

Dr. Marv Wilson, Prophets, Session 25, Isaiah, Part 3

© 2024 Marv Wilson and Ted Hildebrandt

This is Dr. Marv Wilson in his teaching on the Prophets. This is session 25, Isaiah, Part 3.

We commit ourselves to you, help us in all of our classes, help us in our relationships, help us in the big questions of life as we struggle to get to your perspective. Thank you for the message of the prophet that resonates in our hearts each day.

Help us to be able to live that out in each of our individual situations. I ask for your blessing on this class. I pray through Christ our Lord. Amen.

A reminder, Monday our test will cover Joel, Obadiah, Micah, and Habakkuk. And the introductory materials we've been talking on, on Isaiah, as well as obviously the reading and the syllabus.

So, follow that as your guide. There will be some true and false, some fill-ins, some multiple choice, some paragraph essays, and at least one longer essay. So, it will cover all the material as it usually does.

So, review that. Do you have any questions on that? Alright, what I want to do this hour is give just a synopsis of the arguments for the unity of the book of Isaiah, and then I want to go on to talk about biblical poetry, which Isaiah personifies and talk about some of the main characteristics of biblical poetry. Our last time we talked about the Deutero-Isaiah school, their arguments being, well, the name of Isaiah is not in 40-66.

There are theological, historical, and literary or stylistic reasons why they say this could not be from the hand of the 8th century prophet Isaiah. In response to the Deutero-Isaiah school that was very strong in the 1800s, 1900s, and is still obviously a very popular theory, those who historically have held to the unity of the book have several arguments. Let me give you two from the area of tradition, very briefly.

One of our apocryphal books is Ecclesiasticus, sometimes called The Wisdom of Jesus ben Sirach, written around 180 BC, which would be right before the Maccabean period, a decade or two before that. The writer of Ecclesiastes praises the activity of Isaiah, and he ties this in with King Hezekiah. In Ecclesiasticus 48, he says, and I quote him, he, namely Isaiah, comforted them that mourned in Zion.

So, this earliest evidence from tradition seems to speak of he, namely Isaiah, which is the context, the prophet of Isaiah himself, who has interaction with Hezekiah, who obviously is a king at the end of the 8th century and going into the 7th century like Isaiah. So, the language there is *parakaleo*, which means to comfort, and the same word we have in the Septuagint for chapter 40, comfort ye, comfort ye my people. So, he says, he comforted them that mourned in Zion, not Babylon, and he showed the things that should be to the end of time.

That material is sometimes cited by the school of the traditional authorship of Isaiah, saying Isaiah was actually ministering there in Zion, not in Babylon among the captives, as the second Isaiah supposedly had his ministry. The second point here in tradition that I briefly want to summarize is that of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Those who hold to the unity of the book would point to the scroll of Isaiah. Particularly you can see this if you go to the Shrine of the Book today to see whether those who are copying this 24-foot scroll made any kind of distinction or separation between part A and part B, between the end of chapter 39 and the beginning of 40, as if these were two separate documents written 200 years apart, which is the argument.

When you look at the Isaiah scroll, you find that there is no break in the manuscript at the end of chapter 39. Chapter 39 ends just one line from the bottom of the page. Now, Hebrew is written right to left, so right here on the Isaiah scroll, we have the end of chapter 39, and the very bottom line in that leaf of the manuscript starts chapter 40 here and goes like that.

So, is there any evidence for a break? Well, the evidence stays for about eight letters at the end of chapter 39. So, it doesn't at least seem to be a major or unusual break between 39 and 40. Another argument used by those who uphold the unity of the book is that the author of 2nd Isaiah, or so-called Deutero-Isaiah, seemed to be quite familiar with Judea.

If this unknown, anonymous prophet allegedly lived among the exiles in Babylon, how is it that he shows a rather detailed knowledge in some passages about plants and animals and climate and trees, for example, native to the land of Israel, mentioned cedars and oaks and cypress, for example, in chapter 44. Also, in 43:14, it speaks of sending to Babylon, not addressed to those who are in Babylon. The vocabulary of the book is another argument that's often leveled, and the key expression that's often cited in the vocabulary of the book is this term, Holy One of Israel.

The word Holy One of Israel is only found five times in the Old Testament, outside the prophecy of Isaiah. But within the prophecy of Isaiah, that expression is found 12 times in chapters 1-39 and it is found 14 times in 40-66. 12 in the first half of the book, 14 times in the last half, the Holy One of Israel.

So, since this is not a ubiquitous term used for the God of Israel but a rather unique term where Isaiah holds better than 80% of all the uses of that term, what do we find? They are equally distributed between both parts of the book. If Holy One of Israel was a trademark of First Isaiah, as it's called, then the best school that holds to the unity of the book would say, well, Second Isaiah is trying to imitate the style of First Isaiah, who loved this term, the Holy One of Israel. Of course, those who uphold the unity of the book would simply say, well, it's simply evidence, obviously, that the same person is responsible for primary material here, comes from Isaiah, the son of Amoz, in both the first and second halves of the book.

There are other interesting expressions, words, and phrases used in both parts. Words like caprice, thornbush, or when you hear in Handel's Messiah, the mouth of the Lord has spoken it. That's a very unusual term.

You haven't been reading that regularly in the other prophets you've been reading. The mouth of the Lord has spoken it, and yet you find that in 1:20 and in chapter 40, verse 5. There are other points of comparison in vocabulary where some of these rather unique expressions are found in both parts. Unity School says this is evidence.

Similar vocabulary is evident of simply the same author, just as one would make the argument in the New Testament. Paul has a flair for athletic terms. He was born in Tarsus.

He knew the games in the Greco-Roman world, and so he uses that. Or it's true, the medical language of Dr. Luke. I have a book in my library by Hobart that takes many expressions in Luke's gospel that were common to the medical world of the first century, and Luke employs those vocabulary words.

The strongest evidence, probably, the Unity School of Isaiah leverages is the so-called New Testament evidence of where the word Isaiah is used in the New Testament. Quotations are introduced from the book of Isaiah, mentioning the prophet himself, rather than mentioning the book of Isaiah. It speaks of Isaiah the prophet who speaks or prophesies.

The New Testament has a good number of references coming from Isaiah 1-39 and others from the second half of the book. For example, in Isaiah the Prophet, that expression is used in both parts of the book. Isaiah's prophecy is used in both halves.

Isaiah said and saw and spoke, or Isaiah cried, or Isaiah became bold and said. So, the New Testament authors quote from all parts of the prophecy as if these parts are from this person, Isaiah. The question, however, even though this is done rather extensively throughout the New Testament using the word Isaiah, especially for chapters 40 and on, the question comes to what degree we can use that expression in the New Testament to solve isagogical questions.

Isogogics is the subject of biblical introduction. Things dealing with authorship and date. The New Testament writers obviously did not use citations and quotations and allude to the Old Testament with the precision that you would be expected to write a term paper today.

We see, for example, that names of Old Testament characters are often associated with a whole collection of writings. For instance, Luke 24-44 speaks about Moses in regard to the law. For me, as I look at the evidence, I think it makes a lot of sense to uphold the Mosaic tradition behind the Pentateuch.

On the other hand, I think probably most of us would argue that the 34th chapter of Deuteronomy was not written by Moses. And yet, his name is associated with the law itself. Psalm 2 is an orphan psalm.

We don't know who wrote Psalm 2. There's no tradition behind it. But when you read Acts 4.25, it says David's name is associated with that psalm. Well, David's name is associated with the whole collection itself.

Does Luke in Acts 4:25 baptize Psalm 2 with David's name, saying he's associated with that psalm? Is that a valid tradition or not a valid tradition? Is it a way of simply referring to the collection of psalms because he's the major contributor? We know there are 73 psalms attributed to David. But a third of the psalms are orphan psalms where we don't know who the author is. So, is this just a general way of ascribing something to David? The same is done in Psalm 95.

95 is not a Davidic psalm, but according to the New Testament, it is ascribed to David. David has a key name associated with the whole work. And so, I'm simply raising the question here.

If New Testament writers use the word Isaiah says or Isaiah prophecies and so forth, it's possible that that could be a more general reference to the whole collection rather than precisely the prophet himself. So, it's not a neat and clean conclusion to that particular point. There's an interesting theory of Isaiah's authorship that R.K. Harrison, in his telephone book Introduction to the Old Testament, comes up with.

R.K. Harrison has a more moderate view of multiple authorship. He says the book of Isaiah is really an anthology of the proclamations of the prophet. The word anthology means a collection of various parts put together.

And he says these were compiled by Isaiah's disciples. Isaiah 8.16 speaks of disciples. We talked a little bit about this collection of traditions and the role of the Talmudim in bringing these together, sayings of the prophets.

And so, Harrison argues the Isaiah disciples preserved his material in what he calls a two-part or a bifed arrangement. And he says chapters 1-33, and by the way, the Masoretes do make a major break after chapter 33. So, there seemed to be a tradition there fairly early.

Masoretes did their work in the 6th and 10th centuries A.D. up in Galilee. Tiberius became a great center where they standardized the text, put the vowels in, and added the verse numbers of the Old Testament. So, if it was a two-part form, chapters 1-33 and then 34-66, and his theory is based on a break, you can see in the Dead Sea Scroll version after chapter 33.

Of course, there are no chapter numbers as we know them in the Dead Sea Scrolls, but what we know today is chapter 33. So, if there is a break after 33, he thinks two scrolls might have been easier to carry and handle rather than one long scroll, easier to use for instructional purposes by his disciples, and he thinks this could have been put together around 630, which would take us pretty close to the time of Josiah, just about to the time of the beginning of Jeremiah's ministry, the last 40-45 years before the end of the Southern Kingdom. So, that's R.K. Harrison, who was an evangelical scholar for many years, taught up in Canada, and one I wrote a lot of dictionary articles with that have yet to have been published.

The project has been going on since 1983. I hope someday it will see the light of day. Just a final practical word.

Well, in certain Christian circles, issues of authorship and date, or issues of how we interpret the Bible, often become issues of separation and division. Choose your battles carefully. If we use Augustine's threefold motto, which I think in general works well, to keep us focused on the big issues, in essential unity, in non-essential liberty, and in all things charity.

You've got it in essential unity. What are your theological non-negotiables, or what are other non-negotiables you have, without which you would say, I'm not going to that church anymore, or I'm out of this Bible study because the issue here to me is a watershed issue that Christians should never divide about.

To have the wisdom to know what those issues are. The reason you want to be very careful is that, remember, biblical interpretation is a man-made science, and even views of authorship can be theories and ideas, and these are put together, and sometimes they may not always reflect the kind of emphasis that you feel should be employed. So, in essential unity.

That's why in the Christian church today, we can have many denominations, but if we're clear on what the Gospel is, if we are clear that the Bible is authoritative, and the Word of God if we are clear on some other essentials, about which there is no

ambiguity about what the Bible teaches. If there is that clarity, then I think it is very important, as the Proverbs says, as iron sharpens iron. We need to be with others who have this consensus.

And that's very important for our growth in faith. If everything is unglued and up in the air about the Bible, you've got nothing to stand on. And there are certainties to the Christian faith.

Verities. There are foundational planks we stand on. And that's why basic Christian theology is very important, to know what you believe and why you believe it.

But there's a difference between the core, the heart of your faith, about which you ought to have convictions and other things that you have opinions, views, and ideas, but Scripture itself is ambiguous or lacking in sufficient evidence. And so therefore, the way we handle those kinds of things should be with a lot of charity, it seems to me. If others come in and don't use that kind of charity, then that can be indeed problematic.

Alright, in the last half of the class today, I want to talk about some of the main characteristics of Hebrew poetry and some examples. Yes? I personally like the traditional argument of the book, but I don't like it in what I would call a very mechanical way. The writers of Scripture were not like court stenographers sitting there, you know, taking dictation.

I think the longer I have studied Scripture, the more I can appreciate that God has been shaping and working within the community of faith some of these documents over a number of years through a living tradition within the community. It's different how they had to collect things in an oral culture, as opposed to a strictly written culture. And because of this, I think we do have to be open, ended a bit on some of these issues rather than having very firm and strict categories.

So, I can see, because Isaiah was such a very powerful figure in Scripture, I can see his disciples over a period of time adding collections, oracles, sermons, and other things to some of this material over a period of time. What I do reject is there are some people, for example, that would say, well, Osiris is mentioned in the second part of the book, and Isaiah lived from 740 to 680, let's use those dates, and that's 540. He could never have perceived those things in advance.

Because you have an anti-supernatural bias about certain things, if an angel could deliver the name of Yeshua in advance because He would save people from their sin, if Isaiah had the wisdom to know the Messiah would be born in Bethlehem, that's a rather precise teaching. Then it certainly is within the realm of divine revelation that God could even reveal names like Cyrus in advance.

So, if that's the only reason because you have to be a contemporary of Cyrus to write that, I don't accept that as really the only reason. So, I think we have to look at this as a more organic and dynamic development and be open to a number of interpretations. It's all the Word of God, and it's all inspired.

Those are the things we go to the stake for, not the name of the author. I don't know who wrote Hebrews, but I know it's part of Holy Scripture, and I know it was authoritative in the life of the church. And I don't have to know who the author is.

Some parts of these prophecies probably were put together long after the prophet himself died. Main characteristics of Hebrew poetry. Just a few things on this.

There are three main characteristics of Hebrew poetry, and I am very briefly going to mention the first and the third. I'm going to spend most of my time on the second, which is parallelism. So, here's the big picture of what I'm going to be talking about for the rest of this class.

There are three universally accepted characteristics of Hebrew poetry. And Hebrew poetry is big in the Old Testament. One third of the Old Testament Scriptures are poetry.

So, it's very important that we know a few of the basic things going on here. The first is rhythmical units of thought. In modern poetry or Western poetry, we tend to have set meter and lines that rhyme.

When Jack and Jill went up the hill to fetch a pail of water, Jack fell down, and Jill came tumbling after. Mr. Foster went to Gloucester. And rhyme.

Rhyme. That's Western rhythm, which often plays a role. Scholars have debated long and furiously about whether there is a set rhythm and meter in the Bible.

It's really more rhythmical units of thought trying to balance lines with more of a sense of rhythm when you look at the Bible. It's quite unlikely the Hebrew poets had standard measures all worked out and defined in a real mechanical sense of the word. If they did, then why are there hundreds and hundreds of amendments to the poetry of the Old Testament to make it conform to this? There seem not to be strict rules of rhyme and meter.

There is an accent in Hebrew poetry, which gives it a kind of rhythmic quality. And sometimes you can hear that accent. Judges 5, Daharot, Daharot avirav, Galloping, galloping go his steeds.

You can hear the horses hit the pavement. Daharot, Daharot avirav. But there are plenty of other places where you feel nothing.

Poetry often expresses emotion and there are emotional impulses which are set forth through poetry. And there are a number of different rhythmical kinds of patterns that emerge. But not in a strict sense of meter.

You know, you have when the writer gets excited and wants to move the narrative quickly, he can have a rhythmical pattern we might call *tutu*. The voice of the Lord is powerful. The voice of the Lord is full of majesty.

The Lord of hosts is with us. The God of Jacob is our refuge. It would be an example of *tutu*.

And I'm not going to go into all these kinds of ways in which lines are arranged and words linked in parallel fashion. There's a lot certainly that could be done here talking about feet and stanzas and all of that. The main point I want to make here is that Hebrew poetry is not in the strict sense metrical as we think of it in modern poetry.

There are words that are lined up in parallel lines and in parallel thoughts. And so it has often that kind of style to it. But if you push that too far and make it too mechanical, it's going to break down.

Sometimes the poets of the Bible get... they use mnemonic devices. Look at Psalm 119. That takes you from aleph to tav, the 22 verses.

Or 22 letters of the Hebrew alphabet. In this case, 8 verses per Hebrew letter. So, you have 176 verses.

Or you take Mrs. Far Above Rubies, the virtuous woman, the noble wife. The last 22 verses of Proverbs 31. She's the total woman.

She's everything from aleph to tav. And so that could be easily remembered and rehearsed as you begin each new verse by moving from the beginning of the alphabet to the end. Four of the five different stanzas of lamentations are alphabetic acrostics.

Lamentations, four of the chapters are 22 verses and one is 66. And four of those five chapters are, again, acrostics set up as a dirge remembering the destruction of Jerusalem. So, these arrangements are varied.

But don't try to make something too mechanical. There's a lot of feeling in poetry. And feeling often trumped in strict lines.

In graduate school, I would read. I had several years of Homeric Greek, which has this dactylic hexameter, which has really a bounce to the ounce as you move along. And there's a cadence there that's very, very precise. Hebrew is quite different from Greek.

Hebrew just moves along as you feel like it rather than Greek, which is very precise and very analytical and sort of reflects the difference between the two languages. Greek is very interested in details. The absence of a definite article in Greek can actually lead to a different theological interpretation of a particular verse.

Whereas in Hebrew, you can leave articles out and throw them in. It's not going to change your theology. So, Greek is so very precise.

It's like working with a brush on a canvas with little details. But Hebrew is more interested in painting word pictures and going with the feelings rather than the precision. The Greeks were very, very precise that way.

I want to talk mostly about parallelism, the second main feature of Hebrew poetry. Parallelism is probably, from our point of view, the primary feature of Hebrew poetry where the second thought line is parallel in some way to the first thought line. And it may be picked up in several different ways.

So, let me comment on several of the main types of parallelism. And I'll give you six or seven of these very quickly and a number of references from Isaiah to illustrate these forms of parallelism. First of all, synonymous parallelism is where the original line is repeated, expanded slightly, or echoed in the second line.

In slightly different words, but essentially, each line says the same thing. One you know from the Psalms, the heavens declare the glory of God, the firmament, which is the roof above, the firmament declares his handiwork. So, two lines.

The second one comes back and restates the first. Isaiah 1.10 Hear the word of the Lord, you rulers of Sodom. Give ear to the teaching of our God, you people of Gomorrah.

That's synonymous parallelism. Isaiah 1:18 is one we will be talking about later in the course.

Though your sins are like scarlet,
they will be white as snow.

Though they are red like crimson,
they will become like wool.

Parallel lines restating the first. Isaiah 9:2 The people who walked in darkness have seen a great light.

Those who dwelt in the land of deep darkness, on them has light shined.
Synonymous parallelism. There are many, many examples of this in Isaiah and, of course, the jackpot of all poetry in the Bible, Psalms, which is the longest book. And that's where you're going to find the most examples.

A second form of parallelism is antithetic parallelism. It's a die stick where the second line expresses a thought that stands in sharp contrast to the first line or in opposition to the first line.

Sometimes, it states a truth in negative form, and often, you have that strong adversative but. My mom used to quote Proverbs 15:1 to me growing up, which is antithetical parallelism.

A soft answer turns away wrath,
but grievous words stir up anger.

The second line is the opposite of the first line. It's set up in a contrasting way.

You know this from your knowledge of Psalm 1.

The Lord knows the way of the righteous,
but the way of the ungodly will perish.

The Lord knows the way of the righteous, which leads to life, but the way of the ungodly will perish. Now in Isaiah 54:7 and 8, antithetical parallelism.

For a brief moment, I forsook you,
but with great compassion, I will gather you.

There's the opposite. There's the contrast.

54:8, In overflowing wrath for a moment, I hid my face from you, but with everlasting love, I will have compassion on you. 65:13,

behold my servant shall eat,
but you will be hungry.
Behold, my servant shall drink,
but you will be thirsty.

Notice again the adversative but. Behold, my servant shall rejoice, but you shall be put to shame. Alright, so the truth in the first line is strengthened or reinforced by a contrasting statement in the second line.

Third kind of parallelism is synthetic. I'm going to give you seven or eight different words because the second line does any number of things with the first line. Here are some of those words that the second line does. It amplifies, compliments, enriches, develops, explains, fills out, supplements. The first line. I could give you a few other words, but the first and second lines bear some definite relationship to each other.

Sometimes it's cause and effect. Sometimes it's prothesis and apothesis. The prothesis is the if clause in a conditional sentence.

The apothesis is the conclusion. If we get clouds today, then it will rain. Prothesis, apothesis, or proposition, and conclusion sometimes in this synthetic.

I'll give you a few examples from Isaiah of the synthetic, where the second line explains, expands, and further develops. 1:23. Your princes are rebels and companions of thieves. The second line comes back then and says, your princes are not just rebellious, but they're hanging around with thieves.

That expands the idea. 2:21. Everyone loves a bribe and runs after gifts. Runs after gifts in the poetry adds, expands a little bit about the intensity.

They're really intent on payola. Isaiah 34:10 is an example of synthetic. 34:10 says, Night and day it shall not be quenched.

Its smoke shall go up forever. Second line adds smoke to expand a little bit further this idea. Isaiah 50:4 The Lord God has given me.

Line one. You don't know what the Lord has given. Line two completes the idea and answers the question.

The Lord God has given me the tongue of those who are taught that they may know how to sustain with the word Him that is weary. So, what God has given comes in the area of speech. That's where the gift is.

So, it completes, amplifies or explains what the first line is about. One other synthetic in 66:2.

All these things my hand has made. Line one.

And so all these things are mine. Line two. Okay.

All these things my hands have made, and so all these things are mine. The implication is that they're made, and so the creator of this claims these as his possessions.

The second line explains further the first line. Synthetic parallelism.

The fourth kind of parallelism is tautological.

If you've studied Greek, you know tautology comes from a demonstrative pronoun meaning these or this. Tautologia is redundancy, needless repetition. Is what I'm saying to you audible to your ear? Is it audible to your ear? You would say, don't bother.

You're saying it twice. Is it audible? You'd say, that's good English. Not, is it audible to your ear? That's redundant.

That's tautology. Now, tautology comes back and repeats the words either verbatim or close to verbatim. They're repeated.

Some of our best examples come from Isaiah 24:16.

But I say, I pine away.

I pine away.

For the treacherous deal treacherously.

Next line. The treacherous deal very treacherously. Say it enough for emphasis, and you get the point.

27:5 of Isaiah.

Let them make peace with me.

Let them make peace with me.

That's real tautology. Strict repetition. 28:10 is one that I've commented on in Our Father Abraham.

I want to call it to your attention because it's a fascinating one where it seems in Isaiah 28:10 and 13, there's a children's spelling lesson going on. RSV says, precept upon precept, precept upon precept, a line upon line, line upon line, here a little, there a little. Which in many ways, I think, obscures what's going on here with this expression, precept upon precept, precept upon precept.

It seems that the prophet is being mocked by a group of men who imply he's treating them like infants. And so, what we have here in Isaiah 28.10 and 13 is the attempt to imitate the sound. These wise guys are making a parody of the prophet.

Much like a child's spelling lesson. And the prophet is confronting the religious leaders of his day who are described here as being in a drunken stupor. And as he seeks to explain God's message to these children who reel and stagger in their vomit and filth, Isaiah 28.7 and 9 finds them making this parody of his teaching.

They seek to imitate his words by mocking him and scoffing him. The Hebrew says, tzav le tzav, tzav le tzav, kav le kav, kav le kav. This is repetitive gibberish.

Isaiah's words are taken as monotonous nonsense. But when you look at it in the Hebrew text, it's tzadi, tzadi, tzadi, tzadi, kav, kav, kav, kav. A little boy here and a little boy there.

Now, the letters tzadi and kav come back to back in the Hebrew alphabet. That's why it very likely is a reference to drilling people in the alphabet. And so what we have here then is a taunt.

And the point of the taunt is that the prophet is like a teacher who thinks that it is his business to instruct grown-up men in their ABCs. So we really miss the meaning here with precept upon precept. It's a caricature of the prophet by people who are trying to mock him and make him to be like a teacher of little kids.

And they mock the message of God, which to them is but a babbling. Kav, kav, tzav, tzav, whatever. That's tautology.

A couple other. Progressive is often called climactic or stare-like. Where it often repeats in the second line a word from the previous line.

Some very good examples of this are in both Psalms and Isaiah. Psalm 29:1,
 Ascribe to the Lord, O heavenly beings, line one.
 Ascribe to the Lord glory and strength.

You come back and pick up that word from the first line. That's why it's called a stair. You build on it.

Then third line,
 Ascribe to the Lord the glory of his name.

24:7, you have the same thing.
 Lift up your heads, O gates.
 Next line, Be lifted up, O ancient doors.

Where you come back and pick up that word from the first line. Isaiah 11:2 is an example of this.

33:22, progressive or climactic parallelism. I do want to talk about chiasmic parallelism in the last couple of minutes as our time is running out.

A chiasm, the letter which looks like an X, the letter chi in Greek. Lends its name to this ABBA kind of poetic structure. So, what is a chiasm? You go A-B-B-A.

When the going gets tough, the tough get going. That's a chiasm. A-B-B-A.

The Sabbath was made for man,
not man for the Sabbath.

So, in arranging your lines, A-B-B-A. More than Israel has kept the Sabbath. It is the Sabbath that has kept Israel. Tradition is not the dead faith of the living. It is the living faith of the dead.

Tradition is not the dead faith of the living. It is the living faith of the dead. That's a chiasm. A-B-B-A. I don't have time to turn to Leviticus 14. But there is a magnificent chiasm there. One of the longest and most complex in the Bible.

The last point. Most of you are familiar with figures of speech in biblical poetry. Similes using Like or as. The righteous man will be like a tree planted by the rivers of water. Simile.

Metaphors. All the trees in the field clap their hands, which is a personification of taking nature and turning it into what humans would do. The hills rejoice.

These kinds of figures of speech are abundant in Scripture. And even zoomorphisms, where animal, forms of an animal, or animal-like beings are attributed to Yahweh. Under the shadow of His wings shalt thou trust, says the psalmist.

As if God is like a big mother bird. Very, very powerful figures. Anthropomorphisms, the eyes of the Lord, the hand of the Lord, using human body parts to be attributed to this invisible one called Yahweh, who has no parts of the body.

But to tell us He's warm, He's personal, He's here. In language, we can relate to. As Calvin said, when God gave the Bible, He lisped.

That is, to get the cookies on the lower shelf so we can understand it. He makes it analogous to the time-space world in which we live. So, when God is described in human-like terms, or having human emotions, anthropomorphisms, as Heschel puts it in his book in the Prophets, it's language that we can process because it's something like this, telling us God is personal, and we can relate to that.

All right, this is a very brief overview of the style of the Prophets in their poetry. That will be it for today.

This is Dr. Marv Wilson in his teaching on the Prophets. This is session 25, Isaiah, Part 3.