

easiest to win people to it. One of them is this Pentateuch theory which is given with such utter dogmatism.

The second point is the book of Isaiah. Here it sounds very simple. Here is Isa. 1 - 39 written by the prophet at c. 700 B.C. dealing with the Assyrian empire, telling about events at that time. Isaiah is mentioned repeatedly in it; Isaiah is dealing with those events. And then they say, 150 years later another prophet, a man whose mind was filled with the style of Isaiah, a man who had read Isaiah a great deal looked at events in his day and speaks not about Assyria but about Babylon, and tells about the very soon coming downfall of the Babylonian empire. He writes the material from chs. 40 - 66 and writes it on the same scroll and Isaiah isn't mentioned in those last 27 chs. So it's very easy to see how the last 27 chs. could have just gotten added on. Doesn't that sound simple? When I was in seminary, our professor of OT died in my second year. They brought in a man from another seminary to teach the course in the prophetic books. He said to us, I have no doubt Moses wrote the Pentateuch, but he said on this question of Isaiah, whether there was one Isaiah or two, he said to me the evidence seems so closely balanced, I just don't know what conclusion to draw." To many people it sounds so simple. And once you divide Isaiah up into two parts, and now they divide it into three, and you go on from there, and they divide up every book of the OT and most of the NT into all kinds of alleged stories and in the end you don't have any solid Word of God at all.

In this trial at Seattle, the professor from Harvard who was testifying referred to the second ~~xxx~~ Isaiah in just about the tone I gave it now, and said how it was written on the same scroll