

by a man with the same general tone. Then he referred to these hypotheses. We tried to get him to give some arguments because I knew that there ~~was~~ is no argument you can give for the Pentateuchal criticism but just with a little logic and a few facts you can easily tear topieces. But he wouldn't give any arguments. He just said, O it's an hypothesis; the latest hypothesis. The best hypothesis ~~a~~ we've got and all that sort of talk. Until finally the lawyer said to him, What can you know anyway? Oh, he said, we know when Isaiah lived, and we know what Isaiah taught. To me that gave a marvellous opportunity. So the minute he said that, I took a piece of paper and wrote: Can we tell ~~what~~ what Isaiah taught by reading Isaiah 13? I handed it to the lawyer. I'm sure the lawyer had no idea what I was referring to. By that time, he had gained a fair amount of confidence in my ability to think of good questions. So he turned to the professor from Harvard and asked, Can we tell what Isaiah taught by reading Isaiah 13? He said, Well, I think there are some verses in Isa. 13 that Isaiah actually wrote. I think there are some, he said. He was very conservative. Most of them wouldn't say that. But he said, Is. 13 tells about the downfall of Babylon. How can Isaiah say anything about that? 150 years before it?

You see this theory about the first Isaiah and the second Isaiah isn't half as simply as they make it sound. Because once you say that everything about Babylon has to be 150 yrs. later, you not only say that from ch. 40 on is later, but you take fully half the material from ch. 1-39 and on exactly the same grounds you tear it out! In the end you have about 40 different people writing anywhere from one verse to a chapter and all combined by a literary process ~~w~~ such as the world has never seen anywhere