

## Is it the Old or New Jerusalem Spoken of in Isaiah 65: 18?

**S. E. PRICE.**

IN this verse and following we are told of the blessings in store for Jerusalem. Some, however, think this refers to the New Jerusalem, while others have applied it to the Jerusalem that now is. In the most part of the first chapter the Lord is denouncing Israel for their sin and idolatry and profaneness. Then inv. 16 he gives them hope and some promises of blessings, saying that the former troubles have been forgotten, because they are hid from my (God's) eyes, and inv. 17 he gives joyous promise, saying, "For behold I create new heavens and anew earth, and the former shall not be remembered or come into mind," (or upon the heart, |margin). Then he commences by a disjoining word, we used to term a disjunctive conjunction, thus a disconnecting of subjects, and say, But be glad and rejoice in that I (will) create: for behold, I create Jerusalem a rejoicing and her people a joy. V.18.

Now first, it would be of no use to make promises to that nation then about a New Jerusalem for they had never heard or been taught of such a thing. But-this is not the greatest reason why I have looked on this as referring to the Jerusalem of then, for the reading goes on to say (v. 19,) And the voice of weeping shall no more be heard in her, nor the voice of crying (no more.)

Now these words 'no more' surely gives the inference that weeping and crying had been heard in this Jerusalem he is speaking of. Surely none will believe that these things were ever heard in the New Jerusalem.

Then he goes farther to say, And there shall be no more thence an infant of days, nor an old man that hath not filled his days, for the child shall die 100 years old. Was there ever (taken) from the New Jerusalem an infant of days, or any that had not filled their days?

1000 years, is not the promise left us, "And there shall be no more death?" Rev. 21: 4, Then we are told that the sinner dying at 100 years shall be accursed, v. 20, (die with a curse. ) Then comes more glorious promises, and v. 23 says, 'They shall not labor in vain nor bring forth for trouble.' Indeed, are we to suppose that they are to bring forth at all? that is, be births in the New Jerusalem.

Then more blessed promises are added. And by a careful reading without a bias of mind it seems one can easily discern that all (I believe) these promises to Jerusalem in the Old Testament refer to the one that then was, of which they knew and understood, Read the same promises in chapter 49, too lengthy to quote, but by reading verse 13 we may see it is the one that has been afflicted that is to be comforted. By verse 14 we may see it is Zion, which of course is in Jerusalem, and she is spoken of as saying, The Lord hath forgotten me. Verse 15, Can a woman forget her sucking child?

We cannot believe that the New Jerusalem would fear that the Lord had forgotten her, but it goes on, Yea, they may forget, yet will I not forget thee. Verse 16, Behold I have graven thee upon the palm of my hand, Thy walls are continually before me. "They that made thee waste shall go forth of thee. V. 19. For the waste and desolate places and the land of thy destruction shall even now be too narrow," etc. This cannot refer to the new earth nor to the city of the New Jerusalem.

When Jesus comes, he comes to restore all things, so the curse will not be in all the earth. So the Lord can easily and literally fulfill Isa, 11, and all the beautiful and cheering promises, and so "the sucking child [plenty will be in the embryo state when he comes] shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child put its hand on the cockatrice's den," v. 8.

In the love of truth, a sister in Christ.

Danrille, Ill.