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Introduction to Isaiah 1-6: It’s position in the Bible, Prophecy

Prayer: We thank you that we can study the word of light, we pray that as we study it, it will enable us to understand it and to see your purposes and your fires in our lives. We ask in Jesus name, Amen.

Introduction and New Testament Connections [1:03]

The course this year is covering a portion of Isaiah different than what we covered last year, and yet there is necessarily in the first lecture a certain amount of overlapping, so those of you who had the course last year will pardon the fact that there will be a third of this morning’s lecture will overlap. An introduction to the book as a whole,— and it will overlap some of what you had last year. I don’t think that there will be anything else this semester, that will overlap because it is a very different part of the book of Isaiah with a whole different subject matter from that which we dealt with last year.

I don’t think we need to start with the text of Isaiah, I’ll simply start with an outline of what we want to cover. And under that, you’ll notice I said part one, you’ll notice this year that we are dealing with two separate and rather unrelated sections of Isaiah, the first part and the last part. They are unrelated, but each is tremendously important and very interesting and so I am going to call it part one, as long as we are dealing with part one, and under that roman numeral one there is: “Introductory,” and under that I have listed as A: “The supreme excellence of the book”. All literary scholars agree, that one of the great masterpieces of the worlds literature is the book of Isaiah. To the Christian it is even greater
importance, for this book contains more pictures of Christ than any other part of the Old Testament. Many different aspects of Christ’s life, primarily of course, the story of his death and its importance for us, his resurrection, and his future activity, are carefully described in the book of Isaiah. Naturally there are those who have different opinions as to how much of this Isaiah understood. Well, Peter tells us that the prophets were “searching what manner of time, the spirit of Christ, which was in them, did signify, when he testified before hand of the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow.” (I Peter 1:11) So we have it on the authority of the apostle Peter that the prophets looked forward to the activities of Christ. They probably understood a great deal about these activities, but there was probably a good deal they did not understand, but the Holy Spirit so led them in what they wrote, that it could be later read and understood in the light of our fuller knowledge of Christ, and we could see how very, very much of the important facts about Christ and the meaning of these facts is already contained in the book of Isaiah.

The book of Isaiah is quoted in the New Testament, probably more than any other section of the Old Testament. There are a great many times when the New Testament quotes Isaiah by name and there are many other times where it quotes “as the scripture says” And so for the real understanding of the New Testament, you need to know the book of Isaiah.

**Literary Quality [4:24]**

The book of Isaiah has a Hebrew style that is perhaps the finest that ever was written. It has a great deal of alliteration. It has many distinctive literary features. We will not deal with these in this class except in so far as they pass over into English. But the remarkable thing about Hebrew is that so much can be translated into other languages. The Mohammadans boast that the Koran is such a great literary masterpiece that it cannot possibly be translated you must read it in the
Arabic. All translations only give a feeble idea of it. The great thing about the Bible is that while no translation exactly represents it, a tremendous part of its literary excellence can be passed over into another languages. One reason for this is the nature of Hebrew poetry. Isaiah’s poetry is not so much a matter of a particular length of syllables or of rhyme though these we do enter into in some extent, but it is a matter of parallelism of thought. It is a matter of arranging thoughts in certain order it is a matter of uses of metaphor and similes, and interrogation. Practically every rhetorical figure you will ever find is found somewhere in the book of Isaiah. And so it is one of the great literary masterpieces of the world and one of the most important books in the Bible for the Christian. And yet, unfortunately, there is comparatively little or no amount understood by Christians.

**Supreme Quality of the Book [6:03]**

Most Christians are familiar with a number of isolated verses in Isaiah. They may have memorized the 53rd chapter of Isaiah and some of the great verses earlier in the book that we use at Christmas. But of the great flow of thought in the book, the interrelations of the parts, the sections that do not immediately bear on the life of Christ, most Christians have a little idea. I have here a book in which a statement is made about the first chapter in Isaiah. It says “the first chapter is a marvel of condensation. It is a complete manual of religion, setting forth the relationship of God and of people. The duties growing out of that relation the error to be avoided and the results of obedience and disobedience to the divine will. And this not in the dry abstract terms of a theological system but in concrete pictures which the simplest souls can understand and appreciate.” But how many people have much realization of what there is in Isaiah, in the first chapter? We will not spend a great deal of time on the first chapter because we have many other matters that I think are intrinsically more important, and we will move on to them,
but this statement gives an idea of the greatness of this work and of the amount that can be gained by careful studies of even that one chapter.

**The Importance of the Old Testament [7:35]**

Now section 3 is “The importance of the Old Testament.” And this I believe needs emphasizing among Christians “The importance of the Old Testament.” It’s all too often forgotten. I have occasionally passed a church in which I’ve seen a sign “no creed but the New Testament” that is not a Christian statement. To the Christian the source is not the New Testament, it is the Bible. And the Bible is one. The New Testament constantly refers to the Old Testament. Constantly quotes from the Old Testament. The apostles and the New Testament writers over and over build their argument upon quotation from the Old Testament. To the Christian the Old Testament is of tremendous importance and when you think of the fact that in one particular Bible I looked into, the New Testament covered 396 pages and the Old Testament 1333 pages; in other words more than three times as long. More than three fourths of the Bible is the Old Testament. The New Testament brings out the great Christian truths. Very, very clearly it’s tremendously important to study the Old Testament, and to neglect it would be utterly wrong. I’ve often said it’s far better to know Greek thoroughly than to have a slight knowledge of Greek and Hebrew. But even a slight knowledge of Hebrew is a great value enabling one to read commentaries and to understand discussions but of course, a good thorough knowledge of both is better, but above all get a good thorough knowledge and ability to interpret the statements of the New Testament in the original.

**The Importance of the Prophetic Books [9:25]**

Well, Capital C we’ll move on to, which is “The importance of the prophetic books.” In the OT the average person who has attended Sunday school is familiar with some of the stories in Genesis and Exodus and Joshua and Kings and perhaps a very few stories from the prophetic books. But the average Christian never gets
into the inside of these books, to understand them, and there are principles you have to have in mind in order to understand them. This same Bible that I spoke of that has the New Testament of 396 pages, devotes 378 pages to the books from Isaiah to Malachi, to those 17 books of the Old Testament. Almost as long, they are, as the whole New Testament.

I must confess that in my second year of teaching in theological seminary I started at the beginning of Isaiah and every day read a chapter or two until I got to the end of Malachi and when I got through I had practically no recollection of anything I had read. It was just words, I did not then understand the principles of interpretation of it to have it really meaningful to me. Since then I’ve devoted thousands of hours to studying these books and they are absolutely endless in the amount of vital truth that they contain that is very important for the Christian. The importance of the prophetic books, C, then we see is something that cannot be over emphasized.

**The Difficulty of the Prophetic Books [11:05]**

But we look at D. “The difficulty of the prophetic books.” I noticed the difficulties very vividly, as I said at that time when I read them through continuously without any understanding, really, and I was then already teaching my second year in seminary. In my seminary course that I had taken, there had been much discussion of the minute points of some of the prophetic books. But to really get into them and to understand their meaning and their relationship and how to go at them, I had never really gotten until I got busy studying them and comparing them and finding the principles which open them up and make them living and vital.

**The Poetic Lineage [11:46]**

But I’m just going to mention three difficulties. Number 1) - the poetic lineage. The prophetic books are very largely composed of poetic lineage. And until one recognizes this fact and learns a little bit about the nature of Hebrew poetry he is
not apt to get into the beauty of them or to have any great understanding of the real meaning. And of course, these poetic features are carried over into English and unfortunately many of the translators have failed to recognize and understand some of these principles. As a result they have made translations which while verbally, they may be quite accurate, do not give a proper idea of the interrelation of the parts. One big reason for that is the fact that in Hebrew you have one common conjunction. The letter \textit{waw} is the common conjunction which we would say means ‘and’. But it is much broader than our English ‘and’. Though our English ‘and’ is much broader than most other would think. We say, “I looked for Him and He was not there,” we might say that. It would be more accurate for us to say, “I looked for Him but He was not there.” Our ‘and’ in English sometimes carries the meaning of ‘but’. Now in Hebrew the \textit{waw} which in half the cases, at least, is best translated by ‘and’, in many cases can be represented by ‘but’ or ‘yet’ or ‘moreover’ or ‘then’. I came across one verse in Daniel in which it was translated four different ways in the course of one work in the King James Version. It simply is a broader word than our English “and”, though our English “and” is a broader word than the average speaker of English recognizes even though he does use it in the broader way, which is part of the language. So the poetic language is one cause of difficulty.

\textbf{The Local Situation [13:59]}

A second is the local situation. The prophets were not men who sat in an ivory tower somewhere and looked up at the sky and wrote down visions that they saw (occasionally they did have visions like this). But as a rule, they were out among the people, dealing with situations of their time. And God was giving them messages and related to these situations. And then out of the many messages that God gave His people that had vital relation to the situations of their time, God selected certain ones to be written down in the books that were to have great meaning for people of all subsequent times. But all of these messages have certain
relationships to the local situations. These local situations are explained in the books of Kings and Chronicles—some of them later in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah. The local background is often referred to and implied without being fully explained in the prophetic book. And until we find what it is, sometimes we fail to get the full meaning.

**There are Partial Glimpses of the Future [15:07]**

And then number 3: “there are partial glimpses of the future.” No prophet, so far as I know, ever sat down to write a full history of the situation that would be ahead. He was not writing a history book for the future. People sometimes say that “prophecy is history written in advance.” Well, there is a sense in which this is true. There is a sense in which it is history written in advance but we don’t understand what history is. We think, often, that by "history" we mean just events, one after another, occurred. Now if you take a history of the last fifty years and in that history you tell what happened in January 1, 1926 in San Francisco and in Siam and in Hong Kong and what happened the next day in Paris and in Madrid and in Dayton, Ohio and so on, you would never call it a history book. It would just be a list of events. A history book gives something of an idea of the interrelation of events and when you come to do that, you’ve got to take one of those regions and trace it through. And then take another and trace it through. If you don’t, that’s just back and forth all the time. You just can’t do that it wouldn’t be a book of history. And so the prophets, when they looked to the future, they looked with particular ideas in mind and God let them see what relates to these ideas. And so a prophet might speak about something, he might rebuke the people for their sins, and then he might look forward to God’s judgment that is coming. And then he might comfort the godly with blessing that God has for them, and then look forward to a different area, to a particular blessing ahead for them. And thus, in one of the glimpses of the future are complete. Of course you couldn’t see all the future or all the past possibly anyway, but they are particular vistas for
different times and we have to see the interrelationship of them. So these three specific difficulties are important in understanding this book: 1. Poetic lineage; 2. Local situation; and 3. Glimpses of the future that are incomplete.

**The Purposes of Prophecy and Their Relation to Prediction [17:36]**

Now capital E, “The purposes of prophecy and their relation to prediction.” There are many purposes of prophecy. The word prophet has come to mean somebody who foretells the future but that’s not what it means in the Bible. It means a man who speaks on behalf of someone else. A prophet is one who represents God and gives God’s message. So that is truly what prophecy is. And some would say that and stress it in such a way as to make you think that they never predicted the future. Actually, prophecy is full of predictions of the future because it is very definitely related to the specific purposes of prophecy.

**To Call People to Repentance [18:22]**

I’m listing these very briefly under three main headings. First, “To call men to repentance.” The prophet is there to call people to repent of their sin and turn to God and he’s also there to call God’s people, the true believers, to turn away from the sin that so easily besets them and to turn back to a fuller obedience to God. And so this does not cover simply the unfaith of the ungodly, it covers all of those to whom the prophet speaks. Probably two-thirds of what the prophet spoke was for this specific purpose: To call people to turn away from their sins and to look to the Lord’s provision and be saved; to call people who are already believers to turn away from the sin that so easily leads them astray and to devote themselves more fully to doing the Lord's will. Now prediction has a great deal to do with this because the prophet tells what the future is, of those who fail to follow the Lord. He tells of the suffering and misery that are ahead for them. He also tells what God is going to do upon his own nation in the comparatively near future, say
within ten years, or within one hundred, or within five hundred. He tells of the future in this life and the future in later times in relation to this call to repentance.

**To Comfort and Reassure Believers [19:51]**

The second great purpose of prophecy can be summarized in the words “To comfort and reassure believers,” or “To comfort believers and give them assurance.” When the prophet speaks of the terrible things that God is going to do, such as punishing his people for their sins; when he stresses them--and some of them stress it a tremendous amount--these are not passages we should pass over lightly in our study, although we will have to pass over many of them quickly in this class because we want to get to some of those that are of most immediate relevance to us. But I would urge you, if you study these passages yourself in the coming years, that they reflect on your life in part and your activity for Christ. But Isaiah greatly stressed the way that God was going to deal with those that turned against his Holy law, true believers were apt to give way to despair. They knew they were part of the nation; as such they were implicated in its sin. They knew the terrible things the prophet said would come, were definitely going to come, they knew judgments were ahead for them, and therefore they might tend to become terribly disturbed. As so while perhaps two-thirds of the prophetic books are devoted to the purpose of leading men to repentance, leading unbelievers to turn to God, leading believers to clean up their lives and follow Him more closely, perhaps a third of the content of the prophetic book is devoted to the purpose of comforting and reassuring those who truly believe. And often the prophet does not say, "now I have quit talking to those people, now I am going to talk to these." It does not introduce a sharp indication of the change. He just, in cold print as it stands, just goes straight on, and you have to recognize that the prophet either turns his head away from one group to another, he thinks of individuals scattered among the group particularly rather than the whole group, he makes a change in his manner perhaps which in not indicated in the writing. And so as you read it
often there is a very sharp and sudden transition from the purpose of calling men to repentance, to the purpose of comforting and reassuring believers.

**The Purpose of Giving Specific Guidance [22:42]**

Now the third purpose does not affect us today so directly, that is “The purpose of giving *specific* guidance.” That was the great purpose of the prophets in ancient times. Isaiah said, when Sennacherib came with his army and he threatened the people of Jerusalem and demanded that they surrender, and told the terrible things that he would do to them if they didn’t, and gave them promises that he would be good to them if they would, Isaiah said, “don’t surrender don’t give into him, God is going to protect you, God is going to deliver you.” And he made them these wonderful promises. He said just like birds flying, God will protect Jerusalem. About a hundred years later Jeremiah spoke and the people said, if we just fight and stand here, since this is God's city God will protect it. We are safe. Jeremiah said, “God is going to turn this city over to the Babylonians. They are going to come in and destroy everything.” He said, “surrender to the Babylonians. That is God’s will.” And of course there were those who called Jeremiah a false prophet. And it is not always easy for people to decide who was the true prophet and who was the false prophet. God did in that case give specific evidence. Jeremiah turned to the false prophet who said within a year we are going to be delivered from the Babylonians. And Jeremiah said “within a year you will be dead.” And within a year he was dead. And there was an evidence God gave that Jeremiah was the one that who he was speaking through.

**Specific Guidelines [24:36]**

Now this purpose is very important in Old Testament times that is the purpose of giving specific guidelines. It is not particularly important in the parts of Isaiah we are going to study this semester. It just doesn’t have to enter in as other portions. But the sections in which this is a vital purpose while not directly of importance
for us today are never the less of great value as showing the manner of God’s dealings and giving us principles which we can apply in situations that confront us in the present time. And so this matter of giving specific guidance in your general study of prophecy is a great future importance, not so much a connection with this particular semester. But this is vital to recognize, that God gave that specific guidance before his whole word was available. And now we have the whole Scripture and he wants us to study it and get are principles of guidance from it. And while he may choose at certain times and certain ways to give us definite personal guidance, his great desire for us is that we learn to understand his word so that we can apply its principles. And he says in one hymn he can guide us with his eye not having to give us direct words but leading us to know that our steps are towards him and that he is working in our lives if we take these principles and apply them.

The Perspective of Prophecy [26:21]

Now capital F “The perspective of prophecy.” In other words, we have in these prophecies glimpses of the future. How are we going to relate them to each other? Do they proceed right in chronological order? How are they arranged?

Logical rather than Chronological Order [26:43]

Well, number one under this category I said that it is not simply that we listen in advance. I have already referred to that fact, so we won’t have to go into that further right now. So now we go onto number two the order is often logical other than chronological. The prophet is dealing with God's punishment for sin then he tells what God's going to do. Then he is dealing with God’s blessing on his people; he looks forward to a particular occasion of blessing that has relevance to the particular matter he is dealing with. And thus the order is often logical rather than chronological and we are doing wrong to assume that there must be a chronological relationship.
**Order is Logical not Historical: I Kings Example [27:47]**

I am going to give an illustration of this from the history books, an illustration that brings out I think in a very interesting and difficult way the fact that the order is often logical rather than chronological. I am going to turn to a passage in the history books that at first sight you would not say was prediction. In fact, I have had theological professors say to me that’s not prediction those are commands. And yet on the little examination it’s obvious that they are not commands. This is the story of Elijah. I trust all of you are familiar with it. In 1 Kings 19 where the Lord spoke to Elijah, Elijah was so terrified with Jezebel’s vain threats that he had fled clear down to Sinai. And there God showed himself in power to Elijah in order to comfort him and to strengthen him and to encourage him. And then we read in verse fifteen “The Lord said go and return on your way to the wilderness of Damascus and when you have arrived you shall anoint Hazael king over Syria.” Now if this is a command, Elijah was a disobedient prophet, because Elijah never anointed Hazeal king over Syria. But to take it as a command would be utter nonsense, because how could Elijah, this Israelite prophet, who was hated by the king of Israel, how could he go over into another country larger and more powerful than Israel – the country of Syria – and take a man there in subordinate position, unrelated to the king and anoint him to be king of Syria? That would sound rather preposterous unless God were to work a miracle, and he did not. The Lord gave this word to Elijah, but what he’s really doing is giving him a prediction. He is saying, “Elijah, you’re afraid of your life of King Ahab, and Queen Jezebel, but I am going to make a change in the control of this great land of Syria, much larger and more powerful area than the region of Israel, where you’re so afraid of the ruler. This greater kingdom, I am going to make a change there. I am going to cause a man to become king there who has no relation to the royal family at all, a man who calls himself “a son of a nobody”. So he gives it in the
form of a command, “you anoint him king over Syria”. Actually, many years later, Elijah’s successor Elisha, went over to Syria.

**Elisha and Hazael [30:39]**

And there he met this man Hazael and Elisha began to weep and Hazael said, “Why are you weeping?” And Elisha said, “I’m weeping because I’m thinking of the terrible way you are going to treat the people of Israel as you attack and destroy” and so on and Hazael said, “Why I’m just a servant. Who am I? I am the son of a nobody. I’m just like a dog. I’m just the servant of the king, how could I do anything like this. I simply carry out the king’s orders.” And Elisha looked at him and said, “The LORD has shown me that you are going to be king of Syria.” And then Hazael went back to the king’s palace where the king was ill, and he took a wet cloth and put it over the king's face and suffocated him. And Hazael made himself king. Syrian records referred to him that, “Hazael, son of a nobody, seized the throne.” Elijah never anointed Hazael. But God predicted that this was going to happen.

**The New King Jehu [31:56]**

And then the word of the Lord to Elijah continues and the next verse: “And Jehu the son of Nimshe you shall anoint king over Israel.” And here was another man who was not related to the royal family, and in this case there was a real anointing, but it wasn’t done by Elijah. In fact it was some years after Elijah’s death that Elisha sent someone else. Elisha didn’t anoint him but Elisha sent one of his men from the group of prophets with him, and he went out where they were fighting against the Syrians, and he went over there and he poured oil over Jehu’s head and thus Jehu was anointed. And Jehu immediately made a rebellion against the son of Ahab and made himself king. God is not here giving a command but a prediction that Jehu will become king and there will be a complete change in the dynasty of Israel.
Elijah and Elisha with the Double Portion [33:06]

After the Lord said this in verse 16 He continues, “And Elisha the son of Shaphat, the son of Abel-meholah, you shall anoint as prophet in your place.” And Elijah couldn’t pick out a man and anoint him to be prophet in his place and as far as the Scripture goes, he never anointed Elisha. In fact when Elijah died, or was taken up to heaven rather, he looked on Elisha as one who poured water onto his hands when he washed them, (his menial servant). And he tried to get away from him but Elisha stayed with him, and finally Elijah said, “What would you like me to do for you when I’m taken up?” And Elisha said, “I would like to have a double portion of your spirit.” That means a duplicate portion or perhaps the portion of an elder son, the double portion an elder son would seek. “I'd like to be your successor in other words!” And Elijah didn't say, “Well I'm ready to anoint you to be prophet in my place.” Elijah said, “You've asked a hard question.” And he said, “Only if you see me as I'm taken up will you know that you can be my successor.”

Order of Prophecy often Logical rather than Chronological [34:36]

So these were not commands, they were not given as commands, that is the verse we read in 1 Kings 19:15-18. 2 Kings 8:8-15 tells how Hazael became king of Syria; 2 Kings 9:1-13 tells how Jehu will be king of Israel; and I Kings 19:19-21 tells how Elijah threw his mantle over Elisha as Elisha was ploughing; and when Elisha said, “Wait a minute till I go and say goodbye to my family and I'll follow you,” Elijah says, “What have I got to do with you?” That's pretty far from anointing him as his successor. They are predictions of who the successors will be and the changes God is going to make. But you notice the order of them? Elisha was called to be Elijah's successor before either of the other two was fulfilled. The order is logical rather than chronological. It starts with the great kingdom of Syria. God is going to make a change there. Then it goes to the kingdom of which Elijah was so terrified. God's going to make a change there, and then he
says, “Elijah, You've done a great work. You've done a great work and you deserve great credit, but now you've gotten frightened from this wicked woman and fled into the wilderness here. Your work has got to be carried on by someone else. You’re not able now to go ahead and do the great work that's needed to follow up the wonderful things you've done. We have to train a new man. Hire a new man that can do that, and that man will be Elisha. But that one was fulfilled long before either of the other two. The order is chronologically not one, two, three; but it's two, three, one. The order of prophecy is often that way. It is logical, rather than chronological.

**Mountain Range Illustration [37:13]**

An illustration that often occurs to me is the illustration of a mountain range. If you look at a range of hills off in the distance, you see the near hill and it'll be higher in some places, lower in others, and then behind there may be another range and there may be another and there may be three of four ranges. When you look at the near one, you can't tell, often, whether the one you see back of it is right back of it or whether there's a big space in between. And you'll look at one range and you'll see, behind a certain part of it, you'll see the third range. The second doesn't show at that point. Then you'll look a little further along and you will see the first and the second. And then you'll look a little further on and you'll see the first and the third and the fourth. It varies. And you might say "logical" is the particular place you look and the "chronology" is obviously what's back of it. But you look at one and then another and so in the order is logical, rather than chronological.

**Assignments [38:21]**

Now, instead of giving the next point right now, I'm going to do something that I should do at the end of class, but usually forget when I leave it to the end of class. So I'm going to do it right now instead. And that is to assign the lesson for next week, the assignment for September 20. Number one is to note all
correspondences as to thought between the early verses of Isaiah 2 and those of Micah 4. Now this, I'll say a word or two more about, but for the moment just get it in mind. That is the first part of the assignment for next time. I shouldn't say the first part. I hope the first part will be to review today's lecture because it's far easier to review it right now than just before exam time. But then, note these correspondences. That I want you to write out, but we'll discuss that after a minute.

The second part is to note any important connection between each of these three groups of verses, or each of these two groups of verses, and the latter verses of the preceding chapter. In other words, as you look at Isaiah 2, look back at the last few verses of Isaiah 1 and see what the connection is. How does it tie in with it? Is there a close connection? As you look at Micah 4, look back at Micah 3 and see if there is a close connection or not between these two passages. The chapter divisions in the Bible were put in by an English archbishop in the thirteenth century. And it is amazing in the book of Hebrews how often the first verse of each chapter’s a summary of the previous chapter, and could just as well be the last verse of the previous chapter. And many times the chapter divisions are quite wrong. Cambell Morgan, the noted English expositor, said once in my hearing that “in nine cases out of ten the chapter divisions were wrong.” Now I think he was quite extreme in that, I think often they are very well placed. But they are badly placed on enough occasions that it is always wise to look back for the connection. So I’d like you to do that and write out next time any important connection (not trivial ones) but really important connections between the first few verses of Isaiah 2 and the last few verses of what precedes, or between particular things in the first few verses Micah 4 and what precedes in Micah 3.
Explain the Purpose of Isaiah 2:1 [41:25]

And then number three; explain the purpose of Isaiah 2:1. Look at the first verse of chapter 2 and see what you think the purpose of that is. Please answer each of these questions from your own study without using help. This is what you thought. I find that one can get far more from the Bible than from most help and if you don’t, if you need help, you get far more from the help if you first try to do it yourself. Well, this is to done direct from the Bible, and I don’t care what Bible version you use. Use any Bible version that you would find, and, if fact, if we have variety in the class so much the better. But I’d like you to state on your paper what Bible version you’re using. And then after you’ve done this yourself, then, if you wish, look in one or more commentaries and state their answer to question three. I’m not asking you, necessarily, to do this, but if some of you are interested in seeing what commentaries say about the purpose of Isaiah 2:1, it will be interesting to see what they say, but I fear most of them will say something that doesn’t add much understanding to it, but it will be interesting to note, perhaps. It is not my purpose to have you look at a lot of books and comparative statements. I find it much better to look at the Scripture and see what you get from it, and then look at other things if you want to. But I’m usually not even assigning you to look at anything.

Translations [43:10]

The King James Version has some very bad slip ups in it, but on the whole it is an excellent translation, probably as good a translation as has ever been made, but it’s in the language of three hundred years ago, and a great many of the words just give a different impression today from what they meant to the writer. I got used to it most of my life and I’ve been using it, mainly. The New American Standard Bible, is on the whole, a good, accurate rather literal translation, and very useful. The New NIV that has just recently come out has got some very fine rendering,
but some very terrible ones, too. I think it was done a little too hastily I don’t think they were quite ready to publish it. I think they wanted to get something out quickly to arouse interest in the Old Testament, which I hope will be an excellent production. But it has some very fine things in it. Now you can use any of those, or if you would like to use the Jerusalem Bible, or the Revised Standard Version, or the New English Bible or any other for this particular class, but I think the different one uses you may have some points of interest you come across in some you would like to wait on the fact. But those three are the best we have, but in the case of all three, time and again the translators failed to see the interrelations between verses. There were very important things that were just overlooked by the fact that the emphasis was put on the particular sentence rather than on the meaning of the particular sentence in relation to major sentences. So I don’t care which of the these you use, if you would like to compare several, of course, its’ up to you.

**Expectations [45:35]**

Now the first of these questions should not be correspondences. I would like to give you an idea of how I’d like that done. But you see on this page how I have marked it, that there in Isaiah chapter 2 and verse 2 I put a 1 next to it, and by that I meant that this verse is very, very similar to verse 1 of Micah 4. You see. I can’t put them next to each other because there is a black space in between; I’ll have to cut off part of the page to do that. But you see the two verses are almost identical. So I put a 2 here on Micah to show that it is very close to the first verse of Isaiah 2 and a 1 on that to show that it’s like that verse in Micah.

Now if you can look at these first five verses of each of these chapter and you’ll find one prophet may say “all,” the other may say “many;” you’ll find little differences like that, that are of interest, but not related to our present purpose. For our present purpose we will call these 2 verses identical, even though they are not
exact they are very very close; the idea is the same. You can just indicate which verses in each are related in thought to the other. I am not interested in identical words. But actually among the prophetic books, you will rarely find two passages so similar as these: This is rare. So it’s very interesting that we do have this similarity. Now for this particular thing it would be better not to use the NIV, simply because we don’t have the NIV of Micah yet. So you need another translation to be able to see the verbal similarities much more closely than if you compare the NIV just for Isaiah with one of the other translations for Micah.

The Division of the Book of Isaiah [48:41]

Now we go on to “the division of the book of Isaiah.” I don't want to take much time on this because in this class we are just dealing with the Septuagint division. You will also find that chapters 36 to 39 are different from the rest of the book (history). Isaiah is what we call a book of prophecy. He is exhorting, he is looking forward to the future, he is comparing things. It is a series of messages. And that is very different from, for instance, the book of Kings or Proverbs. But in this book of Isaiah, which has comparatively few statements of events, what you call historical statements, you have very few in the book, aside from chapters 36 to 39. You have there, four chapters which describe a series of events. In the course of them, Isaiah gives some long messages. But you have that somebody came and said something, somebody answered, certain things happened. It’s a historical section. And so the book of Isaiah naturally divides into three parts: Chapters 1 to 27, 35, 36-39 and 40 to 66.

Now there are those who call 1 to 39 "First Isaiah" and call chapter 40 and on "Deutero-Isaiah," and say it was written 150 years later. I don’t believe that at all. But it’s interesting to note that just as the Bible has 39 books in the Old Testament, 27 in the New, what they call the First Isaiah has 39 chapters and the rest of the book is 27 chapters. Now that’s purely coincidental, but it’s a help to
remember, the divisions. Now, this historical section 36-39, then, is in the middle. There and up to there the chapter divisions are, many of them, quite well made.

You notice that chapters one through six is the section we’re going to study as part one of this course. Then, 7 to 12 is the Book of Immanuel, 13 to 23 is largely about other nations, 24 to 27 is called the Isaiah Apocalypse, it’s a view of, you might say, the consummation of the ages following the statements largely about other nations. And then 28 to 35 is about Immanuel continued. So last year we studied 7 to 12 and 28 to 35, which makes one unit closely related. Now you notice these divisions could all be made according to chapter. But when you go on after chapter 36, the chapter divisions are very poorly made. There are two main divisions after that: chapters 40:1 to 56:8, I used to call the “Gospel of Isaiah”. I’ve now changed it to “Isaiah sees the Savior” because this is the section which tells about the atonement. And it leads up to the atonement, stresses it, explains it. I gave a course in this section two years ago. But it ends abruptly at 56:8. I shouldn’t say it ends abruptly there, I should say the archbishop didn’t notice it there. Because the next three verses of chapter 56 belong with the remaining part of the book. Well, we are going, in this course, to take those as part two, that last half. And that is a section of Isaiah which is comparatively little known, but one of the most thrilling sections of the whole book, when you really get into it and see its real meaning you’ll see what I mean.

**The structure of Isaiah 1 to 6 and the comparison to Micah 1 to 7** [53:03]

Now, a capital H, “The structure of Isaiah 1 to 6 and the comparison to Micah 1 to 7.” Isaiah and Micah prophesied at about the same time. Many books refer to Micah as Isaiah’s younger, as a man who was younger than Isaiah, but I know of no evidence for that. We don’t know which was younger, which was older. But they were about the same time. And each of them starts: i.e., the first six chapters of Isaiah and the first seven chapters of Micah, with rebuke for sin, then go on to
deal with God’s blessing in the future. Then another passage of rebuke for sin, then a wonderful passage of blessing for the future. The second one, in Micah, corresponds to the first one in Isaiah. Then you will have again a passage of rebuke for sin and then the last chapter of this section of Isaiah and the last chapter of Micah is either a prayer to God or a vision of God. So there was a remarkable similarity of structure between them.

And for next time, I would like you to make this comparison between the beginning of Micah 4 and the beginning of Isaiah 2, noting the relationship of each to the last few verses of the preceding chapter. I see the clock has moved so we better stop for now. Oh, I didn’t mean to show you the basic themes yet, but that I’ll show you next time…
MacRae, Isaiah 1-6: Lecture 1 Outline

I. Introduction to Isaiah 1-6
   A. The supreme excellence of the book
      1. Isaiah is one of the great masterpieces of the world’s literature
      2. To the Christian more pictures of Christ than any other part of the Old Testament
         a. How much did Isaiah understand?
         b. 1 Peter 1:11
            The prophets were "searching what manner of time, the spirit of Christ, which was in them, did signify, when he testified before hand of the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow."
         c. Quotes in the New Testament more than any other section of the OT: Isaiah/as the Scripture says
         d. To understand the NT you have to understand Isaiah
      3. Isaiah as a Literary Masterpiece
         a. The book of Isaiah has a Hebrew style that is perhaps the finest that ever was written
         b. Much of the literary style can be translated contra Koran
         c. Key literary device is parallelism of thought
         d. Almost every rhetorical figure found in Isaiah
   B. Key book for Christians
      1. Most Christians unaware
         a. Most Christians know Isaiah 53 and Christmas stories
         b. Most Christians unaware of the great flow of thought of the book
         c. Isaiah ch. 1 itself is called "Complete Manual of Religion"
      2. The importance of the Old Testament
         a. Sign "No creed but the New Testament" is not Christian
         b. Whole Bible is our creed
            1. New Testament constantly refers to the Old Testament
            2. 3/4 of the Bible is composed of the Old Testament
   C. The importance of the prophetic books
      1. Many Christians know stories of Genesis/Exodus...
      2. Prophets often ignored yet Isaiah-Malachi = size of the NT
3. Need to understand principles of prophetic interpretation:
   personal confession

D. The difficulty of the prophetic books—finding principles to open them up
   1. Poetic lineage: much of the prophets is Hebrew poetry therefore one must understand poetic features
      a. For example: waw "and" translated many ways including "but" "then" "moreover" and "yet" so it is much broader than our English word "and"
      b. Translating and understanding poetry is difficult
   2. Local situation
      a. God is giving messages related to local situations
      b. Historical situations described in Kings/Chronicles/Ezra/Nehemiah
   3. Partial glimpses of the future
      a. Nature of history writing. Not just a list of events but the interrelation of events and their meaning
      b. Brief vistas of the future not complete and not totally understood and function in relation to the message being given at that time: rebuke or comfort

E. The purposes of prophecy and their relation to prediction
   1. A prophet is one who represents God and gives God’s message not just one who tells the future
   2. Purposes of prophecy
      a. The prophet is there to call people to repent of their sin and turn in obedience to God
         1) 2/3’s of the prophets manifest this purpose
         2) Future tells suffering of those who fail to repent
      b. To comfort and reassure believers giving them assurance
         1) With all the predictions of coming judgment, comforted not to despair
         2) Perhaps 1/3 of the prophetic book is devoted to the purpose
         3) Prophet's unannounced switch between purposes results in sudden/abrupt transitions in their texts
      c. Giving specific guidance
a. Vital to recognize that God gave that specific guidance when before His whole Word was available
b. Isaiah's specific guidance resist Sennacherib when he attacks Jerusalem, God will protect
c. Jeremiah specific guidance do not resist the Babylonians for God has delivered you into their hands...true/false prophets
d. Discovering principles for our times

F. The perspective of prophecy
   1) How are we going to relate them to each other? How are they arranged?
      a) It is not simply this that we listen in advance
      b) Does it proceed right in chronological order?
         1) Often logical not chronological
            a. The story of Elijah meeting God at Sinai (I Kgs. 19)--3 predictions not commands
               1) Hazael, son of nobody to be the king of Syria
                  --Elijah doesn't do this, Elisha does
               2) Jehu to be anointed king of Israel
                  --Elijah doesn't do it, Elisha sends someone to do it
               3) Anoint Elisha as Elijah's replacement
                  --Elijah doesn't do that although Elisha asked for a double portion of his spirit
               4) Order predictions given: 1, 2, 3 order actually happen 2, 3, 1
                  Logical not chronological arrangement
            c) Mountain range illustration: distance the near and far hills look close but miss the valleys in between. Similar to prophecy logical not chronological arrangement

Aside on the assignment for next time: three things:
   1) Note all the correspondences between the early verses in Isaiah 2 and Micah 4.
2) Look at connections between the beginning of Isaiah 2 and the end of chapter 1
3) Look at the connections between the beginning of Micah 4 and the end of Micah 3.

Guidelines:
- What do you think of the chapter divisions?
- Do not use commentaries, look at it for yourself
- Focus on the thought flow not the minute details
- Use a good translation: KJV, NASB, NIV

II. Divisions of Isaiah
   A. Historical events section 36-39 unique in the book
   B. 3 Divisions: 1-27, 28-39, and 40-66
      1) Chapters 7-12 and 28-35 make up the "Book of Immanuel"
      2) Chapters 13-23 mostly describe other nations
      3) Chapters 24-27 referred to as "Isaiah’s Apocalypse"
      4) Chapters 40:1-56:8 called “Isaiah sees the Savior”

H. The structure of Isaiah 1-6 and the comparison to Micah 1-7
   1. Isaiah and Micah prophesied at about the same time
      We don’t know which was younger and which was older
   2. The parallel structure: Isaiah 1-6 and Micah 1-7
      a) start with rebuke for sin,
      b) God’s blessing in the future.
      a') Another passage of rebuke for sin
      b') A wonderful blessing for the future.
      a") Then you will have again a passage of rebuke for sin
      c) Last chapter Isaiah 6 and Micah 7 is either a prayer to God or a vision of God
Comparison of Isaiah 2 and Micah 4

Why students should not use commentaries [0:0]

Now some of you did some study in commentaries and that is good. Commentaries often have helpful ideas, and sometimes have very misleading ideas. But for this class, I am anxious that before you do anything in these commentaries, you study the text yourself. And, in fact, in this course, since we are not requiring any language for this course— it is possible to take this as a first year student— I am not requiring for this class, unless specifically posted, any study in a commentary. But even if I believed a commentary will be valuable for you, I’d like you to study the text first yourself.

I remember about 20 years ago, I had 2 students who had graduated with all my work for 3 years. And then they went to another seminary, which at that time was quite a conservative seminary. And they worked there for a TH.D. degree. And I saw them when they had been there about 2 years and they said to me, "We have a tremendous advantage over the students here in this seminary who did their undergraduate work here." They said these students are accustomed on every question to look up commentaries and say these commentaries say this and these commentaries say that, and play them off one against the other to see what the different opinions are. But they said none of those students go right to the Scripture to see what it says.

It's amazing how many things that are quite obvious in the Scripture are overlooked by most of the commentaries. The commentaries often have a habit of copying from one another and sometimes when some very great student has
written a commentary that has a lot of excellent material in it he will get careless in some fact that he cannot investigate thoroughly and make some rather foolish mistakes in those passages. It’s amazing how many later commentaries will copy this mistake. So my great interest in this course is that you learn to go direct to the scriptures yourself to see what is there. And then as I say after that, if you want to do some studying in commentaries that’s all very good, of course.

**Comparisons between Micah and Isaiah [2:36]**

Now, today I gave you an assignment which involves a comparison of Micah 4 and Isaiah 2. And in this comparison, I was interested to see what you would get. And as you compare the verses, just as a rough comparison at first, you see that in Isaiah verse 2 of chapter 2 is almost identical of Micah 4:1. And in Isaiah, the 3rd verse is almost identical with the second verse of Micah. And the fourth verse in Isaiah is almost identical with the third verse in Micah. But then the 4th verse in Micah, the first part of it has nothing corresponding to it in Isaiah, and yet as you look at that 4th verse, the first ¾ of the verse, you see that it is actually a development of what is already in the previous verse. And so by not having those verses in Isaiah, you don’t have that expressed quite as clearly and fully as you do in Micah. But you might say that it is inferred in what Isaiah has in the previous verse. “They will not learn war anymore.” There will be no violence. There will be no external danger. Now Micah makes this more specific, I don’t think he adds anything to it but he makes it more specific in that fourth verse where he says that “they shall sit every man under his vine, under his fig tree, and none shall make them afraid.” He has in mind a time when the Assyrian army is spread all over the land of Eden and the people are safe behind the great walls of Jerusalem and they don’t dare go out, they are protected from the army as long as those walls stand. They don’t dare go out where those walls don’t stand, men can combine and injure them.
Personal story: Traveling in Palestine [4:32]

Even within our present generation, the condition was somewhat similar in Palestine. In 1929, I traveled to a part of the backcountry of Palestine on horseback. There were four of us there, born in four different continents. And then we had some Arabs with us, taking care of carrying the stuff and so on. We would camp at night, I don’t know if you can do that in that area now, but at that time it was very interesting. Conditions were much more like they had been for a couple of thousand of years than they are today. And Dr. Albright who was leading the party, was one who spoke Arabic very fluently, and had been in Palestine many years, was very familiar with the customs and social standing and every time when we were in the backcountry when night would approached, he would find an Arab village, and there he would come to that village, and the headmaster, or the leader of the village would come out, Dr. Albright would greet him, and he would welcome him to the village, and we were under their protection. And then we would camp on the edge of the village. We would hire someone from the village to sit out in front of our tents overnight, just to watch for sneak thieves and that sort of thing. But as far as any real danger was concerned, we were perfectly safe because we were under the protection of that village.

Now we heard how just a year before a young couple from Czechoslovakia had begun to make a walking trip, carrying most of their provisions and their tents. And they had gone from Czechoslovakia, westward across Europe, down into Spain, and had come along the northern section of Africa, and had come to Palestine, and they had no injuries or real difficulties until they got into Palestine. But there they were not aware of the customs in the country. And so one night they camped in a place where the nearest village was over a mile away. There were three villages, in three different directions, so they weren’t under the protection of any one of them. You might say they were out in the open, under their vine, under their fig tree. And then during the night, the son of the head of
one of the villages, and two of his friends came down, began to seize their property, and when they objected, they were both killed. Later on the British government found who the criminals were and hanged them. But it illustrated the fact that even within the present generation, it was not safe in Palestine out in the open to camp overnight. In the protection of a town, you were safe, hospitality they called it. But out there under your vine and fig tree, there was constant danger that someone would come along, of whom you had every reason to be afraid. And so Micah adds this, and this is not really an addition to people who were there, it just makes it more specific to their understanding, “they shall not make war anymore,” they will not even learn how to make war anymore that the previous verse covered.

**For the mouth of the Lord has spoken** [7:45]
So Micah doesn’t add anything, he simply makes more specific what Isaiah even said in the greater part of this fourth verse. But the last verse, the last line of the fourth verse adds another idea. He says, “For the mouth of the Lord has spoken it.” Here is something which is so important, so tremendous to people living in that area in almost any time in its history. It is so critical. A few years ago, that would have seemed very strange to us in America. Things are getting natural, perhaps more like it is now, like it used to be then.

But it seemed very strange to them at that time I’m sure, that there would be none that make him afraid and in order to give us assurance that this is true, he adds the words “for the mouth of the Lord has spoken it.” Now this you might say is the distinct idea found in this fourth verse. Does this idea have any parallel in the passage in Isaiah? That’s an interesting question.

**Walking in the light of the Lord** [8:47]
Now we look at the next verse, I asked you to compare verses 1 to 5. And you notice that verse five has considerable general similarities. Verse 5 in speaks about
walking. About walking in the name of the Lord or walking in the light of the Lord. There’s considerable similarity and I believe these verses go together. Now in the Bible from which I copied this in the section from Isaiah, you will notice that they put a heading separating verses 4 and 5. I think that’s a mistake. I think it goes with what precedes. It is a parallel to the same exact words in Micah. There is much similarity between Isaiah and Micah as we have seen. I think you can consider them as parallel so the way the next verse starts doesn’t make much sense if it is attached to what follows: “Let us walk in the light of the Lord,” "therefore thou hast forsaken thy people.” You can assume that there’s a break really after verse 5 and the break certainly should not come after verse 4. We will speak a little bit more about the relationship between the two passages when we place them side by side as we go through the book.

Comparing each section in Isaiah and Micah [10:09]

I speak in relation to the assignment now. The second part of the assignment I asked you to compare each section in Isaiah and Micah with the immediately preceding context. Now most of you said that there was quite a similarity or quite a relationship between these verses and the preceding ones. And that’s true with almost anything in the prophetic books. The greater part of the prophetic books is made up of rebuke for sin. The next greatest part is blessings to God’s people and promise of the wonderful things that God is going to do in the future. Well now these themes are related and these themes are so closely related that we can find some relation between almost anything in the prophetic books and anything anywhere else in the prophetic books. But in one case here it seems to me that there is a very specific relationship, a very close relationship, and if you can see that on the board, you’ll notice that in verse 12 of chapter 3 in Micah (the last verse in chapter 3) I have underlined certain words. Those words that I’ve underlined in green up there are: Zion, Jerusalem, and The Mountain of the House. Now look at the very next verse: i.e., the first verse of the
next chapter, chapter 4 of Micah, and you find that in this and in the next verse, these very same places are spoken of again, these same places.

I will call your attention to the 13th verse of chapter 3 “therefore shall Zion for your sake be plowed as a field.” Terrible punishment will come upon Zion the place where David’s palace was. And Jerusalem will become heaps, just piles of rubble. Terrible punishment God is going to bring to Jerusalem “and the mountain of the house,” which I think is more literally translated the “temple hill.” The Hebrew word "hill" which means mountain, often can mean almost any hill. It might mean a great mountain or a medium sized hill. “The mountain of the house” or the temple hill “will become just like a high place in the forest.” Just a place that has nothing in particular to stand out from the surrounding area. This wonderful temple is going to just disappear and there is going to be a place in the wilderness.

**Micah and Isaiah are not always parallel [12:46]**

But these three specific statements of the terrible things that God is going to allow to happen to Jerusalem are made in Micah and there is no parallel for them in the corresponding passages in Isaiah.

But when you go on to the next verse, in Micah, he immediately says, “it will come to pass that the mountain of the house of the Lord,” or the temple hill, “will be established in the top of the mountain.” The previous verse says “that the mountain of the house will be like a high place of a fort,” now he says that it will be established in the top of a mountain, and the next verse says that “The law will go forth from Zion.” Verse 12 said: “Zion will be plowed as a field.” And here it says "The word of the Lord will go forth from Jerusalem" and the last verse of the pervious chapter said that, "Jerusalem will become a heap."
Now, there’s a relationship then there between the last verse of the third chapter of Micah, and the first two verses of the fourth chapter. There is a full relationship. There’s a relationship between almost any passage in a prophetic book and a preceding or following passage. But here is a very close relationship. Three specific words that you can indicate important places in or about Jerusalem are said to be utterly destroyed and then said to become great world centers. Now that is a relationship between the previous chapter and the following in Micah that is far, far closer than the relationship between the previous chapter and the following one in Isaiah.

And then, of course, in addition to that, Micah brings life smoothly forward. God is going to bring this terrible overflow, but God is going to bring tremendous blessing to these very places previously mentioned, and Micah continues with this theme right straight on a continuous discourse. Whereas in Isaiah he has one chapter, mostly of rebuke for sin, ending and then says "this is the word that the son of Amos saw for Judah and Jerusalem.” It sounds like a heading; it seems a natural place to make a chapter division. In Micah it doesn’t seem like a natural place to make a chapter division. It is just a direct continuation from 3:12 to 4:1, 2. And so I was interested in seeing how many of you would notice that close relationship between the previous chapter and the following chapter in Micah, a relationship much closer than it is in Isaiah. So I’ve underlined two places in blue.

**Heading discrepancy [15:41]**

Now, the question about chapter 2 verse 1 there, is a very interesting chapter and it’s an interesting question. How many chapters of Isaiah have headings that say, “This is the vision that Isaiah saw,” “This is the word that God gave to Isaiah.” Well, out of 66 chapters, you’ll find very, very few cases. Most of the cases where there are headings for specific visions come in connection with the visions about foreign nations between chapters 13 and 22. There are a few there. “The burden of
this country, the burden of that country, the burden of the other” that you occasionally find there. Ordinarily you don’t find separate headings in Isaiah. You just go straight on and you have to figure out where the break comes. Now you might think that Isaiah would put a heading at the beginning of his book and he’d put another heading at the middle of the book. Perhaps putting the things from the middle part of his life and in the latter part of his life separate from the first part. But you have no reference of this from Isaiah in the last 27 chapters of the book. His name does not occur there at all. There are very few such headings in the book. Now what a strange thing to have a heading which seems to describe the whole book in Isaiah 1:1 and then you’ll have another heading in Isaiah 2, which might just as well describe the whole book as the heading in chapter 1. How strange to have it there. You don’t have it in three, you don’t have it in four, you don’t have it in five. You have it very seldom. You might think somewhere in the middle would be a good place, but he put it right in the beginning of the second chapter. A very strange thing. And I have not come across any commentaries, I may find some in the future, but I have not come across any, that gives what I consider to be the natural explanation of the reason why this particular heading has come here. I believe that the clue to it is found in that last part of the fourth verse of Micah. There he says, “For the mouth of the Lord of Hosts has spoken.” In Isaiah 2:1 says, “The words of Isaiah the son of Amoz saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem.” This term “saw,” frankly, is not the ordinary word for saw, it is the word that is used primarily for the visions that the prophets had. Certainly the meaning of this word is: Here is something that Isaiah received as a revelation from God about the future of Judah and Jerusalem. I do not believe that that is a heading for chapters two to four, or two to twelve as indicated by one commentary. Some may say it's the title of only the second chapter. I don’t think it is at all. I think it is a heading to the first five verses of the second chapter. I believe that here Isaiah is saying, "What I’m now going to give you is such a wonderful thing--such a tremendous thing, complete end of violence, complete
end of danger of war, Jerusalem will be coming at the very center from which God’s word goes out to all the world—it’s such a tremendous thing that I am going to assure you that this is a message that I have received from God. And so I believe this is parallel to the latter part of that fourth verse in Micah where he says, “For the mouth of the Lord has spoken.” Now the two I think are parallel in idea but Isaiah adds to those things that Micah didn’t mention. Micah simply goes right on with what he’s been giving and gives you additional material. Isaiah says, “The words that Isaiah saw about Judah and Jerusalem.” It is my feeling that in both cases the Lord gave them a vision not in which they saw a word passing along, like they sometimes have in front of the big buildings like a marquee in New York or in other places where you see words passing along the screen. But that he saw a picture. He saw a wonderful picture and he described that picture he saw. And the Holy Spirit, by his inspiration, checked the writer from error. He prevented him from saying anything about the description of the picture in the vision God had given him that was not correct. So we have a statement that is inspired by God and that is free from error. But the statement is not necessarily and entirely a word that God gave the prophet, it is the picture of what God caused the prophet to see. But stated perhaps in the prophet’s own words that these words were kept from error as we believe that all the scripture is kept from error. And thus it would seem to be what I described.

**Micah and Isaiah’s relationship [21:13]**

Now there are some commentaries that speak of Micah as Isaiah’s younger contemporary. Now, Micah wrote only seven chapters while Isaiah wrote sixty-six. But as to which of them was older, I know of no evidence anywhere to tell which one of them was older. Each of them names the kings under whom he wrote and they named the same kings. And we have no way to know which was older and which was younger. But it is my personal guess, and I think it’s a very good one, that Isaiah read the words of Micah. And Isaiah is indicating that Micah’s
words describe the vision God had given him, too. And so when he says “the words that Isaiah saw,” he’s not saying Micah didn’t received his word from God, he is saying, "I have also received this vision from God. This thing that someone may have read in Micah, the words that he gave, describe pretty well what I thought. There is no reason I should make up new words to describe it. I can use pretty generally the same words he does." Isaiah didn’t use exactly the same words, but 19 words out of 20 are identical with the words that Micah used.

**Differences: Isaiah stresses Universality More [22:28]**

There is one interesting difference. In the very first verse of this, Micah says that “nations will enter.” No, Micah says, “people shall flow onto it,” Isaiah says “all shall flow onto it.” He stresses this universality a little more than Micah did. There is a place further on where Micah stresses universality a little bit more than Isaiah did. But to my mind that is a satisfactory explanation of the reasons why we have a new heading at the beginning of chapter 2 of Isaiah. I don’t think it’s the heading for the whole chapter, but just for the first 5 verses. And the heading should say, “I put my authority in back of this thing, too; God gave me this same vision. It doesn’t fit right in with what I’ve just said like it does with Micah. It’s part of Micah’s continued presentation. But it is a vision I saw which can logically come at this point and I Isaiah am certifying that God has caused me to do this.”

You cannot tell which prophet got them from the other, but the fact is that Micah’s words fit right in with his previous works that were straight along, while in Isaiah’s there’s a new start. A new start seems to me to be a strong argument in the direction of it being originally part of Micah, rather than a part of Isaiah. And if that is the case, then the fact that Isaiah put his name to it gives a reason why he put his name to it. In effect, he says “Yes, you’ve read this in Micah, I’m not just copying something Micah said. I’m telling you what I also saw, the vision God has also given me.”
Assignment and hopes for students [24:30]

Well, so much then for a summary of the assignment that I gave you for today, unless you’re interested in knowing what I think or what any commentary thinks. I’m interested in your learning how to get into the book and see what’s there, and that takes practice, it takes time and effort. And I hope that you will in this course not merely learn what certain chapters of Isaiah mean, but learn a message of getting into the scripture that will enable you in any part of Old and New Testament to go further in your understanding than you would otherwise.

Divisions in Micah [25:04]

Now in our outline we had reached H at the end of the last hour. Under Roman numeral 1 we had reached H. And I had spoken about the fact that the book of Micah naturally divides into 6 divisions though there are 7 chapters. In the book of Micah, the whole of the first chapter and all but the last two verses of the second chapter of Micah is rebuke to the people for their sins. And then there are 2 verses of marvelous blessing. Then in Micah, there is chapter 3 which is rebuke for sin. But chapter 4, the whole chapter is various aspects of future blessings that God is going to give his people. Then chapter 5 again is largely rebuke for sin, although towards the end of it there is some blessing. And then the last part of Micah is dealing more with Micah’s relationship to God and God’s blessing to him. Now we’re not going through Micah now, I’m just interested in pointing out the similarity of organization between the 7 chapters of Micah and the first six chapters of Isaiah, these six chapters being a definite unit separate from chapters 7 to 12, the latter of which is called the Book of Emmanuel, because they deal with a very specific situation and some very wonderful promises. But these first 6 chapters of Isaiah are similar to Micah, in that the first chapter is very largely rebuke and then you have five verses of future blessings, then you have the rest of chapter 2 and chapter 3 with mostly rebuke for sin and a declaration of God’s
punishment that is coming. Then chapter four of Isaiah is mostly future blessings. Chapter 2 of Isaiah, as we know, is similar, almost identical, to chapter four of Micah. Then in Isaiah you have rebuke for sin again to chapter 5 and then you have Isaiah's personal experience of coming to know God more intimately in chapter 6.

 Declarations, Rebuke and Punishment [27:20]
The greater part of the prophetic books is thus made up of declarations and rebuke and punishment of sin on the one hand, and the promises of specific blessing that God is going to give in the year or distant future. There are also, of course, circumstances in some of the prophetic books in which God gives specific information in what people should do in specific circumstances. But this is a far smaller part of the prophetic book.

 The next assignment [27:48]
Now for next time, I have a rather short assignment for you. I would like you to jump over to Isaiah chapters 56 and 57. I would like you to look at those two chapters and to indicate which sections of them are rebukes and which sections are blessings. Which sections, that is, deal particularly with the people’s sin or with God’s punishment of sin and which part deals with God’s promises and blessings to the people. Look for that purpose in chapter 56 and 57. And then you might just make a brief summary of their context; that is, you might say verses one through 17 deal with such and such in general, verse 18 deals with something else. Just where are the natural breaks in those two chapters 56 and 57? That’s the assignment for next time. I thought this was a logical place to give the assignment after I barely touched on it at the end of the last hour and in light of the similarities of the 1st 6 chapters of Isaiah and the 7 chapters of the book of Micah.
Isaiah 1:1: The vision of Isaiah in King Uzziah’s Days [29:17]

Now we go on to Roman numeral two in the syllabus, which is the first chapter of Isaiah. We have, under this Roman numeral two, capital A: Verse one. Verse one says “The vision of Isaiah the son of Amoz, which he saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem” and up to there this statement almost identical to chapter 2. He goes on now mentioning. “In the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah” I have looked up what I wrote in the Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia as the dates for these kings and I’ll dictate them to you, just for your record but I won’t ask you to memorize them. Uzziah, and this is a pretty good guess reigned from 791 to 740 BC. The Scripture says he reigned 52 years. There’s only 51 between these, but if you count each of them, there’s 52, and of course we have no reason to think he died on the same date of the year in which he became king. Jotham probably reigned from 750 to 732 BC. You notice it overlaps. We read in the book of 2nd Kings how Uzziah sinned against the Lord and God made him a leper. So during the latter years of his reign he lived apart, although he was still king, and Jotham was also king, so there were two kings at that time. So Jotham, then, we have 750-732, Ahaz 736-716 BC. Now according to these figures, Ahaz, Jotham's son, was king four years while his father was also king. Uzziah reigned so long that its probable Jotham was along in years when his father died. And Jotham having been co-king with his father for so long, it would be quite natural for him to follow the practice of making his son king while he was still living. It is a good practice for a king anyway to make his successor king while he is still alive. It prevents an upheaval after his death. Whether this actually was the case we don’t know. We have certain dates we can fix, like parallels to the history of the Assyrian kings, and then in between them we have to try to fit other dates in, but a Professor Thiele, who has spent many years of studying the chronology, has suggested the dates I gave you, and they seem to work pretty well with the evidence we have. Hezekiah then would reign from 716-687 BC.
The Lord’s Complaint [32:21]

Now capital B of the outline refer to Isaiah, we go back to chapter 1 verses 2-6. I’ve entitled this "The Lord’s Complaint." Now the division between chapter 1 and chapter 2 is a very definite division. The division between chapter 2 vs. 5 and vs. 6 is a very definite division. These divisions within chapter 1 are less definite. Someone might suggest that they be placed at a different place. But I think this is a fairly logical division. Verses 2-6. “Hear O heaven and give ear O earth, for the Lord has spoken. I have nourished and brought up children and they have rebelled against me.” A terrible denunciation that God makes of Israel when you think of all Israel did, after all that God did for Israel: bringing them up out of Egypt, and caring for them in the wilderness, protecting them as he did. “I have nourished and brought up children and they have rebelled against me.” It is something that is repeated over and over in human history. And it is good for parents to realize that it is something that is easy, that often repeats itself I have heard many times someone say “I don’t know what to do with my son, 19 years of age, 18 years of age. He just won’t pay any attention to what I say, he’s doing everything different from what I think he ought to.” I don’t always say what I think, but what I think is “You had your chance. You had him during his formative years.” A child, say before he is fourteen, is tremendously moldable by his parents, but when he gets in his latter teens, he doesn’t like to be pushed. And you can push him a lot in earlier years, as long as you don’t overdo it. You can push him a lot in earlier years, but when he reaches the age of adolescence, what you’ve done before has a tremendous effect on him, but what you do then is not going to have much effect. The main thing you can do then is to pray for him and show forebearance. But think how the heart of God felt and think of how a parent feels. And think of how God felt after all he had done for Israel. He had nourished and brought up children, and they rebelled against him.
We have forsaken the Lord [34:55]

Now, verses 3-6: “The ox knows his owner and the donkey his master’s crib, but Israel does not know, my people do not consider. Oh sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a seed of evildoers, children that are corrupt, they have forsaken the Lord they have provoked the Holy One of Israel to anger they have gone away backwards (i.e. from him). Why should you be stricken anymore? Will you revolt more and more? The whole head is sick, the whole heart is sick, from the sole of the foot even from the head there is no soundness in it, but wounds, bruises and putrefying sores; they've not been clothed nor bound up, neither mollified with ointment.” The Lord's complaint begins this book of Isaiah.

Now in that fifth verse, “Why should you be stricken any more? Will you revolt more and more?” The Hebrew there is an imperfect verb; the imperfect is quite commonly translated as a future as the King James has done here. But the imperfect very often expresses what we might call a "frequentative," i.e., an action that occurs and is repeated rather then something at present or even in the past. It is used to express frequent past action as in Genesis 2 where it says that “a mist will come up and water the earth.” It uses there the imperfect tense though it is talking about things way back in the Garden of Eden. It is referring to something that occurred and occurred and occurred again. And so I think that in verse 5 it might express the idea a little better here if we said “why should you be stricken any more? You revolt more and more; the whole head is sick.” The imperfect tense should be translated as a frequentative, rather than a future.

The Desolation of the Land [37:10]

Now, chapter one verses seven through nine refer to the desolation of the land. Now, these verses are quite different from the verses that preceded it. “Your country is desolate your cities are burned with fire; your land, strangers devour it in your presence, and it is desolate, it is over thrown by strangers. And the daughter of Zion is left as a cottage in the vineyard as a lodge in a garden of
cucumbers, as a besieged city. Except the Lord of Hope had left a very small remnant, we should have been as Sodom, we would have been like unto Gomorrah.”

These verses seem to describe a condition that is actually in existence as Isaiah writes. Now, some take this as a prophetic perfect: they take it as a description of something that God is going to bring. Yet I have looked at five of the most recent translations of the Bible, three by evangelicals two by other scholars. And in all five I found they take it just like the King James does, as a present event, a present situation. And that fits for Isaiah wrote these words while Hezekiah was king of Judah and Sennacherib, was king of Assyria, overran the whole land in 701 BC. At that time the whole land was overcome Lachish the second largest city in Judah was taken prisoner. The city was overcome and demolished; people were carried into captivity, thousands of people were taken off into captivity by Sennacherib and Jerusalem was left alone. You read the history of that in Isaiah chapter 36 and 37. It also is given in Kings and Chronicles. For nearly 3 years the people of Judah suspected that anytime the Assyrian army would come and attack Jerusalem and it, also, would be demolished. But what Isaiah said to them in later chapters in the book: “No, Jerusalem is not going to taken, God is going to protect this city. As birds fly He will protect Jerusalem. It won’t be by your strength and your power, but by His actions.” And then we read in Kings and Chronicles and in Isaiah how the Lord destroyed great numbers of the Assyrian army. It was probably by a great plague that He did it, and Sennacherib could do nothing but return to his home in Mesopotamia. And this exactly describes this situation, “The country was desolate, strangers were devouring it, and the people from the walls of Jerusalem could see the horrid truth that they were destroying village after village in their presence. The land was desolate, overthrown by strangers, and the Daughter of Zion left as a cottage in a vineyard, as a lodge in a garden of cucumbers, as a besieged city.” Isaiah says,
“Except the Lord of Hope, who has left unto us a very small remnant, we should have been like Sodom. We should have been like unto Gomorrah.”

So we have here three verses which were, I believe, dealing with that particular time. I’m inclined to think the first six chapters were gathered together as an introduction to the whole book of Isaiah, representing materials he gave various times through his long life as God’s prophet. This material makes a good introduction to the whole book: i.e., the first six chapters. But chapter 1 reflects the situation of that particular time. Now, let’s go on to fifteen. By the way, this ninth verse is quoted in Romans 9:29. But in the context in Romans, there is not much specific reference to this situation of Isaiah, simply due to the fact that it was only through God’s mercy that any were left. So it fits very well in the context in Romans, but it does not draw on the whole situation, just on this general aspect of it.

**The Futility of Empty Ceremony [41:30]**

Now, capital D chapter 1 verses 10 to 15, “The futility of empty ceremony.” These are verses that can be very applicable in our own day. We have to transpose some of the words of the verses to fit our own day because we do not have the same type of religion at work now that they had then, but the verses are just as applicable when this transposition is made. Look at verses 10 and 11: “Hear the word of the Lord, you rulers of Sodom! Give ear to the law of God, you people of Gomorrah! To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices to me? says the Lord, I am full of the burnt offerings of rams and the fat of fed beef, and I delight not in the blood of bulls or of lambs or of a few goats.” There is a large school of Old Testament interpretation that thinks of the prophets as being against the temple servants and the priests; that there was a conflict between priests and prophets. And they quote this passage here. But it’s entirely a misunderstanding. Isaiah is not against the sacrificial system. In fact, he promises elsewhere in the book that everything the sacrificial system stands for will continue. He is not
against anything that is taught or described in the Scripture, but he is against putting our faith in such matters. He says, “To what purpose are these things? When you come to appear before me, who has required this of your hands to tread my court? Bring no more vain oblation; incense is an abomination to me. The new moons and Sabbath, the callings of assembly, I cannot, away with it, it’s iniquity, even the solemn meetings” (verses 12 and 13). That’s a strange statement. “I cannot away with” it doesn’t make much sense, to take the four words as they stand in the King James. If you make a break in them like I did it makes more sense, “I cannot; away with…” I think perhaps a better interpretation is the way some modern translations take it. They say, “I cannot bear the new moon, the Sabbath, the callings of assembly. Away with the iniquity, even the solemn meetings.” I’m not sure that it’s better, but it carries the idea that they, the listeners, needed.

**There’s no punctuation in the Hebrew [44:22]**

There’s no punctuation in the Hebrew, in the original Hebrew. The punctuation of the verses was put in many years after the Bible was originally written. The chapters weren’t there originally, the chapters were recent, in the thirteenth century AD. And in the 10th century AD, the Massoretes, a group of Hebrew scribes, put in certain accent marks that show where they thought words and phrases should be merged and where they thought they should be divided. But these merely represent the tradition handed down by word of mouth and it’s pretty hard to hand down such tradition as that. Now the vowel marks distinct from the accent marks also represent tradition handed down by word of mouth but it’s much easier to preserve the vowels, as you read them over and over through the ages. Much easier to preserve the vowels than to preserve these accent marks. Even so, some scholars say “Forget the vowels, just focus on the consonants and what they imply.” But most scholars say that vowels represent a very well-preserved tradition, but not quite as well preserved as the consonants. But the accents, well most of us don’t pay much attention to them. Some of them we don’t
know for sure what they mean anyway. But in your Hebrew Bible, there are a
great many of these little accent marks which most Christian scholars simply
disregard, except once in a while, when someone has a big argument and wants to
debate on the basis of one of them. But when he does, I think he should be
consistent and try to interpret them all consistently, but I don’t know any
Protestant scholar who does that.

**Hypocrisy Exposed [46:07]**

Well, back to our theme. This is a very vital idea in our own day. It continues,
“Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hates. They are trouble to
me, I am [There’s no punctuation in the Hebrew,.] And when you spread forth
your hands, I will hide my eyes from you. Yes, when you make many prayers I
will not hear. Your hands are full of blood.” This is a criticism of hypocrisy and a
criticism of putting your trust in observances, or form or ceremony, or regularity.
I know a man who used to teach here in this seminary whose father was a very
pious Jew and he could quote from memory all his father's sermons, which
included great parts of the Old Testament in Hebrew, but he didn’t have any idea
what a word of it meant. He didn’t know a word of Hebrew to understand its
meaning, but he said these words of form, and some of our Protestant churches are
almost exactly like that. And certainly a lot of the Roman Catholic churches are
that way. They speak Latin words which the bulk of the people have no idea what
they’re talking about. Empty forms and ceremonies, they may have much meaning
when you understand them, when you put your thoughts on what they stand for.
What they stand for that is right. We won’t have time to look at “E, F, G,” today.
That won’t take us a long time. Please review the material on Isaiah, on the next
chapter, for next time a little bit too because we will spend much more time on the
next chapter than on the rest of this chapter.
1. Opening comments on the assignment

A. Comments on methodology
   1. Exam the text yourself before going to commentaries
   2. Story of students who knew how to examine the text versus those who only compare commentaries
   3. Commentary mistakes being copied from one to the next

B. Observations on Micah 4 // Isaiah 2 comparison

Isaiah 2:2 almost identical to Micah 4:1

In the last days the mountain of the LORD's temple will be established as chief among the mountains; it will be raised above the hills, and all nations will stream to it. (Isa. 2:2)

Micah 4:1: In the last days the mountain of the LORD's temple will be established as chief among the mountains; it will be raised above the hills, and peoples will stream to it. (Mic. 4:1)

Isaiah 2:3: Many peoples will come and say, "Come, let us go up to the mountain of the LORD, to the house of the God of Jacob. He will teach us his ways, so that we may walk in his paths." The law will go out from Zion, the word of the LORD from Jerusalem.

Micah 4:2: Many nations will come and say, "Come, let us go up to the mountain of the LORD, to the house of the God of Jacob. He will teach us his ways, so that we may walk in his paths." The law will go out from Zion, the word of the LORD from Jerusalem.

Isaiah 2:4: He will judge between the nations and will settle disputes for many peoples. They will beat their swords into pruning hooks. Nation will not take up sword against nation, nor will they
train for war anymore.

Micah 4:3: He will judge between many peoples and will settle disputes for strong nations far and wide. They will beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks. Nation will not take up sword against nation, nor will they train for war anymore.

Isa. 2:5 Come, O house of Jacob, let us walk in the light of the LORD.

Micah 4:4: Every man will sit under his own vine and under his own fig tree, and no one will make them afraid, for the LORD Almighty has spoken.

Illustration of traveling safely with Dr. W.F. Albright in Palestine, hospitality customs in 1929.

C. Micah 4 and its relationship with the end of Micah 3

Micah 3:12 Therefore because of you, Zion will be plowed like a field, Jerusalem will become a heap of rubble, the temple hill a mount overgrown with thickets.

Micah 4:1f: mountain of the LORD's temple...law out of Zion and word of the LORD from Jerusalem...

Micah 3:12, destruction of Jerusalem, not found in Isaiah parallel

D. Isaiah 2:1 "This is what Isaiah son of Amoz saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem." Title comments

1) This is a title and hence a good break between Isaiah 1 and 2 with no parallel in Micah where 3:12 and 4:1, 2 flow continuously.

2) How many chapters in Isaiah have a heading like Isa. 2:1?

very few, usually only for specific visions (cf. chs. 13-22)

3) Normally you have to figure out where the break comes yourself
4) Heading in Isaiah 1 and then again in chapter 2 yet rarely elsewhere and never in the last 27 chapters (Isa. 40-66).

5) Reason may be found in relation to Micah 4.
   a. Isa. 2:1 "The words of Isaiah the son of Amoz saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem."
      Word for saw = prophetic vision.
   b. Is it the title for all of chapter 2?
   c. Title is for Isa. 2:1-5. Micah relationship, Isaiah saying he too had the same vision as Micah.
   d. Difference Micah says "peoples will enter" where Isaiah universal "all nations will stream to it"
   e. Isaiah saying he is putting his authority behind it as he too saw the same thing.
   f. Seems like Micah first because he fits it right in with what he was saying in ch. 3 so Isaiah gives a title saying I'm not just copying Micah I also had the same vision...

H. Micah 1-7 and Isaiah 1-6 comparison
   1. Micah 7 chapters really 6 divisions
      chs. 1-2 Rebuke people for their sins
      Ch. 2 few verses of marvelous blessing
      Ch. 3 Rebuke for sin
      Ch. 4 Aspects of future blessing
      Ch. 5 Rebuke for sin
      Ch. 6-7 Micah's relationship to God
   2. Isaiah 1-6
      Ch. 1 Rebuke for sin
      Ch. 2 few verses of marvelous blessing
      Chs. 2-3 Rebuke for sin and coming punishment
      Ch. 4 Future blessing
Ch. 5 Rebuke for sin
Ch. 6 Isaiah's experience of God
3. General prophetic message: rebuke and punishment of sin, promise and comfort of future blessing

Assignment for next time:
1) Isaiah 56-57 note sections on rebuke and punishment for sin and sections where God promises blessing to his people

II. Isaiah chapter 1
A. Verse 1:
"The vision of Isaiah the son of Amoz, which he saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem."
1. Almost exactly the same as we saw in chapter 2:1
"In the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz and Hezekiah"
2. Uzziah 791-740 BC reigned 52 years, sinned and got leprosy
3. Jotham 750-732 co-reigned with his father
4. Ahaz 736-716 co-reigned with his father, co-regency made for more stable transition
5. Hezekiah 716-687 BC

B. Verses 2-6: The LORD's Complaint
1. "Hear O heaven and give ear O earth, for the Lord has spoken. I have nourished and brought up children and they have rebelled against me."
2. Terrible denunciation that God makes against Israel especially for all God had done from them in bringing them out of Egypt and care for them in the wilderness
3. Parent raising child who rebels... God feels that heartbreak
4. Verses 3-6 The LORD's complaint:
"The ox knows his owner and the donkey his master's crib, but Isaiah does not know, my people do not consider. Oh sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a seed of evildoers, children that are corrupt, they have forsaken the LORD they have provoked the Holy One of Israel to anger they have gone away backwards. Why should you be stricken any more? Will you revolt more and more? The whole head is sick, the whole heart is sick, from the sole of the foot even from the head there is no soundness in it, but wounds, bruises and putrefying sores; they've not been clothed nor bound up, neither mollified with ointment."

5. Verse 5 "Why should you be stricken any more?
   a) Hebrew Imperfect verse tense: frequentative=action that occurs repeatedly and not future as some take it

C. Verses 7-9

1. Desolation of the land

"Your country is desolate your cities are burned with fire; you land, strangers devour it in your presence, and it is desolate, it is over thrown by strangers. And the daughter of Zion is left as a cottage in the vineyard as a lodge in a garden of cucumbers, as a besieged city. Except the Lord of Hope had left a very small remnant, we should have been as Sodom, we would have been like unto Gomorrah."

2. These seem to described the actual historical situation.

3. Perfect tense verbs are used: not prophetic perfects but actual

4. Hezekiah facing Sennacherib king of Assyria 701 BC.

5. Sennacherib had captured Lachish the second largest city of Judah. Now Jerusalem is worried they were next. See chs. 36-37 and Kings and Chronicles for the background

6. Lord destroyed the army of Sennacherib with a plague saving Jerusalem
Lecture 2: Comparison of Isaiah 2 and Micah 4

7. So these verses deal with a particular time.

8. Chapters 1-6 gathered as an introduction to the book of Isaiah, but chapter 1 reflects the situation of a particular time.

9. Verse 9 quoted in Rom. 9:29--only through God's mercy a remnant left.

D. Isaiah 1:10-15: The futility of empty ceremony

1. Verses 10-11: "Hear the word of the Lord, you rulers of Sodom! Give ear to the law of God, you people of Gomorrah! To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices to me? says the Lord, I am full of the burnt offerings of rams and the fat of fed beef, and I delight not in the blood of bulls or of lambs or of a few goats."

2. School of thought: suggests there was a conflict between the prophets and priests--this is a complete misunderstanding.

3. Isaiah not against sacrificial system but against putting our faith in such matters.

4. Verses 12-13 "I cannot away with" in King James version doesn't make much sense. Better: "I cannot bear the new moon."

5. There's no punctuation in the Hebrew. The chapter divisions were added in the 13th century AD. The Massoretes in the 10th century added a series of accents indicating how they thought the text was divided. Vowels represent a long established tradition and shouldn't be simply discarded.

6. "Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hates. They are trouble to me, I am weary. And when you spread forth your hands, I will hide my eyes from you. Yes, when you make many prayers I will not hear. Your hands are full of blood.

   a. This criticism is of hypocrisy of putting one's trust in form and ceremony.
b. Many churches recite empty liturgies from memory that mean next to nothing

Don't have time for E, F, G, today...
Isaiah 2:1-5 and the Millennium

Assignments [00:00]

Now for October 11th for next week the assignment is a rather brief one. It is simply to read over the fifth chapter of Isaiah and make a general outline of that chapter, putting together those verses that make up a section with the same topic, but is a different topic from what precedes or follows. Give a brief title to each section that you make and then also if as you read it you notice something that seems to you to be rather specifically related to something that we’ve already looked at in Isaiah 1 – 4 or 56 – 57, which were included in the assignment I gave you earlier or in some other part of the Bible, if it occurs to you that these sections are related as you go through them, please mention that. Now the assignment I’d like to have done without looking at any commentary or looking up any marginal notes in the annotated Bible you have. That is to say, I’d be interested in seeing what you see from your own recollection, or your own knowledge, or your own observations, because my primary purpose in all places in the Bible is not to see what somebody else has said or thought, but to train you in methods of finding out for yourself what the Bible said. Now after you have done that, then if you want to look up marginal notes in your Bible, footnotes in your Bible, or commentaries, or anything that is extra--not assigned--I’m glad to have you do it if you feel like it. But if you do, please mention that you’ve done so on your paper and say what you’ve used. And of course, you might mention what version you were using at
the beginning of the paper. I don’t care what version you’ve used for this assignment, but I’d like to know what version you are using anyway.

The Danger of Taking Things out of Context [2:07]

Now our purpose in this course is to learn how to find what is in the Bible. Some people have a very magical idea of the Bible. They pick out 3 or 4 words, and here is God’s truth. They’re like the Episcopalian minister, rector I guess they call him, who once gave a sermon with the title, “Hear the church.” Of course that was from the verse in Matthew 18 that said, “and if he will not hear the church then call him as an unbeliever”. That’s after describing the way to deal with disagreements between individuals, and so on. If you are one of the parties, you see the other first alone. Eventually you may have to bring the matter before the church, and if he will not "hear the church," he is to be treated as an unbeliever. So these words “hear the church”, were taken out of context. Now the bishop was present, and afterwards, the rector was expecting to be highly complimented by the bishop on his sermon, but the bishop simply turned to him and said, “I have another verse for you that you might want to do a sermon on.” He said this verse is “hang all the law and the prophets,” you know Jesus said, “Upon this hang all the laws and the prophets.” In this way the bishop humorously pointed out the rector's mistake. Well, unfortunately, many people will take three or four words that way out of context and build up some crazy doctrine. Of course, all words in the Bible are tremendously important, but some words you might say are simply transitional words. Some words are absolutely clear and definite, and some words are possible to be translated in two or three different ways. There are people who are making a tremendous fuss about the fact that an earlier ancient manuscript doesn’t have every word in it found in some of the later manuscripts, and if a translation is made from early manuscripts, they say “all this translation doesn’t believe in the deity of Christ because it leaves out this statement about the deity” that appears in a later manuscript. Such an attitude, I think, just like this attitude of the person
who suggested we should “hang the law on the prophets.” In other words, this attitude takes words of Scripture as magical words instead of as an attempt, in spite of the very difficult and weak instrument that human language is, of using that instrument to present the truth of God. And so when we say the Bible is inspired and free from error, we don’t’ mean you can take three words out of context and get God’s truth. We mean that in the Bible, carefully studied, you cannot find anything clearly stated that is not part of God’s truth. We can draw a lot of conclusions, but what you clearly find taught there you can stand on. That’s what we mean by saying the Bible is verbally inspired. But these words do not convey false ideas if correctly interpreted. And that, of course, is my great stress in this course. We do not want to read into the Bible, but to find what is there.

The Matter of the Millennium [5:31]

Now this is particular to the case when we come to matters on which consecrated Christians differ. One such matter is the matter of the millennium. If a person is thoroughly convinced that there is to be a millennium, as I am, then such a person can go to the Bible and he may find in light of his conviction, new evidence that nobody ever realized before relating to the millennium. There is value in that approach. But there are people who do not think the millennium is taught in the Bible. I believe it is particularly valuable on all such matters to go to the Bible and not say, e.g. "can I fit this into the teaching of the millennium?" But "does this prove there is a millennium?" Do you see the difference? There are these two approaches and there’s value in both. But I believe that this second approach is absolutely necessary. Upon all on which we are going to stand strongly, and which we are going to insist upon as the word of God, we should be able to say "these passages prove it" not "I think this passage must be related to it."

Now we asked the question at the end of the last hour as to whether the last part of chapter one relates to the millennium. I think you can see there verse 25
thru 28 of Isaiah 1 reads: “I will turn my hand upon thee and purely purge away thy dross and take away all thy sins. And I will restore thy judges as of the first and thy counselors as of the beginning. Afterwards, you shall be called the city of righteousness, the faithful city. Zion shall be redeemed with judgment and her converts with righteousness. And the destruction of the transgressors and the sinners shall be together and they that forsake the Lord shall be consumed.” Now this twenty-eighth verse is not out of context. It really does relate to the question whether this passage relates to the millennium.

We look at those words, “I will turn my hand upon thee and purely purge away thy dross and take away all thy sins.” That might be said of those who are believing in the millennium that God does this to them. But it might also be a prediction of God’s taking the people off into captivity. The Israelites tended to fall into idolatry during all of their history up to the time of the exile. And during all of that period we find constant attacks on idolatry in the writing of the prophets. But we do not find Christ criticizing the people of his day, at least the Israelites of his day, that they were worshipping idols. In the exile, those that leave to return from the exile to Jerusalem were thoroughly weaned away from idolatry and from that phase of heathenism. And therefore, one can say that, in a sense in that regard and in certain other regards at least, that this statement that “I will purely purge away thy dross and take away thy sins” could be a prediction of what is going to happen in connection with the millennium.

Now if someone wants to say "no this is referring to what is going to happen in the great tribulation," well, something similar may happen in the Great Tribulation, but you can’t prove it from this verse. If I tell you I’m going to go to Philadelphia, and there I’m going to buy a new suit, and if I do that next week, you can quote my words six months from now and say that I am still going to do it. I may do it next weekend or six months from now. But if I make the statement and fulfill the statement, the statement has been fulfilled. If I would say, “I am going
to go to Philadelphia frequently and buy new suits there, then when I went once it would not fulfill the statement. But when a prediction is made and can be conceived of as having been fulfilled, we may say that it is similar to events that will take place later, but we have no right to say it is a prediction of an event that is going to happen later.

**Cannot Prove Connection Between Millennium and Passage [10:09]**

Now the passage continues “…and I will restore thy judges as at the first and thy counselors as at the beginning.” How were Israel’s judges at the first? How were their counselors at the beginning? We read of great judges in the history of Israel: we read of Samuel, we read of Gideon, we read of many other judges and counselors whom God marvelously used. But we do not find that their condition was a perfect condition in any of those periods. If you want to say there is a similarity between this and something God is going to do in the millennium, that means there’s going to be some sort of a similar organization in the millennium to what there was then. That you can prove from this passage if you prove the passage is about the millennium. But you can’t prove the passage is about the millennium from this statement. This statement can just as well be taken as saying after returning from exile, there will be men like Ezra, like Nehemiah, men like the Maccabees who gave their life for their loyalty to their God. These are men who are worthy to stand in every regard as the equal of the men who were judges and counselors of Israel in earlier days.

**Prediction of the Millennium [11:26]**

And the statement afterwards “Thou shalt be called the City of Righteousness, the Faithful City.” Well certainly, there were centuries after the time of the exile when despite their sin, their wickedness, and their failure the Jews nevertheless did become known as a group that were ready, many of them, to
give their lives for their belief in the one true God. It is pretty hard to prove that this could not be a prediction of that period.

The Unfortunate Translation of “converts” in Zion’s Future Redemption

[11:54] The statement that follows: “Zion shall be redeemed with judgment and her converts with righteousness.” In this statement there is an unfortunate translation. The word rendered there as “converts” is simply the participle of the Hebrew word “to return.” And so literally it is “those who return.” Well, that could certainly be a reference to those who returned from the exile but it does not have to be. The idea of returning is used not only in a material sense; it is also used in a figurative sense. And so it is quite proper to translate “those who return” as “those who return to the Lord/those who become converted.” But the translation “convert,” while not an incorrect translation, is a translation which takes only a small part of the meaning of the word, and I believe it is better to translate it literally as “those who return” and then allow the possibility of taking it as a spiritual return. It is interesting to notice that this statement, which in the King James is “her converts,” in the New American Standard Bible is translated “her repenting ones.” And “her repenting ones” is perhaps slightly nearer the original than “her converts” because it is a definite act of returning, spiritually. But then the NIV has gone one step further, and it says not “her repenting ones” but “her penitent ones.” Now penitence simply describes a state of mind. And the Hebrew "shav" does not describe a state of mind, it describes a change. In most people it produces a visible change. Maybe the word can refer to a spiritual journey, but certainly not a state of mind. Either way, this is important enough for me to write and share my thoughts with the editor of the NIV. I have a lot of other matters to write to him about that are more important, but I may reference this as well when I write. The editor had specifically asked me for suggestions, and so I certainly shall make some that I
think are important and I may make this one about penitence, for it is certainly not the full representation of the Hebrew.

Now, if you want to say here is a picture that describes what will happen in the millennium, perhaps what happens in the millennium will be exactly like this. I do not wish to fight with someone who says this is a picture of the millennium. But I do wish to say you can’t prove the millennium from this because it can very will be a picture of the fact that God is going to bring the Israelites back from the north from the Babylonian exile, and going to give them very great blessings at that time, not in the future time we call the millennium.

**The Glory of the Promise in Isaiah 2:1-5 [14:57]**

Now we can go on with our regular outline and I have condensed the first part of it that I will put up, so as not to repeat matters that we have already discussed. We are discussing Roman numeral III. "The Glory of the Promise in Isaiah 2:1-5," and in our discussion of it we noted most interpreters, albeit, reluctantly, think that it is a passage that describes a period when there is to be no external danger, a period when there is no need of defense, a period when there is nothing to fear. I read to you the exposition by one of the church fathers that we may think of as early but actually it’s about 300 years after the time of Christ. Something that was 300 years ago we think of as quite a long time ago. When we speak of them, of those early fathers, we seem to think they have a special importance. They certainly have a blessing for us in their writings. But this church father said that the vine and fig tree here show God’s protection, that the vine and the fig tree represent the protection God will give. How will the vine and the fig tree provide you protection? The vine and the fig tree are simply given as a picture of the possibility of sitting out doors, outside of the city, out to the open field and there sitting down under your vine and under your fig tree to escape the
sun. You have no fear, whatever; it shows a time when there is no external danger, no need of defense, nothing to fear.

The Manner of Fulfillment - Belief [16:36]

Now I just mentioned at the end of the hour chapter D- “The Fulfillment of Belief” - and under this I looked at four subjects, and I mentioned a fifth that the manner of fulfillment is not entirely specified here. It begins here with telling how the law will go forth from Jerusalem and the word of God from Zion. But whether this is necessarily the beginning of what is here described or whether it is a statement of what will occur at another time is not specifically stated. The early Christians took it as the manner of fulfillment. They said Christ was born in Bethlehem, he preached in Jerusalem, from Jerusalem the word of God began and went out to the world, and after the end of the first or second century, they said, this word is going to conquer the world and thus all the world will have a time of absolute peace. And then some of them said, "yes, we had marvelous peace for 300 years." The world indeed enjoyed not complete peace, but such peace as the world had never known before because the Roman armies were present, preventing people from fighting, and this began about twenty-years before Christ was born, so they said the kingdom of Christ spends its influence back before He was born. This is a beautiful, but rather irrational, idea. Certainly, the birth of Christ in Bethlehem has nothing to do with Augustus’s conquering of Egypt and establishing a condition of peace such that the world had not seen before. And after 3 or 4 centuries, the Roman peace, or Pax Romana, completely broke down and all areas of the Roman Empire became a section where roaming tribes were fighting one another. And literacy in the empire, which might have been 90 or 95% decreased to maybe 5 or 10% at the very most. And the terrible dark ages began. Then the Heathens turned against the Christians who said Christianity is proved by this period of absolute peace. When it came to an end, Christianity had
fallen and along with it the fact that this passage is not a prediction of the 300 year peace of that time; it is something yet to come in the future.

**Peace in the Future - Fulfillment of Belief [19:04]**

We are left with how this passage is going to be fulfilled. Well, it will be entirely possible as far as this passage is concerned, for us to say, "The word of God going out from Jerusalem is going to reach all people to the extent where they will all say, 'Let’s turn to the light. Let’s go to Jerusalem. Let’s go to the Lord Jesus Christ who is in the heavenly Jerusalem; let us find from him how he wants us to live.'" And thus there will be established a condition of absolute peace throughout the world. Now it looks a lot more like that might have happened 50 years ago than it does today, let’s say 80 years ago was more possible than it might happen today. During this century (20th) there have been about as many wars as any century in history. And it does not appear, at present, that there’s much likelihood of their stopping. I understand that Russia’s spending about 25% of its total production on preparation for war every year; we’re spending about 5% of our GDP, and there are those who are making big protests against that. Just why the Russians are putting all this into war preparation when there’s people many of whom are half-starved and would like to have part of that, or at least have more to eat, is something they have not explained. But that a condition of peace is going to continue for a long time certainly appears extremely unlikely.

**A Strong Force is Going to Establish Peace [20:34]**

And so when someone says, “The gospel is going to go on and on and conquer more and more nations, more and more people until we have absolute freedom from war all over the world, and this is going to last for a long, long time,” well, if the Bible definitely predicted that I would say "certainly," though everything looks contrary. I would believe God can say what he wants to do. But the passage does not specifically say that that is what is going to happen. In fact, it
sounds a bit different, because it says that he will reprove all nations that are afar off and He will judge among the nations, and it sounds as if a strong force is going to establish peace. So that just as the Romans fought over areas of Europe, and North Africa, and part of the Middle East and established peace, it appears to me that the Lord himself is going to establish power on this earth, and no one will think of making war because they will have had no opportunity to do it, and nobody will need to prepare for war because there’s nobody else who would dare make war. A condition, at any rate, of external peace and safety will be brought about in one of these two ways. On the basis of passages of Micah 4 and of Isaiah 11, I believe we can dogmatically say that there is to be such a long period. The New Testament says a thousand years—six times it says a thousand years. I’m not going to fight for those who say a thousand is simply a round number, but I’m not going to think that it could be a round number for 10 seconds versus 10 minutes. It would seem to me that it would have to be a long period of time. And therefore it seems to me that the Bible clearly states that there is to be a millennial reign of Christ upon this earth, but I don’t think that we should try to prove that by these last verses of chapter one. I do believe that chapter two, however, very definitely shows a period in which there will be complete external freedom from external danger.

**Parallel Between Micah 4:1-3 and Isaiah 2:2-4 [23:01]**

Now number 6, note Micah 4:4c. We have noticed how in Micah 4:1-3 we have almost the exact parallel to Isaiah 2:2-4. But Micah for the first three fourths of the verse has no exact parallel in Isaiah, but it simply stresses and drives home that fact, which is rather clearly taught in the previous verse, very clearly taught I would say, that there is to be a time of no external danger, no need of defense, nothing to fear. But the last part of Micah 4 says, “for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it.” In other words, Micah says this prediction of a world free from war, the world’s freedom from external danger, is such a tremendous thing, that in
order for you to believe that, you must know that actually the mouth of the Lord has said it. "God has given me this vision." is what Micah is saying. Well, now is there any parallel to the word in Isaiah 2. Personally, I believe that there is. I believe that that is why Isaiah put in verse 1 of chapter 2 the phrase "The word that Isaiah the son of Amoz saw concerning Judea and Jerusalem." This is the equivalent of what Micah said when he said, "for the mouth of the Lord has spoken." It looks, I think, rather silly for the average person approaching the book of Isaiah--certainly it did for me before I studied it--to have the book start with verse 1 telling you that these are the visions that Isaiah had, which serve as an excellent introduction to the whole book, and then in the very next chapter the same introduction is repeated. Now that wouldn’t be silly if he did that for every chapter or even every 10 chapters. But there’s not more than 7 or 8 cases where the word Isaiah even occurs in the book. We have it in 1:1 that the vision of Isaiah the son of Amoz, and the days of the various kings, and in chapter 2 we have this again, but we don’t have the word "Isaiah" again until Isaiah 7 verse 3 telling us of his meeting with Ahab where he says there what the Lord said unto Isaiah. And then in chapter 13 verse 1 we have the "burden of Babylon," which Isaiah did see, which begins this way, "the burden of" not merely in one chapter, but appears at about a dozen chapters dealing with other nations and showing what God says is going to happen to them.

Isaiah’s Confirmation of Micah in 2:1-5 [26:00]

In chapter 20 verse 2 it says the Lord spoke to Isaiah, and in verse 2 and in verse 3 it says Isaiah walked naked and barefoot for a year. And then in chapter 37-39, where you have a historical account of Isaiah’s relations with Hezekiah you find the word "Isaiah" ten times and then never again in the whole book. So aside from chapter 13 verse 1, where it introduces a long passage of about a dozen chapters of a type quite different from most of the rest of the book, such a title occurs only in the beginning of chapter 1 and the beginning of chapter 2, and that
seems rather not a very sensible arrangement if you take it as a heading for a group of chapters. Why give a heading and then give it again unless you are going to do it all the way through? I believe that chapter 2 verse 1 is a heading for the next 5 verses only. Isaiah realizes he’s giving a tremendous prediction, such a prediction that’s almost impossible for one to believe, and is particularly difficult for those Israelites to believe. Note the context. The Egyptians south of them and Assyrians northeast of them are clashing and fighting each other. And the Assyrian army is coming and overrunning Israel to the north, which was twice as large as Judah, and Assyria was also overrunning most of Judah, taking Lachish, the second largest city in Judah captive. In those conditions for three years nobody dared to go out and sit under their vine or their fig tree. But Isaiah is saying, "You might find it difficult to believe. You may say Micah has said it and that’s wonderful that we will have peace, but how do we know Micah is a true prophet of God? Answer: God gave me the same vision." Here is a vision that Isaiah has seen. It is as though Isaiah is saying, "God has enabled me to give my word to what Micah has given that this wonderful thing is actually going to take place that this world is going to become so separate from war, that there will be a complete freedom from external danger. War will be entirely removed."

**The Parallel between Micah 4:5 and Isaiah 2:5 [28:39]**

And so we have this parallel, I believe here, and then I believe we have one more parallel. That one more parallel I call E- "Micah 4:5 and Isaiah 2:5." I think we have a lot of ground to cover this semester, so I won’t spend much time on it, particularly as the real problem in this comparison lies in Micah instead of Isaiah. But most Bibles, like the one that I have copied this from, (and the reason I use that one is it has the largest type of any Bible I was able to lay hands on and that I could get the page to lie flat enough to make it transparency for you, and for that reason I use this one. That said,) you notice the heading of this passage, "the Lord Judges the crowd," “Oh House of Jacob, Oh House of Jacob, Come ye and
let us walk in the light of the Lord therefore thou has forsaken thy people the House of Jacob.” What sense does that make? Putting Verse 5 and Verse 6 together like that, in my opinion, makes absolutely no sense. That is not a reason why God has forsaken these people, because they want to walk in the way of the Lord. That is Isaiah’s conclusion to the wonderful picture. God is able to promise this tremendous thing, this thing you couldn’t believe if Isaiah didn’t say “God has revealed this to me, as he revealed it to Micah so you can know better that it will come to pass. Therefore, O House of Jacob, come, and let us walk in the light of the Lord.” That’s wonderful; God’s going to do bring peace in Isaiah's future, but what does it mean to us? We who believe in a God who could do this wonderful thing. We should walk in the Light of the Lord. We should follow as He leads. And we should make our life count for Him.

Importance of Contemporary Application [30:53]

Now, as a slight digression, I think it is utterly wasteful when a man takes a biblical teaching, no matter how wonderful it is, and simply presents it to a congregation without application. Here’s something interesting for you to know. God’s going to do this, or this is going to happen. It’s good to know, but we should draw it to our purpose. In view of what God’s going to do, let us walk in the light of the Lord. And that’s what Isaiah does here, and I think it’s very sad that many Bibles put in a division at that point where there certainly does not belong one. And you notice that the passage in Micah ends with a word in verse 5, “For the people will walk everyone in the name of his god, and we will walk in the name of the Lord our God forever and ever.” And that used to puzzle me greatly because it sounds as if all the heathens are going to keep on worshiping their heathen god forever and ever. But the trouble is that the Hebrew imperfect verb tense can just as well be translated as a frequentative, or it can be translated as an exhortation, not in all cases, but in many. But in any case it can be translated
as a frequentative. And most of the modern translations render it that way. “For the people walk everyone in the name of their God.”

This is a fact that if you will go to most any part of the world where people are worshipping false gods, you will find that they have no shame about doing so. I was on a train in Egypt, and it came time for evening prayer, and the men, dozens of them, got out in the aisle in the train and bowed down toward Mecca, and nobody thought of being ashamed of it. The only religion that I’ve ever heard that people feel any shame about is Christianity. And people are afraid to say grace often in a public place for fear someone will think they are pious or they won’t make a testimony to the Lord when there is a marvelous opportunity for it. They are afraid people will look down on them. Muslims don’t feel that way; they’re proud of their belief in Allah. The worshipers of Buddha, the followers of Confucius, the Brahmins aren’t ashamed. The difference, of course, is that Christianity requires a standard of life that most of us find hard to live up to. And consequently, those who don’t want to follow this standard have managed, in many Christian areas, to get an attitude in which people cover up the fact that they believe in Christ instead of being proud of the fact. And Isaiah says these heathen people, who believe in these gods, they direct their lives in accordance with the teachings of their gods they worship. They do it publicly and they think nothing of it. Shall not we who have a God who can make such a prediction as this, shall not we who have a God who can do these wonderful things? Shall not we walk in his name for ever and ever?

**Rebuke for Israel’s Sins (34:11)**

I believe we have covered most of what is necessary at this point about Isaiah 2:1-5 so we can go on to chapter 4. And I don’t want to show you the whole passage on the overhead because I don’t want you copying it until we discuss it more. But chapter 2, verse 6, to chapter 4, verse 1, is made up of rebuke
for Israel’s sins. And this is one of the characteristics of the prophets that I find most useful in studying them. That is to note what is the purpose of a passage: is it a rebuke, a passage dealing with sin; or is it a blessing passage, comforting those who wish to be true to the Lord. Most passages in the prophets can be put under one of these two headings. And I find it a very useful first step in interpretation to ask that question about every passage, that is, is it rebuke or is it blessing.

**The New Chapter Should Have Started in 2:6 [35:07]**

And so here it is true of the rest of chapter 2, certainly at verse 6, a new chapter should have begun. If chapter 4 can be made up of five verses, certainly there is no reason why chapter 2 could not have been made up of 5 verses. We have a complete change of thought at verse 6, so I don’t know why they translated the beginning of verse 6 as, “therefore thou hast forsaken thy people.” The Hebrew word there is a word that is ordinarily translated “for” and I guess that the translators of the King James Version thought it ridiculous to say, “let us follow the Lord for thou hast forsaken thy people,” and they thought it sounded a little less ridiculous to say, “therefore thou hast forsaken thy people,” but there are a few cases where there is no question that the Hebrew word “for” refers to what follows rather than what precedes, but there are a few places where it seems simply to be an assertion of the certainty of what has been said. And so I would rather translate this, “sure, or surely thou hast forsaken thy people,” or “indeed thou hast forsaken thy people.” I think “for” goes with what follows than with what precedes in the sense that God is going to send punishment because of what preceded.

But at any rate it is definitely a new section. We have had this section of rebuke through most of chapter 1, but then this marvelous picture of blessings and comfort for God's people at the end of chapter 1 followed by this marvelous picture in the beginning of chapter 2. Now we start a new part of the book, and this part begins with capital A. “Its idolatry and heathenism.” In chapter 2,
verses 6 to 9, God rebukes Judah for turning to the gods of the east, and for looking to them that claim to predict the future by their false methods.

**Idolatry and Heathenism [37:24]**

And that is just as appropriate today as it ever was with the way that people today are turning for the gods of the east. My wife and I less than a week ago were standing in front of the Lincoln Memorial, and a man came up to us and began to talk in a very attractive pleasant manner. In fact, my wife at first thought he was connected with some Christian group, but then when we questioned him, we found that he was trying to get people to give money to advance the worship of Krishna, the Hindu god. The religions of the east are coming in like a flood into our country now; astrology is widely being followed, and all of these cults and "isms" and false ideas, and God rebukes the Israelites in verses 6-9 for the way they allow these things to come, are coming into our nation.

On account of the way the time is going, I won’t read the rest of the verses, or even the verses in part B, which is a much larger section from chapter 2:10 to 3:9. This is one whole section which is interrupted by a chapter division which should not have been placed there. It should have been at the end of verse 5 in chapter 2, but there is no reason for one at the beginning of chapter 3. There is hardly a paragraph division there at the beginning of chapters, for the theme of the certainty of punishment continues beyond 3:1.

**Conditional Predictions [39:11]**

There are verses there that would be well worth our time but I think we will move on and look at capital C, "A conditional prediction," which is in chapter 3 verses 10-11. And I am going to take a second on that because there is something there that you find quite frequently in the prophetic books. At various places you find something like this: “Say ye to the righteous that it shall be well with him for they shall eat the fruit of their doing; but woe unto the wicked! It shall be ill with
him for the reward of his hands shall be given him.” In other words, we have here two conditional predictions. It does not say that either of these things is going to happen: that it is going to be well with the people, or that they are going to suffer terrible punishment. Rather, it says that the result depends on the decision that they make. And I believe thoroughly in the sovereignty of God, that God controls all things, that everything is in line with his glorious plan, but I believe that people can easily take that wonderful doctrine and make it into something that gives them an idea of life as if it were like a moving picture, that you look at and you see it running before you and people look as if they are surprised, they’re terrified, they weep, they laugh. And yet you know what’s going to happen right in the next minute. It’s all there, it’s pure play-acting, there’s no reality to it. Life is real and what we do matters, and over and over in the Scriptures God says that what we do matters. And we cannot understand exactly how we fit together with the fact that God controls all things. What we do, what we think, what we say, what we decide, matters to God. And so at many places in the prophetic books you have these conditional predictions. God knows what decisions are going to be made. God knows what is going to happen, God knows how his wonderful plan is going to work out and yet what we decide and what we do matters.

**Judgment on Unworthy Leaders and Rebuke of Vain and Worldly Women**

[41:23]

And then capital D is “Judgment on unworthy leaders.” Chapter 3 verses 12-15 deal with the unworthy leaders and tell how God is going to enter into judgment with them and rebukes them for their sin. And then section E is “Rebuke of the vain and worldly women,” Chapter 3:16-4:1. Here he turns to those daughters of Zion who are haughty and rough with stretchforthed necks and wanton eyes and all their interests in their adornment and in the beautiful things they had, and all that, and he describes it in detail and says that all this beauty is going to be burnt to ash. He does not criticize them for wanting to look attractive.
He does not criticize them for giving reasonable attention to making the world a more pleasant place to live in by dressing themselves as attractively and pleasantly as they can. But he rebukes them for making this their end in life, and the thing from which they get their joy and their pleasure. And he rebukes them for it and tells them how they are going to be punished for it. "They are going to have instead of a sash, a torn rag; instead of well-set hair, baldness; and instead of a cape, a girding of sackcloth; and burning instead of beauty. Thy men shall fall by the sword, and thy mighty in the war. And her gates shall lament and mourn; and she being desolate shall sit on the ground. And in that day seven women shall take hold of one man, saying, 'we will eat our own bread, and wear our own apparel and let us be called by thy name, to take away our reproach.'"

Disproportion of Sexes in Post WWI Germany [43:18]

I was in Germany in the years after the first world war. And I felt great sympathy for a whole generation of young women, women, say, in their thirties and forties, who were left with there being, say, three women to one man. Of that particular age group most definitely. Now, of course, the older people were still living, both sexes, the young children were living both sexes. But in that particular age group there was that disproportion which leads to all sorts of evils in society. And Isaiah predicts here to the Israelites that there will come war and difficulty in which the men will fall in the war and this disproportion will be introduced. Now if the women’s libers succeed in their ideal of making women and men absolutely indistinguishable, we will not have that particular evil in the next war because there will be just as many women as men in combat, but whether they will succeed or not, nobody can tell at this time.

Misplaced Chapter Divisions in Chapters 3 and 4 [44:24]

But verse one of chapter 3 very clearly belongs with the preceding verse, and yet the chapter division breaks the continuous thought between the end of
chapter 3 and the first verse of chapter 4. Now there are those who say these seven women represent the seven churches of Asia and these seven churches have shown their love for the Lord saying, "we will depart from all others, only let us be called by your name." But that sort of a metaphorical interpretation can prove anything and this verse is clearly not amenable to this interpretation. This all to say the archbishop put the chapter division in what is clearly the wrong place.

I was hoping to get to chapter four today, so we are behind, but next week I’ll hopefully finish that and glance at chapter five.
Isaiah 4-5

**Messiah: the Branch; child born/son given [0:0]**

And here then is it possible that the Messiah is also the branch that comes from the Lord and is also the fruit that comes from the earth (Isaiah 4)? The adjectives used with the second part of it are just as strong as the adjectives used in the first part of it. And we find that whether Isaiah understood this or not, he suggested the same thing where he said “Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given.” Now that could simply be Hebrew parallelism. But the fact is that we have the two terms used one "born" and one "given," It is reasonable to consider these terms as suggesting the twofold nature of Christ. He is the second person of the trinity. He is God incarnate in human flesh. He is the branch of the Lord but he also is man. He had a human heritage, a human background a human lineage. He is the fruit of the earth as well as being the branch of the Lord. And so it seems to me that it is altogether reasonable to consider that we have the two aspects of Christ here predicted by Isaiah. I mention here Romans 1:3-4 because the apostle Paul brought out those two aspects so clearly there, though it is also done in many other places in the New Testament. I will just read the King James Version of those two verses: “Concerning his son, Jesus Christ our Lord who was made according to the seed of David according to the flesh and declared to be the son of God with power according to the spirit of holiness.” Here we have the two aspects of the person of Christ. And so I believe we are justified in saying that we have them here in this verse of Isaiah.
The Divine Provision for Holiness [2:18]

Now we go on to capital B: which is "The divine provision for holiness." And that is unquestionably what is contained in Isaiah 4 verses 3 and 4. This point I might switch back to the passage and read chapter 4, verses 3 and 4: “and it shall come to pass that he that is left in Zion and he that remains in Jerusalem, shall be called holy. Even everyone that is written among the living in Jerusalem, when the Lord shall have washed away the filth of the daughters of Zion”--do you notice the daughters of Zion can make up with what precedes but it does not necessarily mean it is the same person. There is a contrast between those who are punished for their sins and those who are purged by the Lord, cleansed from their sin. And this cleansing ties right up here with their finding their joy and satisfaction through the branch of the Lord and the fruit of the earth. “He that is left in Zion and that remains in Jerusalem shall be called holy. Even everyone that is written among the living in Jerusalem. When the Lord shall have washed away the filth of the daughters of Zion and shall have purged the blood of Jerusalem from the midst thereof by the spirit of judgment and by the spirit of burning.” One could take this as simply meaning that through the attacks of the enemy, through the great catastrophes they are going through they are going to be purged and cleanse and all who are left will be cleansed from their filth and will be finding their joy in the branch of the Lord and the fruit of the earth.

Christ’s Atonement [4:05]

But one can equally well say it is looking forward to a later period contrasted with this earlier period. Contrasted with the sin of Isaiah’s day there is to be a time when the Messiah, the one who is both God and man, will be the one who is wonderful and glorious and that will be a time when the Lord will have washed away the filth of his people and purged the blood of Jerusalem by the spirit of judgment and the spirit of burning. It does not explicitly and clearly refer to Christ’s atonement, but it certainly can be considered as such, for we certainly
have no real cleansing at any time except in some relation to Christ's atonement. So we have in these two verses the divine provision for holiness.

**Divine Protection and Leadership for God’s Children [4:56]**

Then capital C. “Divine protection and leadership for God’s children.” I repeat, "Divine protection and leadership for God’s children." There is quite a bit put into that title, and there are some things very definitely left out of it. Divine protection and leadership for God’s children. We look at Isaiah 4 verses 5-6, “The Lord will create upon every dwelling place of mount Zion and upon her assembly,” this word, "assembly" is a word that does not apply something that is permanent it is more something that is temporary, people coming together, upon her assembly, “a cloud and smoke by day and the shining of a flaming fire by night.” Anyone in Isaiah’s day, or in fact anyone familiar with the Bible ever since, reading those phrases immediately thinks of the pilgrimage journey of the Israelites as they came from Egypt after being delivered from Egypt and going through the experience of the Passover there, as they were coming towards the promised land, how God puts over them a cloud of smoke by day and a flaming fire by night to guide them and to protect them. Remember, when they came to the Red sea, the Lord caused it that the pillar of fire should give them light, but that the cloud should hide them from the Egyptian forces who had followed them and were intending to destroy them. It gave them both leadership and protection. And so here we have a reference back to the exodus to the pilgrimage journey of the Israelites, when God led and protected them, and it is stated that there will be a similar protection for them, a similar leading for them stated as, “and upon all the glory shall be a defense” I don’t know why the KJV uses the word “defense” at this particular place. The word is only translated “defense” once in the KJV, it is translated "chamber" once and "closet" once. It is derived from a verb, which would seem to me that which closes something in and protects
It is translated “canopy” in the NASB version and it is a word, that seems to suggest a sort of a temporary type of a protection.

**The Multiple Meanings of the word “Tabernacle” (7:27)**

And that idea is still further drawn out in the next verse (Isa. 4:6), “there shall be a tabernacle for a shelter.” Now this word “tabernacle” in the Bible doesn’t mean something put up to hold evangelistic services. This word “tabernacle” does not necessarily in itself imply a religious significance, but it does have the significance of something temporary. Very often in the Old Testament, the King James uses the word tabernacle to translate the word “Ohel” which means a tent, but in this case it is not that word, but the word “sukkah,” which means a booth. It is used where Jonah put up a little temporary structure to protect himself from the sun. It is used the Feast of Booths, it is a feast which is also called the Feast of Tabernacle. It is a time when among modern Jews they often in their backyards, put up a little temporary thing of branches and leaves to remind them of the wilderness journey and the way God protected them as they went through the desert. It is a temporary place, not a permanent place of living.

**God’s Protection [8:42]**

There will be a booth for a shadow in the daytime from the heat and for a place of refuge and for a cover from storm and from rain. Here is the divine leadership and divine protection of people thought of as pilgrims, but people who have been cleansed through the one who is both God and man. These people are here protected from the dangers that are round about them. They are protected from the storm from the rain from the heat of the sun. It is quite different from chapter 2. I asked you in the assignment from last time what verses in this chapter (chapter 4) show the removal of external danger and in this chapter I do not find anything that shows the removal of external danger. That is the clear emphasis in chapter 2--it is to be a period of complete removal of external danger. God has
promised that we can look forward to it and now it is going to come. But in chapter 4 we have something different; we have dangers round about. We do not have a permanent dwelling, we have temporary abodes, but we have God’s protection and God’s leadership to those who have been cleansed by "the spirit of burning and the spirit of judgment." And so it would seem to me one must say that verses 4 to 6 cannot look forward -- let's say versus 3 to 6--cannot look forward to the millennium but must look forward to a time when God's people are being particularly protected by him. A time when these people have been cleansed by the spirit of burning and the spirit of judgment. If we have only verses 3 to 6, we might very well say this reverses God’s protection of Israel at some time during this history subsequent to the time of Isaiah. In the view of the fact that it is so closely connected with verse 2, which predicts the glory of the one who is both the “branch of the lord and the fruit of the earth.” It would seem to me to be still more reasonable to say that it looks forward to those who find in him their glory and satisfaction; that it looks forward to them as they carry on their earthly journey in the midst of danger, of persecution, of difficulty and trouble, that God will give them guidance, leadership and protection whatever it comes, just as he did for the Israelites as they went through the wilderness.

Now, as between these two interpretations I would not wish to be dogmatic. If we did not have verse 2, if we only had verses 3 to 6, I would say that I could not decide between the two. I would not know which of the three might it be. In view of verses 2, it seems to me it is hard to escape the conclusion that, as Peter said, “they are looking forward to the Christ and to the glory that should follow” and that he is looking forward to the complete glory of the millennium, or the period that follows the millennium, or looking forward to the time of the pilgrim journey of each believer.
Chapter 5: Rebuke for Sin and Declaration of Coming Punishment [11:59]

So I think that at this point we can go on to chapter five, and in chapter five it seems to me the most important thing as we approach the chapter is to note that there is an important division in this chapter. First, the general subject of the whole chapter is rebuke for sin and declaration of coming punishment; that is the theme of the chapter as a whole. Nevertheless, it is true that the first seven verses deal with one specific parable or picture. And this picture is not referred to again in the chapter. There is no further reference to the Lord's vineyard or to the Lord's treatment of sins. So, while the whole chapter is dealing with God's condemnation of sin, of his people, verses 1-7 form a definite unit by themselves. I was disappointed to find some in the class who in the assignment divided these seven verses into one part, two parts, maybe three parts. It seems to me, the real division is between verses 7 and 8.

Isaiah 5:8 and Beyond: Rebuke and Punishment for Sin [13:18]

Now from verse 8 on, the direction I have suggested to you in looking at all the prophetic books, is a dealing with rebuke and a dealing with blessing for God's people. I think that the greater part of the prophetic books falls on to one of these two headings. And all of this falls under the head of rebuke. But under the subject of rebuke, we have material that deals particularly with pointing out and pointing to sin, and declaring God's unhappiness with their sin, his rebuke for their sin, and urging people to turn away from it. And we have passages in which he specifically predicts punishment for sin.

Now in this chapter the last part is very definitely dealing with punishment for sin. Look at verses 24-30. They are entirely dealing with punishment of sin. The fact that verse 25 ends with a phrase that is used as the end of several stanzas of a poem later in the book of Isaiah, leads people easily to think that there's an important break after verse 25, but actually the subject matter of verse 25 and that of the verses that follow are very closely related. From 24 on through, he is telling
what God is going to cause, that there shall be great misery to come to the land, when a fierce people, fierce and wildly aggressive people attack with the tremendous roaring like a lion and roar against the people of Judah like the roaring of the sea, and if you look to the land you behold darkness. So there is punishment from verse 24 on.

But in the part from verse 8 – 23, you have largely rebuked sin. You also have certain verses that deal with punishment, verses 9- 10 for instance, 9 and 10 coming after telling them in verse 8 about the wrong of covetousness and selfishness in trying to build up tremendous estates. He then goes on to say that many houses will become desolate, without inhabitants, and that the land will produce very, very little. That is definitely punishment.

**Interpreting Isaiah 5:13-17 : Punishment for Sin [15:41]**

Then Isaiah goes on with various types of sins, then rebuke, and then in verses 13-17 again you have punishments for their sins. "Therefore my people are gone into captivity" He writes. Does this describe what happened in Isaiah’s’ days when many people were taken via Damascus by Sennacherib into captivity or does it look forward to the future days when the whole nation would go into captivity? We cannot say. Of course in English, we translate this passage differently depending on which way you take it. But, we don't know for sure how the author meant it. He may have been looking forward to the Assyrian conquest, but may also be including later conquests and attacks. Some commentators think this passage does not refer to the Assyrian conquest. Note the phrase “many nations,” but the Assyrians had conquered many nations and had their forces made up of people from many nations. So it could conceivably be a reference to the Assyrian conquest. It could, however, refer to the Babylonian conquest; it could refer to the Persian conquest, or to the later coming of the Hellenistic empire, or the Roman Empire, which was made up of people from many nations under Roman control. There is no conclusive proof that one would be wrong or say that the last few
verses of the chapter were pointing forward to a terrible catastrophe for Israel towards the end of the age. That is not impossible, but there’s nothing in the passage that requires it. It could point forward to matters that have already happened.

**Isaiah Chapter 5’s Connection to Today [17:29]**

Some of these woes in this chapter, against particular sins, I think, are very appropriate to our day. Look at verse 20, “Woe to them that call evil good and good evil, that put darkness for light and light for darkness, that put bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter”. What a picture of the relativity of the present day. When people use words in the exact opposite sense in which they are usually taken. I see its time to quit. I’ve just mentioned that this first parable of the Lord’s vineyard is the background of a parable that our Lord gave in the New Testament, which is quoted in Matthew, Mark, and Luke and therefore of special interest. Next time, the first half hour we will have a little test on what we have done thus far and then we will continue.
1. Isaiah 4:
   A. The Messiah is the branch and the fruit of the earth
      1. "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given" (Isa. 9:6)
         suggesting the two-fold nature of Christ (human and divine)
      2. Rom 1:3-4 "Concerning his son, Jesus Christ our Lord who was
         made according to the seed of David according to the flesh
         and declared to be the son of God with power according to
         the spirit of holiness."
         2 aspects of the person of Christ.
   B. The divine provision for holiness
      1. Isaiah 4:3-4: "and it shall come to pass that he that is left in Zion
         and he that remains in Jerusalem, shall be called holy. Even
         everyone that is written among the living in Jerusalem, when
         the Lord shall have washed away the filth of the daughter of
         Zion"
         2. Is this simply that through the attacks of the enemy and
            catastrophe this will happen?
      3. Possibly looking forward to later period when Messiah will wash
         away the filth of his people --Christ's atonement
   C. Divine protection and leadership for God's children (Isa. 4:5-6)
      1. "The Lord will create upon every dwelling place of mount Zion
         and upon her assembly"
Assembly: something temporary gathering

2. "A cloud and smoke by day and the shining of a flaming fire by night."

a. Images back to pilgrimage journey of the Israelites as they came out of Egypt led into the wilderness by cloud of smoke by day and flaming fire by night

b. Symbol of leadership and protection

3. KJV says "and upon all the glory shall be a defense"

but the word for "defense" better translated "canopy"

--temporary protection (vid. NASB, NIV)

4. "there shall be a tabernacle for a shelter"

a) Tabernacle not evangelistic tabernacle

b) Temporary shelter not "ohel"=tent but "sukkah" = a booth

c) Used by Jonah to get relief from the sun and Feast of Booths --showing God's protection in the wilderness

j Journey. --Temporary dwelling place

d) Booth signifies divine leadership and protection for his pilgrim people

5. Contrast with Chapter 2

a) Isa. 2 there was a removal of external danger

   Isa. 4 we have dangers around and no permanent dwelling

b) Thus Isa 4:3-6 not millennial but look forward to a time when God's people are particularly protected in history
c) Isa 4:2 looks like millennium but may be referring to a time of pilgrimage for each believer or subsequent point in Israel's history.

5. Isaiah 5

A. Chapter about rebuke for sin and coming punishment
   1. Definite unit: 5:1-7 Lord's vineyard --a parable or picture
   2. Real division comes between verse 7 and 8 --when rebuke for sin picks up
   3. Prophetic books: rebuke and God's blessing two main themes
   4. Verses 24-30 look forward to punishment for sin, misery of the land and attack by aggressive adversaries
   5. Verses 8-23 largely rebuke for sin...covetousness and selfishness
   6. Verses 13-17 punishment for sins

"Therefore my people are gone into captivity"

Is this in Isaiah's day? Which captivity?

Assyrian conquest

Babylonian exile

Persians, Greek or Roman

7. Application to today: 5:20 "Woe to them that call evil good and good evil."
   a) Fits modern relativity where words are taken in their exact opposite sense

8. Vineyard fits with our Lord's parable of the vineyards in...
Matthew, Mark and Luke... next time
Technical Terms vs. Ordinary Terms [0:0]

Now, at the end of last class I got a very thoughtful question: “Dr. MacRae I’ve had a problem with the phrase ‘the last days’ in Isaiah 2:1 and ‘in that day’ in 4:1 and 4:2. Is there any special significance to this?” Now that is a very good question, not so much in relation to this section of Isaiah as it is to the Old Testament in general. And in relation to this question, the first thing I’d like to mention is that almost any phrase, almost any word, can come to be used as a technical term. Take for instance the word “millennium.” What does millennium mean? Millennium means a thousand year period. I used to find that when I was teaching archeology in the seminary and I would say something happened in the second millennium BC, the students would laugh. Now there’s no reason to laugh because you refer to the second thousand year period before the coming of Christ, but the reason they laughed was because they had only heard the term, or generally heard the term, as referring to one specific thousand year period. And so the term “millennium” has come to be used as a technical term among Christians to mean that period of absolute freedom from external danger that the Lord has promised to establish upon this earth at some time in the period that is still the future. It has become a technical term. That doesn’t mean we can’t use it as an ordinary term as is done regularly in such work as archeology where they speak of the second millennium BC, or the fourth millennium BC. "Millennium" is not used so much in history because we’re more apt to go by centuries instead of by thousand year periods. But any phrase like “the last days” or “in that day” may be
an ordinary term or may become a technical term. But there is a great error or a rather common error, among a great many students of the Bible if they insist that some word is strictly a technical term. When someone suggests that something is a technical term we must examine it carefully and see if indeed it is used as technical terms. But there are many cases where it is said that words are used as technical terms where they are not. I remember one man who had a very definite theory of the New Testament. He was a very prominent professor. He had a very definite theory which would do away with any belief in the future millennium - he was very insistent on it. And one of his arguments was based upon the use of the word “end.” He said wherever it speaks of the word “end” that refers to the end of the nation and leaves no room for a millennium. Someone pointed out that the word “end” is very often used for the end of the day or the end of the century but if it’s something like that he said, "yes, but in those cases it is not used absolutely; it has a phrase after it, such as "my end," "his end," "their end," or something like that." Well then we found a passage where "end" refers to the end of the world as we know it, not the millennium. And he admitted, “Well there’s a technical word that’s used non-technically.” I thought it was a very good illustration of the great danger of jumping to the conclusion that something is a technical term.

“Last day,” technical term or not? (4:43)

Now we want to, in each case, see what is the evidence that something is or is not, a technical term. Let's take the word “Branch of the Lord” as we have to date, the tsemach in Hebrew. Now in the context that could easily be interpreted as a non-technical word and refer simply to vegetation. But we find several places later in the Old Testament where it is very obvious that that word is used to refer to the coming Messiah. And therefore, when we find this word later used as a technical term, we have the right to ask in this case, is it simply a non-technical
term which later came to be a technical term, or does it already refer to the Messiah in this case. Now the term “last day,” English translation *aharit yamim* I had not intended to discuss it because it only occurs once in the section of Isaiah we’re dealing with now. But I will say just a word about it, I am quite sure that it is not a technical term for the final end of the age. I believe that it really is “just after a while.” Now "after a while" may point to the very end of the age and there are many cases where it does. But there are a number of cases where it definitely does not. And I would simply mention three of them to you. One is Genesis 49:1. If you try to take Genesis 49 and refer it to the last days and you’d find great difficulty in some parts of it. I believe it simply means that after the Israelites go into Canaan. And Deuteronomy 4:30 and 31:29 refer to how God is going to punish His people for their sins and then he says “In the last days if you turn to God He will again give you mercy”. He is not there saying that you have sinned, you will be punished now, but then if 3000 years later you turn to God He will give you mercy. He’s saying he will punish you for your sins but after you have endured the punishment for a while, if you turn to God, He will give you mercy. Now, if we had more uses of it in this section, I would go into the Hebrew words of it, which I think are a very interesting in this connection.

**Multiple Interpretations of “In that day” [8:00]**

But I’m not going to do that in this class because there is only one usage of it in the material we’re going to cover for this semester. Now the other phrase, “In that day” occurred eight times in the section of Isaiah that we have had up to this point including today's assignment. It occurs eight times. And in most of them it means the day we’ve just been talking about. And that is very clear in most of its occurrences. It occurs in verse 2:11, 17; 20; 3:7, 18; 4:1-2, 5:30, and in most of them it clearly means the day we’ve just been talking about. That’s what the
phrase in that day would ordinarily mean in English. And so there are seven cases, I believe, of the eight where it is definitely not a technical term, so we would need some pretty good evidence to say that it is a technical term for the others. I believe, I was looking at it in other cases, we find that the term occurs in other parts of Isaiah a great many times. It occurs in Micah quite a few times and occurs a great many times in Zechariah. And looking at them we find that the phrase often means the day we’ve just been talking about. But there are many cases where it means the day we’re going to talk about now “in that day.” We don’t use it that way in English, but that Hebrew phrase is often used introducing something. And I would think that the best way to say it in English would be, “There will be a day when…” “In that day” something would happen.

This is how I think it is used in the section we are going to look at today in the beginning of chapter 4. You have the beginning, "and in that day, 7 women shall," and so on, that I believe is the same day just spoken of. Israel is speaking of the men falling in war at the depopulation. It is at that particular time but then “in that day shall the branch of the Lord be beautiful and good.” Now you have your choice here; you can say the first verse is looking on to the same time mentioned in verses 3:26 and 4:1. Or you can say it refers to the immediate situation of chapter 3 and between verse one and two there is a period of time which might conceivably be a long period. So in either case one of these two must be the day we are now going to speak about. I know some Bible teachers say whenever you see the phrase “in that day” it is pointing to the “day of the Lord.” I think that is a guess that is based on insufficient evidence. I have here listed all the cases where the term occurs in the Old Testament and some of them refer to that period, but the great bulk of them do not. So I believe "in that day" can mean the “day we are about to speak of,” which may be the day about which we were just speaking, or may be "the day of the Lord," but doesn’t have to be.

Anytime there is a question you have that comes into your mind and would
like to have clarification of it I wish you would turn it into me. Now for this question I intend to write a letter to the one that handed it in instead of bringing it to class, but then I decided that after all it would be worth the whole class’s attention. Because while it is not of great importance to this section of Isaiah, it is of great importance for a number of sections of the Old Testament. I also wanted to point out the difference between technical terms and non-technical terms.

Isaiah 3: Rebuke of the Worldly Woman [12:48]

Now we were ready to proceed. At our last class we had already begun to look at chapter 4. So I will put the outline first perhaps right here in front of you. Chapter 4, Roman numeral five: And under that we have “the branch of the Lord”. Well I guess we were really at the selection “rebuke the worldly woman,” and we have all this long description of the vain habits of the Israelites, of many of the Israelite woman, at the time of Isaiah, and then we have the terrible statements towards the end of chapter 3 about the way God is going to punish them and it is quite obvious, I believe, that verse one of chapter four is simply concluding the condemnation with the statement that there will be such great depopulations that the number of woman will be far greater than the number of men in the land. The fact that the Arch Bishop made the division here shows that clearly he understood it, as some interpreters have, as meaning the seven women represent seven churches or some group of Christians, and the man of whom they take hold as the Lord Jesus Christ. Now that is an allegorical interpretation of the verse. There are verses in the Scripture that can be taken allegorically, there is much in this that can be taken figuratively and that should be taken figuratively. But in this verse I believe it is quite clear that that is not the case. So we go on to Roman numeral five, the branch of the Lord Isaiah speaks of in 4:2-6, and under that we look first
at verse 2. Now I don’t know whether most of you would find it easier to look in
your Bible or whether it would be easier if I put the Scripture in front of you.
Anyway we can put it up here on the board and see if you can read it from where
you sit.

“The Branch of the Lord”- Interpretations [15:10]

These verses 2 through 6 are here before you, and I’ve entitled them “The
Branch of the Lord” because it begins with the words “In that day shall the Branch
of the Lord be beautiful and glorious and the fruit of the land shall be excellent
and comely for them that have escaped to Israel”.

The relation of these verses to the preceding passage is quit obvious.
Chapter four verse one is clearly a part of the passage that precedes. Verse two is
clearly related to it, but it might conceivably refer to something that will happen
after the depopulation or at the time that is after the death of so many in war and
after the great impoverishment of these people. However, it can equally well be:
there is going to be a later day much different from this day. There is going to be a
day when the women of those who should be God’s people will find their
adornment and their joy not in the bonnets and the ornaments of the legs, and the
head bands, and tablets, and the earrings, and all the different things named before;
it will not be in these objects that are not, most of them, bad in of themselves, but
they are bad when they become the matter of primary interest for the women. But
instead they will find their satisfaction through “the Branch of the Lord which will
be beautiful and glorious and the fruit of the Earth will be excellent and comely
for those who are who have escaped of Israel.” Instead of these women being
interested in all these physical adornments and all that sort of thing, they will be
interested on growing good crops and having plenty for everybody to eat, and
getting back to the necessities of life. Now that is a very natural way to interpret
the verse in relation to what precedes. It is not however the only way. It may be that instead of saying that they will turn their head away from these things, superficial things, to the solid things of agriculture, it may be that their love and devotion will be turned away from these vain and worldly things to something higher and finer that the Lord will make available—“the Branch of the Lord.”

A ‘Branch’; not necessarily a part of a tree [17:38]

Now there are seventeen words in the Old Testament that the King James version translates “branch,” and the word used here makes it obvious it is not necessarily, specifically, and technically a branch of a tree. It is a larger term than that; it means the produce, that which is produced by something that grows out of the ground. Here it is called the “Branch of the Lord.” It does not mean a “piece of the Lord” like we say a branch of the railroad. It doesn’t mean that. It means that which is produced which comes from the Lord. Well of course when you go through a period of a famine and starvation the slightest food looks good.

Appreciating the Simple Things in Times of Desperation [18:33]

In 1927 I took a walking trip through Germany and there I talked to a man who told me how after the First World War ended, in the section of Germany in which he was living, everything had broken down; there was no transportation; he said there was just no food available. He said turnips were the only things they could get to eat and for six weeks they had nothing to eat but turnips. And then, he said, after six weeks an American Red Cross car came through the area and distributed little cans of lard. And he said when they ate some of that lard it just tasted like some of the finest ice cream ever tasted in their lives because they had nothing but turnips for the previous six weeks, and they had been half starved
during half of World War I anyway. And my landlady there in Berlin told me that she lost fifty pounds during the course of that war. Well this man said when they just swallowed up the lard it seemed so good but, he said their stomachs where so closed up from having so little to eat that when they put this in they all felt cramped and miserable. And I know one evening, how I never saw such joy in eating, whipped cream and things like that, anywhere in my life as I did in Berlin, by these people who’ve had already 5 or 6 years experience with the war. Some of us in America felt it terrible when we couldn’t get real butter during the war and thought we were suffering greatly. But we have never experienced what so many nations have experienced during times of war and famine. And so, it would be quite natural that if you say when the ground began to produce and the trees began to give fruit, “The Lord has provided. Isn’t this wonderful.”

**Interpretation of “branch” as a word for the Messiah (20:35)**

And so that it’s not an impossible interpretation of this verse, but the fact is that this particular word for branch, *tsemach*, is used in Jeremiah 23:5, Jeremiah 33:15, and Zechariah 3:18 and 6:12; I’ll put those up on the board a little later for those who are taking references. But the fact is that it is used there as a term for the Lord, for the Messiah. The expression “the Lord provides” would suggest strongly that those writers understood this passage in Isaiah as referring to the one whom the Lord would provide, the great Messiah, who has come to deliver from war and trouble, rather than simply to the fact that famine would be at an end and they would have plenty to eat.

**Interpretation of “branch” as representing something excellent [21:35]**
So the first point we discussed was relation to the preceding passages, but number two, number two is: note the descriptive terms that is, “The branch of the Lord will be beautiful and glorious.” You don’t ordinarily speak of a tree as beautiful and glorious. “And the fruit of the earth will be excellent and comely.” Now these four Hebrew words that are used here: I looked up a couple of days ago to see how they are used elsewhere in the Scripture to see whether the King James translators had given them special grandeur. You might say that these are simple words, but I found that they are uniformly used to mean “that which is glorious,” “that which is beautiful,” “that which is excellent,” or “that which is absolutely transcendent.” Now you would hardly use such a term ordinarily simply for food or for agriculture. And so these descriptive terms being so very strong in this second verse suggests very strongly that God led Isaiah to predict not the end of famine, not the women turning their attention away from worldly adornment and turning it to agriculture, but the sending of something that would have direct relation to the cause of the famine and the depopulation of the war, direct relation to the sin of the people, that God would send the one who would bring relief from all of this, the one who would work out God’s own purposes and that he is the Branch of the Lord.

Branch: Messiah or Agriculture? [23:16]

Well, I asked before whether number three here refers to vegetation or something greater. That is the question, number three. “Is this vegetation or is it something greater?” And I’ve put that on the board so you can write down those references, though I am not asking you to memorize them. But the fact that this very same word for “branch,” out of 17 words for “branch” used in the Old Testament, that this very same one is used in all four of those passages, suggests very strongly that they understood that the branch of the Lord was the Messiah.
Well, so much then for number three, the question as to whether it is agriculture--the Branch of the Lord--or whether it is the Messiah. Somebody in Isaiah’s day might have had difficulty. But Peter said, as you recall, Peter said that the prophets “searched and inquired,” tried to figure out “what or what manner of time the spirit of Christ, which was in them, signified, when he prophesized of the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow.” And so we have it clearly taught in the New Testament that God gave the prophets understanding of, or at least words, that could be understood as describing important matters about Christ, even if the prophets themselves didn’t fully understand the words. And therefore we certainly are justified in saying that the branch of the Lord is the Messiah here.

“Branch of the Lord” vs. “Fruit of the Tree” [25:03]

But now the verse goes on: “the branch of the Lord will be beautiful and glorious and the fruit of the tree will be excellent and comely”. So here are these women, who formerly gave all their attention to their personal adornment and vanity, who now are finding their joy in the coming of the Messiah and the fruits that grow out of the earth. They are uniting, they’re looking forward to Christ, with the agriculture which has yet to be established. Well, it seems rather incongruous in one verse in that way, to combine the two in that way. You can take them both as referring to agriculture, but the adjectives used seem to go far beyond what reasonably can apply to agriculture. If you take the first one as the Messiah, is it reasonable to take the second one as also referring to the Messiah? The “branch of the Lord” and “the fruit of the earth” are the same. Now this word "fruit" is not fruit in the narrow sense that we use it for apples and pears, and so forth. The word "fruit" is used for a man when he speaks of the fruit of his body; they speak of the fruit as that which is produced. As used in the scripture, often it stands for ordinary food of any kind.
1. Introductory Question:
   A. What is the significance of the phrase "last days" in Isaiah 2:1 and "in that day" in 4:1, 2?
      1. Words being used as technical terms.
         a. Example: millennium, used in archaeology--second millennium BC
         b. Student only think of "the" millennium as the millennial rule of Christ a period free from external danger and peace on earth
         c. Problem with technical terms they can be used in a normal context too
         d. NT professor taking the word "end" as a technical term for the end of the nation (with no millennium). But the word end could be the end of the day, his end, their end...etc.
         e. Don't jump to conclusion that something is a technical term
         f. "Branch of the Lord" (tsemach)--are we to understand it as a technical term for the Messiah or a non-technical term?
         g. "Last day" (aharit yamim) only occurs once in Isaiah meaning "after a while" not a technical term
         h. Gen. 49:1; Deut 4:30 and 31:29... last days not technical term
i. "In that day" occurs 8 times in our section of Isaiah (2:11, 17, 20; 3:7, 18, 4:1-2, 5:30); 7 of the 8 not technical term for sure.

j. Perhaps best to translate it: "There will be a day when"

k. Is depopulation referring to 3:26 the same as 4:1. Probably so.

l. Some say "in that day" always = "the Day of the Lord" the evidence doesn't support that

5. The Branch of the LORD

A. 4:1

1. "Rebuke of worldly woman" -- 4:1 simply concludes what was happening at the end of chapter 3.

   2. Seven women not = seven churches. Not allegorical, Bible does have figures of speech but not here

B. 4:2-6 "The Branch of the LORD"

   1. "in that day shall the Branch of the Lord be beautiful and glorious and the fruit of the land shall be excellent and comely for them that have escaped to Israel."

   2. 4:2 relates to 4:1 and 4:1 back to the end of chapter 3 Women in that day will not find joy in ornaments as their primary interest

   3. KJV translates the Hebrew word for "branch" 17 different ways

   a. Story of Germany and starvation resulting joy when little food supplied
4. Other places "branch" is used: Jer. 23:5; 33:15; Zech. 3:18; 6:12.

5. "The Lord provides" suggests provision of the Messiah come to deliver from war and famine

C. "The branch of the Lord will be beautiful and glorious"

1. Not usual terms to describe a tree:

2. Not just to end famine, or to turn women from worldly adornment but getting at the root cause --sin and the working out of God's purpose.

3. Is this vegetation or is it something greater?
   a. 4 uses suggests identification of "branch" with the Messiah

   b. 1 Peter 1:11 God gave prophets words about Christ

D. "The branch of the Lord will be beautiful and glorious and the fruit of the tree will be excellent and comely."

1. Women will not pay attention to adornment but find joy in the Messiah

2. Terms go beyond agriculture

3. Parallel terms: branch of the Lord // fruit of the earth fruit of the body can refer to man
Dr. Allan MacRae: Isaiah 1-6: Lecture 7  
Biblical Theological Seminary, 1976

Isaiah 6: Isaiah’s Call to Service [0:0]

Now I would like to be sure that everybody is in their right seat because I have one set of tests for the odd numbered seats and one for the even numbered seats. So you won’t be distracted by whatever anybody is writing next to you…. I will give these out but I will tell you the first question so you can start immediately. The first question for students in odd numbered seats is to discuss Isaiah 4:1. The first for an even numbered seat is to discuss Micah 4:1. You see its 4:1 in both cases, but for even numbered seats its 4:1 in Micah; for odd numbered seats its 4:1 in Isaiah. And now I’ll give you – I’ll give you the rest of the questions.

Now as you see by the outline on the board, we are ready for Roman numeral 7. "Isaiah's call to service," which is the sixth chapter of Isaiah. Thus far we have noticed that most of the material goes under one of two headings. It is either rebuke for sin and declaration of coming punishment, or else it is comfort for the godly with promises of future blessing. Most everything thus far can be put under a heading of rebuke or blessing. Now, this sixth chapter is hard to put under either heading because it involves very great blessing for Isaiah but it involves a very great rebuke for the people as a whole. It really then should go under a different category. There is much discussion as to whether this is Isaiah's original call for service or whether it is a renewed call given later in his ministry. It’s a rather silly thing to spend time arguing about this because there is absolutely no way that we can decide this. If it was given in the first chapter of Isaiah as we have Jeremiah’s call in his first chapter and Ezekiel’s call in his first chapter, nobody would question whether this is Isaiah's original call for service. As you read it, it
certainly sounds like an original call for service. I think myself it’s a good guess that it is, but one cannot rule out the possibility that after Isaiah had been serving the Lord for some time he had a renewed call, which is described in this chapter here. These first 6 chapters, which we call part 1 of our course – of this particular course - are actually part one of the book of Isaiah. There is a sharp division between the end of chapter six and the beginning of chapter seven. Chapters seven to chapter 12 form a very definite unit separate from these first 6 chapters. I think a good argument can be made for these first 6 chapters being a sort of a summary of a great part of Isaiah’s mission. Possibly written during his ministry or toward the end of it but placed at the beginning as a very proper introduction for the whole of his book.

The last chapter then in this section, which I am calling Roman numeral 7, “Isaiah’s call for service,” is one which I am not going to divide up by means of an outline. The divisions are quite obvious. It is a definite account of a series of events and we will look at these events and look at certain features about them. I don’t think there is much to put on the board about it. It is one of the finest chapters in the book of Isaiah from the viewpoint of preaching.

**Importance of Isaiah 6 [4:50]**

One time in the seminary, we arranged to have this chapter be the subject of maybe a dozen continuous chapel messages, looking at various aspects of it. It is full of spiritual meaning. It is a tremendously vital chapter, for every Christian, I would say. But a great part of the lesson of it is quite obvious. There are comparatively few problems in it that we need to go into in a class of this type, though I do think we should take time to emphasize its great value in the Scripture and its great importance in your preaching and in your studies.

Now the chapter I put up there, hopefully you can see it, the screen doesn't seem to be quite as straight as usual. As I said, I don't care what version of the scripture you use in this class. Any version at all, in any language is fine, but if
you use something other than the three most used among conservatives today--The King James, the New American Standard, and the NIV,—or if you use another one, or even if you use one of these, if any different reading arises in these or in another version, I wish you would call our attention to it. It adds to the value of the course if some are comparing other versions.

**Ancient Systems of Time and Chronology [6:23]**

Now let’s begin with a strange statement. "In the year that King Uzziah died, I saw the Lord." Why didn't he say in 732 BC I saw the Lord? That would seem much more reasonable wouldn't it? It would have been much easier? But it is strange thing that this system we have of calling years by numbers only originated about 400 years after the time of Christ. Before that time there was one nation which got into the habit of using it. That was the nation of Syria where Seleucus, one of Alexander the Great's generals, had secured the largest portion of Alexander's empire after Alexander's death. And Seleucus had been in control in Babylon for a brief time, as governor, then been driven out and took service with Ptolemy, King of Egypt, and then he came back with Ptolemy's help to Babylon and reestablished himself there. He did this in 312 B.C. And for some reason they started numbering years in that region from the year when Seleucus came back to Syria, and that's the oldest known system of continuous numbers. That system was continued so long that in a Hebrew manuscript of the Old Testament, written say a thousand A.D., you will have the year often given as such and such a year of the Seleucid era; that is so many years after 312 B.C. when Seleucus went to Babylon. But the worst of it is, that often in making those manuscripts a hundred years seemed so long, that people wouldn't bother to put down the century, they would just say, "written in the year 54," and you don't know whether its 1454 years or 1354 or 1254 after Seleucus went to Babylon. But that is the first time that numbers were used that way. In Egypt they would often number by the reign of kings, and also as you know from the Old Testament, in they would say in
such and such a reign, of such a king. And then you had a king like Uzziah, who
was stricken with leprosy and had to turn over everything to his son Jotham, but
we don't know what year it was when that happened. Somebody might say an
event took place in the thirtieth year of Uzziah who reigned 52 years, and
somebody else might say it was in the sixth year of Jotham. In Assyria they
named the years after particular officials: the first year was the year of the king,
the second year was the year of the leading minister and so on. And if you reign
say forty years they get down to fairly unimportant officers, getting a different
man as the man for the year. In Rome they named them after the counsels. And
you can see this became very complicated. The Seleucid era perhaps gave the idea
to the monk named Dionysius sometime in the 5th century to name years from
Christ's birth. He estimated when Christ was born. Dionysius thought he was in
the 467th year after Christ was born and from then on we begin using BC and AD.
But, he was somewhere between four and six years off by miscalculation. So our
years are off by a few years but he has given us a wonderfully convenient system.

Uzziah’s Death in Relation to Isaiah’s Ministry [10:27]

So Isaiah said in the year that Uzziah died, but when he mentioned it this
way most interpreters think that he is not merely calling our attention to the time
when this happened, and incidentally the time when it happened doesn’t tell us
whether this is the beginning of Isaiah’s ministry or not. Isaiah ministered in the
reigns of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah. And if his call came the year King
Uzziah died that could be enough to justify putting the name Uzziah in with the
other three kings giving you a very long period of time for Isaiah's ministry. But
that doesn’t prove whether this was his original call or a later call. But most
interpreters think that his mentioning Uzziah's death is not merely a means of
saying when this vision came, that it also points to the background to the general
situation.
Separation of Church and State [11:34]

Uzziah had begun as a very godly king; a man who desired to do the will of God and a man whom God blessed. But as he succeeded in reigning as a very good and successful king for a time, the situation went to his head, as it so often does when a person is in a position of authority or a position of real power, and he began to consider himself as of greater importance that he was, and decided to take over control of the religious aspect of the nation. Theoretically, that is true even today in England. In England today, the Queen of England is, according to her official title, the head of the Church of England. And theoretically, nobody can ascend to any position in the Church of England today except as the Queen appoints him. Actually, the church makes most of its decisions, but the prime minister may change it and put in whoever he wants in any position in the Church of England. The Prime Minister really controls, but that is done in the name of the Queen. And that was forbidden in the Old Testament. The rulers were civil rulers. They were supposed to protect the religious authority. But they were not themselves to assume leadership or make determinations in lieu of this matter. That was a distinctly separate matter. And legally church and state should be separate. That was one of Calvin’s great stands: it was that church and state should be separate. And even though the leaders in the church in Geneva during this time were appointed from the counsel that were elected by the people as a political election and thus the state had great authority over it--Calvin didn’t like that, but there was nothing he could do about it. Yet, Calvin insisted that the minister, along with these men, who were the leaders and in control of the church, that they should not be interfered with by the civil authority. Luther took the opposite attitude of that and Luther said, “What do we care who runs the church. Let the bishops keep on running it, just so they teach the gospel.” And in other words, the bishops at this time were not teaching the gospel. And there was no way to make them. So in Denmark he began appointing new members to the
clergy while often in Sweden the king appointed them, and eventually the situation had changed, but it remained in the Lutheran country that the state controlled the church. And to some extent it remains that way today in Germany and in the Scandinavian countries.

**Uzziah’s Punishment [14:27]**

But this was forbidden in the Old Testament, and so King Uzziah, when he went beyond his authority as King and decided he would take over the religious life and went right into the temple and began to offer incense, which only the priest was supposed to do, we read in the books of Kings and Chronicles, how the priest came in and rebuked him for it, and then he looked at him, and Uzziah's face had broken out with leprosy, and he hated how God had punished him in this way. So his face broke out with leprosy, and we read that he lived in his own house alone for the rest of his life. And how long that was, whether that was forty years or ten years or something like that, we don't know.

**Uzziah’s Departure from the Lord [15:21]**

But it would seem likely that Isaiah would pass by the palace where Uzziah lived alone. Nobody dared go near it for fear of catching leprosy but as Isaiah would pass and perhaps see Uzziah's face at the window, it would suggest to Isaiah the wonderful start that this man made as he seemed to be such a wonderful man, so true in following the Lord, and then the way in which he departed from the Lord and the terrible way in which the Lord punished him. And so it is thought by most interpreters that Isaiah says this not merely to tell us when this vision of God came to him, but to show something of the background in Isaiah's mind when it happened. There would be a tragic feeling that he would have, to think of one who started out so wonderfully and who failed so miserably. When you look back as I can on a good many years of friends and Christian workers, one cannot avoid sometimes having similar feelings as you think of individuals who have started out
and done wonderfully in the Lord, and then have fallen by the wayside, and it truly is amazing the number of terribly wonderful Christian leaders who have fallen into sin of one sort or another, and then fall away. It is awful, very shocking when we hear of individuals like this. And so Isaiah has in his mind a situation in which he was very conscious of the tragedy that is so common in human life, for he saw it in King Uzziah. Whether this vision came after Uzziah died or shortly before, we don't know, but at least Uzziah, in this vision, was very much in Isaiah's mind.

**Location of Isaiah’s Vision [17:17]**

Isaiah says that he saw the Lord sitting upon the throne, high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple. Now where was Isaiah when he had this vision? It immediately suggests that he was in the temple and he saw this in the temple. Certainly the temple is called God's house. God speaks of the temple as a place where he would dwell, but he dwelt above the mercy seat, and the mercy seat was in the Holy of Holies, where the people could not reach him. Only the High Priest could reach him. And consequently, we are not at all sure whether he is referring to the earthly temple. Some claim that Isaiah, like Paul later on, was taken up to Heaven for three days. Paul says he saw things that were not lawful for a man to utter. It does not tell us of his experiences during those three days. But Paul had a marvelous experience, although we don't know how much entered into his Epistle and into his work with God. But here we have Isaiah giving this account of this experience. We often find the prophet had a great vision of God. But did he have this vision in the temple, or in the vision did he see a temple and imagine himself in it, and if so, was it the earthly temple or was it what the temple stood for? Was he lifted up to Heaven or did he see Heaven, and see God in an imaginary form because God does not have a human form. No man has seen God, but Isaiah saw something that represented God to him. There is no mention of a face, or of arms, or of other human features. Here it is the train of his robe Isaiah saw. It is the
manifestation of God that filled the temple where Isaiah was or which Isaiah saw, whichever it was.

“Seraph”- Messengers of God [19:19]

And above this train stood the seraphim. And this word "seraph" appears only in this chapter, nowhere else in the Bible. The word, which seems to be related to a verb that means “to burn,” sometimes people translate as “the burning ones”. Evidently they would be messengers of God, perhaps we could call them angels. At least they would be individuals who would be so bright that they would seem to be burning. They were God’s emissaries in this vision of Isaiah. We do not have this word "seraph" anywhere else except as it occurs in this chapter.

The Vast Unknown of the Spiritual World [20:09]

We also have the word "cherubim," or "cherub" if you please, and by a most peculiar thing, as developed today, "cherub" has come to mean a little child, and we have pictures of cute little children, or usually you speak of somebody as having this cherubic countenance, but actually the cherub seems to have been like an ox rather than like a human being. And the cherub is mentioned much more than the seraph in the Scriptures. But these two are mentioned, simply as a reminder to us, that in the spiritual world there is much that we do not know about. The material world today is known to have all sorts of things in it that people never dreamed of a hundred years ago. There are forces in the material world that scientists have discovered, that a hundred years ago were absolutely undreamed of, absolutely unknown, that are today referred to often in common ways. The great import; take something like electricity that is so important in the lives of all of us today and 300 years ago nobody ever dreamed of it. The idea that you could pick up a telephone and dial something and it rings a bell thousands of miles away, nobody could have imagined it. So if the material world is so far beyond what we could have imagined, think of the spiritual world, what that must be like. God has
revealed certain things about it in the Scriptures, but there’s an awful lot that we
don’t know about it, and this is all we know about the seraphim. They were
messengers of God, they were instruments to do his will.

**The Seraphim- Showing God Reverence [22:04]**

And he gives this peculiar description: “Each one had six wings. With 2 he
covered his face, 2 of them covered his feet, and he used 2 of them to fly.” He
only needed 2 wings to fly, but he had 6. God provides for the needs of his
servants. He gives us far more than we need to accomplish his will, and it's the
covering the face before the majesty of God that’s implied here and yet we have
an intimate view of God. We know Jesus as we know our best friend, and yet we
must always know that he is so great and so wonderful beyond what we can
imagine, so we should know to show to him reverence, just as even the seraphim
covered their faces in the presence of the Lord.

**“The Fullness of the Whole Earth is His Glory” [22:55]**

And one seraph cried to another and said, “Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of
hosts, the whole earth is full of his glory.” This statement “is full of his glory” is
not an exact translation. The Hebrew word "full" is *ma'ale* but the word here is
*malo*. It is the same root, but it is a noun rather than an adjective. Literally it
would be “The fullness of the whole earth is His glory.” Well everybody that I
have looked into, every one of the varied sources that I have looked at translated
this way “The whole earth is full of his glory.” But I can’t escape the feeling that
it might be a little more literal to say that “the fullness of the whole earth is his
glory” in other words that all of the wonderful things that we know of in the
world, and all the wonderful things that are in the universe that God has made that
we don’t know anything about, they are all a part of God’s glory. Now that is to
say that I have not found anybody who else who expresses that thought, but it does
seem to me that that would be a more literal translation in Hebrew. And there are
plenty, the plenty places in the Bible that make us think that the earth is all of
God's glory, I can’t help thinking that all of the marvelous universe is just a part of
the wonderful glory of God who created it all.

**God is Greater Than the Forces of Nature [24:43]**

And the post of the doors,—more literally the foundation of the walls—
moved at the voice of him who cries. As the seraphim cries, the whole place
shook. We read in Acts how when God spoke to the people that the building
shook, or at least that was the feeling of Isaiah was this mighty force of God, like
people have in the midst of an earthquake, that the world seems to just shake, and
you feel how puny, how small is humanity and all of its people compared to the
tremendous force of nature, and God of course is far greater than any of these.

**Assignment [25:24]**

Though I think we should take a look further into the chapter next week
because I didn’t mention the assignment till I met you at the beginning. It’ll only
take a second, we have already. It’s not a long assignment; this time you have
already looked at chapters 56 and 57 and noted in them what parts were rebuke
and what parts were blessing. All I’m asking that you do is just look over chapters
58 and 59 and divide them that way what is there in rebuke, what is there in this
that is blessing, and what is in there in it that you don’t think belongs under either
category and that you would suggest another category. This is quite the brief
assignment, but please turn that in by next Friday.
Lecture 7: Isaiah 6: Isaiah's Call to Service

MacRae: Isaiah 1-6  Lecture 7 Outline

7. Isaiah's call to service

A. Introduction
   1. Review: so far chs. 1-5 under two topics
      a. Rebu ke for sin and coming punishment
      b. Comfort of godly and promised blessing
   2. Is this Isaiah's original call or a renewed call later in his ministry?
      a. No way to know for sure
      b. Jeremiah's and Ezkiel's call found in their first chapters
      c. Perhaps original call is best option
   3. Division between chapters 1-6 and 7-12 is definite
      1-6 summary of Isaiah's mission
      Written later and placed here as an introduction to the book

4. Isaiah 6 one of the finest chapters for preaching

B. "In the year that King Uzziah died, I saw the LORD"

1. Why didn't it say 732 B.C. I saw the LORD?
   a. BC/AD system designed about 400 years after Christ
   b. Before that the system was dated to when Seleucus, Alexander's general took control of Babylon (ca. 312 BC).
   c. Old Testament manuscripts even used this Seleucus dating system till around 1000 AD but often they wouldn't put in the century
   d. Egypt dated according to the king as did the OT
   e. Rome used their counsels for dating
   f. Dionysius around 467 AD developed the BC/AD system which has been so helpful
   g. Dionysius missed Christ's birth by 4-5 years though
   h. Point in Isaiah is not exactly the date when Isaiah's vision came but points to the general historical background

2. Uzziah as king
   a. Initial a godly king
   b. Situation went to his head
   c. Separation of church and state
      1. England Queen or the prime minister in the Queen's name picks the head of the church of
England

2. Calvin in Geneva disagreed with the state's ability to choose clergy, argued for separation of church and state

3. Luther had no problem with it so even till today in Germany and Scandinavian countries the state controls the church

4. OT King was not to do priestly rituals: Uzziah offers incense resulting in his being smitten with leprosy

5. After the leprosy it says Uzziah lived alone

6. Tragic feeling one who started so well and failed. Many Christian leaders similar tragic pathway.

7. Uzziah on his mind when he has this vision

C. Isaiah saw LORD sitting on the throne, high and lifted up, and his train filling the temple
   a. Where was Isaiah when he had this vision?
   b. Holy of Holies only the high priest could enter
   c. Was it like Paul who was taken up into heaven for 3 days
   d. Train filling the temple -- God's presence filling
   e. Seraphim--only occurs here
   1. Root: burning ones
   2. Messengers of God hence --angels
   f. Cherubim:
   1. Not little children
   2. Described as an ox looking
   3. So much we don't know of the spiritual world
   a. Science discovering forces like electricity unknown before 300 years ago yet now we can take to someone on the other side of the planet.
   g. Seraphim: 6 wings, 2 to fly, 2 to cover face, 2 cover feet--reverence before God

D. "Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts, the whole earth is full of his glory"
   1. Ma'ale word for full
a. Most translate it "The whole earth is full of his glory"
b. Perhaps better: "the fullness of the whole earth is his glory"
c. Whole universe just part of God's wonderful glory of its creator

E. Door posts--literally the foundation walls--shaking
   1. In Acts when God speaks building shakes
   2. Mighty force of God--like earthquake--humans puny

F. Assignment for next week: Look at Isaiah 58 and 59 divide them into rebuke and blessing sections
Now, we were still discussing Roman numeral seven, which was Isaiah’s call to service, which I did not go into in detail in the outline. And we had come to the point where we were speaking about the seraph coming to Isaiah and touching his lips with the coal from off the altar – a very interesting point. What would it mean to someone in those days? We don’t know how much they knew. Remember when Jesus Christ called the men on the road to Emmaus, “fools and slow of heart to believe all the prophets have spoken, ought not Christ to have suffered these things and to enter into his glory?” In other words these disciples of Jesus should have understood from the Old Testament what Jesus, as Messiah, was supposed to go through. Now, how much Isaiah understood, we don’t know. Peter says, "The prophets were searching, trying to find out what and what manner of time the spirit of Christ that was in them signified when he told of the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow." But the fact is that in Isaiah’s vision, it was the coal from off the altar that touched his lips and when that happened he was then made fit for service. It certainly is a representation of the fact that the sacrifices were necessary in order that man could be cleansed from his sin and made fit to serve the Lord, and as Scripture says, "the blood of bulls and goats can’t take away sin." The sacrifices represented the death of Christ on the cross. And it was only through that that anyone, whoever, has been saved or ever can be saved. And this is very clearly suggested in this vision of Isaiah. After Isaiah was cleansed by this seraph bringing the coal from off the altar and touching his lips,
then he heard the Lord saying, “Who shall we send, and who will go for us?” And Isaiah said, “Here am I; send me.” He was ready for service now. Today, we are not ready for service until we have been cleansed through the blood of the Lord Jesus Christ.

The People’s Hard Heart [2:50]

And then, what a disappointment it must have been to Isaiah to hear the Lord’s words. The Lord said, “Go and tell this people: hear, but don’t understand. See, but don’t perceive. Make their heart fat and their ears heavy, and shut their eyes.” What a terrible thing to tell a man who thinks he’s just going to go out and lead the world into a great successful movement for God. Tell them: go and harden their heart, close their eyes. Of course, there is a background of the people turning away from the Lord before this. Isaiah has given much rebuke to the people in previous chapters for the way they have turned from the Lord. The mass of the people have reached the point where they have already gone so far in that direction that the presentation of the truth will simply harden them. Now that does not mean that Isaiah’s work had no effects in helping people. It doesn’t mean that at all. It means that this was an important part of his work and that the Lord was giving him and showing him that worst feature of it so that he wouldn’t feel too bad when he found that though he had many loyal followers they were only a minority in the nation.

The Remnant and the Stump [4:13]

It’s interesting how the Lord in giving the call to someone, sometimes emphasized the side that you might say was less important but perhaps psychologically needed. You’ll find in Jeremiah 1 where God tells Jeremiah he’s going to send him over the nations to “plant, to tear down, to build up.” He talks as if Jeremiah’s going to have a tremendously important function, as indeed he did. But Jeremiah served in a much worse time than Isaiah and saw the nation go off
into exile and into misery. But the Lord gave Jeremiah a wonderful, happy command, to plant and to build up whereas in Isaiah’s case here the Lord gives him these sad words as he begins his ministry. So God told Isaiah to say all this, and Isaiah said in verse 11, “How long? Lord, how long?” Isaiah is hoping it won’t be more than a day or two like this or at least no more than two or three years at most. But the Lord said “Until the city be wasted without inhabitants and the houses without men and the land be utterly desolate and the Lord has removed men far away and there’s a great forsaking in the midst of the land.” The people had reached the point in their apostasy where God was going to bring a calamity and going to send them off into exile. But look at verse 13, which is not very well translated in the King James Version. I think that most of you looking at verse 13 at first sight would not get much sense out of it. “Yet there shall be in it a tenth and it shall return and it shall be eaten.” The New American Standard expresses that much better and I think the King James probably would be clear to someone in that time. But we use our words differently now which is why I don’t think this verse makes much sense to most of us. But the New American Standard says, “Yet there will be a tenth portion in it.” Notice that the King James said “But yet in it shall be a tenth.” But then the NASV says “And it will be again be subject to burning.” The NIV, “And will again be destroyed.” This cleansing the Lord is going to give, this punishment, will have to be repeated. There will be a remnant which will follow Isaiah and stand through. And yet in this remnant there will be those who will turn away. There will be a tenth that will remain true, but yet out of them there will be those who will again bring judgment upon this group. And yet it is not to be a complete destruction. The King James says “As a teak tree, and as an oak, whose substance is in them, so the holy seed shall be the substance thereof.” The word “substance” doesn’t carry meaning to us. In modern English, “stump” would be much better and most recent translations render it “stump.” The NASV says, “It will be like a terebinth or an oak whose stump remains when it is felled. The holy seed is its stump.” In other words, there will be these constant,
these repeated purges and cleansing among God’s people. But there will still always be a remnant of good. The holy seed is the stump which still remains no matter how often the tree may be cut down, may be destroyed, and may be purged. So Isaiah is given this general vision to encourage him to go on and to find that though things are bad, they are not nearly as bad as he feared after God’s call because God’s call stressed mostly one side--destruction. And yet he did give him his final word that there would be a remnant of grace after all.

A Glance at the Predictions in Isaiah 9 to 11 [8:47]

Now I thought when I started this course that I was going to divide it into two parts. I’m going to speak first of Isaiah one to six and then go onto part two which would be the last ten chapters of the book. But I think that it is better to touch on certain matters in between because in looking at one to six we’ve already referred to chapters nine and eleven, and in going into the latter chapters we need something of background. So I’m not going to make two parts but make it all one part, and simply have Roman numerals labeling the parts, so the next will be number eight, “A glance at the predictions in Isaiah nine to eleven.” Under that, capital A will be “Isaiah 9” and if you will look in your Bible at Isaiah 9, to which we have already made reference in connection with chapter 4, you find that the relation to what precedes is very interesting. Chapter 8 ends with a picture of calamity, the people are being punished for their sin. Verse 22: “They look into the earth and are bold, trouble and darkness, dimness and anguish and they shall be driven to darkness.” And in the context Isaiah is predicting the attack by the Assyrian army, which came during Isaiah’s time of ministry. And these Assyrian armies came marching in from the northeast and as they marched there and attacked the land, they brought terrible darkness and misery to the people there. Now the first verse of chapter 9 in the King James begins, “Nevertheless, the dimness shall be not such as was in her vexation when at first he lightly afflicted the land of Zebulon and the land of Naphtali and afterward will more grievously
afflict her by way of the sea beyond Jordan in Galilee of the nations. The people have walked in darkness have seen a great light.” That’s a strange connection. That is the Jewish copies of the Scripture, when they took over the chapter division from the Latin Bible they did not put it where the archbishop had put it here, but put it one verse later. And just looking casually at it, it looks as if you have a brand new start in verse 2, as if the break should be where you find it in the Hebrew Bible and in the Jewish copies of the scripture. But Matthew quotes the 2 verses together and it is clear as you examine them together, particularly in the light of Matthew, it is clear that what Isaiah is saying is there is going to be this terrible darkness as the Assyrian armies come marching in to the northeastern corner, through the land of Zebulon and the land of Naphtali, Galilee of the nations. But that this very region in which the darkness first comes as these hoards of enemies come rolling over the land, this very area is to be where the great light will first come; in other words where Jesus Christ will begin His preaching, a definite prediction of the coming of Christ. Now if we only had verse 2 we might hesitate about thinking that it is specifically looking forward to Christ but in verse 6 it makes it very clear. The reason for the light “unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given and the government shall be upon his shoulders.” It is a prediction of the coming of Christ.

**The Quotation of Isaiah in Mathew 4:14-16** [12:43]

So then we have number 2: the quotation in Matthew 4: 14-16. And there in the gospel of Matthew, Matthew quotes this passage after telling how Jesus went and began his preaching up in that region of Zebulon and Naphtali he says that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Isaiah the prophet, saying “The land of Zebulon, the land of Naphtali, by the way of the sea beyond Jordan, Galilee and the Gentiles," this is the region where the great darkness first came from the Assyrian invasion. There the people who sat in darkness saw a great light. And to them which sat in the region and shadow of death, light just sprung up and from
that time, when Jesus began to preach and to say, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." So we have the quotation from this section of Isaiah in Mathew, and in verse 5 of chapter 9, we have the promised end of war. Verse 5 is not always immediately understandable to us, but as you look at it closely, it is quite clear what it means. “Every battle of the warrior is with confused noise and garments rolled in blood. But this shall be for burning and fuel of fire, for unto us a child is born, unto us a child is given.” The implements of war are to be destroyed. War is to come to an end because the prince of peace is coming. So the promise is to end the war, verse 5, and then verse 4 the one who will do this is the two natured redeemer. We looked at this connection with chapter 4 where he was called the "branch of the Lord" and "the fruit of the earth." Here he is called “a child is born, and a son is given.” God gave his only begotten son. God caused that Jesus Christ be born there, of the Virgin Mary. And so we have here the two natured redeemer, and we have those tremendous names given to him, showing his deity; “he is the Mighty God, the everlasting Father, and the Prince of Peace.”

Now in the course I gave last year, we looked at chapter 9 at length. Here I merely want to point to its relation to chapter 4 and go on to Isaiah 11.

**Isaiah 11 in its Context [15:32]**

In Isaiah 11, again we note the relation to what precedes. The end of chapter 10 shows the downfall of the Assyrian empire. The great Assyrian empire attacked Israel was God’s instrument for punishment. The Assyrians did not do it in order to please God. God used these wicked men for his purposes and then he punished them for their wickedness. And so we read a description of their downfall in verses 33 and 34 of chapter 10. And it’s given under the figure of a forest. “He shall cut down the thickets of a forest with an iron; Lebanon shall fall by a mighty one." But in contrast to that, the stem of Jesse, which seems also to have been cut down, "a rod will come out of the stem of Jesse and a branch will
grow out of his roots.” So here, as in chapter 9, it is closely related to what precedes.

Isaiah’s Branch in Matthew 2:23 [16:37]

Now number 2 of the outline, here is “the branch.” We must always distinguish between Assyria and Syria. Actually they’re utterly distinct. Assyria was really Arab, but it was conquered by the Assyrians and became a part of the Assyrian Empire, and later the Greeks called it Syria as from the name Assyria. But the Assyrian empire was the great empire with its headquarters in Ninevah, which conquered the northern kingdom of Israel and over ran most of the southern kingdom of Judah. Now this word, ”the branch,” we had in chapter 4, then there the Hebrew was *tsemach*. There are 17 Hebrew words that are translated as “branch” in the KJV. Now at that time in discussing chapter 4, I gave you a connection with the Hebrew word *tsemach* in two or three references where it is clearly used on the messianic sense later on. That was the word *tsemach*. Now in this particular case, that word is not used, but a different word is used. The word *Natzer*. And *Natzer* is another word for branch, which is not used so much in the messianic sense as the word *tsemach* is. Yet *Natzer* has an important connection to the New Testament. Because there is a reference to this passage, I am quite convinced, in Mather 2:23. I say I am quite convinced because there are some who advance a different interpretation of Matthew 2:23, but one which does not have much to be said in its favor. But this I am quite convinced: Matthew has in mind this passage in Isaiah when he says in Matthew 2:23 “that he came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth,” which is derived from this root *Natzer*, and it means the place of this type of vegetation. "He came and dwelt in a town called Nazareth that it might be fulfilled that which was spoken by the prophet, that he shall be called a 'Nazarene'." Now we must never confuse a Nazarene with a Nazarite. The Old Testament tells about the particular arrangements that can be made for a Nazarite. A Nazarite was one who never cut his hair, never touched anything that came from
grapes, even raisins, never touched wine or strong drink, or even raisins, anything from the vine. Remember Samson. He was one of the men in the book of judges who was a Nazarite from birth through his life ordinarily to be a Nazarite was a vow taken by an individual. So it is from this root Natzer that the word Nazarene comes, not the word Nazarite. And Matthew connects that up with Jesus' living in Nazareth, “He will be called a Nazarene.” He is the branch of the Lord referred to just once under this title at this point in Isaiah 11.

**Isaiah 11: His Character [20:37]**

Number 3 of the outline then, the quotation Matthew 2:23, Number 4 is, “His character,” which we find here in chapter 11 of Isaiah. We very briefly glance at it because it is not the section we are really dealing with in this course but we want to see the relation of this passage to the other material we looked at in chapter 4. His character is discussed in verse 2 to 3 and again in verse 5. “The spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord, and shall make him of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord. He shall not judge after the sight of his eyes neither reprove after the hearing of his ears.” And you remember that it says of Christ that he knew what was in man, nobody needed to tell him, he understood people as nobody else ever had. And when he met Nathaniel he said “behold an Israelite in whom is there is no guilt” and Nathaniel said “how you come to know me.” Jesus knew all things; he was quick in understanding and had thorough comprehension of human nature. And verse 5 of Isaiah 11 says, “Righteousness shall be the girdle of his loin and faithfulness the girdle of his reign.” I put these three verses together in order to mention verse four separately.

**His Victory over Antichrist [22:36]**

Number 5 of the outline, "His victory over Antichrist." That is verse 4
chapter 11: “But with Righteousness shall he judge the poor and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth and he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked.” Look at the phrase: “With the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked.” Now I have called that his victory over Antichrist. That word Antichrist has come to be used for the great enemy of God’s people at the end of the age. The New Testament says that there are many antichrists, so it really would be better if we used a different word for that one particular Antichrist. But since it has become rather widespread to refer to that one great opponent of God as "The Antichrist” or to refer to him as Antichrist with a capital "A," I am using that designation here referring to that one great individual at the end of the age. Here I’ll read the last part of verse 4 again. “He shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked.” We now compare 2 Thessalonians 2:8 and Revelation 19:15 and 21. Let us look at 2 Thessalonians 2:8 and see how the apostle Paul interprets this passage. 2 Thessalonians 2:8 we find that Paul said, “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 coming.” That wicked one; what wicked one? The one referred to in Isaiah 11:4. There is nothing else in the Old Testament to which to connect it. He will be destroyed by the Lord with the spirit of his mouth, and this word translated spirit could also be translated breath. The same word could be translated either way, both in Greek and in the Hebrew. And so Paul says this which was predicted about Christ. This was not something that Christ did at his first coming, but something that is yet to come because the wicked one whom he will destroy in that way, Paul says has not yet been revealed. He will be revealed at the end of the age, and the Lord will destroy him with the breath of his mouth and with the brightness of his coming.
Revelation 19:15-21 and Isaiah [25:35]

Then in Revelation 19 verses 15 and 21 we find what is doubtless another reference to this. In verse 15, after it describes the coming of one on a white horse whose name is called the word of God, we read in verse 15 that “Out of his mouth goes a sharp sword that with it he should smite the nations, and he shall rule them with a rod of iron.” Out of his mouth goes a sharp sword. “And he has on his vesture and on his thigh a name written 'King of kings,' and 'Lord of lords.'” And there’s another reference to the same thing in verse 21 of Revelation 19 where it says, “The remnant were slain with the sword of him that sat upon the horse, which sword proceeded out of his mouth.” Now there’s a figure of speech here and exactly what it represents may be hard to say, but it represents a destruction. It represents an overthrow of the Antichrist and his force and his hope, just as described here in Isaiah. Paul says it is still to come at the end of the age. Revelation 19 uses this figure twice. One commentary on Revelation says that this reference to the sword coming out of the mouth refers to the preaching of the gospel and when it says it will destroy a whole host of people what it means is that everyone on earth is to be converted by the gospel. Now, that is taking it in a very figurative way and if you had only Revelation alone, a considerable argument might be made for interpreting it that way but I don’t think one can in light of the other passages we read and in light of the passage in Isaiah.

Reader and Editor: Perry Phillips
Class Editor: Ken Hallenbeck; Outliner: Frank Hannigan, Transcribers: Jordan Tymann, Laura Bothwell, Alyssa Ferris, Emily Latvis, Robert Harkins, Tom Wholley
Alan MacRae: Isaiah 1-6, Lecture 8

7. Isaiah's call to Service (Isa. 6)

A. Seraph touching Isaiah's lips with a coal from off the altar
   1. Emmaus Road --Luke 24--Jesus after the resurrection tells some disciples
      "Fools and slow of heart to believe all the prophets have spoken, ought not Christ to have suffered these things and to enter into his glory?"
   2. Peter says (1 Pet. 1) "the prophets were searching, trying to find out what and what manner of time the spirit of Christ that was in them signified when he told of the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow."
   3. Sacrifices represented the death of Christ on the cross...suggested here in Isaiah

B. Lord asks: "Who shall we send, and who will go for us? And Isaiah said "Here am I; send me" He was ready for service
   1. What a disappointing response: "Go and tell this people: hear but don't understand. See, but don't perceive. Make their heart fat and their ears heavy, and shut their eyes."
   2. Doesn't mean Isaiah's work will have no effect--worse case
   3. God's call--highlights things psychologically needed
      a. Jeremiah in a worse time yet given a much more happy commission --to plant and build up (he needed that)

C. Isaiah's lament response: "How long? Lord, how long?"
1. Lord's answer: "Until the city be wasted without inhabitants..."

2. The people's apostasy was going to bring calamity of exile

3. Verse 6:13: KJV: "Yet there shall be in it a tenth and it shall return and it shall be eaten"
   NASB clearer: "Yet there will be a tenth portion in it"

   Cleansing punishment is going to leave a remnant, thus the destruction will not be total

4. Substance to stump:
   KJV: As a teil tree, and as an oak, whose substance is in them, so the holy seed shall be substance thereof."
   NASV better: "like an oak whose stump remains when it is felled."--the holy seed will be a stump that remains

5. So Isaiah is given this vision to encourage him--remnant of grace after all

2. Background to part two: the last ten chapter

A. Chapter 8 ends with a picture of calamity as people are punished for their sin.
   Verse 22: "They look into the earth and are bold, trouble and darkness, dimness and anguish and they shall be driven to darkness"
   Predicting the Assyrian attack during Isaiah's day

B. Chapter 9:1 "Nevertheless the dimness shall be not such as was in her vexation when at first he lightly afflicted the land of Zebulon..."
   1. Jewish scriptures put a break between 9:1 and 9:2.
   2. Matthew quotes the two verses together (Mat. 4:14-16)
3. As darkness or Assyrian armies hit that region first so
the light would come there first

4. Matthew 4:14ff notes Jesus began his preaching in Zebulon

....

B. Chapter 9:5f

1. Promised end of war. Instruments of war burned up
2. Coming of the Prince of Peace
3. Two natured redeemer: as ch. 4 the "branch of the Lord"
and "fruit of the earth" so here "a child is born, and a son
is given" but he is called "Mighty God, the everlasting
Father, and the Prince of Peace"

C. Isaiah 11

1. Chapter 10 shows the downfall of Assyrians using the figure
of the forest. Tree of Assyria cut down.. yet a "rod will come
out of Jesse and a branch will grow out of his roots".

2. "The Branch"

A. Distinction between Syria (Damascus just north of Israel and Assyria
(Nineveh on the Tigris)

B. 17 Hebrew words translated "branch" in ch. 4 tsemach is used

1. Several times tsemach (branch) has messianic sense

3. Natzer: another word for branch

A. New Testament connection with Mat. 2:23 concerning Jesus
"that he came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth that it might
be fulfilled that which was spoken by the prophet, that he
shall be called a 'Nazarene'."
B. Never confuse Nazarene with the Nazarite who took a vow not to cut his hair, touch any grape products (Samson).

C. This reference points back to Isa. 11 "the natzer" branch

4. "His character"

A. Found in Isaiah 11

"The spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord, and shall make him of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord. He shall not judge after the sight of his eyes neither reprove after the hearing of his ears."

1. Remember it said of Jesus he knew what was in a man and nobody had to tell him

2. Jesus meeting Nathaniel--behold an Israelite in whom there is no guile.

3. Isaiah 11:5: "Righteousness shall be the girdle of his loin and faithfulness the girdle of his reign."

5. "His victory over Antichrist"

A. Isaiah 11:4: "But with righteousness shall he judge the poor and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth and he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked."

1. NT says there are many antichrists

2. Compare this to 2 Thess. 2:8 and Rev 19:15 and 21

   Paul says: "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 coming."

3. Wicked one referred to in Isa. 11:4
4. Rev 19:15, 21:
"Out of his mouth goes a sharp sword that with it he should smite the nations, and he shall rule them with a rod of iron."
"And he has on his vesture and on his thigh a name written King of kings,' and 'Lord of lords.'"
"The remnant were slain with the sword of him that sat upon the horse, which sword proceeded out of his mouth."

5. Figure of speech representing the overthrow of the Antichrist
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The Servant/Servants of the Lord

His Millennial Reign [0:00]

Last time we discussed Isaiah 11:4 and pointed out that this is looking forward to one not yet revealed who will destroy by the spirit of his mouth and the brightness of his coming. To me it is perfectly clear that this refers to Revelation 19; that is, Jesus' victory over the Antichrist is described here in verse 4 of Isaiah 11. And then number 6 of the outline: “His millennial reign” in Revelation, right after chapter 19, we have the description of a period which is six times referred to as 1000 years. It is a period in which “Satan is bound so that he will deceive the nations no more.” Some say that when it says, "Satan is bound so that he cannot deceive the nations," it means that Satan is unable to injure the saved after they go to heaven. Well, that is an extremely figurative interpretation. And I don’t think it is really worthy of much consideration. But what it clearly says here: Satan is unable to deceive the nations in this period of 1000 years in which Christ reigns on the earth. And that is described in Isaiah 11 in the account of the conditions on earth during the 1000 years. In verses 6 to 9, Isaiah describes the conditions, at the time when there will be a complete end of external violence. The wolf will dwell with the lamb. Not that the lamb will be inside of the wolf but that lamb doesn’t need to fear the wolf. That neither one will injure the other. And it is stated in figurative language in verses 6 to 8, and then verse 9 makes it literally “they shall not hurt or destroy on all my holy mountain. For the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as waters cover the sea.” So, number 6 in the outline is, then, “His millennial reign”
The Obedience of the Nation [2:40]

Number seven of the outline: “The obedience of the nation.” This is contained here in chapter 11, verse 10, which says that, “In that day there shall be a Root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign to the people; it shall the Gentiles seek and his rest shall be glorious.” This word "rest" is not such a good translation. The word can mean rest like when you go to bed and be refreshed, but it can mean just like this glass case rests on the table. The Hebrew word is used in both ways. But there are those who take it in the sense of a place of rest, and they say it refers to the place of the Holy Sepulcher in Jerusalem, but most interpreters do not take it that way. But the main thing in the verse is that Christ will be an ensign or a sign, to the people, and him shall the Gentiles seek, and that is exactly what we have in Isaiah 2. It says, “All nations will come and they will say, 'let us go to the mountain of the Lord to the house of the God of Jacob. And he will teach us his ways and we will walk in his paths.' For out of Zion shall go forth the law and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.”

Now there is a book written recently by a man who takes this 11th chapter and insists that it must be exactly in chronological order. And therefore since verse 11 speaks of regathering of the Israelites and verse 4 of the millennium, he says that the regathering cannot come until after the millennium. And therefore the present state of Israel is not the regathering from the Scripture. Now, we cannot be dogmatic that the present state of Israel is the regathering of Israel spoken of in Isaiah 11, but it certainly looks that way. It looks very much that way to me. It is possible that the state of Israel might be destroyed, the Jews dispersed, and that another regathering will take place before the coming of Christ, which is yet to come. It is possible. We cannot be dogmatic. But there is to be a regathering of Israel, which most interpreters think comes before the millennium, and to say that because of verse 11 it comes after the millennium is, I think, reading into
Scripture. But the obedience of the nations is here in verse 10 which we have in Isaiah 2:3 and in Micah 4:2.

**The Time Perspective [5:33]**

And number 8 of the outline: “The time perspective.” We have the account in verses 1-9 and then verse 10 refers to what happens in the beginning of the millennium or what is all through the millennium. Does verse 11 refer to what happens in the millennium or does it refer to what is afterwards? The prophetic perspective is not always made clear in Scripture. If he said, “After that this will happen,” that would make it clear. If he said, “before this will happen, that will happen,” then that would be clear. But if I were to tell you that “I have business in Rome and in Jerusalem,” that statement would not tell you which I went to first. You might assume I went to Rome first, but perhaps I'm speaking of a logical rather than a chronological order. You don't know unless I tell you. And in reading the Scripture, we can make guesses from the order of passages so to their chronology but if we are to be dogmatic, we have to have consistent statement either in the passage or in some parallel passage that gives us chronological information. Well, we won’t spend more time on that now because, after all, that is not the section of Isaiah that we are specifically dealing with in this course. But it is related very definitely to what we have already covered.

**The Servant of the Lord [ 7:20]**

And we go on now to a passage which also is not in part we are dealing with, but which is vital background to the part of that we will deal with in most of the rest of the course. And so, Roman numeral 9 will be: “The Servant of the Lord” Thus far we have had no reference to what you might call the “Servant of the Lord.” But capital A: “Isaiah’s use of the word ‘Servant’”. We have had the word "servant" occasionally in this early part of Isaiah. There are a few general uses in the early part of the book. Its speaks of "a servant of the King" it speaks of
the king of Assyria sending his servant to do something. It's used in the plural occasionally in the early part of Isaiah. But the singular word “servant” is once used in Isaiah 20, verse 3, where the King James Version reads: “The Lord said ‘Like as my servant Isaiah has walked naked and barefoot 3 years for a sign of wonder upon Egypt and upon Ethiopia; so shall the king of Assyria lead away the Egyptians prisoner.” In this passage it refers to Isaiah as God’s servant. That’s the only passage in the first part of Isaiah that refers to Isaiah as God’s servant. There is one place in the latter part of the book that may refer to Isaiah, but may not. You will notice it as you go through this assignment for next time. Now, all uses of the singular of the word “servant” after Isaiah 37, are of a special type, all uses with one possible exception. There is at most one exception where this word “servant,” which is used occasionally in the general sense in the early part of Isaiah, is used a great deal in the latter part as you see from the sheets I gave you for the assignment for next time. The word is used a great deal in expressions like “my servant,” “the Lord’s servant,” and “the servant of the Lord.” And these expressions are of a special type. They do not refer to an ordinary person or an ordinary situation. There is one possible exception that might refer to Isaiah, but not necessarily.

So what we have is a special usage of this term “the Servant of the Lord.” And we will look at the first 3 occurrences of this type of expression. They are in Isaiah 41. And there in Isaiah 41, we have in verse 8 the statement: “But thou Israel art my servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham my friend. And verse 9 says: “Thou whom I have taken from the ends of the earth and called thee from the chief men thereof and said ‘thou art my servant I have chosen and not cast thee away.’” Is this servant here called Israel? I don’t think that any of you would have question about verse 8. “Thou Israel, art my servant.” God is calling Israel his servant. And he is speaking here of the nation of Israel. And then in verse 9, he also refers to Israel. Now, verse 8 specifically calls the servant,
Israel. Verse 9, in the light of context, must be taken in light of the context. So here we have in these first two cases the use of the word “Servant” and it is clearly Israel who is designated by name in the first instance, and who is clearly indicated by the context in the second.

But when you turn to the next chapter, we find in chapter 42 begins with the words, “Behold my servant whom I uphold, my elect in whom my soul delights.” Well, thus far could that be Israel in view of all the rebuke of Israel before for their sin and their terrible punishment described? It seems a bit strong to speak of Israel “the servant in whom his soul delights.” But the verse goes on, “I have put my spirit upon him. He shall bring forth justice to the Gentiles.” Well, Israel was a small nation. The word “Gentile” can equally well be translated “nation.” The same is true in the New Testament where the word “Gentile” and “nation” are identical. And you have to get which meaning is implied from context and often it is very difficult to know which. Getting back to Isaiah, although there are a few cases where the word "gentile" is even used to include Israel, usually it refers to nations outside of Israel. But God says His servant is going, “to bring justice to the Gentiles.” How is he going to do it? Israel is a small nation. Assyria had ten times the power that Israel had. Persia, a century later, had perhaps fifteen times the power that Israel ever had. How is Israel going to bring justice to the nations? Is Israel going to be able to build a large enough army and strong enough force to establish justice throughout the world?

Well, how it is going to be done? The servant “will not cry or lift up nor cause his voice to be heard in the street.” It is not going to be done through a great, tremendous military power. There is some other method involved. “A bruised reed he will not break, and a smoking flax he will not quench, but he will bring forth judgment into truth.” Does that sound like the nation of Israel? It is a gentle progress here described. God will use those that are giving a little light, and making a rather poor job and yet sincerely trying. He is not going to cast them out
of the way as unfit for his purposes. He is not going to quench them. There is a
gentleness there is a confidence. “He shall not fail or be discouraged until he has
spread judgment on the earth and the isles of distant lands shall wait for his law.”
These first seven verses describe “my servant,” the Lord’s servant, in a way that
will be very, very difficult to apply to Israel. And we have cases later on that are
similar and that are very, very difficult to apply to Israel. And so we have here a
very interesting problem. The servant of the Lord is specifically called Israel. Not
only in this one case we referred to, but in a number of others, which you will see.
The servant of the Lord is these contexts clearly refer to Israel, not only in chapter
41 verse 9, but in a number of other cases at which we will look. But the servant
of the Lord cannot be the nation in chapter 42. It just does not fit Israel. It is
entirely different than what Israel could possibly do.

And when you get to chapter 49 you find that the servant of the Lord is
distinguished from Israel. You find the statement made there in verse 6: He says,
“It is a light thing that you should be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob,
and to restore the tribes of Israel? I will also give you as a light to the Gentiles.”
Clearly, the servant is distinguished from Israel in chapter 49. And when you get
to chapter 53, which should start 3 verses earlier at 52:13, where we read, “behold
my servant shall be exalted and extolled and be very high.” And then follows the
great description of the suffering of Christ in chapter 53. And the word “servant”
used in verse 53:11. “By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many.”
And the word is never used again in the singular in the whole book of Isaiah. So
we have all of these uses of the term “servant,” some of which clearly refer to
Israel, and some of which could not possibly refer to Israel. Yet are spoken of as
"my servant" or the “servant of the Lord.”
Servants of the Lord (Plural) [16:53]

As I said, the word is never again used in the singular. But we have here the tremendous work to be done by the servant of the Lord. And after this we have the “servants” of the Lord spoken of. Never again a singular “servant.” In chapter 54 verse 17 we read at the very end of the chapter, "This is the heritage of the servants of the Lord. And their righteousness is from me," says the Lord. The servants of the Lord are the followers of the servant of the Lord. It is always used in the plural after this never again in the singular in the book of Isaiah. And so the examination of these passages will make clear to you the nature of the problem. How can the servant be Israel and also be Christ? Is the word used in two entirely different ways? Or is there one way in which it is used which covers all of the usages? Well think I won’t get into that today. I’ll let you look at it first to get an idea of, and to think about the problem. So we will close now for the day and continue this discussion next time.

Read and edited by Dr. Perry Phillips
How is the term “servant” used? [0:0]

I’m going to move forward rapidly in order to get to the point we discussed last time: how is the term "servant" used? We were speaking at the end of the last hour about number 9 in the outline, “the Servant of the Lord.” Now as we announced in the catalogue, this class is to cover Isaiah 1-6 and 56-64. And I thought at first to divide it into two parts, separately. But then as I thought about it, I saw that in order to properly understand the latter part, it’s necessary to have some idea of certain important things in the parts in between. And so last week and this week we are just glancing at certain outstanding things in between these two main parts. And I’m not going to call them part one and part two; I’m just going to go straight along with the numbers.

So I gave Roman numeral nine in the outline “The Servant of the Lord.” And we notice that capital A. Isaiah’s use of the word ‘servant’. There are a few general uses in the early part of the book, where it just speaks of a servant of a king, or something like that. Isaiah uses it of himself in Isaiah 23.

But then we pointed out all uses of the singular use of "servant" after Isaiah 37 are of a special type --for emphasis--with two exceptions at most. Last lecture I said one exception at most, but I’ve changed that to two exceptions at most. I don’t think that there are any other exceptions, but I say at most there are two. Isaiah uses this word so many, many times in this part of his book and never uses it again after chapter 53, and right in this section, he uses it so many times. Is there a very special reason why he uses it so many times? Does it have a very special meaning? And either way, you can say that it does have a special meaning.
every time it is used. Now, there are two cases where someone might say it’s referring to Isaiah. I don’t think that they could prove that, but if you want to hold it that way, it’s not particularly important in the whole matter, because you have these many cases that I gave you to turn in last Friday, where "servant" is used in a very specific sense and we want to find out what that specific sense is.

**First three Uses of “Servant” [3:05]**

And so, capital B, we take the first three appearances, or occurrences, and these first three appearances of the term "servant" are very different, as you doubtless noticed as you prepared this assignment for last time. They are very different from one another. The first two, of course, are identical, but the third is very different from the other two. And so look at the first: the word "servant" is specifically applied to Israel, 9 times, of which Isaiah 41:8-9 are as clear as any. There can be no question in chapter 41 verses 8 and 9 what he is talking about. Now I hope you all have your Bibles open to these. So, I think if you can look at your own Bible for this – and I don’t care what version you are using – we will look at those two verses, 8 and 9:

“But you Israel are my servant, Jacob, whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham, my friend; you whom I have taken from the ends of the earth and called from the chief men thereof and said to you, ‘You are my servant, I have chosen you and not cast you away’”

There is no question in these two verses that he is talking to Israel – which can be called Israel or called Jacob, for the two terms are used indiscriminately. We tend to think of Jacob as a man, who was the son of Isaac and of Israel as the nation. While Jacob’s name was changed to Israel in the latter part of his life, the nation of Israel is often referred to as the province of Jacob, though more often as Israel. So there is no question that in these two cases he is speaking to Israel, and about Israel, even though Israel refers to the nation as "Jacob" does also.
And the whole point of us here is – Israel need not fear, for God has called her in order that a task be performed. This chapter begins with the coming of the great conqueror, Cyrus the Persian. He is named later, but he is coming and the nations are filled with terror and the different people of the nations are rushing to make new idols, looking for help and protection from this terrible aggressor that is coming against them. But God says to Israel: you don’t need to fear, because you are my servant. And he twice in these two verses brings out that idea. Israel is his servant. Now you might expect him to say: Israel, you are my chosen one, but he doesn’t. Again, you might expect Him to say: "You are my chosen one; you’re the one I’ve called; you’re the one I have great blessings for; you are one I have great interest in." We find such things in other parts of the Bible, but here he says: you are my servant. And he says it twice in these two verses, and I believe that points to a very important matter. God did not call Israel simply because he chose to pick out a certain people group and give them special blessing. God called Israel in order that a task should be performed. He called Israel to be his servant. Israel to perform certain things.

Now, of course, the most immediate task of Israel is to keep a memory in the minds of people of the name of the Lord. We know the world had turned away from God and tried to put Him out of its memory. God revealed himself to Abraham and called Abraham out, to separate himself from the ungodly world and to raise up a nation which would keep alive the memory of the name of God and his greatness. That is a great part of Israel’s task. It’s keeping alive the knowledge of God and be the instrument through which God would give His revelations in the world. God used Israel in a very definite way, and God loves Israel, and he blesses Israel. But His great reason in calling Israel is in order that a task be performed. And this task has certain obvious elements that we have just referred to, and which He might enlarge on, but here in Isaiah, He thinks of a very special aspect of the task and that’s why He uses the word “servant” so many
times; specifically to stress the fact that there is a great task that is to be performed, and he has called Israel for that purpose and so Israel need not fear. God has called her in order that the task be performed.

**Use of the Term “Servant” In Isaiah 42 [7:58]**

Now we turn over to chapter 42 and we find a tremendous difference. There we find the word “servant” again. “Behold, my servant whom I uphold, my chosen one in whom my soul delights. I have put my Spirit upon him and he should bring justice forth to the Gentiles.” That would be a tremendous thing wouldn’t it, to tell this little nation of Israel there, surrounded by great empires many times as strong as they were, “You are to bring justice to all of the nations of the world?” Tremendous isn’t it? Is that Israel’s task, to bring justice to the Gentiles? “He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the streets. A bruised reed he shall not break, and the smoking flax he shall not quench. He will bring forth judgment unto truth. He will not fail, nor be discouraged, till he has set judgment in the earth and the isles (that’s the distant land that seems like shadowy, distant, great areas to the people of Israel) they will wait for his law." “Thus says God the Lord, he that created the heavens, and stretched them out; he that spread forth the earth, and that which cometh out of it; he that giveth breath unto the people upon it, and spirit to them that walk therein. I, the Lord, have called you in righteousness and will hold your hand, and keep you, and give you for a covenant of the people, for a light of the nations; to open the blind eyes; to bring out prisoners from the prison, and those that sit in darkness out to the truth.” Here is a tremendous picture of the task that is to be performed. A description of the servant of God who is to perform a very great task. So Isaiah 42:1-7 presents this task that must be performed.

Now certain ideas are clearly presented in these verses. Small a: "The Task involves bringing light and justice to all the nations." That, we have noticed in
verse one, to which He said that He will bring forth judgment, you can translate
the recipients of light and justice by the word "Gentiles," or "nations." You can
find it again in verse four, where we read, “He will not fail nor be discouraged till
he has set judgment in the earth and the isles will wait for his law.” We find it
again in verse six, where he says at the end of it, “I will make you a covenant of
the people, a light of the nation (or the Gentiles)” whichever way you want to
translate it. So you find this idea expressed here. Here is a tremendous task for
the whole world, and God has called Israel in order that this task be fulfilled.

**God Guarantees the Fulfillment of the Servant’s Task [11:07]**

Now b, “God guarantees fulfillment of the task.” It is not merely a hope.
Somebody might say to Hezekiah, “God wants you to establish justice throughout
the world.” Hezekiah says, “That’s wonderful. Give me the strength that David
had. David conquered a big realm.” And the big Assyrian Empire is five times as
big as the area that David conquered. “So give me great forces; give me great
arms. I’ll go out and establish justice throughout the world.” But for Hezekiah to
do such a thing would have been as silly as if the nation of Israel today would say,
“We’re going to establish justice in the world: America and Russia, you do what
we tell you.” People would just laugh, it would be ridiculous. It would have been
just the same way for them to undertake to do such a thing then.

c. "But this is not merely a hope." Wouldn’t it be nice if you could do
this? This is God’s statement that he guarantees that this task is going to be
performed. He guarantees fulfillment of the task. It is not merely a hope. We
find that in verses 1, 3, 4, and 6. He says “I have put my spirit upon him, and he
will do this”. In verse 3, “A bruised reed he will not break.” In verse 4, “He will
not fail or be discouraged until he has done this”. In verse 5 God says, “You think
this is impossible?” Well, God who created the heavens, God who controls all
things, this God said, “This is going to be done”. So verse 5 in here is a guarantee
of the fulfillment of these promises. And verse 6 says, “I the Lord have called you in righteousness and will hold your hand and keep you and give you for a covenant for the people for a light for the Gentiles.” We find it is in this section that we finally see the path with which these actions will be done, without uncertainty or discouragement. In verse 4, “He shall not fail or be discouraged, until he has set judgment in the earth and the isles shall wait for his law.”

**Servant will not Embrace Violence [13:57]**

d. “It will not be done with violent effort, but with gentleness and consideration”. We find that in verses 2-3. Hezekiah might have said, "Give me a new army, give me half of, give me ¾ of the forces of the Assyrians, let me step out and bring justice to the world: let me bring light to all the nations. They don’t want to listen to the message of our God, so let me force them to. Let me send messengers everywhere with this message and carry God’s truth to them. "He might say it, he might send the force out to try to forcefully do this, but this is not the picture of the servant. He will not cry, nor lift up his voice to be heard in the street. It is done with gentleness. “A bruised reed he won’t break, and a smoking wick he won’t quench.” In other words, here is somebody who is trying to serve the Lord. And he’s not succeeding; he’s not accomplishing much. Well, push him out of the way; let's put somebody in there who can do the task. No, that’s not the way a servant should be. The true servant of the Lord is going to be kind and helpful. And those who are sincerely trying to follow and to do God’s will, he is going to help them, not to push them out of the way. He won’t quench the smoking wick that’s just about to go out; instead of that, he will give it light and give it opportunity of accomplishment.

**Servant in Isaiah 42 cannot be Israel [15:31]**

Now number 4, these were 4 aspects of the task. Number 4 is, “It is hard to think of 42:1-7 as describing Israel.” As we already mentioned: a. Israel lacks the
tremendous power needed. How could Israel do this tremendous thing? A
tremendous power is involved. God has never made such a call to Israel.  b. Israel
is human and subject to discouragement. Israel has fallen into sin repeatedly, and
God has had to punish them for their sins. A great part of the book of Isaiah is the
punishment that has come for their sins. And yet He has called Israel to be His
servant in order that this work be accomplished, and here is the work that is to be
done and the servant is to accomplish it. Not to be discouraged, not to fail until
they have done this tremendous task.

Small d: “Israel hardly fulfills the characteristics described in verses 3 and
4.” A bruised reed he won’t break, a smoking wick he won’t quench. One must
admire the Israelites for their accomplishments in the world. Persecuted,
oppresses, kicked about, they have nevertheless risen up and actively worked and
gotten ahead and had influence on the world far out of proportion to their number.
But, they have not done it by being quiet and not lifting up their voice in the street
and being as gentle and kindly to everybody. They have done it with force, and
with energy, and often with violence. But Isaiah's picture of the servant hardly
seems to fit Israel, as Israel was in that day, or as Israel, as the whole, has been
since.

Yes, Isaiah 41:8-9 and also many later passages clearly show that Israel has
a responsibility for the servant’s task. Now we look at a few of these verses,
which bring this out so clearly. Here is the beginning of chapter 42 telling us
about the servant’s task: what he must do and how he is going to do it. But look at
verse 19, “Who is blind but my servant? Or deaf as my messenger that I sent”.
“Who is blind”, the King James says, “as he that is perfect”? The “he that is” is
in italics. The word can be derived from either one of two Hebrew roots. One of
them would mean, “he that is in a covenant of peace”. The other one would mean,
“he that should be perfect”. Now, either meaning would fit with Israel. Israel was
in a covenant of peace with God. Israel had a duty to carry out God’s law, and to
show for it His perfect justice. That is what Israel should be, he says, but Israel is blind and decadent. Who is blind as the Lord’s servant? Israel, Israel the Lord’s servant. And yet Israel is blind and death is following the nation. Sin is turning to idolatry and to wickedness. And He goes right on and He says (this is a), in verse 22, “This is a people robbed and spoiled. They are snared, they are hid in prison a house”. But verse 24 says, “Who gave Jacob for a spoil, and Israel to the robbers? And did not the Lord, against whom we have sinned? Therefore, pour out upon him the fury of his anger”. And if Israel is in sin, how can Israel fulfill this purpose of servant? And yet, this is the task of the servant, and Israel has been called in order that this task be fulfilled. In chapter 43 verse 10, again he says, “You are my witnesses says the Lord, and my servant whom I have chosen”. Israel is God’s servant to perform some great task. We know that it is to preserve the work of God. We know that Israel preserves the knowledge of God through all those years, when all the world is trying to put Him out of their mind. But there is far more than that in this picture in verses 1 to 7.

Isaiah 43 and 45 Servant is Israel Again [20:23]

How is this going to be fulfilled? 43:10 says that Israel is indeed God’s Servant. Chapter 44 verse 1, “Yet now hear, O, Jacob my servant and Israel whom I have chosen”. Definitely designated as God’s servant. Again in verse 2, “Thus says the Lord that made you and formed you from the womb, fear not, Jacob my servant”. And in verse 21, He says, “Remember these, O Jacob and Israel, for you are my servant, I have formed you, you are my servant O Israel.” Clearly, Israel is God’s servant. And yet, how can Israel fulfill the fact described in the first 7 verses of chapter 42? In chapter 45 verse 4 again He says, “For Jacob my servant's sake" and "Israel my chosen one," and He (God) tells how He is going to call Cyrus by his name, and bring Cyrus to deliver them from the Babylonian captivity. And in chapter 48 verse 20 we read at the end of the verse, “Say the Lord has redeemed His servant Jacob”. So there’s no question the term
servant is used of Israel, but there is no question that the picture in chapter 42 of the work the servant has to do is a picture of something that is very hard to think of Israel as fulfilling.

**Servant as “the Remnant”? [22:02]**

What is the answer to this problem? Delitzsch, in his excellent commentary, which has many fine things on his commentary on Isaiah, has one thing that I think is quite a mistake. He says the concept of the servant of the Lord is to be thought of as like a pyramid, and sometimes a prophet looks at the base of the pyramid, which is all of Israel, sometimes he looks at the top of the pyramid which is Christ, and sometimes he looks at the middle, which is the remnant. Now I know of no case where the word servant is used of “the remnant.” I know of no such case. So there are only the two ways in which "servant" is used, with a possible exception of two cases where it might refer to Isaiah, but where it doesn’t have to be. With that possible exception, in this whole section, the word "servant" would either refer to the whole nation of Israel, or it would refer, perhaps, to Christ.

**Responsibility versus Accomplishment [23:15]**

What is the relation then? How can the word be used in such different ways. Number 6, "There is a difference between responsibility and accomplishment." That is the point that I don’t think Delitsch talks about. There is a difference between responsibility and accomplishment. Though all Israel bears responsibility for the task, all Israel cannot be involved in accomplishing it. Now that is an obvious thing but it may not appear obvious at first sight. Suppose that I say that members of this class have responsibility to see to it that this table here is put here for me before the beginning of class. Suppose I were to say it:  could everyone in the class do it? It would be impossible. We might give responsibility to the whole class, but the actual accomplishment of that particular thing would
have to be carried out by a part of the class. Now Israel has many people who did not take part in the major part of the work of the servant and who did not make the truth of God known, who went and worshipped idols, who disobeyed God’s law. They certainly can’t be thought of as part of those who were accomplishing the task of the servant, but they certainly bear responsibility along with the rest for the task that God has given. The whole nation has a responsibility. But the task cannot be fulfilled by all of them. Some are certainly utterly unworthy; some have definitely turned their backs on God, so it must be just a portion of the nation that will carry out the task.

Now how large a portion of the nation will it be that will fulfill this vital part of the work of the servant? Will justice be brought to all the world, will there be light brought to all the nations? Two thirds of Israel? Will it be half of Israel? Or is it possible that one individual out of Israel, representing Israel, actually an Israelite, can fulfill the task for which all Israel has responsibility? You see the question then, now there is a difference between responsibility and accomplishment.

**Individualization of the Servant [25:46]**

Now we move on to C, "the individualization of the servant." When we get to chapter 49 we find evidence that this great task of the servant of the Lord that Isaiah described so much is to be fulfilled not by the whole nation, which would be absurd; not fulfilled by even 2/3 or half the nation, but by one individual who is Israel because he is fulfilling Israel’s responsibility, because he is an Israelite, because he belongs to the nation of Israel. He is one individual who can represent Israel in carrying out the great task that God has for Israel to do, the task that will end up bringing light to all the nations, light to all the Gentiles, the task that will end up bringing justice throughout the whole world.
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MacRae: Isaiah 1-6 Lecture 10 Outline

By Bekah Macchia

Israel Called to Servant-hood

I. Introduction to the class
   a. Covering Isaiah
   b. Big Idea: being a servant (Israel)

II. Israel called into servant-hood
   a. Called to perform tasks in addition to being a servant
      i. Think Israel (or Jacob) as a nation: “God has called her in order that a task be performed”
      ii. Israel is a servant
          Eg. “But God says to Israel: you don’t need to fear, because you are my servant.”
      iii. God calls Israel to service
          Eg. “God called Israel in order that a task be performed. He called Israel to be his servant. Israel to perform certain things”.

III. God Reveals and Reminds…
   a. Revealed himself to Abraham and calls him to separate himself and build up a nation
      i. To keep the knowledge of Christ
      ii. Instruments through how God gives revelations in the world
   b. Loves and blesses Israel
      i. Therefore they must build up a nation (their task at hand)
   c. Servant as a prevalent theme throughout
      i. Reminds Israel of their task at hand
      ii. Service is a great task to accomplish, God finds favor with and blesses Israel, calling them to build up a nation
      iii. Isaiah 42:1-7
          1. Israel is to be light and justice to all nations
             a. Judgment toward Gentiles

IV. God’s promise with Israel
   a. Not only a hope but a guarantee that this task will be achieved
      i. Do not have uncertainty or discouragement
b. True service
   i. Done through gentleness
   ii. Servants of God are kind and helpful
   iii. They help others instead of pushing them away

c. Review of two laws discussed so far
   i. Law A: Israel lacks power, tremendous power is involved found through God’s call to Israel
   ii. Law B: Israel is human and subject to discouragement, fallen into sin repeatedly and yet God still calls Israel to be his servants so that his task will be fulfilled

V. Israel’s called to being servants and the importance of doing so

a. Biblical References in Isaiah

VI. More answers

a. Concept of being servant of the Lord viewed like a pyramid

b. Servant has two references
   i. Nation of Israel
   ii. God himself

c. Not everyone can be involved at the task at hand, even though we are all called to do so
   i. Whole nation has this responsibility, but the task cannot be fulfilled by all of them
      1. Some viewed “unworthy”

d. Law C: individualization of the system
   i. Final evidence that this task of the servant of the Lord that Isaiah threatened so much is to be fulfilled not by the whole nation, but one individual who is Israel by fulfilling the responsibility
      1. Isaiah 49

e. Task will:
   i. Bring light to all nations
   ii. Light to Gentiles
   iii. Bring Justice in the world
Servant of the Lord Discussion Continued

Review of Servant Theme in Isa 42 and 49

Last time we ended with our discussion of the "Servant" that Isaiah describes in chapter 42. We then moved onto chapter 49 when we continue Isaiah's description of the "servant." Now, verse 3 of Isaiah chapter 49 has a new idea we did not have in chapter 42 at all. The chapter shows that the servant must accomplish a work for Israel as well as for other nations. Note verses 49:5-6, “And now, saith the LORD that formed me from the womb to be his servant, to bring Jacob again to him, Though Israel be not gathered, yet shall I be glorious in the eyes of the LORD, and my God shall be my strength. And he said, It is a light thing that you should be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel: I will also give you for a light to the Gentiles, that you may be my salvation unto the end of the earth.” The Servant must do a work for Israel as well as for the sins of other nations. So here we have clear evidence that the servant of the Lord is separate from Israel as a whole. So what appeared to be unclean in chapter 42--whether the "servant" was distinct from Israel--is made clean in chapter 49: The "servant" is distinct from Israel for the Servant is to bring Israel back to the Lord! Hence, the Servant here cannot be Israel. Moving onto Isaiah 49:4 we read “Though Israel be not gathered.” Many translations, most of the recent translations, will say that verse 5 of chapter 49 reads, "in order that Israel is gathered," whereas the KJV reads: "though Israel is not gathered." It is hard for a layman who does not know the Hebrew language to understand why we have this difference in. As a matter of fact, the difference between those two translations is a difference of one letter in Hebrew. Some manuscripts have one
version and some have the other. And either way you take it, it is still definitely taught that the servant has a responsibility toward Israel as well as toward the whole world.

**Servant Must Suffer Humiliation [2:36]**

Now number 4 of the outline: “This chapter distinguishes the servant from Israel, as we already brought out."

Number 5: "The chapter shows that the servant, like Israel, must suffer humiliation." This is suggested in verse seven. “Thus saith the LORD, the Redeemer of Israel, and his Holy One, to him whom man despiseth, to him whom the nation abhorreth,” not the “nations”, but the "nation." What nation abhors the Holy One? The word “nation” is usually used to suggest, or to refer to, foreign nations. But there are cases where it is used of Israel. So the main one who is the Holy One is going to be despised by the people. It seems to me here that for redemption the servant must suffer humiliation like Israel. And this thought is further developed in chapter 42 and 53:4-11. We will not take time to look at these passages. There are some points there that require consideration in detail, and that is not part of our purpose this semester, but it is good to have in your notes the reference here.

**Fulfillment of the Servant’s Work [3:58 ]**

Now capital D: "Fulfillment of the servant’s work” The Servant’s work has captured the ideals that God says must be done, and will be done as described in chapter 48. It is clearly brought out that Israel has responsibility to carry out God's ideals. Israel has responsibility, but as chapter 49 brings out, the one who accomplishes it can be distinguished from Israel as a whole. This one has work to do for Israel, as well as for the temple, work that Israel as a whole could not do.
Now we get further detail about the servant’s work with the assurances he will succeed. In chapter 52 verse 13 to 53 verse 12, we have one of the great chapters of the Scriptures. It should start in 52 verse 13. It is a great chapter of the description of the work of Christ. That which is so important in bringing light to the nations, that which is the very foundation upon which justice is to be brought to the whole world, is described here. That is described in this section, beginning in chapter 52 verse 13, “Behold, my servant shall deal prudently.” The word here for "prudently" is the Hebrew word that you cannot translate exactly into English. It also means “to act wisely”; it also means “to be successful.” It usually means to be successful because you do that which brings success. Now I don’t know which of these two ideas is meant. Sometimes it is often translated "to be successful," and it is often translated “to act wisely.” And this shows what the servant is going to accomplish. We don’t have time to go into the details of this passage outside this section. I am simply looking at the background for what follows.

**The Servant and Vicarious Atonement [6:07]**

But the essential, outstanding idea in this chapter is the “vicarious atonement.” And we find that already in verse 15, “so shall he sprinkle many nations.” The Old Testament tells how in the temple the priests must sprinkle blood, or oil, or water on the altar and upon the furnishings in the temple. It is the purification usually for the sacrifice. No modernist can understand how this can make any sense whatever. So if we take up the Revised Standard Version we will find it says, “So shall he startle many nations,” and there is a footnote where it says “the Hebrew is obscure”

Well, there is nothing obscure about the Hebrew. This word occurs either 22 or 23 times in the Old Testament. In every case except this and one other the Revised Standard Version translates the word “sprinkled.” In at least 20 cases,
and the one case besides this one, the Revised Standard Version does not translate it "sprinkled;" it is translates it “spattered,” which is really the same thing. And so in say 22 out of 23 cases they translate it either "sprinkled" or "spattered." Yet in this one they say, "Hebrew is obscure." It is obscure because they do not believe in expiatory sacrifice, and because they don't understand the Hebrew language.

They can’t understand it, but you know Peter could. Peter had no difficulty with this one. If you look at 1 Peter 1:1, the beginning of it, you will find that Peter writes to many nations. Peter says in verse 1. “Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ, to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia,” He writes to many nations. And what does he say about these many nations? He says, “They are elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ.” Peter certainly never would have said that he did not have this verse in his mind. He says here is the fulfillment of what Isaiah predicted: that through the servant of the Lord, many nations will be sprinkled. Well, that is what modernists cannot believe: the vicarious atonement. So they try to get rid of this verse. But they can’t get rid of it in chapter 53. The idea of atonement is expressed four times. “But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed.” Four times vicarious atonement is expressed in that one verse. It is again in verse 6: “All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the LORD hath laid on him the iniquity of us all.”

Atonement is expressed in verse 10 where it says, “When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the LORD shall prosper in his hand.” It is expressed in verse 11: “by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities.” And it is expressed again in verse 12. And so fulfillment of the servant’s work, which is described so clearly in these verses, has a great stress on
the vicarious atonement, which is the foundation by means of which that light will be brought to all the nations and by means of which the foundation will be laid that eventually he will establish justice throughout the earth. Now this word “servant” is never again used in the singular in Isaiah. Not once more in the remaining 10 chapters of the book is the word used in the singular. But the word “servants” is used. The word “servants” is used twice in the next couple of chapters. And then toward the end of the book "servants" is used quite a number of times. And it is reasonable to interpret “servants” as meaning those who are the followers of the Servant, those who are the recipients of the word. Those who are saved through what Jesus did on the cross. The servants are those who are his representatives in carrying Jesus' message. They are the “servants of the Lord”. And so in the next chapter 54:17 he says in the end of the last verse: “This is the heritage of the servants of the LORD, and their righteousness is of me, saith the LORD.” They are righteous, not because they work hard to do good works, but because God imputes righteousness to them because of what Jesus had done on the cross.

**Gospel Call in Isaiah 55 [12:03 ]**

And Then in chapter 55 verse 1, we have as wonderful a gospel call as is anywhere in Scripture. “Ho, every one that thirsts, come to the waters, and he that hath no money; come, buy, and eat; yea, come, without money and without price.” And go on through chapter 55 and it refers to that which will come to David’s greater son, which is the marvelous blessing, which has simply to be taken by faith. You don’t have to pay for it because Christ has paid it all for us.

And this section of the book of Isaiah continues with chapter 56, verses 4-8, which show the word going out to all the world. So that as verse 7 says: “He will bring them to his house of prayer, and my house shall be called a house of prayer to all people.” And verse 8 ends that major section of the book. And the section
we are now going to look at is starts with verse 9, and I’ve already had you divide that section into blessing and rebuke. We had no such section to speak of just before, which is the great teaching of the servant. But now it becomes more like the first part, and we will go on from there next time.
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Higher Critical Approaches to Isaiah

Smoking Flax and Broken Reed (Isa 42:3) [0:0]

I had a very intelligent question asked at the end of the last part of the last hour. It relates to the section of the book that I ran over rapidly because it was not what we had in mind for our main emphasis this time. So I won’t take long at it. But it is one I think is well worth looking at. The Question is: Could you comment on what is a smoking flax (or wick) and broken reed in Isaiah 42:3. Now Isaiah 42:3, taken just by itself, let’s say the first 2/3’s of it, you wouldn’t have any idea what he means. “A bruised reed shall he not break and a smoking flax shall he not quench.” That could mean any one of a hundred different things when you just take that alone. When you read the rest of the verse, “he shall bring forth judgment into truth” you see you are speaking about one who is doing a task. One who is going forward to accomplish something. And when you look at the preceding and following verses it is quite clear that is what it is. Someone is undertaking a great task. He is going forward to fulfill this task, and in the course of it, he will not break a bruised reed and he won’t quench a smoking flax. And so you have a picture of one who is heading for a task, a very vital task and you might think that whatever gets in his way he’s apt to just throw out of the way and be done with it. But he’s not going to do that.

And what is he not going to break? A broken reed. What would a reed be? A reed would be like a cane. It would be something that you lean on or something you use for some purpose. Here you take a hold of something and it just doesn’t
accomplish the work. And you say, “ah throw it away and let’s get a new one.” No he’s not going to do that. A bruised reed he is not going to break.

And a smoking flax, this refers to the wick of a lamp--of course in our day, we just turn the button and the electricity comes on, but in those days they didn’t have electricity or even kerosene lamps. And so they had to have a little wick. And here is the little wick that gives you light. Maybe the oil is underneath and comes up through the wick that gives you light. Some wicks don’t work very well. Instead of giving light, all it gives only smoke. And you say throw it away, that one, and get us a new one.

But the picture here, I believe, refers to those who are trying to serve the Lord: sincerely trying to do the best of their ability to understand what the Lord’s will is and to accomplish it. And as they try to do it, they just do not have the particular abilities they need, or perhaps they have made bad mistakes and they have fallen back and they have injured themselves. They have failed to do what the Lord wanted, but they have repented, and they have come to Him and sought his forgiveness. He has granted it through the blood of Christ. They are cleansed from their sin but they still are a broken reed or a smoking flax. The bird with a broken wing never flies as high again. And under those circumstances it is very easy to give way to despair.

But the true servant of the Lord is one who has the great task of bringing light to all the nations, the one who is interested in every one of them. But in spite of our failures and weaknesses, he is not going to just toss us out of the way if we sincerely look to him and sincerely try to do his will and bring our faults and our sins before him for his cleansing. He doesn’t promise he will make us a great evangelists or great accomplishes necessarily. He will use us in proportion to our abilities and in proportion to his particular desires for us in his plan, but He won’t toss us out of the way saying, "that one is no good let’s get a new one." And so in
light of the context, this is undoubtedly what this particular statement means. It shows the gentleness in the servant and his confidence. He’s not one who is struggling to get results.

For example, when you are in ordinary circumstances, you are very careful not to break things. And you would feel very bad if you upset your table and broke your china or broke your glasses. But if there was a fire started there, and you had the chance to rush over and to crush out that fire before your house burned down, you wouldn’t worry about how much china you broke or how many glasses you broke. Anything that got in your way would be very secondary. Like when I hear somebody who’s been in a bad auto accident and they’ve come through it without much injury. The car perhaps is ruined but we say “isn’t it wonderful you weren’t hurt”; we don’t feel so bad about the car; we feel happy that the person wasn’t injured. Well, that’s not the way the servant is going to have to work. He doesn’t have to just struggle to accomplish his work; he goes forward with confidence and certainty to accomplish the task to which he has set himself. And so that, I think, and I believe, you would find as to the meaning of this verse. All commentaries would agree. I don’t think that it is a questionable thing at all. But it is something that is not apparent when we first look at this verse. And so I think that it was worth taking a minute or two to explain it.

In God’s Sight No “Little People” [7:10]

In connection with this, Francis Schaeffer (who was a student of Allan MacRae) has written a book, *No Little People*. That’s just the name of the first of a series of talks he gave. But in God’s sight, there are no little people. He had a student who was, well he was right at the top of the lowest third of the class in just about every regard, academically and personally and every other way. But he got a letter from his mother and she said, “What does Billy Graham have that you
don’t have? Why can’t you accomplish everything that Billy Graham did? Just get busy and work!” Well, that’s no way to help a fellow. If he did the best he could with the ability he had, I’m sure God would use him and bless him. But to make one of us think that we have got to have particular abilities that only few people perhaps have, is not, I repeat, is not helpful. But on the other hand, every one of us probably can accomplish much more than we do if we really try to the very best we can with what we have. And Jesus is the one who gives us our gifts, and He will use them. But He doesn’t want us to become discouraged or think because of our failure he’s going to throw us out of the way. If we sincerely trust in him and rest in him, we can depend upon Him for accomplishment of His will. And there’s many a person whom I’ve seen, who has worked hard and has had great effect for a time and then things have come along and derailed their efforts. And they look back on their life and think it was a waste and a ruin, when actually they accomplished much in God’s sight. God didn’t cast him aside.

Assignment [9:19]

Now getting back to the matter at hand. By the next lesson I hope to be discussing the section after the first part of it that I gave you, i.e., chapter 59, and then going on to the latter part of 59 and 60 and chapters beyond, thru chapter 63. Now there’s four chapters, or three and a fraction chapter if you wish, that I’d like you just to look over in the English, or you could use the Hebrew to confirm if you prefer, but look it over rapidly just in order to see the main divisions in subject matter. Don’t take any division you find in the Bible or a commentary or anything. I don’t object to your looking at all things like that, but I prefer that first you do the work yourself. And this is a number of chapters, so I’m not asking anything but a rather superficial subdivision of them. Just what are the main subjects, and what are the points of division.
How far does what we discussed last time go through 59? We talked about 59:20 to the last part of 59. I want you to take what we said from there and run on through 63, but you don’t need to look at 63 more than just to note the general subject and where the important divisions occur. And as a hint there are no more than three divisions at the most.

**Relation of the Latter Parts of Isaiah to its Earlier Parts [10:52]**

Now having laid out the assignment for next time, I believe we are ready to continue with our discussion and so I will go on to section 10. e.g. Roman numeral ten. "The relation of the latter parts of Isaiah to its earlier parts." That’s Roman numeral ten. And we are now going to start this last section, but here I am speaking at the moment about the part from chapter forty on.

**“Higher Criticism” of Isaiah [11:20]**

So under that capital A, "Higher Criticism of Isaiah." And notice that I put the “higher criticism” in quotes. Forty years ago there was wide-spread discussion, “Is the higher criticism right?” And among Christians the term, “higher criticism,” came to mean the attitude of those who would divide the Bible books up into all sorts of sections, and say they were written by different authors than what they seemed to be, and also written at different times. And the term “higher criticism” came to mean, to most Christians, destructive criticism of the Bible. But in most classes forty years ago, even if they were classes taught by thoroughly orthodox people, they would say the term "higher criticism" should not be thought of as having a bad connotation”. “Higher” criticism simply is a term for investigation. They would say, “who is the author of the book, when was it written, what is its unity?” And they would say, “that term is used with all literature!” And there’s nothing wrong with higher criticism, it’s just what we also call "lower criticism"
trying to get the exact text, and to study the meaning of particular words. So higher criticism studies authorship, unity, and questions like that. Well that’s what they would have told you forty years ago in any class in Old Testament study.

But today I fear many orthodox teachers, in orthodox schools, will say the same thing. But for me it wasn’t long ago that I thought this description of higher criticism wasn’t true. So I went to the public library and checked out all of the books I could get on literary criticism: books which were not particularly concerned with the Bible, but were dealing with literature in general. And I looked up the term “higher criticism” in their indexes and I found that practically all of them didn’t mention the term at all. It is never referred to it in their book. It is not a term used in literary study today, outside of us. But I found in a few books of that type that when they used the term, they used it only in relation to the Bible. The term "higher criticism" has now been given up in literary study in general. Not only the term, but the things that is stood for have been abandoned. Forty years ago, fifty years ago, literary critics would take almost any work of literature and divide it up into all kinds of sections and claim they were written by different authors at different times. Today, that is just about, or entirely, given up regarding all literature except the Bible. But Bible students, many of them, are way behind the times in this regard. And in most any university that you would take a course in religion, and in almost any theological seminary that is over forty years old, you will find that they are dividing up the Bible according to these higher critical theories. And so, we still use the term “higher criticism” because it’s come to be a term for that sort of division.

I met a man teaching in a seminary in the city long ago, who told me he was meeting with others from other seminaries and they were discussing the boundaries of the so-called Q source [A presumed document containing sayings of Jesus shared by Matthew and Luke but not Mark]. That is, they were discussing what parts of Matthew, Mark, and Luke are from the Q source, and what parts are
from the other sorts. They are tremendously interested in subdividing the text and saying this half verse goes here, and this verse goes there. They don’t do that today with other literature, at least hardly anybody does. But it still is taught in all of the older schools as established fact. Well now we’re interested here in something about the higher criticism of Isaiah, but we are not going to take much time on that.

There is no question that anyone, no evidence that anyone questioned Isaiah’s authorship or any part of the book until the 18th century. There were people in ancient times who said, “Daniel didn’t write the book of Daniel”. There were beginnings of the denial, of the authorship of biblical books in ancient times. But we have no evidence that before the 18th century that anybody questioned that the book of Isaiah was one continuous unit, written by one man. And of course, the book says that his name was “Isaiah”.

“Two Isaiah Theory” [16:55]

This brings us to number two, the “Two Isaiah theory”. About two hundred years ago one of the higher critics advanced a very simple theory; of “apparent simplicity.” If you will look at Isaiah chapters one through thirty-nine you will find many mentions of Isaiah, well I shouldn’t say “many”, not over ten, but there are quite a few. But if you look at Isaiah forty to sixty-six, the name “Isaiah” never occurs; never from forty to sixty-six. You look at Isaiah one to thirty-nine; you have occasional mentions of the civic Israelite kings, particularly in the chapters from thirty-six to thirty nine. You have no Israelite king mentioned by name after that; i.e., after chapter forty. In the sections one to thirty-nine you have many statements that the land is going to be taken into exile if the people there don’t repent from their sins. In the section from forty on, you find it presupposed, or assumed, that exile is already here. In the first part there are many references to the backgrounds of situations in Palestine. In the section from forty on you get the
feeling he is talking to people way across the desert in Babylonia. So it's a very simple theory: here's Isaiah’s book, chapters one through thirty-nine. Somebody, the critics say a great unknown, a greater writer than Isaiah--they call him “Deutero-Isaiah”, or the “second Isaiah”--wrote a book, more or less in the Spirit of Isaiah, but it was 150 years later. And some way, since it was so similar, it got written on the same scroll, and it didn’t have any title so people forgot that it was by a different writer. Well you might say, “What’s the great difference? God inspired it all. Whether it is the first book Isaiah wrote, or the other by a great unknown 150 years later.”

You might say that at this point. It is a very apparently simple theory. But hardly any conservative scholar holds that view today. Even among modernist scholars, hardly anybody holds any more to the “Two Isaiah” theory today.

“Deutero- and Trito- Isaiah” [19:37]

Looking at more recent higher critical attitudes, we find that it was not long after the "Deutero-Isaiah" theory was advanced, that people began to look at Isaiah forty on, and look back at one to thirty-nine, and find parts of it that they said were similar. And so, they said, the same evidences that show us that much of forty on wasn’t written by Isaiah also shows many sections of chapters one through thirty-nine weren’t written by Isaiah. So they broke one to thirty-nine all up into little sections. And then, while a "Trito-Isaiah" or "Third-Isaiah," was noticed, a great argument and discussion was carried on between those who said the book has a Palestinian background, is written by Isaiah in the time of Hezekiah, and those who said, "no, the last part from forty to sixty-six has a background of Babylonia, when the exile is all ready in progress." It was noted that those who said the background is Babylonian were presenting most of their evidence from chapters
forty to fifty-five. And those who said the background is Palestine were presenting most of their evidence from the last ten chapters. And so they said, “No, there is a third Isaiah!” Trito-Isaiah. And so they said the last ten chapters or so differ according to the relationship we made with the other chapters, so they were written 100 years after "second Isaiah." So now you have three Isaiahs. And if there are any critical scholars who hold the “Two Isaiahs” theory, you will probably find six for every one of them who will hold the “Three Isaiahs” theory. But they don’t merely hold to three different books written by three different authors; if you pick up almost any critical commentaries today, they will say the question is not “Is this by Isaiah or not?”; the question is “examine these verses here and decide what is the time at which they probably were written”. And so they will say, “Here’s six and a half verses that were written probably a hundred years before Isaiah. Here’s a hundred or so verses that were probably written 300 years after Isaiah. Then here’s six verses maybe written by the second Isaiah. Then here’s ten verses written by an unknown author.” And so the book came to be completely fragmented. Now that was the practice of critics, let’s say 20 years ago, whereby Isaiah was completely fragmented. We see the absurdity of going to such extremes today, so there is not quite as much fragmentation of Isaiah going on as there was. But you will find books entitled *The Second Isaiah*. And you will find that most of the books, even some written by fairly conservative authors, will adopt part of this theory.

**Argument for Two Isaiahs [22:54]**

Now number 4 of the outline—“A Glance of the Argument for two Isaiahs”. Number one—“The Historical Background”- this is a very strong argument. The section from forty on, passage after passage, talks as if the Babylonian exile were already in progress. This is a very strong argument. As I see it, Isaiah talked in great parts of chapters one through thirty-nine to the nation as a whole, and he told them, “if you do not turn from your sins, God is going to send you into exile. You
are having these terrible problems with the Sennacherib and Assyrian armies, but worse things are ahead for you if you do not turn from your sin.” And He even, at the end of chapter 39, specifically predicted that they would be taken into exile, not into Assyria, but into Babylonia, which seemed to them at that time to be a rather insignificant nation that was subject to Assyria. But from chapter forty on, He says, “Comfort you, comfort you my people. Call on to Jerusalem that her iniquity is pardoned and her warfare is ended” and so on. You have a tone which is very different. I explain it by saying that from chapter forty on, Isaiah turn his attention away from the ungodly mass of the nation, to the very sizeable group of believing people who were knowing what he said was true, knowing that exile was certain to come, and God was giving them comfort. They were already familiar with waht God would do--The Northern Kingdom had already been taken into exile and they knew what it meant. And they knew that the sin of their own nation of Judah was just as Isaiah said it was. Exile was sure to come, and they tended to give way to despair. And Isaiah said, “No, God is not through with Israel. God has a great work for Israel to do. There’s the work of the servant of the Lord that must be accomplished.” And so from forty on, which sometimes is called the “The Book of Consolation,” God was speaking to the godly remnant and comforting them. And from chapter forty to fifty six, that is His principle emphasis,--comfort--and so the argument for a Second Isaiah is from historical background. If you do not believe in a God who could enable his prophet to predict the future, then a "Second Isaiah" makes sense. But to those who do not believe in such a God, it is clear that Isaiah could have written chapter forty and following.

**Other Arguments for Two Isaiahs [26:15]**

There are two other main arguments to handle. Critics say that there are differences in the style, and they say that the theology is different. For instance, in chapters one to thirty nine, God is majestic. In forty to sixty six, God is universal. From one to thirty nine he is speaking to the nation of Israel, with occasional
glimpses of the outreach to the whole world with the message of salvation. But from forty to sixty six he is looking at the world and at the salvation God is going to bring thru the servant of the Lord. And so the style naturally varies a little bit with the subject matter. You write on two different subjects and your styles are going to be somewhat different. And your emphasis in theology will naturally be different in two different situations, but there’s no contradiction whatever between the theology of Isaiah chapters one to thirty nine and in Isaiah forty to sixty six. And as far as the style is concerned, some of the critics say it is amazing that Deutero-Isaiah is so much like Isaiah in style, you would think it was "Isaiah raised from the dead." You can find differences in style with differences in subject matter. But the similarity in style for Isaiah as a whole is so great that I’m ready to say let almost anybody hear three chapters picked at random in Isaiah, and then read them in conjunction with chapters from almost any other part of the Bible, and they’ll be able to tell you whether it’s from Isaiah or not because Isaiah has a very distinctive style. He uses all through his book far larger vocabulary than anywhere else in the Old Testament. He has a poetic flavor and an approach that is found throughout the book, and that is different from any other book. The only one that is fairly close is Micah, but there are still differences between Micah and Isaiah, but not nearly as great between Isaiah and any other part of the Old Testament. So there is one argument that really matters, and that is the argument from historical background. The other two can be looked at in detail and thoroughly answered. But unless you believe in a God who can predict the future, and not only predict the future but enable his prophets to be so carried along that he actually imagines himself in the future, in that situation, and talks to people who know that exile is coming and who are tending to give way to despair, unless you believe in that kind of a God, you can’t believe in the unity of Isaiah.

To me, the thing that matters is the New Testament quotes from Isaiah, and here we note especially that New Testament quotes from Isaiah more than any other book in the Old Testament, except for the book of Psalms, which has 150
chapters as opposed to the 66 in Isaiah. But the New Testament quotes many, many times from various passages in Isaiah. About 13 times it quotes from it as the work of Isaiah, and 6 of these are from chapters 1 to 39, that is, the first 39 chapters, and seven of them are from the last 27 chapters. And to me, one of the most interesting things is to look at the book of Romans and see what God led the apostle Paul to say when quoting from the book of Isaiah. We find there that in Romans 9:27 Paul says “Isaiah also cries concerning Israel, though the number of the children of Israel be as the sand of the sea, a remnant shall be saved.” This is quoted from Isaiah 10:22, and then we find that two verses further he says, “And as Isaiah said before, 'except the Lord of Hosts had left us a seed, we should have been like Sodom and like Gomorrah’” and this is a quotation from the first chapter of Isaiah, as you probably recall Isaiah 1:9, so here are two quotations that he makes from the first part of Isaiah. Then in chapter 10, in verse 16, he says, “For they have not all obeyed the gospel, for Isaiah said, 'Lord who has believed our report.’” Here he quotes from the second part of Isaiah, using the same terminology, exactly, as he used quoting from the first part. And then four verses further on, in verse 20, he says, “but Isaiah is very bold.” He says, “I was found by them that sought me not; I was made manifest unto them that asked not after me,” and here he is quoting from chapter 65, verse 1, which is called "Third Isaiah." So here within two chapters, Paul quotes from the "First-Isaiah," the "Second-Isaiah," and the "Third-Isaiah," introducing them all with the word, “Isaiah says,” or “Isaiah is very bold when he says.” It's very plain that he’s not saying, "the book says," he’s saying, "the man says." He could have easily said, "First-Isaiah, or "Second," or "Third," or he could have side-stepped the question he could have simply said, "it's written in the book," or, "the prophet said," or "it's in the book of the prophets" or, "in the book of Isaiah." But the fact that he so specifically refers to all three parts as the work of Isaiah, to my mind, for a Christian, settles the matter that the book of Isaiah is one book written by one man, even though it is a difficult thing humanly speaking to believe that one man,
in the time in the Hezekiah, could look forward so specifically to events that would occur, situations that would occur 150 years later. It's as though God knew the question regarding Isaiah that would be raised today, and he inspired the Apostle Paul to write in such a way as to emphasize the fact that Isaiah has one author.

**An Important Change in Isaiah 40 [33:01]**

Now, Capital B, "An important change in Isaiah chapter forty." I’ve just been referring to that in number one: “In relation to the exile.” We did not, for the purpose of this class, make references to specific passages, but there are a good plenty that say that God is going to deliver Judah. He will take Judah home from Babylon. In the first part of Isaiah 39 he says they will go to Babylon as exiles, but that was a prediction; now he assumed them already there.

Going back to Number two, "the servant of the Lord," Well, we spent our last hours in seeing how the concept was developed. Israel cannot perish, because Israel has responsibility for this great work that must be done, and so Israel is the servant of the Lord. But in the fullest sense, the servant of the Lord is one who is from Israel who can represent Israel, but who is an individual and does the work of the Lord for the whole world and for Israel, also. So we looked at this that last week, the development of this concept, “the servant of the Lord.”

**Possibility of Prediction [34:24]**

But let's look at number three, "the possibility of prediction." When the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament came out, I found many excellent translations. I found a good flowing English, and on the whole, I was really very well pleased with it. The Old Testament RSV did not come out until about five years later, and I said, "the RSV New Testament strikes me in many ways as a wonderful translation, but when the Old Testament comes we’re going to have a very harmful book, because," I said, "Is it possible for a group of men who do not
believe in a miracle-working God, who do not believe in the necessity of salvation through Christ, who think of these as foolish ideas, to make a good translation?" Nevertheless, they were first class Greek scholars who could say, "here is what the apostles believed," and so they present, objectively on the whole, a good translation of the New Testament which is written in Greek. But when they combine it with the translation of the Old Testament, it is impossible for men with that viewpoint to think that writers in the Old Testament times could look forward five hundred or a thousand years and see Christ and predict His coming; and predict specific things about his birth and about his life; about his death; and his resurrection so therefore, these men, though they can objectively give a pretty decent translation of most of the New Testament, when it comes to the Old, they simply cannot believe that those things could happen. And therefore, they are bound to translate them in ridiculous ways.

When the Old Testament of the RSV came out, I immediately looked up the Messianic passages, and I found that where it says, “kiss the son lest ye be angry (Ps. 2),” they translated it by, if I recall correctly, “kiss the feet,” and then they had a footnote, "Hebrew is obscure," but the very same word they translated in another place as “the son.” It’s not the common word for “son” but in the other place they translated it “son.” And where Peter says that Jesus’ resurrection fulfilled the statement in Psalm 16, “thy holy one shall not see corruption,” the RSV translated it “he will not see the pit.” In the New Testament they translated it "corruption." They have a footnote referring to the Old Testament passage but in the Old Testament they translate it "pit." And where it says in Micah 5:2 "his going forth is from an eternity, from everlasting," they say "his genealogy is from way back." They get away from the Messianic interpretation because, naturally, not believing in a supernatural God, they can’t believe that people back then could predict the wonderful things about Christ; they can’t believe that, so in just about every case I found that the twisting they did was not in line with the actual study
of the Hebrew, although Messianic emphasis had plentiful evidence philologically.

**Two New Testament Passages that Address the Issue [38:21]**

But I was reminded of two clear passages in the New Testament. In I Peter 1:10-12 the apostle explicitly said, speaking about Christ, “of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently who prophesied of the grace that should come to you. Searching what or what manner of time the spirit of Christ, which was in them did signify. When he testified before him the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow.” So Peter said that the Old Testament prophets did predict things they didn’t fully understand. They predicted the suffering of Christ and the glory that should follow. Now that doesn’t mean we should be like some who find Christ on every page of the Old Testament and claim that everything in the Old Testament looked forward to the coming of the Savior. There is a great deal in the Old Testament about other subjects. But there are specific passages in almost every book of the OT in which the prophet looks forward to the coming of the Savior. And how much he understood of it I don’t know.

But there are these passages, the second of which is Luke 24:25, when Jesus talks with the disciples on the road to Emmaus, when they thought that Jesus' life was over, he said, “fools and slow of heart to believe all the prophets had spoken. Ought not Christ to have suffered these things and to enter into his glory.” And this shows very literally that God, through the Holy Spirit, enabled the Old Testament writers to see things they didn’t fully understand and to predict things in the future. And if this can be true about the coming of Christ, there’s no reason this can't be true about the exiled people. And there’s no reason, then why God could not enable Isaiah to put himself in the situation of those in exile, say that God would bring them back, and speak to people who were themselves imagining that situation.
Now that was the change in chapter forty, and very interestingly I noticed it once but I never heard it said, that just there are 39 books in the Old Testament and 27 in the New Testament, there’s 39 chapters in what the critics call "First-Isaiah" and 27 in what they call "Second-Isaiah". Now that’s one of the many coincidences in life, but it makes it easier to remember how Isaiah is divided.

**Change in Isaiah 56:9 [40:59]**

But now back to our outline. At chapter 56:9 there comes a change, not as important as the one in chapter 40, but let's say second in importance as that. And so I consider chapter 41-56:8 as one section, which I have written a book called “Isaiah sees the Savior,” discussing that section and ending at that particular point because it forms a definite unit.

And that is what the archbishop got so confused. He made his chapter division right in the middle of a chapter. But I think we have this important change at 56:9.

First, there is a greater similarity to earlier portions hereafter than before. Now there is a difference between what follows in the early part of Isaiah, but in some ways, from 56 on, it is more like the first 35 chapters of Isaiah than it is 40-56. Forty to fifty-six form a very definite union. And this is somewhat like the earlier setting. One most important reason I say this is because of the alternation of the section between blessings, and rebuke for sin, followed by blessing for those who appeal to God. That’s very common in many of the prophetic books, and it's common in the early part of Isaiah. It's common from here on, but practically not found at all between chapters 40-56.

Second, there is likelihood that the emphasis on the future continues for at least come extent. In other words, what do we find from 56:9 on? Does Isaiah,
after looking forward to deliverance from exile, look forward to the coming of the servant of the Lord; then come back to his own time and deal entirely with his own time? Does he, to some extent, come back to his own time? No, he still looks forward to the days after the exile. So in my mind there may be a good bit of proof that Isaiah does look forward to the situation of the Israelites after they return from exile. But it is hard to imagine this unless you believe that God led Isaiah to put himself in that future time and write in the first instance for people in his own day, who put themselves into that time because they knew it was true – were bound to be fulfilled – but in a way that would be even more helpful to people at a later date than Isaiah’s day, as is certainly the case from Isaiah 40 to 56.

Passages of Rebuke and Blessing [44:15]

Now, let's look at Roman numeral 11. There are passages of rebuke and blessing after 56 just like passages of rebuke and blessing we had at many points in the first part of Isaiah. We have practically nothing like that except for a very small extent from forty to 56. But now we have a succession of passages of rebuke and blessing. I gave you an assignment early in the semester to look at chapters 56 and 57, and I believe that all of you know that between 56:8 and 9 there was a very sharp break. But then from 56:8 for quite a distance – is all rebuke of sin – and then there’s a section that is all questions to God’s people. I begin this section with letter A: – "Rebuke against the watchmen and the leaders of the people." This is 56:9 through 57:13. In this section here we have three alternates. We have a rebuke, a blessing; a rebuke, a blessing; and then the rebuke and then a looking forward to the wonderful things God going to do. We have a long section that is made up of this triple alternation. The first part is this rebuke against the watchmen and the leaders of the people from 56:9 to 57:13a. And in my notes here
I have indicated a number of comments on individual verses there, which I think will be helpful and edifying, but are, perhaps, not as important to us now as some of the comments I make later on.

I will call your attention to a few of those matters which are in this section. Verse 8 ends the previous section, “The Lord God who gathers the outcasts of Israel says, ‘yet will I gather others besides those that are already gathered to Him.’” That ended that section. The previous verse, verse 7 has "my house shall be called a house of prayer." Now probably the Archbishop was mislead in marking the verses by the fact that after saying they’re going to be gathered, the next verse says, “All ye beasts of the field come to devour.” Here there’s a gathering of people and then there’s a coming of animals. But actually there’s such a complete difference between the preceding and following thoughts that I think there should be a complete new start here in verse 9. But then he goes on to inform us why the beasts of the field are called to devour. Why is God calling for vengeance on the people? Because the watchmen are blind; they’re ignorant; they’re all dumb dogs. They cannot bark; they're sleepy, lying down, loving to slumber. Somebody once said that the D.D. for "Doctor of Divinity," often means "dumb dog." And of course that is true in areas where you have modernism coming in and where a man really believes the Bible, but keeps quiet for fear of not getting the D.D.

**Slothful Watchmen [47:41]**

The Lord goes on to say his watchman are not calling people's attention to sin. I read a book just a couple of days ago by a great Christian leader who died a couple years ago, and in this book he speaks in most glowing terms of his years in a Christian college, some forty or 50 years ago, and he tells about his wonderful times there and how much this college meant to him, and all that. He is a man who has written books showing the terrible fruit of modernism of our day, but he
doesn’t give even a suggestion in his book of the fact of that college, which was then a good Christian college, within 20 years after he graduated from it, it became a place that tore down people’s faith. I met a young fellow who went to it thoroughly believing in the Bible, wishing to make his life count for Christ, and when he graduated from that so-called Christian college, his mind was full of doubts and he was very much upset and didn’t know what he believed in. Then he went to a seminary that was quite modernistic and when he came out of that he didn’t believe anything about God; he was completely changed by that previous college. Well now, this man doesn’t put a single word in about the danger of it. And there are people who love that man’s wonderful preaching. They love some of his great stands for the Lord, but they can read his book and say, “Oh, that’s were I want my son to go to college.” I would far go to an atheistic college than a college that has all forms of piety and all the right terminology, and yet is destroying people's faith. I would say to that extent he is one described here, “they are blind and ignorant as dumb dogs; they cannot bark, sleeping, lying down, and loving to slumber.” And so these watchmen are called slothful, lying down, loving to sleep like slumbering dogs. They are called selfish, greedy dogs who can never have enough. They are called sensual. Note verse 12, “Come all, they say, fetch us wine; we will fetch ourselves strong drinks.” Their selfishness is again stressed in the next 2 verses and then verses 3 and 4 again stress their selfishness, and idolatry, and so on. But we better not glance today at the blessing to the men of faith in 57:13b to 19. And I believe I have given the assignment, so we better close today so you won’t be late to your next class.
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I’d like to mention the assignment; I thought of writing it out but I don’t think it’s necessary. It’s not very complicated, though it may sound so. It deals with a prayer. This prayer ends at the end of Isaiah 64. It includes at least five verses of the previous chapter, 63. So long as you include at least five verses of the previous chapter, I don’t care whether you go further back or not, but I want you to answer three questions. Number one, what is the purpose of the prayer? That is, what is petition being made for? What are they asking? So what is the purpose of the prayer is number one. Number two, on what grounds is this petition being made? What are the reasons? Suppose you ask your father to give you an auto for Christmas, and you say reason number one is "you’re my father and you owe it to me." Number two, "I’ve been a good boy all year." Number three, "I promise not to get into any accidents with it." Now, what are the reasons for the petition that is made in Isaiah? What grounds are given? And number three, what evidence is there in the prayer of sincere repentance and determination to turn away from sin? I repeat, what evidence is there in the prayer of sincere repentance and determination to turn away from sin? Now a person might conceivably spend several hours on this, but there’s no need of it. Try to answer the first question in one sentence. I would like you to spend an hour reviewing the material we’ve covered in class. So, I do not intend the assignment necessarily to take more than an hour. If you spend an hour on it, I will be satisfied, but if you feel like spending more, that’s up to you. You notice I’m not asking you to do any commentary work on this, I’m asking you to read it for yourself and get the
answers to these questions. Of course if you want to consult a commentary for any particular verse or anything, I have no objections.

It is quite obvious as you look at the latter part of chapter 64 that it is a prayer that is being given. This prayer starts at least five verses before the beginning of chapter 64; that is, chapter 63:15-19. Now, you may think it starts further back than that. I don’t care whether you think so or not. I want whatever you think is the prayer. I think it includes at least all of 64 and the five verses immediately preceding. That is a prayer to the Lord. What are they asking for? On what grounds are they asking for it? And what are the evidences of sincere repentance and determination to turn away from sin and be faithful to the Lord in the future?

Watchmen in Isaiah 56:9 [3:38]

Now, I had a question turned in to me last time at the end of the hour. Just what is meant by the “watchmen” in the passage we were just speaking of in chapter 56, starting at verse 9? This was capital A under 11 in the outline, “Rebuke against the watchmen and the leaders of the people.” The term “watchmen” as used here in the context means those who have responsibility, not only for themselves, but for others. Naturally, the leaders of the people, the priests, the prophets, the kings, the rulers, they were watchmen in a very special sense because they were appointed to watch over the well-being of the nation, and so they are the ones here who are called the “watchmen”. The message has equal importance for us today because today, because we trust that all of you will someday be in a position where you are expected to be watching over the welfare of the people in your congregation or in the group to which you minister. You will be a watchman for them to show them how to avoid evil, to guide them away from that which would destroy their lives, and to lead them toward the Lord. But there is a sense in which every Christian is a watchman, because God has not given the oversight of Christians only to those who were set apart for this, for
everyone of us has a duty, regardless of how he earns his living. If he’s a true Christian, he has a duty to try to lead other people into the fold of Christ and a duty to help others. And so this rebuke against the watchmen and the leaders of the people, which runs from 56:9 to 57:13, deals particularly with the leaders but has a relevancy to all.

**Rebuke and Blessing Passages [5:38]**

We are now dealing with Roman numeral eleven, a succession of passages of rebuke and blessing. You find such successions like this moving from rebuke to blessing in most of the prophets. You find it in earlier parts of Isaiah but not in the section after chapter forty until you get to here. You find very little rebuke in that section where he is comforting the exiles, promising them that he will bring them safely back to the land of Israel, and showing how the cure for exile must be more than just bringing them back. They need to have the sin problem dealt with and the servant of the Lord is to be sent to bear on the cross the sins of all who will believe on his name.

So we have a difference now after the beginning of this section, 56:9; quite a marked difference, in fact, from what immediately preceded it. And as I mentioned last time, this has a greater similarity to earlier portions of Isaiah, and yet you will probably notice, as I have numbered number two on the board, that future emphasis continues at least to some extent. That is, Isaiah is speaking to his own people in his own time, but not exclusively to them. It may even be that God particularly has in mind these people after the exile, when they return to their land, and when there is a tendency after a time to become careless and selfish. And so he speaks here in these verses about the watchmen. He reproves them for being slothful. In verses one and two of chapter 57, he reproves them for being selfish. In verses three and four he reproves them for being sensuous. In verses four to nine he points to the terrible danger of idolatry again; they’re falling into putting
other things ahead of the Lord. In verse ten he speaks of the fact that their failure as watchmen results in their becoming wearied, becoming unhappy; and yet they are not turning to the Lord for the help that he is ready to give them. And he stresses how they turn to human resources instead of to God.

Our tendency is to put all our emphasis on the wonderful blessings through Christ that are available and certainly that should be our main emphasis. But there also is needed an emphasis on the nature of sin. That is needed, and these Old Testament passages have great relevancy to our own day, even though addressed originally to the people of Israel. There’s much in this section that we could look at at length, but there are other matters later on in Isaiah that I must get through this semester.

Rebuke in Isaiah 57:13 [8:43]

So I’m going to hurry through this section and call your attention to the fact that the transition from this section to the next comes in the middle of a verse; It is in verse thirteen. In verse thirteen we read, “When thou criest let thy company deliver thee. But the wind shall carry them away; vanity shall take them.” That is an important part of the rebuke. Their own resources will be insufficient for their protection. But the last half of the verse says, “but he that puts his trust in me shall possess the land and shall inherit my holy mountain and shall say ‘cast ye up, cast ye up, prepare the way, take up the stumbling block out of the way of my people’.” So, from there on, for a section, he is dealing with blessing to those true to him. And so verse thirteen might seem to flow smoothly at first with part of the same idea as in the previous verses, but there is a change in the middle that runs through several subsequent verses. And these changes, thus, seem, in this section, quite gradual, and yet actually they’re rather sudden, and they often come in the middle of a verse. There’ll be several verses before you that are rebuke and several verses after that are blessings.
Now, there are various ways in which one may attempt to divide up the Scripture. We have to see what ways will work out in particular patterns and I have found that in prophetic scriptures, in many places, the easiest division is between passages of rebuke and passages of blessing. I have found this often very helpful in seeing the changes in the general approach that the prophet takes. Here, in 57:13 he turns his attention away: his attention has been for about twenty verses on the watchmen and the leaders who were unfaithful to God. Now he turns it away to the men of faith and so he gives blessings to the men of faith in the next few verses, 57:13b to 19. There he speaks about, in contrast, the situation of those who do not follow the Lord truly.

These who do follow the Lord are described in the beginning of verse 13 as the ones who put their trust in God and who say, “cast up, cast up, prepare the way”. Now this word, “cast up” doesn’t make much sense to us today, we would say, “build up”. In making a road, the usual way was to take dirt and rocks and put them down and smooth them off until the road was built up higher than what was around. The road must actually be higher than what was around because otherwise the water would run into it and would soon wreck it. And so this term was used, was definitely used in old English, “cast up”, in casting up the materials to build a road. It is used of building roads and building highways. And these are the people who are preparing the way for others to go in accordance with God’s desire, and the road builders are taking stumbling blocks out of their way.

Promises in Isaiah 57:15 [12:30]

And so the Lord gives them these wonderful promises. He says in 57:15, “I dwell in the high and holy place and with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit”. And verse 16, “I will not contend forever, neither will I always be angry, for the spirit would fail before me and the souls which I have made”. The Lord recognizes that these who are faithful are not perfect by any means. They are
people who are trying to serve Him, trying to seek His way, trying to find the true meaning of what Isaiah has given about the Servant of the Lord and how He will give Himself as a ransom for many; and he says, “The spirit would fail before me if you were to try to find salvation by your works of righteousness”. It is impossible. But those who are contrite and humble and try to follow the Lord and put their faith in the redemption that He provides, He says that these He will revive and He will help.

Now, in verse 17 he points back to their sin; but back to it, not to rebuke them, but to show how He has brought them out of it. “For the iniquity of his covetousness I was angry and smote him. I hid and was angry, and he went on frowardly in the way of his heart”. Good old English word “frowardly.” I’m not sure what it does mean in modern English [note: It means "disobediently"]. But it’s one of those words that has disappeared from our language, which I don’t think will do a fraction of the harm that the words that have changed their meaning do. You strike a word "frowardly," or the words of that type, and you don’t know what that means, it’s just blank. But when you strike a word that we use today, like, when you say, “take no thought for the morrow”. Of course, that’s absurd, “take no thought for the morrow.” The Lord definitely wants us to take thought, but what He means is do not take an anxious thought. It means, "don’t be upset about tomorrow." He certainly wants us to plan. So, it’s these words that are changed a little in their meaning that are the main reason why we need the Bible in our own language today. Here's another example: "I do you to wit"; nobody would have any idea in the world what that meant today if they did not go on to read the context. By the way, "I do you to wit," means, "I would like you to know." But getting back to our discussion, this section goes through verse 18 and I wish the archbishop had made the end of the chapter at the end of verse 18 instead of verse 21.
Verse 18 reads, “I have seen his ways and will heal him. I will lead him also and restore comfort unto him and his mourners. I create the fruit of the lips, peace peace to him that is far off and to him that is near, says the Lord, and I will heal him.” This is our first alternation. In this passage we see the change from rebuke to blessing.

Rebuke against Wickedness and Insincere Formalism [16:52]

Then we go on to the next part of the outline, C: “Rebuke against wickedness and especially against insincere formalism.” This is 57:20 to 58:5. Again, we have a connection between the last word of this chapter 57, and the first of the next, 58. This is telling how God brings peace to those who are distant and to those who are near, but who put their trust in the Servant of the Lord and look to him for redemption.

He says, "I will heal him," but in contrast, “The wicked are like the troubled sea when it cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt. There is no peace, says my God, to the wicked. Cry aloud, spare not, lift up your voice like a trumpet, and show my people their transgression and house of Jacob their sin.”

This phrase, “there is no peace says my God to the wicked,” occurs at the end of two chapters, namely, here in chapter 57 and at the end of chapter 48. That is the way the arch bishop divided the chapters, and some people say the last part of Isaiah can be divided into three parts because two chapters end with this particular verse and the book, as a whole, ends with reference to God’s punishment of the wicked. Mere similarity in words, however, is not the way to divide a literary work and to see what its natural divisions are. We must go by the thought and not simply by the repetition of the words.

Very often a writer will use a repetition of words to show a division. I believe Micah starts each of his three main divisions with the words, “Hear ye,” and he put that in to note and to call attention to the divisions. A writer might
conceivably, as has been suggested, put a verse at the end of each section that is similar to show that this is the end. He might; however, I don’t believe it is nearly so likely; but in either case, it is the content, not a superficial designation of similar words that we should use. If the context really shows the proper division, then it is interesting to see if the writer has put in an indication. In this case in chapter 57, he has not, but he continues right on from speaking of the peace God gives to the righteous to turning to the wicked and starting the second of these alternations: “The wicked are like the troubled sea when it cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt. There is no peace, says my God, to the wicked. Cry aloud spare not, lift up your voice like a trumpet, and show my people their transgression and the house of Jacob their sin.” And so this runs through the fifth verse of the next chapter. Notice how I have combined the last verse in chapter 57 and the first verse in chapter 58, for I believe they form one unit and should not be divided by the chapter. And immediately we find here, as I have noted in the outline, “insincere formalism.” “The people”, he says in verse two, “they seek me daily; they delight to know my ways.” He doesn’t mean they really delight to follow the Lord. It is obvious in the context that he means they are using all the formalism of being his people, for Isaiah continues in verse 2, "as if they were like a nation that did righteousness and didn’t forsake the ordinance of their God; as if they ask of me the ordinance of justice, they take delight in God." They take all the forms of religion. And then they say in verse three: “Why have we fasted,” they say, "and you don’t see it? Why don’t you pay attention?" And the Lord's answer is: “Behold, in the day of your fast you find pleasure and oppress all your workers. Behold, you fast for strife and debate and to smite with the fist of the wicked. You shall not fast as you do this day to make your voice to be heard on high.” So here they are fasting in order to observe outwardly the ordinances the Lord gives. They are as Christ preached about the Pharisees, praying in the street corners. They are showing how pious they are but actually in their lives, they are not at all. Jesus said, "when you fast, go into your chamber and when you pray do
it secretly before God, and God who sees in secret will reward you openly." Here
Isaiah says, “Is it such a fast I have chosen? A day for a man to afflict his soul to
bow down his head like a reed and to spread sackcloth and ashes under him? Will
you call this a fast and an acceptable day to the Lord?” And so we have God's
rebuke against wickedness and especially against insincere formalism.

But now He turns to his blessing on sincere believers in verses 58:6 to 59:1.
Again, the chapter divisions were not so well put in. And again, the transition is
very gentle, so you hardly notice it unless you have in mind this alternation that
keeps taking place.

**Blessings on Sincere Believers [23:34]**

So let's move on to His blessing on sincere believers from 58:6 to 59:1. Here He shows how true devotion to God requires honesty and compassion. In
verses 6 and 7 we read, “Is this not the fast that I have chosen, to loosen the bands
of wickedness, to undo the heavy burden, to let the oppressed go free, and to break
every yoke? Is it not to deal your bread to the hungry, and bring the poor, that are
cast out, into your house; when you see the naked, to cover them and not to hide
yourself from your own flesh?” Here is the kind of fast He desires: the kind of
fast that shows itself as true humanitarian and Christian activity. And he continues
in verse 8, "Then shall your light break forth as the morning and your health will
spring forth speedily." This word “health” is a good example of what I would say
is a slight change in meaning between how the word was used in the KJV and
now. Today, when we say "health," we mean the condition you are in. But in the
old English health could include the idea of the change from poor health to good
health. So in modern English “healing” is a more accurate translation, and the
verse would read, “your healing will spring forth speedily and your righteousness
will go before you. The glory of the Lord will be” as the KJV says, "your
rereward," spelled REREWARD, which makes it look like "re-reward.” This old
English word "rereward" is very puzzling to the average reader of the scripture. We spell "rear," R E A R, but in old English it was spelled R E R E. So what the verse says is, “The glory of the Lord will be your 'rear-ward,' or 'rear guard.'” He continues in verse 9, "then you will call and the Lord will answer. And you will cry and He will say, 'here I am.'" If you turn away from these various wicked things he mentions and draw your soul to the hungry and satisfy the afflicted soul, then your life will rise in a pure light and darkness will be like the noonday. And the Lord will guide you continually. Wonderful blessings here are given to those who sincerely try to follow the Lord. These blessings are offered to the people in Isaiah day, but they are blessings that would be very, very appropriate for the people after they return from exile, and blessings that any believer in the Lord has the right to appropriate to himself, and to know that God will bring him wonderful things in his life.

Jumping to verse 13, "If you turn away your foot from the Sabbath from doing your pleasure on my holy day and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable, then you will take delight in the Lord, etc." God made us in such a way that we need one day of rest in seven. And there are many a ministers that break the Sabbath by working harder on Sunday than on any other day and then working equally hard through the remaining six days of the week. A minister cannot take his day of rest as Sunday, which is the busiest day, but he should take another day of rest. And many ministers take Monday as their day to get rest, except for matters of emergency, and to get completely away from their regular work. And if they do, they live longer and accomplish more in the end. God has made us this way that we need just one day of rest in seven. And of course, he wants all our life to take the Sabbath in the sense that all of our life we devote to Him, but it is good to take a certain special time that we devote particularly to serving him. And there are these two features on the Sabbath: There is service, and there is the rest that everyone needs and that God intends us to have.
Continuing in verse 13 He says, "If you honor him, not giving into your own ways, nor finding your own places, nor speaking your own words, then you will delight yourself in the Lord and He will cause you to ride on the high places of the earth and feed you with the heritage of Jacob your father, for the mouth of the Lord has spoken. Behold the Lord’s hand is not shortened that He cannot save you, nor His ear heavy that he cannot hear." This section of blessing includes the first verse of chapter fifty nine. But again, the transition from this context of blessing to the next section of rebuke comes gradually.

Here we read that the Lord’s hand is not shortened nor His ear so heavy that he can’t hear, but as it says in 59:2, "your inequities have separated you and your God." So we have the start the next section, which is a picture of rebuke that I have called, “a picture of a transgressor,” because it is not so much directly rebuking as it is describing, but the impact of it is just the same. We can naturally divide this section of chapter 59:2-15: The first part of it is inequity described in verses two to 8c. That is, “Your inequities have separated you from your God.” He goes on, “none calls for justice, they weave the spiders' webs, ... they cover themselves with their work, their works of worth are iniquity; their feet run to evil, they make haste to shed innocent blood.” He continues through verse eight, “the way of peace they do not know. There’s no judgment in their ways, they have made them crooked paths.” Up to this point he has been describing the inequity of those who have turned away from the Lord. But then the last fourth of this eighth verse begins to speak of the result. “Whoever goes in these paths, these crooked paths that the wicked make shall not know peace. Therefore his judgment is far from us neither does judgment overtake us. We wait for light but behold obscurity.” Then he describes the result, largely in the first person. Here their transgression from verse 8b to 15a. “Our transgressions are multiplied, our sins testify against us our transgressions are before us in transgressing and lying against the Lord. Departing away from our God, speaking oppression and revolt;
and judgment is turned away backwards, and justice stands far off. For truth has fallen in the street and equity cannot enter. Yet, truth fails and he that departs from evil makes himself afraid.”

Now the first half of verse fifteen definitely is, in this picture of the transgressor, giving the result of the transgression. As to whether the division should be made in the middle of verse fifteen or at the end of the verse, one may argue. I don’t think it is tremendously important. I have made it here at the beginning.

**A Long Picture of Future Divine Activity [32:53]**

We go on there to the next point: “A long picture of future divine activity.” Here we have had rebuke for about twenty verses, then blessing of about fifteen verses, and then rebuke for about 10 or 15 verses, and then blessing for a few verses, and then here rebuke for about fifteen verses. Now we have a section that can be considered as the sixth of these alternations, but that runs much longer than any of the others. I have called it "a long picture of divine activity" and it starts at 59:15b. Now, someone might argue against starting here, but wherever one starts, the section runs from there, I believe, to 63:6. This is a long picture of future divine activity and completes this triple cycle of alternation. I was going to put this section under Roman numeral 11, but I thought it wise to give it a section to itself. And so I’m making it Roman numeral 12: "The long picture of divine activity: Isaiah 59:15b thru 63:6." And under that, capital “A” is “God’s sovereign interposition to overthrow His adversaries.” I gave you an assignment a couple of weeks ago in which I gave you a sheet of paper with a passage from Isaiah 59 on one side of the page and a passage from Isaiah 62 to 63 on the other side, and asked you to note parallels. And I believe you all noticed that the last two verses in what I had on one side of the page was very close to the two verses rather near the beginning on the other side. You also noticed that there was a large
group of statements that were, say, toward the bottom part of the first side that correspond to the first part of the other side. I believe all the papers noticed that. Some noticed many similarities, some noticed few.

Well, I took the passage from 59:15b-19a, which was on the first page, and I wrote those verses, in order, on the left side of the sheet and after each verse I put the parallel verses from the other side correlating both sides except that from 59:15b, which might be considered an introduction to this section; and that’s why I say before that if you want to consider 59:15b as part of the previous section, I certainly have no objection. But I don’t know anywhere in Scripture where you would have within a few chapters, two passages that are quite as similar as these are. And so I gave you that assignment in order that you might see the very remarkable similarity between two passages, which are quite extraordinary passages. There’s very little that really is quite as identical with either of these passages anywhere in Scripture, but they are very, very close to one another. And last week I mentioned in the class that I had typed these passages up, and had them copied, and that they were here on my desk and you could take copies at the end of the hour. I want to look at these sheets with you now, but I’d like you to have them in front of you as we look at these two passages, which have this very remarkable similarity. And I think that the content can be pretty well summarized in the title I gave it, “God’s Sovereign interposition to overthrow His adversaries.”

Now it seems to me that the last two clauses in verse 15c and d serve as an introduction to the whole of what follows. But you might find parallels between this and some of the other verses, but I put these two clauses alone at the top. They read, “And the Lord saw it, and it displeased him that there was no judgment.” Continuing in 16a we have this statement, “and he saw there was no man and wondered that there was no intercessor.” Proceeding to chapter 63 verses 3a and b we read, “I have trodden the winepress alone, and of the people there is
none with me.” Certainly this is a striking similarity and 63:5a “I looked, and there was none to help, and I wondered and there was none to uphold.”

Then going right back to chapter 59 verse 1b, c, which I have starting on the left side of the page, "therefore his arm brought salvation unto him." Then back to chapter 63, the big difference is that in chapter 63 the first person is used instead of the third person as in chapter 59. In 63:1 he says, “I that speak in righteousness, mighty to save.” That is even closer to 63:5c, “therefore mine own arm brought salvation,” and this is almost identical to 59:16, “therefore his arm brought salvation.” And then the next part of verse 16 in chapter 59, that His righteousness sustains him, parallels 63:1, “I that speak in righteousness, mighty to save.” Then 59:17 we read, “then he put on righteousness as a breastplate, and the helmet of salvation on his head, and the garments of vengeance for clothing, and clad with zeal as a cloke.” And this emphasis on clothing parallels very closely with the beginning of chapter 63.

To wit: “Who is this who comes from Edom with dyed garments from Bosrah? Who is this robed in splendor, and traveling in the greatness of his strength”? And then verse 2, “wherefore are you red in your apparel and garments like him who treadeth in the winepress?” And also verses 3 and 4, “and their blood shall be sprinkled upon my garments and I will stain all my raiments, for the day of vengeance is in my heart”.

Back to 59:18 we read, “According to their deeds, accordingly he will repay. Fury to his adversaries, recompense to his enemies, to the islands he will pay recompense.” The parallel in 63:3 is, “For I will tread them in my anger and trample them in my fury, and their blood will be sprinkled on my garments.” A further parallel is 63:5, “I will tread down the people in my anger and make them drunk in my fury and bring down their strength to the earth.”
Then 59:19a, “So shall they fear the name of the Lord from the west and His glory from the rising of the sun.” This last verse, some say, perhaps parallels 63: 1a, which says, “Who is this who comes from Edom with dyed garments from Bosrah.” Some see a parallel in these verses because Edom and Bosrah, a city of Edom, are to the east of Israel where the sun comes up. So we have this passage of Isaiah 63, which in the Encyclopedia Biblica describes as "a very beautiful but aesthetically disgusting picture," or something like that. This modernistic author thinks this scene violent, as he calls it. But it is very striking to find in chapter 59 declaring how the Lord is going to come in vengeance and in chapter 63 giving a picturesque image of how he is coming. The ideas of both passages are so closely parallel. And that being the case, it seems to me that it provides strong evidence for considering that these passages form one unit of a long picture of divine activity beginning and ending with this almost identical activity of God’s sovereign interposition to overthrow his adversaries.

Isaiah 59:20 [43:18]

Then it is very interesting to note that in chapter 59 verse 20, this is immediately followed by the declaration that “a redeemer comes to Zion.” And that chapter 63 is immediately preceded by the statement in 62:11 that “salvation comes to Zion.” Thus you have the beginning and ending of this long passage from chapter 59 to 63 being identical. And then you have just before one section and just after the other section the statement of two verses that again are almost identical. "Salvation comes to Zion" is not quite as identical as the previous parallels perhaps, but very close to “a redeemer comes to Zion.”

In chapter 59 I’m starting it with verse 19b. Here there might be an argument whether it should start with verse 20 or with 19b. I’ll start with 20 right now. "'The Redeemer shall come to Zion and unto them that turn from transgression in Jacob,' says the Lord." And in chapter 62 the two verses just
before that picture of judgment given in chapter 63, you have in verse 11 of chapter 62: “Behold the Lord has proclaimed unto the end of the world, say to the daughter of Zion, 'behold your salvation cometh, behold his reward is with him and his work before him.'"

The term “daughter” is used in the Scripture as a common term for the people. “Daughter of Zion” is just like we say, “France is not happy, she should be better treated.” Feminine pronouns in English are used for nations. The Bible often speaks of the “daughter of Zion” or the “daughter of Babylon,” meaning the people of the town.

In 59:20 you have, “the redeemer comes to Zion,” and the next verse, 59:21 continues, "And as for me, this is my covenant with them,' says the Lord. 'My spirit that is on thee and my word which I have put in thy mouth shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed,' saith the Lord, 'from henceforth and forever.'" The verse corresponding to this in chapter 62 is verse 12, "and they shall call them the holy people, the redeemed of the Lord, and thou shall be called 'sought out,' a 'city not forsaken.'" And you see the two verses 59:20 and 62:12 are very dissimilar in wording but very close in meaning. The continuing covenant that God will have with his people is seen in the phrase, “the redeemer comes to Zion” and the covenant continues because God will never go back on his promises that he has made.

Isaiah 62 and 59 Compared [46:53]

Now the end of chapter 62 we read, “Go through, Go through the gate." that is verse 10a. It continues, "Prepare the way of the people. Cast up, Cast up the highway gather out the stone. Lift up a standard for the people." And that can be put right together with verse 11 that speaks of the coming of the redeemer who comes to Zion. And whether 59:19b is parallel to 62:11 may be a question raised
particularly if you are using some modern version of the Bible. In the King James version, 59:19b says, “when the enemy will come in like a flood, the Spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against it.” There we have a standard lifted up, and the standard lifted up in 62:10 is, “lift up a standard for the people” I originally entitled this: “a banner is raised and a redeemer comes to Zion.” I shortened the title and left out “the banner” because there are those who object to the King James translation of 59:19b. And I cannot complain about their objecting to it, but I will say that I believe this translation can be as well defended as any translation that has been subsequently made.

I will read you what the NIV says for it 59:19b: “For he will come like a pent up flood that the breath of the Lord drives along.” Now if you have the King James Version in front of you, you might wonder how on earth could anyone translate it so utterly differently. I think, if I recall correctly, the NASB takes a position about halfway in between the two. It translates it, “For he will come like a rushing stream which the wind of the Lord drives.” It’s like the NIV. But it has a footnote opposite the word “rushing.” It says "literally, narrow." “Like a narrow stream which the wind of the Lord drives.” Now if you want to take either of these modern translations, there is not the same parallel between 59:19b and 62:11 as you find in the King James.

And when you see such a tremendous difference, a person naturally asks: "How can there be such a tremendous difference in the translation?" And the answer is that in every language there are words that are ambiguous. In English you look at the word “light.” And you don’t know whether it is the opposite of "dark" or the opposite "heavy." You have to guess it from context. And English is worse than any language I know of for having words that are ambiguous. So you have to get the translation from the context. Usually we have no difficulty getting it, but there are cases where you get two or three ambiguous words like that together and then you "are up against it" if there is no larger context that makes it
clear. And in this particular verse we have a succession of such words. For instance “when the enemy shall come in like a flood.” The Hebrew word “sar” is used a good many times for "enemy," but there is another word that looks exactly the same, which can mean “narrow.” And so, “when he shall come in like a river, its either an enemy or narrow, which can be an adjective describing the river. Adjectives usually follow nouns in Hebrew. Even so, do we have “when he shall come like a narrow river,” or “when an enemy shall come like a river?” Both translations are equally possible.

**Spirit of the Lord** [51:46]

And then the word “Spirit.” Do we have the phrase, "the Spirit of the Lord will lift up a banner against him,” or the phrase, “which the wind of the Lord drives?” Now, the word “spirit” is used before the word "Lord" in the New Testament over and over, and this is the case in the Old Testament a good many times, as well. So it seems to me more reasonable to take this here as the “Spirit of the Lord” than the “wind of the Lord.” I think the RSV and modern translations translate it as a “mighty wind.” I do not quite see that “the wind of the Lord” has relevance in this particular passage. It is unfortunate that in Hebrew this same word can mean either “spirit” or “wind” or “breath.” And it is used a good many times for two of these meanings: either as "wind" or as "spirit." It is translated as “spirit” 230 times in the Old Testament, “breath” 28 times, and “wind” 90 times. So you see that leaves you with a difficult choice to make. Now one place in the Old Testament where it says that, “The Lord will destroy antichrist with the breath of his mouth,” in the New Testament in the King James it says, “the Lord will destroy him [antichrist] with the spirit of his mouth” and you would think that breath would make more sense there. But in the New Testament the corresponding word “pneuma” is generally translated “spirit.” But there is one case where it is translated “life” and one case where it is translated "wind". And it seems to me the “breath of the mouth” makes more sense than “spirit of the
mouth” in this case. But you see you have that same ambiguity in this word in both the Hebrew and in the Greek. But I am inclined to take 59:19c as the “spirit of the Lord” rather than “a mighty wind” in that case.

So there is this ambiguity here—yes, and we have one other ambiguity: the phrase “to lift up a banner.” The word for "banner" occurs only once in the Old Testament. The word “banner,” “nays,” is very common, and to make a verb from it would not be all that unusual in Hebrew. So it could well mean to “lift up the banner,” but there is another word “noose,” which is similar to "nays," that means "to flee." So where they say, “the wind of the Lord drives,” they are taking this word, which means “to flee,” which is used in the causative here, and can be translated, “which the wind of the Lord makes to flee.” Now, you usually speak of people fleeing; you do not speak of water fleeing as in the rushing of a stream. So it does not seem to be impossible to make the translation from “noose” (flee), but it seems more likely to come from “nays,” to lift. It is a word that occurs only once. And then when you notice this parallel in 62:11, there it seems to me an added argument for thinking the King James translation is right in this case.

But in either case, you have God’s sovereign interposition to overthrow his adversaries beginning this long picture and ending it. And the beginning is followed by the declaration of the redeemer coming to Zion, and at the end of the passage it is preceded by the account of a redeemer coming to Zion, whether there is a banner raised or not. We’ll have to stop now.
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Assignment [0:0]

Before I continue with today’s lesson, I should mention the assignment for next time. We have been noticing these alternations of rebuke and blessing, and now we have come to this long passage of divine activity (59:19b-63:11), which comes as the second part of the third alternation of this particular series. The last chapter of Isaiah could easily be divided the same way, in sections of rebuke and blessing, but in the 65th chapter you will find that individual verses or even halves of verses go under one of these categories. And so the assignment for next time is to look at Isaiah 65, and in Isaiah 65 make a list of the sections, or the way, it alternates between what might be considered rebuke, or description of sin, or statement of the punishment for sin, or what might be considered as blessing, description of the righteous, or God’s blessing that he gives the righteous. Note these alternations as you have in other chapters we have studied. This chapter you will find is not made up of two long sections like other chapters; it will be made up of a lot of little short sections, perhaps even including half of a verse. This should not be a long assignment, but it will, I think, be helpful in preparation for our discussion of chapter 65. If you feel like looking at chapter 66, you will find that within two or three minutes you can see how it divides into large sections much like the many previous ones.

A Redeemer Comes to Zion [2:22]

Now we were speaking at the end of the hour about this section, "a redeemer comes to Zion," as I have given the title for it. I had thought of giving it a title of “a banner is raised and the redeemer comes to Zion.” But I shortened it because the greater part of it is dealing with the redeemer's coming to Zion in spite of the fact that in chapter 59 we have that half of verse 19, which the King James
Version translates with such a beautiful statement, "When the enemy comes in like a flood, the Spirit of the Lord will lift up a standard against him." I’ve heard that verse preached on. It is a beautiful statement, but all the recent translations translate it differently. But here is a case where I believe the King James translation is better than any of the recent translations. Now, I don’t say it’s enough better that the recent translation is wrong. I mentioned last time, this is one of those cases, which you find in any language, including in English statements at times where you have several ambiguous words in one verse. And here in this verse you have a word that is used rather commonly for "enemy," but that could also be considered to be from a root word that means "to be narrow," and therefore can be translated as an adjective modifying the word "river" rather than "the enemy."

**The Spirit of the Lord (4:01)**

And also you have in this verse the word “spirit.” Now the translation "Spirit of the Lord" seems a lot more reasonable than "breath of the Lord." I think “spirit” is more naturally used with "Lord." Now the word is also translated breath. Let me turn to the New American Standard and read Isaiah 59:19 to you exactly as it occurs there. It says, "For he will come like a rushing stream which the wind of the Lord drives." It’s hard to get much further away than, “When the enemy comes in like a flood the Spirit of the Lord will raise up a standard against him.” It’s hard to get much further away than that. But in that, the word "rushing," they say in the margin, literally means “narrow”, but the Hebrew word is practically never used to mean "narrow"; it’s used more often to mean “enemy”, so that is one of the ambiguities in this passage.

**He Causes to Flee [5:23]**

Now this word that they translate “rise”, which the King James translates “raise a banner”, is a word that occurs nowhere else in the Scripture. And so we have to decide what the word means by analogy if we have no other evidence for
its meaning. And most recent interpreters take it from a verb that means “to flee”, and since it’s in the positive, they say “He causes to flee.” Well that might fit with the idea of the Spirit of the Lord causing the enemy to flee, quite alright; but to say that “His glory comes in like a rushing stream which the wind of the Lord drives”, the word to “cause to flee” would not naturally mean drive, although it could be thought of that way, but it’s not a natural interpretation.

**Spirit [6:24]**

Now, it’s not of great importance in the sense that nothing critical hangs on which of the translations we take, but another interesting thing in connection with this verse is that word "spirit." In the Hebrew, it can mean “spirit” or “breath”, and the corresponding Greek word “pneuma” is also translated occasionally “breath” or “wind”, and is also often translated “Spirit”, and so that makes an ambiguity in the New Testament.

**Spirit/Wind [6:55]**

I was very much puzzled years ago with the third chapter of John where we read in verse eight, “the wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh and whither in goeth. So is everyone that is born of the Spirit.” I was talking with Dr. James O. Buswell a noted theologian, and I said, “It seems to me that this must be an incorrect translation, because it simply isn’t true.” The wind blows where it chooses and you don’t know where it comes from and where it’s going to? Why in the earliest days people could tell what direction the wind came from and they could see the wind blowing the trees off in the distance, blowing the branches and so on. It was easy to get an idea where the wind came from and where it goes to. And certainly in our day with our weather stations they can predict what the winds are out in the state of Washington that are apt to reach us a week later, and we don’t know exactly when they will reach us, yes, but we certainly can get a pretty good
general idea where the wind comes from and where it goes to. So the statement simply is not true as it stands in the King James Version. And the very same word which in verse eight is translated “the wind bloweth where it chooses”, in the same verse is translated in the end, "so is everyone that is born of the Spirit." Why don’t you say everyone was born of wind? Well if you’re going to translate the word “Spirit” in the last why not in the first? So I said to Dr. Buswell, who knows far, far more about the New Testament than I do, I said, “Why don’t you say ‘the Spirit blows where he chooses’, and you hear the sound of it, you see the result, the action of the Spirit, but you can’t tell where He comes from or where He goes, and so is everyone born of the Spirit.” And his rather contemptuous answer, after all who am I to speak about New Testament interpretation which he’s done far more work in than I have, led me to think that I had better keep out of the book of John as far as new ideas are concerned. So about fifteen years later, fifteen or twenty years after I had made that suggestion to Dr. Buswell, I happened to be looking at this Zondervan Pictorial Bible Dictionary, for which I wrote the article on creation, and I noticed in it the end of the article on Spirit which was signed by J. Oliver Buswell, and in this article on Spirit, he says “The same Hebrew and Greek words translated ‘Spirit’ can also mean ‘wind’ or ‘breath’, and in at least one passage, John 3:8, this interpretation is doubtful.”

In at least one passage, John 3:8, this interpretation is doubtful but the verse would much better be translated, “the Spirit breathes where he chooses”. So, I was glad to see the result of my skepticism worked over by a New Testament man and finding the expression here. I fear that none of the new translations have read the Buswell article and in part, as far as I know, they all still say "wind." I think it’s a good example—the fact that when we find a scientific error in the Scripture, one of two things is probably true. It is probably either a mistranslation, or it deals with something that science has not yet fully understood. The translation may contradict a scientific theory of today that will be given up in the future, or may represent something that will be discovered by science later on. Now that’s not
directly related to our matter here, but I was very interested in making a connection with it in the New Testament.

**Cause to Flee [11:29]**

Now, back to Isaiah 59:19. This word that so many translations now render “cause to flee” is only so rendered here. In other places this word is rendered "drive." And I don’t think that’s right for “cause to flee”. I don’t think it’s the proper rendering of the word, for this form of the word is not used ordinarily with the word “flee”. It is possible here that this word could be derived from the word “banner”. And being a banner is a very good guess, like the King James text, but I wouldn’t be dogmatic between the two. We can, however, be absolutely certain that Isaiah 59:19b-21 and 62:10-12 deal with the subject, “A Redeemer Comes to Zion”, whether it also has included in it the raising of the banner by the Spirit.

**Millennial Blessings [12:39]**

Then as we move on from that passage in Isaiah 59, or as we come back from the passage in Isaiah 62, we come to a section, or another two sections, which for want of better title, I have entitled “Millennial Blessings”. Now these are two fairly long passages, Isaiah 60:1-20 and Isaiah 61:4-62:9. And these two passages are not passages on which we can build the doctrine of a millennium. But these two long sections deal entirely with blessing. They are pictures of ways that God is going to bless His people in the future. Neither of them is a passage upon which we can ground our belief that there is to be a millennium upon this earth. I believe that that belief is securely grounded in Micah 4, Isaiah 2 and Isaiah 11. Those three passages teach, absolutely plainly, that there is to be a sizable period upon this very earth when there will be freedom from external danger.
Freedom from External Danger [13:53]

Now having, I believe, proved it from those passages and gained information as to when it is to come (and there is a certain amount of further detail from Revelation 20), having done so, we are justified in asking the question, "Do these two passages deal with that period?" And when we look at these two passages we find a few verses in them that fit very positively in with that idea. I don't say they do prove it, but they very positively fit into it. One of them is chapter 60, verse 18, where we read, "violence shall no more be heard in thy land, wasting nor destruction within thy borders". Now this has a theme of "freedom from external danger"—that was brought to this country, in one way, when the pilgrims came over in the early 1700's and introduced a Christian civilization in this country. And when Charles Dickens came here, in about the 1845 or 50, somewhere around then, though he detested the United States on his first visit, and contemptuously refused the invitation of the president of the United States to have dinner in the White House, and wrote a book, which caused great anger in the United States in which he criticized so much about this country after he returned to England; yet this same Charles Dickens said that a woman could walk at any part of the United States at any time of day or night without any danger of molestation. Now, that's a tremendous statement. I wouldn't make that statement about any of our states today, and for some, I wouldn't even make about the daytime.

But this safety was a result of the Christian background and the Christian teaching that the pilgrims brought to this country. But of course, you can't say there was no violence when they were here because they had the Indians around who every now and then would bring their men and scalp many people, but places with a Christian environment have had a tremendous decrease in violence, but never for a period of much more than two or three centuries has this been fulfilled in any country of the world.

Now this verse 18 in chapter 60 just says, "thy land," but those passages in Isaiah 11, for instance, speak of the whole earth being full of the knowledge of the
Lord as the water covers the sea. The universality of this condition would be hard to prove from this text in Isaiah 60. The two passages in Isaiah 11 and Micah 4 have a certain emphasis on the long continuum of the situation. Their great emphasis is on the prominence of Jerusalem during the period of which he speaks, on the freedom from invaders from other lands, the great honor that will be given to it, and the general blessing of the LORD. So, if you are already convinced of the millennium from other sources, you can get added information about it, perhaps, from Isaiah 60:18. I wouldn't want to be too dogmatic about that because there is no great time in the past on the universality or on the permanence of this peaceful condition.

But I want us to remember that as the prophet looks forward to the future, he often sees things rather telescoped together, in a sense. I often used the figure of the person looking at a range of hills. You see something on the near hill and then next to it may be something that is on the fourth range back, and the second and third ranges may look like they are part of the near one. Often it is hard to distinguish between ranges. And so the prophet may be here looking forward to various periods of the Lord's blessings in the future. Certainly it would be interesting to look at these passages in detail, but the semester comes to a close earlier than it used to, and we will have to forego that because we want to cover some very interesting things ahead.

The Millennium in Isa 2; Micah 4, Revelation 20 [18:38]

Did you have a question? (Student's question about the millennium). Well, I would say that Isaiah 2 and Micah 4 definitely show that there will be an earthly kingdom, an earthly period, you could debate, a period in which there will be complete freedom from external violence, and a period that will last for a long time. Now, this kind of earthly peace has given to our language the word "millennium." The word "millennium," also used in secular writing, refers to that kind of period, a period of complete peace and general well-being. The word itself,
of course, means “thousand years” and that is taken from the fact that six times in Revelation 20 the phrase “thousand years” is used of a time when Satan will be gone. The universality of this period is very clear in Isaiah 11 and 2 and Micah 4. So these may not be the clearest passages dealing with the millennium at all, and I would not be dogmatic at how large a part of them deal with the millennium, but every bit of these passages deal with the great blessings that God is going to give in the future. So I think "millennial blessings" is not erroneous for a title for it.

**The Messiah's Mission (Isa 61:1-3) [20:19]**

And then we have the Messiah's mission in Isaiah 61:1-3. It's only three verses, but it gives the distinctive nature of the Messiah. The first verse is very similar to previous statements about the servant of the Lord seen in Isaiah 11:2, 42:1, 49:8, and 54:5. You have those passages; those passages are very closely related to the beginning of 61:1-3. You remember these verses were read by our Lord as described in Luke 4; they were read by him in the synagogue in Nazareth. “The spirit of the Lord God is upon me,” and in these other passages we find much reference to the Spirit of God resting upon him. “It is upon me because the Lord has anointed me to preach good tidings to the meek,” (Luke 4:18). You notice it says right there "to bring good tidings," not "to bring a time of happiness" but "to preach good tidings." But Jesus did not quote the entire passage from Isaiah 61:1-3. But we continue in Isaiah 61: "He has sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prisons of those who are bound, to proclaim the year of favor of the Lord and the day of vengeance of our God." I mention here that this phrase, "the day of the vengeance of our God" was not read by Jesus. But we continue: "to comfort those all that mourn, and to proclaim liberty to the captive and the opening of the prison to those who are bound. To appoint unto those that mourn and Zion, to give them beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness that they might be called trees of righteousness, the planting of the Lord that He might
be glorified.” Our Lord read the first half of this passage as it is described there in Luke. And he closed the book and said, "today you have seen this that was spoken of fulfilled." He did not say today all captives are being given liberty. He didn’t say today all of the broken hearted are being bound up. He did not say that. He said “the Lord has anointed me to preach to you,” and this was the beginning of his preaching ministry.

**The First and Second Comings of Christ [23:24]**

Now, the statement is sometimes made of the fact that the Lord suspended the reading of this passage from Isaiah 61 in the middle of verse 2. He quoted, "to proclaim the acceptable year of our Lord," but didn’t go on to quote, "the day of vengeance." Some say this shows that the passage up to this point deals with the first coming of Christ and from there on it deals with His second coming. I think that is a guess that is without foundation. I would not say this is impossible, but I would say that it is a guess. For one thing, we don’t know this is all that the Lord read. It is very often we have a verse that, is pointing to a passage, but perhaps the Lord read more of them. More important than that, the passage doesn’t say that He is now bringing these things mentioned in Isaiah 61; rather, it says that he’s preaching them, proclaiming them. And in His earthly ministry, He proclaimed God’s favor, but he also proclaimed vengeance then. And he did much to comfort those that mourn in his first coming, which according to Isaiah, as some interpret it, should only apply to his second coming. I would say that the Isaiah 61 passage, as a whole, describes Jesus' preaching and pointed forward to what He was going to do through his atoning death. His first coming laid the foundation for all the blessings that are to happen, and though His second coming He will bring all these things to fruition where all who mourn will really be comforted and all that are imprisoned will be released. I think that it is a guess that he stopped right at that point in Luke 4:18, thereby dividing between the first and second coming. This really does not work out. There have been many clever guesses made, and some of
them work out. I think it’s good to make guesses, but I think it’s important to check them very carefully before we are dogmatic about them. Now at this point, you’ve seen how these passages Isaiah 59 and 63 parallel each other. We discussed all this in the last lecture, so I will not repeat that material here.

**God’s Violent Interposition to Cover Evil (26:09)**

We start with A in the outline here on the left, “God’s violent interposition to cover evil.” I didn’t use the word "violent" in the heading I gave you for "A" of the outline before, but I’m wondering if I shouldn’t have because of the beginning of chapter 63. So I could have added to the heading: “The Lord comes with his garment spattered with blood”. There is a picture which one modern writer says is beautiful but “ethically repulsive.” Well, from the viewpoint of the general modernist attitude, it is repulsive, but from the viewpoint of Scripture's teaching, it represents a fact that God does occasionally interfere violently in the affairs of the world. But the main point to our discussion is that in Isaiah 59 and 63 we have two passages which are remarkably parallel, as we saw. We saw how wonderfully they fit together, clearly describing the same things, beginning and end. And they remind us that life is real and the struggle between good and evil is real. Satan is a real force even though he can go no further than God permits him to go. And God has promised that he will, with violence, put an end to the work of Satan and to the evil in the world.

**The Servant/Messiah [27:40]**

In previous lectures we spoke of the work of the Servant/Messiah, specifically looking at the end of chapter 52 and at chapter 53. And after that we have the redeemer comes to Zion (Isaiah 59:20 and 62:11) and then the millennial blessing spoken of in Isaiah 61 and repeated by our Lord in Luke 4. We have the acceptable year of the Lord, and the period of wonderful blessing of the
millennium. And we have the day of vengeance with the Lord's violent imposition both before and after the millennium.

Now these passages climax where the Messiah Himself speaks, and it has parallels where the Servant of the Lord speaks in Isaiah 49, and elsewhere, where there are many similarities as I will bring forth.

A Long Prayer [28:39]

I think from this point we can go on to our next section in the outline, Roman numeral 13: “A long prayer”. This was the assignment you turned into me today. As I mentioned to you earlier, chapter 64, the whole thing, is undoubtedly a prayer. And this prayer begins in chapter 63; there is no real reason for a division of chapters at that particular point. How far back into chapter 63 does it go? Well, it is clearly a prayer when you start in 63 at verse 15, “Look down from heaven.” Before verse 15 there is nothing to identify it as a prayer, but it would seem quite reasonable to be an introduction to a prayer. Verses 7-14 before say, “I will mention the loving kindnesses of the Lord and the praises of the Lord according to all the Lord has bestowed on us and the great goodness he has bestowed on them, according to his mercy. For he said, 'surely they are my people, children that will not lie,' though he was their savior.” I want to turn at this hour to the problem with the part of that verse that states, "they are children that will not lie." Revelation says all liars will have their place in the lake of fire. But I don’t imagine there’s anyone who ever lived who did not, at some time or another, tell a lie. And this is certainly not why He became their Savior, because of the children that do not lie. Children ought not to lie. Children, perhaps after they have received regeneration, would not lie. Or at least after they had been completely sanctified, they would not lie.

But, He says in chapter 63:9, “In all their afflictions He was afflicted, and the angel of His presence saved them. In His love and in His pity He redeemed them and He bore them and carried them all the days of old, but they rebelled and
vexed His Holy Spirit. Therefore, He was turned to be their enemy and He fought against them.” And notice Isaiah doesn't say He fought against "us"; he says "them." He is looking back at earlier stages in their history. But then you read in Leviticus 26 that the Lord says that if Israel turns against the Lord and rebels and vexes Him, that He will make them subject to their enemies. They will have all kinds of misery and trouble. And then, if they remember the Lord, and turn to him in complete repentance, He will turn back to them and will deliver them. But here in Isaiah, after saying they rebel, it doesn’t say then they remembered and turned to the Lord and God forgave them. But the people in Isaiah's day seem to remember the days of old, Moses and His people. And they ask "where is He that brought them out of the sea? Where is He that put His Holy Spirit within them?" referring to all these wonderful things when Moses was there. And notice there is not a suggestion of repentance by the people at that point, only questions. It looks as if, it sort of gives you the impression as if, God punished them for their rebellion, and then God said, "well, after all, I did all these wonderful things for them in the past so I'm going to deliver you." I don’t say you have to draw that out of the text, but I do point out that repentance for restoration is not here as it is in Leviticus. So this passage from verses 7-14 certainly can properly be called, “A remembrance of God’s past blessings,” including his repeatedly giving the people deliverance when they had turned away from him as in the book of Judges.

**The Holy Spirit and Leadership (33:15)**

Now, some questions. Where is the one who put His Holy Spirit within Moses to lead the people? Why doesn’t He put His Holy Spirit in somebody today to lead us the same way He did with Moses? Oh yes, the Holy Spirit certainly indwelt all the leaders of Israel; there’s no question of that. And that’s clearly seen in that the Holy Spirit directed the leaders of Israel and worked through Moses and through the prophets and inspired them and led them--there’s no question of that. Now, of course, if nobody was saved in Old Testament times, then we could say
that the Holy Spirit did not enter into anybody in Old Testament times as He does now. And if He did not regenerate them, then they are all going to Hell. But if, as the book of Hebrews says, we are surrounded by so great a cloud of witnesses, and that they without us will not be made perfect - that will seem to imply rather clearly that the Holy Spirit has worked in the Old Testament as He did in the New, and as He works today. There’s one method of salvation at all times, and the only method of salvation that the Bible mentions anywhere is that of the Holy Spirit regenerating people through faith. Old Testament saints were not saved thru sacrifices. The sacrifices merely pointed ahead to the perfect sacrifice of Jesus Christ. But here we are talking of the Holy Spirit's leading thru people like Moses.

Well, this introduction then, is entirely biased; though it speaks of their rebellion, there is no statement for repentance for them in this. It’s the statement that despite the fact that they rebelled, God stayed with them and led them as we find in verses 7-14.

**What is the object of the Prayer? [35:21]**

Now after the introduction, I’m going to look at dissections of what follows so to raise the question: What is the object of the prayer? What is it about? It is always good to look at this prayer and see if it assumes any particular situation. For example, you pray for God’s mercy, but are you praying in a silly situation? Is there a great illness? Is there some tremendous danger? Is your country at war? Is there any indication in the prayer of the situation under which it is given? Here we have three rather clear indications. In chapter 63:18 we read that the people of God, "of Your Holiness," which in modern English would be "Your Holy People," have possessed Jerusalem for the little while our adversaries have trodden down your sanctuary. Now, this seems to be a time when Jerusalem itself came into the hands of the enemy. It would seem that you could guess that pretty strongly. It’s much clearer when you get to chapter 64:10 and 11: “Your Holy Cities are a wilderness. Zion is a wilderness. Jerusalem, a desolation. Our Holy and our
beautiful house, where our father’s praised you, is burned with fire and all our pleasant things are laid waste.” Now that’s not simply the land being overrun as it was by Sennacherib, as it was in the days of Hezekiah. This is a time when Jerusalem itself had been laid waste. And so we must at this point either go with the higher critic and say this part of Isaiah is not by Isaiah and that we are looking at a much later period, or we must say God caused Isaiah prophetically to describe a situation. And I believe that God often did show his prophets the future. And in view of the New Testament, I would say that all so-called three parts of Isaiah are from the same Isaiah, but are, as Paul says, what Isaiah said would take place later, and that here in 63:15 Isaiah prophetically looked forward to the future and gives us a prayer that will express the general sentiment that will prevail by some group of people at a time in the future, and which might represent the ideas and thoughts of someone in their own days as they look forward to the coming exile and desolation.

As we think of that, we must realize that among the people of that day you might say that there would be three categories of them. There were those who scoffed and said Isaiah’s an old fool for these ideas. They would scoff, "Our land has stood up for centuries and will continue, we will never turn to exile as the Northern Kingdom did in their lifetime." Then there were a smaller group that can be divided into two parts. Well, let’s say three divisions, and that would be those who said, "Yes Isaiah is right, this destruction is soon to come." Some of them might say, "We can see the international situation; we can see the tremendous force of the period. That is serious, and other powers have taken the Northern Kingdom and the Kingdom of Aram and headed towards Damascus. And it is only reasonable to believe what Isaiah said is correct and we must expect such a thing, but without much true repentance as he believes." But we can also say, of course, true followers of God who put Isaiah as a true prophet and said, "this is right; this is what is coming," and they intended to give way to despair, so Isaiah gives them God's message of comfort.
Well, now with this prayer then, there could be any of these truths as we look forward to the future. You notice here now how the prayer eventually ends in chapter 64, verse twelve, “Will you refrain yourself for these things, Oh Lord. Will you hold your peace and afflict this very soul?” Well, after the introduction and ending we've discussed, look back at verse fifteen. He said, "look down from Heaven; behold from the habitation of your holiness." This should be translated "from your Holy habitation" have compassion and mercy towards me, followed by a question. "Are they (compassion and mercy) restrained?" But is this a question or a statement? There is no question mark in the Hebrew. Hebrew has no punctuations like English, but very often a question begins with the Hebrew syllable “hah” that we can put at the end, but very often they put in the beginning of a clause, and “hah” can mean what follows question. But there is no “hah” here. So it’s a possible interpretation to say as a question, "are they restrained?" But the better translation might be the simple statement that compassion and mercy are restrained. You can put the question in your voice, but there is no actual punctuation in the writing, so probably it’s better to say, “they are restrained.” And then go ahead with the prayer. The prayer ends in 64:12 with, "will you refrain yourself for these?" The King James says "refrain" in 64:12 and "restrain" in 63:15, but they both are the same Hebrew word and the same form where both the prayer begins and ends. The Hebrew word is in the Hithpael form. God is holding back; he is not giving us blessings in this situation. Isaiah starts the introduction asking will God keep holding back when our beautiful city has been burnt, all the temple has been burnt, the cities are a wilderness, there is all this desolation to this land God has blessed. Is He now going to hold back in that situation?

**Understanding the Prayer [42:35]**

This, then, is the situation and it is very important in understanding the prayer. Now, the next natural approach to the interpretation of the prayer would
be to ask what specific requests it contains. So it would be quite a reasonable thing to go through these verses and take all the statements that sound like requests and take a look at them. And we find there are not a great many. There are more infractions mentioned and implications than requests. Take this one: “Will you restrain?” That’s not specifically a request, but the meaning of it is as we tend to understand it, "you let these things go on." But there are specific statements why God looked down from Heaven. In verse fifteen of chapter 63 and chapter sixty four verse one we read: "Oh that you would rend the Heavens," and chapter 64 verse nine, “Do not be exceedingly angry with us. Lord, do not remember iniquity anymore. Look how we are bowing before You and showing our great repentance." That’s not what it says; it says: "behold see, we beseech Thee, we are all Thy people." So the reasons advanced for the prayer are two: first, there are past blessings. But you notice chapter 63, verses seven to fourteen, especially verses eleven and twelve, telling of God blessing the people and having Moses leading them and having them brought into the promised land. Then we have the second basis for blessing: Israel's claimed relationship. Chapter sixty three verses sixteen, seventeen, and eighteen read: “Thou art our Father, oh Lord, our Father; your name is everlasting. Oh Lord, why have you made us turn from your ways and hardened our hearts from your fear? Return for your servants' sake.” And in chapter 64, verses 8-9, says, “Now, oh Lord, you are our Father, we are the clay and you are the potter.” And in the end of verse 9, “See, we are your people.” And, perhaps the climax of it all is the last verse in 63, “We are yours, you never had more rule over them. They were not called by your name.” And now it’s rather interesting, right at that point, you’ll notice they say, “Give us your blessing. We’re your people. We’re the ones you blessed in the past. You are our Father. You never bore rule over those other people. They were not called by your name." Then it’s interesting to look at chapter 65, verse 1, which says, “I am sought of those who did not ask for me. I am found by those who did not seek me. I said ‘Behold me! Behold me!’ to a nation that was not called by my name.” They say,
“These others were never called by your name.” He says, “I say ‘Behold me!’ to a nation that was not called by my name.” And you’ll find commentaries that say, even sound, evangelical commentaries, that say Paul in Romans 10:20 twisted this, in this quotation, and got something out of it that wasn’t in it at all. I don’t believe so; I believe Paul was an inspired interpreter of scripture. And when he interpreted, he may not take the whole meaning, he may draw something that, in fact, was there, and not put the stress on something that's not there too; but whatever, I think Paul very definitely quotes 65:1. But, we’re not ready, yet, to look at 65; we are just looking at 64.

**Is There Evidence of True Repentance? [46:57]**

And in the outline, letter D: “Is there evidence of true repentance?” Daniel, the prophet Daniel, was one of the godliest men in all of Israel’s’ history, and he understood by books (Jeremiah 29) that seventy years was past, and the time had come when the nation would be delivered from the Babylonian exile. He didn’t say, "Oh, God, you’ve promised it and now bring it to us." He is one of the godliest people in all Israel’s history, yet he said a great prayer of contrition and repentance for the sins of his people in Daniel 9. And evidently, the Lord didn’t think that Daniel was representing all the people, because Daniel says, “The Seventy years are finished, we have been wicked; now we are repenting.” The angel came to him and said, “Not only are seventy years finished, but seventy weeks are determined upon your people.” So there is a long time ahead, “because, you, Daniel, do not represent all the people by any means.” Well, we have to stop there and continue later, next week.
Sin and Repentance in Israel’s Future

Review of the Long Prayer (Isa 63:7-64:12)

Last week, we began to look at the long prayer that runs from Isaiah 63:7 to 64:12, and we noticed eight verses of introduction verses, 7 thru 14, in which God’s blessings were recalled. Of course, someone could take these verses as a separate thing, separate from the prayer if they want, but it seems altogether reasonable to me to consider that it is a part of the prayer. The prayer is calling on God, beseeching Him that He treat them as He has in the past, and that He continue the previous blessing. Then we looked at part B of the outline, "The object of the prayer." We noticed the situation, that it assumes that Jerusalem is in ruin, assumes that the temple has been destroyed, and it calls on God to re-establish them. Isaiah may be speaking to the people in his day who know he is a prophet of God and that he speaks truly. And yet, perhaps to some of them, who while they believe what he said, yet they desire to follow in their own ways and works, rather than to follow God. Others, more faithful, can easily imagine the future situation Isaiah describes as having occurred, but they are remembering God’s past blessings and are encouraged. However, even though Isaiah is writing during the Assyrian period, certainly the Lord had particularly in mind people toward the end of the Babylonian exile, when they had come back and were finding difficulty getting reestablished, and they are calling on God for his blessing. And I think that’s the situation.

The Reason Advanced [2:04]

We also recalled the specific request. We looked at 63:15-64:12 last time. Then we come on capital letter C: “The reason advanced,” and we noticed that the
principal stress for asking for mercy is on the past blessing. And another point with that is a claimed covenantal relationship between God and Israel. They maintain that God is their father. They belong to Him; therefore, he should bless them. And this comes to clear expression as we noticed in verses 16, 17 and 18 of chapter 63, where they said, “Oh Lord, you are our father, our redeemer; your name is from everlasting. Oh Lord, why have you made us to err from your ways? And harden our heart from your fear? Return for thy servants’ sake, the tribe of your inheritance. The people of thy holiness has possessed it for a little, while our adversaries have trodden down your sanctuary. We are yours; you never bore rule over them. They were not called by your name.” And in chapter 64 verses 8 to 9; “But now, Oh Lord, thou art our father; we are the clay, and thou our potter; and we all are the work of thy hand.” So “the claimed relationship” is the basis for blessing; God has promised and God has blessed in the past, so it's up to him to continue. Notice the contrast with the non-Israelites in chapter 63 verse 19. “We are yours: you never bore rule over them; they were not called by your name.” It’s interesting to notice how this verse has been translated in the two most recent evangelical translations. The King James says, “We are thine: thou never bore rule over them.” The New American Standard Bible says, “We have become like those over whom You have never ruled.” And the NIV says, “We are yours from of old; you have not ruled over them.” At first sight, there seems to be quite a difference between these, particularly between the NASB and the others. I’ve underlined the word “thine” in the KJV because it is not in the Hebrew. It is an insertion that seemed to the writers of the King James to belong there. Verse 19 without the word "thou" reads, “We are, thou never bore rule over them” and we see that the “we are” means that “we are yours.” But the KJV put "thou" in italics to show that it is an insertion to bring out the sense. Similarly, in the NASB they put the word “like” in italics. Actually, it still has the contrast, so it doesn’t make a great deal of difference. The NIV gets around it by taking the word that the KJV translates "never" in the phrase, “Thou never bore rule over them” and putting it
with the first “we are,” and making it “We are yours from of old. You have not ruled over them.” It’s an interesting little illustration of the various possibilities of translation. But whichever you take, it seems to me that there is still the contrast between Israel and other nations. The argument is: Israel belonged to God, and it is not right that they should now become like those over whom He has not ruled before.

**Translation Differences [6:28]**

I just put down English renderings of the Hebrew to make this a little clearer. The reason for the NASB making that change, I think, is the fact that the Hebrew word which is translated “We are” in the King James Version usually does not occur in Hebrew in this sense, at least not until very late Hebrew. Usually, if you say one thing is also something else in Hebrew, for example, "Israel is a nation," you just put the two nouns or the noun and adjective, next to each other and do not use a verb. This unstated verb is some form of the verb "to be," but can also really be “to become,” or might perhaps be used as something “has been” in the past. And consequently, if the Hebrew is “We have become,” the NASB felt that to put in a “like” would give a reason for that. So I don’t say we can say that the NASB is necessarily wrong here. There is a good argument that can be made for it. Also, however, the fact that the “like” is not there might be a reason for preferring the King James.

**From of “Old” (‘olam) [7:55]**

But in either case, it stresses the contrast between peoples, and that’s the point. Why should these people be able to burn our temple when they’re not people that were called by God’s name? They’re not His people. We are his people. Therefore, He should bless us. You notice I didn’t put up there “from of old,” I put “from ‘Olam.” where I transliterated the Hebrew word ”‘olam.” And some of you may not be aware that that little mark that I put just before the “O” of
"'olam" there, which is like the beginning of a printed single quotation mark. That mark is regularly used in transliteration to indicate the Hebrew letter "ayin." So this indicates the Hebrew letter "ayin," in "‘Olam." Now that word “‘Olam” is many, many times translated “ever” in the Bible. We say “This will endure for ‘Olam”. We translate it “Forever.” But when you look at the flip side, in this case with the negative used with "‘olam," it is easy to say “Never.” They were not since all eternity. But when they say “These are the men of ‘olam,” you know that means the men who were way back. So from this single word you cannot get the idea of “endlessness,” but you get the idea of a long, long stretch, as far as the eye can see.

They make the contrast here that Israel, unlike other nations has been the Lord's "from ‘olam." In addition to that, in this same verse, we have the last phrase, “They were not called by thy name.” And that ties right up with the next chapter, chapter 65, the first verse, which has as its end the words “I said, 'behold me, behold me' unto a nation that was not called by my name.” I think the connection is rather important. The very phrase "called by my name" is used here where there is no question about its usage in the translation. That very phrase is used in the very first sentence of the answer that is given to them, so I believe the KJV version of Isaiah 63:19 is correct.

**Question about External Danger [11:32]**

Maybe right at this point would be a good time to interrupt this for reading a question that I intended to read right at the very beginning of the hour but it slipped my mind. I was given this at the end of the last hour. Here's the question: “In speaking about the millennium do you purposely use the words “freedom from external danger”?” ---External is underlined. Why do you use external danger? Does that imply that there will be other kinds of danger?” That is a very good question. I’m very glad it was raised. I have frequently used this statement that this is a picture of external danger. I’m not using that to say at the time when these
events are fulfilled there will be other types of danger. I am using it to say you cannot interpret this passage as simply referring to something else than external danger. There are those who take pictures of the time when, as it says in Isaiah 2 and 11, and in Micah 4, everyone can sit under his vine and his fig tree and none will make them afraid because the fear of the Lord will cover the land as the waters cover the sea. They take it as a picture of a person whose mind is so stayed on God that he has no fear of anything. And so his heart is at peace. But that is not what this pictures. This picture is of a time when one need not fear, when there is no external danger. So I appreciate the question. I have stressed that word “external” because these particular passages look forward to a time when there is no external danger; they do not merely look forward to a time when there is an inner change. It doesn’t mean to say that there wouldn't be any other kind of danger in the future. That doesn’t enter into these particular passages.

**Is There Evidence of True Repentance? [13:39]**

Then continuing there, capital D of the outline. “Is there evidence of true repentance?” And here we must say that if evidence of true repentance is lacking, then we know that God will not hear prayer. This is brought out right in the book of Isaiah, and in many other places. In Isaiah, the first chapter, verse 15 he says, “When you spread forth you hands I will hide my eyes from you. Yes, when you make many prayers I will not hear. Your hands are full of blood.” Now there are many such statements in the Scripture, that there are times when people pray and God will not hear. Now of course, He does hear; God knows everything that happens. But what it means is, He will not pay attention; He will not answer your prayer. And so, if true repentance is lacking, we cannot expect a favorable answer to the prayer. But right here we should note God’s relation to Israel. And I like here to call your attention to the fact that it is very clearly brought out in the Scripture that rebellion on the part of Israel is to be terribly punished. Perhaps even more terribly than of most other nations because they have greater blessings.
and greater opportunities to know the Lord. In Leviticus 26, verses 14-39, we have a most terrible statement of the awful misery that will come upon the people if they turn away from the Lord. In Deuteronomy 28:15-68, we have an even longer passage of similar nature. This is greatly stressed in the Old Testament. Rebellion has to be horribly punished.

But be it so, it is also stressed (maybe not as much stressed but just as clearly given) that God promises to bless all who turn to him with their whole heart. So right after this long passage in Leviticus 26, verses 40-41, we read, “If they shall confess their iniquity and the iniquity of their fathers, with their trespass which they have trespassed against me and that also they have walked contrary onto me,” and at the end of verse 41, “if then their uncircumcised hearts be humbled and they then accept the punishment of their iniquity, then will I remember my covenant with Jacob and also my covenant with Isaac and also my covenant with Abraham, and I will remember the land”.

And in Deuteronomy: Deuteronomy 28 has this long passage telling what the results of rebellion are to be. Deuteronomy 30 verses 1-2 say, “and it shall come to pass when all these things have come upon thee, the blessing and the curse which I have set before thee, and thou shall call unto mind among all the nations whither the Lord thy God has driven thee and shall return unto the Lord thy God and shall obey his voice according to all that I command thee this day, thou and thy children, with all thy heart and with all thy soul, that then the Lord thy God will turn thy captivity.” So if they turn to him with their full heart, He promises that then He will bless them again. And in 2 Chronicles 6:37-39, in Solomon’s dedication to prayer, he reiterates this same idea.

**Understanding God’s Work [17:31]**

Then as we pointed out in point C of the outline, and as seen in Leviticus 26, “God has made an everlasting covenant with Israel.” This enters into the great problem of understanding God’s work, a problem that no human being can really
grasp. God has his plans and those plans will be fulfilled. What man does is tremendously important, if man sins and turns away from God, God will punish him. If man turns to God with a full heart, God will bless him. But God has promised that certain blessings will be given to Israel: these people will be given these blessings and this is given as an unconditional promise. He has made an everlasting covenant with Israel; this is brought out in Leviticus 26:44-45 where he says that he will remember his promises to their ancestors.

And in Isaiah 66:22, at the very end of our present book, this promise is reiterated. He says in verse 22, “for as the new heavens and the new earth which I will make shall remain before me,' says the Lord, 'so shall your seed and your name remain’”. God promises everlasting blessings to Israel, and yet he says that each individual, if they are to receive His blessings, must turn to him with their whole hearts.

**Student Question: “Hasn’t the church supplanted Israel?”** [19:06]

Student asks a question: "Hasn't the church supplanted Israel?"

Certainly the New Testament teaches that we are the Israel of God; that is truly stated in Galatians 6:15. We are the Israel of God; it is God’s purpose through all ages that all who believe in Christ should form the Israel of God. And yet it is also true that God has a very special place for this particular nation that he called out. That is very true and when Isaiah 66 says, verse 22, “for the new heavens and the new earth which I shall make shall remain before me,' says the Lord, 'so shall your seed and your name remain',” then to my opinion anyone who says that God was through with Israel at Pentecost is simply talking out of the air. I know of no Scriptural reference for it, and I don’t think its fair to say "covenant theology" in general holds that because I believe there are very few people that hold that. Do I believe there are a great many people who believe in God’s continued covenant with Israel? There are a considerable number, yes.
True Repentance [20:33]

Well now, we believe that God has made this everlasting covenant, and I don’t think we can be disproved that is the clear teaching of scripture. But now our present problem is this prayer that we are looking at from Isaiah 63:15-64:12. Does it contain evidence of true repentance? And we note here that Daniel, in Daniel nine, he tells us in the second verse that he read in the books “the word of the Lord that came to Jeremiah the prophet that he would accomplish seventy years in the desolation of Jerusalem” (Jer. 29:10). Now, Daniel had gone to Babylon probably in 604 BC. It’s now about sixty-five years after Daniel went. When Daniel was taken, much of the land was laid desolate. At that time God said it would be desolate about seventy years. Now the seventy years is nearly over and Daniel prays, in effect, "Oh God, remember your promise and restore it. We are your people." Well, that’s all true. God is one who remembers his promise and they are his people. But as you read this prayer, to which the greater part of Daniel is made up, you find Daniel over and over beseeching the Lord, and according to all the Lord's righteousness, to turn away his anger and fury. Because of their sins and the iniquities of the people, they have become a reproach to all that are about them. "Incline your ear, we present our supplications," he prays whole heartedly, confessing their sin, and praying that God will fulfill the promise he has given and bring them back. And God does fulfill that promise and permit them to come back. But his answer to Daniel’s prayer recognizes that the prayer represents the heart of Daniel, not necessarily the whole people. And I’m sure Daniel must have felt very disturbed when he got the answer to that prayer, because the answer is, "Yes, God is going to bless you; now you are going to get everything back you had before: your nation. The seventy years are over, yes, but the seventy weeks are determined on your people, and there is a lot of misery ahead." So Daniel makes a real prayer of repentance on behalf of the people. But the question is, how many of them does
he represent truly by his prayer? But Daniel's prayer has quite a different tone from this prayer here in Isaiah.

The Fact of Sin [23:40]

Further, remember David’s prayer? In Psalms 51, David had sinned, David says “I acknowledge my transgressions; my sin is ever before me. Against thee, thee only have I sinned, and have done this evil in thy sight.” Verse seven, “purge me with hyssop and I shall be clean. Wash me and I shall be whiter than snow.” Verse nine, “Hide thy face from my sins and blot out all my iniquity. Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me.” There is an altogether different tone in David’s prayer of repentance than you find in this prayer in Isaiah. Now this prayer does, it is true, recognize the fact of sin. That is recognized in verses 10, and in verse 17. In verse 10, chapter 63, we have the statement, "they rebelled and vexed his Holy Spirit, therefore he was turned to be their enemy." You don’t find any evidence of repentance in this, simply a statement of a fact. In verse 17, “O Lord, why hast thou made us to err from thy ways, and hardened our heart from thy fear?” Sounds as if they are blaming God for their difficulty. It doesn’t say, "Oh God, we have sinned, we are very sorry; do change us; do help us to follow, we promise to do our best." Nothing like that is in there. Rather, verse 17 continues, “Return for thy servants’ sake, the tribes of thine inheritance.” Chapter 64, verses five to seven, recognize the fact of sin; “Behold, you were angry, we have sinned ... But we are all as an unclean thing and all of our righteousness are like filthy rags, and we fade as a leaf.” You’d expect them to say, “Oh, do remedy our iniquity; cleanse us from it; purge us.” No, they say, "our iniquities have taken us away, and there’s none that calls on your name. You’ve hid your face from us and consumed us." Real repentance would follow with, "Now Lord, we turn to you with our whole heart, restore us." But we do not find this. Rather, we read, "But now Lord you’re our father we’re the clay, and you’re our potter. We’re all the work of your hands. We can’t help ourselves. This is what
you put us into and here we are. We have sinned, yes, but you have promised us we’re your people and you’re going to bless us." The passage recognizes the fact of sin, but it seems to lay on God the blame for sin; as we just noticed in 63:17 and 64:8-9.

Finally, This prayer contains no plea for a chastening heart and no promise to seek or to obey God in the future. Now, those are facts about this prayer. I'm sorry its so negative.

**Whose Prayer is This? [27:07]**

Now capital E of the outline: “Whose prayer is this?” And as I read the prayer, I am reminded of the attitude of the Pharisees described in the New Testament and referred to in Isaiah 65, verse 5, where it says: “For those who say, 'stand by thyself, come not near me, for I am holier than thou.' These are a smoke in my nose, a fire that burns all the day.” We compare Matthew 3:8-9 where the Pharisees thought, “We are Abraham’s children; it is up to God to bless us.” John the Baptist said, “bring forth the fruits, appropriate for repentance and think not to say within yourselves: 'We have Abraham as our father, for I say unto you that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham.’” And we notice what Christ said in John 9, verse 33 and 39. In John, I seem to have copied the reference wrong. It is where he said “If you are Abraham’s seed you would…”, I guess it was chapter 8, yes, it was John 8:33, which reads, “they answered him, 'We are Abraham’s seed and we have never been in bondage to any man. How do you say, 'ye shall be made free.’” And verse 39, “they answered to him, ‘Abraham is our father.’ Jesus said, ‘if you were Abraham’s children, you would do the works of Abraham.” They simply were expecting blessing because of connection, or past blessing, or relationship, but this is condemned.

Whose prayer is this? It seems to me that it is a reasonable suggestion that this prayer represents the attitude of a part of the people who believed in God’s power, believed in God’s control, believed that God sent them in exile for their
sin, but who are claiming their blessing simply on the basis, as the Pharisees did, of carrying out particular external observances, or of having a particular connection, a particular family, a particular relationship. Now that seems to me to be the answer to this question: "Whose prayer is this?"

Since the Speaker is Not Named One Must Avoid Dogmatism [29:38]

But, capital F of the outline: "Since the speaker is not named one must avoid all dogmatism." As I studied the passage, I have reached the conclusion that I have just given you. But I do not wish to be dogmatic about it. I do not know if anyone else has reached the same conclusion, I rather doubt that they have. But it impresses me to be the conclusion that the evidence calls for. Frank Delitzsch was one of the great German commentators of the last century. He wrote four editions to his commentary on Isaiah. Every one of them contains some material that is not in any of the others. The second of these four editions is contained in the set called "Keil and Delitzsch," which is a very excellent set on the interpretation of the Old Testament for those who know Hebrew. In the fourth edition of Delitzsch, he found himself unable to answer the critical arguments, and he made confession to that, which for us makes his fourth edition much less valuable to us than his earlier editions.

But he simply takes this prayer as penitential, as I think anyone would when they first approach it, if they don’t study it. And so when Delitzsch begins the next chapter, chapter 65:1, he makes what seems to me to be a very peculiar statement, but one that is necessary if you accept the view that this is a true prayer of those who truly are serving the Lord. Delitzsch says here on page 474, “After the people have poured out their heart before Jehovah, He announces what they may expect from him. But instead of commencing with a promise, as we might anticipate after the foregoing prayer, He begins with a reproach and threatening.” It seems to me that it is a pretty good clue that this is not a penitential prayer. Instead of saying “Oh this is wonderful; you’ve come back to me, I’m going to
bless you,” The Lord starts in with reproach and threatening in 65:1. And He uses the very phrase they used about being "called by His name." He says those people were not called by His name here. He says in verse 1 of chapter 65 “‘Behold me, behold me,' to a nation that was not called by my name.” The very same word is used both here and in 63:19; the very same phrase, the very same expression, and of course that is the way that Paul, the apostle Paul, took it. He quotes it in Romans 10, which we shall look at in a few minutes, and quotes it as showing that God had predicted already, through Isaiah, the attitude that Paul found among so many of his contemporaries, specifically, that more gentiles had come into the family of God than were coming in from the Jewish community. Although there have been Jews who have believed through every generation from Paul's time to ours, and that has happened in every generation. Not only have Jews converted, but in nearly every generation there have been Jews that have become great Christian leaders. But the fact remains that the great mass of the nation has followed the attitude described in this prayer.

**Inerrancy in the Bible [33:13]**

Now, before looking at Isaiah 65:1, at this point I want to raise the question of inerrancy. That is to say, that if we believe that the Bible is free from error, what right do we have to take a long prayer like this and say that it represents a wrong attitude? That is an approach that is taken by some at various points in the New Testament. For instance, I've seen a good commentary, a statement that when Paul spoke to the Athenians (Acts 17), he tries to give them an argument about the altar from the unknown God and so on, but that when he got to Corinth he saw the error of what he had done in Athens, and he said that "I resolve among you to know only Jesus Christ and his crucified" (1 Cor. 2:2). I believe that that is an erroneous approach. I believe that Paul was the apostle of the Lord; that Paul was led of the Lord in what he did. I think that Paul made mistakes and that Peter made mistakes. I think they all made mistakes, but I think if the great leaders that
God wants us to follow made mistakes, that he will either not tell us about their mistakes, or he will label them as mistakes. He will make it clear and unmistakable the fact that there were mistakes. So when the New Testament gives preaching of the apostles, I feel that we can take their preachings as an example of the preaching we should do rather than at any point as something we should avoid. I’ve heard it said that Paul made a terrible mistake of taking in a vow and entering the temple in Jerusalem as he did. But I think if that was a mistake, it would be labeled as such in the New Testament; it would tell us. I do think that we can take what is told to us of the apostles as being true to the Lord and truly following the Lord.

But here we have a passage, a long passage, which is not labeled, which is clearly a prayer, but which is met at the end not with a statement of “how wonderful, this is your prayer of repentance, how happy I am you are turning back! I am going to give you all the blessings you asked,” but with terrible condemnations going through these next 10 or so verses in chapter 65.

And under those circumstances it seems to me we are justified in the hypothesis, which I believe is the correct one, that it is simply presenting to us a wrong attitude in order to go on to show what God’s relationship is to that attitude. But now the question of inerrancy comes up, and there are three considerations we should note. The first of these is that every statement in the prayer is true. They talk about what God did for them in the past, and everything that they say is entirely true. God did do all the things that they say He had. They say why they were sent into captivity. It was for their sin, and that is entirely true. There is no statement in the prayer that is not itself a fact. God has a covenant promise with Abraham and his seed forever. They point to these promises. Every statement in the prayer is true.

Second, the claims they make in the prayer are true, though lacking a vital element. God has promised eternal blessing to Israel and he will fulfill the promises he has made. And they call attention to these promises. There is nothing
false in the prayer as far as facts are concerned. The vital element of repentance of sin however, and an expression of a heart felt desire to follow the Lord with their whole heart is lacking from their prayer. The claims are true though lacking this vital element of repentance.

So number 3: “only the attitude is wrong.” The statements are true; they are inerrant, they are factual, but the attitude is wrong. And I say, "what could be more important than the attitude." From the viewpoint of inerrancy all statements are entirely true. But the attitude is wrong, and that is clearly brought out in the next chapter.

**The Divine Rebuke and Promise in Isaiah 65:1-6 [37:41]**

So we go on to Roman numeral 14: "The divine rebuke and promise in Isaiah 65:1-6." And there we have in capital A in our outline. "The contrast in verses 1 and 2." And here we have the book of Romans where Paul discusses this matter, and he very clearly says in Romans 10:20, “But Isaiah is very bold and says, ‘I was found of them that sought me not, I was made manifest unto them who asked not after me’." That’s verse one here in Isaiah 65. Then Paul says in verse 21. "But to Israel He says," and Paul quotes chapter 65 verse 2, “All day long have I stretched forth my hands to a disobedient and gainsaying people.” So we have the apostle Paul saying that this is a prediction of what happened in his day.

Now, I’d like to read to you how the Revised Standard Version renders this. The Revised Standard Version, a version made by some highly trained scholars, though most of them holding a very different viewpoint that what we do, they translate this first verse of 65: “I was ready to be sought by those who did not ask for me. I was ready to be found by those who did not seek me. I said ‘Here am I, Here am I.’ To a nation that did not call on my name.”

So, as you see, they have completely changed it so that it makes Paul completely wrong in his interpretation. And I was rather shocked to find that a
man who truly desires to follow the Lord, I believe, and who in his commentaries takes an attitude of believing in the great Scriptural doctrines, that he follows this translation. The commentator translates this verse as, “I made myself available to those who did not ask for me, I was ready to be found by those who did not seek me. I said ‘Here am I, here am I,’ to a nation that was not called by my name.” You notice that he follows that same RSV translation, except at the end of it He keeps the Hebrew "was called by my name" instead of changing it to "they did not call on my name." It is obvious, according to our translation and interpretation, that we regard verse 1 as describing Israel’s attitude towards God, and that verse 2 clearly refers to Israel, as well. Isaiah is making it clear why even Israel’s prayers had to be rejected. Strangely, however, Paul in Romans 10 quotes these two verses applying verse 1 to the gentiles and verse 2 to Israel. According to the text and context of Romans 10, Paul does not abide by the letter of the text. In fact, it would appear that according to the Greek translation the words lent themselves to a fresh application of Paul's word-view. Paul is not employing strict scientific exegesis but with great freedom he is re-adapting the original as an effective statement of his case. I don’t think that we can say that Paul would simply take the Old Testament passage and re-adapt it to mean something entirely different than what it actually meant.

**Niphal Verb Form [41:20]**

Now, this phrase, “I was ready to be sought by those who did not ask for me” is a simple Niphal verb form in Hebrew. The King James translation was translated exactly as it stands, “I have been sought” or "I was sought" and serves as a "prophetic perfect" looking forward to the time when he will save Israel. But the RSV translates this as, “I was willing to be sought by those who did not ask for me”. Certainly, if God wasn’t willing, it couldn’t happen. But the phrase, “I was ready to be sought by those who did not ask for me.” Well, there is absolutely no warrant, no exegetical warrant, for that translation. However that idea was worked out by unbelieving scholars at least a century before. And as a result, they
developed what they called the "Niphal Tolerativum." And with many people, if you give a good Latin name to something, it proves that it’s true. Take a very common thing and apply a Latin name to it, and that establishes it.

Well, you’ll find this term in many commentaries that, of course, this is an "Niphal Tolerativum." Well, it is a Niphal, and the Niphal is used in hundreds of accounts of the Old Testaments, hundreds of accounts. As for this so-called "Niphal Tolerativum," most of your commentators will say “it’s the Niphal Tolerativum as in” and then they’ll refer you to a few other references. But there are very a few verses they ever refer to. They only deal with two words: this word "seek" and this word "find" found here in 65:1. I have found no reference to an alleged "Niphal Tolerativum" dealing with any other words accept these two words. And I have looked up every reference that they say is the "Niphal Tolerativum" and every one of them has God as the subject. “I was found, I was sought.” Well naturally, God can’t be found unless he permits you to find him. But they claim the "Tolerativum" is the permissive act because God is the subject, not because it is Niphal. And if they learn to translate this as, “I have let myself be sought by those who did not ask me, I have let myself be found by those who did not seek me”, it wouldn’t change the thought at all. But when they put in the form of the RSV, they are adding another thought that goes even beyond the alleged "Niphal Tolerativum," which, despite the beautiful Latin term, I don’t think represents any actuality whatever in Hebrew grammar. You won't find it mentioned in most of the Hebrew grammars, and I want to say here that one of the important things in Bible study is that grammars and dictionaries with all types of words are purely a human production. The best dictionary for Hebrew is Brown, Driver and Briggs, by far. But the reason for that is not because those three modernists that made it knew what Hebrew words mean, its because they give you the evidence fully for the interpretation. They take the words and they analyze them. They look at the possible meanings of the parallels of everything they find, and they put down in lengthy, analytical form all the evidence so you find you
have a great deal of confidence their opinion is probably correct. But when they
give two or three references, you have the right, and perhaps the duty, if it is an
important point, to look up those references and see if they really support what
they say it does. And the same thing is true of grammars in any language. (You
also need a course in the Hebrew we have in our Old Testament.) And so all the
evidence we have about meanings of Hebrew words is there, and Brown, Driver
and Briggs lay out the evidence for you to examine and see how much there is,
and see whether there is only a little, and if it is valid or not. There’s a more recent
dictionary that is now published in the third edition, which apparently is called the
"Third Edition." Two German scholars, Baumgartner and Kohler wrote….the
First Edition. Then Kohler died and Baumgartner got in there …..and called it the
Second edition. Then he died, and now they have some other men who are getting
out the Third Edition that is coming out a little bit at a time. And scholars all over
America are looking forward impatiently to the arrival of Kohler and Baumgartner
to see how they define these words. But Baumgartner only says the word is in the
Song of Songs. It only gives references; it does not analyze it like Brown, Driver
and Briggs. It does not give the evidence fully like BDB; it only gives their
opinion. I would also say that the BDB are at a great disadvantage because they
followed a theory that was universally held a century ago that to some extent is
given up now. That is, that every Hebrew word is derived from a three letter root,
and therefore they arranged their words according to the roots. And it wouldn’t be
so bad if they just put their roots at the top of the page, but at the top of the page
they put the words that occur on that page. So often you’re not sure what root
BDB will put the word under, and that means that sometimes there are three
possibilities, and you’re not sure which root they will guess and put the word
under. So you can waste a lot of time looking for words. The Moody Press has
just published an index to BDB that lists all the words in a verse strait through as
you read it, and tells you on what pages of BDB has the discussion. With that
index BDB should become many times more useful. So Baumgartner lists words
so they are easier to find, but I hope that this advantage will not overcome the disadvantage of BDB so we won't replace BDB, which I think is a far better dictionary. Getting back to chapter 65, you notice that the clause, "those that did not call on my name" is used in some translations. There is no question of the tradition of what has been preserved: in both of these places the term is “called on”. That is the tradition. I am sorry that somebody in the NASB committee had enough influence to get them to follow the same translation as the RSV. But you notice that new translations do not follow that wrong translation, and neither did the NIV.
God’s Answer to Prayer (Isa 65-66)

Review [0:0]

I’m going to put the last two chapters under the heading I gave to you last time which covered the first few verses of chapter 65. That heading was "God's answer to the prayer." The answer covers chapters 65 and 66. But I think it will be better to study them together as a unit. This covers God’s answer to the prayer that came in the previous chapter and a half. We noticed last time the contrast in verses one and two of chapter sixty-five. And we noticed in Romans 10:20-21 how the apostle Paul said that the first of these verses describes the fact that God was going to call into his kingdom those who had not been known "by his name." Paul implies this was predicted by Isaiah. Isaiah is very bold and says “I was found of them that sought me not. I was made manifest to them who asked not after me.” Now, of course, it would be all together reasonable if instead of saying, “I was found,” to say, “I let myself be found,” because, after all, anything that is done to God is only done to him because he permits it to be done. As we noticed that’s hardly reason enough to make up a new grammatical form and say that this is the "Niphal Tolerativum." Any verb form that is passive that is related to God must imply God’s permission, but this is never true of anything any human being does. But God predicts that he will bring the gentiles into a relationship with Himself even though they had not been called by his name, and even though they have not sought him in the past. But Paul goes on and says in verse 21, “But to Israel,” he says, “all day long have I stretched my hands onto a disobedient and gainsaying people.” And thus Paul spoke from these first two verses of chapter 65 as being fulfilled in what was happening in his own day.
Christ in the Old Testament [2:50]

This brings up a very vital question: does the Old Testament tell us about Christ? Or is the Old Testament prophet only interested in events of his own day? Are the prophets only interested in the Jews and what will happen to the Jews? Or are the Old Testament prophets looking forward and seeing that which will reach far beyond the Jews? Of course, if we study the New Testament with even the slightest amount of care, we see that the New Testament teaches that the Old Testament very definitely teaches about the cross. We must not take every verse in the Old Testament and try to find Christ in it in some way and twist it if necessary to put Him in it. But we must not be surprised if we find many things in the Old Testament that look forward to Christ. Jesus himself said in John 5:39, “search the scriptures,” by which he means the Old Testament. That was all the scripture that was written when he said this: “Search the scriptures, for in them you think you have eternal life and they are they which testify of me.” He said that the Old Testament testifies of Him. ... I think that’s a little of a broad statement but I think that it is true that everything the Lord says has some relation to His Son, there is no question of that. But there are many verses that very explicitly point to Christ and there are chapters probably that do not necessarily have to do with Christ. We don’t want to go to one extreme or the other. A hyperbole that most people utter at one time or another is that "Christ can be found on every page of the Bible." I would say that a man reading every page of the Bible should be looking for Christ, and seeing whether he finds something that either explicitly points to Christ is a teaching that brings him closer to the Lord. But we should turn every page with the certainty that the Bible comes into connection with our relationship with God, and of course, Jesus Christ is God.

But now in Luke 24:25 when Jesus was talking to the men on the road to Emmaus, he said, “Oh fools and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken. Must not the Christ suffer these things before he enters into his glory”.
He there rebukes those who do not find Christ in the Old Testament. Now, I don't quite like that English translation; "Oh fools". The Greek word, anoeisis is only this one time rendered "fool". Four times it's rendered “foolish”, and once "thoughtless." He wasn't calling them fools, but he was saying "you are foolish" in this particular case. He was saying that it is foolish not to see that the Old Testament, as a whole, points to Christ, and that there are many verses that very explicitly point to him.

**Those Who Deny Christ in the Old Testament [6:10]**

Now, those who do not accept Christianity naturally cannot believe this about the Old Testament. When the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament came out, I was greatly pleased with many things in it. And even though it was a group of modernists who translated it, I could see that these men who were expert Greek Scholars, and who had studied the Bible all their lives, even though there was a darkness over them as far as the great truth of salvation was concerned; nevertheless, they could look at the New Testament and read those words and say, “These people two thousand years ago had some very crazy, foolish ideas, but here's what the ideas are” and they could accurately translate what they found. But when these same men went into the Old Testament, they could not believe that a man seven hundred years before Christ could possibly say something about Christ. That would go beyond a possibility for them, unless a man 700 hundred years before Christ was completely out of his mind, which none of them believe. The men, the Prophets, were greatly interested in their own people and their own situations, and the Revised Standard Version has got many excellent translations of passages in the Old Testament dealing with contemporary situations, and dealing with the things that were at the time the Prophets spoke. But whenever the prophet said something that the New Testament says is fulfilled in Christ, the translators could not take that. So they worked out various theories of grammar, various theories of meanings of words, and various other approaches.
This was done a century ago by various unbelieving scholars in Europe, and they wrote up these theories, just like this idea of the "Niphal Tolerativum." They wrote up these theories, and today, those who want to study the Bible in a scholarly way have to take what they said as established fact. And the fact is that a great deal of study needs to be done on the Hebrew language because there is much more to understand, and much misinterpretation of it. I wrote a little booklet once on the Revised Standard Version, largely on the Old Testament. Some thousands of them were distributed at that time, and in it I pointed out fifteen or twenty pages where it specifically pointed to Christ. For example, right where it says in Micah 5:2, "he was the one whose goings forth were from of old," which describes Christ preexistence, and his appearance in Old Testament times, they changed it to "one whose genealogy goes way back to ancient times." And where Peter says that the grave could not keep Christ because David looked forward to him, and said "he would not see corruption (Ps. 16).” they translated it correctly in the New Testament, but in the Old Testament, and in the New Testament reference back to the words of Psalms, they say that "he would not see the pit." But that same word "pit," in the majority of cases in the Old Testament is translated as "corruption." So it appears that Peter was not correctly using Psalm 16 when he really was. And I could give many instances but this has affected the study of the Hebrew of many places in the Old Testament, and it needs further careful study.

**Calling of the Gentiles [10:04]**

Now, how about this concept in 65:2 of the calling of the Gentiles? Would this be contained in the Old Testament? Was God in Old Testament times only interested in the Jews? Would he say anything about the Greeks or about other people, other than Jews, except by way of condemnation? Well when Peter, who was at one time a very bigoted Jew, when Peter went to Cornelius, being led by the Spirit of God, we read in Acts 10:34 that Peter opened his mouth and said, “Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that
fears Him and works righteousness is accepted with Him.” Peter doesn’t say, “I see that God is now making a change. Up till now everybody except the Jew is headed for hell and there was nothing they could do about it, but now God has introduced a new method in which people other than Jews can also be saved. And so there’s a change now.” That’s not what Peter said. Peter said, “God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that fears Him and works righteousness is accepted with Him.”

One of the great books of the Old Testament is the book of Job; and the book of Job has no mention in it of Israel, no mention in it of the law--the Sinaitic Law, no mention of those specific matters. These were people who were not Israelites but people with whom God dealt in a very definite way. God called Israel in order that He might prepare the way for the coming of Christ and in order that the word of Christ might go out through the whole world. But he did not cause it to go out into the world until after Christ had come and had laid down His life on the cross. During his earthly ministry Christ said, “Go only to the lost people of the house of Israel (Mat. 10:5, 6).” But after the actual crucifixion, then he said go to all the world and preach the gospel. But this was foretold in the Old Testament. In Isaiah 42 it is three times stated about Christ that “he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles. He will set judgment in the earth and the distant isles will wait for his law. I will give him for a light to the Gentiles (verses 1, 4, 6).” It’s stated in chapter 42 and 49 and 52 and in 56. “My house will be a house of prayer for all people (Isa 56:7).” And so it is not a strange thing that the Old Testament would predict many events connected with the coming of Christ and that it would particularity predict that the word of God would not be limited to the Jews. But that it would go out just as much as to the Jews, also to the Gentiles. In fact, it is not strange that the church would come to include more Gentiles than Jews, even though in every single generation since that time there have been Jews brought
into the church and many of them have become leaders, have become Christian leaders.

**How were people saved before Christ? [13:39]**

As for the question: "How were people saved before Christ came?" Well, look at Hebrews 10:4, and in Hebrews 10:4 we do not find that the inspired writer says, “In past times people were saved because they made sacrifices, but now they are going to be saved through Christ.” He says in verse four, “For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sin.” These sacrifices simply look forward to Christ. But God is interested in our salvation through Christ. He also is interested in our earthly life, and in Old Testament times he took a particular interest in the earthly life of the people of Israel, and there is a great deal related to their earthly life in the Old Testament. Now there are those who go to the extreme of saying that Israel’s whole purpose was to bring Christ into the world and once that was done, God was through with Israel. But there are comparatively few who hold such a view. The most important thing in the Old Testament wasn’t whether the Israelites defeated the Philistines. It wasn’t whether a man lived a hundred years instead of living eighty, or lived eighty instead of living fifty on this earth. It was whether they were saved for eternity or whether they were lost, and there were the saved and the lost at every period, as there are today. God is interested in our salvation--in our eternal life,--but he is also interested in our life on this earth. And He set aside Israel for a very vital purpose. And He still has the purpose in Israel. And it is His purpose eventually that all Israel shall be saved. And so we have these two things from the prophets to look forward to in our own day and we are. We have the marvelous way they looked forward to the going out to the gospel, leading souls in Israel and in other nations to believe in Christ. We also have a wonderful promise relating to a continued purpose for Israel, and it is a great mistake to take one promise and not the other.
To take one side of the truth and to neglect, or to overlook, or even to deny the second side as others do, is wrong.

But we were looking at these first two verses of chapter 65, and what I was just saying relates not merely to the interpretations of them, but the interpretation of the whole of these two chapters 65 and 66. I should say one further word to remind you of the fact that as the prophet looks forward, he does not necessarily understand everything that he sees any more than you see a great range of mountains in the distance, you can tell what’s in the first one, what’s in the second, what’s in the third, what’s in the fourth, and you certainly can’t see what’s after that. And so the prophet’s vision of the future includes both. It includes God’s will for all those who are to be saved through Christ, and it also includes God’s specific will for the people of Israel. And sometimes we can be sure he’s talking about one, sometimes we can be sure he’s talking about the other, and sometimes we cannot be sure which it is. We will be sure when it happens. And I’m sure in the times of the apostles many were amazed when they saw what Jesus brought out into the open. They said, “We never saw this before.” He calls them foolish and slow of heart not to see it, but there are few of us who are wise enough and quick enough to see the will of God generally vis-a-vis Israel until Christ returns. And so we don’t expect to understand everything in the rest of these two chapters, but there’s a good deal we can understand.

The Contrast between the Unfaithful People and God’s Chosen Servant

In the outline call A, "The contrast in verses one and two of chapter 65," and B might just as well be included with this. These two headings summarize the situation clearly. I make B separate: “The contrast between the unfaithful people and God’s chosen servant.” Let’s look at Isaiah 65: 3-15. Now I’m going to have to run a bit hastily through this, only touching on a few outstanding features. But
as we do this, we will note that in verses 3-4 he is speaking about hypocrisy. People, while claiming to follow the Lord are doing that which is an abomination to Him. In verse 5, he speaks about pride and this is just as accurate for today as it was then. In verse 5, which says “Stand by thyself, come not near to me; for I am holier than thou. These are a smoke in my nose, a fire that burneth all the day.” God wants us to realize that we deserve nothing good from His hand; that it’s only because in his wonderful goodness he caused the word of salvation to be brought to us. Now, this describes an attitude that wasn’t only characteristic of Pharisees in Christ’s day, but also characteristic of many Christians today. But God doesn’t want us to say, “Oh, look how wonderful I am, aren’t those people terrible.” He wants us to say, “Isn’t it wonderful what God has done in saving me, I should bring this message to others, so that they also might receive the marvelous gift of salvation.” So we have this pride in verse 5.

Now, in verses 8-10 we have an expression of the true remnant: “Thus says the Lord: As the new wine is found in the cluster, and one saith, destroy it not; for a blessing is in it: so will I do for my servants' sakes, that I may not destroy them all. And I will bring forth a seed out of Jacob, and out of Judah an inheritor of my mountains, and my elect shall inherit it, and my servants shall dwell there.” The "cluster" referred to here is the true remnant in Israel, the true remnant in our Christian circles, the true remnant in humanity whom the Lord is going to bless. You’d think I should see the wickedness here. Nations that were founded by people who love the Lord, turn away from the Lord, and you wonder why the Lord didn’t just destroy them, and be done with them. But because of this wonderful mercy, he preserves a remnant, even in sinful nations, to be bearers of God's gracious gospel to others.
“Curse” better Translated “Oath” (Isa 65:15) [20:52]

Then in verse 15, it’s a striking verse. It is not translated, I believe, quite accurately in the King James. It is a beautiful translation, but unfortunately not exactly accurate. “And ye shall leave your name for a curse unto my chosen! For the Lord God shall slay thee and call his servants by another name.” Now the inaccuracies are rather minor in the translation, but that word "curse" never is translated "curse" anywhere else in the Old Testament. There are six words translated "curse" in the Old Testament. The word curse occurs in the King James Old Testament 52 times and this is the only case where this word is translated "curse". This word is translated "oath" 28 times so we can translate verse 15 as, “you shall leave your name for an oath unto my chosen. His people will say, ‘Oh that God may bless us as he blessed Israel of old.’” The oath, the word, this word shevuah in Hebrew, is used for an oath of loyalty, of fidelity, of blessing, that sort of thing. Other words, not this one, carry the idea of execration, so "curse" is an unfortunate translation here in verse 15 should read, “You shall leave your name for an oath to my chosen (or my elect).”

And then it says, “For the Lord God shall slay thee” in the KJV. In modern English I don’t know whether we use ‘slay’ much. I never heard of soldiers going out and "slaying the enemy." We don’t use it much today. It’s become a slang word today. But the word ‘slay’ suggests to us violence, but the Hebrew term here has no violence associated with it. The Hebrew is simply ‘shall cause thee to die’. It can be taken that he will remove you as a nation from the center of blessing during that period in the sense that He will cause many of your members, the members of your race, to die. He will cause that you will not be the center of his revelation during the period that I believe means that which follows the coming of Christ. The latter part of verse 15 says, “He will call his servants by a different name,” and that, of course, is what happens seven hundred years after this prophecy when the center of God’s blessing passed to those who followed
Christ, specifically as they were called "Christians," rather than being called "Israelites." So as the verse stands, it is inaccurate, but yet it has a very definite truth in it, namely, the changing of the name of the followers of God whom he is blessing for a time.

And right there should be, I believe, a break between verses 15 and 16. Now most people put the break a verse later verse 17, and I’m quite sure the King James translators did because they start verse 16, “That he who blesses himself in the earth shall bless himself in the God of truth.” They see verse 16 as the reason for the statements in verse 15. This is why I’m going to do this. “That he who blesses himself in the earth shall bless himself in the God of truth.” Now we don’t use that in that sense exactly today. Today, this suggests to us that it means ‘so that he who blesses himself’. But the Hebrew is simply asher, the relative pronoun, which means ‘that one’, ‘the one who’. And so it can just as well be the start of a new paragraph, which I believe it is here.

**Millennial Blessing Described [25:05]**

I believe we start a new paragraph here, which I call “Millennial Blessing Described”. Isaiah 65:16-25. “Millennial blessing described.” It starts not “in order that (asher) he who.” I went through a considerable portion of Isaiah looking at all the occurrences of the word ‘that’ to see which might be purposed like this that is, translated "in order that." And in every one where the King James had translated it as ‘a purpose’, I found the Hebrew used the word lema’an, in order that, or if it was negative, it used the word min. This word asher is rarely, if ever--and I’m trying to question if ever it was--used to show purpose. And so that should not be translated “That he who blesses himself.”

Let’s start a new section here and translate verse 16, "Whoever blesses himself," "the one who blesses himself in the earth," or "who is blessed." The word could be taken either way. So let's translate verse 16. "The man who is
blessed in the Earth shall be blessed by the God of Amen," or "The one who swears in the Earth should swear by the God of Amen." Now the word "truth" in the Old Testament is usually the Hebrew word *emet*, and there’s many, many times where *emet* is rendered ‘truth’. Now this word here is "amen" and it is related to the word *emet*. But *amen* is never translated "truth" anywhere except in this one verse. Perhaps "faithfulness" would be better; I don’t know. But it inevitably reminds us of the passage, or maybe I should say the passage in 2 Corinthians 1:20 where it says “Where all the promises of God in him are 'yeah' and in him 'amen,' under the glory of God for us.” Surely the apostle there is thinking of this fact, the God of "amen." He is led by the God of "amen," a God who is dependable and faithful. Back to Isaiah 65:16. The phrase translated, “the former,” that’s feminine, “the former troubles are forgotten because they are hid from mine eyes so behold, I create a new heavens and a new earth (masculine), and the former (feminine) shall not be remembered nor come to mind.” At least the former troubles, not the former heavens and earth will not be remembered. The former troubles will not be remembered. He’s using the same feminine word, "former," exactly the same word as used in the previous verse.

**Wolf and the Lamb [28:18]**

He continues there then with this section of millennial blessing from verses 16-25, and to look at this passage, to really understand it, we look at the last verse first, verse 25. “The wolf and the lamb shall feed together and the lion shall eat straw-like a bullock and dust shall be the serpent’s food. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain’ says the Lord.” Now when you read this you are immediately reminded of Isaiah 11, which uses the same figures in the same picture of a time when there is complete freedom from external danger, a time when even the animals are no longer destructive, and the serpent that led Eve into temptation and brought about her fall, the serpent will no longer be able to enter and Satan will bow down at that time. So I think the connection of this verse with
the millennium is clear. You would not prove the millennium from this passage. Isaiah 2 and Isaiah 11 and Micah 4 definitely prove the coming of a new millennium, but this passage describes something about the millennium. Whether that is what is being described is proven by comparing this passage with the passages in Isaiah and in Micah that I just referred to.

So this passage looks forward to the millennium and gives us further light on it that was not given in previous passages. It is an interesting passage and if we had time, we could spend three or four hours on it, but all we will do now is draw your attention to a few points. If you start with verse 17, it says, “Behold I create new heavens and a new Earth.” Someone can easily get convinced this is looking way beyond the millennium. But when you go on to the next few verses, it is perfectly clear Isaiah is not looking beyond the millennium, he is looking at the millennium. The word “I create” here is a participle best translated, “I am creating.” It seems clear to me that here he is describing a change, a renewed heaven and earth, a heaven and earth from which the earth has the curses being removed. He is looking here at the millennium, not at something beyond the millennium. And then as he looks at the millennium here in this passage, we find in verse 19 it will be a time where there will be no more weeping, no more crying; a time of universal joy.

And verse 20 shows the great longevity of the time. "There will not be an infant of days, nor an old man that has not filled his years, for the child shall die 100 years old." It is a time of greatly increased longevity; it is not a time of immortality. There will still be death at that time. The end of the verse shows there will still be sinners at that time, though it will not be possible for sinners to work violence or destruction. There will be no external violence; and sinners will be in a very small minority. That is those who actually refuse to believe in the Lord will be in a great minority in that time. A sinner dying 100 years old shall be considered cursed, for most will live well beyond that. And so this is a time that
is not a time of absolute perfection, but a time of complete removal of external danger, and a time of a renewed earth, like the earth in the days of the Garden of Eden.

In verse 22 the longevity is brought out further it says that “as the days of a tree are the days of my people.” You see a tree that stood there for 100, 150, 200 years, so will we, like at that time when people lived longer.

**Further Rebuke and Censoring Formalism [32:29]**

Then capital D: “Further rebuke and censoring formalism, chapter 66 verses 1 to 4." The great prayer was, “Our beautiful temple has been destroyed. Help us to rebuild our temple.” That was the great prayer there in the prayer that just preceded this section. Well, the Lord says, "thus says the Lord, 'The heavens are my throne, The earth my footstool, where is the house you built for me? Where is the place of my rest?’” What this means is to rest like a book rests on a table, not that God had to rest or "to take it easy," but the place where he takes his station, where he takes his stand. And he is saying the temple had a great place in God’s economy and continues with that, but the temple in itself is nothing. He wants them to go back and build His temple, yes. But the important thing is that the temple remind them of the truth he has given them, and that in the temple they perform the sacrifices to bring to their hearts the realization of the fact that sin requires atonement, and the realization of the fact that a perfect sacrifice must be provided. That the Lamb of God must come to take away their sins. The temple is a figure, it is a picture, but when you make it primary then it is of no value.

What is the temple of God? What are these earthly things in the temple? They are wonderful as pictures, but they are nothing in themselves. He fills all the universe, so here he rebukes them; he says what good are your sacrifices? He that kills an ox, is as if he sacrifices a lamb, he that sacrifices a lamb as if he cut off a dog's neck. In other words, he takes the animals that they thought of as unclean and
likens them to their heart attitude when they make their sacrifices. He says, in effect, you bring a beautiful clean animal, a lamb, a perfect unblemished lamb, you sacrifice it, but if your heart isn’t right before God, then it is absolutely no good at all. You might as well have brought a dog, or a pig as a lamb, if your heart is wrong. So the temple and sacrificial system are merely pictures of Christ is going to do. So these four verses were important for those people then, and they are important for us today because we can take the same attitude towards formal things as the unfaithful ones did then.

A Nation Born of the Day [35:16]

And now capital E is a very interesting section. But one in which we must say that we do not know exactly how much or what part of the future the prophet saw. We do not know exactly fully what it meant. I label E as: "A Nation born of the day. Isaiah 66:5 to 11," It begins, “Hear the word of the Lord, you that fear him, you that tremble at his word. Your brother that hated you, that cast you out for mine name sake said, ‘let the Lord be glorified,’ He shall appear to your joy and they shall be ashamed. A voice, a noise from the city, a voice from the temple, a voice from the Lord that renders recompense to his enemy. Before she travails she brings forth; before her pain she was delivered from a man-child. Who has heard of such a thing? Who has seen such things? Shall the earth be made to bring forth in one day, or should a nation be born in one day? For as soon as Zion travails, she brought fourth her children.” This does not describe anything that has happened up to our time. And so it would seem, people would think mostly of this as a picture of the conversion of the Jewish nation as a whole. Many individuals have talked about this: that they will view him whom they have pierced and there will be the great turning of Israel to God, which was predicted in the Old Testament. This will be so sudden, and so tremendous, that it will be like
a nation being born in a day. I will not be dogmatic on that, but it is the most reasonable explanation.

There are some who have tried to make this passage refer to be the beginning of the Christian church. But certainly, it was not, in this sudden way, the beginning of the Christian church. The beginning of the Christian church began with twelve disciples, and then they went out and God brought three thousand and then they went a little further, a little further, and took three centuries that you have, maybe a fifth of the Roman Empire. They took three centuries to convert, but I don’t think that that’s what is described here in Isaiah.

**The Indestructible Glory [37:44]**

Well, then, “F” is "The indestructible glory.” This is verses 12 to 24. And here in these last verses of the chapter, the last verses of the book, the Lord gives a wonderful picture of a future glory that Isaiah saw as he looked far beyond his immediate situations. “Behold, I will extend peace to her like a river, and the glory of the Gentiles like a flowing stream.” Verse thirteen, “As one whom his mother comforts, so will I comfort you, and you shall be comforted in Jerusalem.” Is he looking way forward there, or is he looking for their return from exile? Or is he including both in these statements? “And when you see this your heart will rejoice and your bones will flourish like an herb.” The picture here looks forward to great blessings in the future and includes many different things. Isaiah, the book, has more than any other book of the Old Testament in the way that it looks forward to the Messiah/Servant. It has twice in the amount that it tells about Christ. Yes, it was a book written for his contemporaries, and in his last words he has them very much in mind, as well as he looks forward to distant glories that God is going to bring. And we find in verse 22 on the permanence of the blessings he will have for his people. “’For as the new heavens and the new earth which I will make shall remain before me’, says the Lord, ‘so shall your seed and your name remain. And
it will come to pass from one moon to another, from one Sabbath to another, all flesh will come to worship before me’, says the Lord.’” Here is a marvelous picture of the permanence of God’s blessings on His people. His blessing on Israel, and His blessing on all who are saved through the provision that He gives. “Just as the new heavens and the new earth will remain before Him, so will your seed and your name remain.”

**Story on Frederick the Great of Prussia and “The Jews” [40:10]**

Fredrick the Great, of Prussia, was once perhaps the greatest doers in the world’s history, took a little region which was quite weak and he built it up into a strong and powerful force, and he did it with his brilliance and his ruthlessness. And he was great admirer of Voltaire, the French atheist, and invited Voltaire to his court, and Voltaire spent some time with him in his court. Fredrick liked to think he could write French poetry, and Voltaire flattered him by saying that his poetry was worth something when it probably wasn’t. Fredrick wouldn’t even bother to speak German except to his underlings. He thought French was much superior. Eventually, he and Voltaire got into a big fight and Voltaire left him. But Fredrick was ruling in a land where the teachings of Luther were widespread, and where the churches were supported by the state, and where there were many very faithful pastors. And Fredrick had a chaplain in his palace, and would have a form of religion, and doubtless, many of the people in his court were truly Christians. He was very much not a Christian he scoffed at it and ridiculed it. And one day he turned to his chaplain and he said, "Give me in one word some proof that Christianity is true." And the chaplain replied, “The Jews.” And for giving a one word of proof of Christianity, I think that was a marvelous victory, because all the great nations of antiquity have disappeared. Egypt was overrun by the Arabs: the present-day Egyptians are Arabs. Mesopotamia has become very minor in power for the last many centuries. Rome is largely a pile of ruins. Greece has some beautiful ruins but is not much of a power. Those lands were
overrun by what they considered barbarians coming from the North, an
overwhelming number of them, taking control and mixing with their people. Only
the Jews have preserved an identity all through these years. And God has kept
them as an identity that has been preserved in spite of being scattered throughout
the world, persecuted, mistreated, but God has enabled them to preserve their
existence to preserve their identity all this times. And it is a wonderful proof that
the Bible is truth, for that it is exactly what was predicted would happen, that their
seed would remain before God but that for their disobedience they would suffer
persecution, they would suffer misery, and it’s interesting that in this passage
about the indestructible glory, we also have interspersed little references to God’s
vengeance on his enemies, to His vengeance, to His punishment of those who do
not accept His marvelous offer of salvation and blessing to those who will truly
turn to him.

**God’s Coming Glory Revealed [43:17]**

So we note right in the 14**th** verse, “When you see that, your heart will
rejoice and your bones will flourish, and the hand of the Lord will be known for
His servant and his indignation for his enemies.” And then it continues through
verse 15: “For behold the Lord will come with fire and with his chariots like a
whirl-wind to render his anger with fury and his rebuke with flames of fire, for by
fire and by his sword will the Lord plead with all flesh and the slain of the Lord
shall be many.” Christ said “I come not to give peace but the sword” (Mat.
10:34). We are not going to get any millennium by human effort, by wonderful
plans of the United Nations, or a government taking care of everyone from birth to
death, or by even the preaching of the gospel. Preaching the Gospel is going to
result in calling out a people, in leading many individuals to salvation. But God
has never promised that peace on earth will be by any human means, the victory
will not be won but by His coming in supreme power.
And so we see that even with the great blessings, the great glory of these passages, we find that at the end in verse 24 we have that very strange verse: “And they shall go forth and look upon the carcasses of the men that have transgressed against me, for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched, and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh.” With all His wonderful promises, and his great pictures of glory in the future, evil still remains a fact in this image. A fact that God must deal with, and He doesn’t want us to get so wrapped up in thoughts of the blessing that He’s given us, in thoughts of the glory, that we overlook the fact of wickedness, and sin and evil in the world.

What Happens after the Millennium? [45:18]

Student Question: "What happens after the millennium?" The millennium will endure for a thousand years, and then Satan is loosed for a little season. What happens after that? Does the condition continue much like a reform on this Earth? Either the righteous will continue to live here, or does God move us to another place? Do we go to another galaxy? What happens? I don’t think we’re told. But I don’t think we have any reason to say that time will stop. There’s a place in Revelation where it says "time will be no more." That means "there’s no more time" left for other events. God is bringing things to a close. It doesn’t mean that time will be different or non-existent. And so I’m very skeptical that Isaiah is speaking of the eternal state altogether. That doesn’t mean that I don’t believe in it. As Isaiah looked forward and saw these things, all we can definitely say is that there will be a time on this Earth with wonderful blessing. And yet there still will be a certain amount of sin. But the exact fitting of these things together, I don’t think we can do. I think it’s a human tendency to try to explain everything. That’s why we have all sorts of theological systems worked out. But in my mind, the great thing we need to do is to take what’s clear in the Scripture. There are clear things we can stand on, but there are other things in the scripture that we'll know only when the time comes. We can study these things but until we have the whole
situation we cannot make definitive conclusions. Some things in the prophets sound "far out." But suppose somebody had said a hundred years ago that a man would have breakfast in London, lunch in New York, and supper in San Francisco, you people would have said, "What silly nonsense! It takes two months to travel the ocean in a fast boat, and to go clear across this continent and do all that in one day--how utterly ridiculous!" But today it is possible. The Lord looks forward and gives us glimpses of many things that appear incredulous to us today, but in the future we will see they are accurate.
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1 Kings 22: Ahab and Jehoshaphat [00:25]

We have finished our discussion of Isaiah, but we have this class period left, and I want to use it to show how stories from the Old Testament can guide us in our Christian living and witness today. Turn, this morning, to the first book of Kings, the 22nd chapter.

Here at the beginning of this chapter we have two men brought before us. One of them is Ahab, the king of Israel. Ahab, the man who was one of the most able, probably, of the kings of Israel: One who, from a political viewpoint, was one of the most effective. But one who was one of the worst kings in that he compromised with the Baal worship for political purposes. He brought on one of the greatest crises in the history of Israel. The other man, who meets with him here, is Jehoshaphat, one of the very best of the kings of Judah. And this king of Judah - of a smaller area to the south - a third as large as the northern kingdom, and about half as populous—joined with the northern kingdom for a purely political purpose. And we’ll read what happens. “And they continued three years without war between Syria and Israel. And it came to pass in the third year that Jehoshaphat, the king of Judah, came down to the king of Israel.” It says he came down and went from South to North. In our idiom we would say he went up. But Jehoshaphat was going from higher to lower elevation, so he went down to meet Ahab. “But he went to the king of Israel, and the king of Israel said to his servants, ‘Know ye that Ramoth-Gilead is ours, and we are still and do not take it out of the hand of the king of Syria.’ And he said to Jehoshaphat, ‘Will thou go
with me to battle, to Ramoth-Gilead?’ And Jehoshaphat said to the king of Israel, ‘I am as thou art, my people as thy people, my horses as thy horses.’” Here we have Jehoshaphat, the great noble king, one of the finest, one of the most godly of the kings of Judah, making this alliance for political purposes and going to this extreme, saying, “I’m right with you, whatever you want to do, I’ll be right there.”

The content of 1 Kings 22 [3:11]

But then I think Jehoshaphat had a second thought about it. He thought, “I’ve promised too much here. I better hold back just a little bit before I promise to go into this battle with the king of Israel. Let's find out what the Lord’s will is.” And I think he should have done that before he made his promise. Jehoshaphat said to the king of Israel, “Inquire, I pray you, at the word of the Lord today.”

Ahab claimed to be a worshiper of the true God. Ahab gave his sons, who turned out to be wicked men, names that included the name of the God of Israel. He followed his wife Jezebel for political purposes and she endeavored to bring the Baal worship into the land, and if it had not been for the way God raised up Elijah and Elisha, humanly speaking, she would have succeeded. And the whole witness to the true God would have been destroyed in that land. But Ahab claimed to be a worshiper of the Lord. He only permitted his wife to bring in this Baal worship. And so Jehoshaphat said to the king of Israel, “Inquire, I pray thee, at the word of the LORD today.”

“LORD” and “Lord” [4:36]

The LORD here is in capitals. Recent scholars would probably say, "Inquire at the word of Yahweh." The translators of the American Standard Version of 1901 would say, "at the word of Jehovah today." We don’t know how the name of God was pronounced. But I think it is unfortunate that we all would say “LORD” when we mean a proper name. And then when we say “God” we mean the title. That is, a type of being of which there is only one God. And yet the
average person gets exactly the opposite impression of God as the proper name, and they think of LORD as a title. The Bible it is very clear that you know the difference between “God” and “LORD.” “God” is the generic God, and “LORD” is Jehovah. So here Jehoshaphat is saying, "Now, don’t look to Baal; don’t look to your advisor here; don’t look to these false things. Look to Jehovah, look to the true God. See what He says."

**Hesitation on the prophecy from 400 prophets [6:03]**

And so the king of Israel gathered the prophets together, about 400 men, and these were not the prophets of Baal, of course. Jezebel had killed most of them, shortly before. Probably Jezebel had brought some new ones in. But if any of them were in this group, they’re not mentioned. They kept their identity secret if they were of them. These were men who claimed to be prophets of the true God. There were four hundred of them, and Ahab said to them, "Should I go up against Ramoth-Gilead, and shall I forbear." And they said, "Go up, for the Lord will deliver them into the hand of the king," and that should have settled it. Four hundred prophets all agree that God said go up, and I will give you this victory; shouldn’t that settle it? But when you find too much unanimity, there is a good reason to hesitate. People don’t agree with others that readily, so, I am always skeptical when people make numerous decrees and want you to sign all of them. It is hard to find even two people who will agree on everything. There are many things that are absolutely clear in the word of God. There are facts about the universe that we can be absolutely positive of, but there is a great deal that we must use caution to see exactly what the facts are. And so when you find four hundred prophets here agreeing, and all saying the same thing together, and nobody raising any questions, it certainly sounds as if they are trying to please Ahab.
Micaiah prophesied calamity [7:58]

And so Jehoshaphat said in verse seven, "Is there not here another prophet of the LORD that we might inquire him?" I’ve known of people who have tried to interpret this as, "Instead of these prophets of Baal, is there a prophet of the LORD we might inquire of him?" But that is not what the Hebrew says. The English could be understood that way but the Hebrew is, "Is there not another additional prophet, is there not another one of the Lord?" These are all claiming to be prophets of the LORD. Jehoshaphat doesn’t enter into the question. He just says, “Let’s find out if we can get better light on it from somebody else, and is there someone else?” And the King of Israel said to Jehoshaphat, “There is just yet one man named Micaiah, the son of Imla, whom we could inquire of the LORD, but I hate him, for he does not prophecy good concerning me, but evil”. But that word "evil" has changed its meaning. Today "evil" means what is morally wrong. But in old English, “evil” means anything that is harmful, whether morally wrong or physically wrong. In this case, he means he doesn’t prophesy good luck, he prophesizes calamity. "He doesn’t prophesy good concerning me, but evil." Jehoshaphat said, "Let not the King’s say so."

Micaiah’s answer to Ahab [9:42]

Now, that’s a very weak answer. Let’s see what happens next. “So the king of Israel called an officer and said, ‘Hurry and bring Micaiah the son of Imla’. And the King of Israel and Jehoshaphat, the King of Judah, sat each on his throne having put on their robes in an empty place near the entrance of the gate of Samaria, and all the prophets prophesied before them. And Zedekiah the son of Hanniah made him horns of iron, and he said, "thus says the LORD, 'with these shall thou push the Syrians until thou has consumed them.'” This is an object lesson, one of many we find in the Scripture. We find in the book of Ezekiel that God caused him to use many object lessons. God wants us to use every way we
can to get his truth across to reach people with it. But here we have a man who
was not a true prophet who uses an object lesson and all the prophets agreed,
saying, “Go up to Ramoth-Gilead and prosper for the Lord shall deliver it into the
king’s hand.” Now a messenger spoke to Micaiah and said, "Behold now the
words of the prophets declared good unto the king with one mouth. Let thy word, I
pray thee, be like the word of them and speak that which is good.” This is good
advice if you want to get along well, you say what the other people think. And if
you get into any, almost any, group anywhere you are going to find a temptation to
do that. God doesn’t want us to be contentious, always causing trouble, always
making difficulties. That’s one of two extremes. Oh, but how many fall into the
other extreme; they just go along with whatever will advance them in the group
that they are in. Even men who are really accomplishing things for the Lord can
fall into this temptation; it’s one of the traps of the Devil that we want to watch out
for.

**Micaiah’s Sarcastic Advice to Ahab [11:59]**

And so this man gave good advice to Micaiah. Micaiah answered him, “As
the Lord lives, what the Lord says to me, that will I speak.” But then he appears to
contradict himself it in the next verse. The next verse says, “So he came to the
King and the King said to Micaiah, ‘Shall we go against Ramoth-Gilead in battle
or shall we forbear?’ And he answered, ‘Go and prosper! For the Lord will deliver
it into the hand of the King.’” Micaiah did exactly what the man told him. His
word was exactly like the rest of them.

But this shows us some of the difficulty of writing. They are two different,
altogether different arts, writing and speaking. When you speak, you use gestures;
you use expressions in your face; you use your accent; you emphasize by the tone
of your voice; you use all these outward actions to get ideas across. But when you
write, its just cold sentences. When you write, you have entirely different methods
of getting your thought across, and those methods are hard to express when you speak. I’m giving a paper at the meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society this coming December. And the man who placed it on the program said, “I believe everybody will be greatly interested in this, can you bring your paper with you and give it to our editor so we can put it in our journal?” And I wrote back and I said, "speaking and writing are two entirely different arts, and I want to get my thoughts across to those who will be listening. If I prepare a paper, I will use quite different language, and it will be quite a bit of work. Whether I will get that particular paper, or whether I will get in shape for publication, I really don’t know. I want to concentrate on what I’m going to say, not on what I’m going write, because speaking and writing indeed are different."

**The understanding of Micaiah’s saying by the context [14:01]**

But here in this passage we have to judge what is said by the context. And here look at verse 16, “And the King said to him, ‘How many times shall I adjure you that you tell me nothing but that which is true in the name of the Lord.’” Why on earth did Ahab say that? Why didn’t Ahab simply say to Jehoshaphat, “See, even this man who always speaks evil to me, even this man agrees with the rest that we should go up to Ramoth-Gilead.” It’s perfectly obvious that there is something going on that the plain words do not indicate. I think we should read it something like this. Verse 15, “And the King said to him, ‘Micaiah, shall we go against Ramoth-Gilead in battle or shall we forbear?’ And Micaiah answered him, “Go and prosper! For the Lord will deliver it into thy hand.” Not sure that’s a good representation, but I’m sure that there was something in his tone and manner of diction that said to anyone who heard him, "I’m saying what you want, but this isn’t what I mean at all." Otherwise, I am sure Ahab wouldn’t have answered the way he did. And I think that’s important in reading the Scripture that we recognize that when things are quoted from people, often there is an expression, which may not be expressed by the written words. And sometimes we can get an erroneous
impression if we don’t examine what we read carefully from that viewpoint. But here it’s made absolutely clear; Ahab said to him, “How many times shall I adjure you, that you tell me nothing but that which is true in the name of the LORD.” And then Micaiah had built a verbal platform for himself from which he could better address Ahab's question. Micaiah might have come right out and said, "No, don't go up to Ramoth-Gilead." And if he had, Ahab would have said, “See Jehoshaphat, this fellow here, he’s just always giving us this awful stuff.” Ahab could have cut him off after a sentence or two if Micaiah had started negatively. Jehoshaphat might have said, “Well, if they don’t all agree, I won’t go” and Ahab would have said, “Well, it’s only one against four hundred, you said you would be with me whatever happened, after all he’s a follower of the LORD, but why pay much attention to him?” But Micaiah worked up a situation in which he would get a chance to speak in length. And I think he gave us an example of that. When we are presenting the Word of God, it’s not enough simply to go and present the Word of God; we want to find an opportunity, we want to build a platform to make a situation where people will be ready to listen.

Now, of course, the church is supposed to do that when we speak in the pulpit. And it did, a hundred years ago or a hundred and fifty. Then everybody worked in the field; they worked, most of them, as farmers or blacksmiths or something like that. They did hard work, hard physical labor all week, and they had little chance to use their minds. So it was a treat to hear the minister expound the Scripture, often for an hour or two. But nowadays, when our minds are full of so many things, just simply standing in the pulpit doesn’t necessarily build you enough of a platform. And many people won’t even come to the church. But God wants us to find ways of getting a hearing; to find ways of getting people interested so they are willing to let us talk. And in this situation, when Ahab adjured him not to say anything but what’s true, he means, "Tell us what you really have in mind." Then Micaiah has a perfect opportunity to speak fully. But
even then he doesn’t come right out and use language that will give Ahab an opportunity immediately to say, "O look at this awful fellow, the way he always rails on me!" Micaiah takes an oblique approach, he makes very clear what he means, but he takes an oblique approach that makes it difficult to interrupt him. This gives an opportunity for him to speak fully and get his message through to Jehoshaphat.

Micaiah’s technique to present truth and the figure of speech [18:32]

So after building verbal platform, Micaiah goes on to say, “I saw all Israel scattered upon the hill as sheep who have not a shepherd. And the Lord said, 'These have no master; let them return, every man to his house in peace.’” Of course, it is easy to see what he means, the king’s going to be killed. The people will be left without a leader. He doesn’t come right out and say it, but he gets the idea across. So that when the king of Israel said in verse 18 to Jehoshaphat, “Did I not tell thee that he will prophesy no good concerning me but evil?” Jehoshaphat wasn’t ready to say, “That’s right; he’s a troublemaker. Let’s go.” Jehoshaphat was rather ready to say, “Let’s hear a little more. What really does he mean?” The passage continues, “And here is the word of the Lord. I saw the Lord sitting on his throne and all the host of heaven standing by Him on his right hand and on his left. And the LORD said, ‘Who shall persuade Ahab so that he may go up and fall at Ramoth-Gilead? And one said on this matter and another said on that matter.’” Do you think this really happened? Do you think God asked some of his emissaries "What do you think we should do?" Certainly not! God is omniscient. God knows all things. God plans all things. He controls all things. But here in a figurative way the truth is presented in a figuratively interesting way. The Bible has figures of speech, and we can use figures of speech too, but let’s be careful that people understand them. The way people often speak about heaven gives the outsider the impression, well, we’re going up there and we’re going to strum harps day after day, year after year. I was just reading a book by a professor
at a university where he said nothing could be more terrible and disgusting than the Christian idea of heaven. Who would want to sit strumming harps and singing for thousands of years? He said he’d prefer hell to that anytime. Well, the Bible never said heaven was like that, but many, many people have the idea of that it is. And we want to be careful distinguishing figures of speech that have a meaning but must not be carried too far, and that which is actually specifically taught that we must say. Actually, the Bible teaches very little about heaven. The main thing we know is that we cannot imagine the glories that God has prepared for those that love him. But the details we know nothing about, and it’s certain that we won’t be something that is monotonous or tiring. There will be change; there will be plenty of worship, plenty of glorifying God, and there will be change; there will be interesting work; there will be all that will satisfy our deepest needs. We can be sure of that.

God is omniscient and uses wickedness to show truth [21:30]

But Micaiah went on; he said, “There came forth a spirit that stood before the LORD and said, ‘I will persuade him’. And the Lord said, ‘Where with,’ and he said, ‘I will go forth and be a lying spirit in the mouth of all these prophets; and He said ‘Thou shall persuade him and prevail upon all to go forth and do so.’ Now therefore, behold, the LORD has put a lying spirit in the mouth of all these thy prophets and the Lord has spoken even with certainty.” Now, the phrase "the LORD has put a lying spirit in the mouth of all thy prophets," that is figurative. The Lord has permitted wickedness to be made clear. The Lord has permitted Ahab to go on in his wicked ways to reach his death at Ramoth-Gilead. God hardened Pharaoh’s heart, but before we read that God hardened Pharaoh’s heart, we read several times that Pharaoh harden his own heart. God permits us, if we turn against him and follow wickedness, to go on in the way of destruction. Yet, even a man that may seem to you absolutely hopeless, God may use you to bring the word of God to that man and lead him to salvation. You may talk to one man
over and over, day after day for years, but he may never become a Christian. And another man with one witness only and he may accept the Lord. You don’t know what God’s deal is. But until a man has actually died, and only if you’d known the thoughts of his mind during those last few moments, can you say that that particular individual was lost. God knows; we don’t know; God alone knows the heart. But God gives us the mission of presenting his word, of building a platform on which to present it, getting people to be interested and willing to hear, and then presenting the word to them. In this case, Ahab refused to hear. Ahab went on in his own way and Ahab died at Ramoth-Gilead. And Jehoshaphat suffered loss, too. As a result of this, his grandson Ahaziah was murdered because Jehoshaphat worked together with Ahab. God wants us to think through what we’re to do. He doesn’t want us off in the corner working with no one, but he doesn’t want us to compromise with that which is evil, which will hurt our testimony and lead us off into wickedness and perhaps into death. There is much to learn from these Old Testament stories. There is more of great interest in this chapter, but I think these few matters we can think upon and pray that God will drive the truth of his glory deep into our hearts.

**Final Prayer [24:23]**

Let’s end this class with prayer! “God, our father, we thank you for Jehoshaphat. Jehoshaphat, a man, who did so much good and yet who made unfortunate mistakes. Help us, our Father, to emulate his good qualities and help us to avoid the mistakes that he made. And our Father, we thank you for Micaiah. We know nothing more about him, Ahab said, “Put him into prison. Hold him there until I come back safely.” We don’t know what happened to him, but we know that you know, and we know that Micaiah has a place of glory in the courts of the LORD because he stood true despite all efforts to destroy his testimony. O lord God, we pray for each one here, that you will use us to lead souls into your kingdom, our primary purpose of the Christian being left in this world. That you
will help us to show others how to grow in grace and how to grow in grace ourselves. In the knowledge of the Lord, O our Father, help us to stand true despite all the efforts of Satan to lead us astray we ask in Jesus name. Amen”.

Read and edited by Dr. Perry Phillips

Initial editing by Ted Hildebrandt;
Class Editor: Brittany Bauman:

Transcribers: Christine Monaco, Courntey Kane, Katelyn Parsons, Michael Miller, Zach Bohling, Molary Pearson, Jennifer Hansen, Victoria Adevai