

6. We take up the <sup>first</sup> ~~last~~ of Driver's arguments as the last. The Argument from Historical background is the one big argument. All the other arguments are weak in comparison with it. It is comparatively easy to dispose of--the argument from style and theological viewpoint--we show that it makes sense. But this is a tremendous argument and under this we have

(a) All these other arguments are insufficient apart from the historical background to overthrow tradition and unified style. The fact that it has been so considered from at least 200 B.C. right up to ~~1700~~ 1870 as one unified book--that doesn't prove that it ~~is~~ is true but it does mean that you must have some pretty good arguments to sweep it aside, and the fact of the unified style in sharp distinction--those two arguments are positive evidence of the unity of the book of Isaiah which these other arguments are utterly insufficient to destroy these arguments.

(b) However, the argument from historical background is a very powerful one. Phiffer is entirely right in placing it at the beginning of his article when he says, if you can believe that Isaiah 200 years before and could put himself forward 150 years and he rests all on this one argument but Driver goes on to the other arguments. This is so vital and tremendous an argument.

### C. The Argument from Historical Background.

1. It is wrong to try to explain the fact away that a very different historical background is assumed after ch. 39. You do not advance the Christian faith, or the cause of Christ, or the cause of Truth by ever trying to explain away facts. It is better to face and see what they are, what they mean and find the true explanation later rather than try to explain them away and it is a ~~fact~~ fact that the historical fact that the historical background that is assumed is very different from the historical background which is assumed in ch. 1-39. In 1-39 Isaiah talks to people in his own day, the bulk of whom are uninterested in God's law and though His law is there, it doesn't affect their lives greatly and Isaiah addresses these people and condemns them for their sin and forgetfulness of God and they try by clever human schemes to protect themselves in stead of getting themselves right with God, but eventually God is going to send them into exile and later on God will give them future blessings. Isaiah says this between ch. 1-39 in various connections and in various ways and that is the great burden of his argument--Yet in 40-66 as far as I know he never predicts exile but it is all prediction deliverance from the exile and it is assumed.