

So very definitely the 2nd Isaiah scroll is not a scroll of the Second Isaiah. It is a scroll which must originally have contained the whole of Isaiah, but now contains sections and there are pages missing. As to whether in the ancient copying in the DSS there might be divisions, it's altogether possible there might be a break between Is. 39 and Is. 40, but anybody who reads can see there is an impt. break between Isa. 39 and 40. That doesn't prove whether it was written by one man or by different men. There's a very impt. break in thought. But there is just as impt. a break in thot between 35 and 36. See 36-39 are four historical chs. telling of Isa. relation to Hezekiah. They are very impt. in the book. Historically they also overlap material given in Kings and Chron. But they tell much more about Isaiah than those other pasages do. A ch. of hist. and a ch. of prphecy are diff. in their type of material. So between 35 and ---- anybody at all reading 35 and 36 will see at once he is in a diff. sort of a period. He will again between 39 and 40. 36-39 is a historical section right there in the middle. Before 36 and after 39 the material is much more similar to each other than they are in the sections from 36 to 39, but there is a great diff. between them because it would seem that from 1 to 35 God is speaking to Isa. ==thro Isa. to the people of Judah saying, Repent and turn back to God or He will send you into exile for your sins. But in the course of it he looks forward to Messiah's coming, he looks forward to his grt. promises for the fut., but the main tenor is a rebuke for their present unbelief and sin. After ch. 39 it's as if == from 39 to middle of 56 == it is as if God said to Isa. there are among the people very many godly, earnest people. These people are part of the nation and are implicated in its sins. They realize that what you say about this terrible exile coming is true, and they tend to give way to despair. Now I want you to comfort these people. So from 36 - 39 when the N. kgdm. has already gone into exile and survivors have escaped and told them all about what they are in, the godly know that thing is coming to them too, a century later of course. But they know it's coming and Isa. comforts them and says there is this terrible thing ahead on account of the sins of the nation, but God is not through with the people. He has a grt. ~~ppm~~ purpose for Isaral beyond the exile. He is going to bring them back, redeem the nation, and out of the nation he's going to bring the One ~~km~~ through whom he is going to redeem all those in the world who have put their trust in Him! So from ch. 40 to 56 you have this wonderful section of comfort. Then there is a strang thing. Right in the middle of ch. 56 you have the second most impt. division in the book, because the last half of ch. 56 and on thro 66 he is again more like the first half. He's looking at sin and then at God's deliverance and then at sin and at God's deliverance. From 40 -56 there is none of the rebuke that's found in most of the chs. before and afterwards. He does not rebuke for sin and threaten judgemnt. He tries to comfort them but says, The judgment that's boming is because of your sin and you need ~~km~~ to turn to the Lord to help you. So there's a diff. tone in the middle there. The theory of multiple authorship began with the idea that chs. 40-66 were written by someone writing in the very spirit of Isa., immersed in its phraseology and method of thot but writing 150 yrs. later, and that this got put on the samescroll and then people got confused and thot it was by the same Isaiah. Then there was a big argument about this, whether this had Babylon as a background & was it part of Isa. Then after they'd argued a while they found that all those who said this was afterwards were quoting from Is. 40 through 55.