

and not a couple of centuries later and they will agree on a few sections like that. Torrey says that when Cyrus is mentioned that it is written in Cyrus' time, and on a few things like that they will agree, but on other things there is such a wide gap, because it is not a key. It is one thing to take a key that unlocks a house and gives access to all its treasures-- it is another thing to take a stick of dynamite that lets you into the house all right but which blows everything to bits. In the original statement, they said that the first man was in Palestine and wrote concerning that land in ch. 1-39. But in ch. 40 ff. you have someone else that speaks on Babylonia. But beginning with ch. 52 ff. there is no evidence of speaking of Babylonia and it seems that it is referring to ~~Babylonia~~ Palestine. In ch. 1-39 you have a different viewpoint than you have from 40-52. The land of Babylonia is not referred at all. In the first part you have the question--will God protect his city and in the second part you have the question--will God rebuild His city. In the first part there is the question--will we be able to continue here and in the second part is the question, Will we be able to rebuild the city and continue to have a happy time but your interest in ch. 40-52 is, how to get away from Babylonia. In 52 ff. is the background of of exile and the return to Palestine but the background is to someone that is in Babylonia that is writing, and so they say that is not true, so they say that it is a man in Palestine that is writing after second Isaiah, and if you are consistent, you have to feel that at least some sections of Isa. 52 ff. Isaiah transports himself in imagination into a future circumstance.

B. Consideration of the Criticism of Isaiah.

1. The complexity of the results of the method. It is not a key which gives you a simple answer but it is something that can go on indefinitely and something that if the unity is thrown away, leaves you in all kinds of theories rather than something definite and in any question, investigation of the Bible of a scientific problem, if you have a key to it, it will give you greater simplicity than you had before, rather than introducing more complexity though it may introduce new problems, but it will solve a lot and here is a method that goes on and on, and it is not the simple thing of here having two books and that is the end. It sounds simple at first--why not believe in two Isaiahs, if God inspired them both. It simply is not that simple. The argument and proof that the first Isaiah is separate from the first also must prove that the first was not written by the first Isa. at all--they also are later. A logical argument to prove the second Isa. will prove a third Isa. and leave you in great ~~confusion~~