# Dr. Robert Vannoy, Foundations of Biblical Prophecy, Lecture 11, Session 12, Course Introduction Resources from NotebookLM

1) Abstract, 2) Audio podcast, 3) Briefing Document, 4) Study Guide, and 5) FAQs

## 1. Abstract of Vannoy, Foundations of Biblical Prophecy, Lecture 11, Session 12, Literary Critics on Isaiah and Daniel, Biblicalelearning.org, BeL

**Lecture 11 of Robert Vannoy's *Foundations of Prophecy* examines scholarly debates surrounding the authorship and dating of Isaiah and Daniel.** The lecture explores arguments for multiple authors of Isaiah, focusing on differences in language, style, and historical context between chapters 1-39 and 40-66, while considering arguments and evidence for the book's unity and single authorship. **It introduces the concept of redactional unity, where a book exhibits thematic consistency despite multiple authors, and analyzes the potential for historical errors in Daniel.** The lecture evaluates claims that predictive prophecy is impossible, and investigates challenges to traditional interpretations of the book of Daniel, looking at the question of whether the prophecies originated with Daniel in 539 B.C. or with someone else. **Ultimately, Vannoy assesses the strength and weaknesses of evidence supporting both traditional and critical views, encouraging critical engagement with these complex issues.**

## 2. 14 - minute Audio Podcast Created on the basis of Dr. Vannoy, Foundations of Biblical Prophecy, Lecture 11, Session 12 – Double click icon to play in Windows media player or go to the Biblicalelearning.org [BeL] Site and click the audio podcast link there (Old Testament → Major Prophets → Foundations).



Vannoy_FoundProp
hecy_Session12.mp3

# 3. Briefing Document: Vannoy, Foundations of Biblical Prophecy, Lecture 11, Session 12, Literary Critics on Isaiah and Daniel

Okay, here's a detailed briefing document summarizing the key themes and ideas from the provided excerpts of Robert Vannoy's "Foundations of Prophecy, Lecture 11," focusing on the authorship of Isaiah and Daniel.

**Briefing Document: Authorship of Isaiah and Daniel**

**Subject:** Analysis of arguments surrounding the authorship of Isaiah 40-66 and the Book of Daniel, drawing on the Vannoy lecture and cited sources.

**Main Themes:**

- **Challenges to Traditional Authorship:** The lecture primarily deals with challenges posed by critical scholarship to the traditional view that the books of Isaiah and Daniel were written by the prophets whose names they bear. These challenges stem from historical-critical approaches and enlightenment worldview that question divine intervention and predictive prophecy.

- **Arguments for and Against Multiple Authorship of Isaiah:** Vannoy examines arguments based on differences in concepts, language/style, and historical background to determine if Isaiah 40-66 was written by a different author than Isaiah 1-39.

- **Critical View of Daniel as Fictional:** Vannoy discusses the mainstream critical scholarly view that the Book of Daniel is fictional, written in the Maccabean period during the second century B.C., rather than by Daniel himself around 539 B.C.

- **Impact of Philosophical Worldview:** Vannoy notes the underlying philosophical assumptions about the impossibility of predictive prophecy influences interpretations of Daniel.

**Key Ideas and Facts:**

**I. Isaiah 40-66 Authorship Debate:**

- **Literary Critical School:** Critical scholars attempt to differentiate authentic portions of prophetic books from later additions. Isaiah and Daniel are frequently studied due to their long-term predictions.

- "The Literary Critical School...would view the prophets as writers, but then attempt to sort out in the prophetic books what was authentic...and to sort that out from later additions."

- **Core Arguments Against Isaianic Authorship of Isaiah 40-66:Conceptual Differences:** Claims that the ideas and concepts in Isaiah 40-66 differ from those in Isaiah 1-39. Vannoy finds this the least convincing argument, stating, "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."

- **Linguistic and Stylistic Differences:** Focuses on word usage and linguistic oddities. Vannoy finds this argument more important than the first.

- Example: Preference for 'ani' (first person singular pronoun) over 'anoki' in Isaiah 40-66. However, Vannoy cites Aalders' counterargument that the usage pattern in Isaiah 40-66 doesn't fit post-exilic times, potentially indicating an earlier date for the second part of Isaiah.

- "In Isaiah 40-66 'ani occurs 79 times 'anoki occurs 29 times... 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."

- **Historical Background Differences:** Recognizes that Isaiah 40-66 reflects a different historical context (exile in Babylon, rise of Cyrus) than Isaiah 1-39 (Assyrian threat). However, Vannoy argues this could be explained by Isaiah writing to provide comfort to a future exiled Israel.

- "It is probably the most important argument. I think it's undeniable that chapters 40-66 reflect a different historical background than 1-39."

- **Counterarguments and Support for Unified Authorship:Linguistic Agreements:** Cites linguistic oddities shared between both sections (e.g., unique variant of "Thus saith the Lord").

- "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".

- **Margalioth's "The Indivisible Isaiah":** Argues for unity based on consistent language and style, classifying the book by subject and finding similar expressions

unique to Isaiah in both parts. Margalioth argues that 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?

- **Rooker's Diachronic Analysis:** Presents linguistic evidence suggesting Isaiah 40-66 is earlier than Ezekiel and post-exilic Hebrew.

- Rooker's 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".

- **Computer Analysis:** Notes that computer analyses of linguistic data have produced divergent conclusions, suggesting this method is not yet conclusive.

- "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."

- **Relevance for Isaiah's Contemporaries:** The message of comfort in Isaiah 40-66 would have been relevant to a "godly remnant" in Isaiah's time, facing the impending exile.

- **New Testament Testimony:** Mentions New Testament quotations attributing passages from both parts of Isaiah to Isaiah the prophet.

- "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."

- **Manuscript Evidence:** Lack of manuscript evidence for a separated Isaiah.

- **Redactional Unity:** Some critical scholars now accept a "redactional unity," meaning that later writers imitated Isaiah's style, creating a unified composition without single authorship.

- "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."

- **Longman/Dillard's Assessment:** Contemporary critical thinking acknowledges the unity of themes and motifs in Isaiah, but attributes it to redaction rather than single authorship. They draw an analogy between Isaiah 40-66 and Deuteronomy 34, suggesting that the historical setting of Isaiah 40-66 precludes Isaiah's authorship, just as Moses could not have written the account of his own death in Deuteronomy 34.

- **Schultz's Critique:** Questions whether the doctrine of inspiration can be stretched to encompass the historical-critical theories of multiple authors and editors of Isaiah, especially when not acknowledged in the text.

## II. Book of Daniel Authorship Debate:

- **Critical View:** Mainstream critical scholars believe the Book of Daniel is fictional, written around 165 B.C. during the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, rather than by Daniel himself around 539 B.C.

- "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."

- **Reasons for Critical View:Rejection of Predictive Prophecy:** Underlying assumption that genuine predictive prophecy does not occur.

- "The fundamental underlying issue; it is the wide spread assumption that generally predictive prophecy does not happen."

- **Alleged Historical Errors:** Claims of historical inaccuracies suggest a later origin.

- Vannoy notes that 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. Also, that a person named Darius the Mede never existed in the historical context in which he is placed in Daniel. 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.

- **Alleged Late Linguistic Indicators:** Claims of linguistic features indicating a later writing date.

- **Daniel 2 & 7 and Critical Theories:** Vannoy points out that 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.

- **Responses to Alleged Historical Errors:Belshazzar:** Babylonian sources suggest Belshazzar was co-regent while Nabonidus was away.

- "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."

- **Darius the Mede:** Suggests possible identities for Darius, including another name for Cyrus or Gubaru (governor of Babylon).

- "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."

- **Nebuchadnezzar as Father:** Argues that referring to Nebuchadnezzar as Belshazzar's "father" is common Semitic usage, meaning ancestor or descendant.

**Conclusion:**

The lecture highlights the complex arguments surrounding the authorship of Isaiah and Daniel. Vannoy emphasizes that the arguments against traditional authorship are not conclusive. He also emphasizes the importance of considering the philosophical assumptions that underlie the interpretations of these books.

# 4. Study Guide: Vannoy, Foundations of Biblical Prophecy, Lecture 11, Session 12, Literary Critics on Isaiah and Daniel

**Foundations of Prophecy: A Study Guide**

**I. Quiz**

**Answer each question in 2-3 sentences.**

1. What are the three main arguments used to support the claim that Isaiah 40-66 was not written by the same author as Isaiah 1-39?

2. How does the book of Deuteronomy provide an analogy for understanding the authorship of the book of Isaiah?

3. How did some critical scholars attempt to reconcile the unity of the book of Isaiah with the claim of multiple authorship?

4. How does the New Testament's use of quotations from both parts of Isaiah factor into the debate about the book's authorship?

5. Why does the mention of Cyrus in Isaiah 40-66 pose a problem for those who believe in a late date for the book's composition?

6. According to the lecture, what was Isaiah's objective in the early chapters of the book?

7. What are the three primary reasons for the lengthy conclusion of mainstream critical scholars regarding the book of Daniel?

8. What is the traditional interpretation of the four empires depicted in Daniel 2 and 7, and how does it conflict with the critical dating of the book?

9. Explain the counterarguments to the alleged historical errors related to Belshazzar, Darius the Mede, and Nebuchadnezzar's relationship to Belshazzar in the book of Daniel.

10. According to the text, what do Dillard and Longman assert about the end results of the debate of Isaiah?

**Quiz Answer Key**

1. The three main arguments are: differences in concepts and ideas, differences in language and style, and differences in historical background. Proponents of

multiple authorship argue that these differences suggest a different author living in a later period.

2. The book of Deuteronomy provides an analogy because Deuteronomy 34, which describes Moses' death, is believed to have been written by someone other than Moses due to its historical setting, even though the book is traditionally attributed to him. Similarly, some argue that Isaiah 40-66 was written by someone other than Isaiah due to its later historical context.

3. Some critical scholars acknowledge a redactional unity, suggesting later writers imitated Isaiah's style, creating a compositional unity without a single author. This acknowledges thematic and linguistic consistency while maintaining multiple authorship.

4. The New Testament frequently quotes from both sections of Isaiah, attributing them all to Isaiah the prophet. This provides strong evidence, in the view of many, for the book's single authorship, challenging the multiple-author theory.

5. The mention of Cyrus, who lived long after Isaiah's time, creates a challenge because it implies predictive prophecy, which some critical scholars reject. They argue that the second part of Isaiah must have been written after Cyrus's rise to power.

6. According to the lecture, Isaiah's objective in the early chapters of the book was to declare to the nation its sin and the need to repent. The second was that God would punish them by sending them into exile.

7. The three primary reasons include the widespread assumption that predictive prophecy does not happen, alleged historical errors in the book, and alleged late linguistic indicators.

8. The traditional interpretation identifies the four empires as Babylonian, Medo-Persian, Greek, and Roman. This conflicts with the critical dating of the book because the Roman Empire arose after the alleged writing date in the Maccabean period.

9. Counterarguments include: Belshazzar was co-regent during Nabonidus's absence; Darius the Mede may have been another name for Cyrus or a governor appointed by him; and "father" can refer to any ancestor in Semitic usage.

10. According to the text, Dillard and Longman assert that "in some respects the end results of the debate are somewhat moot". This relates to the idea that the

historical background does not necessarily eliminate the reality of prophetic inspiration.

## II. Essay Questions

**Answer each of the following questions in essay format, demonstrating your understanding of the source material.**

1. Discuss the arguments for and against the multiple authorship of Isaiah, focusing on the linguistic and stylistic evidence. How convincing are the arguments, and what are the limitations of each?

2. Explore the significance of the historical context in the debate surrounding the authorship of Isaiah. How do different interpretations of the historical setting influence conclusions about authorship?

3. Analyze the role of predictive prophecy in the critical assessment of the books of Isaiah and Daniel. How does one's view of predictive prophecy affect their interpretation of these books?

4. Compare and contrast the conservative and critical approaches to the authorship of Isaiah, highlighting the key assumptions and arguments of each perspective.

5. Evaluate the analogy between Deuteronomy 34 and Isaiah 40-66, as presented in the lecture. Is this a valid comparison, and how does it impact the debate surrounding Isaiah's authorship?

## III. Glossary of Key Terms

- **Diachronic Analysis:** Analysis that studies the historical development and change of a language over time.

- **Synchronic Analysis:** Analysis that examines a language at a specific point in time, focusing on its structure and relationships among its elements.

- **Redactional Unity:** The concept that a text has coherence and unity not due to a single author, but due to later editors or redactors who compiled and shaped the material.

- **Eschatological:** Relating to the end times, or the ultimate destiny of humanity and the world.

- **Apocryphal:** Of doubtful authenticity, although widely circulated as being true.

- **Historical-Critical Method:** A method of biblical interpretation that seeks to understand the historical context, sources, and development of biblical texts.

- **Prophetic Inspiration:** The belief that prophets received divine communication or guidance, enabling them to speak or write God's message.

- **Septuagint:** The Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible (Old Testament).

- **Predictive Prophecy:** The ability to foretell future events through divine inspiration.

- **Literary Critical School:** A method that views prophetic books as the products of multiple authors and editors, attempting to distinguish between authentic words and later additions.

# 5. FAQs on Vannoy, Foundations of Biblical Prophecy, Lecture 11, Session 12, Literary Critics on Isaiah and Daniel, Biblicalelearning.org (BeL)

Here is an 8-question FAQ based on the provided text, formatted in Markdown:

**1. What are the main arguments used by critical scholars to suggest that the book of Isaiah has multiple authors?**

Critical scholars primarily argue for multiple authorship of Isaiah based on three key points: First, they claim there are differences in the *concepts and ideas* presented in Isaiah 40-66 compared to Isaiah 1-39. Second, they point to *differences in language and style* between the two sections. Third, they emphasize *differences in the historical background and context* reflected in the different parts of the book, with Isaiah 40-66 appearing to address a people already in exile in Babylon.

**2. How do proponents of a single Isaiah authorship respond to arguments about differences in language and style within the book?**

Those who believe in a single author for Isaiah argue that differences in language and style can be attributed to the *difference in subject matter* between the first and second parts of the book. Just as different subjects necessitate different vocabulary and modes of expression in modern writing, the same could be true for Isaiah. They also point to *linguistic oddities* shared between both sections of Isaiah as evidence of a unified authorship. Additionally, some scholars, like Rachel Margalioth, have argued that the two sections are remarkably similar in language and style, even using unique expressions that are peculiar to Isaiah.

**3. What is "redactional unity" and how does it relate to the debate about Isaiah's authorship?**

"Redactional unity" is a concept used by some critical scholars to acknowledge the coherence and unity of themes and style in the book of Isaiah *without* attributing it to a single author. They propose that later writers and editors imitated Isaiah's style, creating a unified composition through a complex process of redaction. This allows them to recognize the book's internal consistency while maintaining their belief that Isaiah himself did not write the entirety of it.

**4. How does the New Testament factor into arguments about the authorship of Isaiah?**

New Testament quotations that attribute passages from both Isaiah 1-39 and Isaiah 40-66 to "Isaiah the prophet" are a *major argument for single authorship*. Examples include John 12:38-41, which quotes from both Isaiah 53 and Isaiah 6 and attributes them to Isaiah, suggesting that Jesus and the New Testament authors viewed the book as a unified work by a single author.

**5. What is the central historical argument against Isaiah being the sole author of the entire Book of Isaiah?**

The main historical argument is that Isaiah 40-66 seems to be *addressed to a people already in exile in Babylon*, and that the message includes named references to Cyrus of Persia. Critical scholars say this would not have made sense to Isaiah's original audience in the 8th century BC, who were facing the threat of Assyria, not Babylon. They argue that the circumstances are more fitting for a prophet living during the Babylonian exile in the 6th century BC.

**6. What are the main reasons why critical scholars consider the Book of Daniel to be a fictional work from the Maccabean period?**

Critical scholars generally consider the Book of Daniel to be fictional and dating from the Maccabean period (around 165 B.C.) for three primary reasons:

- **Denial of predictive prophecy:** A widespread assumption among critical scholars is that genuine predictive prophecy does not occur.

- **Alleged historical errors:** Claims of historical inaccuracies in Daniel are interpreted as evidence that the book was written long after the events it describes, when the author either didn't know or had forgotten the actual historical details.

- **Alleged late linguistic indicators:** Late linguistic indicators in the text.

**7. What specific historical "errors" in the Book of Daniel are often cited by critical scholars, and how are these "errors" addressed by those who support the historicity of the book?**

Critical scholars often cite the following alleged historical errors in Daniel:

- **Reference to Belshazzar instead of Nabonidus:** Critics argue that Daniel incorrectly identifies Belshazzar as the king of Babylon when it fell to the Persians, when Nabonidus was actually the king. Defenders point to evidence that Nabonidus appointed Belshazzar as co-regent while Nabonidus was away.

- **Existence of Darius the Mede:** Critics claim that Darius the Mede never existed in the historical context presented in Daniel. Defenders propose that Darius the Mede could be another name for Cyrus himself, or a reference to a governor appointed by Cyrus.

- **Nebuchadnezzar as father of Belshazzar:** Critics argue that calling Nebuchadnezzar the father of Belshazzar is inaccurate, as Belshazzar was likely his grandson. Defenders explain that "father" is used as a broader term for ancestor in Semitic languages.

**8. What is the significance of Daniel's visions of empires (Daniel 2 and 7) in the debate over the book's dating and authorship?**

The visions in Daniel 2 and 7, which depict a succession of empires, are crucial to the debate. The traditional interpretation identifies these empires as Babylonian, Medo-Persian, Greek, and Roman. However, the *rise of the Roman Empire after the Maccabean period* presents a problem for critical scholars who date Daniel to that time. If Daniel's prophecies include the Roman Empire, it would suggest that the book was written before the rise of Rome, lending credence to the traditional view of Daniel writing in the 6th century BC. To avoid this, critical scholars often reinterpret the visions to fit a sequence of empires existing prior to the Maccabean period, sometimes requiring the creation of an "apocryphal" Median kingdom.