

you take the words, word by word, they do fit. Yes? Those are the heads of God's people. They are the ones who should be leading them in the paths of righteousness. They, however, instead of that, are leading them into these human schemes, ~~of~~ ⁱⁿ forgetfulness of God. And therefore the Lord said that the leadership of God's people will instead be given to a different people, that the wilderness will become a fruitful field, and the fruitful field will become a wilderness. As Christ said, that the kingdom of heaven ~~of~~ will be taken from you and given to a people who will bring forth the fruits thereof. I don't think there is much more, no. (stu.5 1/2) Well, I would say this, that in chapter 7, he is looking at the head of the house ~~of~~ David, the representative of God as head of David's house. He is starting in with the failure of the present one, he is looking forward to the future history of this position. Now the emphasis is ~~on~~ the coming one who is going to be the true head of the house of David, and what he is going to accomplish. In this case, it is the leadership of the people of God and how this leadership (6 1/2) and how they are-- what is their future to be, and in the one aspect of the future is the substitution of another. But other aspects of the future are dwelt upon, but in the main, they are the future of this people, rather than of the substitute people. That is, it is a little earlier in the stage, that the emphasis comes. The fact of the substituting is not brought out clearly here but is I think definitely brought out, though not stressed (7) But you look forward to the king, God's own king, what's going to happen? Here is the future, in the one case, God's people, what's going to happen about God's people, here is the future. That's the two. But one aspect of the two is Ahaz replaced by a one who is far better. The other, a turning to the Gentiles, as one feature. But there are other features in both cases. Yes? Does Eph. 3.5-6 mean that this mystery was previously absolutely unknown, or does it mean that it was not known the way it is now? You take John 1, the law came by Moses but grace and truth by Jesus Christ. Goes that mean there was no grace to Moses, no truth to Moses?