

figurative statement of one who hasn't accomplished for the Lord, or something like that. But the one who has not accomplished, the one who was barren, it could be a description of the person in the exile, ~~but~~ of Israel in the exile, but if it was, it ~~was~~ <sup>would</sup> surely seem to be a more logical thing, to have the imperfect rather than the perfect. ~~used~~ You who have not been for a certain time in the habit of doing this more than you who have not done it, it would seem as if you had never done it, wouldn't it? It seems to me it is exactly reverse. Now here he addresses the one who is described as barren. And then he says more are the children of the desolate than the children of the married wife. Well, many commentaries say the desolate ones and the married wife are the same one, they both stand for Israel. The desolate is Israel in exile, and possibly a little bit after. The married wife is Israel in Jerusalem, having the capital, having the king, being the Lord's city, and the children of the married wife would be the spiritual successors, the effectiveness, the outreach, whatever you want to call it, of Israel in the days before the exile. Now more are the children of Israel in exile, or coming out of exile, than the children of the married wife. Well, the married wife seems a rather strange way to use a comparison, because if he could take them and bring them back from exile, surely they were no longer desolate but were again becoming the married wife--it wouldn't, they wouldn't have had these children while desolate, they'd have had them after again becoming the married wife, wouldn't they? When you said back in the previous chapter, where is the bill of your mother's divorcement? What's the evidence of the divorce? Isn't she still the married wife? Well, if she was considered as divorced during the exile, she was certainly taken back when brought back. It doesn't seem to me at all a satisfactory interpretation, but it is the one that you find in a good many of these commentaries. Now the apostle Paul gives a very different sort of interpretation. Where is the verse where Paul quotes it, do you remember? Yes. That is the reference to Hagar, where in Gal. 4, Paul says that there are two Jerusalems, there is the Jerusalem that now is, that is in bondage with her children, and the Jerusalem which is above,