

Prophets 89, continued

two or three hours to bringing out the results of this verse here, proving that there is no millennial kingdom of Christ, because if you have the millennial kingdom of Christ you take Revelation literally when it says that Christ is going to reign upon the earth and in this verse they say you cannot possibly take this literally because Isaiah couldn't have walked naked and barefoot. It would have been shameful, it would have been unclean, it would not have been in line with God's commands to His people, therefore it cannot possibly have happened, therefore this must be taken figuratively. It is only a dream, which Isaiah had, and not to be taken literally unless you get away from gross literalism all such low ideas as this of a millennial kingdom of Christ. Now incidentally here I always feel like asking when somebody presents an interpretation of the verse: "Well, what is the purpose of it if you take it that way?" The thing that has always irritated me with many teachers of systematic theology had been that I had known them often to take a verse a few verses and get a principle and then take another verse that seemed to present something sharply in contrast with it and just explain it away so that it means absolutely nothing. Now I don't think that is a right way to deal with systematic theology. I think it is handling the Word of God deceitfully. I don't think God wants us to explain anything away. Something is in the Scripture for a purpose; it has a lesson for us or God wouldn't put it there and He does not contradict Himself. Something clearly revealed in one place will not be proven false in another but the understanding--the true understanding--may involve bringing both together, and seeing the truth in both texts. Now in this case it seems to me that the problem that they raise is altogether unnecessary. Here the whole purpose of this is to attract attention, to present an object lesson to lead the people to ask: "What does this mean. What is the point of all this" and then Isaiah can give the answer and explain what God's message is for them and he is to take the sackcloth off his loins and his shoe off his foot and he walks around naked and barefoot. Now it seems to me that we do not have to--you could take that word barefoot fairly literally if you want. The word naked you do not have to press to the extreme. Perhaps he went without his neck tie. He went around in some way which made the people feel he wasn't properly dressed. He went about in a way that,