

The simple form of the critical theory assumed that two books by different authors simply came to be written on one scroll, and that it was eventually forgotten that they were two distinct books.

It was not very long after this theory was first advanced before its supporters realized that it could not be maintained in this simple form. The argument which seemed so strong for thinking that chapters 40-66 were not the work of Isaiah applied with equal force to many sections in the earlier part of the book. Outstanding among these sections were chapters 13 and 14, where Babylon seems to be regarded as the great world power. Consequently those who accepted the theory of the two Isaiahs also took chapters 13 and 14 away from the writings of Isaiah and supposed them to have been written 150 years later, and then to have been interpolated into the midst of Isaiah's work. Similar positions were taken regarding many other chapters in the first part of the book. Thus the apparent simplicity of the critical theory proved to be illusory. In view of the situation in Isaiah's day it seems very strange that Babylon instead of Assyria should occupy the first place among the great world powers against which the Lord gives His judgment, and that no part of Isaiah 13-23 should be entitled, "The Burden of Assyria."

*2. The relation of 14:24-28 to what precedes*

In these four verses the Lord speaks not of Babylon but of Assyria. If this were written in the time of Babylonian supremacy one might think of Assyria as a previous great power whose name was now used as a figure for the present great power of Babylon. However, the description in these four verses is clearly a prediction of God's deliverance of the Jews from the attack of Sennacherib, the king of Assyria in Isaiah's own day. That deliverance is described in more detail in Isaiah 36 and 37. There is nothing in connection with the relation of the Jews to the Babylonians to which these verses could possibly be referred. They fit perfectly if the word "Assyrian" is taken in the literal sense. Then, however, the question arises, "Why should a passage predicting the destruction of the hosts of Sennacherib, an Assyrian