress of thought in ^{Isaiah} Isa.30, entire chapter. Now this one, the people who are taking this for undergraduate credit I would say put at least 4 hours on this assignment for next time. 2 credit class, 2 hours of class, four hours outside, and some weeks we have not assigned anything, so if anybody wants to do more than 4, that is optional, but I'm assigning it four for undergraduates. For graduate students six. Assignment is the same, but the graduate students do 2 hours longer. Next Monday morning by 11 o'clock, please have them in my box so that I can look them over. Thank you. (3 1/2, break, record starting again at 3 3/4--4/9/62)

...I think everything falls in place, the passage makes perfect sense. It gives a consistent picture of God's plan, fits in with other parts of the Bible, every word in it, has a purpose in the conveying of the truth that is there included. Now we went straight through it and I believe I brought out all the vital points, but before going on, I'd like to ask if there is anything that isn't clear, any question, any particular aspect that we should look at a little further? Anybody have any such?

...factors in which there are quite a few verses that I have to say well now

I'm just not sure what that means, but I don't feel that way about 29. I feel as if once you get the key, see how it fits together, how it relates to what precedes, how it relates to Isa.7, and what the parallel is to the New Testament teaching, it seems to me that every ~~ew~~ word falls in place, that there is no real problem involved in it, but the interpretation I gave you, going straight through, I have not come across in any book. Of course I haven't looked up every book on it, ~~it~~ it may be some where, but I haven't seen it. But if everything is perfectly clear on that to you and you have no questions or problems on any part of it, then we can go on to chapter 30. If not, I'd like to look into any problems anyone has to raise. Everybody seems to understand it perfectly, that is wonderful. Then we go on to chapter 30. Oh, I just get a glimpse of Mr. Gregory once in a while, when he pokes his head around, that's better. All right, now let's look at chapter 30.

Now in chapter 30, we start in with a title which seems to go back to the section that ran through verses 9-13. It has the same sort of a criticism of the people's character and attitude. It ties us back then immediately. We are not tied up to the end of the chapter where we have this picture of God's plan, this turning things upside down, which runs from verses 16-24, we are carried back to the place where he began his discussion of the character of the people, a character that is quite similar to the character of Ahaz. We are not only, however, carried back to the beginning, to this middle part of chapter 29, we are also carried back to chapter 7. What is there in this verse that particularly carries us back to chapter 7, Mr. Golin? How does v.1 of chapter 30 which takes us back, not to the previous 8 verses but to what was the section that preceded them, how does it carry us back also to chapter 7? Hope everyone is looking either in your own English Bible or your own Hebrew Bible. Yes, Mr. Abbott? (7) You say, as far as the time is concerned that we're moving forward, but I don't see any reason to think that we have moved any distance yet, here. In chapter 28 he attacks the clever plan which Ahaz and his nobles have made, to

rescue them from Ephraim and Syria, and he says instead of that you should have looked to God for help and trusted God. Your plan is going to bring you into terrible situation where Jerusalem will be about ready to be destroyed but God will deliver. Then, he comes back to that same attitude again here. He says woe to them that look for counsel to men, not to me. He is going back I would say to that same theme. Now of course he is looking forward to a continuance of the attitude on the people's part. But I see no reason in the world to say that he is cutting off (7 3/4) at the time of Ahaz. Yes? (stu.) Well, now that's the next verse. We are not to the next verse yet. We're on v.1 ~~now~~ now. V.1 shows the people saying we are going to get Assyria to help us against Ephraim and Syria, that's the way we're going to get deliverance. God said your scheme for deliverance is going to backfire, He said it's going to simply do away with the buffer state, you'll have Assyria right next to you, Jerusalem is going to be like Ariel, going to be reduced to a terrible condition, where disaster seems immediately ahead, but then God says, I'm going to intervene and going to protect Jerusalem from the situation into which you bring it. But then He goes back to your character that is going to bring that on it, and criticizes their character that turn to these schemes instead of following God, in the middle section of chapter 29. Then in the latter part, just as he told Ahaz, Ahaz I'm going to replace you by a true descendant of David, a true leader of the house of David, here He says to the leaders of God's people who were looking to men instead of to God, I am going to replace you with another ^{people.} ~~king.~~ I'm going to turn things upside down, replace you with another people, as the center of the carrying on of the work of God, but then eventually I'm going to bring you back in to the olive tree. Now He continues on the same theme.

He says in this verse, Woe to them that, rebellious children, that take counsel, but not of me. The nobles and Ahaz, they take counsel together, they don't ask the

Lord what He thinks, what are His principles, what does He have in mind they should do, instead they work out their clever schemes, and then their clever schemes that they work out, that they think is going to succeed, he says won't succeed, so He says this is the situation you're going to be in, you are facing Assyria, with nothing in between, you're in far worse danger than before, and then they answer, they say -- now maybe they immediately answer--they say, well, if that happens this is what we're going to do. Maybe, however, he looks forward to what they will answer when the situation gets into that. Here they're faced with Israel and Syria. Trust in God, He will deliver you, if you put your heart entirely in His will. They say, no, you can't see God, these beautiful platitudes, but we've got to have helpers, somebody that has got some force. Let's get Assyria. So Isaiah says well, you go to Assyria, next you know, you'll have a worse enemy than these, you'll have Assyria. They say, well, all right then, if we get facing with Assyria, we'll do the same thing we did before, we look to Assyria to protect us from Ephraim and Syria, now with Assyria against us, now we look to Egypt, we'll play off the great powers, one against the other, that way we'll be safe. That'll be our next step in doing exactly the same thing we were doing before, but doing it in the next step when we find that scheme backfires, we'll make another one exactly like it. We will look to Egypt for help, so he says, woe to the people that take counsel, but not of me, that cover with a covering--he told them in 28 the covering is too short to cover you, the bedding is too narrow, to wrap yourself in, cover with a covering, but not of my spirit, that they add sin to sin. You have been blameworthy before God, you have had sin in looking to Assyria instead of God, for help against Syria and Ephraim, now you're going to add sin to sin, you're going to look to Egypt for help, instead of trusting God and following Him, against Assyria. God will deliver you from Assyria, by this tremendous thing that He has promised to do, that is to deliver you by a miraculous protection of Jerusalem, but no, you've got to go to Egypt for help.

Well, did they ever look to Egypt for help? Well, as we find in Isa. 36.6 in the section with which we began our examination of this passage, this semester, we found that in Isa. 36.6, that he said, that the King of Assyria said to Hezekiah, Lo, thou trustest in the staff of this broken reed, on Egypt, whereon if a man lean it will go into his hand and pierce it. So is Pharaoh king of Egypt to all that trust in him, that is what Sennacherib's representative says to Hezekiah about their trusting in Egypt, which shows very clearly that in the time between the failure of Ahaz' plan to deliver them by having Assyria come, and Assyria has removed the buffer state, now between that and the time described in chapter 36, they have been doing exactly the same thing as before only with a different people, they have been looking to Egypt for help against Assyria, just as before they looked to Assyria for help against Syria and Egypt. So here in this 30th chapter of Isaiah, here, we just started looking at this 2nd verse and we find how it fits in with the statement in chapter 36...

15. (3/4)

...Sennacherib's representative is going to say to them, when he is actually come, Isaiah here, I would guess, still in the time of Ahaz, though it may be that these chapters were added on, rather than all being given immediately at the time of the banquet, my guess would be that he is right at the banquet. My guess would be that this is at the very time in which in chapter 28, we had Isaiah going into the banquet and rebuking the nobles for their trusting Assyria instead of trusting God, and that here now they are saying, well, if that works out the way he says and we have Assyria as our enemy, we'll just look to Egypt, and we'll get help from Egypt. That would be my guess. Now it's possible that instead of that Isaiah wrote it five or ten years later, in addition. But it seems to me more natural that right then God permitted him to look on into the future, and that he either said this at the banquet, at which chapter 28 occurs, or else that he, having made a start at the banquet, and then finally

gotten thrown out before he got it all said, he went on and wrote down what he would have said if he'd gone on talking an hour or two. At any rate I think it relates right to that situation, they're looking to the next step. He said, the Lord said, you're not asking counsel of me, you're looking for your own clever schemes to protect yourself, they won't work, Assyria is not going to simply deliver you from Ephraim and Syria, you'll have a worse enemy in front of you than you had before. They say, well, then we'll look to Egypt, so now we find that in these next few verses he is dealing with this matter of Egypt. V.3, therefore shall the strength of Pharaoh be your shame and to trust in the shadow of Egypt your confusion. That is exactly the idea that is brought out so forcibly by Sennacherib's representative in that interesting figure of speech, that he uses in 36.6 where it says, Egypt is a broken reed, trust in it and it will go through your hand, pierce through your hand,

So here he is saying the same thing in advance, they're going to find it does not work and Sennacherib's representatives will (3) Now he says, your princes will be at Zoan and your ambassadors come to Hanes, these places in Egypt, but you will find that it won't help. The strength of Pharaoh will be your shame, trust in the shadow of Egypt your confusion. They are all ashamed of a people that could not profit them, nor be an help nor profit, but a shame, and also a reproach. You won't get anything out of this looking to Egypt, they'll take all you give them, but they won't give you any real protection. Now v.6 begins with a verse and I asked you today to look up certain verses. I asked everybody, didn't I? The whole class.

All right, the first of those was 13.1. The burden of Babylon, the thing lifted up or carried, about Babylon. You go on and there is God's message of rebuke regarding Babylon. The next time we find that expression is in 15.1. Did you look at that, Mr. Cohen? Well, what do you think it means there? (4) You look at 17.1, what does that mean? Against Damascus. A message which the prophet has relating

to Damascus. Actually the chapter relates more to Egypt than Damascus, but it does relate to Damascus. And then did I mention 19.1? What did you notice in 19.1, Mr. Miller? Yes, what does it say? What does that mean? Mr. Grauley, what do you think about v.6 of chapter 30. You get light on the problem by the Hebrew word? The answer is, no, the Hebrew word is different. And therefore Mr. Gregory is quite right in considering that the fact that the word burden is used in many other cases, to mean a strong message which God has against someone or some thing, establishes a presumption that in a similar phrase here the word is used the same way. Then you examine the presumption and see whether it is justified, and in examining the presumption, Mr. Gregory came up against a tough problem. How would you think of Egypt as being the beast of the south? And the problem that that establishes is a very, very difficult one, how would this be a way to express Egypt, the best of the south? And the answer to that is the answer which Mr. Grauley has already given us. That though the word here is an identical word, it is here used not in the somewhat figurative sense of a burden namely a message of woe that the prophets have from the Lord, but in the strictly literal sense of something that is carried. You see, if you read this chapter without having read anything of the prophets before, you should have no problem, the burden of the beasts of the south is what the beasts of the south carry. But a person shouldn't read this without reading what comes before, because we have the word used in the other sense in Isaiah several times before, and therefore a person normally approaching this, having looked at all the previous passages in Isaiah, will immediately ask, well, what's the message about the beasts of the south, what does that stand for? But actually, you don't find any sensible answer, and so you come back to the strictly literal interpretation in this case. As Mr. Golin said, it is something carried. Now when he says the beasts of the south, what are beasts of the south? Camel, the beast of the south. § Do you think somebody in South Africa would say the camel was the beast of the south? I think he'd say the camel was the

beast of the north, don't you? Camel is the beast of the desert, but he is not the beast of the south, unless you happen to be north of him. This might be camel, I'm not saying it isn't a camel, but what I'm saying is, what is the beast of the south? Is it the beast that comes from the south? Is it a beast that is particularly characteristic of the south? Or what does it mean in this case? What would you think, Mr. Grauley? (7 1/4) It is found there but I don't think that is the meaning of this. What do you think, Mr. Cohen? (7 1/4) This is, I believe, the beasts that are going to the south. The burden of the beasts of the south. In other words, Isaiah gives a vivid picture. He says to these nobles, well, you say, you sent this heavy tribute to Assyria, Assyria is going to protect you from, going to deliver you from Ephraim, and Syria, well, they will, but they will destroy them, then you will be faced with Assyria, in worse danger than you are now. Well, they said, then we'll look to Egypt and Egypt will protect us from Assyria, we could play our international politics a step further. If we don't like Hitler, we'll make alliance with Stalin against Hitler. Well, all right, then suppose you and Stalin together get rid of Hitler, then you're face to face with Stalin, what are you going to do in that case? Well, we'll just make a few more missiles then. If we'd start trusting God in the first place, we'd be better off. We can't say now there is some other dictator we'll look to for help against Stalin because there isn't any, we've reached the end. But they thought they hadn't reached the end, they had Egypt to look to. Well, he says, you may look to Egypt and you think you'll get help from Egypt, well, I'll tell you what's going to happen, he says: the burden of the beasts of the south. If you're going to get help from Egypt, you are going to be sending great amounts of your material off to Egypt to try to get their support, so you're going to be impoverishing yourself, and weakening yourself, in order to get Egyptian support, and then when you get it you'll find it isn't worth anything. So he gives a vivid picture, he says, the burden of the

beasts of the south. This is what is going to happen. Just look at the burden. The burden of the beasts of the south. Into the land of trouble of anguish, from whence come the young and old lion, the viper and fiery flying serpent. Is that Egypt, the land from whence comes the young and old lion, the viper and fiery flying serpent? I don't think there he is referring to Egypt, I think he is there referring to the region between Palestine and Egypt, into which they go on the way to Egypt, and you recall how when the Israelites came up out of Egypt, down south of the Dead Sea there, they came into the area where there was a—where there were great numbers of these fiery serpents that bit the people, and God gave them the brazen serpent to look to and trust in and find, through God's provision, find deliverance from the poison of this world into which they had come. That was the region into which they're going to have to send their animals with their heavily laden burden, on their way to Egypt.

When Lawrence of Arabia came, with his forces from Arabia up to Palestine, he came through that region and he describes in his book how they were camping at night, and he said it was filled with serpents, and he said they'd lie down on the ground to sleep at night and he said in the morning the first one that got up each morning would have to get up very, very quietly, and move himself very gradually and lest he should excite a serpent that might be lying right straight against him and scare it and it might bite him, and then if he got up safely he would go and take a big stick and come around and pull the serpents away that were lying up against the others for the width of their bodies. And he describes that region through which the Israelites came and through which now they're going to send all this great amount of materials in order to get Egyptian help. He says, you can look to God, make your heart right before the Lord, see His provision, but instead of that, you're going to play off your clever human schemes, this is what it's going to lead to, you're going to impoverish yourselves and it won't do you any good anyway.

So they are going to go into the land from whence comes the young and old

lion, the viper and the fiery flying serpent, 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. For the Egyptians shall help in vain, and to no purpose. I don't know as that is a very good English expression of it. The Egyptians will promise to help. You will seek Egyptian help in vain and to no purpose. Therefore, have I ~~erect~~ cried concerning this, their strength is to sit still. Egypt a thousand years before had been the greatest force in the middle east, and just a word that the Egyptian army was coming was enough to make most people submit, because Egypt was so powerful, a thousand years before. But Egypt had declined and declined in its strength until now it was just a shadow of its former self, but there was a very vigorous shadow. It was like when the Spanish American War began, Spain had been the great power which held all of South America, except Brazil, in its hands, and held the Philippine Islands, it was the greatest empire in the world, and all the world had been rather terrified of Spain. And Spain had continued that way for some centuries, but it has been getting weaker and weaker while outwardly it seemed to be just as strong as ever, and when the Spanish-American War began, they say that there was hardly a country in Europe that thought the United States had a chance against Spain, they thought it was very foolish of this little upstart country over here to think they could defeat the mighty Spanish empire, but when the American troops attacked the Spanish in Cuba and in the Philippines it soon became apparent that Spain was just an empty frame inside of which the strength was largely gone, the people hadn't realized it for decades they had been simply going on the strength of their name.

Well, Egypt was in more or less that situation now, and they say we'll look to Egypt, we'll get our help. He says, yes, Egypt will take all the plunder and all the money that you want to send them, to get their help, but he says, when you get ~~thru~~ through with them, you will find that their strength is to sit still.

And so we have these seven verses, the theme of which is that the same attitude be taken against Assyria, you continue by using Egypt as your means of getting human help instead of help from God, and in the end you'll find it doesn't do you any more good than the previous one, although the reason is a different reason. Yes, Mr. Abbott? ...

16. (3/4)

...(stu.) Yes, it is. The parallel is very striking and the parallel is so striking, I'm glad you raised the question, Mr. Abbott, about this chapter 6, verse 1. It is quite an unnatural way, to start telling about sending a lot of tribute to Egypt, with the words, the burden of the beasts of the south. And there are two explanations of it, I think. One is that it is a very vivid picture, instead of a statement. Here is a picture. The burden of the beasts of the south, see the beasts going down there, one after another, with this mighty burden that they are carrying, it is presented in pictorial vivid form that will get the theme across much more than a simple declaration of it. And it's true, you think back over the sermons you've heard, you will probably all of you find you've heard many very wonderful explanations, expositions of Scripture, some of which have stayed in your mind, and some haven't, but you will find that among the sermons you've heard are some very simple sermons which have contained a very vivid picture and that picture has stuck with you, and sometimes people say one picture is worth a thousand words. Well, it is if you know what the picture means, ^{for sure,} but it usually takes the words to explain the picture. But the picture may make a more vivid and lasting impression, so he has given a picture. But I also, in view of our having the phrase so many times before, that the fact that he uses it again, in exactly the same form, where a different meaning is intended, perhaps is a rhetorical device, to cause the reader or the listener, to stop, expect something like before, then see that he is giving something different, and then realize that though it is something different, that there is still a similar idea, that

it is not a burden of woe upon the beasts of the south, no, the woe is upon them for trusting in Egypt, but that it is a message of woe for those who are doing what is contrary to God's will, and so it calls back some of the emotional feeling of the previous statement, even though in actual meaning, it is very different. But probably that is one reason for the use of that particular thing. But then he goes on and these first seven verses of the chapter are dealing with the folly of looking to Egypt, and thus making exactly the same mistake they did before in looking to Assyria. He says that it will not help. But then there is --the next section is verses 8-12, and vv.8-12 are similar to vv.9-13 in the previous chapter, they are simply a declaration of the attitude of the people. They are a pointing of the character of the leaders of the people, a character which is here being tremendously criticized by the Lord through His prophet. He gave that vivid characterization of it in chapter 29.9-13, and then showed in vv.14-24 how God was going to take away the kingdom of heaven from them and give it to a people who would really bring forth the fruits thereof. He was going to turn the thing upside down. Here He shows their character and then shows what He is going to do about it, so He shows the character in vv.8-12. He says, write it before them in a table, and note it in a book, that it may be for he time to come for ever and ever. In other words, this is a continuing characteristic of people who have the marvelous blessing of having [^]God's Word, having the opportunity of knowing Him, and then who have fallen away from making full use of it, who have, as he said back in 29.13, honored him with their mouth but removed their heart from Him.

So he says the result of it is going to be, or further he describes the conditions, he says, note in the book, write it in a table. In other words, what he is going to give is something important, this is important enough to write down so that in the times that come people can know it. Now we had some of his statements about Israel quoted by our Lord, in the New Testament. We have statements about the character of people quoted from these sections of Isaiah, later on. Is it for that purpose, he

says write it down? Or is it to write it down in order that the result is going to come from it, when it becomes apparent, will draw our attention to it, and make us to stop and realize that exactly the same fate can come to us, if we, having great privileges from the Lord, great opportunities, simply honor Him with our mouth, but our heart turns to be far from Him. Mouth honor of the Lord isn't going to give any blessing to anybody, in the end, and the greater the opportunity the greater responsibility. So he says write it down in a book and I think one reason to write in a book is that when you see the result, you'll see how it is fulfilled, what is going to come. So we want to see what the result is, but first we look a little further at what the rebuke is, what is their attitude he describes. This is a rebellious people, lying children, children that will not hear the word of the Lord.

Now he said back in chapter 29, that they make excuses to get away from studying God's book, one says I can't read it because it is sealed, the next says I can't read it because I'm unable to read. They make excuses. Now he says, they tell others not to give it to them, which say to the seers, see not; and to the prophets, Prophecy not unto us right things, speak unto us smooth things, prophecy deceits. Give us something, it doesn't mean by deceits, give us something that is a lie necessarily, but give us something that is not the thing the Lord wants us to have. Give us something that'll make us happy, give us something that will amuse us. I once heard a pastor of a very large church speak, he was asked to speak in a Christian school I was attending, on doctrinal preaching. He came and gave a message on doctrinal preaching, and he said, people in my church came to me and they said, Dr. Smith, won't you give us a series of doctrinal messages, give us some doctrinal sermons. Well, he said, I said to them ^{do} if you think I want to have my church emptied? Why should I do that? Well he said, they ~~said~~ said, we'd like to ^{know} what we believe, give us some doctrinal messages. Well, he said, I don't want to

empty my church, he said, they urged him, he said, I'll tell you, I'll preach one, and see what happens. He says, you know, I preached a doctrinal message and instead of people going away, we got bigger crowds, so I gave a whole series of them.

Well, it struck me, but he was an orthodox man, but what was he preaching for? He was preaching to amuse the people, to keep them comfortable, the important question was will the people come? How big will my crowd be? He gave them a true message, but there was not much of an ardent and sincere desire to give the Lord's message to the people, to give what they need, as what he of course wants to give it in a form that will keep them coming, and getting more, there is not much point in giving the Lord's message in an empty desert, nobody listens in an empty room, but his objective was to please them rather than to get the message of the Lord to them. When he found they really were interested in the message of the Lord, he kept on giving it. Well, in other words, he thought that they had the attitude that it describes here. Prophecy to us smooth things, give us something that will make us feel confident, instead of pointing out our needs to us and causing us to turn to the Lord for help, to see the wickedness of our ways.

Get you out of the way, turn aside out of the path, cause the Holy One of Israel to cease from before us. In other words, don't follow the word, follow our desires. Therefore, thus saith the Holy One of Israel, because you despise this word, and trust in oppression and perverseness, and stay thereon,--you see, he is still speaking to the nobles as he was in chapter 28: to trust in oppression, you wouldn't say that to the people as a whole. The people as a whole wouldn't be trusting in oppression unless they were a strong masterful, you might say, over another people that they were oppressing, but it is the nobles, the leaders who were oppressing the others. Therefore,--now in v.13 we begin our statement of what the result is going to be. 13-14, therefore this iniquity shall be to you as a breach ready to fall,

swelling out in a high wall, whose breaking comes suddenly at an instant. And he shall break it as the breaking of the potters' vessel that is broken in pieces; he shall not spare; so there shall not be found in the bursting of it a sherd to take fire from the hearth, or to take water withal out of the pit.

Here is the statement of what is going to happen but in vv.13-14 we don't have very much specific, do we? What's going to happen? Calamity. That's about all you can say. There is going to be calamity. There is one more thing, the calamity will come suddenly. There is sudden calamity for those who turn away from God, for those who fail to take advantage of the opportunity given to them, there is sudden calamity. Well, you might say, what's this? This is just ordinary preaching, you can say to anybody, if you don't follow the Lord, you'll have calamity. Maybe not immediately, the longer it's put off the worse it tends to be. If you don't follow Him there is calamity ahead. All right, this is very general. What is there^t specific about this? Well, in the previous chapter, you had that tremendously specific declaration of what is going to happen. ~~He~~^{That} God would take away the kingdom of heaven from them and give it to a nation which would utilize the fruits thereof. We had a specific declaration in the previous one, well, do we have one here? Well, we look on and see what we come to. He says that there is going to be sudden calamity, vv.13-14. Now we return for a verse and a half, I guess you could almost say two verses, let's say for a verse and a half, there is a further statement of the attitude of the people. For thus says 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. That is a wonderful verse, isn't it? Thus says 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. It's a wonderful verse, but it's not the whole of the verse. I think it is quite justifiable to quote that much of the verse, because the way it's used in the verse, it is clearly implied that this is a message which he has given in the past.

I doubt if "thus saith" is the correct interpretation of the beginning of the verse. Now of course in the Hebrew where it says, thus the Lord has said, we regularly translate it in English, thus the Lord said, because what He has said is of continuing validity, therefore, over and over it says thus saith the Lord, where the Hebrew is, thus the Lord hath said. But in this case, I think the literal rendering of the Hebrew would fit the sentence then. As it is, you see, it doesn't make a great deal of sense, for thus saith the Lord...and ye would not. Why, what sense is that. ~~Thus~~ Thus the Lord has said, but you would not. That is the verse. For thus the Lord has said, here is the wonderful promise God gave you: in repentance and rest, v.15, in repentance and rest shall you be saved, in quietness and in confidence shall be your strength. This is God's promise to His people, which Isaiah gave in chapter 7, and said, Ahaz, ask for a sign, and Ahaz, in mock piety, said, I won't ask a sign, I won't tempt the Lord, then he rebuked Ahaz for his insincerity. And here he thinks this is the promise which God gave, that you could trust Him and follow Him and have confidence that what He would bring to pass would be what was right and was best and what was best for you, and He gave you this promise and instead of doing it, you have looked to Assyria for help in your clever scheme, that backfired, and now you're going to look to Egypt for help, and that isn't going to help you either, he said. ...

17. (1/2)

...so he says this was the wonderful promise that God has given, not a promise given here, it's a promise that he is here referring back to, as having been given before. But ye would not, of course in Hebrew--And ye would not, is a perfectly good word, here translated "and" but *g'* frequently translated "but," in the Old Testament. It could just as well mean but as and. So our English and is sometimes used to express the idea but, with a little different accent. I think that is altogether proper, essentially *not* "but" would make the sense of the verse clearer. ~~That~~ ^{not} That reading into

the verse, that's perfectly obvious if you examine it closely. But you would not. So he says, what did they say. Well, first they said, we're ~~safe~~ faced with Syria and Ephraim, either one of them bigger than we are, we're going to look to Assyria, perhaps, with this secret, wicked plan of Ahaz. All right, he says, that won't do you any good, remove the buffer state, you'll be in great danger, Jerusalem will be reduced to condition described in the beginning of chapter 29, only God's power will deliver you. He says, well then, we're in that situation before Assyria, we'll look to Egypt for help. He says, no, that won't do you any good, you'll find their strength is to sit still. Then they say, no, but we will flee on horses. He says, therefore, you will flee. Notice this 16th verse is a combination of what they say and what He says. But you say, no, we'll flee on horses, therefore you will flee. If this is your attitude, you think you can get away, well, you'll have a chance to try; therefore you will flee. And you say, we will ride upon the swift. He says, therefore shall they that pursue you be swift. You think you'll get away because you have such swift means, well, they'll be swift too. And then in v.17 he gives his climax to this section: In v.17 he gives his declaration of what the outcome is going to be. They are going to look to Assyria for help, it does away with the buffer state, puts them in terrible danger, then they look to Egypt for help, their strength will be to sit still, then they think they're going to flee. All right, he says, you're going to start a process that they'll be no end to. One thousand shall flee at the rebuke of one, and at the rebuke of five shall ye flee. I think that makes--if you're going to put in "shall flee" in italics in the first line, to show what is implied in the verse, but not expressed in the Hebrew, why not put in the word "all" here, it would ^{make} it much better. At the rebuke of one, one thousand shall flee; at the rebuke of five you'll all flee, till you be left with nobody left at all, you are going to be reduced, you are going to be decimated, you are going to have terrible losses in war, in persecution, in difficulty, from the Babylonians and on through the ages from attacker after attacker, and persecutor

after persecutor, yes. This will be done until you're wiped out off the face of the earth. But that's not what he says. Not that you shall be wiped out off the face of the earth, but all right, until what happens? Till you're left with *only* a few remaining, hardly any of you left. Well of course, that idea is in here. But it is a very unusual way to express that idea, isn't it? You notice what he says. Till you ~~are~~ are left as a beacon on the top of a mountain, and as an ensign on a *hill*. What a strange statement God makes in the time of Isaiah. Well, suppose that you don't find that in any predictions to Egypt, or to Assyria. Here is this mighty Assyrian empire, ~~what's~~ what's going to happen? God is going to destroy you, you will be completely destroyed, they won't even know where Nineveh was, for two thousand years. The place will disappear, it will be just--the Assyrian empire is the greatest empire in the world, and five years later, the Assyrian people have practically disappeared from the face of the earth. Never again a force to be reckoned with. Nation after nation God rebuked and says you will be utterly destroyed and that's the end, but here he says, you will become, be left like a beacon on the top of a mountain, and an ensign on a hill. You don't run up the top of a mountain for safety, (5 1/4)

to the whole world, do you? You don't run up there, do you, where everybody can see you? You go off and hide in a valley somewhere if you want to get away, but he says you're going to be left like a beacon on a mountain, and like an ensign on the top of a hill. You're going to be left so that everybody knows you're still left. There will be few left but they will be visible to everybody. They will be conspicuous, those who are left, not only conspicuous, there is more than that, look at the terminology used, a flag, an ensign, a beacon, something that is visible, something that is observable, something that is prominent, something that causes attention to something, what does it call attention to? And it is a remarkable thing, that here in the ancient world, you have all these different nations, you have Edom, you have Moab, you have the Canaanites, the Am~~o~~ites, the Jebusites, the

Assyrians, the Ishmaelites, the Midianites, the Babylonians, and you have the Jews, you have all of these, and they disappear. They disappear from the face of the earth, are absorbed into other nations, they fail to be of any importance as history changes, and time changes, and peoples get mixed up and all that, but this one nation there, in 700 B.C., God says of them you'll be left as a beacon on the top of a mountain, or as an ensign on top of a hill. You will be left in such a way that everybody will know you exist, you'll be left visible everywhere, and you go off into the heart of China, you go way down to the southern end of Arabia, you go anywhere in the world just about, and you find evidence that this little nation of the ancient Jews, they still exist, they are there, they're an ensign, they're a beacon. Once they say, that the unbelieving king of Prussia, Frederick the Great, who was a close friend of Voltaire and was always scoffing at everything that was sacred, Voltaire turned to his court chaplain, because his people were very religious people, they were a very earnest Christian people, but they were very loyal to their king, and Frederick the Great organized them ^{very effectual} ~~into various sections~~ into armies and left a great influence in the world, great changes many of which were for the good, but Frederick the Great once turned to his court Chaplain, he went through the forms of religion and his chaplain preached real Christian messages to his people, and Frederick the Great though, then, would privately like to rather chaff at the chaplain, make fun of him, ridicule him a little, though publicly he maintained the dignity of the state service. He turned to this chaplain, he says give me in one word a proof of Christianity. The chaplain said, "The Jews." And it is interesting that God predicted in 700 B.C. that this people ^{through} ~~to whom~~ He brought His message into this world, this people who as a result of their sin were to be driven into exile, were to be subject to such a fate as came to all the other nations of that (8 1/2) were not to be ended by that fate as the other nations were but were to become like a beacon on top of a mountain, like an ensign on a hill, were to be conspicuous, even though cut down, even though

suffering for their failure to follow God as they should, they were to be conspicuous, were to be visible and an ensign, a beacon, isn't merely something that you see, but something that stands for something, that indicates something, to be an indication of the truth of God's Word, that He had spoken to Abraham, that He had given His message to Moses, that He had prepared the way for the coming of His Son, and that His message in the book is true, we have this visible evidence of it, in the preservation and the widespread existence, a few here and a few there, but conspicuous. And mutely, often, against their will, witnessing to the truth of God's word.

I think that is a tremendous verse there in Isaiah, that He would use this particular language as the climax of these predictions to show what God's will was to do regarding the future of this people, and then He goes in the next section and in vv. 18--on he refers to other events in the future of the people, what's going to happen to them, how they are not going to come to an end, how they're going to go through a long period of adversity, but a period in which they are to turn away completely from idols, completely from idolatry, they are to--that is to be entirely eradicated from them, the nation, and it is a marvel how through the centuries Israel has maintained ^{this} testimony to the spiritual nature of God. They often fell into idolatry in Old Testament times, but after the time of exile, they were so true on this point. Then, until the time comes when the Lord will bind up the grief of his people, in that time when the light of the moon and the light of the sun will be sevenfold as the light of seven days. That picture comparing with the pictures of the glory of the millennium, when God will bind up the wounds of His people and then He ends the chapter with coming back to the immediate situation and declaring as He had in 29 that God is going to deliver them from the Assurians, and that this terrible thing Ahaz and his people have done is not going to mean disaster, it should, but it's not going to, because God is going to marvelously intervene and deliver them from Assyria. We continue there tomorrow...

...any question about Isa.29 and there seems to be none, so in the section with the Graduate students, I asked them a few questions about it, and after I asked them a few they had a lot to ask. So we'd like to find out how well the other four understand Isa.29. Mr. Abbott, could you explain to us just what is the similarity ^{and} ~~how~~ the difference between chapter 29 and chapter 7, what points of contact are there, or what differences? (1 1/4) Ahaz is told that he will be put down and God will put His own man in his place. Wouldn't you say the same thing in 29? The leaders of Israel are told that they're indifferent, ~~they're~~ ^{their} failure to follow God with their whole heart is going to receive punishment and that God will turn over the leadership of His people to another people. So you have a great similarity between the two chapters. But your fundamental difference is that one is talking about the king being replaced by God's own provided king, the other is speaking about the leaders of Israel being replaced in the leadership of God's people by those whom He by His sovereign power will raise up from outside. Mr. Golin (1 3/4)... 11 and 12 show a people who have the power to get the truth, they have the word accessible to them, the word is in their hand, it is delivered to them, it is available, to them, and they're too indifferent to study ~~it~~ it

(2) They're not blind, they're not deaf, they have access to it, but though they have access to it, they take no advantage to the access they have, they make excuses, they'd rather watch the television than study the Bible. It is something else that amuses them, they prefer to that which advances their knowledge of Christ, they are indfferent, they are not (2 1/2) They are not like the people in distant lands who have no Bible, don't know a Bible, they are people who have it but they don't use it, they're indifferent, but you wouldn't call them blind or deaf. So who would you call blind or deaf, or sick? They would be the ones who had never heard, the ones that have no access. Yes? (2 3/4) Yes, so the one who has access and doesn't take it is the fruitful field which is going to be turned into a forest, and

the one which has no access, has no power to get it, is like Lebanon, and ~~there's~~ ^{they're} going to be turned into a fruitful field, and so we have exactly what ~~is~~ said in the first half of v.17 said in v.18, that the deaf will hear the words of the book and the eyes of the blind will see, they who would not have any access to it, they are to be given access. It is God's sovereign power extended to those who were previously outside the pale. Yes? (3 1/2) Chapter 7 has Ahaz with his clever scheme, neath of which clever scheme he thinks that he is going to deliver his land from the attack of Israel and Syria. God says I am ready to deliver you, trust in me, he says for a sign, proof that you can trust Me. Ahaz sidestepped it, he gives a very pious statement, he won't ask for a sign, but it really isn't because he is pious, but because he isn't interested, he is indifferent. And so Isaiah says the Lord Himself will give you a sign, he says not just to Ahaz, but to the whole house of David, the house of David is now in the miserable situation of having an unworthy man at its head, one who is indifferent to God's grace, and as a result of this man's scheme, resting on human wisdom instead of following the Lord, as a result of those, the land is going to come, the rest of the chapter tells us, into very serious difficulty. But eventually, we're not told when, God is going to provide His own king, the substitute for this one, so now we find in chapter 7 what this one is doing, and what the effects of it are going to be, and chapter 8 continues that thought, until at the end of chapter 8 and the beginning of chapter 9 we have the coming of terrible darkness and misery as nation after nation sweeps over Israel as the result of Ahaz/'indifference in turning away from God, and that result just when it seems to reach its very darkest, then the Lord is going to intervene and bring the substitute for Ahaz, the one who will be God's proper head of the house of David, the one through whom all the misery that came through the sin of Ahaz and ^{of} the people is going to be cleared up. So he says in v.2, the people that walk in darkness have seen a great light, in the very area where the Assyrians began their march into the land, as a result of Ahaz'

summons, in that very area, the successor to Ahaz is going to start preaching and bringing light where Ahaz' clever scheme brought darkness. So the only hope of deliverance from the situation into which Ahaz leads with his clever scheme is the coming of the substitute for Ahaz, the child ~~that~~ is to be born, who is going to govern in the power of the Lord and in the wisdom of the Lord instead of, as Ahaz did, in indifference and human ideas. That ties 7 and 9 together and gives the attitude toward the king, which is paralleled over in 28 and 29, by the attitude toward the leaders of the nation. Yes? (6) Vv 4 and 5 describe the suffering of the war which sweeps over the land as a result of Ahaz' scheme. They are facing enemies who the men could not possibly protect themselves against, but God said trust in me and I will protect you from them. Ahaz, instead of trusting in God, trusted in Assyria. The result of Ahaz' trusting in Assyria, is that the danger he feared from the coming of the warriors from Syria and from Ephraim, is going to be multiplied many times with the coming of warriors from greater enemies, Assyria, Egypt, the Persians, and eventually the Greeks, and eventually the Romans, so they sweep over the land and their battles with confused noise, the boots of the warriors marching through, the garments ^{rolled} in blood, but God has claimed to give all that over to burning and fuel of fire, He is going to break the staff of the oppressor, and the way He is going to break it is by sending His own Immanuel, as described in v.6. Just go back, anything we didn't make ~~it~~ clear at the time, but unless there is further question on 7 or 9 we turn to 29.

And in 29 then, we notice how 18 repeats what is in 17, in more literal language than 17, although with still with some figures of speech, and then 19 and 20 and 21 describe the joy of the true believers at the carrying out of God's will and these verses could fit with any declaration of God's wonderful mercy, though they don't prove a great deal of what the passage is talking about, they simply show that God's true people, ~~the~~ (8) are going to rejoice in these developments. Yes?

(stu) ...if we can speak dogmatically on that as to whether it is Satan specifically or whether it is those wicked people who are carrying out Satan's policy. It does not give us a ground on which to decide between the two, but it certainly is the defeat of God's enemies (8 1/4)

but whether it specifically states them it would be hard to say without some mention in the context. Yes? (8 1/2) yes, I would say that 19 was probably simply those who see this happen will rejoice in the Lord, and my guess would be that the actual fulfillment of it came in v.18 when the gospel began to be proclaimed, and to the surprise of those who were doing, greater numbers of Gentiles began to come in than of Jews, and as greater numbers of Gentiles began to come in, there were those who questioned it, but the true believers, the meek, the poor among men, they were rejoicing to see the extension of God's mercy, both to the Jews who were believing, and also to that great number of Gentiles. So I would not think that the meek here meant the new people who were coming, but meant the followers of Christ, the ones who were already ~~meek~~, who were rejoicing at the development. I would incline to think that that would be the way (9 1/2) (stu).

The Holy One of Israel is the Lord. (stu) Not necessarily. It could be the triune God. The triune God is the Holy One of Israel. Now of course Jesus is God so that you can find a fulfillment of it in the rejoicing in Jesus, but I don't think that anyone at this time would have to consider that it was anything other than simply God, the Holy One of Israel. (9 3/4)(stu) 19? No, oh, the whole verse, you mean. Yes. The meek rejoice in the Lord, the poor among men rejoice in the the Lord, the Holy One of Israel. I'd say it was just a parallel, but of course when the time comes, you can say the Holy One of Israel, which is God, is perhaps most specifically the second person of the trinity, the Lord Jesus Christ, but I don't think in advance that in this verse you would have to say, well, there is a new thought brought in there. This is referring specifically to Immanuel. I don't think anybody would have to say that, because

the Holy One of Israel is frequently used just for God. Of course, Jesus is God.

So then we have the general fulfillment of God's overcoming of evil and His establishment of righteousness in vv.20 and 21. That could fit any time when God works in a marvelous way. It does not necessarily point to any particular time the way that vv.17 and 18 do, but then when you come to 22, what do you think about 22, Mr. Golin? What do you think that talks about? (11.stu) Why it says, the Lord who redeemed Abraham, instead of saying the Lord who redeemed Jacob? (stu)

Going to fulfill (11 1/4)

that's what he says here. But

it looks as if he isn't, doesn't it? Jacob will not be ashamed, nor will his face wax pale. When Jacob sees his descendants turning away from the Word of God, forgetting the truth, showing indifference, not studying the Word, God turning aside from many of them. That would be plenty of reason for Jacob, for his face to wax pale, for him to be discouraged and disheartened, wouldn't it? But this says, Jacob will not be ashamed, nor will his face wax pale, why won't it? (12.stu.)

Speaking about here? (stu) Does he speak about any part? (stu) I doubt if he is in this verse speaking of any part. I think he is here speaking of the people of God, but I think he is speaking of the fact that Jacob, seeing great numbers of his physical descendants turning away from the Word of God and refusing to accept it, might be expected to grieve and his face turn pale, but to his surprise he sees their numbers made up, in fact increasing, he sees his spiritual descendants multiplying tremendously. And he sees in the midst of those who are his physical descendants who are also his spiritual descendants, he sees in the midst of them great numbers of new ones, who are not his physical descendants but are his spiritual descendants, and these are referred to, not as those who are descended from Jacob, but those who become Jacob's children because they are the work of God's hands, because God with His marvelous sovereignty has got them into the kingdom as described up in the verse 17, and 18, they are the blind and the deaf who have--God has marvelously given (13 1/2)

and so God calls them specifically the work of my hands, and these whom He calls the work of His hands because He has taken them from an unbelieving background and has brought them into the family of God, made them part of the witness, part of the people of God, these whom He mentions thus in v.23, He had in mind specifically I think when he mentioned Abraham in 22, because you might think, simply say that the Lord says, concerning the house of Jacob, Jacob will not be ashamed, you don't need the phrase, God who redeemed Abraham, why do you need that? The thought is complete without it, but you put it in to show that the way Jacob got into the kingdom in the first place was because God redeemed Abraham, then He redeemed Jacob also. But you might say Jacob...

19. (1/2)

...you might say Jacob is Abraham's child, Jacob is the heir of the covenant, Jacob is the child of promise, Jacob receives these blessings because God has promised Abraham, His friend, that his descendants will be blessed. You might say that. It is also true that God specifically redeemed Jacob. But this aspect of it is true, but this aspect does not enter in with Abraham at all. Abraham is taken from his kindred, from his family, from his connection, from his upbringing, the call to separate from it all, and to go out into the land that God will give him, he is called away from all of his background, he is specifically in God's sovereign power, brought into the kingdom, and so he refers specifically to Abraham, when He says to Jacob, Jacob is going to rejoice when he sees his true spiritual descendants tremendously increased in numbers, by the sovereignty of God, by God's bringing individuals who were part of Lebanon rather than of the fruitful field. He is going to rejoice in that and is going to realize that the God who did that is the God who redeemed Abraham, the God who brought Abraham in from an unbelieving background, so that is the sovereign power of God to choose whom He will, is now shown in His turning

to Lebanon and for a time away from the fruitful field. (stu) you suggested is practically identical with mine through v.24, 21 I mean. But then the only thing is you come to 22, and 22 says Jacob will not be ashamed, but why will he not be ashamed, v.23 says because he will see his children, the work of mine hands, in the midst of him. And the question is what that means? (stu) Isn't "his children" in apposition with the words "among them" , wouldn't it look that way?

That would be the (stu) The phrase "Holy One of Jacob," which is here in v.23 is identical with the phrase of 19, the Holy One of Israel, the two of them are regular terms used often by Isaiah, occasionally by other writers, for the Lord God. He is called the Holy One of Jacob or the Holy One of Israel, and of course Jesus is God so the term that can be applied to God can be applied to Jesus, but I doubt that there is evidence to say that it is specifically ~~te~~ applied to Jesus here. That is, I would think that it is rather applied to the triune God, rather than specifically to Jesus in these two passages. I don't see anything in the context that would require that it is specifically Jesus. There is no specific mention of Jesus in the context here. I think it is in the background, but whether that was understood by Isaiah or not, I don't know. (stu.3 1/2) Mr. Golin, what was your question? (3 3/4) Yes, I incline to feel that the picture of in v.22-23 is a picture of Jacob thought of looking down on his descendants, and seeing his descendants who are descendants according to the flesh but who also are the people of the promise, the people through whom God is going to bring blessing to the whole world, and he sees these people and he sees, as described earlier in the chapter, many of them indifferent many of them uninterested, many of them turning aside from carrying on the work of God as they should, and consequently the number of true believers among them is becoming less and as a result of that you would expect ~~them~~^{him} to be ashamed and his face wax pale, but the promise is given that he won't wax pale, because while we see the diminution in the number that are true believers who follow the Lord, yet he

sees this diminution made up by a great increase, and that number, that increase, would be the children, the work of mine hands, who are placed in the midst of it. When he sees the children who are the work of my hands, the children who are not simply his physical progeny, who were not his physical progeny, who were the work of mine hands, these put into the people of God, and greatly increasing their number, when he sees this, he will rejoice (5 1/2) and if so, that would be a parallel with v.18 to carry on the same idea, from just another aspect. Mr. Abbott? (5 1/2) Yes, so I will redeem them. As I redeemed--as the people of God, the family of God, started in the first place, not with Jacob, Jacob is the great father, the great but Jacob is the third in line, and Jacob has great blessings because of God's sovereign action in Jacob's life, but in addition to this, Jacob was also the repository of the promises given to Abraham and Isaac, he is, Jacob is the grandson of the one to whom the promises were given, but he is reminded of the fact that the way that the whole group started was by God's picking Abraham out of a heathen environment, taking one from among the heathen and with his sovereign power, telling him to come out and be separated from him, and found the people of God. So he is saying I am going to make a great increase in my people, from the forest, from grabbing those who were outside, by the sovereign power of God, by the work of His hands, bringing them in, so that just as Abraham was redeemed from outside, similarly Jacob is going to be among his physical descendants, that is among those of them who are part of his spiritual ones, who are the true Israel of God, among them he is going to be a great number, as by the sovereign power of God bringing them in from outside, just as He brought Abraham in. Yes, Mr. Gregory? (7) I had not really thought a great deal about 21 before. I have simply taken 21 in a general sense of God's overcoming evil. I take it in a general sense, but now that you suggest it, I see that the specific type of ^{evil} people which it speaks of, is the type of evil which was involved in the

crucifixion itself, so it is altogether possible that it does involve that particular aspect of evil, used as a figure for all evil, but using that one as a figure which exactly fits with (7 1/2)

I think that is a very interesting idea which I hadn't thought of before. Mr. Cohen? (7 3/4) V.20 and 21 you might take in a very general sense, they're going to rejoice in the Holy One of Israel because He is overcoming iniquity, he is destroying those who do terrible things, who do wicked things, such as some of these leaders of the people have been doing. You can take it in that very general sense. But he does describe a specific kind of evil, and he does bring it in ~~w~~ right in connection with the rejoicing of these who see out of darkness, the deaf and the blind, who are to be enabled to see, and the meek are going to rejoice in the Lord, now why are they going to rejoice? That the terrible one is brought to nought. Now it may be just a general statement of God's victory over evil, but what if you think of the possibility at this time of the turn^{ing to} of the gentiles, of specific reference being in it, and see whether it can fit ~~or~~ or not. Why, if you try to fit that in, the terrible one brought to nought could certainly refer to the smiting, the bruising of the serpent's head, the terrible one brought to nought. What the Lord did on Calvary. They are rejoicing, they see out of darkness, the Gentiles come to see the truth who before were absolutely in utter darkness, add the reason is because the message is brought to them, that Satan has been bruised through the tremendous act of the Lord at Calvary. Now that is not specifically stated (9 1/4) but it fits as far as time is concerned, and consequently one can examine it and see if it could be, not merely a general reference to God's overcoming of evil, but a specific reference to the way in which he particularly will overcome evil at that time, so if you do, the terrible one brought to nought could fit. Now, "the scorner" being consumed, that would hardly be a description of Satan I wouldn't think, but that "and all that watch for iniquity are cut off" could be a

general reference to the Lord, His ~~making~~ that which is going to draw a sharp line between those that follow Him and those that continue in evil. And here it speaks of the scorner, you think of the scornors and those who are involved in the crucifixion and in the persecution of him, and you read, those "that make a man an offender for a word, and lay a snare for him that reproveth in the gate," and you think right away of how he was rebuking the scribes and the Pharisees for their wickedness and they laid a plot for him, to get him at night when the people wouldn't see him, and to bring him and to get him condemned as a traitor against Rome, and make him an offender for a word, he said that he would rebuild this temple if we destroy it, and he said he was greater than Caesar, and so on, add turn aside the just for a thing of nought, and of course they gave 30 pieces of silver to get him turned over. Whether there is any specific reference in that, it certainly would not be clear enough for anybody in Isaiah's time to see, but which when the time came you could see him exactly fit; whether there is or not I'd have to give a bit further study to, but it's an interesting suggestion which I had never thought of before, and since I'm quite convinced we have the turning to the gentiles in vv.17 and 18, and also I believe in vv.22 and 23, it is an interesting thought that perhaps in the verses in between we have given in rather veiled language, but yet somewhat specifically things which might fit exactly that which then occurred, at the time when he turned to the Gentiles. So it's an interesting suggestion, which I'd have to study a bit further before I'd be ready to be sure it was right, but I certainly couldn't be at all sure it's wrong. That was very interesting. Mr. Miller? (11 3/4) ...that it wouldn't fit with the attitude which I found exemplified in a minor way in a fellow I was talking with a few years ago, who is now a teacher of ancient Babylonian in a great university in the far west, and he was telling me then about how he said he was the firstborn in his family, and he said that the firstborn were required on certain days to fast, and he said they didn't like to fast, so he said, there was another law that said

that when you finish reading a section of the scripture then you rejoice and feast because you rejoice, so he said when the day came when the firstborn had to fast, he said, two or three days before they would start reading in a section of scripture, in such a way that they would just finish the section of scripture the day before they were supposed to fast, so he said having one law that the firstborn was supposed to fast on that day but the other law that if you finished a section of scripture, you're allowed to feast and rejoice on that day, they could proceed to feast and rejoice.

Well, that's the watching for iniquity I would say, I don't think it is iniquity of the terrible type, but it's the indifferent type of using the scripture simply as an excuse to get your own pleasure out of it. It is watching for iniquity, isn't it? Looking for a chance to utilize things that should be ends in themselves, simply as means for your own comfort....

20 (1/2)

...the proper way to approach it is to take the word, take the phrase and see what else we find in the prophets, or in the Old Testament, which would have a parallel here and would therefore throw light on it, and we might find something which would throw great light upon it. Now here is where your commentaries are apt to be helpful. I find that the commentaries are very disappointing on the whole in their failure to take passages as a whole, what they're really trying to give us, and what their real meaning is, but that many of them are very good at taking a word and finding a parallel, finding a precise use somewhere else, suggesting interpretation, even if the interpretation they suggest isn't the right one, it calls your attention to something which you can consider and see if it throws light on it. Now that is the proper approach to any phrase like that. Now there is one other method of approach, but that is the proper approach. Yes, Mr. Cohen? (1 1/2) Yes, there is an interesting possibility that the same, what I just spoke of as this usage of getting around the law which they considered meant they should fast on a certain day, then ~~where~~ swear by the

gold, they say if you swear by the temple it's no good, but if you swear by the gold in the temple that's valid.

There's a story they tell about William the Conqueror, that William the Conqueror wanted to become the king of England and Edward the Confessor was king, and the next relative of Edward the Confessor would be either Harold the Saxon or William the Conqueror. William had a claim to it, and William had more power than Harold did though he was across the channel, over in England. And Harold was visiting William, Harold was planning to succeed Edward the Confessor as ~~king~~ king of England. William the Conqueror wanted to take over, so Harold was in France, in Normandy, visiting William the Conqueror, and William said to him, now he said, Harold, I feel that when Edward dies I should be the king of England, and he said will you swear that you will support me and help me in getting this? And Harold thought well he thought, ^{William} ~~Edward~~ said here is a piece of the true cross, if you would put your hand on this and swear why I would be so glad to have you do it. Well Harold knew William was a man of violence, he had rudely treated many before. If he told him that he was going to try to get to be king himself, William might kill him, at least make it impossible for him to get back to England, and he thought oh, that's supposed to be part of the true cross, it isn't at all, it's a fake, consequently an oath taken on that it is absolutely worthless, and perfectly all right to swear on that because the oath is meaningless, you don't have a real relic that's genuine.

So Harold said certainly I'll be glad to swear, give you every help I can toward it, so he put his hand on this piece of the true cross, which he knew was a fake, which William knew he knew was a fake, he puts his hand on that and makes his oath. And then as soon as he finished his oath, William the Conqueror lifts up the tablecloth and shows that under the cloth he has got some relics that are genuine relics, of which there is no question, and consequently he has sworn on genuine relics which makes his vow one that is absolutely binding, when he thought he was only saying

words because this wasn't a genuine relic. Well, that is of course, that sort of making a man an offender for a word, well, I think that perhaps comes more under the line of watching for iniquity, watching for a chance of iniquity. I would incline to think that making a man an offender for a word is more likely to mean causing a man to be convicted on the ground of a word which is ~~carelessly~~^{idly} spoken or misunderstood by the hearers, or something like that, but there again you'd want to find a parallel to these. But that would be my inclination to think that that particularly would fit under the watching for iniquity rather than under making a man an offender for a word. Yes? (4 3/4) I think our law today would consider that a promise made under a compulsion is not bidding. I think that would be a principle of law. If you grabbed a man down here and put a knife to his back and said sign this pledge that you'll pay me a hundred dollars a month for the rest of your life, and he would have your signature on that, your solemn promise, I think if you could prove that he put a knife to your back and made you do it, that it would not count as binding in law.

But whether in this there is a specific reference or not, I don't know, I never thought of it before, it's worth a bit of investigation to see whether it could be so interpreted, but if it can be so interpreted, it would be the sort of interpretation that when the time comes you see how it fits, not the sort that could tell somebody in advance what is going to happen. Because I don't think anybody at the time of Isaiah would figure this is talking about the Messiah, or about the redeemed, I do think they could tell, a man at that time carefully studying this, could tell that it is a turning to the Gentiles and substituting another group for the Jewish leaders as the real leaders of God's people. I think they should be able to get that out of it, but any reference here ~~should suffice~~ to Christ would be something you'd only see when the time came, if it fit, and it may be there. I am struck with a number of points which look very much in that direction. Well, we went back a bit but I think we got some ideas that were useful, and helpful, and perhaps even more than

what--Dr. Robert Dick Wilson used to say, I'm not interested in teaching Exegesis, but in training Exegetes, and I have the same feeling when it comes to telling you what I think every chapter in the Bible means, we could take the next fifty years and you'd get a lot that wasn't right anyway, but I am interested in teaching you to develop sound methods of interpretation, so that you can go on the rest of your life studying the Bible and finding out what it means. So perhaps from that viewpoint today was more fruitful day than the days when I do 95% of the talking. Oh, I didn't announce the assignment. (break in record, starting again at 7 3/4)

...a very interesting suggestion last time, which I hadn't thought of before, that when it tells about the calling of the Gentiles that then those two verses in vv.20 and 21 are referred specifically to that time, a very interesting suggestion, because otherwise they seemed ^{rather} ~~very~~ general verses, you just wonder how they do fit in the whole context, but the meek is going to rejoice in the Lord, when the deaf hear the words of the book, and the eyes of the blind see out of obscurity, it seems very reasonable, but then v.20, for the terrible one is brought to nought. Does that mean a special defeat ministered to the devil? Or if not, just what does it mean? And the scorner is consumed, that could of course be parallel. But all that watch for iniquity are cut off--is a very peculiar phrase, and any interpretation of the passage--if it means the end of all people connected with wickedness, why then it would certainly, unless it referred to the very end of the age, refer simply to that which was done in principle, and it was done in principle (9)

I don't know of any other time that could possibly refer, except the very end of the age. And those that watch for iniquity, but then going on, that make a man an offender for a word, and lay a snare for him that reproveth in the gate, and turn aside the just for a thing of nought, that verse could certainly describe exactly what was done by the enemies of Christ, exactly how they treated him. Of course, it is not given here in the sense of expressing a description of those great events which are coming,

but the selection of these particular things to mention is very peculiar, and just how it would specifically with Isaiah's time I don't think we have any way of knowing, any evidence whatever. Many things it might have been said, the picking up of this specifically, to say at this point would fit very accurately with Christ, I would think, and I don't know, of the many things that might be said as to the wickedness, just why this particular one would be selected to put here, unless that was the reason, so I thought it was a very interesting suggestion, and while I can't say that I feel that ~~we have~~ it is proven, I must say that I feel at present as if the balance of probability is in that direction very definitely. And it is a suggestion I want to look into further.

But then the passage goes on with v.22 which I feel, well, did we discuss 22 last time? I know we did time before last. But last time we discussed 22? What did we say 22 meant, or what did we feel, Mr. Grauley, that it meant? (10 1/2) Try to put it in a couple of words, I would incline to say something like that this: at the time of the turning to the Gentiles, Jacob, thought of as the father of the faithful will not be ashamed, that is to say, at the time when the fruitful field is esteemed as the forest, at the time when God's mercy seems to turn away from Israel, Jacob the father of Israel will not be ashamed, because he will realize that though for a time being, many of his (now this goes into 23) natural progeny will be outside the camp, yet that the true olive tree, the true descendants of Israel, will be vastly increased in number. But when he sees his children, the work of mine hands, when he sees the new addition, that is, that when, as you see the mercy of God seeming to depart and many losing out, as you see the characteristics described in the verses earlier, coming out to their natural effect, you would think that he would be ashamed, and to see this result, and he should be, except that God is introducing an offsetting factor, which is going to result in his not being changed, because the misery that this brings is offset by a new great joy, and what that great joy is, there

is preparation made for it, in v.22, with referring to Abraham. God who redeemed Abraham--it lays the foundation for it, but doesn't yet tell us what it is, and in v.23 we are told what it is, so that v.22 I would say it is the negative, ~~yes~~ he won't be ashamed, but that 23 gives the reason why, that is, that he *rejoices in the great* extension of God's people. I would say, for instance, that in 22 the important part in 22 isn't Abraham, it is Jacob, but Abraham is introduced as a preparatory thought to what follows. It lays foundations for 23, it actually, as far as 22 is concerned, a minor thing. The great good God has done it. If you described the ~~great~~ good God, in such a way as to remind you of the fact that in the past He has acted without reference to the family, and as in His sovereign will picked out the founder of all this family out of a background of heathenism, and so you're just incidentally told that that's what the great good God has done in the past, but the big thing you're told now is Jacob isn't going to have the ~~great~~ disappointment that you would think he would have to have, when you think of all of the misery that would come to him from seeing the failure of his natural descendants. ~~Then~~ Then you go on in 23 and see why you won't because he has a great number, a tremendous number of spiritual descendants, making up 30 times over numerically for the ones who are lost for the time being, from the physical viewpoint. Yes? . . .

21. (1/2)

. . .in mind certain parallels. I feel that taking it just as it stands, it lends itself to the interpretation I've given, but when that feeling is based simply upon the words here or upon my recollection of certain parallels, I'm not sure. Let's just speak of the words for a minute, apart from the parallel. The way the words alone impressed me is thus says the Lord, Jacob will not now be ashamed, neither will his face now wax pale, the implication seems to me is, you would expect he would, when a fruitful field is turned into a forest, when God does a marvelous work among these people ~~and~~ so the wisdom of their wise men perish, and the understanding of their prudent men

is hid. And ~~they're~~ ^{their} turning of things upside down is ~~a theme that the father~~ ^{esteemed as the potter's} clay, you would think that now when God does these things Jacob would be terribly ashamed and his face wax pale, but it won't be, the way you would expect, it won't be that way because of a new factor, which is going to the subject. Now the reason I say that, let me, before we part from this perhaps just finish this thought, that it impresses me that I would get that thought just from the words alone, but maybe I wouldn't, maybe in saying that, I am passing it upon my recollection of parallels. Let's look at the parallel I have in mind.

I have a feeling that there are quite a number of parallels but I don't think of them now. But there is one I think of very definitely, and this one may be what is in the back of my mind that makes me feel that that is the right way to interpret it. That is, if you turn to Micah 4, you find in Micah 4 that in v.8, it says, and though, O tower of the flock, the strong hold of the daughter of Zion, unto thee shall it come, even the first dominion; the kingdom shall come to the daughter of Jerusalem. There is going to be a great worldwide rule, with its headquarters in Jerusalem. That is a wonderful promise. Now he immediately follows up that promise with "Now why dost thou cry out aloud? is there no king in thee? is thy counsellor perished?" He is saying, that now is referring to a different time. He says now there is a certain time we're going to think of. Why is there going to be a time when you're in such misery? Well, he says, "Be in pain, labour to bring forth, O daughter of Zion...for now shalt thou go forth out of the city; ~~and th-~~ He is

(3)

Thou shalt dwell in the field, thou shalt go to Babylon; there shalt thou be delivered; there the Lord will redeem thee. Then he says now also many nations are gathered against thee. When? When they're in Babylon? Certainly not. And I don't think this refers to the time before they go to Babylon. I think this refers either to Sennacherib, which is most likely, or to the Maccabeans, but it's another time introduced with not. Now also many nations are

gathered ~~against~~ thee. And he describes that and then he starts the next verse, --next chapter: Now gather thyself in troops, he has laid siege against us, that's pointing to the Babylonian conquest. He refers to three different times, introducing each with (3 3/4)

By now, meaning now, in the time of which I am speaking, the time which I picture before you. And that's my feeling from ~~the~~ case, that now, in the time when these things are done ~~we've~~ ^{he has} been describing, now in that time when I picture, the result will not be what might be expected. Jacob will not have the sorrow one might expect, because although there is a decline to his physical descendants, a decrease in the number then who in the family of God, for a time. Yet there is an offsetting factor, which would make the true Israel rejoice, in an offsetting factor, a tremendous increase, when Lebanon is turned into a fruitful field. Mr. Grauley? (4 1/2) I hadn't thought of that as being included in it, but it certainly could be a fact. As he would see his descendants following the characteristics described in vv.9-13, and of course if he would see Ahaz' scheme in forgetfulness of God and all that, he ~~would~~ be ashamed, but it seems to me that the being ashamed and his face turning pale, is probably not thinking so much of a moral reaction as, you might say, a disappointment, that is, a decline. If you take it in a ~~moral~~ material way like that, it would be simply the turning away from Israel as a whole for a time. But it is true, that if you think of it in the moral direction, which may be the right way, I hadn't thought of it before, but it may very well be, that you're thinking that all this description he has given, forasmuch as this people honors me with their mouth but their heart is far from me, that Jacob has been greatly ashamed, on account of all this, but now he will not be ashamed, because God brings in a new factor. I don't know, between the two, I think I incline a little more towards the other, I see a little difficulty each way but perhaps a little less this way. (stu.5 3/4) It is the imaginary, well I don't know as you'd say imaginary, we don't know of course, how much one who is dead knows about his posterity, how much direct interest he has

in them, so that I can't say it is not the actual but I would think of the picture rather as being an imaginary picture of an ancestor thought of as looking upon the state of his descendants, and from that viewpoint thinking of him as the father of physical Israel, but even more as the father of the people of the (6 1/2) the ancestor of the true Israel, the father of all those who are God's people, who are in the land of promise. And, that we should be justified in drawing from it that Jacob personally, as a real entity, is in mind, I think would be going further than we are entitled to. I think, that we think of it as a figurative mode of expression, which may be literally true, perhaps ought to be, but I don't think that's what's in the prophets mind, necessarily, as he speaks. Because we don't read often about Jacob's reaction to this, that and the other thing that happened, but when you say, Jacob, though not now is he embarrassed, nor not will his face wax pale, you think of how the imaginary ancestor, if he sees these things, how naturally he would feel, but yet you say there is a new factor so that he need not feel that way, he can rejoice because of what God has done. The God who redeemed Abraham supplies him with new children, the work of God's hands. Well, Mr. Grauley, what was your suggestion? (7 1/2) I incline to think that that suggestion would be very excellent if it said now saith the Lord who made the covenant with Abraham, but when it says the Lord who redeemed Abraham, it seems to me the emphasis is on redemption, rather than on covenant, and of course we don't find many specific statements in the scripture about God redeeming Abraham. The great emphasis is on Abraham as the friend of God, Abraham as the man who followed as God led, Abraham the man who was the pilgrim and a stranger upon the earth, and Abraham the one with whom God made a covenant that he was going to bless all nations through his seed. But the thought of God as the redeemer of Abraham is one that we-- God is the one who redeemed Israel out of Egypt. There are many aspects where we find God as the redeemer greatly stressed. In Isaiah, in 40-66 it is often said to

have erred in spirit, but what basis is there in the Hebrew for the "also?" ? How much basis do you find in Hebrew for an also?...

22. ~~(1/2)~~ (1/2)

...by simply saying "and the ones erring in spirit shall know understanding. (3/4)

And shall fear the God of Israel,

and the ones erring in spirit shall know understanding. So that as far as the Hebrew is concerned there is no actual warrant for the "also." It is not wrong though. Instead of saying "and" they shall, you could say "they also shall", but it does imply very strongly that there is a change of thought, and we had the same thing back in chapter 29 where ~~he~~ he said "moreover." It was just a wau. The King James translates it "moreover." It seems to me that in modern English, instead of moreover, "however" would be much better. Maybe in Old English, "moreover" meant what we mean by "however" now, I don't know. But there is a "moreover" starting at a verse early in chapter 29, which is just a wau, Now in this case there is just the also. But the fact they use the also, I'm not sure the King James interpreters thought this way, but I incline to think they did, ~~the~~ and if the "also" were there, I would think there were two strong reasons for thinking this was the Jews, this verse, so one is the contrast with v.18, and that the other is the "also," but since the also is purely a matter of translation, we have to base it on ~~just~~ just one reason, and that weakens it, considerably. Although, I incline to think the "also" must have come because somebody saw it this way. Whether it was the King James translators, whether it was Martin Luther's, because they used Luther's Bible a lot in making their translation, whether it was Tyndale in this translation, which they say three-fourths of the words of the King James Version were taken directly from Tyndale, 80 years before, 90 years before. Or whether it was St. Jerome, because after the Vulgate ~~was~~ (2 1/2)

I don't know. It would be an interesting little paper. But the "also" certainly fits with the idea, that now we have a change. And if you just say "and the ones erring,"

Israel, God is your redeemer, but I just don't recall it being said much about Abraham's children, so it seems to me that the, here the emphasis is not simply on Abraham but on Abraham as how God redeemed Abraham, and that brings in the thought that he redeemed him not because there was any family factor entering in to it, in that case, because God promises to extend His mercy to thousands of generations of those that love Him. God deals very definitely with families, that's very clear. But in the case of Abraham that would not enter in. He dealt with him as out of an ungodly family, in an ungodly day. So it is not just the word Abraham, but the redeemed Abraham, that leads me to think that that is what is here being stressed. That when he says ~~the~~ children, the work of his hands, Abraham was the work of his hands, Of course, Jacob was too, Jacob was a marvelous instance of God's sovereignty when he took a man who was naturally more selfish and naturally so inclined to ~~self-~~ self-seeking in every way as Jacob was, and redeemed him and regenerated him, and made him one who could be called a prince of God, that is in a way a greater illustration of God's sovereignty than his treatment of Abraham, but as far as the family point is concerned, you might say the goodness ^{to} of Jacob was fulfilling a promise to Abraham, while the goodness to Abraham was pure grace. That would be my inclination in that case. Any further questions?

Well, then, v.23, but when he sees his children the work of mine hands-- there certainly is a stress there, that is a very unusual phrase, his children the work of my hands, in the midst of him. If it isn't a reference to bringing the Gentiles in to the family of God it is very peculiar phrasing. And it fits that perfectly, I don't know what else (10 3/4)

They shall sanctify my name and sanctify the Holy One of Jacob, and shall fear the God of Israel. Who is the χ "they" there, when he sees this, they will-- it would seem to me, since it is tied up with the "he" there, it should include the "he." Surely the "they will sanctify my name" means Jacob and all the others who are the

leaders of the family of God, leaders of the people of God. Who else is the "they" otherwise? Jacob is going to rejoice and praise God for what He has done, but not only will Jacob, so will Abraham and Isaac, so will all the leaders of God's people. They will ~~praise~~ praise God for what He has done. But then we come to v.24, and what do you think, Miss Luke, v.24 is talking about? Yes, I would incline to feel that way for two reasons. One is an inadequate reason, the other I think is an adequate reason. First, let me mention what I think is an adequate reason, that is if you contrast v.24 with v.18. V.18 says the deaf, those who have no natural ability to do it, they will receive a wonderful gift of God's grace in being enabled to see out of darkness. And this is the contrast, these are not those who are unable, but those who have been unwilling, those who have wandered, those who have erred, and this would seem to tie back with the attitude of the people who refused to read the book, who honor with their mouth but their heart is far from Him. There is a contrast there which seems to me to justify thinking that verse 24 is a different group from the group in the previous verses. I would incline to feel that we're justified in that by the contrast between the erring and the actually being deaf and blind, that it is going back to v.17 when Lebanon becomes a fruitful field, and a fruitful field becomes a forest, and saying ^{well,} this fruitful field that has become a forest is going to again become a fruitful field. And that would tie up with Romans where it says, so all Israel shall be saved, ^{with} the references ~~//~~ to Israel as a nation ~~being~~ born in a day. Now I incline to think we're justified in that interpretation from the context, between this verse and v.18, and its likeness to the thought of the previous verses. I am not sure however that I would have thought of that, if it were not for the fact that I incline to think the King James translators thought of it first. Or maybe if they didn't, maybe they copied, maybe St. Jerome thought of it first, and they copied him, I don't know, I haven't looked it up in the Vulgate to see, but the word "also" seems to me to say that we have now been talking about the Gentiles, then also those who

well, you don't have that idea at all. Yes? (2 3/4) Because they have not translated the "and". If they said, "and they also," the also would have to be attached, because the wau would be translated by the "and." But they have translated the wau by an "also" which is perfectly possible but a bit unusual. And since they have not done so, very much before, you take v.18, starts "and in that day shall the deaf hear"-- you could have said "also in that day shall the deaf hear," or "in that day the deaf also shall hear." But it doesn't. And I don't think it should because I think that 18 is just saying what was said in 17. But they have chosen to translate the wau by an "also," and doing so, it represents a word of the Hebrew. Of course this matter of italics is a difficult one. There are many cases where in English we have to have a certain word to make sense. You don't have to have it in the Hebrew but the Hebrew implies it. Well, then why put it in italics, it is required by the Hebrew, the Hebrew means it. It is a question. It is very difficult to know when you should put it-- well, let's put it this way. There are many cases where there is no question, italics should not be used, you have a Hebrew word represented by an English word, which should not be used. There are cases where you put your Hebrew words together and it is very hard to make sense out of it. And in order to make sense you have to assume something, and it is rather uncertain what you should assume, but you have to assume something or it makes no sense. Therefore you assume something and you do your reader a great favor by putting that in italics, so that he knows this is your assumption, this is not to be considered as if it was God's word. But then in between there are many cases where the Hebrew definitely requires something to get the thought across in English and where it is perfectly obvious from the context that that is what it meant and the Hebrew reader would understand it fully, and in those cases, since there is no specific Hebrew word for it, you can see you *have to put it in italics*, and on the other hand, since the Hebrew does definitely mean it, you can say putting it in italics is confusing, so that there are those cases, many cases where

there is no question, italics are right, but there are cases where there is question of whether you should use italics or not. So that the result is that some people like the Revised Standard Version, they say, why put it in italics, it doesn't add anything, they don't put it in any italics. And if what they put in is clearly unrelated to what is in the Hebrew, they put a footnote and say, "Hebrew omits" so and so. And Hebrew never omitted, they just added it, but they say, "Hebrew omits." I think the italics are a little better than that. But in this particular case, the question of whether to say "and" or whether to take κ it "also," is a question of discretion, but it is a very considerable exercise of discretion, and certainly we have no right to build an argument on the English fact that it's altered. Except to say that is what the King James writers thought. Whether they thought (6 1/4) copied it from some previous man who got it, somebody made a highly^{thought of} translation of the Bible, but I consider there was a break here, rather than just a continuation. Mr. Gregory? (6 1/2). In v.23 there, that when he sees his children the work of my hands, I don't see grammatically how you can parse it other than that what he sees is his children and that what he sees is the work of my hands. In other words, he sees his children who are the work of my hands, and therefore that he is seeing children that are different from the normal children. (6 3/4) that he sees something wonderful that God has done which causes him to rejoice, and then he is reminded of the fact that in the previous verse, in a little parenthetic phrase, he reminded them of the fact that Abraham was called by God, the work of God's hand, called by His sovereign grace, rather than showing his continuing resting upon a family. And similarly His sovereign grace is going to bring into the family those from outside, just as Abraham was brought in to the family of God. That's very important in my opinion, in the interpretation of the whole passage, to have that clear. The last part of the verse, I find it a little bit awkward that it changes to a "they" instead of a "he." Three verses in the "they." But I suggest that it includes

with Jacob the others who are thought of as the leaders of God's people. I know of no other explanation for the "they." But when Jacob sees his children in the midst of him, his children will sanctify my name, and sanctify the Holy One of Jacob, and fear the God of Israel. I don't say it's impossible. It might be. Jacob will not now be ashamed nor will his face wax pale, but when he sees his children, he will see them sanctifying my name, sanctifying the Holy One of Jacob, fearing the God of Israel, and then, implied, therefore he will rejoice. That's not impossible. In fact, it may be better, I'm just not sure. There is an interesting change there. It seems a little strange to say ~~he~~ won't now be ashamed, neither will his face wax pale, but when he sees his children the work of my hands, and then just stop, implying that he will rejoice instead of being ashamed. It seems as if it requires a further statement about Jacob, but it may be implied in why he does being because he sees what these children are doing. It is a little difficult either way, I'm not at all sure. ^(stu.) He and the children rather than he and and the leaders. Now that's interesting idea here. When he sees these children. He and these children will do that. I don't know, it's very interesting. There is a third point that --and I'd like to have a decision between the three, but I don't at the moment feel able to make one. Yes, Mr. Miller? (9 1/2) Don't do much with it. I don't think they do. I was ^{when I saw} thrilled ~~this~~, in this, all these different strands seemed to me to fit together, that this is what he is predicting. And then the parallel to Isa. 7 seems to me to be a strong assurance that it is correct, that what he tells there in relation to the king there, here he tells in relation to the leaders and the nobles. And all these little strands seem to me to fit ~~g~~ together and to give it. But I doubt if you'll find many commentaries that give it. There is this tendency--I find commentaries on the whole quite disappointing because the tendency of most commentaries is to take a word and tell you some interesting things about this word, or this phrase. This word here is found also there and there, and they bring in some very interesting things about it,

but what the passage means, what the progress of thought really is, I find most of the commentaries quite disappointing. Now I believe you would find some that would bring out at least to some extent the progress of thought as we have here, but I can't say with certainty just which ones. I'm not at all sure you'll find any that have worked out in detail like (10 3/4)

But I

think we have a full warrant for not thinking it strange if we find such a thing, because if the statement in § 1 Peter says that when they prophesied of the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow, they searched, trying to determine what and what manner of time the spirit of Christ that was in them did signify, when he testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow. We have no warrant there for believing that there is specific teaching relating to the work of Christ and the things connected with the work of Christ, in the Old Testament, which would not have been obvious to the writers when they first wrote it. We have specific warrant for that. Now we don't to read things in, but when you read a passage and you say well what did you talk about, just general exhortation, or is there some specific meaning? Well, this sounds as if there is some specific meaning (12)

It doesn't sound like just general exhortation.

What is the specific meaning? There are many places where I don't know what the specific meaning. But I believe there is ^{one, and in this case,} ~~a specific meaning~~ it just seems to me that so many different factors converge and fit together and I don't know of any real problem with this interpretation and I don't know any other interpretation that makes it anything other than just a series of more or less unconnected verses. But I don't think the problem, the difficulty that the Jewish commentators have had with it is any greater than the average Christian commentator. They don't find, I think, what is really (12 3/4)

Yes, Mr. Abbott? As between

the three possible interpretations, you incline then rather strongly ^{toward the one} that it is the children? (stu.) Except that they won't do that when he sees them in the midst,

they'll do it all the time. Yes. I am very uncertain between those three. I can see advantages to each one. I can see very great advantages the way you're speaking. Very great. I think over the one I had previously taken it, that it was Jacob and the other leaders, Israelites, there is a great advantage over that, because the language, it doesn't say then you will rejoice, or then they will rejoice, but then they will sanctify, they will fear the name and so on, that seems to fit the children, more than it does him, on the other hand, from the logical progress of thought, it seems to me that you more or less expect an opposite to (14) that he will rejoice. You sort of expect what he is going to do. So that I'm just not sure, but I am ^{inclining} ~~moving~~ a way from the one I suggested before, toward either that or the other suggestion Mr. Vannoy made, that (14 1/4)

(stu) No. (stu.) I feel a little difficulty grammatically, but I would like to find a grammatical parallel. If you can find another passage that is grammatically parallel to it, that would settle it, but that's not easy. If you have the problem in mind, it's hard to know where to look to find such a parallel to a thing like that. But if you have the thing in mind, then when you're studying and reading, all of a sudden some time you come across something that's remarkably parallel to this, and then you look at it and you see how it fits. It may be dealing with an entirely different subject, but grammatically, it may be quite parallel, and then you'll see that and you'll say my that that gives warrant for this, or that gives warrant against this. One won't prove it, but one will strongly urge one against the other, if you find three or four, it would probably prove it...

23. (3/4)

...I think we're justified in considering it as the conversion of the Jews at the end of the age. Jacob rejoices in the new addition of the family of God from the wild branches which are grafted in to the olive tree, but that in addition the natural branches will again be grafted in, which is certainly strongly implied in Romans 11, that's not

clearly expressed there but certainly strongly implied. Then we take up v.30 and here surely the archbishop made a change of chapter division at a *correct* place. The, 29, flows straight along continuously, and it would be very hard to make a break in the thought because it is tightly bound together, but when you start with 30, you are, well, v.1 of 30, maybe I spoke too rapidly, v.1 of 30 could just be tied right up to v. 1 of 29. V.1 of 30 could be a direct continuation of the first half of 29, so that whether there is such a sharp break here, he is moving forward in thought, he has looked ahead to the distant, not extremely distant, he's looked ahead maybe 30 years, what 's going to happen to Jerusalem when Ahaz' clever scheme brings its bitter results, in the attack of Sennacherib. And then how God is going to intervene and deliver them. The real --perhaps actually you might say it would be more logical to start chapter 29 at v.9, because the first part follows so logically on from everything in 28, but then in 9 he directs himself back to the rulers again, discusses their character, discusses their attitude, shows God's eventual turning to the Gentiles, then he comes back to the immediate again, discusses their character, why does he bring Egypt into it, what's Egypt got to do with it? One answer that is given to that is to say , now, we have added on material he wrote five years later, ten years later, this is not part of the same (3 1/4) discourse. ----- The other interpretation which impresses me as more likely is that he is continuing in the same discourse, but that in the same discourse, he is dealing with the same answer which they give to the situation. The answer which is in their minds. He says, you think you'll get deliverance from Israel and Syria by calling in Assyria to help, but it won't work. You should have trusted God in the first place. Well, they say, he says, you'll be face to face with Assyria, you'll be in terrible trouble. They answer, well, if that comes the way you say, you're a prophet of doom anyway, aren't you, trying to look on the dark side of things. Here we're going to get relief through friendship with Assyria, isn't that wonderful. You say Assyria is going to injure us, well, if they

do, we'll trust Egypt

So he says, well,

all right, so you turn to Egypt, what good will Egypt do? So he deals with their questions. They're carrying on the same method that they're using now, only they're extending it a little further. Yes? (stu.) (4 1/2) That is an interesting question. It is closer, but it's in the opposite direction. When the British, now I had an illustration, about Poland, oh yes:

When the British said to Hitler, don't attack Poland, they said, in 1939, Hendrickson said to the British, he said don't attack Poland, it is bound to us with an alliance, why should you attack Poland. They said, be friends with us, look at Russia, look at the Great Bolshevik enemy, attack the Bolsheviks, that would be more sensible than to attack Poland. Well, Hitler's foreign minister took down a tape recording secretly some time before this, what the British Ambassador said, and then he played it to the Russians, and when the Russians heard it that helped them to make their alliance with Russia. But when Hitler began attacking Poland, the British said to Poland, we'll defend you against Hitler, well, now the British couldn't help Poland against Hitler. The British declared war against Germany because Germany attacked Poland, well, what good does it do Poland, here the British--Hitler just went in and conquered Poland. But the Russians also, the British said to Poland we'll help you against Hitler, the British asked Russia, won't you help the Polish? Russia said, sure we'll be glad to help the Poles, they said to the Poles we'll be glad to help you against Russia, just open up your border, let us bring our troops in and we'll deliver you from Hitler. Well the Poles said we're just as much afraid of you as we are of Hitler. They said if we let you come in to our land we might as well let Hitler come in. See what I mean to say is Poland was between Russia and Germany, and the only way Poland could get protection through Russia from Germany was to let the Russians come right in. Well, now, you might say that in this immediate situation Israel is between Egypt and, I mean Judah is between Egypt and Ephraim and Syria, and the

thought, you say to the ~~Russians~~ ^{Egyptians} down there, you help us, the only way you could help is to bring their forces right into your land, and that's a pretty dangerous thing to do, but you say to Assyria over the other side, you protect us, they come in and attack from the rear, they take them (7 1/4) you're not in danger, so that as long as you had your choice between the two, the thought would never occur to you to go to Egypt for help if you could get it from Assyria. But then when he says now Assyria is going to be right next to you, well, they say, we'll play the powers off against each other, we'll go to Egypt. They might have gone to Egypt in the first place, but I think that's the reason why it wouldn't even have occurred to them at first. Well, I guess we have to stop until tomorrow.

(break in record, starting again at 9:)

...discussing the 29th and 30th chapters of the book of Isaiah. And after we noticed how the 29th chapter begins with that marvelous prediction of God's deliverance of the people from the attack of Sennacherib, by His wonderful power alone, and then we saw that criticism of the character of the people who were not following Him as they should. Then we ~~enter~~ ^{ended} with the glorious promise of God's calling, turning to the Gentiles, calling out from the Gentiles those who would be members of the family of God during this age, ending in the 24th verse with the conversion of Israel as a nation at the end of the age.

Now in chapter 30 we noticed that we can consider 30 as a continuation of the address which Isaiah gave at this banquet of the nobles who were celebrating Ahaz' ungodly scheme. Or we can consider that he wrote a continuation of it at a later time. I don't quite feel we should think of it as something written years later and unconnected, because the problems are so closely connected and there is such a continuation of thought, but the first verse of 30 would seem to have a reminiscence of the plan of Ahaz to get deliverance from the attack of Israel by a means other than that which God wanted him to have. Where do you find this reminiscence particularly

Mr. Abbott? Something in that first verse which also refers back to the error he is criticising. What is that, Mr. Abbot? (10 3/4) "...take counsel, but not of me"-- there the Lord is criticising them because they are not looking to Him for their guidance, for their leading. In those days God sent His prophets to tell His people what to do. And the main burden of the prophets' message is, follow the Lord and put Him first, instead of your human ideas of human advantage. In these days the Lord does not ordinarily speak directly to us, He speaks to us through His ~~words~~^{word,} but He wants us to get our counsel from His word, rather than from what seems to us to be the effective way to do ~~some~~ something.

Then we go on to v.2 here, and in v.2, Mr. Gregory, what is the theme there in v.2? ^(stu. 11 1/2) He points out that in v.2 here he is going further with the discussion of Ahaz. Of course not directly with Ahaz, but it's the idea that Ahaz has ~~discussed~~^{discussed} with the nobles, he is either showing what they think then, or what they will think later, which they certainly did. If this plan didn't work, then they seek another similar plan, if Assyria, protecting them against ^{Israel,} Assyria comes against them, then they'll go to Egypt, and so how far does he go on talking about this matter of looking to the Egyptians for help, Mr. Greeley? (12) Through v.7, yes. Through v.7 is all one united theme. The discussion of the looking to Egypt for help against Assyria, and he points out that this will not succeed. God says their strength is to sit still. You trust the Egyptians, they've got a big name, a big reputation, but God says the day of Egypt's greatness is over, Egypt won't be of much help to you.

There is also another lesser and yet vital objection that he raises to going to Egypt. Mr. Golin, could you tell us what that is? (12 3/4) Well, yes, that's the thought though that is brought out in v.7, isn't it? Their strength is to sit still. There is another point. Mr. Gregory? (13 1/4) Well, that of course is the big point here, that they're not to look to that which is ungodly for their help. It is--they're God's people, they should use God's methods, and do what God directs, but--that's

the big main point, but the specific point for Egypt is, you're looking to Egypt to help, Egypt won't profit you. As He says at the end of v.7 and at the end of v.6 in this chapter, Egypt won't be able to do as you expect them to. But then there is a lesser point also that's brought out in the middle of these verses, quite a different point. Mr. Golin, do you have that in mind? ...

24. (1/2)

...well, that is the point just given, that Egypt is weak, it looks strong, but they're weak. But still a different point. Let's get at it this way. Mr. Vannoy, what is the point of v.6. (1) Yes, but what's the point of it? He says in v.6, the burden of the beast of the south, and describes animals going to Egypt, one after another, going this long difficult trip, going through this difficult country there, making that long trip down there, and what is the big point that he is stressing it for, just that it's a beautiful sight, camels wending through the desert? What is the point of it? Well, that's the point we've already got. They're going to a people that won't profit them. The Egyptian strength is to stand still. But there is another point. Why talk about all the animals, why all the treasure, what is the stress in all that, Mr. Abbott? (1 3/4) Yes, it's expensive. His point is you are expending a tremendous lot on this scheme. That's his point. His point is that you are sending all these treasures off, you're sending camel after camel, animals, all this (2) it's expensive sending these animals, it's expensive buying all this treasure to send, it's expensive doing all this, after you do it all, it won't profit you, that's the big point, it won't profit you, that's expressed in verse after verse here. But the subsidiary point is, not only will it not profit you to look to Egypt to help but you're going to spend an awful lot while you're going it. And that is a point that Christ brings out. He says, what shall it profit a man, if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul. In other words, what He says is, if you are expending all sorts of effort and struggle in order to get what won't profit you anyway, you lose your soul,

what good is it to you? Your life, without your soul, your whole existence is worthless, but you are spending a lot for that. Here is a man who ^{is lazy and} sits around and loaf and takes it easy, and he has a little pleasure of this type ^{and} of that, but he doesn't amount to anything. Well, ~~we're~~ we're very sorry to see it, and we say that man is not serving the Lord, he is not doing anything worthwhile, he is lost, his life is worthless, and we feel bad about it, but we feel twice as bad, at least I do, when I see somebody who is really out there trying to do something, he is working hard, he is pushing, struggling, he is working up a brilliant scheme, and I know that he is working for the bread that perishes, and history is full of examples of men who have worked and toiled and struggled, and shown most admirable perseverance and most wonderful initiative and energy in trying to accomplish things, and it was all for an ungodly purpose, for their own self-aggrandizement, for their own pride, for their own luxury, or something that wouldn't last, wouldn't amount to anything, it was for something that wouldn't profit, and they put all this energy, all this effort, all this expense on to it, so he stresses here, you think you're going to look to Egypt for help, well, Egypt won't profit you, Egypt won't give you the help you want, but he is also stressing the fact, that in looking to Egypt, you're going to have to go to an awful lot of expense. You're going to have to send tremendous amounts of tribute down to Egypt, you can send a little bit up to Tiglath-pileser, it's a fair amount but I mean it is not a tremendous amount, because Tiglath-pileser wants to get rid of these people, he wants to get so he is right next to them, but when you go down to Egypt, you're between Egypt and Assyria, and you asked Egypt to come up and help you against Assyria, well Assyria is out of their way, doesn't do them ^{great} any good to help you, so they will charge you a tremendous amount of of booty and then when they get it, you'll find they don't profit you any anyway. So that is stressed all through here, that if the people, v.5 says, that will not help nor profit, v.6 says to a people that will not profit, v.7 says the Egyptians will help in vain and to no purpose, there-

fore have I cried concerning this, Their strength is to sit still. In other words, you are looking to a false place to get what you need, but not only that, you're looking there is going to cost you ~~not only~~ a tremendous expenditure, and when you get through with all this expenditure, you just won't have anything to show for it. So that is his big theme in vv.1-7 here, you think you'll find protection from Assyria in Egypt, well God says that Egypt won't give you it, you'll go to tremendous expense trying to get it and when you get through, it'll all be just a lie. You will not get what you want from Egypt. And then in v.8 he says, now to write it in a book, write it in a book. Why does he say this in v.8? Do you think that this means that the ~~verse~~ verse before about the Egyptians not profiting is one of the most outstanding statements in the Bible, and therefore it should be spread, that this should be written in a book for the time to come? Is that why this verse is here, or why do you think it's here?

Mr. Gregory? (5 3/4) A very good point. Yes, this is something which will take time to fulfill, you spend, and you spend, and you spend and you spend, and then when the time comes you look back and somebody says, well, Isaiah told us this all the time, another says oh I don't think he did, his emphasis was different than that. He says here is something that you will see the proof of at a later date, so write it down in a book, have it here definitely before them, the witness, so there is no question about it. Our Lord Jesus Christ tells us when He was on earth here, gave many wonderful predictions that aren't in the Scripture at all. You remember when he saw one of the disciples just before he was called and he said, behold, an Israelite in whom is no guile, ~~and~~ John 1, and the man said, where did you know me? He said, before you were called, when you were under the fig tree, I saw you. The man, said, Master, thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel. Jesus says, do you say that because I noticed you this way, and knew this about your heart? He said, you'll see greater things than these. In other words, Jesus gave a proof right then of the fact that He was God because He was able to have knowledge that nobody else had.

And we have a few of them in the gospels but He probably did that sort of thing many, many times. But when He gave a prediction about what was going to happen thousands of years later, when He described the end of the age, when He gave things like that, it was important they be written down in a book, for the time to come, so that as they're fulfilled you can see that what Jesus said actually is coming to pass. We can see the proof that He is what He claims to be, that He is the Son of God. It isn't so necessary on the immediate things, the prophets probably gave many things that weren't written down, but something that was going to deal with w' things a few years off, it is good to have written down, so that it is definite, and that is one reason, there are other reasons why--yes, Mr. Vannoy? (7 3/4) I don't think you can confine it necessarily to one or to the other, unless you have some clear evidence in the passage. If it refers to what is before, there is a good reason for it that Mr. Gregory just gave. If it refers to what is after, that is something he said in several other passages. That is said many times in Isaiah, why should he say specifically, write that in a book? What would the reason be in that case? (8 1/2) Yes, I incline to think that there are two reasons for having ^{this} ~~it~~ written down. I incline to think that one reason was that what they've predicted about Egypt, and also what they predicted about the deliverance from Assyria at the beginning of 29 and at the end of 30, will take a few years before it is fulfilled. But I incline to think there is also another reason which relates to what follows. That they are rebellious people. On account of that write it down. I incline to think that ~~it~~ is about at this point perhaps that Isaiah was put out of the banquet hall. Perhaps he was giving the message to the nobles there that starts in 28, and you notice how cleverly he speaks in such a way as to get their sympathy, and to get their interest, and then he turns on them and then he turns on things that they'll approve of, and then he turns on them, and it is a question how long they'd let him stay. Now he has gotten their interest aroused, not their s particularly, but the interest of the people who were there, the

mass of the people heard about what Isaiah did, how he went in there and rebuked them to their face, they're interested in hearing the whole message. Now he says, this is a rebellious people, they won't let me give all the message to their face, write it down so they can read it in writing that this is a rebellious people, so that it is available for the whole land to hear. So it seems to me that if it points to what's after it refers to his being unable to get these oral hearings that he was getting previously in the banquet hall, if it refers to what precedes, it looks forward to the distant time when this will be fulfilled, and my guess is that both are involved in it. Well, now he goes on then and speaks in v.8 and following, v.9 and following, about the character of the people who bore the name of God, but who don't want to follow Him.

V.10, people who say to the seers, see not, and to the prophets, prophesy not unto us right things, speak unto us smooth things, prophesy deceits. If you want to get a nice big church, if you want to have a good opportunity to live an easy life and yet thing you're serving God, why follow this verse, go into a big pulpit and tell the people that they're mighty fine people and they're doing a wonderful thing to come to church on Sunday and God is going to bless them and God is going to protect them on account of it, and if they'll just come out to one service they can go home and live the way they want the rest of the week, you can give them, and many, many a pulpit does, just that sort of a message, and it demands a good speaker who can get a high position in the church perhaps, he can be looked up to, can be highly regarded, he is fulfilling this request. Prophecy to us not right things, speak to us smooth things, prophesy deceits. He could be highly regarded in the church, but how much will God regard him, in the end? What is the value of it, if he just wants to get reputation, to get a name, to get money, to get standing, why doesn't he go into some other work, instead of into the Lord's work. If he is going into the Lord's work, his purpose should be, not to please the people, but to please the Lord, he

wants to please the people enough to keep them coming, to get the Lord's message, but he wants to please the Lord and if he doesn't please the Lord, there is nothing gained with please^{ing} the people. So these criticisms here given against the people there could fit people later just as well, they fit any people who go by the name of God, but who drift into the attitude of putting their own desires ahead of God's ~~pre~~ purpose. So he goes on in this passage, and we notice that he first speaks of their character through v.12 and then he speaks of what is going to follow from it. This iniquity shall be to you as a breach ready to fall, swelling out in a high wall, whose breaking comes suddenly at an instant. He tells how there is going to be a calamity and destruction for it, and then v.15 says, thus say s the Lord, thus did the Lord say, notice that in v.15 "thus saith the Lord" would be much better literally translated, wouldn't it? It gives a false idea here. If you leave off the last four words, this would make a good verse, for thus saith the Lord God, the Holy One of Israel; in returning and res t shall ye be saved; in quietness and in confidence shall be your strength. That is a wonderful verse, a wonderful promise of God, put confidence in Him, trust Him and do His will, and you'll be saved, but that's not the purpose here as shown by the last four words. This is not here a promise of blessing, it is a rebuke for not having availed themselves previously of a promise of blessing that was given, and so it would be much better if we followed the Hebrew literally here and instead of translating the perfect in Hebrew, as saith, as we do so often, if we here translated it , "thus said the Lord." This is what the Lord said to you, and you would not. It would be much better. As it is, I 'm sure many people are greatly puzzled by it, ...

25. (1/2)

... simply because the Hebrew is not literally translated. We don't literally translate (3/4) ordinarily. We translate it in the present, because what God has said is valid today and therefore saith is not an incorrect translation, but in this context the past is the thought, and therefore translating the verse we usually do simply

gives a false idea. Question, Mr. Vannoy? That's a very interesting thought, and I think the thought is true but I don't think it is what the words mean. That in returning and rest shall you be saved, that in quietness and confidence shall be your strength, this word returning, is the very word which is often translated converting, changing, turning about. It means in returning from putting your trust in earthly things, to putting it in God. Now of course it is true they are putting it in Egypt, and to turn away from putting your trust, but return sounds like literally come back from Egypt, but the leaders weren't going to Egypt, they were sending all this tribute down, so that is, I think, the commentaries bring out a true idea that the whole reliance on Egypt is in mind here, but is fastening undue stress on the literal rendering of the word, yes? (1 3/4) No, if it could be implied. Yes, I think his whole thought is, you're foolish to trust Egypt, well, that implies, quit doing it, quit sending it, but you couldn't bring back what you've already sent, that the Egyptians have got. You are just out that, and as far as bringing back the ambassadors is concerned, they sent ambassadors to ask help, but they would come back anyway when they had made their request. I don't think returning, bringing back the ambassadors hardly expresses the thought here. He is not urging them to break off relations with Egypt, he is not urging them to ~~get~~ fight Egypt, or anything like that. Ordinarily when you bring back your ambassadors, it means you're breaking relations. But of course the special ambassadors, you bring them back, but they'll come back anyway. Of course, if he is writing today, you might say you could send a message, send a telegram, come right back, a quick message, but you couldn't do that then. If they've gone, they've gone, they'll give their message and they'll come back. But I don't think ~~they're~~ their returning literally fits, but the idea fits certainly. Mr. Gregory? (3) He is addressing people who should have put their trust in quietness and confidence in the Lord, and he is saying to these people as he said back in chapter 28 and chapter 7, that if ye will trust the Lord and do His will, you can receive blessing through Him.

Look at 28.16. Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation; he that believeth shall not make haste. In other words the one that is trusting the Lord doesn't need to be looking to Assyria ~~at all~~ for help against Israel. And now, as you look forward, you say well if Assyria becomes our great danger, we'll get help from Egypt. Well, the same thought applies, you shouldn't look to either one of them, but look to the Lord. So he then as we noticed in the next few verses, here, he says to them, you should put your trust in God and you would not, v.15, you wouldn't turn aside from earthly methods of thinking you're going to advance what is right, and put your trust in God, you won't do it, you say well if this goes as bad as you say it is, well, we'll flee on horses, v.16. We'll get the quickest thing we can find. You don't find so many horses in Palestine, Ordinarily they use the donkey, or the camel for the beast of burden, they ride on the donkey, even the king, when he (4 1/2) He came sitting on an ass, on the colt, the foal of an ass. Jesus didn't ride a horse in to the triumphal entry, he rode a donkey. The donkey was the regal animal and it was the common beast of burden too, and when I was traveling in Palestine for three months in 1929, we saw donkeys everywhere, some camels, lots of donkeys, we rode on horses, but the minute my horse would see another horse, he didn't bother with a donkey, but the minute he saw another horse he reared up on his hind legs and began to kick the air with his front feet, he wanted to fight, because he didn't see enough horses to get used to them, they were fairly uncommon there, at that time.

Well, at this time the horse was thought of, not as the ordinary animal that you use, not as the regal animal that had the style and luxury and all that, but he was very specifically one thing, he was the fast one, the swift one, the one that would be brought in to do a special task that needed speed, he might be used during war, he would be useful in carrying the message speedily, and that was the purpose of the horses, for fighting or for speeding. So they say, we'll flee on horses, these nobles,

they have the means available to get away from this, they don't think of the poor people who will be left for the Assyrian juggernaut to roll across, they're going to get out of the way, they're going to flee on horses, and that's the ordinary human method of desperation, we try our human expedients and then when they don't work, well, we'll just flee away, and you take your common literature today that is so much touted by the world and much of it is the literature of desperation. You take Franz Kafka whose writings are much discussed today, and what does Kafka write? He wrote about people who were caught in a world situation in which they found no help, no means of escape, it's just absolutely hopeless, and that's the stress, and not only in Kafka, but so many other writers today, that is the thing, we are in a world situation that we just can't get out of, we're just caught hopelessly, and people seem to get a pleasure out of reading that sort of thing and feeling, well, we're all in the same boat together, and it's just hopeless. ¶

But these leaders, these nobles, they say, well, we'll get out of this situation, we'll just flee away. You won't catch us, if it goes wrong, it goes wrong. We won't turn aside from our wicked lusts, or follow the Lord, we'll work our schemes and we think they'll work, but if they don't, we'll flee. And so they say, we'll flee on horses. Now this is interesting, this v.16. Did they say this? "But ye said, No; for we will flee upon horses; therefore shall ye fleeⁿ? Is that what they said? Does that sound to you like what they said? It is an interesting verse here, because this is a verse in which we have the speakers very clearly differentiated and yet it is not indicated. It is there. It is perfectly plain, but it is not indicated, and there are many times in Scripture when that is the situation. When they do not put in designations of the speakers, but when you can tell them from the context with no difficulty, and you have to tell them, to make sense out of it. What sense does that make? "But ye said, No; for we will flee upon horses; therefore shall ye flee." Doesn't make any sense at all, does it? You have to read it in a different

tone of voice. You read, he says, But ye said, No, for we will flee upon horses. End of quotes. This is what you said. If Assyria will protect you from Israel and Syria. Well, if Assyria turns against us, we'll look to Egypt. Egypt will protect us. Well, he says, Egypt will prove to not profit you. Their strength is to stand still. Then they say, oh, well, we'll flee on horseback, Anything but to trust the Lord and turn away from the anti-God objectives of this wicked age. No, he says, we'll flee on horses then. So he says, the prophet says, therefore shall ye flee. Yes, you're going to, and again, what ye said. It doesn't state it, but it's clear. And again what did they say? We will ride on the swift. We have got good enough horses to get out of the way. We can still be safe. We will ride on the swift. He says, therefore, they that pursue will be swift. So you have three changes of person in this. There is a quotation of the people, there is an answer, there is another quotation from them, and there is an answer. Now this may be a quotation of something they actually say, more likely it is a quotation of what they're thinking, what they would say if they entered into dialogue, and he answers the thought in their minds, just as Jesus so often did, when people would say, among themselves, can this man forgive sins? They probably didn't say that audibly but it was in their minds. He knew what was in their minds, and he turned to them and answered the thought in their heart. Yes? (9 3/4) I wouldn't think in the context. The thought of Egypt might suggest horses because at this time Egypt is where the best horses come from. Maybe they were getting horses from Egypt, but (stu.10) yes, but they weren't getting help from Egypt in order to be able to flee, they were just getting help from Egypt in order to be able to protect themselves. The fleeing is a last resort. They're not sending all this treasure to Egypt just to get a few horses. (stu.) No, I think the emphasis on the horses is if the Egyptians fail them, then they'll flee. See, first they say, we get protection from Israel and Syria by looking to Assyria. They don't say that but that's what they're doing, so he criticizes that. Then he says, Assyria

won't help you. That is, it'll help you temporarily, but you remove the buffer state, you're face to face with the tremendous Assyrian danger. Then, they say, well, we're face to face with Assyria, we'll go to Egypt for help. He says, oh, yes, I see what'll happen then. The burden of the beasts of the south, all these animals going to Egypt, all this, you're sending all this to Egypt, in order to get Egypt to promise to help you, but he says you're sending it to a people that won't profit you. He repeats that three times. He says Egypt's strength is to stand still. You think Egypt can protect you but Egypt is past its day, Egypt is not in its decline, so you won't get help from Egypt. He says what you should have done is to trust the Lord, He said to you "in quietness and confidence shall be your strength," but you won't. The Egyptian scheme won't work, well, the Assyrian scheme ^{doesn't} ~~won't~~ work, all right, we'll look to Egypt. Now the Egyptian scheme doesn't work, we still won't turn to God, we'll flee on horseback, ~~be~~ Of course, they may have gotten the horses from Egypt but it is a very, very small part of the help from Egypt (11 1/.2)

We'll flee on horses then. And He says, well, He says, that's what is going to happen to you. He says you're going to have to flee as a result of this attitude you have, and then we have this very striking thing where they say, we'll ride on the swift. He says ^{yes,} and the ones that pursue you, they'll be swift too. He says, here is what is going to happen. One thousand will flee at the rebuke of one. At the rebuke of five all of you will flee. They say, well, this is hopeless then, Isaiah says it's hopeless, you better trust the Lord. If you don't, it's just hopeless, there is no answer. No, that's not what Isaiah said, that's part of it, but that's not all of it. Isaiah says it is hopeless to get deliverance through your human schemes, but Isaiah is implying all through, God has a purpose in Israel, and God's purpose is going to be accomplished, and whatever they do, He is going to accomplish His purpose, and He comes back to this. The Assyrian, He says, you'll be faced with this great enemy, what can you do? But He says, God is going to intervene, going

to protect you, earlier. Now here He says, you will flee, a thousand will flee at the rebuke of one, at the rebuke of five all of you will flee. Well, it is hopeless, in other words, we are just lost. Till ye be left, how As a beacon on the top of a mountain, and as an ensign on a hill. He uses this very vivid language, the beacon, and the ensign. Why does He speak of being left as a beacon and as an ensign? Somebody might have said, in the Civil War, might have said to the South well you think you're going to divide up the nation, you're going to have your own section down here, that will carry on the law the way you want, regardless of what the rest of the country wants. You ~~w~~ think you're going to do that? Well, you'll find when it comes to a clash of strength, that you won't get anywhere, you think England and France will come over and help you, you'll find they don't. They'll give you a lot of words, and a little help, but not much. They won't do anything in the end. You will be left absolutely destroyed. Your allies will flee and there'll be nothing left of them. But he never would have said, till you be left as a beacon on the top of a mountain, and as an ensign on a hill. Who would think of using language like that to a country, to say you're going to be defeated, you'll be left this way. It wouldn't be true. They weren't.

Some commentaries say, this shows the prophet is saying, they'll be left so there are no two together, they are just individuals separately. Well, that didn't happen, that's not what (14)

Why does he use this language? Mr. Gregory? ~~X~~...

26. (1/2)

...yes, we don't know. (stu) I don't think so, because I think he is looking further into the future. I think that here he is looking beyond that. He is looking to the very distant result. I think that, simply because of the language here. He is going to deliver Jerusalem, and the other cities (1) but I don't think that is involved here. I think what he is stressing here is, that they will flee and

you'll think it's hopeless, you'll think there is nothing left of it, but that won't be true, there will be something left, something very important left, what will be left will be a beacon, and an ensign. Although, instead of calling it an ensign, call it a flagpole if you want, it still is the same thing. It is that which stands as a lesson and more than a lesson, as an indication that ~~that~~ which represents something. And what he is saying is God has a purpose in Israel and the purpose of Israel is to keep Israel alive, to keep the memory of God alive to them, as the people through whom His Son will come into the world, but He says, you leaders of the people are turning against God, the people as a whole are implicated with you, in what you're doing, you are trying these ungodly schemes, one after another, in the end, it will result in failure for you, in dispersion, in being scattered throughout the world, but it will not result in complete destruction, and it will result in a testimony, in a sign, in an indication, which Frederick the Great's chaplain could point to, when Frederick the Great said, "Give me in a word some evidence of Christianity." In other words, he says, I don't want a long sermon from you now, trying to give some closely spun arguments to prove that Christianity is true, give me something brief, in one word, that will mean something. And the chaplain took Frederick the Great at his word, it is a good thing to take him at his word, because you might lose your head if you didn't, but he took him more literally than Frederick probably meant it, and the chaplain said, "The Jews." And suggested something that is unique in the word. All the nations of antiquity have disappeared. They're the great nations. The people have gone. Look at the great Egyptian power, the Egyptians today are Arabs, they're not Egyptians. There is a lot of the old Egyptian blood in them, but the continuity of culture is gone, the whole relationship is changed, the Arab conqueror has come in and taken over the country of Egypt. The Assyrians, the great empire, they disappeared. What has become of the ancient Romans? What has become of the great cities of ancient Greece? They have all gone. And here is a nation which was much smaller

than any of those. You could find a dozen nations as great as Israel ever seems to be, which had their day and disappeared. The people were scattered, were divided up among other peoples, and forgotten, except somebody who is going into tomes of ancient history, but though the leaders of the Jews turn away from God, though they flee, though they're divided, though a few chase a thousand, so that they're scattered abroad, you think there is nothing left of them, yet they remain, they continue their existence, they continue their distinctiveness, and they stand there as an indication to the world that God's word is true, that God's testimony is true, and that He has worked something very unusual, very remarkable, as an indication of the fact that He did set them apart for a special purpose, and that His word is indeed the Word of God. So they, though they are scattered, though they are divided, though they are driven away, they remain as an ensign on a mountain, as a banner on the top of a hill, an indication that cannot be hid, that stands out, there, as something that has lasted down from ancient days into this present age, and found all over the world, indication of the truth of His word. And then you have v.18.

After 17, v.18 is one which if you do not see the purpose of the chapter as a whole you don't get a great deal of sense out of 18. But if you see the chapter as a whole there is a great deal of meaning in v.18 here. And therefore, will the Lord wait, that he may be gracious unto you. Some say well the therefore must skip back to what precedes, therefore will the Lord wait because of your rebellious spirit, because of your failure, he will wait, in order to be gracious unto you. I think that is a wrong interpretation of the "therefore." I think the "therefore" means "for this reason." For what reason? For the reason of the carrying out of history. For the reason of the ensign, for the reason of the pointing to God's purpose in Christ. Therefore, will the Lord wait, in order that He may be gracious unto you, therefore will he be exalted, in order that he may have mercy upon you. How can the Lord be gracious to those who are sinners? How can the Lord have mercy upon those who

turn away from Him? How can He? He only can through fulfilling His purpose in the Lord Jesus Christ. Only through doing what He brought Israel into existence for, in the first place, can he do it. It is by the working out of His plan, that the Lord can do this, and we have an occasional verse in the prophets pointing to the fact that God has a plan, looking on through the ages, from Isaiah's time on, a purpose which is going to result in carrying out His gracious purpose of mercy to the whole world. It is a plan which leads up to the coming of the Lord, who is going to bear our sins. And it is all related to that. They are to be, not simply destroyed, not simply reduced, but rendered like a beacon on the top of a mountain, an ensign on a hill, a sign of the Lord's activity, the Lord's control, a sign that these were the people set aside for Himself, and that the misery that comes on many is the result of the quality of forgetfulness of Him, which they have, which they're not unique in having, which all the world has, except those who are really true to the Lord, but which becomes particularly deserving of punishment when there is opportunity ^{of} knowing the Lord's will and when they represent a turning away from light that is given them. But it is not simply destruction, it is making them a sign, an indication of what the Lord's purpose is, and what is His purpose? His purpose is to be gracious. Here He is sitting here, doing all this, you won't trust the Lord, therefore you're going to flee, therefore those that pursue will be swift, and then all of a sudden, He says, the Lord's purpose is to be gracious. Yes, the Lord's purpose is to be gracious by doing that which makes it possible for Him to be gracious. Why will He be gracious? For the Lord is a God of judgment. How can He be gracious and be a God of judgment? Because He works out His purpose and makes it possible for a just God to be gracious. His purpose that makes it possible for Him to be just and also the justifier of them that believe in Christ. So He looks forward to the great blessings that He is going to bring, through the carrying out of His purpose, for the people shall dwell in Zion at Jerusalem. Thou shalt weep no more. Isn't that a sharp change from you're going to

flee, until you become a beacon on top of a mountain. You shall weep no more. Yet, when will you weep no more? There'll be plenty of weeping in Isaiah's day, and still more in the day of Jeremiah, the weeping prophet, and still more in the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, and still more at many times through the ages, but the time is coming when you shall weep no more, a time is coming when the Lord will have worked out His plan, so that He can bring His wonderful grace to all the world, beginning at Jerusalem, and going on to Judea and Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth. 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. We did not stop on the last of v.18; "Blessed are all they that wait for him." The Lord is going to wait, that he may be gracious. Blessed are all they that wait for Him. The same Hebrew word is used. Those that he is--the word is to look with expectancy. This, the Lord is going to wait that He may be gracious unto you, He is going to look for the fulfillment of His marvelous ~~promises~~^{plan} for the working out of it, which involves the ensign, the beacon on a hill. He is going to wait, to look with expectancy, to the fulfillment of His plan. Blessed are all they that look with expectancy to Him, that put their trust in Him, that have their strength in quietness and in confidence. And then in v.20, you see the change of the time you look at. Thou shalt weep no more in v.20; though the Lord give you the bread of adversity, and the water of affliction. Well you'll certainly weep when you have the bread of adversity and the water of affliction, won't you? You will weep. He looked at a different time. Though you shall do this, 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 right way, walk ye in it, when ye turn to the right hand, and when ye turn to the left.

God is going to give His word, His means of knowing the truth, He is going to provide His spirit to lead those who wait for Him, who look to Him with expectancy.

This is the right way. When ye turn to the right hand and when ye turn to the left-- why should He say that? Why doesn't He say this is the right way, turn to the **✓** right or turn to the left. Why does He say it this way? Mr. Miller, do you have an idea on that? (11 1/.4) The point of it is, not that he is going to say, you turn this way, you turn that, but that He is going to indicate where you've gone wrong, when you turn out of the way, He will show you how to get back into it. Reminds of Psalm 32, be not as the horse that must be held in with bit and bridle, that must be forced in this direction, but learn to have Him lead you with His eye. It is a call to learn from the word the way that God wants you to go, and then to know that if you are trusting Him, that when you start to go in the wrong direction, He'll nudge you back to the right way. There'll be a voice saying, no, that's the wrong way, you get back to the direct way you were going. Because every one goes wrong, there is no one who has been redeemed from sin who always goes in what is right. We are always taking wrong steps, but if the Spirit is dwelling in us, He says, no, no, you're turning wrong here, get back to the direction God wants you to have. Man's life is a series of, you might say, of revivals, a series of drifting and then being brought back. Drift and then being brought back. Naturally, we go down. It is God's mercy that brings us back. It is God's intervention in our lives, when we start to go astray, and if we are listening for the voice of the Spirit, looking for what He wants us to do, if we put out of our minds that which is our own selfish desire, and learn to look for His purposes, He promises that He will enable us to hear the voice of the Spirit saying, no, not this way, no, back to here, not over here, no keep on, keep on following Him, don't turn aside to the right or to the left, from His paths, and His purposes.

So that v.22 now is an interesting verse. What do you think 22 is about?...

...yes, there is a promise that there is going to be a real loyalty to God, but I think vv.21 has a great note on the personal leading of those who are really true to the Lord, while 22 is more general in nature. In 22 he makes a specific prediction which would've been hard to make in view of the history of Israel, because you read in Judges and Kings that people were constantly falling into idolatry, they were going after the abominations of the Sidonians, and of the Ammonites and of the different people, they were falling into idolatry repeatedly. But God says you are going to flee, going to be scattered like an ensign on a hill, but, He says, you are going to defile the covering of your graven images of silver, you're going to cast away out of the temple and say get thee hence, the idols and the images, and how much since the time of the exile has Israel been characterized by idolatry. People have fallen into many errors, as all people do. There has been much that they could be criticized for as there is of all of us, but the loyalty and fidelity of on this vital point, which was not characteristic before the exile of the Israelites has been carried through ever since. They have been characterized by their loyalty to the spiritual nature of God and to the great principle of monotheism, and refusal to have any compromise with idolatry in any form. They have been characterized by that wherever they've been scattered throughout the world, and that is a marvel, and something that no one knowing their past history would have predicted, but Isaiah predicts it here very definitely, in v.22. You're going to flee, you're going to be an ensign on a hill, you're going to be subject to all of this, but he says, you are going to defile the covering of your graven images, and and the ornament of your molten images, you're going to cast them away, you're going to say, get thee hence. And this has characterized the Jews ever since, a marvelous loyalty on this one extremely important point. And it is a marvelous evidence of the accuracy of Isaiah's prediction, that Isaiah would pick out the one thing on which they had been so disloyal in the past, and on which they're going to be so loyal in the future. Of course, he doesn't

say immediately, starting in his time. You get on to Ezekiel and you find Ezekiel carried ~~the~~ ⁱⁿ vision to Jerusalem and seeing the people worshipping (3 1/2) and worshipping these images in the temple and all that, the idolatry in Ezekiel's time had come right into the temple, but after the exile, this very important stand was clearly taken by Israel and characterized them through the centuries (4) and it is a marvelous prediction of Isaiah on this.

Then in v.23 he looks forward to the material blessings of the millennium. There are going to be material blessings of the millennium, described in 23, 24, 25, and 26, material blessings of the time when God is going to have put an end to the evil of Israel and established His reign of righteousness upon this earth, and when there is going to be great agricultural blessing, described here, wonderful prosperity which is going to come, this figure, the light of the moon, the light of the sun being so greatly increased when the Lord binds up the breach of his people, and heals the stroke of their wound. Revelation says there will be no night there, it doesn't mean we won't have refreshing, it doesn't mean we won't have the strengthening we need, that we get from sleep, but it does mean that there will be a tremendous increase in energy and strength and blessing in every way, during that wonderful millennial kingdom. And Isaiah just has a brief glimpse of it here, up through v.26, and then he comes back to the nearer time and looks at the nearer blessings that God is going to give, and we have to discontinue there until next week, but look over chapter 30 and 31 tomorrow and see the parallel between the two, how they fit together, and see these latter verses of 30, try to be sure just what they're looking to, are they looking to an immediate situation? Are they looking to the present age? Are they looking to the Millennium? Just what are they looking toward? (break in record) (continuing again at 6 1/4) ...at our last meeting we were looking at, still at chapter 30, a very interesting chapter. These chapters, by the way, when you start with Isa.28, once you have the background, the historical background of 28, everything

just falls into line, quite simply. We get to 29 and we have one rather startling new thing we find, but once we find it, I think it falls into line. In 30 we get a little bit more that is difficult I'm sure. And when you get to 32 and 33 I think we're in a much less solid position, there is a good deal we can tell very definitely, but there are many more details that we find it difficult to be sure about than there are in the earlier chapters, but unless you have the historical background well in mind, and also the long distance matters that the Lord is interested in revealing to Isaiah, most of these chapters are just a lot of words, they don't convey much of a message, unless you have these two things in mind, the historical background in relation to Isaiah's day and the distant things that God has revealed to us elsewhere that we find suggested, hinted at, that we find these related to. We don't want to read into it anything because we find it elsewhere, but we want to take suggestions we find elsewhere, and see how they fit, and whether they give the key in places which otherwise would be very difficult to understand. Now in chapter 30, we were looking I think at the end of the hour at that 18th verse.

We might have glanced a little further ahead, but the 18th verse is a very interesting verse. It seems to me that it ties tightly to the 17th verse. I'm not sure that this has been much noticed except by expositors, this relationship, but it seems to me that it is a very vital proof to the understanding of the whole material, therefore, will the Lord wait that He may be gracious unto you. I don't think it means, the reason the Lord is going to wait is so He can be gracious unto you, maybe it is that way, but I incline to think that He waits to be gracious to you in order that He may fulfil His purpose of the beacon, of the ensign, His purpose after all which is the purpose for which Israel was called in the first place, the purpose of being a witness to His message, and that is what Israel has witnessed to right from the time of Abraham, It is a witness to His message, it is that which through which He brings His message, and by which He presents it to the world. So the ensign, the beacon, are not just

figures but they are figures which convey their real natural significance, the significance of proclaiming something, and it is the proclamation of God's purpose, and the outworking of His gracious purposes and also for the whole world, that He may be gracious, that He may be gracious because He works out His purpose which involves establishment of bases upon which He can be gracious, and involves eventually bringing an end to all that is wicked in this world. Therefore, will He be exalted that He may have mercy upon it, He is not just one, like an indulgent parent, that simply gives the child everything that he wants regardless of whether it is for his good or not. God is a God of judgment, He is a God who loves His children, but a God who loves righteously, and justly, and His perfect plan involves working justice, judgment, righteousness, and at the same time, providing for the gracious loving merciful gift that He gives of His own mercy alone, not through any desert of ours. So from v.19 on, we carry on this note of the mercy, this note of the graciousness of what God is going to do, up to v.27, through v.26, we have the constant stress on this note of God's graciousness. You find it in 19^g, He will be very gracious unto thee, in 23--He will give the rain of thy seed, the increase of the earth, fat and plenteous, cattle feed in large pastures; 24--the oxen and the young asses, the domestic animals are to have plenty to eat, the blessings He is going to give; 25--streams of waters on every high hill, rivers and streams of waters, the deserts to blossom like the rose; and 26--the light of the moon like the light of the sun, the light of the sun sevenfold, in the day the Lord binds up the breach of his people and heals the stroke of their wound. The graciousness then is , after a break of a few verses, is continued in v.29 and 30, where there is to be a strong song of joy, the glory of the goodness of God shown in His protecting power, now. There is a break after 26 but yet the gracious note is not ended, it continues very definitely with 29 and 30. Then, this graciousness then is introduced with a theme, God's marvelous blessing in the future for His people. His people are being punished for

their sins, they are being told of the terrible denunciation in the first part of chapter 30, and yet there is marvelous blessing^{is going to wait} ahead of them. God ~~knows when to be~~ gracious, and blessed are all they that wait for Him. Here surely is a justification by faith, here is the gracious mercy of God given without any desert on our part. Blessed are those who look expectantly to Him, those who put their trust in Him, those who enter into an intimate relationship with Him in which He is Saviour and Lord. And then in v.20 we have a glimpse of the fact that the marvelous blessings that He promises in v.19, the people will weep no more. ^{Does} /~~That means~~ that from now on they'll never weep any more? Well, there was a great deal of misery then. But the time is going to come when they will weep no more, the time ~~is~~ going to come when His great graciousness will be shown, but that time is not necessarily immediately, because v.20 shows that there may be first before the marvelous graciousness of God, when the people weep no more, there may be first a time when they have to undergo the bread of adversity and the water of affliction. This time may come first, before the marvelous graciousness, but He is going to wait before His being gracious and showing His marvelous love, and inbetween there may be a time of bread of adversity and water of affliction, because He has not only punishment to bring to those who turn away from Him...

28. (1/2)

...but He also has lessons to teach those who were waiting for Him, those who were true to Him, and it may be His will that we have the bread of adversity, and the water of affliction, it may be His will for any of us, it is quite different, the whole atmosphere of v.20 from the atmosphere of the verses from v.8 say, up to v.17. There is denunciation and punishment, here is chastisement, and care for His own. They may have to go through hardships, they may have to do these things, and yet if they do, if they are truly waiting for Him, they can know that it is part of His purpose for them, and they should rejoice in it. There is no excuse for-- well, I

don't like to say in such strong language, in a way, there is no excuse, because we don't want to condemn others for faults which we may not have, and we may have other faults that they haven't, but in God's sight, let us say, there is no excuse for the Christian getting ulcers. In God's sight there is no reason for it. Now we all have our faults, and I don't condemn a man who does, I probably have great faults that he doesn't have, but what I mean is, that we fully avail ourselves of the blessings that God provides for His children, if we are waiting expectantly for Him, if we are looking to Him, we should be able to learn to do His work with our utmost energy and ability, but to leave the results officially in His hands, that we do not have the nervous tension that produces ulcers. Of course, I have far more respect for the man that gets out and does something, accomplishes something and gets ulcers as a result, than for the man that lies under a tree and does nothing. I have far more, but I mean that the Christian should be able to do the work to the very utmost of his energy, and then when he has disappointments, when things go wrong, when he is just not sure how it is going to turn out, when this particular one he has worked so hard with, just doesn't seem to get anywhere or turns against him and does what he didn't expect, to just lean on the arms of the Lord and leave the result with Him, and not be himself scathed by it, it is a high ideal and an ideal which none of us fully reach, but in God's sight, I say, there is no need for the Christian to suffer from nervousness. Of course, the worst thing is the laziness that does nothing, that certainly is far worse than having the nervous tension, but what I mean is the Lord wants us to realize that when the bread of affliction comes, if the water of affliction comes, well, those those who are His, it is part of His purpose for them, and He had a blessing for us in it. He has a meaning for us in it, and the meaning might not even not be for us, He might have a meaning of having us glorify Him by having the bread of affliction, and the water of affliction. Whereby we would suffer as Job did, not as a punishment to Job, not as a chastisement to Job, but as a means of showing

forth God's wonderful grace, and showing how Job took it, how Job retained ~~his~~ his loyalty to God through it all, even though he didn't understand everything. God never explains~~d~~ everything. At the end of Job, we see how great and how good God is, who are you to question His will. But we are told when Job starts ~~that~~ there was a real reason in the spiritual world for it, that something very definite was accomplished for God's will by Job's undergoing this misery. But Job wasn't told, it says the great ~~question~~ ^{blessing} for Job was, not to have everything explained to him, but to be able to wait upon the Lord, and know that he could fully trust the Lord, and the Lord was able to (4 1/.2)

So this verse here, when we start, turn to presentation of God's wonderful gracious goodness to His people in v.18 and 19, then to have 20 ~~w~~ stuck in with the bread of adversity and the water of affliction, seems at first sight as if he is oscillating. After looking at the judgment upon sin in vv.8-17, as if now--which God uses for His own purposes of goodness--that new Hevas after two verses of graciousness, oscillating back again. Of course, that's not the case. This is a description of His gracious good purposes to His people. That before the covenant of the time when the marvelous material blessings are to be given, that are suggested in v.19 and described rather fully in vv.23-26, that before that happened, for the one who is waiting upon the Lord, there may be a period of severe testing, a period of chastisement, a period of training that is very difficult while it is going on, but that God promises that the one who is truly waiting upon Him, will not have his creatures removed into a corner, but that He will have the word available, his eyes will see (5 3/4)

He will have the full word of God available, which God is preparing, was preparing through Isaiah, had been through others before, that the word will be available to Him, to get the message that God wants to give, and to see that whatever the material situation, that God provides for them. There is the spiritual blessing of the nearness of God, and the leaning upon Him and the

feeling the assurance that He is leading. Then, 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. This doesn't mean He is going to make us into a robot that He can press a button and we'll turn right, He can press a button and we'll turn left, He wants us to learn to use our minds to figure out what way He wants us to go, but to give the assurance that as we study the word and learn principles and as we study situations and figure out how we can glorify Him more fully, that when we make a wrong turn, He will in some way move things about so that in the end we'll be able to look back and see that we were just the way He wanted, that He will lead us, even though we hear Him through a voice behind us. He does not give us that clear sight that He gave some of the prophets of old, at some times, when He said, go to this place, go here, go exactly there. He wants us to learn to be guided with His eye. Yes, Mr. Abbott? (7 1/4) I would say very definitely that vv.8-17 are punishment upon those who are a rebellious people, who are turning against the Lord, saying as in v.10, saying to the seers, See not; and to the prophets, Prophecy not unto us right things, speak unto us smooth things, prophecy deceits. That is the condemnation of the attitude also described in chapter 29, of seeking our own counsel instead of God's and using Him as a means to help us, instead of desiring to be His servants, to bring ourself in line with Him. That is a definite condemnation in those verses. I wouldn't say condemnation of the nation, certainly not, but condemnation of the wicked leaders of the nation, and of all leaders who would follow in the footsteps of them. Not of all the leaders by any means, but condemnation of those leaders who follow in this direction, with the assurance, in v.17, that God's punishment of them is not like the punishment of the Assyrians, a destruction, but a punishment that involves carrying on of His purposes, and accomplishing His blessing, that He will do His work through us or in spite of us, but He will use us for (8 3/4) He makes the wrath of wicked men to praise Him, so, you see, it all seems to be

simply punishment, destruction, vv.8-17, and then we find it is advancing His great purpose, even so . And He called Abraham for a great purpose of goodness to the whole world, and that purpose is going to be accomplished. And then of course, when we get to vv.19 and vv.20, 21, I think we're in an entirely different atmosphere, because the ones there are promised definite spiritual blessings. You couldn't promise spiritual blessings to the people in 8-17. They are promised definite spiritual blessings, but told that this blessing may be accompanied by material hardship, and by severe chastisement. Mr. ? (9 1/2) The way that I would figure it out was, that vv.17,18 turn to the unbelieving, or at least the leaders who--I won't say not believing intellectually, but who are refusing to follow the Lord, trying to use Him for their purpose. It is a rebuke to them which looks ahead and sees how God is going to use this, even though there is punishment, God will use it, and then v.18 refers specifically to His own people, His own people of Israel, with I think inclusion of His own people who are to be added to the tree, who are not of Israel, of earthly Israel. I don't think you can tell that, just from this part of Isaiah, but of course you have that definitely taught in 29, so we have, here there is no emphasis on that whatever, but there is the inclusion of it in the blessing. This is the blessing upon the true Israel of God, upon God's true people, and His true people are told they are to weep no more in 19, but this "weep no more" is the culmination and then in 20 I think we look back before the culmination, which is in the very distant future, and it says, if before that time, you have chastisement, you have material suffering, if you are one of those ~~who are~~ described in the end of v.18, who are waiting for Him, who are looking to Him and following Him, then you may know that the misfortune is not a punishment but a chastisement. You may know that He is blessing you even if you have adversity, that in the adversity, you can praise Him and you can know that you will look backward afterward and say, praise the Lord even for that. I couldn't see it at the time, but I know I was following Him, I know that I was looking

to Him,

~~11 1/2~~ waiting for Him, so even though nothing turned out the way I expected or wanted, I know it was His will. He was guiding and He was leading me, in order to accomplish His purpose. It is a different atmosphere altogether from the previous. And then having given this 20 to 21, then we have a statement made in v.22 in which I think he is looking at this intermediate period which is covered in vv.19 to the end of 20 or 20 and 21--he is looking at this intermediate period and at this intermediate period, he is declaring an attitude which his people are going to take. It is an attitude of turning away with vigor from one thing that had been a characteristic and downfall of Israel in earlier days. Time and again they had fallen into idolatry, but he says you are going to say to the idolaters, Get thee hence, you are going to defile the covenant with the graven images, you're going to turn utterly away from it, as something you will have nothing to do with, and of course that's the thing a person should do toward idolatry, but where he predicts, this is what they're going to do with it, right in the midst of ~~the~~ his promises of blessing here, it is a prediction I think that has been marvelously fulfilled. ~~It~~ Just like we have the prediction to Egypt where Ezekiel says, there shall no more be a prince out of the land of Egypt, and Egypt had had a succession of 26 dynasties and native princes, and Ezekiel says there is going to be a change, Egypt is going to be ruled by foreigners, and for 3000 years they had always had native princes and now for the next 3000 they practically always had foreigners, and here Israel has fallen in this particular direction repeatedly in the Old Testament. This is going to be the great characteristic of the people in the future, their solid stand against idolatry, for which they've been known through these last 2000 years. It is a characteristic of all of God's true people, but it is a characteristic which again makes a wonderful evidence of God's authorship of it as you see it in His physical people, the people of Israel, you see how they have carried this out. I'm afraid you don't see it very well carried out in the Roman Catholic and Greek Orthodox Church, this particular phase, that is. If

you take the teachings of their leaders, there is no idolatry. But if you take the view of their common people, it is pretty hard to distinguish from idolatry, their attitude toward a lot of their images and ikons, but it is an error that Judaism renounced, and turned away from with vigor, as this verse describes, and has continued that attitude, right up to the present day...

29. (3/4)

...and this of idolatry and complete turning away from it as given in the vivid language of v.22, then we have the continuation of the graciousness, the picture of the specific material blessings which he promised, with the emphasis on agricultural blessings, and these blessings are mentioned in vv.24 and 25, and there is a promise of a very great fertility of the land, a very great material increase. Your cattle will feed in large pastures. A series of promises which could perhaps be taken in a rather general way of the fact that though God's people suffer adversity, yet over the long period of time, they enjoy material blessings and wherever a people is true to God you find that over a period of time the material blessings come. You find that the material (1 3/4) level raises. It could be taken in that rather general way, vv.23 and 24, and perhaps 25. I incline personally to feel that instead of taking it that way, that it is a specific promise of millennial blessing, given in agricultural terms. I incline to feel that it is looking forward to that which comes after the waiting, that He may be gracious, that it is what is described in v.19, thou shalt weep no more. The marvelous time of millennial blessing, which is often in the Bible described in agricultural terms, that with the abundant rain given and the increase of the earth, fat and plenteous, the cattle feeding in large pastures, the oxen and the young asses that plow the ground would have plenty of good provender, and a picture of great material blessings, I would think probably the millennial blessing at the end of the present age, and I think of that view as rather strengthened by v.25, because otherwise 25 is a rather hard verse to fit in here. It has got one or two suggestions

that fit perfectly with that interpretation. Otherwise it is a little hard to explain just what does 25 mean? "And there shall be on every high mountain, and on every high hill, rivers and streams of waters," well that's plain enough, great agricultural blessing. The desert will blossom as the rose. Wonderful. But look at the last of the verse. When will all this be? In the day of the great slaughter, when the towers fall. Well, if they're promised to have such wonderful blessing, how does the great slaughter have to do with it? What does the falling of the towers have to do with it. That is a real problem in that verse. Just what are you going to do with those? Well, the simplest explanation I know of is to take it that in the terrible days in the end of this age, the day of the outpouring of God's wrath, the day of the great flood, the day when the towers fall, that that will be followed by the great millennial period of blessing, such as the earth has never seen. It seems to me that that interpretation gives a real reason for these references here, and I haven't thought of any other that fits with the interpretation that seems to me to run through the passage as a whole.

And of course when you look at the next verse, you have figures which are used elsewhere in the Scripture, for the time of millennial blessing, the time when the Lord binds up the girds up the breach of his people, and heals the stroke of their wound. This time, when the light of the moon will be as the light of the sun, and the light of the sun will be sevenfold, as the light of seven days. You take it too literally, it is a ghastly picture, such a blinding light as that you couldn't stand, it would wreck you completely. If you take it as a picture of the light that God has so tremendously increased that there is no darkness at all, there is just light and joy and an end to all suffering, surely 26 is along with the previous four verses, a promise of God's marvelous blessing, to His people, which is at the end of this present age, to which we look forward, that God is waiting that He may accomplish His great purpose. First, He is waiting that He may fulfil the atonement

which is the necessary foundation for them all, then He is waiting that He may carry out His purposes of grace, to bring in the complete outworking of what is won by the atonement in the millennial age. I don't think there is much, is there, of problem in specific statements in these verses otherwise? Than what we've looked at? I feel that if you get what the general purpose of it is, what it is leading to, and what it is dealing with, that just about ^{all} the words fit quite nicely into place, and I don't see any great problems with taking it this way. Mr. Miller? (6) I would say so. I would think that it is the day of the Lord which begins with the great promise, or which comes after the great promise. (stu.) Yes, certainly not a 24-hour day. It is a period. I would say the period which begins with the great promise. The period which is characterized by peace, by complete lack of (6 1/2) but which begins with the great flood, and when the towers fall, what does that mean? What towers fall? He isn't here talking about the Babylonian conquest of Jerusalem taking the people off into exile, it doesn't fit with that at all.. He is looking forward to a time when the human means of defense are brought to an end, when they beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks, because they are no further of any use to them, the human means are destroyed to a great extent in the tribulation, but they are completely abolished as unnecessary when Christ rules with a rod of iron, but in absolute justice and mercy all over the world. Otherwise I just don't see how you fit it together, except they're just a lot of isolated verses. It seems to me that in this approach you have a connected concerted picture of the future that all fits together and fits into the teaching of the rest of Scripture. Mr. Vannoy? Mr. Cohen? (7 1/2) I was saying that we cannot picture, but that it is a picture, I don't know how literal it is, exactly, but it is the sort of a picture that we have given in connection with the millennium, quite a bit. What is the picture at the end of Isaiah 24? There the moon shall be confounded and the sun ashamed, and the Lord of hosts shall reign. Maybe that is the opposite, I don't know, but at

least it is a mention of the moon and the sun in connection with the glory of the millennial age, and the time when there is no darkness at all, when everything is just shining light. I think that it is a figure which includes within itself the removal of the curse, and the introduction of great material changes in this world, material blessing, but exactly what they will be, to put in physical or chemical terms, I doubt if even our most advanced scientists are in a position properly to do that. I certainly wouldn't be. I say, just take it in the most immediate literal sound and it just sounds terrible, but take it as the figures are given regularly and it fits in to a figure of something very wonderful. Yes? (8 3/4) That is an interesting suggestion, connecting it with Joel's the stars falling from heaven and that sort of thing, but I don't get out of it, it doesn't seem to me a picture of commotion so much as an increase. I don't quite feel that it fits with that. It is a change which is pictured as entirely to the good. We know literally it is a little hard (9 1/4) (stu.) Yes, it certainly would. But, say, now there is an interesting idea, I hadn't thought of that. The usual interpretation of 2 Peter is that the day of the Lord in which the elements will melt with fervent heat, is a day of a thousand years, a period of a thousand years, at the end of which comes the melting, because people say, well, how could there be any earthly millennium after all this has happened, on the other hand, Theodore (10) considers that the promise of--and Harnack said he was the most learned Biblical scholar of the last century, as I recall. (11 1/4) was a very conservation man, a very godly man, a very great intellect, but Zahn(?) holds a view of revelation a little different from most interpreters. He holds that after you have the picture of the millennium then as it goes on and says a new heaven and a new earth, it is not describing what follows the millennium, but describing the millennium, that that is the new heaven and the new earth, that it is a regenerated earth. And if he should be right, then 2 Peter might refer to the removal of the curse at the beginning of the millennium, to the changing of conditions of this earth, with

the elements melting with fervent heat, it sounds to me though a little more like destruction rather than regeneration. I don't know. But I know as far as revelation is concerned Dr. Zahn I thought made a very convincing argument for it (11) revelation, and I once had a meeting with Dr. Buswell and Dr. Harrison in which I rather strongly espoused Zahn's view, and they rather disgustingly opposed and criticized my attitude on the matter. We took it all down on the subscriber, the evening of discussion. And I was a little sorry to see them^{both} get quite so emotional about it, because I felt as if there was a lot to be said for Zahn's view, I thought he expressed it very well, but I frankly was unable to decide between the two. But they seemed to feel something was at stake and holding that Rev. 21 comes after the millennium, it isn't a picture of the millennium. Now they may be right, it may come after, but I just can't ^{yet see} get how something is so vitally at stake in holding (11 3/4)

I think that Rev. 20 comes after 19 is very important. I think something is at stake there, because 19 describes the return of Christ and 20 describes the millennium, and there are those who say 20 describes the intermediate age prior to the return of Christ, ~~at~~ in the end of 19. I don't think you can just say a priori it can't be, but you examine the evidence and you find that the end of 19 the devil is cast--no, at the end of 19, the beast and the false prophet are cast into the lake of fire, and then in 20 you have Satan bound for a thousand years and then loosed for a season and then it says that he was put into the Lake of Fire where the beast and the false prophet are, which ties it up with 19 and says this comes later, but I don't think you have any such tie-up between 20 and 21. But I don't feel dogmatic at all, I would say I incline a little bit toward following Zahn, but even if you do follow Zahn, to say that 2 Peter is the beginning of the millennium. I am not ready to say it isn't but I'm just a little bit hesitant. Well, you get into a lot of interesting lines in these connections, but I think the vital thing is, like in Isaiah here, is to see what we can tell with certainty just from Isaiah alone, what he is talking about,

then to see what with the added ^{light}/you get from clear teaching elsewhere, what can we say further about what Isaiah predicts, then having done that then we see what added light can we get from Isaiah, and further details that we can bring in relation to those other things . But we must proceed very carefully upon it, and personally, I think getting emotional, as between various views that are both equally possible for Christians, ^{tend to} can make it harder for us to find the truth, rather than to make it easier for us to find just what the Bible is really saying.

I've often found in classes in the Prophets, in the ~~past~~, we take up...

30. (1/2)

...wonderful promise of the millennium, and I would find my students who came from premillennial background rejoiced in the clear evidence I'd find in Isa.2 of the millennium, and then when I'd get on to Isa.4, in which it seems to be an entirely different picture, Isa.2 is a world in which there is peace, there is no more fighting, there is no more war, it is all done away with, they are under their vine and fig tree out in the open, there is nothing to fear . It is a picture of the millennial glory, the millennial peace, but when you get to chapter 4 you have a picture of the time when they have a ~~parade~~ pavilion for protection, they have protection from rain and from storm, and you have figures that are drawn from Israel coming through the wilderness . It seems to me that in 4 you have a picture of the pilgrimage journey of this age, with God's protecting hand on them. It is an entirely different picture from what you have in two, but I found students get very emotional about this. Two is millennial and four has got to be the millennial too. Well, the millennium is clearly taught in Scripture, but that doesn't mean that every prediction of the future has got to be the millennium, we can find pictures of other things clearly given in the Bible, but I have had much more, with my students, difficulty convincing them that four was not millennial than I ever had convincing them that two is the millennium. If you went over there to Westminster, you'd have the opposite (2)

I don't know, even there, though, a great many of their students come from the same background as our students. But the teaching there is very much against any
 (2 1/4) so they would joyously
 accept what and they would get the emotional reaction there too. It seems to me we shouldn't go to the Bible to find in it one particular view but take each passage and see what it is, see what is there and see how it fits into God's plan, as we find it elsewhere. Well, these verses then, through 26, seems to me form a pretty definite unit, and that the progress of thought is quite easy to trace. But when we get to 27, we have a sharp change, we have a new section, behold, something is going to happen. What is going to happen? There comes anger, there comes indignation, there comes a dividing fire, there comes a sifting of the nations. Well, you see this picture of 27 and 28, and you immediately say is this a picture of the day of great slaughter when the towers fall that is described in v.25? I think that is the immediate natural suggestion, but don't think it is the correct one. I think that that is one possibility when you take 27 and 28 by themselves.

Here is this situation at the end of the age, God has come with fire and indignation to pour out His wrath upon all that is wicked. Well, vv.27 and 28 would fit perfectly with that, but as we go on we may find that something else with which they fit equally well is what is really pictured. And we must remember, I think, that Isaiah always keeps his relationship to the background. He is in the immediate situation, from it he looks forward and sees various aspects of God's plan for the future, but he never gets too far away from his immediate situation, He returns to it repeatedly. And so the question is, in 27 and 28, is He in some way returning to His immediate background, or is He dealing with the end of the age, the day of the great slaughter, when the towers fall? Which is He dealing with in 27 and 28? And I doubt if anybody could prove which He means, from these two verses. The figures of it, it is a figurative passage, it is very plain the figure means decisive

action by the Lord. Action, showing His anger and His indignation. Vigorous action, it is action which fits the nations, and I might suggest that He talks about pouring out His wrath on the nations at the very end of the age, but it could fit with something a lot nearer. I just think that the Old English confuses us at the end of v.27, or 28 rather-- where He says that there shall be a bridle in the jaws of the people, causing them to err. Why would God cause anybody to err? I don't think that is what it means? The Hebrew word meaning to wander or to turn aside, and I don't think it means to err from that which is right, to do that which is wrong, but it means to wander from that which they desire to do, to turn them aside from that which they had intended (5 3/4) causing them to turn aside, to wander. Wander is the idea of err. To wander. But when we say err, we don't mean simply wander, we mean wander from the path of righteousness. This means to wander (6) and I think it means that He put the bridle in the jaws of the people so that they have no--Hitler started out, he had his definite purposes, he knew what he was going to accomplish, it looked as if he was going to do it, but God put a bridle in His mouth and caused ~~it~~ him to fail, caused him to make a few rather bad mistakes, and caused him in the end to wholly and completely fail. And I think that is what this means here.

But then v.29, in v.29 we have a verse of blessing, but it shows us what I think we could get out of vv.27 and 28, that the indignation of the Lord there is ^{directed} not against God's people, but against the enemies of God's people. There is a bridle in the jaws of the people, causing them to err, this is not God's people. You have God's indignation against the earthly people, early in the chapter, we have His indignation against those who use His name and do not follow as He desires, but here we have His own people rejoicing, v.29, greatly rejoicing, coming to the mountain of the Lord, to the Holy One of Israel, rejoicing in the outpouring of God's indignation in vv.27 and 28. Now when do they do that? What is it fitted here beside? It seems

to me there are ^{only} two possibilities. It is the end of the age when the towers fall, or it is coming back to his immediate situation, which has (7 3/4) so large in previous chapters. And v.30 again doesn't tell us what it is.

The Lord will cause his glorious voice to be heard, and show the lighting down of his arm, with the indignation of his anger, and with the flame of a devouring fire, with scattering, and tempest, and hailstones. Is this a physical, literal statement of what God is going to do, or is this like the figure in v.27? His tongue as a devouring fire. Is it figurative language showing decisive destructive action on the part of God against His enemies? The great divine force. Well, v.31 tells us what it all is: For through the voice of the Lord shall the Assyrian be beaten down, which smote with a rod. And of course you could say the Assyrian was the great enemy of God, great enemy of God's people, the Assyrian is used as a figure of speech for all the enemies of God, in future time, and it can be used that way, but in this context I don't think it is, in this context I think it means specifically the Assyrian, because that's what we have in our previous three chapters. It is the danger that comes from the Assyrian as a result of Ahaz' clever scheme, they get into this great terrible danger from the Assyrian and at the beginning of chapter 29 we had pictured how man gets into terrible situation because of his clever schemes and forgetfulness of God, but God by His mighty power enters in and delivers him. So this, it seems to me, is an exact parallel to that. God will beat down the Assyrian by giving His people great armaments and tremendous force to accomplish things. He does that at times. But that's not what this verse says. Through the voice of the Lord will the Assyrian be beaten down. It is an act of divine power, which puts an end to the Assyrian. And of course you have, in Isaiah's day, you have the Assyrian empire, the greatest empire on the face of the world, Hitler said, that his realm would endure for a thousand years, and the Assyrian in Canaan certainly looked as if it would last for a thousand years, it was the solidest, most firmly established thing, ruling with

cruelty, over most of the known world, and reaching out for other sections, and within a century after it, they just disappeared completely. Completely ended. And of course that was prefigured, the complete end of the Assyrian empire, by the end of the Sennacherib's great attack upon Jerusalem, when Sennacherib was there with his tremendous army, on the Philistine plain, it looked absolutely hopeless, what would Jerusalem ever do? Once he took the notion to march up there, he could just take the city, and that's the end of Jerusalem, but the angel of the Lord smote thousands of the troops one night, the army melted away, and Sennacherib had to head back, as quickly as he could, head back home, before people would realize quite how weak he had become, and attack him. So through the voice of the Lord will the Assyrian be beaten down, which smote with a rod. After our look into the glorious future, through v.26, we come back to the immediate, and say Ahaz has got his clever scheme, the nobles are in with him, and this shows the attitude these nobles are taking, God is going to punish it, but He is still going to use it for His purposes, to make a great beacon on the mountain, this great ensign, but He still has His marvelous purposes of grace, He is waiting that He may be gracious, He is going to have this marvelous period of material blessing that is coming, but now the immediate result of the scheme of the nobles and of Ahaz, which looks hopeless, and God is in this case intervening, with His marvelous power, and through His voice, He is going to beat down the Assyrians, which smote with a rod the Assyrian. Comes with His physical power, which was very great, very (12) But God simply with His voice puts an end to it (12) The Assyrian smites with a rod, God simply uses His voice, beats them down.

Yes Mr. Cohen? (12) No, I'm referring to the leaders of the nation. The ones who had the banquet in chapter 28. I feel that we are still in that situation, whether Isaiah is still talking of the banquet, I doubt if they would have let him go on this long, but that he concludes his message, either verbally to his friends, or in writing,

or both, he continues the message he started in that situation, going on and dealing with God's relationship to the leadership of the people, which is at one with Ahaz in the scheme. I don't think Ahaz was a man like DeGaulle, who they say, you ask one of his cabinet, what is the policy of the French Government toward such-and-such a country, and he says, well, I knew half an hour what it was, but I haven't talked with DeGaulle since, and he determines and they follow, but I don't think Ahaz was that sort of an unusual able man, he doubtless had his group work with him, pretty closely. Yes, Mr. Cohen? (13 1/4) No, I don't think this was a specific, I certainly don't think they were hereditary leaders. There may, some of them, have been men who by virtue of their money or their power, had leadership in the nation, some of them may have had hereditary power and influence, but they were the men who you might say were Ahaz' close associates, they were the leaders of the people, and the people had to suffer for their attitude, as every nation does. Well, I guess the time is up and we haven't finished the chapter, but we're mighty near there...

31. (1/2)

...chapter 30 at our last meeting, and we are noticing how in the end of which, that latter part of the chapter, we had a section which, after the graciousness of the Lord, and His goodness, and what He is going to do for His people in the future, clear on to the very end of the age, then we had the expression, "the indignation of the Lord," and this indignation of the Lord certainly is not after the wonderful millennial blessings described in the previous verses. It is not after, nor at the same time, it must be before, but is it immediately before, or is he coming right back to the problems that are before him in this whole section, and dealing thus with events not 3000 or more years later, by saying maybe 20 years later. Well, we couldn't tell from vv.27 or 28, and then in v.29 we have great joy in what's going to happen, so it was definitely tied up in some way with the people of God to whom He is speaking. It associates with the great joy that they are having, and it is not it would seem

just a general outpouring of God's wrath upon the world but a definite deliverance that He is giving these people, something that very specifically relates to them. And then in v.30 you have a rather general expression of what the Lord is going to do with His voice, but it is a great tempestuous, tremendous, sudden, exertion of His power that is going to occur. And in 31 it is tied up to present situations with the name of the Assyrian. Now of course, as we noticed, the Assyrians could be used, being the great aggressor of that day, it could be used as a general figure for great forces in the future, it could be. But it is not proven to be the ^{immediate} future by the use of the term Assyrian, but it certainly is at least suggested, and what you get from it, a sudden overthrow, which brings great joy to God's people and which is accomplished by a tremendous act of God's power alone, through the voice of the Lord, the Assyrian is beaten down. The Assyrian is beating with a rod, using human force, human effort, which is superior to anything that Judah or Israel could bring against him, but God is going to use His voice to overcome the greatest human force you can get. It exactly fits with Sennacherib's invasion, and God's deliverance. Just exactly fits with it, fits with the prediction given at the beginning of chapter 29, just precisely, and we have nothing taught elsewhere in the Scripture which it would necessarily fit well with for the last days. It does fit exactly with the immediate situation, the thought that is constantly coming back to his immediate situation, it seems to me that it is a reasonable interpretation of ^{verses} ~~chapter 29~~ 27-33.

Then we have the full section, 27-33, summarized in this verse 31, through the voice of the Lord shall the Assyrian be beaten down, which smote with a rod. And then the next verse is a rather general verse, which combines the power of the ~~the~~ Lord and the joy of those of the observers who are delivered by it. In every place where the grounded staff shall pass, which the Lord shall lay upon him, the Lord (3 3/4) His power against the Assyrians, those who are delivered will be rejoicing with tabrets and harps, and the joy of those who are delivered, the power of the God who

delivers them, very fine, except that the last phrase I just don't know what to do with, --and in battles of shaking will he fight with it. One commentator suggests that the battle of shaking refers to the power of God and the pouring out of His wrath as being ^{like} the base of a great orchestra, and so he said, you have the soprano in the tabrets and the harps and you have the bass in the sound of the shaking that comes with the Lord's battle. Well, now whether his imagination is running rather freely on that, I don't know, but I personally am not prepared to say what this last part of the verse means. I don't think my ignorance of the meaning of this last part of the verse in any way casts doubt on the interpretation of the passage as a whole, but I would like some ~~ref~~ further evidence as to how to put that in, and in battles of shaking will he fight with it, ^{as you can see,} the words are such that there could easily be some other sort of a translation of these words here, fitting them together--will he fight with it, is a very general phrase, but exactly what it means, I don't know. Perhaps there is some parallel elsewhere in Scripture, perhaps some other use of one of these words, perhaps there is something that will make it very clear, perhaps there is something somebody can think of, the explanation of these words, that will throw further light on the whole situation and fit in with the situation as we find it in the rest, but up to the present time have not observed.

Well, then v. 33 is an interesting verse: For Tophet is ordained of old. What is Tophet? Tophet is a place just outside Jerusalem, where they used to burn refuse, and the fires ~~from~~ flamed up from there, and there was a story that before that, when the Canaanites had the place, that they used to pass their babies through the fire to the ~~of~~ god Molech, at that place, so that there was the human sacrifice offered at that place, Tophet, and Tophet is used as a figure for internal burning, in the Scriptures. I believe it is the same as the Valley of Hinnom, referred to in the New Testament (6)

and Gehenna is the Greek form which it has taken. But it says Tophet is ordained of

old, yea, for the king it is prepared. Now is this the king, or is this melachir, is it really Molech? Is it really the Molech who was formerly worshipped there when they had human sacrifices to Molech, or is ^{it} perhaps a play on words, in referring to a king which has the same consonants as the former god Molech had.

At any rate, if you relate this to the present situation, the king would seem not to be the king of Israel surely here, but the king of Assyria, and if the king of Assyria, that Tophet is prepared for him, well, Sennacherib didn't go there, Sennacherib went back safely to his own land, lived there 20 years, and then was assassinated by his sons, so that the only way that it seems to me it can be fit into that situation, is that it refers to the ultimate destiny, that for this wicked aggressor, God has His ultimate purpose, His ultimate plan, he is going to lose out in this world, through the voice of the Lord will the Assyrian be beaten down, but eventually he is to pay for his misdeeds, that Tophet is ordained for him, the pile of fire and much wood, the breath of the Lord, like a stream of brimstone, kindles it, that it is the picture of the ultimate fate of the king of Assyria, the great wicked aggressor here described.

Now that seems to me to do justice to the words here, and to fit into the thought quite generally, but perhaps there is something of a jump in bringing it in, we have not had much similar in other passages to parallel. So that if any of you come up with further evidence to prove this is right, or with an alternative explanation of it, which might fit better, I would be greatly interested. I feel that it is quite clear from 27-31 and that 32 and 33 seem to fit in with the same general interpretation. But I hardly-- it hardly seems to me that 33 can be taken as purely a figurative statement, the king of Assyria is going to lose out, seems to me that there must be more to it than that. He is going to lose out, he has a downfall, destruction for him, put in these vivid terms, it seems to me there must be more literal to it than that. And if so, the relation to his ultimate destiny would seem to me to be the most scholarly interpretation. It is interesting that we have this section starting in 29, with the hearth of God,

they kill sacrifices, the place where the flames are, here we have the breath of the Lord, like a stream of brimstone kindling, the pile thereof is fire and much wood, and you get to the end of chapter 31, and there you read about the Lord whose fire is in Zion and his furnace in Jerusalem. It is interesting, this stress on this particular idea, which may to some extent tie it together, but the idea of a picture of eternal destruction right here, while it seems to me probably to be justified, we don't have enough parallel to make me feel certain that it is (9)

Now in chapter 31 it seems to me that we have a definite break between 30 and 31. We've been talking about Assyria, and now we're talking about Egypt. It is not a tremendous break, we're still in the same area, we're in the same general situation, we're dealing with the same people, but it seems to me that 31 is to quite an extent a recapitulation of 30, that we have here a parallel right through 31 to 30, as if the prophet said, now I've gone through, I've given this great message for the future, looked to Egypt for help, Egypt doesn't help them, this spirit of always looking to someone else instead of God for their aid, this spirit is going to result in destruction and difficulty for them, but they will remain a great indication of God's purpose, a great witness to Him, a beacon, an ensign on a hill, but God is not through with them, He is going to be gracious to them, God's purpose is yet going to be fulfilled in the world, He has a marvelous millennial blessing ahead for all these people, and before the millennial blessing, He has great spiritual blessing along the way, but now we come back to the immediate, the danger from Assyria, that is brought in, they're going to send to Egypt for help, Egypt will not be able to deliver them, but God is going to deliver them by His mighty power. Even though they've made these mistakes, God still has His purpose in Israel, God is going to accomplish His purpose through us, if we let Him, in spite of us, if we don't, so He is going to accomplish His purpose here, so He is going to deliver from Assyria. Now we've had those four elements here in 30, and you might say the prophet stopped and he thinks well, now, I've

given some marvelous glimpses of the future, I look way ahead to the great blessings God is going to give in the end, will the listeners lose the immediate message that is so vital for now? Had I better recapitulate the immediate message to be sure they get that? So he says, all right, let's recapitulate the immediate message, without recapitulating the marvelous glimpses^{of} the future. So he starts in at the beginning of 31 and he recapitulates the first part of 30, and in fact he says, in 30, I told them that if they get help from Egypt, it's going to be terribly expensive, they're going to have to send a great deal of stuff to Egypt to get it. Well, I dealt with that sufficiently, I don't need to stress that again, but I have said that sending to Egypt is not going to help because the Egyptians will not really give them help, they will sit still and do nothing, and they will, all they spend is going to be worthless, well, he says I'm going to recapitulate and put a little more stress on the element of the fact, that even if the Egyptians do give them help, the Egyptians are only men, the men are not gods, they should look to God for their help, not to mere men like the Egyptians. So he starts in, woe to them that go down to Egypt for help, and put their trust in horses, and chariots. I don't think that "stay on" probably conveys the idea of the present-day meaning of stay on horses. Put their stay, put their trust, it's a parallel to trust (12 1/4) their trust in chariots, stay on horses. It doesn't mean that they're able to stick on the horse no matter how much they buck, they won't be thrown off, it means they're putting their trust in a horse, and in modern English it ~~is~~ just doesn't carry it. I didn't notice that, unfortunately, in going over our Scofield, so I didn't make a suggestion to change that word there, but I wish I had now, because I think stay is certainly here archaic. Trust in horses and in chariots, and in horsemen, they say these Egyptian horsemen are strong, got lots of chariots, they put their trust in great amounts of human resources, instead of looking to the Holy One of Israel, seeking the Lord, and He has, ~~that~~ this is the big thought all through, it is in the Holy One of Israel, it is in the Lord that you can find help, not in ...

...human sources, not to God. He says, yet he also is wise and will bring evil. Will God bring evil? Is God the author of evil? What does it mean, God will bring evil? Does that not contradict our whole teaching about God being a good God? I think evil here is physical evil, and my personal conviction is that the word, raph, the Hebrew word that is translated "evil" or "bad" is a word which describes physical harm or destruction, rather than moral evil. There are other words that describe moral evil. This word can be applied to moral evil, as we can use that which is physical as figurative, that which is spiritual, but its primary application I believe is ^{to the} physical. Like when this word is used when Jeremiah brought out the figs to show to people, and it says that he had two bags, one of them ^{were} ~~was~~ delicious, lovely figs, and the other one were naughty figs, so naughty that you couldn't stand them, naughty you couldn't eat them. Well, the word naughty there is the Old English translation of the same word "raph." They were evil figs, naughty figs, but in our present sense, both of them mean moral, and what this means, the figs aren't moral, aren't morally bad, the figs are simply spoiled, they are an illustration of that which is morally bad, or an illustration of that which is weak and not good for much, but it is not in itself moral. And it is like the good cows and the bad cows that Pharaoh saw in his dream, the good healthy fine cows, and the worn-out, good-for-nothing cows. They represent the years of famine and the years of plenty, it is not moral. So here it doesn't say God is the author of evil, but it says that God is going to bring harm, God is going to bring harm, is not not going to call back His word, the harm is going to come, but God is going to deliver from it, God will arise against the house of evil doers, and against the help of them that work iniquity. Now he says the Egyptians are men and not gods, why do you trust the Egyptians instead of trusting God? Yes? (2 1/2) There is--what is the "he" in the Hebrew? ...them that work iniquity. It seems to me that it is describing that which the Lord would do, and that just before we had Egypt mentioned, we had the Lord mentioned, we haven't had any

specific Egyptian mentioned. We have God who is one mentioned before, so it would seem to me that from the viewpoint of grammar there would be a presumption it was the one mentioned, the Lord, rather than the nation mentioned, Egypt. A presumption but not a proof, but it would seem to me the proof would be in the content, that the content describes what the Lord does rather than what the Egyptian does. It is not a thing you can dogmatically say, this is now going to talk about the Lord, it doesn't say the Lord. The "he" you have to decide from context always, but in this case the content of the verse, rather than the context of the previous verses, would seem to me to warrant our saying it is the Lord here spoken of. Yes? (3 3/4) Yes, the Lord had said that you make this scheme with Assyria, to get deliverance from Ephraim, and ~~Ass~~ Syria, they had made this scheme, God says that the covering is too narrow to wrap yourself in, the bed is too short to stretch yourself on, He says this scheme of yours is not going to work, it is going to backfire, you get rid of the states in between and you're in tremendous danger from Assyria, and they say, well right, we will trust in Egypt then, Egypt will deliver us from Assyria. He says, yet God is wise, God says He is going to bring harm, He'll bring it and He won't call back His word, what He declares is going to stand, he said you're wrong to make this alliance with Assyria, He is going to see that you get the harm that He has predicted, He will not call back His word, but He says, nevertheless He is going to rise against the house of evildoers, against the help of them that work iniquity. Now you could take the last part as still referring to Israel, the evildoers were making alliance with Assyria, God's going to rise against them. I incline to think that it's better to take it ~~simply~~, since we have it so abundantly taught in the other chapters, near, that it's going onto the second phase of God's wrath. God is going not to call back His words,

(5) but God is going to deliver you from it, He is going to rise against the house of evildoers. I appreciate questions being raised on this thing, we want to examine the evidence carefully, this is not the

simplest part of the Scripture by any means, but I do think that when we examine it carefully we find a clear guidepost to show what is being given. Yes? (5 1/2)

Yes, the help would probably be the Egyptians, the house of evildoers, the Assyrians, and then you think the Egyptians will deliver you, that their help will deliver you, well, God will cause that neither one shall. I would incline that way.

Now we continue, v.3: Now the Egyptians are man and not God; their horses-- you've got a lot of horses, tremendous lot, only he says their horses are flesh and not spirit. When the Lord shall stretch out his hand, both he that helps shall fall, and he that is holpen shall fall, good Old English, like in Luke 1, the Lord hath holpen His people Israel. He that is holpen shall fall down, and they all shall fail together. The Lord says, you're not going to get deliverance through Egypt or through Assyria. He says, this thing of playing off one human deliverance against another, is in the end going to fail. We have to break (6 1/2) sometime, break this alliance, and turn to God, turn to the only source of permanent help. He that helps and he that is holpen shall fall down, and they all shall fail together. For thus the Lord hath spoken unto me, like as the lion and the young lion roaring on his prey, (I'm getting oriental, 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 for the noise of them. What is this a figure of thus far? Well, we wouldn't know. Is he talking about the Assyrian coming? What is he talkigg about? Well, the end of the verse tells us. So shall the Lord of hosts come down to fight for mount Zion, and for the hill thereof. And you might say, are we justified in saying that the end of v.2, "will arise against the house of the evildoers," mean God arises against the Assyrians and the Egyptians to deliver? Well, you ~~could~~ certainly couldn't draw it from the end of v.2 alone, but it's a possible interpretation, and it is what is given clearly, explicitly in v.4. So shall the Lord of hosts come down to fight for Mount Zion, and for the hill thereof. There is a clear statement that the Lord is going to

deliver Jerusalem. You can't deliver them by getting help from the Egyptians, that won't work, your human schemes are going to fail, but you're not going to go under, because God still has purposes of grace that He is going to work out. He is preserving Israel with the intentions to prepare the way for the coming of His Son into the world, no matter mistakes Israel does, no matter how they feel, no matter what tremendous forces come against them, God's purpose is going to be accomplished, and Israel cannot be taken captive till God chooses Himself for His own purposes to permit it to be done. So he says He will deliver like a great lion that nothing can stop. So, he says, no matter how many shepherds ^{you} he calls together, to do your will, thinking your plans are going to work out, the Lord is like a great lion, roaring on His prey, He will come down to fight for mount Zion and for the hill thereof. He will deliver Jerusalem. He doesn't promise to deliver Judah. He doesn't promise to deliver Israel. The Assyrian takes Israel captive, then Sennacherib captures all Judah except Jerusalem. But the Lord delivers Jerusalem, which after all, was the main large city, the greatest thing, the central stronghold, and meant that when the Assyrian marched back, the rest of Judah was available to them, and they had nearly another hundred years before they were taken captive. And then, not by the Assyrian but by the Babylonian. So that you have your transition from first, the Egyptians can't protect you, but the Lord will protect you. The transition occurs here between vv. 3 and 4, but I think you already have, in the last half of 2, the groundwork laid for what is explicit in 4. And then v. 5 declares again, back in chapter 31 we read that through the voice of the Lord, the Assyrian will be beaten down. It was through His voice, not a physical sending an army or something like that, it is through the voice of the Lord, it is by a superhuman, mysterious, supernatural way, God is going to do it, and to give another figure to express the same thing. And in v. 5 he does not give a prediction of warfare with airplanes in modern times, as some have drawn from this verse, that is not what he is giving here, any more than back in Isaiah, at

the end of Isa. 3, he was predicting the tire shortage during the war, as the Governor of Texas declared in a public address. That is not his purpose here at all. He is here describing the way he is going to deliver from Sennacherib, and he says that there will--it will be like birds flying. Well, in those days what could they do about birds flying. The birds fly up over head and you might be able to hit them with rocks, or with arrows, but they can fly high enough that you can't reach them. The birds fly overhead and there is nothing you can do about it. And that's the way God is going to deliver Jerusalem, going to deliver it by a power beyond your reach, something which doesn't seem to you to be a tremendous forceful attack of an army, or anything like that, it is the divine intervention by an unusual method, ^{just as where he said} that the voice of the Lord will beat down the Assyrian which smote with a rod. Here, like birds flying, the Lord will descend, the Lord covers you might say like birds over (11 1/4) their young, over their nest, like the bird flying, that's how, by the power that you can't reach, the Lord accomplishes, and of course the way He accomplishes it, we're told in chapter 37, through the angel of the Lord killing thousands of them, in one night. Yes? (11 1/4) The 4th verse, yes, the Lord of hosts will come down to fight for mount Zion, and for the hill thereof. That's part of it. (stu.) Well, that particular picture, the 4th verse, doesn't particularly fit (11 3/4) the young lion roaring on his prey, or in the 5th verse, --the 4th verse, the stress in the 4th, is on the power, the irresistible power. The young lion roars on his prey, and they call forth a multitude of shepherds against him. He is not afraid of their voice, he doesn't abate himself for their noise. It is the picture of people before they had guns, when a lion would come against them and all they could do is run. Even if you get a bunch of shepherds. What could they do, without a gun? All they could do is run. The lion comes through and they're ~~not~~ ended. And he says that's the way the Lord comes. It is the irresistible power of God that is pictured in v. 4. But the lion roaring hardly fits with the quietness of it, that fits (12 3/4)

the birds flying over, is again the irresistible power, but it is the irresistible power of a type that could not represent a human army. The quietness, the irresistible power of God in an unexpected way, but in 4, simply the irresistible power is brought out, under this vivid picture of the lion. A very different picture from the picture of the birds' flying....

33. (1/2)

...then we have the rest of v.5, the Lord defending them, he will deliver them, in passing over, he will preserve them. The general idea of the passing over, makes you think perhaps of the Passover in Egypt, how the Lord smote the Egyptians and He passed over those who were under the blood. Passing over he will deliver them. Again it fits with the birds flying, defending them in general terms ^{which} fits with this kind of protection, but which would more usually be used with the more forceful army-type protection. But it could fit.

So then we have the folly of trusting Egypt, but the fact that God will deliver. These, of which one is brought out in the beginning of chapter 30, the other not till the end of 30, they are both brought out here in these first five verses of chapter 31. And the second of them, the deliverance from the Assyrian, by the mighty power of God is brought out very clearly in vv.8 and 9, at the end here, that which is limited to the last part of 30 is here brought out in the early part of 31 but again at the end very clearly, --Then shall the Assyrian fall with the sword, not of a mighty man, and what is the Hebrew word translated here "mighty man" Mr. Cohen? (2 1/4)

Yes. He took it right out of his head, he has got this whole Hebrew memorized. Of a mighty man. And the sword of not of a mean man shall devour man. What is the mean man, Mr. Grauley? (2 1/4) Good, he's got it memorized too, very good. So we have eash and arah, here. Now how do you get mighty man out of eash and mean man out of arah? Well, you know Adam was a mean man, he took the apple his wife gave him, instead of refusing ~~it~~ it. He was mean, wasn't he? But that's not what

the English word mean means. Here it means low, here it means one of little power, but why does (2 3/4) mean of little power? I don't think it is a good translation. To get the idea sufficiently, though I don't say the verse is at all misrepresented by the translation, but the word each is a man compared with a ~~wo~~man, here is a man (3) and the woman So speaking of the man who they say is not as physically well put together as the woman, women on the whole live longer than men do, they have perhaps a better physical constitution than men, but the man has the stronger muscles, he is muscularly strong, and the medical aspects of it probably weren't known to people in those days, but the difference in muscles has always been, so that (3 3/4) is not erroneous at all, to call it a mighty man, but he doesn't say "a mighty man." That would be (3 3/4) of a mighty man, but here it is just a man. But when you say an (3 3/4) or an well you mean the same thing. (3 3/4) is humanity, it means man regardless of sex, it means humanity, and you say it is just a parallel, it means no kind of a man, so if you say, not a mighty man, nor a mean man, you're saying the same thing, not a big man, nor a little man--not any kind of a man, but the precise meaning is not in the Hebrew. The Hebrew is just two words for a man, not any kind of a man. So it seems to me that the King James Version gets the sense of it exactly, but that it can hardly be called a literal translation, in this particular case. I doubt if the King James Translators would have taken that much liberty with the text. My guess is that probably in the Latin or in the Greek translation you would find that somebody else took the liberty and the King James Translators followed them, I don't know. I think very often that is the case, when you find (4 1/2) like that. They're following an old tradition, because I don't think ordinarily they would take that much liberty with it, they tried to be as literal as they could, with the Hebrew. And in this case, ^{literally,} it would be to take them both man, any kind of man.

Not a man, nor a human being, that would be the most literal. Not from a man will they fall, not from a human being will they fall, that would be an exact rendering. But of course, what does it mean? The Assyrian won't fall with the sword of a mighty man, of a man, the sword of a human being won't devour him, but he shall flee from the sword, there is a Hebrew word (5 1/4) --he shall flee for himself, which doesn't make much reason, why should he have to flee for himself? Why put in a (5 1/2) there, as some of the manuscripts have, instead of which seems to me to have considerable to be said in its favor, that it's not that he shall flee from the sword, but that he shall not flee from the sword. He won't flee from the sword of a man, he won't flee, he won't be destroyed by the sword of humanity, no sword is what will destroy him, but he will flee. Well, now, if you change he will flee into he won't flee, maybe that isn't so good, so perhaps it's better to stick to the "him," and say, but he will flee for himself from the sword, and his young men will be overwhelmed, that it's not a human sword that devours the Assyrians, it is the angel of the Lord who comes down and kills some thousands in the night, the pestilences the Lord uses destroys the Assyrian army, and then the king of Assyria, who himself is not destroyed in the pestilence, knows that with the small group that is left to him, once the Jews find out what has happened, he'll be in mortal danger. They would certainly attack and wreck him, after that, so he'd better get out of there in a hurry, so he flees for himself from the sword, after his force has been destroyed not by the sword of any kind of a man, but by God's intervention, and his young men, the young men that weren't killed with the pestilence, they better flee with him, because there is too few of them to do anything now. So the Assyrian defeat, not by human power, but by divine intervention is described repeatedly in these various verses. And v.9, he will pass over to his strong hold for fear--some try to take that as "his rock," literally, that this means he goes into his own territory, gets to his first fortress, but it seems

to me it's better to take the rock as standing for his capital city of Nineveh, or for the power of his empire as a whole, that he gets away from this distant place, to which he had come in order to destroy Jerusalem, then he heads back to what is his actual domain, of strength, his rock, where it would be pretty hard to get at him. And for fear, in view of his small number of men he had left, he heads back to his strong hold, and his princes are afraid of the ensign--interesting to bring in the banner here, Hebrew word is (7 3/4) literally banner, they are afraid of the ensign, afraid of this sign, this indication of a supernatural power which has protected Israel, makes Israel an ensign, a sign that it is God's instrument for His purpose. He is afraid of the ensign, says the Lord, whose fire is in Zion, and his furnace in Jerusalem. We had the fire, we had the furnace, at the end of v. 33. I don't see that this is a parallel to that at all. This refers back to the beginning of 29, the hearth of God, this place in Jerusalem is where all these tensions (8 1/2)

but the greatest force of the day comes there and vows to destroy Jerusalem, but God delivers Jerusalem by His own power. It is the place where His mighty purposes are worked out, it is His hearth, the place where there is fire and his furnace not fire and furnace in the sense used in 33 of the previous chapter, of the destruction but of the tensions, the great changing forces. Reminds of 1959 when I got into Berlin, and I immediately went to the Free University in (9) to see if-- I was only going to be there four days--I could hear some good lectures. And I found that the lectures that day in the University didn't interest me particularly, but they had, that evening, in the Institute for Political Science, which was further down town, they had advertised out at the University, a lecture that evening, on Berlin (9 1/2) Berlin, Burning Point of Europe, so I went to the lecture that night and I was so sleepy, having been all the night before on the plane -- it was all I could do to keep my eyes open, but I heard a lecture, a 40-minute, 50-minute talk on all these crises that are coming together in Berlin, the tensions of

the different countries of Europe, all showing themselves there. ~~¶~~ Don't think they even dreamed that two years later the wall would be put straight across the middle of the city, but you could feel the tension there. Berlin is the (10) point of the present situation because the tensions are coming together there, and showing themselves there, and Jerusalem was the place where the tension between the power of God and the power of evil is displayed and the people turning against God and not carrying out His purpose, but God intervened with His mighty power, showing to all the world that His purposes will be accomplished, and so we have chapter 31 ending with this note which began 29, so although we have a unit that runs from chapter 28 to the end of 35, within that unit, you might say we have a subordinate unit, a unit which runs from 29, 30, and 31, which is dealing very specifically with this situation, the outworking of the scheme they made, to bring in Assyria into their situation, outworking in terrible danger for them, but in God's deliverance to them, and looking ahead on to the distant future, as we had in chapter 29 when he shows his turning to the Gentiles, he shows the wild olive branch as being grafted in to the olive tree, and in chapter 30, it shows the Israelites being the beacon on the hill, the emblem, the ensign to show, to witness to God's power, and he goes on there to look forward to the ultimate graciousness is to show to the Israelites and to all of these people, and he in 31 had this one verse, in v.22, which shows that forceful action in which the people from the exile on are going to turn utterly away from idolatry and say to the idols, "Get thee hence," and so now in 31 we notice the beginning and the ending, but we skip two verses, and these two verses represent the whole middle half or two-thirds of chapter 30. In that middle half and two-thirds of 30 he looks forward to the ^{millennium,} ~~time,~~ he looks to the period just before the millennium, and he showed the removal of idolatry among the Israelites from the exile on. Well, here, he just devotes two verses to that whole long section, and deals with that which is most immediate, he says turn ye unto him from whom

the children of Israel have deeply revolted. For in that day -- in other words, for a day is coming 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. The turning away from idolatry, which is described in 31 and characteristic of Israel all through this age, this is the one element in that long passage in 30 which he recapitulates here in 31 at this place...

34. (3/4)

...now after this section that runs from 29 through 31, he continues in four more chapters of which the last two are rather unified, and perhaps not so difficult to see what the purpose of them is, the last two. They look way on to the future, but before these last two that look way on to the future, we have the two chapters that come first ahead of those, chapters 32 and 33, and of these two chapters, chapter 32 starts in a most interesting way, so I would like to ask you to look into 32 and 33, particularly 32, for next time, look into both of them, but hand me in a written piece of paper by 11 o'clock next Monday morning, a written statement by Monday morning at 11, and on that written paper, you need deal only with chapter 32, but try to get 33 also a good deal in mind so we can probably get to it by Tuesday. But Monday turn this in written about 32.

And I'd like you to look at these verses of 32, and ask yourselves this question, here we are in this book dealing with the nobles, dealing with the leaders, do we have any direct statement specifically referring to the political situation of Isaiah's day? The immediate or a little later in Isaiah's time, in each verse, ask yourself about each verse. Secondly, if the verse about that, does the verse deal with God's plans in the very distant future, or does He deal with not quite so distant? That is to say, is the passage talking about the Ephraimitic-- Syro-Ephraimitic alliance, and Tiglath-pileser's dealing with him, is it talking about their getting help from Egypt, is it talking about the time of the exile, is it talking about

the first coming of Christ? Is it talking about the period after the first coming of Christ, or is it talking about the millennium? Do you find clear evidence in the verse, what particular time or situation it is talking about. That's number 1 about each verse.

Secondly, who is the verse talking to? Is it talking about God's own, His true believers, regardless of racial background? Is it talking of people of a certain racial background regardless of whether they're believers or not? Or what exactly is the meaning of the particular verse? And thus see if you can't work out what is the trend of thought here. Now do that for each verse of 32 for next time. There are 20 verses in that and 24 in the next, so that's a fairly even division. And then study into 33.

But now in 32, it's interesting how it begins, begins with a very interesting verse, behold, a king shall reign in righteousness. What have we had about a king reigning in righteousness yet in our present section, from 28 on? We have had nothing, have we? We had in 33 of 31 that Tophet is prepared for the king, that's no king who reigns in righteousness. Our emphasis has not been on kings from 28 on, we are dealing with the nobles, we are dealing with the leaders of the people, not with the kings, but now we have a promise which would certainly seem to remind us of the promises of Isaiah 7, that Immanuel is coming, God with us, and the Assyrians can't destroy this land because it's Immanuel's land, and the government will be upon His shoulders, Immanuel's. Now is this referring to that or is it just a prediction that Hezekiah is going to (4 3/4) ? Well, you may vote one way or the other on that if you want, but I will at least say this, listen to the verse now: Behold a king shall reign in righteousness and princes shall rule in judgment. We have 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 --I have noted seven passages which have similar promises in. If you have others to mention why just jot them down on a piece of paper and give them to me after class, but I have these seven to note. Now we have five minutes

left, I think I can read the seven. Listen to them closely and when I get through with them, tell me whether you think there is anything in this verse that is markedly different from every one of the seven parallels to which I know direct your attention. Here, I read to you again: Behold a king shall reign in righteousness and princes shall rule in judgment. There in Jer.23.5 we will read these words: Behold the day is coming that the Lord thou wilt raise unto David, ~~the~~^a righteous branch and a king shall reign and prosper and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. I won't take time now, since there is little time, to read much of the context, but you notice how similar it is to 32.1, behold a king shall reign in righteousness and princes shall rule in judgment.

Turn to Isa.9.6,7, and there in Isa.9.6,7, there is a very familiar verse, for unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulders, his name shall be called wonderful, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the prince of peace, of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom to order and establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even forever. And 11.4, Isa.11.4:

But with righteousness shall he judge the poor and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth, when he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked, and Isa.2.4 and 7 say:

He shall judge among the nations, to rebuke many people--you're familiar with that, of course. Isa.2.4.

And Micah 4.4 is the parallel to it, and Ps.110.2 is the wonderful promise which says the Lord shall send the rod of thy strength out of Zion, rule thou in the midst of thine enemies, and one more:

Isa.24.23, where we read that verse, then the moon shall be confounded and sun ashamed when the Lord of hosts shall reign in mount Zion and in Jerusalem, and before His ancient glory. Now we read (break) .. ⁷are parallel to this I believe: behold,

a king shall reign in righteousness. What is there in our present verse that found no parallel in the other? Mr. Abbott? Yes, our present verse ~~and~~ -- all these other wonderful promises, Immanuel's coming, he is going to reign, the nearest to it is 24, where the Lord of hosts, which is Christ, there, is going to reign in mount Zion, and before his ancient glory. But there it doesn't say they reigned with him, it says he reigns before his (8 1/4) glory. But this one says, a king shall reign in righteousness and princes shall rule in judgment. Why here alone, in all the wonderful promises of Immanuel, do we have the princes here? Because, while the great outstanding thing is that Christ is going to reign, and that's so important, everything pales into insignificance in comparison with it, yet this section here, from chapter 24-35 is dealing not with Ahaz, and the king, the house of David, but primarily with the leaders of the people, primarily with the nobles, with those who were associated with the wicked plan, and he is telling us that there will be leaders of God's people who will be entirely true to Him, and they are to have rich blessing, they are to rule with Christ, and of course we're told in Revelation 24.6 how they shall rise again, those who are his and they shall reign with Christ, a thousand years. It is a truth which is brought out later, clearly brought out in Revelation, but it is a truth which is so secondary in comparison with the far greater truth of His reigning, that ordinarily you don't even read sources, but in this one place it is brought out because here that is the emphasis of our passage, it is on the leaders of the people, rather than on the king specifically. I thought that was a very interesting point which I only noticed this noon, which I never thought of before, so I looked up all these verses, found it works out, but I think it is quite valid, if any of you thinks it isn't, please write out a statement why, and give it to me next time...

(break in record from 10 to 11 1/4)

...passage now that we were starting last time to look at. We are not at all, as if we had a chapter absolutely detached to try to interpret. We have many clues, or

much help for its interpretation given by the context which has preceded it. We have no reason to feel that there is any sharp break between this 32nd chapter and the chapters before. We have no reason to think such a thing, we have every reason to think that it will continue in relation to what precedes. As we have already noticed, v.1 seems to fit exactly with the whole context of the preceding. Of course, it is the first bringing ϕ in of the idea of the king. We have been dealing with the people, with the leaders of the people, rather than with the king, but in the parallel section, in Isa.7-12 the king is what is in the foreground, and the general idea about the king there is the general idea about the leaders of the people here, so v.1 is very natural in relation to what precedes, as being you might say, a resume of what you find in chapter 7, the whole ~~same~~ situation referred to the king, but of course, not starting with the king. Because there is this other verse which deals with...

35. (1/2)

... which deals with the matter of the leaders, princes shall rule. We have no (3/4) of princes anywhere that I recall ~~anywhere~~ in chapters 7-12. There it is the king alone who is in mind. Well, we've been thinking of the nobility, of the leaders, of the ruling class, up to the present point, and we continue speaking of them, princes will rule in judgment, not like these here, but we have the king also brought in. So that v.1 of 32 would seem to fit very nicely with what precedes, and as we go on in 32 we have every reason to think it is connected with what precedes, and if it is, then we think of what are the possibilities? One possibility is that the prophet might at any time turn his attention away from ideas of the future, to an immediate address to his own contemporaries. That is always a possibility in prophecy. He is talking to the people there, he might say something directly to them. That is one possibility, another possibility is he may speak with very definite reference to the historical situation, which had been discussed rather fully, he may refer to it,

he may deal with it specifically, though it has already been discussed quite fully. But then in dealing with the historical situation he has looked on beyond this, and seen things that are going to happen in the distant future, which are logically related to the more immediate situation, and having already stopped at that, it would not be at all unnatural if he were to continue looking on into the future. It will be quite unusual for a prophet to start with that, a prophet does not often in the Bible simply start in and say now I'm going to tell you what's going to happen 2000 years from now. That is not the usual approach, the usual approach is dealing with immediate situations, with rebuke for sin, or with blessing upon people if they will follow the Lord, some way of dealing directly with their situation, and then bringing added argument from glimpses of the future, or added explanations of God's attitude from something in the future, and thus we have had already in our section, we've looked forward in the immediate situation to the coming of Sennacherib, and God's delivering them from Sennacherib. We've looked on to the leaders fleeing and then being reduced to being a beacon on the top of a mountain, we've looked at that, we've looked at the ~~cause~~ ^{calling} of the Gentiles, to the continuation of the spiritual blessing of the Lord, but with the transfer of the center of emphasis from these Jewish leaders who are proving unworthy to a new group of spiritual leaders. Now what follows may then at any time, he may take any one of these different aspects for his starting point, or his point of ~~entry~~ ^{emphasis}. He may do it. It is altogether possible to introduce some other entirely new idea, but we will require very definite proof if we do. Otherwise it will be rather natural if we are continuing the same discourse, to expect it to fit in with one of the main emphases already recognized. So we looked at v.1 last time, and noticed that in v.1 we have something which would seem to look to the distant future. Some commentators say this is a prediction of Hezekiah, and it is true that Hezekiah was a great improvement over Ahaz, he was indeed a righteous king, but in the context, the context would seem to look for something much greater, much more important than

Hezekiah. It would seem to look these great wonderful promises of the more distant future that he is stressing, and if you take it in its fullest meaning, certainly that must be what is involved here. The Immanuel spoken of in 7-12 He is going to reign in righteousness, and princes shall rule in judgment. If that is what you're speaking of then this looks forward to the very end of the present age, looks forward to the millennial period when He will indeed reign in righteousness. So there you have two possibilities regarding this, first a specific looking to Hezekiah which we cannot completely rule out. But either that or the definite promise of Immanuel who with his princes shall rule in righteousness. When we look at v.2, and v.2 seems to tie up with v.1, I think that a certain question may be raised, is v.2 speaking about the same time as v.1, or is it speaking of the same individual, but at a different time? That would be a possibility. And it's rather difficult to see how the first two would refer to Hezekiah. If Hezekiah rules in righteousness and his princes rule in judgment, well, that is fine, it is excellent to have as good a king as you have in Hezekiah, but are you justified in using such language as in v.2? Well, if you read what the King James translators said about the great wonderful sun that rose on the land of England when King James came to be there, great king and all that, the preface that is in many of our books, you will think that they could have written this about Hezekiah, but I incline to think that most of the Biblical writers are a little more chaste in their language, a little more sober in their expression, a little more true to historical fact than the fulsome dedicatory epistle which the King James translators felt they had to do in order to continue the favor of that slobbering pedant who asked them to do the work.

So I cannot feel that this v.2 is Hezekiah. A man who is a hiding place from the wind, a covert from the tempest, rivers of water in a dry place, shadow of a great rock in a weary land. It seems to me this must be the true Immanuel that is here spoken of. And if this is the true Immanuel, that would fit very clearly, very definitely,

with the first being Immanuel rather than being Hezekiah. But if this is Immanuel you could describe the activity of Christ as He reigns in the Millennium in these figures, but I don't think you'd be apt to do so. This seems to fit with Isa.4 more than with Isa.2. It seems to describe not a time when there is not external danger, as the millennium is described as being, but rather a time when there still is external danger, there is wind, there is tempest, there are dry places, there is a weary land, but in this there is a shelter, there is a shade, there is a refuge, there is a wonderful opportunity for those who put their trust in Him, so my inclination would be to feel that in v.1, we look forward to the wonderful consummation in the millennium when the true son of David reigns in true righteousness in a world from which all danger has been removed, but then to see that same one who is going to rule in righteousness during the period before that being a hiding place from wind for those who put their trust in Him, being rivers of water in a dry place for those who truly know Him.

So I would incline to think that v.2 is describing Immanuel's relation to His people in the time previous to His establishing His time of ruling with an iron hand, over all the earth. And if we take that of v.2, then v.3, the eyes of--it is interesting how these three verses look at three different things, isn't it? Seem to be related but it's not a repetition, there is a lot of repetition in 2, under different figures, but there are three very distinct ideas in 1, 2, and 3, related but distinct. And the eyes of them that see shall not be dim, and the ~~ears~~ ears of them that hear shall hearken. Is that a description of the people in the millennium time, having access directly to God's truth, or is it a description of those before that time, who shall have greater access than ever before, because the word will be complete, we have the whole word of God, and we have the knowledge of so many things that we saw through a glass dimly, through a glass darkly, but now face to face, as Paul says, because we know how the Old Testament prophecies were fulfilled, and thus we have the ability to see much more clearly than before. I incline toward this latter which

would put it with two rather than one, but not strongly. I feel something could be said both ways. Mr. Gregory? (9 1/2) I'm not sure that it would necessarily have a direct relationship to either one, because there we had those who were blind and couldn't see who were enabled to see, and then we had those who could see but refused to see. They were punished for it, but who later know do see.

Well, here it seems rather to be individuals who want, well, the ears of those that hear shall hearken. Say, there is an idea. The first one might be those who couldn't see, the second, those who wouldn't see, Those who see shall not be dim, they won't be unable to see. And the ears of those that hear will pay attention (10 1/4)

it could include both together. Yes? ...feel that there is a start in that direction in Hezekiah's time, but I would doubt if v.2 could fit there, and I would feel as if the others used language that was pretty much beyond. That you might in Hezekiah's day (10 3/4) that you are getting, and then find that it was a start in that direction, but not actually

I would incline that way. I don't like the word (10 3/4) "double fulfillment"

much. If something is a plural thing, if it is predicted that there will be occasions of a certain type, then there could be five or six, and there may be, there are cases where something is a type of something, but ordinarily, as far as possible, I like to say (11 1/4)

exegetically. Well, the three verses then seem to have quite different ideas in them, but when you come to four, perhaps four is close to three. Do we perhaps in four have again a parallel to the two parts of three, the heart of the rash will understand knowledge, and the tongue of the stammerers shall be ready to speak plainly. Well, I'm not sure whether 3 is inability, changed to ability, or whether to some extent unwillingly changed to willingly. I can't tell for sure, but I incline to think that this is inability instead of unwillingly, in this verse. But then we start a section which seems to run together, vv.5-8 seem to be fairly continuous, it is closely related to

what precedes, but it seems to me that you have several different ideas before, now you have pretty much one thing you discuss from 5-8, and the 6th verse, as translated in the English, is a bit baffling. The 5th is quite clear, the vile person shall no more be called liberal, nor the churl said to be bountiful...

36. (1/2)

...attitude of today, the statement that no more will black be called white, things will be seen as what they are. That [^]I don't think is yet fulfilled, it may have been fulfilled to a slight extent, in times of revival, like Hezekiah's time, but when ~~you~~ he says, no more, to cease this double talk for a brief period and it comes back again as long as sin is widely rampant, and today it is worse than it ever was. Karl Barth believes in the bodily resurrection of Christ, not the spiritual resurrection, no, no, he believes in the physical bodily resurrection of Christ, but of course, he says, what became of those temporal elements (1 3/4)

Well, that certainly is double talk, to say a thing and then you take it back, or like when Karl Barth says another time, he says, I believe in the resurrection of Christ, and I believe in the second coming of Christ, but he says, the resurrection is not something that happened 2000 years ago and the 2nd coming isn't something that is going to happen in the future, they are both the same thing and they're both right now. When he says that, he better say I don't believe in them. Maybe he believes in them and interprets them in such a way that it is entirely different from what any reasonable reading of the Biblical narrative or of the creeds of the church would ever suggest. That is double talk (2) but here

it says, this is going to decline when this is brought to an end. So here I would incline to think that you have a fulfillment over a period. But you have a people come to know the Lord, you have a turning away from this type of thing. You are beginning to see things in black and white instead of just a variegated gray. Beginning to call things by their right names, beginning to turn away from sin and call it sin, and then

of course in the millennium you have

things are clear and sharp

Mr. Gregory, you had a question? ... comes to interpretation, I think that Alexander has a tendency to a certain vagueness, putting things together unnecessarily. I believe he is determined not to find any millennium anywhere, and that enters into the (3) gives him a certain vagueness, and a certain figurative-ization that often, I think, leads him astray, but he was a good student of Hebrew, and very evangelical, and he read all the standard German commentators of his day and he refers to many of their views, so he has a great deal of but on that particular point, I find him to be bad, because often he explains things away in what I would call a spiritual (3 1/4) Yes? Just how much premillennialism (3 1/2) I don't know, but certainly nothing like as much as but he does have very much of a spiritualizing attitude, which I don't like. But I do like his evangelical attitude, and I like his careful scholarly work, so I find it a very useful work up to a point, but I think he often misses some of the most important points. But on this particular matter of the stammering, he has, says, nothing about the words that would be helpful here. He says, some interpreters suppose this last metaphor relates to scoffers of religion, who were elsewhere represented as stammering and derision of the prophet's admonition, but it seems more natural to understand the bodily defects here mentioned as denoting others of intellectual and spiritual nature, neglecting ignorance of spiritual matters. The minds of man shall begin to be directed to religious things and delivered from ignorance and error in relation to it. Well, that doesn't add anything of importance (4 1/2) But looking up the Hebrew

word and checking on its use in other places and so on, one might get some definite further insight on the verse. Yes? Mr. Gregory? (4 1/2) I think putting yourself back in Isaiah's day, when he gave it, and reading this, I think that is a very excellent suggestion that you made. A person in Ahaz's day might say, this looks to

me most likely what is going to happen, that what will happen will be that there will be a godly king succeed Ahaz, rather soon, and when he comes, people will chafe. And when they see then the deliverance that is described in 29, people will turn to the Lord and the power of the Lord will extend to the Assyrians as well. I can see a very natural way to interpret it at that time, Against interpreting it that way, at that time, there would come to mind the fact that in chapter 30, he tells how they say they're going to flee and he says, yes, you will flee, one will chase a thousand, five will chase all of you, and you'll become a beacon on a hill, and so on, well, it suggests that there is going to be a period of reversal, and a period, and then of course the prediction of the turning to the Gentiles, I don't know just what that means, but it does mean at least that there are some pretty dark days ahead for them, and so the suggestion of these rather dark days and this fleeing and all that, which is given, wouldn't fit very well with the idea that there's going to be under Ahaz a son, this wonderful turning to God that will introduce this grand situation where righteousness will reign and the king, righteous king, will--this will continue from that.

Well, that might raise a question, but all a person could do in that day is to say I question if this is quite that soon, because we have these other things definitely promised, or definitely (6 1/2) Therefore, I question it is that soon but I hope I'm wrong. I hope we'll find it is that way. And then Hezekiah comes and Hezekiah is a godly king and has a marvelous passover and stands for the Lord and does so much that it is so wonderful, but then Isaiah says to Hezekiah who were these men you made alliance with, you showed everything to? He says, they come from a far country, from Babylon, and Isaiah says, your descendants are going to be carried off to be eunuchs in the palace of the king of Babylon, they're going to take all your treasures. Well, that sounds as if these wonderful promises are not yet to be fulfilled. And then Hezekiah dies and is succeeded by his son Manasseh, one of the wickedest kings they ever had, in whose reign the scripture is completely lost, has to

be rediscovered in the temple by Josiah, and in his days they have heathenism all through the land, they have that awful period, and the Assyrian~~s~~ does not turn to the Lord at all, but Sennacherib tries to comfort himself for failing to take Jerusalem by putting up a great big picture in his palace of his capture of Lachish, and makes a lot of that and tried to forget his defeat, and actually^{I think}/then the reader of Isaiah would say , my, it would have been nice if this (7 3/4)

yet the Lord says this is going to come, and then we read 7-12 and we see those marvelous things said about the Messiah, about Immanuel, and we say, well, Hezekiah was a wonderful man and a great king, but he fell far short of what was predicted about the Messiah then, and this must be (8 1/4)

So I think in the~~end~~ we would come to the conclusion, I think, by the reign of Manasseh we would be in a position to come to the conclusion, that it could not be Hezekiah. Though I think in advance that would be the hope that it would be Hezekiah. The hope would be that Hezekiah would be Immanuel, but he proves to be a very wonderful man but hardly comparable with Immanuel. So that we are looking forward then to something that is way off, I believe we are looking to the millennium and that which was shortly before the millennium, and yes, Mr. Abbot? (8 3/4) I would say that v.1 is definitely the millennium, I would say that v.2 is the millennial king, as he is in relation to his own during the whole period before the millennium, after He is known, that He is the hiding^{place}/from the wind. He is the shadow of a great rock in a weary land, or during all the periods ever since He has been known at all. And then in v.3 that we have the wonderful blessing that can come to all who believe on Him, up to the time of the millennium, and that will be available to a far greater number during the millennium, and then in v.4 I would incline to think the same thing, that all those who come to Christ can find themselves able to speak much more plainly than they could before, but that it will get its fullest expression when He is actually here. And then 5, we hope, I would say, that wherever groups really turn to the Lord,

and follow Him, you find an increase in their truthfulness in speaking, and a decline in the attitude of double talk, you find that, but we don't have it fully in force in any group prior to the millennium, but we have a tremendous step in that direction, and it is most interesting, I have been reading some of the literature of England during the last century, when they were under the effect of the great revivals of the 18th century, and ^{then} the so-called Victorian Age is the time when the great increase in Christian character, and in Christian faith, and Christian living throughout England had affected the general standard, so that a century ago, you find in England an attitude toward truth and duty and these things, that is hard to parallel almost anywhere. You find a willingness, a risk, a national, everything, for the sake of what they consider to be right, what they consider to be true, even on the part of those who have no faith. But I think that it is in them a by-product and a result of the tremendous spread of Christian character and Christian teaching that had come as a result of the revivals of the previous century, which continued on indirectly.

So I believe that it is true that wherever you have real Christians, double talk is tremendously cut down, truthfulness and true appraisal become greatly increased. But of course it doesn't reach its real full expression until you (11 1/2) but it's interesting to have here that prediction of that effect of the divine teaching upon the life, of making people no longer call a churl, a liberal, and no longer use this double talk, though all fallible human beings do it to some extent. But it is one of the results of true godly ~~people~~ teaching to cut it down and eventually do away with it altogether. But then you come to v.6, and v.6 for anyone who knows a little bit about Hebrew, is a very simple verse, but for anybody who knows nothing about Hebrew, v.6 would be a tough problem. Look at these wonderful promises of the future in v.5, the vile person shall no more be called liberal, nor the churl said to be bountiful. No, what is going to happen? Isn't this wonderful, the vile person is going to speak villainy, and his heart is going to work iniquity. Isn't that a marvelous

promise?...

37. (3/4)

...the imperfect in Hebrew is not a future, the imperfect of Hebrew may be used as future, and in fact ^{used sufficiently of the} ~~is future~~ that for an ordinary conjugation, that is perhaps the simplest way of giving it in English. But that doesn't mean that it is ~~in~~^a the future, that it is ^{an} imperfect, and the imperfect can be used to indicate an event in future time, but another very common use of imperfect is what I would call a (1 1/4)

Now you spoke of (1 1/4) the present. Now in English, very few people I've ever met know anything about English grammar, because our grammar is usually simply based on Latin, it is difficult to get. We take a form and we say that's English present, but it ~~isn't~~. I sit. We say that's present but that isn't present. Present is I am sitting. I sit is frequentative. You meet somebody who is walking away from here. You say where do you go to school. He says, I go to Faith Seminary, and he is walking out the gate. It is not a present but a frequentative. It is a statement of his customs, his habits, a frequentative.

So this is not a statement of something that is going to be in the future, not a statement ^{of something} ~~they are going~~ at this present time. But something which it is their habit to do, and so what we miscall our English present, which is really English frequentative, is the exact (2 1/4)

He says that this is going to be changed, he says that the vile person ~~will~~ speak villany, his heart works/ iniquity, his heart practices hypocrisy, utters error against the Lord, he causes the drink of the thirsty to fail, these are the things which the vile person does. In other words, a person whose heart is vile performs vile actions, and a person whose heart is good performs good actions. Just as the Lord said, He said that it is out of the heart that the mouth speaks, and it is the matter of the type of person and by having a wicked person start in to act in a kind apparently helpful manner, merely enable s him to put on a pretense that makes him all the more

dangerous. You have to change the heart, not

He says that ^{person whose} the heart is deceitful and desperately wicked and turned against the Lord, that is what that person is and the only way to remedy it is to make a thorough-going change of the heart, not merely an external change of manner. He says that there is the churl, there's the wicked person, and the wicked person does wickedly, and it is the heart that counts, and the actions follow the heart, and you've got to make a change in the person, not merely a change in the actions. So, after these three brief verses, suggestions of previous things, 1, 2, and then 3, 4 together, of wonderful results of Immanuel's coming, now we have a stress on His relationship to the heart of the people, that the person is put in the category in which he belongs, he is not just reformed slightly, he must be completely changed. The instruments of the churl are evil, he deviseth wicked devices to destroy the poor with lying words, but the liberal devises right things, and by right things, liberal things, he stands. There are the two categories, and the Lord can change (4 3/4)

from one category to the other, but it takes a thorough-going change and not just a little change of actions. Yes, Mr. Gregory? (5) The word liberal, ^{is about} ~~is not~~ as wide from the modern ~~know why they~~ English there is. From meaning unbelieving to meaning generous, kindly, advanced, it means all kinds of things. It is an unfortunate phrase because it just simply has tremendous breadth of meaning, and it is used very dogmatically by different people in different connections. (stu.) I don't think this refers to (5 1/2) I think this is referring to people who are affected by (5 3/4)

(stu) Yes, of course, it is true that he represents the good character to the ultimate, and to that extent the word could doubtless describe him, but I don't think in this verse it is talking about him, I think it is talking about those who are here described. But "liberal" is a rather unfortunate translation but of course in King James' day they probably didn't know how many different ways the word would come to be used later.

Well, then vv.1-3 I don't think we have very difficult time getting the general sense of it fairly well in mind, there are particular details that could profit with further investigation, but as to the general thought I would incline to think that one to eight might be considered as a wonderful conclusion to what precedes, suppose that this were the end of chapter 31, you have these wonderful promises in previous chapters, you have the destruction of Sennacherib, and then you have God's wonderful purpose in the end, and you could think of it as a conclusion to 31. In v.9, there is a paragraph mark in my Bible. Do you think that a paragraph mark is justified at this point? Mr. Abbott? (7 1/4) Why? You have pretty condemnation also in vv.5, 6, and 7, don't you? Yes, well, why can't this be? (stu) Yes, v.9. (stu) Whom is he speaking to in v.1? In general, yes. Whom is he speaking to in v.9? Well, I think you can be more specific than that, can't you say Jewesses? He makes a change of grammatical gender, and that is a rather marked thing, isn't it? He has been talking in a general way in the third person, and all of a sudden he changes to second. He has been talking, his emphasis has been on men, of course it includes everybody, he is not specifically speaking of men, but it is in the masculine, there has been no specific feminine at all, I don't think in all we've looked at lately. Now, all of a sudden he addresses women, and he speaks right to them, we've had very little direct speech until now. Till you get back to where he says you will flee, and indeed you shall flee, there is that, but since that there has been very little direct speech. Now all of a sudden, after talking about (9 1/4) he starts speaking to some of them directly. He denounces the church in those three verses, but now he addresses somebody. So there is quite a change of manner. Now you can have as marked change as that in the middle of one discourse, but it's not ordinarily. When you get as marked change in manner, it is ~~at~~ at least a paragraph, and perhaps a greater.

And now he has been talking here about wonderful things that are going to happen

when we get to the millennium, or during the period before the millennium, but now who is he talking to? Do you have any reason to think he is not talking to his contemporaries? Does he now, after this wonderful picture of the future he has given, does he now come right back and talk to people right then and there? Well, if so, there is quite a marked change. So we have--all you have pointed out is true, but I just (10 1/4) is a little more obvious and should perhaps be that there is all this evidence of quite a definite break, that a paragraph division is certainly in order, I would incline to think maybe even a chapter. It is quite an important break. But so then now, he addresses some people, and how long does he keep on with this second person address? How far does it go? Mr. Golin? (10 3/4) 14? What is in the second person in 14? (stu.) V.14, you say? My Bible has only a semicolon. That is a matter of interpretation, but (stu) Yes, yes. Mr. Gregory? (stu) He started talking in the banquet hall. Whether he got kicked out and then wrote out the rest of his message he wasn't able to give, or whether he continued and gave it to people out on the street in front, I don't know. But I think that it's the same continuous discourse (11 1/2) (stu) So that could fit very well with his not having just been kicked out, still being right there. Very interesting, very good. Yes? (12 1/4) (break in record, starting again at 13) ...yes, you would define the thing as a little too long to have been delivered there. Yes, it's hard to tell, if they were getting pretty drunk, they might (stu)-- it is hard to tell. At least, I think in thought it is one discourse, whether he was able to give it all at once or whether he finished up later in writing, or whether he gave it out in the front, or whether he gave it in one side of the place. Or what he did. It is one continuous discourse for a definite specific situation, and dealing with all its various facts. (stu.) The suggestion, just as he said before, that these tables have I (13 3/4)

He said when they said line on line, jot on jot, he said

it is just possible that something there gave the proper...

39. (3/4)

...let's see, we were on 31, no, it was 32 we were on, wasn't it? And we noticed the beginning of 32, and we noticed the first verse of the millennium, I believe, second verse, Christ before the millennium, I believe. I don't see how it could fit the millennium. Third and fourth verse, the wisdom through Christ that those have who trust in Him. Fifth to eighth verses, the clear views we get through Him of right and wrong. No longer calling white black and ~~wh~~ black white, and then 9th verse, he reverts to the present situation, talks to the--for a time turns his attention away from the leaders and looks at the rank and file of the people, these women that are at ease, and speaks to them, rebukes them for their indifference, which is the same thing he had rebuked the leaders for, and says how they are going to lose their present prosperity, and going to sorrow for it as they look back upon it, but looking forward through the age ahead, when the indifference and worldliness of the people, is punished by the Lord, and it then goes on to look at details of this, the exilic condition, thorns and briers in 13, I don't think we--yes, we spoke a little beyond that, didn't we? To v.9 only? Yes, then when the graduates met later we looked a little beyond. But in this class we looked to v.9, and we noticed what I just spoke of, the character of the people in general, vv.9-11. He speaks specifically to the women, but it seems to me that he is here using the women as representatives of the people as a whole, aside from the leaders. Doesn't that strike you as reasonable? I don't think it is women as compared with men, so much, as it is the fact that the women were typical of the people who were not the leaders, and the wives of the leaders would be included who were not taking an interest in the vital progress of the nation, but they were simply enjoying the finery and the luxury ~~w~~ that they had as Wives of the leaders, and then to some extent representing the mass of the people who were indifferent to the great things of the kingdom of God and interested only in their own personal pleasures, or misfortunes. So he addresses them from v.9 on, and simply speaks

of the character, the carelessness principally, in vv.9-11, but the end of 10 speaks a little bit of the coming loss of prosperity, where he says that the vintage ~~that~~ ^{will} fail, the ingathering will not come, and then in v.12, they are going to lament for the loss of the prosperity, the produce of the cows, the animals, the pleasant fields, and the fruitful. Or it is sometimes taken as being that they will feed upon the grass-breasts for the pleasant fields and the fruitful vines, the Hebrew could be translated either way there, and it is pretty hard to tell which is the real meaning in that case. It comes back to the same thing though. I think that is very important in examining Biblical interpretation, is to notice how sometimes there are slight differences in the interpretation of words, which actually make tremendous differences in the meaning of a passage. And other times there are tremendous differences (4 3/4) in the meaning of words, and yet you find sometimes that tremendous differences in the translation of a phrase of a verse will nevertheless end up with ~~the~~ exactly the same thing as far as the meaning of the passage is concerned. Now I think it is very important to, well, to see exactly what we can get out of a verse, or a passage, what is there that is sure? And don't try to be any surer than you can be. A word in any language, words have various possibilities of meaning. Now of course when you are going to present your final results ~~you~~ you have to do it with definiteness, if you are just presenting your doubts and your uncertainties, you get nowhere. But find the things that are definite and present them, and see what the things are, where there is an ambiguity of word, an ambiguity of expression, you find this in every language, just determine where it is, and then when you determine (5 1/2) instead of spending too much trying to decide which of two meanings, if it isn't clear fairly soon, which of the two it is, then see what the results will be, and very often you find that whichever of the two you take, the passage means exactly the same thing, whether the verse reiterates what was two verses before, or whether it gives in advance what is two verses ~~after~~ after, if the interpretation is between the two,

it makes no difference to the meaning of the passage, which it is. So then there is no need of spending a lot of time. But if you find that there are two possible interpretations, one of which makes a tremendous difference in the meaning of the passage, then it's worth a good bit of time to decide between the two. And of course in such a case you want to look at other passages, to see whether you can rule one of the two out, whether you can prove that it is well authenticated by a parallel somewhere else. Now, I think Miss Luke had a question? (6 1/2) In chapter 12, you say? Yes, I would think so, quite definitely. Chapter 3, verse 16 to the end of the chapter has the prophet's rebuke against the worldly women of his time who were thinking only of worldly adornment and human pleasure, and he gives God's judgment upon these people in very strong language, in vv.16-26, ending up with the exile which is coming as a rebuke against them. Now that is a general thing in this portion of Isaiah which is a rather general introduction to the whole book, and ties up with this whole situation, but not very much with any one immediate historical situation. Now over here, we have the same message substantially, but it is tied up specifically with the particular situation, where the leaders of the people are doing this way, and he is criticizing them for it, and then he applies it to the women, at that time. The message is substantially the same of the two, but there is a little difference in approach because of the content. So naturally in studying either one of them it is very helpful to bring the others into comparison. Then ~~in~~ in vv.13 and 14, we have the prediction of exile: Upon the land of my people shall come up thorns and briers, 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, a joy of wild asses, a pasture of flocks.

Now when he says shall be for dens forever, it immediately gives you the suggestion that he is here describing a permanent situation. But the word forever translated "forever" here (8 1/2) the is a parallel

to and these words are not specifically eternal, they do not mean endless. I saw a long book written by a man once who based his whole teaching of eternal punishment in the book on this word (9) Now this isn't olam but this is a definite parallel to it. He bases his whole book on this, his whole teaching of eternal punishment, that there is no other word for endlessness, therefore this must be. Well, that doesn't prove it. Because actually, how often in daily life do you have need for a word for endlessness? It's a philosophical content, which there may be a good philosophical word for it that will express it exactly, but it may not do you much good in speaking to a group of common people like people who are not highly educated to use a word that will mean nothing to them. You have to use words that have a meaning in their vocabulary, and there may not even be such a philosophic term in a particular language, it's a philosophic idea. You never say that child is going to keep on going forever. You never say we're going to build this house, it is going to last forever, or if you do, you don't mean endlessly. If you do, you're using a hyperbole. But the specific idea of endlessness is not in these words (10 1/4) olam and ~~and~~ we can prove by the fact that they are used for that which occurred long, long ago, but yet in historic times, we have instances of that. So that these two words, I feel, we can quite safely say are words that indicate a long, long period of time. You would not use them for anything ^{with} in your lifetime. It is like the picture of the railroad track if you stand at the end of a straight track and you see it going on and on and on, until the two rails ~~w~~ seem to meet, way off in the distance, so distant you can't really see it, but you just know it goes on, you don't see an end to it. That's the idea of these words. That does not deny endlessness at all, it just means that these particular words do not have, --and the fact that they will say that something goes on forever, and ever, shows that there is something longer than just forever. It is stressed, for way on as far as you can see, and that much more, it is way off. But the specific idea of endlessness, though I think it is definitely

taught in Scripture, is not contained in a specific word. Consequently when this says they will be dens forever, it does not mean this land is going to become--that is, as far as the word is concerned, it does not mean this land is going to become just a ruin and it's going to stay that way, and there will never, never, never be any change to it, but it--neither does it mean that the thing is going to be conquered and going to be left a ruin and then ten years later somebody is going to come and rebuild it. It means something that lasts on for a long, long time. So when he says that these will be made dens for ever, he is suggesting a condition which is going to last for a long time. The Lord is looking to, I would say, the end of the Davidic kingdom as it then existed. He is looking to the end of national Israel settled on the land as a theocracy, as a kingdom, monarchy, whose kings were the descendants of the one appointed of the Lord, as it then existed. There is going to be a long time of ruination. Now do we think of this ruination then as ending at the return from exile, when the little group came back and started in struggling to rebuild, is that the end of this, or does this refer to a period which is going to continue on...

40. (1/2)

...after the little group comes back, there is a very considerable return but there is not a rebuilding in the former sense, there is a continuation of the period which you might call the times of the Gentiles. The period of a different sort of general organization in the world, a period which is characterized to a great extent by ruins and by wandering.

Well, I merely suggest those as possibilities in relation to this word "for ever" here, because I feel that the picture here is not Isaiah-saying, "I'm going to tell you history in advance, I'm going to give you a lot of specific details about the future, but he is giving certain details definitely, like Sennacherib's deliverance, but then he is giving them the broad picture of God's future plan as it is going to work out. And here we find that this condition is occurring now, and going to continue until

something happens, and possibly it's going to continue

that is to say, there is God's plan all through it, and He punishes indifference, He punishes turning away from His will, failing to follow His definite purposes, He punishes all this, but it all is part of His plan in preparing the way for bringing the great salvation to the whole world. Just as we had back in v.18 of chapter 30, where He tells about their fleeing and becoming like an ensign on a hill, therefore will the Lord wait ~~that~~ that He may be gracious unto you. All this has a place in God's plan for the world, and so now He says in v.15 this happens until the spirit be poured upon us from on high, and the wilderness be a fruitful field and the fruitful field be counted for a forest. And here you have the same figure that you had back in chapter 29. The wilderness becomes a fruitful field, the fruitful ~~field~~ field becomes like a forest. In other words there is going to be the outpouring of the spirit, there is going to be the change in the leadership of God's people, the former large group that were their leaders being grafted out of the tree, and in the main leadership being brought in from what was formerly a wild olive tree. And so this change is going to take place, described in chapter 29, there entirely with a matter of God's rebuke, but here ~~being~~ ^{joined} with the idea of real blessing. Because connected with it is the spirit being poured out upon us from on high. And then v.16 says what is going to happen and our question is does v.16 describe what happens at the same time as 15, or does 16 look beyond it to a later time? Then judgment shall dwell in the wilderness, and righteousness shall abide in a fruitful field. I don't think remain is quite the word. Remain suggests it is there and it's going to stay there. I don't think that's what it means. I think it means to be there continuously rather than the idea of staying there after having been there. Judgment will dwell in the wilderness. There is the outpouring of God's mercy among the Gentiles, as we had suggested in the previous verse, but righteousness will abide in the fruitful field, as that looks to the regathering, the regrafting of the olive tree natural branches back in to the olive tree. I would incline to think

that it does, though I'm not sure I could be dogmatic about it. Mr. Abbott? (4 1/4)

A very good point. It is a matter of the interrelation of figures. You have the specific physical literal land of Israel, described back there in 14, which becomes barren. That is the specific literal prediction in vv.9-14, made particularly clear in 14. Then ~~when~~ we get into 15, there would be the possibility of interpretation, that it is the same thing talked about, as in 14, that it is the country that has become a wilderness again becomes a fruitful field, that would be a possibility, and in fact I would incline to think that that would be the most likely possibility, if we had only this chapter to interpret, but we do have in the verse, not merely the wilderness becoming a fruitful field, but we have the fruitful field becoming a forest, and what is the fruitful field? If you only take this chapter into account. If Israel has become a wilderness and becomes a fruitful field, what now is the fruitful field? Does it mean the next step is this that becomes fruitful, again becomes a forest? Or ~~if~~ does it mean something else? We don't have anything in this chapter to interpret it by.

But if we look back to chapter 29 we find there that this precise figure was used back in 29 and that there it was used in v.17, is it not yet a very little while and Lebanon shall be turned into a fruitful field, and a fruitful field shall be esteemed as a forest, and there in the context it becomes quite apparent that what is here described, one side at least, has yet been described in the previous two or three verses in literal language, and there it ~~seems~~ means the Gentiles, the outside, becoming a fruitful field, and it means Israel being grafted out of the olive tree for a time. That is perfectly plain, I think, in 29.17, and the identical figures are here used with that, the parallel, the contrast, and everything. And if you take it in that sense, then in v.15 here, you do not have a reference to an agricultural situation in the physical land of Israel, but rather a figure used to compare w~~it~~ Israel which *even if in exile* is thought of as God's vineyard, God's fruitful field, which as Jesus described, it was let out to husbandmen, the husbandmen refused to bring forth the fruits of it, and

they drove away the owner and even killed his son, so if that figure used in 29 and in the gospels, if that is the figure here, then we're no longer talking of agricultural Israel, but we are speaking of Israel in contrast with you might say Gentiles. And of course not Gentiles on the whole, but a portion of them, that this condition lasts up to, it doesn't say stop at, but lasts up to the time, and longer too, up to the time when the Gentiles are brought into the kingdom, and Israel itself ceases to be the center of God's revelation but becomes outside of the main line of God's revelation. Yes? (8) Yes, very good. The "upon us" is the introduction of a first person which we have nowhere else in the chapter. And of course the changes of person occur in the Bible in a way that is rather foreign to our usage, we are apt to be more consistent with our persons, but we do have changes between third and second and first person. In a way, in the Bible, it is sometimes rather confusing, so it is possible ^{to say} that it is just a change of person without a specific reason for it. But I incline to think that even if we can't find the reason, there is some sort of a reason in scripture, and in this case the reason seems to me to be easier to find than it is in some others. That is, in this case, I feel that Isaiah is speaking here as one of the people of God, and here he speaks to the nobles, he speaks about you wicked leaders, and then he speaks about the nations as a whole, they, the nations, if the city. But here, he speaks of "us" as he does in another place, where he says behold, in chapter 8, wasn't it, or nine, eight: behold I and the son whom the Lord has given me. We are (9 1/2)

He is speaking of the godly people, and here he doesn't mean that he is looking forward now to the time when the whole nation has the spirit poured out upon them. Not in this verse looking to the time when a nation is born in a day, when the whole nation is converted at one time, at the very end of the present age, but he is looking to the time when the godly in the nation, symbolized by him and his disciples, receive a very special outpouring of ^{the} ~~his~~ Spirit of God, and an outpouring which, however, does not as they might expect continue to stretch out until the whole

nation is one with Christ, but reaches out over a substantial number from the nation, but then to their surprise reaches out to the Gentiles, and brings in great numbers of Gentiles until eventually the church is in its majority Gentile, rather than Jew, and has the problem to explain, how could this happen, and he explains it with God having grafted out the natural branch, for a time, it says they will eventually be grafted back in again. So it would seem to me that the ^{"us"} ~~ew~~ is a little touch which suggests, the spirit is poured out, not upon you wicked, no, not upon you women that are at ease, not upon them, the nation as a whole, but upon us the godly in the nation, eventually becoming the ~~godless~~ godly regardless of physical background.

(10 3/4) I wouldn't say the reason, I would say a reason. I would say that the figure here of the land, the figure of a fruitful field, the wilderness, might conceivably be used in several different ways, even in the same chapter, but that here we have not merely one figure, we have two figures, we have the fruitful field, and the wilderness contrasted, and the statement made of the interchange between them. And that is quite an unusual concept, something which you don't often find, and therefore if I found it here and found the same thing over in Ezekiel, I wouldn't say Ezekiel proves what this must mean, but I'd say it rather strongly suggests an interpretation to see if it won't fit. And when we find this unusual combination, and the suggestion of the interchange of the two, with the same figure, with not just one thing, but with the two different things, and the interchange between them, expressed right in our same main section of the book, the same discourse, a little before, I would think that we were just about compelled to think that here it has the same meaning...

41. (3/4)

...say that this is the same thing ~~that~~ exactly as 29.17. (stu.) Yes, I would say so. That is to say, in 29.17 you have Lebanon becoming a fruitful field, and a fruitful field becoming a wilderness. (3/4) Becoming a forest. Here you have a wilderness becoming a fruitful field, and a fruitful field becoming a ~~w~~ forest.

It is identical in three of the four things mentioned. The other one, one case says Lebanon, one case says wilderness, and I would incline to think when we looked at Lebanon, that Lebanon was a figure for that which is outside the land. It is that which is unfruitful as far as producing ordinary crops or flowers, but Lebanon there was the figure of the powerful thing that is outside the land, there they were thinking of it from the viewpoint of power, here the thing was from the viewpoint simply of wildness, not producing. But the other three being identical and Lebanon the land outside the fruitful field, being very close in idea to what you mean by the wilderness, it seems to me that we are justified in (1 3/4)

And particularly as the thing described in 29 exactly fits the context too. Yes?
 (1 3/4) No, I'm not sure I would specifically say pentecost, I would include pentecost I would say that it describes the coming of the Holy Spirit for service upon the people of God, right through the early days of the church, because there is such an emphasis on the turning to the Gentiles, which didn't happen for maybe five or ten years after that, so that would certainly I think have to be included in it, though I think it would definitely include pentecost also. It would be the beginning of the time of the special outpouring of God's wonderful grace which comes following His death and resurrection. But not confined to one day or one month, but to the period in which they were turning to the Gentiles. Probably a picture of say the first 30 years. (stu.3) I think here that it refers to the time just before the millennium because I don't think there is any interchange there, I think 16 might. 15 I think is the time of the turning to the Gentiles, identical with 29.17, but 16 might very well be the millennium or just before. I would think that entirely possible. I incline to feel that, because if here, after you've had the two interchange, then you have the blessing on both of them, and that's the way chapter 29 ends, with renewed blessing upon the fruitful field, so I incline to think that 16 is the millennium or just before, but I don't feel it likely that 15 is, because I don't think there is anything comparable to turning to the Gentiles,

that I know of, in prediction, just before the millennium, that is, rather, the bringing the grace back to Israel, just before the millennium.

And then in v.17 we have a picture which I don't think refers to the millennium. I think it refers to the whole period when the spirit is poured out upon us, the whole period when Isaiah's followers, the godly people, are living in close relation with the Lord, the Lord is blessing them, Even though there is agricultural lack of prosperity even though there may be persecution and suffering, and misery in many ways, yet that there is a work of God within the heart, a work of righteousness shall be peace and the effect of righteousness quietness and assurance forever. It is blessing, peace within the heart. That I think is 17, I think that is the present rather than the millennium. Now 18, I would incline to think is looking forward beyond that to the millennium, because it speaks of the peaceable habitation, sure dwellings, and quiet resting places I incline to think that blessing there is on the habitation rather than on peace in the heart, if so, then in 15 you see the present age, 16 you look forward to the millennium, 17 the present age, 18 looking forward, and 19 back here again. Well, whether you oscillate that much, quite, I don't know. I don't think it's impossible that 18 can, like 17, refer to the present time. If you think of the habitation, the sure dwellings, and the quiet resting places, more as a figure of the situation in the heart, rather than of the external situation, I am a little loth to do that because we do have definite promises of a time when the external situation will be one that will be free from all external danger and that of course is the millennium.

But v.18 of course is wither now or the millennium or covering both, but 19 I think is quite definitely the present time. That is to say, in 18, we seem to have absence of external danger, well in 19 we have external danger. In 19 we have catastrophe, we have difficulty, we have trouble, it hails coming down on the forest and laying low the city. There is trouble, there is difficulty, *which the Lord says,* in the world ye shall have tribulation, but be of good cheer, I have overcome the world.

We can expect tribulation if we belong to Him. In some periods it is very slight, in other periods it is very great. But all that live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution, you can expect that. If the world thinks well of us and has nothing to say against us, we better begin to question whether we are really serving the Lord effectively. Salvation Army went out and preached the gospel of Christ and was stoned and persecuted, and mistreated, but they stuck to the gospel and did a tremendous work, and then they got to where they were putting their emphasis on social service, brotherliness, instead of on the gospel, and today as far as I can see, they're pretty largely just a social service organization, as far as I know, everybody speaks well of them, all the modernists get behind them and give them gifts to help do some good social service. That's good as far as it goes, but it is not doing the work of Christ for which they were started, and it is certainly a farce to call it a salvation army if they're not putting their stress on salvation. And in this present age, we are not promised freedom from difficulty but we're going to have-- Jesus said, there will be wars and rumors of wars and there will be trouble for all of us. It may be His will that we personally don't have to go through them, and it may be His will that we have to go through a great deal of it, that is something that cannot be predicted in the individual case, but it is characteristic of the present age to have trouble, difficulty, persecution, and wars. And consequently v.19 seems to me to be a description again of the continuing situation of the present age, ~~which~~ We had it back in 11-14, there was trouble, there was misery, there was persecution, well, we have seen wonderful spiritual blessings but we have a continuation of the condition to make us realize that we have no continuing city here, that our citizenship is in heaven, and remains so until heaven is brought here in the millennium, and v.20 impresses me as the most wonderful statement about the period mainly described in the previous verse, a wonderful practical exhortation dealing with that period. Now there are two ways it could be taken. One is in the strictly literal sense. Here we have

had up in the verses above, the land becomes infertile, the place, dens for ever, a joy of wild asses, you're agriculturally badly off but my, those who don't put up with this, those who get out and plant a good field anyway and do their best, wherever there is any little bit of water they begin to plant a garden and they try to produce things and they send out the ox and the ass. Well, that's good advice from a practical worldly viewpoint, but hardly seems to me to be what Isaiah's talking about. So it impresses me we are justified in taking v.20, the figure ~~the~~ rather than the literal statement. Of course, we have many figures in the Bible, if you take it all figure you have nothing but nonsense. You cannot translate anything, it is all figure. But you have figures scattered here and there, in most any writing that amounts to anything. You have to decide whether a thing is figurative or literal. And I incline to think that v.20 is figurative. And that v.20 is saying in this time when the hail ~~seems~~ comes down on the forest, and the city is devastated, and demolished and laid low, in this time when there is great blessing of peace in the heart, calmness of mind as we put our trust in the Lord, who has saved us, in this period, well, if we sit back and say oh what a blessing we've got in the Lord, isn't it grand, let's just praise Him and be happy, and sit here and hope we'll survive, we're not satisfying Him at all. He wants us, though in this period, to get out and do something for Him. He wants us to sow beside all waters, He wants us to send out the ox and the ass, He wants us to use ~~we~~ every reasonable means we can have to get the precious seed out. To get the message out, to reach others with the blessing that He has given us. It is quite figurative but it seems to me that it is a very natural reasonable figure and that it fits into the thought of the context perfectly and that it fits exactly into the situation of the present day when that is the primary task that God gives His people, is to sow the precious seed to bring out the truth, and this being the age I believe that is discussed in the previous verses, I feel that that is what this verse is talking about. Now the average commentary will have a nice little discussion perhaps on

the difference between the ox and the ass in agricultural work, a discussion perhaps of what kind of water this means, but when it comes to getting into what the verse is talking about and how it ~~relates~~ relates to the other verses, I find that most commentaries ignore it, don't give you anything that is really helpful, and I don't want to imagine something, try to read in what isn't there, but it seems to me that we are justified in considering that there is a continuous discourse with a continuous thought, and we must try to find it. And we try to see if the figures and the literal statements and the expressions will fit into a continuous presentation. And I believe it does. And I believe that we have a chapter here of tremendous blessing for us today, if we read it with the whole context in mind, the whole situation. Mr. Abbott?

(12 1/4) ...

42. (1/2)

...these figures, these statements, could be used to express that meaning quite well, but I think they have a different wording for this. Blessed are they that send forth thither the feet of the ox and the ass. Why say blessed are they that do this if what you mean is, you mean well they are (3/4) fortunate. How lucky to live in a land when you've got plenty to eat, lots of places for your oxen to pasture. Ordinarily when you say blessed, you're not meaning it that way, you're meaning this is the way you ought to be, this is the way you'll get blessed. (1 1/4)

Take the beatitudes. Are the beatitudes a statement, my, aren't these people fortunate that have these good qualities? Or is it a statement that if you want to have God's blessing, try to develop these. It would impress me that that is the real meaning of blessing there. So I would incline to think the interpretation I have given is the one that fits in the context, rather than another, but anybody who is going to interpret the whole Bible from some viewpoint has got to fit in the different sections from his viewpoint, and if a person says, as some do, there is nothing in the Old Testament about the church age, well, some of these verses, I think you have got a

difficult job to make any sensible interpretation out of them if there is nothing in them about the church age. And I don't know what right we have to adopt the principle like that, there is nothing about the Church Age. Who says there isn't? Did Jesus Christ say when you read the Old Testament, remember there is nothing in it about the Church Age? Well, of course I will immediately say well then I won't look for it there. But I don't know any time He ever said that. He opened up the Scriptures to them and showed them things concerning Himself. And Peter says that the prophets prophesied of the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow. Did they mean that would follow during the next ten days and then during the period 2000 years later? Skipping over what is between? Well, if they did, I mean, they could, but until we say that that's what they mean, we should have a definite statement to that extent in Scripture. Or somebody can say there is nothing in the Old Testament about the Church Age because he has gone through the Old Testament and examined every verse and found there is nothing. He can say it on that basis, but if he is saying it on that basis then I have a right to look at the verses and see if I come to the same conclusion. And I find a number of passages in the Old Testament which seem to me to be very clear descriptions of our present situation. And for that matter, when they had the great council in Jerusalem, on the matter of circumcision, the thing that decided it was James says, to this agree the words of the prophets, and he quoted from (3 1/4) Amos, and (3 1/2) the teaching as to whether they needed to be circumcized. Well he certainly doesn't sound as if they thought, well, the Old Testament has nothing to say about our present age, it is only talking about the future, and the past. It seems to me we have no right to lay down dogmatic generalizations which we think we have to follow. We have a right to make observations and if we observe in many cases, then we have the right to see whether you can consistently carry this through. But we have no right to say you must (4) until you find that that is what it means. So that we were going yesterday and today

to look at chapter 32 and 33, I asked you to study both of them for these two days, and then we have one more week to do 34 and 35. So that doesn't leave us *much* time today for 33, even if I'd been able to get here on the very minute class was supposed to start, we still wouldn't have a great deal of time left for chapter 33. But I have not yet reached the point where I feel nearly as sure about the interpretation of 33 as I do about 32. I feel quite sure about just about everything in 32 now. 33 I do not at all feel that I am in an unknown world where I don't know what it's talking about, certainly not, but neither do I feel quite so sure. I think there are some very clear things, now if I had each one of you interpret two verses and//you discussed it for 20 minutes in each case, we won't get through this hour. I'd like to do that. We did quite a bit of that yesterday with 32 and I think it was very profitable, but I think in view of the end of the year coming so soon, we'd better just glance at a few outstanding things, quickly, now.

It starts: Woe to thee that spoilest, and thou wast not spoiled, and dealest treacherously and they dealt not treacherously with thee! Who is he talking to there? Well, don't you think that's the Assyrian again, who else do you think it's apt to be? It seems to me that if it is, the archbishop made a very correct chapter division here. Because it is a paragraph, it is not a main division, but it is a break in thought from his looking forward to this period ahead, after the exile starts, a period that runs until the spirit be poured out upon us from on high, and on through that time. He now comes back to the present and says God is going to punish the Assyrian for his sin. Then we have the first person again, O Lord, be gracious unto us, we have waited for thee. Be thoug their arm every morning, our salvation also in the time of trouble. Here we have the godly seeing the situation with the coming in of the Assyrian, coming because Ahaz and the nobles have called upon him to come and deliver them. They have takn council but not of God, they have found their own clever scheme as a means of solving

their problem, but the Lord says this is bringing misery to the nation, but Isaiah says we have waited for him. The nobles have not put their trust in God, they have not waited for Him, but Isaiah says there are a lot of us that have. We are putting our trust in God. We know ~~th~~ we are part of the nation and are implicated with the nation, and are going to suffer with the nation, but O Lord, be gracious to us, we have waited for thee. Be our salvation in the time of trouble. I don't wish to speak about the "their arm every morning" right now, maybe you can give it a little thought. It is a little strange for "their" in that.

Now: At the time of the tumult the people fled, at the lifting up of thyself the nations were scattered, and your spoil shall be gathered like the gathering of the caterpillar. Is this still description of the Assyrian, or is it looking forward a long distance? Well, our time is very short today, let's look on, we have exile, the highways lie waste, the wayfaring man ceases, the earth mourns, and so on. Then we have back to the condition of the people now, v.13. 14 the sinners in Zion are afraid, difficulty is coming, that the Lord sends. But then in v.17 we have again a change to God's wonderful blessing. Thine eyes shall see the king in his beauty. We've only had one reference to the king before, here is another one. That is, unless this is the Assyrian king, which I don't think it is. Thine eyes shall see the king in his beauty, they shall behold the land that is very far off. Some people say this means they are going to see the Assyrian king and be taken off into exile very far off. But I don't think so, I think it is the coming of the blessing from the Lord, they see the king in his beauty, and they behold that which is now very far off, but which is coming.

Thy heart shall meditate terror. What does meditate mean? I think here it means shall recollect terror, shall look back on the terror after it's over, because v.19 is thou shalt not see a fierce people, a stammering tongue that thou canst not understand. This is surely after the Assyrian and Babylonian difficulty is over, and when they don't see it any more. Previously we were told they would see it, now

we are told they will not see it. It's looking beyond it, and /you might say well the "not" doesn't belong in 19, it'll fit exactly without the "not" in the declaration of the difficulties that are coming, but look at 20: Look to Zion, the city of our 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, ~~er~~ neither shall any of the cords thereof be broken. Surely that is the new Jerusalem. That is looking beyond so I think the "not" is correct in the previous verse, and that to meditate means to recall rather than look forward to. There the glorious Lord will be to us a place of broad rivers, and streams, the Lord is our judge, the Lord is our lawgiver. We did have great difficulty though: Thy tacklings are loosed, they could not well strengthen their mast, --those things have been gone through, but now there is joy afterward.

Well, our time is about up, next time, we have only two more meetings with this group. We have only one more with the graduates. We have chapters 33, 34, and 35, and I suggest you look at 35 first, and my guess is that you can quickly reach a conclusion about the main things in 35, and having done so, in ~~ve~~ view of the shortness of time, let's not spend more time on 35. Let's look back then to 34, see what you can do with it, and then I hope that some at least of the graduates will have time to look at 33 and do some good work on it, for next time. ...

May 7, 1962 record #1 (1/2)

...that we are dealing with this semester. It had been thought that possibly we'd finish this section up and still have time to spend some more time on the historical section. But we didn't get that far, some of the sections of it took more time than I had figures on, but I think it was wise to put that time on. Some of those sections particularly between chapters 29 and 31 have so much in them that is very clear when you examine them carefully, and not obviously, until you do that it was well worth the time, but now we're sort of rushed getting through these three chapters. Mr.

Grauley? Take a couple of minutes on it. Yes, oh, the development, I see. Didn't get the general survey of the whole book from that viewpoint. Yes. Oh, surely, well, we could say a word about that. The book of Isaiah as you look at it, chapters 36-39 are different from most everything else. They are historical while others have comparatively few verses that are narrative, or history. Most of the rest of the material is prophecy in the sense of discourse, and consequently they made a division of the book, there is no question of that. There are three natural divisions of the book, 1-35, 36-39, and 40-66. No question of that. 36-39 is a unified section. Then when you take the last part of the book, it starts immediately in with the vision beyond the exile, so it seems quite reasonable to take it that from 40 on the primary outlook is on the distant things of his day, that is, a hundred years or more after his time. And I think of it that after the great prophecies of the first part of the book, that he saw the nation going on in wickedness and sin, the godly following Isaiah knew that his predictions of exile, must come to pass, there was no escape ^{because the} ~~if the~~ nation as a whole was heading on in the direction it was going, and therefore that the last 27 chapters are given to the godly of the nation, those who dissociate themselves from the present situation, but who were nevertheless against their will implicated in it. While the first part of the book is primarily addressed to Isaiah's own day. That I think is the main division into three parts and I find among the three a great unity of approach, of expression, of manner, but a difference as to the objective. First 35 being written right at this time, and the last 27 being projecting forward to the time of the exile. And all of it of course, first and last, having many glimpses into the distant future. Then it seems to me that the first part naturally divides into the sections we have been looking at this term. The book of Immanuel, 6-12, and the condition of the nobles, under the same situation as the book of Immanuel looks at the king--28-35, which leads, in before the first of those, 1-6, general prophecy, and between the two of them 13-27, which deals with the, starts in with

various particular foreign nations, and ends up with a great apocalyptic discourse looking at the future of the world as a whole with particular emphasis on the foreign nations. That's the first part. The last part of the book, we looked last semester at 40-55, the beginning of 56, which is looking forward definitely to the suffering Saviour. And then at the middle of 56 he comes back either ^{to} the immediate present, or to the condition of sinful Israel returning from exile. And deals from there on again with judgment and blessing interspersed, as he has in the first part of the book, and that (4 1/2) until he reaches his great climax in his visions of the millennium and the ultimate glory and the ultimate destruction of wickedness in chapters 55-56.

Now that's just a very rapid survey of the unity of the book as a whole, which seems to me to be very clear, once you look even slightly below the surface. Did you have something further in mind or does that cover your question. (4 3/4) ...of course who divide Isaiah up into 40 different writers. Where do you get men of this genius, of this great ability, (4 3/4)

It is much more reasonable to think of one great writer, looking at different situations. It's like saying that Shakespeare's plays were written by 20 different writers. Where are the men that would have the ability to write Shakespeare's plays? I don't think anybody holds that view about Shakespeare. There are those who hold Shakespeare did not write them, somebody else did, but they pretty well hold to this one person. One person has the great genius shown in Shakespeare, and Isaiah is unique, in his style, in his imagination, in his outlook, he has a native genius far above that of any other of the prophetic writers. The general critical attitude is, many different writers, at many different times. Now of course if you divide it up and have all sorts of little sections, you can have all sorts of separate poems and there is no unity whatever, but once you recognize the great unity there is in these particular sections you've looked at, it is only reasonable to consider the possibility that there is a similar

unity in the book as a whole. So the critics who deny the unity of the book as a whole also deny it to these sections, and once you start dividing things up, a verse here and a verse there, and a section here and a section there, why you can make anything mean anything. You don't get meaning out of it but you've looked at it to try to find in it meaning you already think you know. There was a man teaching in a Christian college who one time told somebody there, he said, I look at things entirely different from Dr. MacRae, he looks at it as a unity, united progress, I look at it as a series of separate poems. Well, (6 1/2) from the training he took at an ungodly university for his advanced work, but once you do that you don't get much meaning to it (6 1/2), it's just a lot of isolated different things. But Isaiah has so many instances ~~of wonderful unity~~ of wonderful unity, that it's not much of a jump to expect to find it in the book as a whole, and where you can't see it to figure that you simply need to study more, that it is there. And of all the sections of Isaiah, one of the most difficult to see the precise meaning is perhaps the very section we're looking at now. I wish --I mean what we're just going to, not we've had. I think what we've had is quite clear, but we still have left of this section, these three chapters, are chapters which at first sight do not yield a great deal of specific meaning. They are chapters which are worthy of a good bit more study before you are ready to be nearly as sure of what their precise meaning is as the chapters that we have been looking at, and consequently to look at them in any decent sort of way, we really need three or four weeks rather than a few days. But we can see a few major things in them which will be very much worth while. The 33rd chapter, 33^{and} 34^{and} 35, while just at a casual reading they seem to be unrelated, yet, with just a little examination there seems to be quite a unity among the three, even if we're not sure of the precise details. You have a good many notes that are stressed in one of them and continued on into others of these three. You have two main themes in these three chapters. One theme is the theme of punishment upon God's enemies. And here we're not thinking, as in some

earlier chapters, of God's dealing with His people who should be true to Him, should be closely following Him, but of the external enemy who is attacking them, those who are entirely hostile to God, and of God's overthrow and punishment of them. That is one of the big themes in these three chapters. The other big ~~thing~~^{theme} is God's ultimate blessing to His own people. These are the two great themes. And we find that each of these themes occupies approximately half of chapter 33, and then the chapter 34 is given over almost entirely to the first of the themes and chapter³⁵ almost entirely to the second of the themes. So that we can see a unity in the three chapters, with a theme stressed strongly for half of the chapter, first chapter and all of the second, and then another theme stressed strongly for the second half of the first chapter and all of the third. Now exactly what is this theme which is stressed, in the half a chapter and then the second chapter. That's a little harder to determine than just what the theme that is stressed in the last half of it and also the third. In fact, I would say, quite a bit harder. At first sight, it does not appear difficult, because you look at chapter 33 once, you have a clear break between 33.1 and 33.20. There is no question that that^{is} the right place for a chapter division. Chapter 32 ends that section where we look forward through the period between the first and second coming of the Lord, and saw the spiritual blessing upon God's people, spiritual blessing but not necessarily physical blessing, but blessing upon them, those who sow beside all waters. And use every means possible to get the precious seed out. But then in 33 we turn to a different direction altogether; 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, thou shalt be spoiled, and when thou shalt make an end to deal treacherously, they shall deal treacherously with thee. Who is he there speaking to? Well, in view of what we have had in the previous five chapters, 28-31, there shouldn't be much difficulty in deciding who he is speaking to here. This is quite evidently spoken to the Assyrian aggressor, and here then we would

seem to be back in the major emphasis of our whole section. Ahaz and the nobles by their clever scheme bring in the Assyrian aggressor, as a terrible danger against the land. They have brought this on to the land, God is going to punish the land through it, it is there, but yet God is going, for a time, to deliver them from it, and of course eventually to give a complete deliverance, but for a time now he gives them a deliverance from the Assyrian aggressor, he is going to marvelously deliver Jerusalem and so there is no question, I think, ^{that in v.1} we are speaking to Sennacherib, whether individually or his representatives. Woe to thee that spoilest, and thou wast not spoiled, the Assyrians are not coming against people who have injured them, they are coming against those who simply are there and they want to take (12) or more, they are aggressors in the full sense of the word. Thou that spoilest without cost, thou wast not spoiled; and dealest treacherously but not with the excuse that somebody else dealt treacherously with you first, but the Assyrian force is reaching out and are conquering more and more territory. ¶ That dealest treacherously and they dealt not treacherously with thee. When thou shalt seek to spoil, thou shalt be spoiled. That is to say, your spoiling is going to come to an end, but that's not all, you will be spoiled yourself, and when thou shalt make an end to dealing treacherously, they shall deal treacherously with thee. Does this look simply to Sennacherib's attempt to conquer, and his failure, because God intervened, or does it look forward to the end of the Assyrian empire when the empire was overcome by its enemies, the Babylonians and the Medes attacked it, and utterly destroyed Nineveh, and completely ended the Assyrian empire. Probably it looks at least beyond the immediate situation, seems to cover more than ^{simply} Sennacherib's failure to take Jerusalem. Then we have a word of prayer, in contrast: O Lord, be gracious to us, we have waited for thee, be thou their arm every morning, our salvation also in the time of trouble. I don't know just what to do with "their arm." "Be thou their arm every morning." Does it mean the arm of the defender? Just what does it mean,

I don't know. But except for the "their" the verse is very simple, very clear, In the face of this great Assyrian danger, the Lord is called to for help. But then we have a continuation of God's victory over the Assyrians. At the noise of the tumult the people fled; at the lifting up of thyself the nations were scattered. God overthrows the army of Sennacherib, great numbers die in the night, in the morning Sennacherib sees the situation, there is nothing he can do but flee back to his own land. Not at the coming of an Israelite army, ~~he~~ or help from Egypt but at the lifting up of the Lord, at the lifting up of thyself the nations were scattered. And your spoil shall be gathered like the gathering of the caterpillar, as the running to and fro of locusts shall he run upon ~~th~~ them. Here was the Assyrian who had come in to the land expecting to take great booty, with him, has to leave with barely enough force to defend himself safely on his return and probably a great amount of material had simply to be left. Reminds you of the story of the Assyrian army that attacked Israel in the days of Elijah when God caused the Assyrians to hear about...

#2 (1/2)

...then 5 and 6 leave the stress and just for a brief instance they look at the Israelites who are delivered. The Lord is exalted; for he dwelleth on high; he hath filled Zion with judgment and righteousness. And wisdom and knowledge shall be the stability of thy times, ~~and strength~~ ^{-- who is he} talking to now? Is he talking to Hezekiah, is he pointing out how Hezekiah is going to have peace now ^{from} that he is delivered ~~to~~ the Assyrian? Of course Hezekiah was told, that his things were going to be carried off by the king of Babylon and his descendants are going to be eunuchs in the palace of the king of Babylon. Hezekiah says well it is good there ~~is~~ will be peace in my time. It was not a selfish idea like the king of France who said , after us, the deluge. Let's enjoy ourselves while we can, we know the revolution is bound to come, but at least let's hope it won't come in our day. I don't think Hezekiah had that spirit at all. But he recognizes the truth of God's prediction, that the punishment is coming, but rejoices

that God revealed that it is not at least coming in his day. So here he has stability in the rest of his day, and the fear of the Lord was indeed Hezekiah's strength.

Now v.7, the verse alone is easy to understand but just when it applies to is not so easy. Behold, their valiant ones shall cry without; the ambassadors of peace shall weep bitterly. The ambassadors of peace shall weep bitterly is a picture of those who are pleading for peace, those who are in terrible anguish and misery because they cannot get the peace for which they are pleading. The ambassadors shall weep bitterly, the ambassadors who are seeking peace. Their valiant ones shall cry without. It is the--but just to what time does it refer? Does it refer to the situation before God delivers from Sennacherib, pointing out again what are going to be the results of Ahaz' scheme, leading^{to} the Assyrian army coming right into the land, and causing this misery. Ahaz sent his ambassadors to Tiglath-pileser, with great amount of booty in order to get him to come and deliver him from Israel and Syria, but the time is going to come when you will have to send ambassadors for peace to the Assyrian trying to get mercy and then you won't be able to get it, and you will weep bitterly. It may describe exactly the situation as Sennacherib was coming, or just before he came. I don't know whether that is really what is pictured here or not but it certainly would fit that very excellently. It is either that or it is something to do with the downfall of the Assyrian empire later on, and which of the two, maybe some of you could come up with an indication, an observant indication of (3 3/4)

At the moment I incline toward thinking that it looks back at what was given in the earlier part of the chapter, back at the situation which is brought into the land, and certainly it would fit with that to read v.8, what happened when the Assyrian came into the land. Highways lie waste, the wayfaring man ceaseth, he hath broken the covenant, he hath despised the cities, he regards no man. Certainly that was the condition in Israel for three or four years when Sennacherib's armies were there, nobody could venture far from Jerusalem, the other cities had been taken, captured by

the Assyrians. The wayfaring man had to cease, there was no safety, no possibility of getting any distance from Jerusalem. The earth mourns and languishes, Lebanon is ashamed and hewn down, Sharon is like a wilderness, Bashan and Carmel shake off their fruits. Here is certainly described what happened at the time of Sennacherib.

The countries of the north were quite in the hands of the Assyrian kings, the area to the west was, Lebanon is to the north, Sharon is the west, Bashan is to the east, northeast, and Carmel again is ^{to} the north. And all this is in the hands of the Assyrian.

Yes? (5 1/4) Explain a little further what you mean now. (stu) I don't know whether that would be possible or not. The ambassadors of peace, the people that Ahaz has sent up to Assyria, to get Assyria to come and produce peace for Ahaz, through overcoming the enemies they are facing, they are going later to weep as they see the result of this act. That is not impossible, it is a bit involved. I incline to think the simpler interpretation is the ambassadors of peace are those whom Hezekiah has sent to try to keep Sennacherib from coming. I incline more in that direction. Of course, we have no mention of the (6 1/4)

but I would imagine. What you said would be certainly a fulfillment of Isaiah's whole picture, the mistake of making this alliance and the results that were going to come from it, but it seems a little too elliptic to express all that in just a few words, I would incline to think. Mr. Golin?

~~5*~~ (6 1/2) 2 Kings 18.37 shows a situation where Ahaz' men who want peace are weeping bitterly, but the trouble is, I think, that the ambassadors, oh--I would think of the messengers of peace are those who go to try to get peace, whereas these men are the men who are in Jerusalem when Rabshakeh comes to them, and says, make peace and be subject to me then. I'll take Hezekiah and do what I feel like with him. Makes them all kinds of promises, and whether it could fit that--they don't quite seem like the messengers of peace, they're the messengers to Hezekiah of misery, rather than of peace. Mr. Cohen? (7 1/4) Now there is an interesting thing.

Sennacherib in his writing claims that it was after he went away that Hezekiah sent

him this money. The Bible presents it that he sent it in advance. Well we certainly would believe the Bible rather than Sennacherib, but taking it, as the Bible says, that would fit with the idea of that being ambassadors ~~speaking~~^{seeking} peace, sending tribute, and they would weep bitterly, because he takes the tribute and gives them nothing, going to take all the rest. And then later on when he can't get the rest, he tries to make it look in his annals as if this, as if after all Hezekiah succumbed to this extent, saying--but the Bible does explain he was sending that before the attack. That is certainly a suggestion that he actually did send messengers of peace. You see the difficulty, Mr. Golin, with the other? They don't seem to be people he sent as messengers, but people who received the message. And I don't think you could call Rabshakeh a messenger of peace. He was a messenger of surrender, calling on them for surrender, and these men told Hezekiah about the terrible things to expect. They were indeed weeping bitterly, I think there is no doubt of that. Someone else? Mr. Miller? (8 1/2) 8 and 9 would seem to me to describe the condition of the land during the period when Sennacherib is already there. That is, I would incline to think that when the ambassadors of peace weep bitterly, it means because they can't get the peace they're trying to, except on conditions that of course (9)

(stu) Tiglath-pileser. (stu) Yes, but I don't know that the highway is laid waste at that time. I would incline to think that that is a picture of after Sennacherib's army actually comes to the land. As far as our evidence goes. At any rate, I think it is referring to that period, to the times of Isaiah, rather than of future time. It does seem to be describing what happened here in the land, and consequently most likely we have the chapter beginning with verses 1-6, a --the story of the defeat of the Assyrians, and then we start again with 7 with the situation before he is defeated. We look at that which is before, from 7 on, that seems to be rather definite. All of our suggestions fit with that. Mr. Gregory? (10 1/2) I incline to think that between 6 and 7 there is a new paragraph, that 6 looks forward to the defeat of Sennacherib, and to the stability

of the times of Hezekiah, and so you have the stability of thy times; and then perhaps Hezekiah is referred to in the 3rd verse, "the fear of the Lord is his treasure." But then when you start 7 you're starting a new paragraph. And here you're looking, I believe, back at the situation before Sennacherib was defeated, when Sennacherib was just going to come, and then when (11) ^{"their"}~~there~~, you are referring to the leaders of Israel, "their valiant ones." You are back to your immediate dealing with these leaders of Israel. "Their valiant ones," their ambassadors, the ones they have sent. You're not just thinking of the king, but before you think, not of Ahaz, but of Hezekiah, and the blessing God gives him. That seems to be most likely.

Well, if we then are justified in saying that the, that we have a paragraph, 1-6, looking to the ~~the~~ destruction of Sennacherib's host, and God's blessing to ^{the rest of} Hezekiah's reign, and then looking back to the period before Sennacherib's ^{destruction,}~~deception,~~ starting with v.7, with that which brings up to it, and then v.8 would seem to be mostly description of the situation, while Sennacherib's host is there, he despised the cities, he sees these various cities of Judah, and he regards no man, he says, lest anything get in his way of accomplishing his aggressive purposes, and nobody dares to go out and travel, the highways lie waste, the wayfaring man ceaseth, the land mourns and languishes, and he has not only taken in the cities of Judah, but he has taken the country to the north, Lebanon, and Carmel, and the country to the west, Sharon, and the country to the east, Bashan, all this area round about he has taken, only Jerusalem remains, so v.9, you have the situation when Sennacherib is there. The country is desolate, afflicted, tormented, looks as if ~~the~~ next thing is to take Jerusalem, everything else in the whole area is under Sennacherib's thumb. When this situation comes to pass, God says in v.10: Now will I rise, says the Lord; now will be exalted; now will I lift up myself, --and then he addresses Sennacherib and his people. He says, you shall conceive chaff, you shall bring forth stubble, your plan of taking Jerusalem is ~~g~~ not going to amount to anything. You are going to fail utterly in it.

Your breath, as fire, shall devour you. Just what does that mean? Your breath as ~~the~~ fire shall devour you? Does it mean that you are not going to be destroyed by the army, by an army from ~~the~~ Israel coming to attack, or by an army from Egypt coming up to give deliverance. It is not a human force. Your breath, as fire, will devour you. Would it perhaps fit with the idea of the pestilence ~~of~~ the Lord sends when the men are feverish, and their breath is hot, and a figure of speech showing people dying with no visible cause, you might say, almost, dying from their own breath. Their breath as fire shall devour them. The falling of the people, we're told the angel of the Lord slew them in the night, but here is another aspect of it, the method of their destruction. It is not a human attack, it is a pestilence sent by the Lord...

#7 (1/2)

...a number of destructions of Edom at various times, but Petra, this situation, I think, was after most of the destructions. It was largely during the Roman period, and the reason was that there were great caravans which came up from Arabia, bringing spices, and Petra was a wasteland on the way, a place going through a long area with little of accommodation or food, water, and so on, ^{here was a wasteland,} so it made possible a great caravan city, and then when the caravan trade was cut off, it destroyed the possibility of continuing. That is, my impression was that Petra was not destroyed through an attack, but rather through a drawing up of its economic (1 1/2)

But Petra itself, while it is in the land of Edom, I think it was a section of it which became very important after the Old Testament times, rather than

Well, some other suggestions. (1 3/4) The phrase "the day of the Lord" like many a phrase in Scripture, many people tend to say, must be a specific technical term, which always means exactly the same thing. Now the fact of the matter is that even such a term as faith does not always mean the same thing in Scripture. But what James says about faith and what ~~the~~ Paul says about faith flatly contradict each other.

Paul says, Abraham was saved by faith alone, without works. And James says,

Abraham was saved by his works, not by faith alone. They contradict each other flatly. But when you read the context, you see that they are using faith in different senses, and if you take what each means by faith, there is absolutely no contradiction, they mean exactly the same thing. When Paul says faith, he means a living faith, no amount of works will ever save anybody, but a faith that doesn't produce work is not a true faith. And James by saying (2 3/4) means a declaration that you believe something which doesn't show itself in your life, which is therefore just an empty (3) or declaration, faith without works is dead, it isn't faith at all. So that there is absolutely no contradiction but there is not the use of a word as a technical term, precisely defined and used always in the same sentence. And that's one thing in the scripture, you can't find a word, some people say, here is the law refers to Christ. You find this word (3 1/4), how it is used first, that gathers how it's used all through the scripture. Well, it's not true. The words are words of their day, and the words may come to be used in such a way that later (3 1/2)

Now the Day of the Lord I would say is undoubtedly in its early uses, used simply as a general term for the idea of any time when situations are completely beyond the control of human forces. We are facing a great earthquake, a great invasion of locusts which we cannot meet, which just devours us, and eats us up, destroys everything we have. A situation from a power far greater than our own, something which we cannot do anything about, actually. We are in the Lord's hands. It is the day of the Lord. That is the original use of the term, but then the term is used to look forward to a special day of the Lord, a special day when God's power will be so manifest that it will be particularly obvious that man can do nothing of himself, because the power that is there displayed is so much beyond him. So the term comes to be used quite a good many times to refer to those great world-shaking events which come immediately before the return of Christ. It says the day of the Lord, in Thessalonians,

I believe, but the better texts have "the day of Christ." And there the term would seem to refer to the day of Christ in the sense of Christ's reign. They say that the Day of Christ is already here, that is, the Thessalonians thought Christ had already come, and they had lost out, they weren't in his kingdom. Paul says that that won't come until the rapture comes first and then the declaration of the man of sin, and these events come before the actual reign of Christ, but the Day of the Lord seems to be the period which of all times is a Day of the Lord, the one which comes just before His return. Yes? (5 1/2) Yes, well, it seems to me it's the Day of Christ there, (stu) Well, of course, now you see there there is a real problem. In 2 Thessalonians there --1 Thessalonians tells us very, very clearly about the rapture, coming at time when no man knows when it's coming, and the Lord intervenes in His marvelous ^{way,} ~~grace,~~ and gives us the resurrection body. Then in 2 Thessalonians, we find that the people are greatly disturbed. In chapter 2, we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you be not soon shaken in mind, as ^{if} ~~at~~ the day of Christ is right here. This word "at hand" is the word used in the papyri to indicate the present tense, the present. It doesn't mean it's coming soon, it means it's already here, let no man deceive you. Christ isn't here reigning and you've lost out and you're not in His kingdom. No, because that day can't come, except what happen? Well, our English says there come a falling away first. So that won't come until there comes an apostasy, and the revelation of the man of sin. Here are the two great things which must happen. And then v.8, then shall the wicked be revealed. Well, first, he that letteth will be taken out of the way, and then the wicked one revealed whom the Lord will consume with the breath of his mouth, and destroy with the brightness of his coming. All these things have to happen before he returns. Well, Paul says to the Thessalonians, don't you worry as if the Day of Christ was already here, it won't come till there is an apostasy. What kind of a sign is that? Already when Paul went to Thessalonica there was an apostasy. There had been fallings away already, and

there are other worse ones through the years. So if he means you folks don't think that the day of Christ is right here now, Christ is here, because He can't come till first the apostasy comes. Well, what good is that for them? There have been apostasies already, and it wasn't long after they had terrible apostasy, so the apostasy is no--Jesus said repeatedly, be ready for in such an hour as ye think not, the Son of Man cometh. You be ready right now, He didn't say you wait till the apostasy comes and then start getting ready. So it's not a good sign. That's a problem. The Greek word is apostasia, but it's not a good sign, and if he says, don't worry because before the Lord comes the man of sin is revealed and first there has got to be a falling away, see, it makes a tremendous problem. But this word "apostasia" Dr. Schuyler English found, a few years ago, that in the--that (8 1/4)

Greek dictionary gives as one of the meanings for apostasia, it gives "departure." So Dr. English suggested, does this mean, this will not come except the departure come? The departure come. And then after the departure the man of sin is revealed and so on, and then he says, just below, that you know who is withholding, only ^{he} who now letteth will let till he be taken out of the way. That would be the departure too as the Holy Spirit acting through the Church, the Holy Spirit is everywhere, you can't take the Holy Spirit away, but you can take away the action of the Holy Spirit through the Church, ~~we~~ by taking the true Church away, so he that lets will let till he be taken out of the way, and then after the Church is taken out of the way, will the wicked one be revealed. Well, now that rests upon that word apostasia there meaning departure. Well, now, I looked it up. Dr. English wrote six people, of whom I was one, and asked us what we thought of that interpretation, and three of them simply looked up in their ordinary dictionaries or commentaries, and said, no, nothing to it. Three of them. But I was one of those who didn't do that, tried to get into the source and examine the real facts. I found that the noun apostasia is derived from the verb (9 1/4)

and the verb is the regular word to depart. It says the angels took

Peter out of prison and then they departed from him. Not they fell away from him, they departed. It is the regular word for depart, the verb. Now the noun then means some kind of a departure. Here it is translated as a falling away. Well, the noun apostasia is used in the Greek, in Greek, quite a bit to mean a change of allegiance from one country to another, something like that. Not so much a falling away as a rebellion perhaps, it is used also ^{I think} for certain (10) the distance, the departure of one for the other. But this specific meaning, physical departure, I was not able to find ~~what~~ but one case of it, but that one seemed to be a pretty definite case, that was in a commentary on Aristotle, and in this commentary on Aristotle, it referred to a piece of paper which is wet and then which after a little while becomes hard and crisp instead of being soft, and it says that this is caused by the apostasia of the water. And it would seem very definitely that what he is saying is the departure of the water from the paper causes that which was flexible and loose to become hard and crisp. So there is only one case that I found, but it is a clear case, and (11)

think it is a clear enough case that they gave that as a definite meaning of the word. And if you take the word in that sense here, it makes the whole passage understandable, while otherwise the passage seems to contradict the next verses, and seems to contradict 1 Thessalonians, and leaves you with a sign for the Lord's coming that is not usable as a sign, because there have been so many apostasies. Some far greater than others, and some far less, but there have been some very, very great (11 1/2)

So I wrote an article expressing this view on the rapture, but when our Scofield committee met I advised putting it into the text and there were not sufficient to stand with me, so it will not be in the new edition of the Scofield Bible, if I recall correctly. But it seems to me that there is much evidence in favor of it, and it makes sense out of the passage. Otherwise ~~you're~~ you're left with a tough problem, how to place this with other passages. Yes? (12) No, I would just say till the departure, till the

departure comes, and if somebody wants to say, until _____ comes, but it isn't a falling away, it is the apostasia, the word "the" is there, see. Until--except there come first the departure and that man of sin be revealed, and then you read down a little further, and it says that the mystery of iniquity does already work, only he who now hinders will hinder till he be taken out of the way, and then shall that wicked one be revealed, and above it says, until the departure and the man of sin is revealed. So the two are exactly parallel, so it seems to me that taking it in its strictly literal sense, the departure, it is reasonable to say, that means departure of the saints from the earth, which is what--I have no doubt that that is what is meant by, he who now lets will let till he is taken out of the way. I know nothing else that can mean. ~~Of course~~ Verkuyl says it is the end of the Roman Empire, which I think is certainly nonsense, but that's what he says in the footnote of his Berkeley Version. But then it makes a perfect parallel here by taking the word in its literal sense, but the word isn't normally used in the literal sense. But if you translate it departure somebody can take it, the word departure, in a ~~fig~~ figurative sense just as well as falling away, but a falling away can't represent the rapture. Departure gives exactly what the word is and leaves the possibility of interpreting it in a way to bring unity to the passage instead of contradiction. (stu.13 1/2) Yes, well I feel that at any rate, what he's telling them is, don't you worry about these things, you'll be gone, when they happen. It won't come in when you don't know anything about it. If you really believe in Christ you'll be gone when this appears. So you keep your eyes on (13 3/4) and don't worry about that. That would be my interpretation