Robert Vannoy, Foundations of Prophecy, Lecture 11
Prophets and the Cult, Were the Prophets Writers?

Review: Were the Prophets Writers?

b. The Literary Critical School Continued

In the handout about the composition of prophetic books asking, "Were the prophets writers?" we looked at the traditional view that the prophets were writers. We started on b., "The Literary Critical School," which also would view the prophets as writers, but then attempt to sort out in the prophetic books what was authentic, what was from the hand of the prophet whose name is given to the book, and to sort that out from later additions. I mentioned last time the two books that are most often focused on as far as critical scholarship is concerned are Isaiah and Daniel. I think part of the reason for the attention given to Isaiah and Daniel are the remarkable long-term predictions that are found in the second part of Isaiah as well as the multitude of the visions of Daniel. Those that have a historical-critical kind of mindset with an enlightenment worldview that does not accept the existence of the supernatural and divine intervention in human affairs and certainly do not see the divine revelation the way the Bible represents it. They have a problem, with a reference to Cyrus, for example in the second part of Isaiah, who lived long after Isaiah the prophet, or the long term predictions that you have in the book of Daniel as well as the long term prophecies of Daniel with respect to eschatological material specific to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes who lived in the second century B.C. How could Daniel have known about that? So, the conclusion was drawn that the second part of Isaiah was not written by the same writer as the first part of Isaiah and that the book of Daniel was written later and not by the original prophet Daniel.

1. Isaiah 40-66 Continued

  b. "There are differences in language and in style in the two parts of the book."

We started looking at some of the arguments that people of that viewpoint use to assert that Isaiah 40 is not from Isaiah. In that handout on the bottom of page one I

summarize three arguments. First, "The Concepts and Ideas in Isaiah 40-66 are different from concepts and ideas in the first part of the book (1-39)." Second, "There are differences in language and in style in the two parts of the book." Third, "There are differences in historical background and fact." We had worked through the responses in the arguments for the first one that the concepts and ideas in Isaiah 40-66 differ from the concepts in the uncontested sections in the first section of the book. I don't think we did much with the second argument which is over on page three, that is, the argument derived from the difference in language and in style. I think that is a more important argument then the first one because the first argument involves the subjective judgment of how much different the concept and ideas have to be to require a different author. As I mentioned I see no reason why God could not have revealed material about the servant of the Lord theme to Isaiah in the later part of his very long ministry rather than early on. It's a new concept but that does not necessarily require a new author.

When you get to language and style the argument is more important. Driver lists many words occurring in 40-66 but not in 1-39 or words that occur frequently in 40-66 but rarely in 1-39. So from that particular perspective you start looking at word usage and you see the difference. In response it can be said that it shouldn't be to surprising that you find different words or expressions in the second part of the book as compared to the first because there is a difference of subject matter. If you have a difference of subject matter you would expect a difference in the use of words. So I don't think that argument is convincing either.

The strongest argument from style is the certain linguistic oddities that go along with the later time are said to be found in Isaiah 40-66. Driver argues this on page 240 in his *Introduction to the Old Testament*. To look at this in detail would require an enormous amount of time, so I don't want to spend that much time on it but let me give you a couple examples. In Aalders' work on *An Introduction to the Old Testament* in which is he discusses Driver's arguments and others, he notes that one stylistic argument they make is the preference in second Isaiah for the first singular *'ani* instead of *'anoki,* as you are aware both are first person pronouns. This is said to indicate, then, the

linguistic usage at a later time. In Isaiah 40-66 *'ani* occurs 79 times *'anoki* occurs 29 times. So, yes, there is a preference for *'ani* in Isaiah 40-66. But then what Aalders points out if you look at Haggai and Zechariah, which are clearly post-exilic as far as Haggai is concerned, *'anoki* doesn't occur at all; *'ani* is 5 times and *'anoki* 0 times. In Zechariah *'ani* occurs 9 times and *'anoki* 0 times. If you go back to Ezekiel—a bit earlier then Haggai and Zechariah—you find *'ani* 162 times and *'anoki* 1 time. There is an occurrence there. What Aalders notes is the tendency not to use *'anoki* in the time of Isaiah 40-66 had not progressed as far as the time of Ezekiel. That tends to say that Isaiah is earlier then Ezekiel. In other words, that the second part of Isaiah has a usage pattern that does not fit in post-exilic times. So Isaiah must be earlier then Ezekiel. So you can look at some of these linguistic usage things and raise questions about them.

I think on the other side of the coin, that is on page 4, you can also find points of linguistic agreements on what you might call linguistic oddities in the book between the two sections. For example, the frequent expression used by the prophets, "Thus saith the Lord," has a variant in Isaiah and that variant occurs only in Isaiah. That variant replaces the perfect "*'amar*" with the imperfect "*yomer*" thus indicating durative action, "thus the Lord is saying." That variant is unique to Isaiah. It's used in 1-39 as well as in 40-66 in variant references, and there are more references that expand to the whole of the book. So the fact that that expression is common in all the prophets but it occurs in a variant in Isaiah and the variant occurs in both sections of Isaiah certainly is a pointer toward unity of authorship rather than multiple authors.

1) Rachel Margalioth Refuting the Argument from Style in Isaiah

Now I give those two illustrations of the use of '*anoki* and the imperfect of *yomer* because when you get into this form of linguistic usage it can get very complicated very quickly. I think that if you're interested in it and take time to do it and look at some of the literature that discusses it, you'll find that the arguments go both ways. It is not as clear as it seems to be. Language and styles are different in the first part of the book than the second part of the book. There's a study done by a woman named Rachel Margalioth

called *The Indivisible Isaiah.* It's out of print but a very useful volume. She argues effectively for the unity of the book based on agreement in language and style. In other words, the argument is turned on its head. If you look at your citations on page 14 go down to the middle of the page in that large paragraph that begins at the middle of page 14 Margalioth says, "Kraus enumerates eighteen words and expressions 'peculiar' to Isaiah 'the second.' Several of them, as he admits, are to be found also in Isaiah 'the first,' but in chapters that Kraus ascribes to Isaiah 'the second.'" Now that's an indication for some of the critical scholars that the model they're imposing on the text doesn't fit that section of the Isaiah. "But even if such expressions were to be found in far greater number, what proof can be deduced therefrom? Do special words or expressions in or another chapter prove anything? Does that fact give ground to separating this chapter or any other from the body of the book? In the prophets it is not unusual for one word or more to appear several times in certain chapters although they are not found even once in preceding chapters. Take the expression "the vengeance of the Lord," which appears several times in Jeremiah 50 and 51, but is not to be found again in the whole of the book. Is that sufficient reason for separating these two chapters from the book?" What she is saying is just because you have two words that appear there that don't occur anywhere else, does that give you a reason to question whether Jeremiah wrote those two chapters?

"Or again the expression 'slain by the sword' is found no fewer than ten times in Ezekiel 31 and 32, but does not appear even once in the preceding chapters. Does Ezekiel 31 start a second Ezekiel? In every prophetic book it is possible to point to numerous words, phrases, expressions appearing several times in only one chapter or in a group of chapters and not elsewhere in the book. We are left to conclude then, that such words and phrases are favored in terms of the context."

2) Margalioth's Arguments for the Unity of Isaiah

You see, if you have different language it may be more connected to whatever of the topic of discussion is or the specific message the prophet is giving in those particular

chapters. "As regards the arguments that the two sections of the book of Isaiah differ in language and style, which occur to Ben Zeev is a thing that can not be proven by example, we shall demonstrate in this book, by hundreds of examples, that the opposite is true. Not only are the two sections similar both in language and style, but they are remarkable for their unity in that the similarities between them cannot be ascribed to any influence whatever… The system here is going to demonstrate the unity of both parts," and this next paragraph is on that handout on page 4 where Margalioth describes the systems she uses, "After classifying the book of Isaiah by subject we have shown that in regard to each subject both parts employ innumerable like expressions which are peculiar only to this book. It has also been proved that the specific expressions reveal the same vigor in both parts as well as the same usage. Even common expressions are distinguished by a particular use identical in both. The second section inverts the words of the first. You'll find on page 4 and onto page 5 and page 6 are subjects she uses to classify the book of Isaiah by subject content.

I'm not going to read through all that material but let's look at just a few of her subject classifications. Number 1., "Designations of God" and what she lists there are divine titles used exclusively in Isaiah found common in both parts. In other words, designations for God not found anywhere else—"the Holy one of Israel," for example, is found in both parts of the book. Or "Designations of Peoples of Israel," there are eleven specific epithets regarding the Jewish people that are found in the two sections. Look at number 9 "Words of Admonition;" twenty-one different wordings of rebuke peculiar to Isaiah and common to both parts. Number 10, "Words of Chastisement;" twenty-nine words specific descriptions of degradation, identical in style in both sections of Isaiah. So there are fifteen topics like that are expressed in both parts of the book of Isaiah, and in many cases are unique to the book of Isaiah. So I think that Margalioth has taken this style and language argument and made a pretty good case for the unity of the book and a single author. We're going to come back to this in a few minutes.

3) Redactional Unity

For a long time these critical arguments dominated the field and convinced the majority of biblical scholars that there were multiple authors to the book of Isaiah and based it on the kinds of arguments of Driver and others. These arguments like those of Margalioth for the unity of language and style in both parts of book are now being accepted even by critical scholars. But that doesn't lead them to the conclusion that Isaiah was the author of the book. They will speak now of a redactional unity. In other words, these other writers imitated the style of Isaiah so you get a compositional unity but not a single author. I said I would come back to that later. But in response to this argument that Margalioth has made and others, look at the middle of page six.

4) Mark Rooker

For a more recent discussion of linguistic usage and the theme of Isaiah see Mark Rooker, "Dating Isaiah 40-66: What does the linguistic evidence say?" That was in the Westminster Theological Journal vol. 58 in 1996—a very useful article if you're interested in this sort of thing. In this article Rooker gives a number of examples of how linguistic usage in Ezekiel and post-exilic Hebrew consistently reflects later linguistic features than those we find in Isaiah 40-66. Again it gets somewhat technical but he makes a very good case and gives very convincing illustrations. His conclusion is that if "critical scholars continue to insist that Isaiah should be dated in the exile or post-exilic period, they must do so in the face of contrary evidence from diachronic analysis," that is, analysis that uses the history of development of the Hebrew language and linguistic usage through time.

My conclusion to the argument of language and style is that it cannot provide final proof for either of these positions, although diachronic studies provide the strongest argument for authenticity and unity. In any case it is certainly true that consideration of language and style do not require two or more authors in Isaiah—this is my point.

5) Computer Analysis of Linguistic Data

Now one other issue that sometimes comes into this particular discussion is

computer analysis of linguistic usage that is beginning to appear in biblical studies. If you look at page 15 of your citation at John Oswalt's NICOT commentary on the book of Isaiah where he's discussing this issue. He says, "The nearest thing to objective proof of a lack of unity in the composition appears in Y. Radday's impressive investigation, *The Unity of Isaiah in Light of Statistical Linguistics*. Radday did a computerized study of numerous linguistic features of the book of Isaiah and compared these in the various sections of the book. As a control he studied other pieces of literature, both biblical and extrabiblical, which were reputed to have come from one author. As a result of these researches he concluded that the linguistic variations were so severe that one author could not have produced the whole book of Isaiah. As might be expected these conclusions were greeted with approbation by critical scholars who saw their position as being vindicated…

A number of questions may be raised by Radday's methodology. The very infancy of the field of statistical linguistics raises some questions." Here's a pretty important point. "Do we yet know enough to speak with confidence about the possible limits of variation in a given person's usage?" If you look at a lifetime spanning sixty years how much does a person's linguistic usage change over time? "None of this is to question the integrity with which Radday's study was undertaken and performed, but it is to point out that the evidence is still not as objective as a manuscript in which chapters 1-39 would appear.

Now there are two footnotes. You notice that right after that question about the "limits of variation in a person's linguistic usage," there's a number 5 footnote. Five follows here, "Note that another sort of computerized study of the book's characteristics led to the conclusion that it is a unitary composition." In other words, computer analysis and the conclusions drawn from it are divergent. A study by R. Posner concluded that the composition is not a unity, but his results pointed to different divisions of the book than Radday's. Now you see there are multiple outcomes of any kind of computer analysis, depending on how you set up the program to do the analysis—there are a lot of factors there.

The other footnote is interesting. Number six, "It is ironic that those who lauded the reliability of Radday's methodology as it applied to Isaiah were much less convinced of its reliability when he recently reported that the same methodology established the unity of Genesis." So that argument for critical theories cuts both ways. One way with Genesis, another way with Isaiah. Undoubtedly the next decade will have a lot more use of computer analysis of the biblical writings with conclusions drawn. It will be interesting to see how it develops, but at this point even that is not something with which conclusive conclusions can be drawn. I don't think arguments based on language and style are conclusive either way. But I think what you can say is that the arguments say that you can't conclusively *deny* that Isaiah could have been responsible for the second part of the book.

3. The argument from Historical Background

The third argument is, "The argument from Historical Background." It is probably the most important argument. I think it's undeniable that chapters 40-66 reflect a different historical background than 1-39. In the early part of Isaiah there's a lot of rebuke of the people of Israel and the prediction that God will send the nation into exile for their sin. When we get to the second part of the book you don't find that kind of material. The assumption is that they are already in exile and that the judgment has already happened. The emphasis in the second part of the book is God's promise that they will be delivered from their captivity. In the first part of the book you have many references to the Assyrians. They were a great enemy of Israel at this time. Ahaz has died. But in the second part of the book it is not the Assyrians in view but the Babylonians and the rise of Cyrus the Persian. Of course, Cyrus is mentioned by name. The people of the second part of the book are in bondage to the Babylonians but are to be delivered. So there's a clear historical difference in historical standpoint between the first and second books.

 a. Explanations

Now given that that is in dispute you can explain it in two ways. The way the

critic suggest is that the second part of the book is written by a different author who lived after the exile which had already begun and was about to be terminated. Israel was about to be released to return to their homeland. The second way you can explain that is that Isaiah wrote both parts of the book but in the second part of the book his purpose was to give comfort to Israel after Israel had gone into exile with the declaration that God would deliver them.

If you take that view that Isaiah was the author, then you must answer the question found frequently in the literature: Is there any reason why Isaiah would write something that would have reference to a situation more than a century after his time?

3. Second Isaiah Historically Divergent

Some say, "No, that doesn't make any sense." They use that to argue that someone else wrote the second part of the book. Look at page 16 of your citations from Whybray's Libraries Old Testament Guide to Isaiah paragraph b, where he says, "It is clearly addressed to a group of people who have been exiled from their homeland by a conquering power, which is also referred to by name: Babylon. In four passages Babylon is spoken of by name in these terms and this historical situation is confirmed in numerous other passages. Chapters 40-55 then, would have made no sense in the eighth century, when the people of Jerusalem and Judah were still living at home under the rule of their own kings; when Babylon, far from being a great power, was—and remained until the fall of Assyria in the late seventh century B.C., long after the death of Isaiah—merely one of the cities of the Assyrian Empire; [Babylon was part of the Assyrian Empire at the time of Isaiah the prophet.] and when Cyrus had not yet been born and the Persian empire did not yet exist." That's the historical background argument. "On the other hand, everything in these chapters makes good sense as the message of a sixth-century prophet to the Jewish exiles in Babylon. In other words, the argument is if Isaiah wrote this it would be meaningless to the people of his time who lived under totally different circumstances. What would have been the point? So you ask the question: Is there any relevance for Isaiah 40-66 for Isaiah's own contemporaries? Go to page 13 of your

citations to Hobart Freeman who discusses that in his *Introduction to the Old Testament Prophets.* His comment is, "Not every prophecy needs to be traced to a definite contemporary historical situation, nor directly applicable to the generation to whom it is spoken. It cannot be maintained, as Driver contends, that 'the prophet speaks always, in the first instance to his own contemporaries: the message which he brings is intimately related with the circumstances of his time: his promises and predictions… correspond to the needs which are then felt.'"

  b. Problems with that View – Need for Words of Comfort

Obvious contradictions to this concept of prophecy are Zechariah 9-14, which is future, Daniel 11-12 is obviously future, and Isaiah 24-27 in the first part of Isaiah, which is often called the "Little Apocalypse." There Isaiah speaks about the day of the Lord and the end times. This is not to overlook of course a general relationship of prophecy to the historical situation, which both record the prophetic utterance. So Freeman's response is that not every prophecy must be directly applicable to the generation to whom it is spoken. Most often it is, but there also time when that eschatological kind of prophecy comes which is obviously spoken to address a situation that will come to pass long after everybody to the whom the prophet spoke is long gone.

My comment here is getting back to page 7 of the handout while Freeman is correct as far as he goes, it seems to me chapters 40-66 do have a purpose in relation to the people of Isaiah's own day. The early chapters of the book Isaiah had two objectives: to declare to the nation its sin and the need to repent; then secondly he told them that God would punish them by sending them into exile. All of those emphases are very clear in the first part of the book. There were some who listened and supported Isaiah, although in general his message was not well received. He had been told that at the time of his call, as recorded in Isaiah 6, that his message would fall on deaf ears. I think more and more it was becoming apparent that the people were turning away from God. The prophecy of Isaiah 6:9-10 was being fulfilled and it was clear that the exile predicted in 6:11-12 would inevitably follow.

After the death of Hezekiah, his son, Manasseh became king. Under Manasseh's rule the nation fell into terrible apostasy. 2 Kings 21 describes the evil of the time of Manasseh, the most wicked of the kings of the southern kingdom. According to Jewish tradition Isaiah was sawn asunder during the time of Manasseh's rule. There's a statement in the eleventh chapter of Hebrews about being sawn asunder and some think that's an allusion to Isaiah who was fleeing from Manasseh's agents in a hollow of a tree. The tree was cut down and consequently, he was sawn asunder. Now it may be apocryphal, but it is clear that Isaiah still lived in the time of Manasseh, even though, if you look at the heading of the book, it says in Isaiah 1:1, "The vision of Isaiah during the reign of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz and Hezekiah." It doesn't mention Manasseh.

But if you look at Isaiah 37:38 in one of those historical narratives you read, "One day while he was worshipping in the temple of his god Nisrok. [This is Sennacherib the Assyrian king], his sons Adrammelek and Sharezer killed him with the sword, and they escaped to the land of Ararat. And Esarhaddon his son succeeded him as king." Esarhaddon began to reign in 681 B.C. Manasseh began to reign in 687 B.C. So in 681, Manasseh was already on the throne. So it seems clear that Isaiah's ministry extended on into the period of Manasseh. Now why wasn't Manasseh mentioned in the heading? Some think that Isaiah turned from a public ministry to a more private kind of ministry with a more godly remnant of Israel during the time of Manasseh when everything was so bad and that the second part of the book comes from that period of time.

But to get back to our handout here, when Manasseh became king, Judah turned away from the Lord. So after the death of the good king Hezekiah it must have been clear to Isaiah that the nation as a whole was not going to repent. Exile was inevitable. This would have been obvious as well to the true people of God, the godly remnant, and under those circumstances there would no longer be the need to continue to bring this message of rebuke and condemnation. There was a new need. The new need was to bring words of comfort and hope for the true people of God, those who were following Isaiah, that small minority of people that were true followers of God. As those people saw that judgment and exile were coming and was inevitable just as Isaiah had, it seems to me,

there is relevance for a message of comfort and hope. Yes, you will go into exile, but the exile will not be forever. You will be able to return. So a message that God was going to deliver his people would be a comfort to the true people of God even during the time of Isaiah, as well as comfort for those people who would later experience that exile and would know that God had not abandoned them.

I might say that the Northern Kingdom went into exile at the hands of the Assyrians during the lifetime of Isaiah. Uzziah's reign was from 729 to 715. The northern kingdom fell in 721 to the Assyrians, so that was during Isaiah's lifetime. So the people of Judah knew of an exile. They knew the same judgment had been pronounced on them. It's interesting that in Sennacherib's annals he claims not only to have taken people into exile from the northern kingdom but also to have taken captives from the land of Judah. So there were even people from Judah, if you accept Sennacherib's annals, that went into exile during the lifetime of Isaiah. So I think the message does have relevance for that time. Exile is not the end. God is still with his people. There is still a future ahead. They will return from exile. Go over to the top of page nine: Thus, while admitting that the historical background of Isaiah 40-66 is that of people already in exile, with their city destroyed and the temple in ruins, I don't see any reason why the passage might not have been written by Isaiah a himself century before the exile to Babylon. There's no reason it could not be of significant for his own contemporaries.

 c. Summary Conclusion

So I think those are the three main arguments for concluding that the second part of Isaiah was not written by Isaiah the prophet. The difference in concepts and ideas, the difference in language and style, or the difference in historical background—I don't think any of those arguments are conclusive that there must be a second Isaiah to write chapters 40-66. So those primary arguments fail to prove multiplicity of authorship.

d) Some Final Arguments for the Unity of Isaiah – NT quotations

I think, to the contrary, there are some strong reasons for maintaining Isaiah's

authorship. First, there's no manuscript evidence that the book ever existed in anything but its present unified form. Of course, the interesting thing there is that among the Dead Sea Scrolls we have a manuscript of the entire book of Isaiah from the second century B.C., which witnesses to its unity. That's pretty old. The Septuagint doesn't separate them either, which came from 250-200 B.C. So, some very early manuscript evidence support unity.

Secondly, and I think most important, is that you have New Testament witness to Isaianic authorship. Isaiah is quoted some 21 times in the New Testament. Those quotations are taken from both parts of the book from chapters 1, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 29, 40, 42, 53, 61, and 65. Note particularly John 12:38-40 where you read "This was to fulfill the word of Isaiah the prophet. 'Lord, who has believed our message and to whom has the arm of the Lord been revealed?'" That's from Isaiah 53:1 that's the second part of the book. "For this reason they could not believe because as Isaiah said elsewhere, 'He has blinded their eyes and deadened their hearts so they could neither see with their eyes nor understand with their hearts or turn I would heal them.'" That's from Isaiah 6:10. So right there in that one quotation you have one quotation from the second part of the book and one quotation from the first part of the book. Both of which are said to be from Isaiah the prophet. In v. 41, John adds Isaiah said this "because he saw Jesus glory and spoke about him." In Luke 4:17 you read that the book of the prophet Isaiah was given to Jesus and that he read from chapter 61 and that's quoted there. That's in the second part of the book. In Acts 8:30 the Ethiopian eunuch was reading Isaiah the prophet and what he's reading from is chapter 53. So those are several examples of that kind of New Testament quotation that clearly attributes material from the second part of the book to Isaiah the prophet.

  e) Longman and Dillard, Intro to the OT

Now I just distributed before the class a single page handout of pages 274-275 from *The Introduction to the Old Testament* by Ray Dillard and Tremper Longman, which is a fairly recent Old Testament introduction by two very competent evangelical

scholars. I want to look though this with you because of what they do with this question. About the middle of the first paragraph on the top page 274 Longman and Dillard say, "In some respects the debate about the unity of Isaiah has come full circle, with one crucial difference:" (this is what was alluded to earlier) "rather than a unity resulting from the hand of a single author, the book is now widely viewed as a redactional unity. Instead of viewing Isaiah 40-66 as an independent work accidentally appended to the work of the eighth-century prophet, some scholars now argue that Isaiah 40-66 never existed apart from the first half of the book and that it was composed (through what could yet be a complex redactional process) in light of the earlier material." So you look at the literature today you have often references to one book but not references to one author. There's multiple authorship and a sometimes very highly complex process of the book coming to the present form in which we find it. So there's a unity in the book but not unity of authorship.

Dillard and Longman's next section here is called "An Assessment" and this is where they assess the current state of the situation and problem, "In many respects contemporary critical thinking about Isaiah has recovered from the excesses that characterized scholarship in the late eighteenth through early nineteenth centuries. The consensus among critical scholars has moved in the direction of acknowledging much of what was dear to conservatives: that Isaiah is not the result of a haphazard accident and internally contradictory, but rather that the book is a whole shows a unity of things and motifs,"—that was what Margalioth was talking about. These themes and the language in the two parts of the book are consistent. "The tenor of much of the debate has shifted from the focus on dissecting the text to recover sources and settings, to efforts to expound the coherence and unity of the text as it exists."

That reflects a shift from diachronic to a synchronic kind of analysis of the text in its final form. Now the focus in the last 20 years or so is that they look at the final form of the text, and not so how much on how it came to that final form. Instead they look synchronically at what holds the text together. Arguments from conservatives for unity of authorship based on common themes and vocabulary have been now to a large part taken

over and pressed into service of arguments not proving its unity but a redactional unity in the book. I want to come back to that later with that other handout but let's go further.

"To be sure, critical and conservative thinking remain divided on the issue of authorship. Although there is a growing consensus about the overall unity of Isaiah, for critical scholarship it is a unity forged through a history of redaction rather than a unity that derives from a single individual author." In the next two paragraphs he discusses the conservative view and then the critical view. He says conservative thinking is anchored in its theological conviction of two things. First, about the reality of prophetic revelation that the spirit of God did give to ancient writers a look into the future. Secondly, about the integrity and the trustworthiness of the Scripture as a whole, that is, statements and superscriptions and New Testament citations require acceptance.

 1) God and Prediction of the Future

The sustained polemic of Isaiah 40-66 is that Isaiah announces the future and God is able to bring it to pass. In other words that reference to Cyrus is not just a kind of isolated reference to some future ruler but that's integrated into a sustained argument that goes through the book, that God is able to predict the future. One example is the servant theme of the Messiah that will come. It is another long-term prediction which is sustained the servant sequence that is more remarkable, some may say, than the Cyrus prediction. "Already in Isaiah 1-39, the Exile and restoration are anticipated in passages almost universally considered generally Isaianic. In his call the prophet anticipates the day when Jerusalem would be destroyed and depopulated and he names a son in light of the anticipated restoration ('Shear-jashub' means 'a remnant will return'). The prophet's pervasive use of the remnant motif in Isaiah 1-39 anticipates the threat that will come from Babylon. The prophet made clear his own understanding of that aspect of his prophecy were not related to the immediate, but the distant future." So he says those things about the conservative view.

"Critical opinion is anchored most particularly in the fact that Isaiah 40-66 presumes a historical setting other than that of Isaiah in Jerusalem in the eighth century."

That's the third argument we talked about under the heading "Historical background."
Now he says both positions need scrutiny and that's what he does on page 275, "On the
one hand, if one accepts the reality of a sovereign God and prophetic inspiration, he
cannot say, 'God could not have revealed himself to Isaiah this way.' Such naïve
confidence in the historical critical is every bit as much a theological statement as
insisting that he did.

2) Comparison to Deut. 34

Yet, on the other hand, when critical scholars conclude from the setting of Isaiah
40-66 that the author of these chapters lived fairly late in the Babylonian exile, this is not
in principle a different argument," (This is the crux of the position going along in this
book that is not in principle a different argument) "from that which conservatives are
ready to make, for example, about Deuteronomy 34." Deuteronomy 34 is a passage about
the death of Moses. See why he argued it, "Whatever one concludes about the historical
relationship between the Moses and Deuteronomy, it is clear that Moses did not write the
account of his own death (Deuteronomy 34:1-8); the person who wrote this final section
of this book lived at a time when a number of prophets had come and gone, but none like
Moses. This is to say that the setting presumed by this chapter (a time after the death of
Moses) precludes Moses' having written it. Although the New Testament cites
Deuteronomy and attributes it to Moses, no one would seriously argue that this included
Deuteronomy 34. Recognizing that the setting of Deuteronomy 34 requires an author
living later then Moses, the author traditionally assigned to the book, is not materially
different from recognizing that the background of Isaiah 40-66 presumes an author living
during the Exile." Now you see the way the argument is made. Deuteronomy's generally
attributed to Moses but it's very clear because of historical background that Moses did
not write chapter 34. The book of Isaiah is generally attributed to Isaiah but because of
historical background with chapters 40-66, it's not necessarily the case that Isaiah must
have written them. Their argument is that there is an analogy between Deuteronomy 34
and Isaiah 40-66.

3) Contra Deut. 34 Comparison

It seems to me that that analogy is questionable. I am not ready to concede the authorship of Isaiah 40-66 is proved to be someone other than Isaiah on the basis of that argument. I'll just make a couple points. Deuteronomy 34 is twelve verses. It is historical material. It really gives the conclusion to the book in the sense of what's leading up to 34 is this transition of leadership between Moses and Joshua—that transition with Moses and Joshua really takes affect with the death of Moses. If you move into Joshua, Joshua has replaced Moses as the leader of Israel. It seems to me there is a quantitative and qualitative difference between Deuteronomy 34 and Isaiah 40-66. As I said, Deuteronomy is twelve verses and a historical narrative. Isaiah 40-66 is 27 chapters of enormously significant and important prophetic discourse. Dillard and Longman say that the New Testament cites Deuteronomy and attributes it to Moses. Yes, but it doesn't cite anything from chapter 34 and attribute it to Moses. In other words, that's quite a difference. When we looked in John 12:38-40 where the second part of the book is quoted and that is attributed to Isaiah, there's nothing comparable to that for Deuteronomy. We do have references that attribute Deuteronomy to Moses which are important because today Deuteronomy is also questioned, but there's nothing from chapter 34 quoted in the New Testament. So, I'm not so sure that that analogy is really adequate to prove the possibility that Isaiah 40-66 is not from Isaiah the prophet.

4) Longman/Dillard – Isaiah Not Mentioned in Isa. 40-66

Notice what they say further, "Isaiah is not mentioned in the second half of the book. However the reality of prophetic inspiration is not thereby eliminated: an author living later in the exile foresaw through divine inspiration what God was about to do through Cyrus, just as Isaiah saw what God would soon do with Tiglath-pileser III. This later author saw Isaiah's prophecies of exile and remnant events that were transpiring in his own day, and he wrote to develop and apply Isaiah's preaching to his fellow exiles. Although the anonymity of this great prophet is a problem, it is no more unusual than the

anonymity of the historical books or the book of Hebrews." I'd say that the anonymity of this is a problem and particularly because, contrary to the historical books, you don't have a verse like Isaiah 1:1. Isaiah 1:1 introduces the book, "The vision that Isaiah son of Amoz saw." That heading seems to be a heading for the entire book attributed to Isaiah. We don't have any records like that in the historic books. So the last paragraph says, "It should not be made a theological *shibboleth* or test for orthodoxy. In some respects the end results of the debate are somewhat moot whether written by Isaiah in the eight century or others who applied his written insights in a later time, Isaiah 40-66, clearly was addressed in large measure to the needs of the exilic community."

5) Richard Schultz's Response on Isaiah

That other handout that I gave you is an article taken from the book *Evangelicals and Scripture* published in 2004, and the article that I've given you there is by Richard Schultz titled, "How many Isaiah's were there and what does it matter? Prophetic inspiration in recent evangelical scholarship." I think this is a good article. Let me just call you attention to a couple pages. Notice what he says on page 158, bottom of the page, where he talks about evangelic scholars open to additions and revisions in the biblical text. He says, "Then, maintaining their evangelical view of Scripture, they simply stretch the doctrine of inspiration to cover what they have just proposed." In other words, what he's saying is a lot of evangelical scholars take over the methodologies of many of the critical scholars but then enlarge their view of inspiration to say that all of these editors and later editions are also assumed under a doctrine of inspiration. "One wonders, however, whether any and every historical-critical theory of the origin of biblical literature can be made evangelically acceptable as long as one affirms the 'substantial participation' of the traditional author in process."

He goes on to say, "I remain unconvinced that intellectual honesty and the textual evidence demand that the evangelical acknowledge what most Old Testament scholars today claim about the complex compositional history of the book of Isaiah."

Over on page 161 at the middle of the page he says, "The issue is whether can we

legitimately posit a series of inspired authors or editors when the involvement of multiple prophets is *not* acknowledged in the text and when one of the reasons for positing such a complex compositional process is the claim that the Spirit of God *could not* (or at least probably *did* not) reveal the diversity of contents identified in the book of Isaiah to just one individual." Good question.

Go over to page 162 second paragraph, "Childs [of Yale] accuses conservatives of turning Isaiah into 'a clairvoyant of the future,'" in that particular conservative style. And in the next paragraph Schultz says, "The troublesome reference to Cyrus is probably a primary reason why many evangelical scholars have abandoned, or at least are questioning, the one-author interpretation. However, in Isaiah 41-42, the presentation of Cyrus is juxtaposed with that of the servant, both portraits used in similar expressions. If Cyrus is already on the scene, must the servant also be a contemporary of the posited prophet Second Isaiah?" Go down a few lines, "However, if it was possible for a prophet to speak at that time of the coming of the spiritual deliverer, Jesus, seven centuries in the future, is it problematic to conceive of Isaiah of Jerusalem's speaking of Cyrus, his political precursor, merely two centuries in the future?"

6) Vannoy's Response to Longman/Dillard

Now go over to the last page second paragraph page 170, where we are returning to our initial question, "How many Isaiah's were there and what does it matter." "Dillard and Longman assert that 'in some respects the end results of the debate are somewhat moot.' On the contrary, I have sought to demonstrate that there are significant consequences of adopting historical-critical conclusions regarding the nature of prophetic inspiration, predictive prophecy, rhetorical coherence and theological development in the prophetic books—consequences that are ignored, downplayed or denied in the recent evangelical (and non-evangelical) literature that we have surveyed." So this is a debate that is ongoing. You may be interested in reading further on it, but we're not reading that whole article; I've just highlighted a couple things.

2. Daniel – There's a General Consensus among Mainstream Critical Scholars that the Book of Daniel's Fictional

Number 2., "There's a general consensus among mainstream critical scholars that the book of Daniel's fictional." They posit it was written when Israel was suffering under Antiochus Epiphanes shortly before 165 B.C. The book itself however represents Daniel as the giver of this prophecy both before and shortly after the capture of Babylon by Cyrus in 539. So there is the issue. To whom are we to attribute the prophecies of the book of Daniel—to Daniel himself at about 539, or to some anonymous figure living in the Maccabean period during the second century B.C., around 165 B.C.

There are three primary reasons for the lengthy conclusion of mainstream critical scholars, I think. One is what I call the fundamental underlying issue; it is the wide spread assumption that generally predictive prophecy does not happen. Secondly, alleged historical errors in the book are said to reflect its origin long after the events described when whoever was writing it either didn't know or had forgotten what had actually happened historically. Third are alleged late linguistic indicators.

a. "Predictive prophecy does not happen."

So let us look at the those three arguments. Assumption a. that "Predictive prophecy does not happen." That's essentially a philosophical worldview issue. If the universe is a closed continuum of cause and effect relationships in which there is no room for divine intervention, then of course you don't have divine revelation. It would be impossible for Daniel to narrate events that occurred so long after the time we attribute it to. If you conclude that that kind of genuine prediction does not and cannot happen that immediately raises a question that is pretty significant because of its prominence in the book of Daniel.

1) Daniel 2 & 7 and Critical Theories

For example, is Daniel in chapter 2 and chapter 7 a sequence of empires? In Daniel 2 you have that vision of the image with the head of gold, breast and arms of

silver, belly and thighs of bronze and legs and feet of iron, which was depicting the succession of four empires that were to come to power in the Near East. That same succession of empires is found in Daniel 7 but there depicted with four different types of animals. Now instead of a head of gold, breast and arms, belly and thighs and feet, in chapter 7 you have a lion, a bear, a leopard and some unnamed dreadful beast. The traditional interpretation of the symbolism of those animals, as well as those parts of the image are the head of gold in the image, is the Babylonian kingdom. The breast and arms is the Medo-Persian kingdom. The belly and thighs are the Greek kingdom, Alexander the Great and his successors. The legs and feet are the Roman kingdom. Now that sequence does not fit with the mainstream critical approach because the Roman Empire did not rise historically until after the time of Antiochus Epiphanies who was part of the Greek period. That in turn means that the mainstream critical scholars who date the book in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, have to find a succession of empires that existed prior to the time the book was alleged to be written or you're back to prediction. If you have the Roman kingdom, that wasn't yet in existence even in the time of Antiochus.

So, the proposal critical scholars generally accepted the head of gold is the Babylonian kingdom. The breast and the arms are an apocryphal Median kingdom—I say "apocryphal" because there was no Median kingdom in independent existence between the Babylonian and the Persian empires. Media became part of Persia before the Persians conquered Babylon, so the critical scholars who get a sequence of four kingdoms have to create this Median kingdom between the Babylonian and Persian when it is historically inaccurate. But then the belly and thighs must be Persian and then the legs and feet would be the Greeks so that would conclude in the time which it allegedly was written.

If then the prophecies of Daniel depict this particular succession of kingdoms they are erroneous historically. For critical scholars that's no problem since they simply claim the writer of these prophecies lived centuries later, during the Maccabean period. He might have been simply confused about the earlier course of history and mistakenly thought there was an independent existence for the Median between the Persian and Babylonian period. The conclusion is, "We know better than Daniel, the author, whoever

he was, who was simply mistaken about that sequence of kingdoms."

2) Response to Critical Theory Accusations of Historical Errors in Dan. 2 & 7

So you have this assumption that genuinely predictive prophecy doesn't happen. These historical errors, as we just noted one of the major alleged historical errors is the existence of this apocryphal Median kingdom, but their other errors include—I'll mention three here, none of which are terribly significant: The reference to Belshazzar instead of Nabonidus at the time when the Babylonians fell to the Persians (Daniel 5:30-31) is said to be a historical mistake. "That very night Belshazzar the king of the Babylonians was slain and Darius the Median took over the kingdom at the age of 62." We'll come back to that in a minute, but it's been often argued that Belshazzar was not the ruler, it was Nabonidus.

Secondly, that a person named Darius the Mede never existed in the historical context in which he is placed in Daniel. That same verse speaks of Darius the Mede taking over the kingdom. Thirdly, the records to Nebuchadnezzar as the father of Belshazzar in Daniel 5:2 and 22 would simply be inaccurate because Belshazzar would be the grandson rather than a son. There are reasonable responses to all those allegations.

a) Nabonidas and Belshazzar

First, Babylonian historical sources show that Nabonidus named his son Belshazzar co-regent while he left Babylon for Assyria and northern Arabia. Daniel 5:29 says they ruled as one. It's quite possible that Nabonidus wasn't around that night and his co-regent Belshazzar was in charge at that time of transition from Babylonian to Persian rule.

b) Who is Darius the Mede

Second, while it's true that Darius the Mede is not referred to outside the Bible and that there's no interval between Belshazzar and Nabonidus in the succession to Cyrus of Persia—it was Cyrus who took over the Babylonian kingdom—this does not

necessarily mean that Daniel is in error. Several reasonable suggestions have been made that try to identify Darius the Mede. It is possible that this is another name for Cyrus himself, perhaps a throne name. In 1 Chronicles 5:26 you have the reference to king Tiglath-pileser as Pul. Was Cyrus also known as Darius the Mede? It's possible. Some look at 6:28 where it says, "So Daniel prospered during the reign of Darius and the reign of Cyrus the Persian" some translate that as just narrowing it down—even the reign of Cyrus the first. So that Darius and Cyrus are the same. It's possible. Others have suggested it was another person named Gubaru, which is a name that occurs in Babylonian texts who Cyrus appointed as governor of Babylon. His name was Gubaru also known as Darius. You see while it is true we don't have sufficient evidence to solve the identity of the Darius the Mede—and we don't—I don't think that's reason to conclude that the book was written in the Maccabean period or that the book is necessarily at fault in historical reference.

c) Nebuchadnezzar as Father or Grandfather?

Third, the reference to Nebuchadnezzar as the father instead of grandfather is common Semitic usage. It's surprising that that is even used as an argument. It's simply that he was ancestor and that Belshazzar was a descendant. If you look at page 17 and 18 in your citation D. R. Davies, not an evangelical, in his Old Testament Guide to Daniel says, "Critical commentaries, especially around the turn of the century, made much of the fact that Belshazzar was neither the son of Nebuchadnezzar nor king of Babylon. This is still sometimes repeated as a charge against the historicity of Daniel, and resisted by conservative scholars. But it has been clear since 1924 that although Nabonidus was the last king of the neo-Babylonian dynasty, Belshazzar was effectively ruling Babylon. In this respect, then, Daniel is correct. The literal meaning of 'son' should not be pressed; even if it might betray a misunderstanding on the part of Daniel, a strong case against Daniel's historical reliability is not enhanced by the inclusion of weak arguments such as this." So those are the kind of historical errors that are alleged to exist that show to some

that Daniel was not the author. Let's take a break at this point.

Transcribed by: Ben Hale
Rough edit by Ted Hildebrandt
Final edit by Katie Ells
Re-narrated by Ted Hildebandt