

Robert Vannoy, Major Prophets, Lecture 8

Isaiah 11:1-9, Difference Approaches to Isa. 11:6-9

Review of Isaiah 10

We're still in the book of Immanuel, which is Isaiah 7-12. We concluded Chapter 10 at the end of the last hour, so we move on to Chapter 11 this morning. Remember Chapter 10 ended with the cutting down, you might say, of the forest of Assyria. That's figurative language at the end, but you see you have from verse 28 the advance of the Assyrians from town to town until they come to Jerusalem in verse 32: "He shall shake his hand against the mount of the daughter of Zion, the hill of Jerusalem." But then we have the Lord's intervention: "The Lord shall lock the bow with terror, the high ones of stature shall be hewn down, the haughty shall be humbled. He shall cut down the thickets of the forest with iron; Lebanon shall fall by a mighty one." So at the end of 10 you have the cutting down of Assyria.

Isaiah 11 – Stump's New Shoot

At the beginning of 11 you have a contrast to that in this sense: Assyria falls not to rise again – by 612 B.C. Nineveh is destroyed Assyria is gone. But in contrast to that, the Kingdom of David, which is also cut down – Israel goes into exile – is not destroyed never to rise again; rather, it sends forth a new shoot. The stump is left; it's still alive, and so you read in 11:1, "There shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, a branch shall grow out of his roots." Even though judgment also comes to Judah, and again using the imagery of the tree, Judah is cut down, there is still life and the Lord sends forth this branch, this shoot. So God's people were punished, but they were not completely destroyed, as was the case with Assyria.

Isaiah 11:2 Branch is Messianic Person Endowed by the Spirit

Now, 11:1 is a very well known verse in the Old Testament, "There shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse," a Messianic reference quite clearly. That becomes clearer as you get into verse 2, because you see that verse 2 speaks as if this rod and this

branch is a person, and it is a person who is endued with the power of the Spirit: “And the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the Spirit of wisdom and understanding, the Spirit of counsel and might, the Spirit of knowledge and the fear of the Lord.” And as you go down through the chapter, verses 2-10 describe the results of the coming forth of this branch, and that can be broken down into two further sections: 2-5 speak of his endowment by the Spirit and his actions, and 6-10 describe the characteristics of his kingdom. So let's look at the chapter with that structure in mind.

Deity and Messianic Person Nexus

As I already mentioned, verse 2 speaks of the branch's endowment by the Spirit. If you go back earlier in the book of Isaiah in 4:2, which I suggested should also be taken in a Messianic sense, 4:2 is: “That day shall the Branch of the Lord be beautiful and glorious,” remember, “and the fruit of the earth shall be excellent and splendid.” There's at least a hint in 4:2 of the deity; it's the Branch of the Lord, the deity of the coming Messiah. That becomes a bit more explicit in 7:14: “The virgin shall conceive and bear a son and you shall call his name Immanuel, God with us.” Deity is certainly brought into view in Isaiah 7:14. And then Isaiah 9:6: “For unto us a child is given, he shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, the Mighty God,” certainly deity there. So in 4:2, 7:14, 9:6 – all of which are Messianic – you have the idea of deity.

Isaiah 11:2-3 6 Aspects of the Power of the Spirit and Righteous Judgment

Deity here in 11:1 is not so much in view or stressed, but what is stressed here is his infilling with the Holy Spirit – his infilling with the Holy Spirit, and the righteousness of his actions. So the picture begins to fill out of the coming Messiah. You notice in verse 2 there are six different aspects of the power of the Holy Spirit. I'm not going to spend time on them, but the Spirit of wisdom and understanding, the Spirit of counsel and might, the Spirit of knowledge and the fear of the Lord – grouped in two, two, two, but six total aspects of the power of the Spirit.

And then verse 3, the righteousness of his judgments: “The Spirit shall make him

of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord and he shall not judge after the sight of the eyes neither reprove after the hearing of his ears, but with righteousness shall he judge the poor.” It’s not superficial judgment; it’s not judgment according to appearance with the sight of the eyes, “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.” So verse three speaks of the righteousness of his judgment. John 2:25 says of Christ that he knew all that was in man, and that same aspect of his power that is in view here.

Isaiah 11:4 Righteous Ruler

Verse four is the only verse that speaks of his activities, and when you read verse four the things that are spoken of seem to be things that are characteristic of a powerful ruler rather than of a teacher. Verse four seems to center on things that really have not yet been done by Christ. He came at his First Advent as a suffering servant, as the teacher; he will come at his Second Advent as the ruler. You see verse four says, “With righteousness he shall 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 he shall slay the wicked,” and I think the things that are in view there are things that will take place at his Second Coming rather than his First Coming. And I think that understanding of the verse is confirmed by 2 Thessalonians 2:8 where Paul makes an allusion to this verse when he says, “And then shall that wicked one be revealed when the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming.” Paul is looking to the future beyond his own time, and he speaks at some time in the future, “The wicked one will be revealed whom the Lord will consume with the spirit [i.e. breath] of his mouth.” Now, Paul then sees the slaying of the wicked one by the breath of his mouth, of his lips, as something that had not yet occurred in his own day.

Isaiah 11:4 – Wicked One Destroyed [2 Thes. 2:8; Rev. 19:11-21]

I think Paul’s quotation of this also helps us in another way: when you read in the

last phrase of 11:4, “With the breath of his lips he shall slay the wicked – he shall slay the wicked,” in English that suggests he’ll slay everyone who is wicked. “He shall slay the wicked” The phrase sounds like a collective, but not necessarily, although it could be understood as a collective the way that it is worded in English. In English, when an adjective is used as a substantive, it implies a plural. So, “He shall slay the wicked.” But the interesting thing is, when Paul alludes to this verse, he uses the singular, and it’s speaking of something that was to occur yet future to his own time, Paul’s time. He says, “Then shall that wicked one be revealed whom the Lord will consume with the spirit of his mouth.” “The wicked one” – the Hebrew would allow it to go either way, either as a singular or a plural--but Paul explicitly makes it a singular, and “The wicked one,” in the Greek, there Paul’s allusion to this verse is the Greek word *anomos*, and it clearly indicates an individual is being referred to – this lawless one, “The wicked one.” King James then translates it as, “The wicked one shall be revealed whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth.” “Spirit of his mouth” in the Greek there is *pneumati*, the Hebrew is *ruah*. The King James there says, “With the breath of his lips.” I think it would have been better to keep *pneumati* as “breath”, you should translate pneumatic as it appears in both places the same way. You can equally translate the word as “breath, spirit, wind” – but it would have been better to keep it consistent. But I think that the main thing about the New Testament allusion to 11:4 is that we are led by that clearly to understand verse four to be referring to something that’s yet future, future to the time of Paul, and presumably then still future, future to our own time – the Antichrist question.

It’s also possible as far as an allusion--it is less clear, and the wording is not as explicit--but if you go to Revelation 19, you notice in the passage beginning at verse 11, “I saw heaven open; behold there was a white horse and he that sat upon him was called faithful, true, and righteousness. He doth judge and make war. His eyes were like a flame of fire,” so forth...

In verse 15 John says, “And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword that with it he should smite the nations, and should rule them with a rod of iron.” We have this idea of

the mouth of the Lord, and what goes forth from the mouth is going to slay the wicked ones –here it’s plural, it’s nations – “And he shall rule them with a rod of iron,” a similar idea, and certainly the Isaiah passage--no direct quotation here--but the Isaiah passage could have been in the background of what is said in Revelation 19:15 – yeah it’s plural, it is plural. Verse 21 says, “And a remnant were slain with the sword of him that sat upon the horse which sword proceeds out of his mouth and all the fowls were filled with their flesh,” but I think the Thessalonians allusion to Isaiah 11:4 is certainly much clearer than in Revelation 19.

Isaiah 11:6-9 Character of His Kingdom

Okay, so this first section, 2-5, described his endowment by the Spirit and his actions. Verses 6-9 describe the character of his kingdom. Verses 6-9 is the well-known section of Isaiah 11, “The wolf shall dwell with the lamb, the leopard shall lie down with the kid, the calf and the young lion and the fatling together, and a little child shall lead them; and the cow and the bear shall feed, their young ones shall lie down together; the lion shall eat straw like the ox; and the nursing child shall play in the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the adder’s den – they shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain; for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea.” The character of his kingdom 6-9: nine sums up the facts, as you might say; nine says, “They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain; for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea.”

It seems to me that nine suggests that the picture here is the removal of external danger, brought about through the reign of the Messiah – yes, the removal of external danger brought about through the reign of the Messiah. “Shall not hurt or destroy, for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord.” It would seem that the reference here is to the same period of time referred to in Isaiah 2:2-4 when, “Swords will be beat into plowshares,” and when, in the parallel Micah passage, it says, “Every man shall sit under his own vine and fig tree; there shall be nothing to make them afraid” – removal of external danger. God says that there will come a time on this earth when no one need

fear injury from external attack, and that time will be established by this ruler who is to come, this divine ruler.

Isaiah 11:6-9 and the Millennium

Now, having said that much, there is still a question, and that question is: how do we understand the specifics of verses 6-9? Is that to be taken literally? Or is it figurative? The wolf dwelling with the lamb, the leopard with the kid, the cow and the bear shall feed – all those specifics. It seems to me, whether you take it figuratively or literally, it is difficult to deny that what it tells us of is a time where danger is removed, and where there are conditions of external peace and safety; that seems to be the point. I think that can be understood even if it is a figurative description of a time where there's removal of danger, and where there is peace and safety. That period is normally referred to as the Millennium, of course, taken from the Revelation 20 indication that Satan will be bound for 1,000 years.

I'm not so sure personally I'd push the thousand years; that may be a figure, too, for a long period of time. I don't know that it need be precisely a thousand years, particularly in that kind of literature, apocalyptic literature, but certainly a long period of time of peace and safety – maybe a thousand years, maybe a figure for a long period of time. Isaiah gives no indication of the length of this period; he just says here is the time to come when this rod out of the stem of Jesse is going to rule, when these conditions will be brought into existence.

3 Ways of Interpreting Isa. 11:6-9

Now to get back to that question of literal or figurative, look at your citation selection page 14. I have some paragraphs here from John Oswald, I guess it's Oswald, I'm not sure. This is the New International Commentary volume on Isaiah, chapters 1-39. It came out a couple years ago – from the use I have made of it, it seems quite good. But notice what he says here: “There are three ways of interpreting such statements,” and he is talking about these verses 6-9, “the first is literalistic: looking for a literal fulfillment

of the words. While this interpretation is possible, the fact that the lion's carnivorousness is fundamental to what a lion is, and that literal fulfillment of the prophecy would require a basic alternation of the lion's nature, suggests that another interpretation is intended." So you have to weigh the Old Testament's statements about the Messiah as have been reinterpreted by the Church. So he says 1) The first way is literalistic.

A second means of interpretation is Spiritualistic: the animals represent various spiritual conditions in states within human beings – in other words, you're not even talking about animals. While this avoids the problems of literal fulfillment, it introduces a host of other problems, chief of which is the absence in the text of any controls upon this process; thus, it depends solely upon the exegetes' ingenuity to find the correspondences, contra 5:1-7, that's the passage where Israel is like a vineyard, where the correspondence is clearly indicated.

A third way of interpreting this passage, and others like it, is the figurative. In this approach one concludes that an extended figure of speech is being used to make a single, overarching point: namely, that in the Messiah's reign the fears associated with insecurity, danger, and evil will be removed; not only for the individual, but for the world as well. (See Romans 8:19-21, where creation travails and groans.) Precisely how God may choose to do this in his infinite creativity is his to decide, but that He will do so we may confidently believe – so that what Oswalt suggests is three ways to do it. He opts for that third one. Notice the distinction between his "spiritualistic" approach and the "figurative" as he labels them.

Now, a few comments on that: if you take this section literally, you certainly have an idea introduced that is not found in either Isaiah 2 or Micah 4 – that is the idea that the animal creation is going to share in these conditions of peace and safety in a way which would radically alter their behavior and maybe even their physiology. Some have suggested that what is spoken of here is a return to the conditions of the Garden of Eden before the Fall into sin, which is an interesting idea. You do find in the early chapters of Genesis that all those animals were brought to Adam and he named them; there is no indication of hostility between Adam and the animals or between the animals and the

animals, although there is not a lot of detail there; it just says that the Lord brought them, and Adam named them, and there was not found among them one like unto himself, and then Eve was created. That seems somewhat attractive; however, if you understand it that way it raises the question of death in the animal kingdom prior to the Fall into sin. Was there death in the animal kingdom prior to the Fall into sin? It seems to me when you reflect on that question, it seems quite likely that there was death in the animal kingdom prior to the Fall into sin.

I have on your bibliography, I think at this point, at the bottom of page two, Daniel Wonderly's book *God's Time Records in Ancient Sediments*. I'm sure that's in the library, probably also in the bookstore. There is an appendix in that book on pages 236-240 entitled, "The Problem of Death Before the Fall." He goes into that in some detail, and I think makes good case for concluding there was death in the animal kingdom before the Fall. Death itself in the animal kingdom was not part of the curse as far as the effects of human sin. You know, Romans 5 says that by the sin of one man death entered the world – death by sin; that seems to be referring to the human race, not necessarily to the animal kingdom.

See, if you are going to say there was no death in the animal kingdom, what do you say about--this may sound like silly things, but they are things you have to think of--what do you say about when the elephant walked down to the stream or pool of water to get his drink and he steps on some insects that are in the grass, or so forth: they must have been crushed. What do you say about whales that take in all this plankton and sustain themselves? You know, it's the water that strays through their whatever those sieve-like devices are called. The whole food chain is built on the feeding of one organism on another, and that, I don't think is necessarily to be viewed as part of the Fall. If it were, it would raise up a whole host of other questions, so I think you have to be careful about pressing the details of this. There are a lot of questions we can ask that are difficult to answer in that area. So I'd be inclined to agree with Oswalt that a figurative interpretation that speaks of conditions of removal of external danger is in view, or the point that's being made by all these specifics, the single point, is that there is no reason to

fear – that will be removed.

Isaiah 11:6-9 From a Post-Mil Perspective

But let's look at another question: how do the post-mil and a-mil interpreters understand verses 6-9? For the post-mil view, go to page 11, and I've taken some paragraphs here from Joseph Addison Alexander's commentary on the prophecies of Isaiah – he was post-mil. He says, "Most Christian writers, ancient and modern, with Aben Ezra and Maimonides among the Jews, explain the prophecy as wholly metaphorical and descriptive of the peace to be enjoyed by God's people. In other words, in the present era of the spread of the Gospel. It's a metaphorical description of peace to be enjoyed by God's people in the new dispensation. Alexander continues, "Coeceius and Clericus apply the passage to the external peace between the Church and the world, but it's commonly regarded as," notice, "descriptive of the change wrought by Christianity in wicked men themselves. Vitringa gives a specific meaning to each figure in the landscape making the lamb, the calf, and the fatted beast denote successive stages in the Christian's progress. The lion [represents] open enemies, the leopard more disguised ones, the wolf treacherous and malignant ones, the little child the minister – the little child will lead them; that's a picture of the minister.

"This kind of exposition not only mars the beauty, but obscures the real meaning of the prophecy. Calvin and Hengstenberg suppose the passage to include the promise of a future change in the material creation, in others words, not just in men who have responded to the Gospel, but in the material creation – restoring it to its original condition (Romans 8:19-22), while they agree with the other writers regarding the specific effects of true religion as the primary subject of verse 7 where it says, 'The cow and the bear shall feed... so forth 'lion and the ox shall eat straw...'. " Alexander notes, "Vitringa carries out his allegorical hypothesis by making the cow the representative of Christians who have reached the point of giving as well as receiving instruction, of yielding milk as well as drinking it. He apologizes for the use of straw as an emblem of divine truth, or the Gospel, on the ground that its doctrines are so simple and uninviting to fastidious

appetites.”

The arbitrary character of such interpretations is betrayed by Gill’s remark that straw here means true doctrine, elsewhere false. See, you start going that route and you can put on almost any meaning you want onto the various phrases. Quoting from 6:11, “The truth is that neither the straw nor the lion means anything by itself, but the lion’s eating straw denotes a total change of habit, and indeed of nature, and is therefore a fit emblem for,” here’s the way he understands it, “the revolution which the Gospel, in proportion to it’s influence, effects in the conditions of society, and then with some allusion possibly as before suggested to the ultimate deliverance of the,”—and he has a Greek term there—*ktisis*, or irrational creation, “from that bondage of corruption to which for man’s sake it is now subjected. And the sucking child shall play on, or over, the hole of the asp; on the den of the basilisk shall the weaned child stretch or place its hand.”

Top of page 12, according to Luther and Calvin and Huss, as the children who were to thrust their hands into the den of the anti-Christian serpents – it is really a mere continuation of the metaphor, you see, is the way he takes it, begun in verse 7, and expresses by an additional figure the change to be effected in society by the prevalence of true religion – destroying not just influences, but rendering it possible to live in safety.

That last statement, you see, is the way he views it, “They shall not hurt or destroy in all my Holy Mountain,” and so forth. The first clause clearly shows that the forgoing description is to be figuratively understood: the wolf and the lamb should lie down together means, in other words, that none should hurt or destroy in the Messiah’s kingdom; but Alexander, as with other post-mils, see conditions of peace to be brought about in society through the spread of the Gospel, perhaps with some allusion to deliverance of the creation from the bondage of corruption. In other words, he is not limiting it just to relationships among men, maybe also in some way it affects the creation itself. Now, there wouldn’t be that much difference, you see, between a post-mil and a pre-mil understanding of this. The difference is how these conditions are going to be established: are they going to be established as through the spread of the Gospel in the

present age? Or must we await the return of Christ, and he will establish it subsequent to his return?

Isaiah 11:6-9 From An A-Mill Perspective

Alright, that's post-mil. For an a-mil interpretation, see page 18 and 19 in your citations. This is taken from E.J. Young, Volume 1, page 390, second paragraph, top of page 18. Young says, "How are we to understand the words of this glorious prophecy? Some think that this passage simply depicts a return to paradise such as was taught by the ancients generally." (See note 13 for references.) "According to the older expositors, these expressions of a change in the animal world were simply figures to express a change in man himself; so Calvin, for example, remarks by these images the prophet indicates that among the people of Christ there will be no disposition for injuring one another nor any ferocity nor any inhumanity. And without question the prophet does desire to teach that there will be a change in human nature, inasmuch as this future time blessing will be one in which the knowledge of the Lord will cover the earth as the waters cover the sea. At the same time, it must be noted that Isaiah has placed great stress upon the animals themselves, and this very fact shows that it is impossible to carry through in detail with a figurative interpretation. If all is merely figurative, what is the point of such detailed statements concerning the change in animals? It would appear also that we have here a parallelism, or comparison, with the condition before the Fall of man into sin. Before the entrance of sin into the world, the animals were the helps of man and were named by him. All that God had made was good; hostility between man and animals at least was unknown.

Hengstenberg says rightly, I believe, and in accordance with Scripture, 'Where there was not a cane, neither was there a lion.' May it not be that in an Isaiah's language, 'a lion shall eat straw like the ox,' there is a reflection upon the command and permission granted to the animals that every green herb should be to them for meat?" The next paragraph is on page 391, next page. "Other passages of scripture also indicate that when evil will cease in the rational creation, the reflection of evil will disappear from the non-

rational creation (Isaiah 65:25, 66:22). This change in the non-rational creation implies, of course, the more wondrous change among men themselves. The animals are no longer at enmity one with another because evil has departed from men. Men will know the Lord, and the reflection of that fact appears that even among the animals there will also be a full and complete cessation of hostility. It may be noted also that even upon this more or less literal interpretation, we may not be compelled to press all the details. We need not assume that there will be physiological changes in the structure of the lion, for example. All that is clearly taught is that the animals will not prey upon one another. This is, as Hengstenberg says, “The outmost limit of the changes to be wrought by the blessed rule of Christ. Here there is a change, how much more among men.” (Top of page 19.)

When, however, is this change to appear? In answer, it should be noted that Isaiah has emphasized the fact that the Messiah is the Prince of Peace. When the Messiah has completed his Messianic work, and here we get into this same sort of position that Young took with respect to Isaiah 2: “When the Messiah has completed his Messianic work, peace is introduced into the hearts of men, and insofar as men are true to the principles of peace which they received from the Messiah, so far do the blessings herein depicted obtain.” So to a degree it is being realized now, insofar as men are true to the principles they received from the Messiah – so to a degree it’s being fulfilled now. In its fullness, however, this condition will not be realized until the earth is covered with the knowledge of the Lord, and that condition will obtain only in the New Heavens and the New Earth wherein dwell righteousness. So he is saying in a measure it is fulfilled now to the degree that people are faithful to the teachings of Christ; in its fullness, though, it will only be realized in the New Heavens and the New Earth.

He tends to be, maybe not 100%, but he tends to move in that direction because he says: What is the point of the figurative of all the animals if it is not really going to affect the animals? Although what he is saying is that as long as there is sin, the animals are still going to be the way they are now – it is not until sin is completely removed that the animals will share in this kind of condition.

You could conclude that from what he does say, but he doesn't explicitly say that. But he says, you see, "Insofar as men are true to the principles of peace, so far do the blessings herein obtain." So that's a qualified degree kind of thing. Now, you can come back, you know, but he could say, "Well men don't adhere completely enough to that which they should so that we don't find those results." So then you push this peaceful time into the eternal state.

At the bottom of page 18 of my handout where it says, "We need not be compelled to press the details," that's on 391. Well, no, there he says, "This very fact shows it's impossible to carry through in detail a figurative interpretation." Is that the point? Oh no, the next statement, "If all is merely figurative, what is the point of such details?" Yeah, that's on page 390 just the page before.

But, you see, he is saying the prophecy is partially fulfilled now, but completeness comes in the eternal state – this is top of page 19. He goes on to say, "'Wherever there is sin,' says Bracker, 'there is lack of peace; only where righteousness reigns is there peace.' For this reason, the condition herein described," notice, "cannot apply to a supposed millennium." That's why he rules out a millennium interpretation. "Advocates of a millennial theory maintain that even during the millennium there is sin, for after the millennium the nations will gather for battle. The picture before us, however, is one in which there is no sin, but in which the fullest manifestation of peace is to be seen. We read these words with grateful hearts, for we know that one day we too shall enjoy these blessings in their full sense, and we shall enjoy them only because of the work of Immanuel – that one who was born from Jesse's reed, who in the great battle of Calvary slew the wicked in order that he gave himself a ransom for sin, to his name be all the praise, honor, and glory given." That's on 391.

Isaiah 11:6-9 When Will This Prophecy Be Realized?

So you ask the question, when will this prophecy be realized? The post-mil say in this present age by means of the spread of the Gospel as the effects of true religion work themselves out in society, and in the creation, these things will come to pass. Alexander

suggests that, as we noted, Delitzsch, who was also post-mil, page 12 of your citations, Delitzsch says, middle of the page: “The fathers, and such commentators as Luther, Calvin, and Vitranga have taken all these figures from the animal world as symbolical. Modern rationalists, on the other hand, have understood them literally, but regard the whole as beautiful dream and wish. It is a prophecy, however,” notice what he says, “the realization of which is to be expected on this side of the boundary between time and eternity, and as Paul has shown Romans 8, is an integral link in the present predestined course of the history of salvation. There now reign among irrational creatures from the greatest to the least, even among such as are invisible, fierce conflicts and blood-thirstiness of the most savage kind. But when the Son of David enters upon the full possession of his royal inheritance, the peace of paradise will be renewed, and all that is true in the popular legend of the golden age are to be realized and confirmed – this is what the prophet depicts in such lovely colors.”

So post-mils say in the present age by the means of the spread of the Gospel; a-mils would say partially in the present age, but completely in the eternal state; whereas pre-mils would say these conditions will not be realized until Christ returns and establishes His kingdom, rules with that rod of iron, and establishes these conditions on earth.

Now I say that of pre-mils generally. J. Barton Payne has his own approach: look at page 15, middle of the page. He is speaking of this prophecy; he says, “Fulfillment period 15,” if you have used his *Encyclopedia of Biblical Prophecy*, you know he divides redemptive history, I guess you could say, into periods, and he gives each period a number so that when he comes to a specific prophecy, and he wants to discuss fulfillment, he can just refer to the number – its an interesting scheme. But period 15 in his scheme of things is the Millennium. So he says “Fulfillment period 15,” that’s the millennium “as in Psalm 96:12, the joy in nature in Christ’s return, Romans 8:21, yet,” and here’s the twist he puts to it, “scripture seems to limit the current conduct of wild beasts to their relations with men, and with the domesticated animals of mankind. They’re prevented from destroying ‘in all my holy mountain,’ but elsewhere, lions and

wolves need be no less carnivorous than they seem to have been prior to, or outside of, Eden.” So he’s suggesting, really, two things there. The conditions here, he says, are limited simply to Mount Zion. Elsewhere, animals presumably remain as they are, but then you see he pulls that analogy back into Genesis and suggests that the conditions of passivity among animals was limited to the Garden of Eden. Outside the Garden of Eden, things presumably were as they are now generally. So, an interesting suggestion.

Isaiah 11:10 Messianic Glorious Rest

Okay, verse 10, “In that day there shall be a root of Jesse,” see that goes back to verse 1, “who shall stand for an ensign of the peoples; to him shall the nations seek: and his rest shall be glorious.” Verse 10 is very similar to Isaiah 2:3, because 2:3 speaks of the nations coming to Zion. 2:3 says, “And many people shall go and say, ‘Come, let us go up to the mountain of the LORD, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of 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.” You see here we have this: “a root of Jesse will be an ensign of the peoples, to him shall the nations seek,” and then the verse ends with the phrase, “His rest shall be glorious.” The Latin Vulgate translated that as *sepulcher*, “His sepulcher shall be glorious,” “His rest – sepulcher,” and took that to be a prediction of the glory of the holy sepulcher in Jerusalem, which has been a traditional Roman Catholic interpretation. But if you look at the use of that word “rest” in the Hebrew, it’s never used in the sense of sepulcher. It speaks of a place where there is rest, and it seems much better to understand this in connection with the words of Christ, “Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest (Matt. 11:28).” So the nations shall seek this one who will come, and his rest will be glorious, in Christ they will find rest.

Okay question or comments on this? Isaiah 11:1-10, it’s a well-known passage and certainly one that is of great interest. In my own view it’s one that speaks of the millennial period.

Question: What is a sepulcher?

Answer: a tomb. The Church of the Holy Sepulcher in Jerusalem is presumably the site of the place where Jesus was buried. That's disputed. He was at a Garden Tomb outside the city, which many think is the location. But a sepulcher is a resting place. [Student interjected something] Sepulcher? I'm not sure; it wouldn't surprise me if it is. I'm not sure of the etymology of sepulcher. But the Latin Vulgate translated this as a burial place, "Sepulcher," rather than just as "rest."

Okay? Let's take a 10 minute break and then we will look at the last part of the chapter.

Transcribed by Naomi Toavs, 2009, Gordon College
Edited by Carly Geiman
Rough edit by Ted Hildebrandt
Final edit by Dr. Perry Phillips
Re-narrated by Dr. Perry Phillips