

he saw His glory, putting the two of them together. The first introduces the work of Isaiah--the two are summarized as to what he said. Now of course it would be very easy to suppose that there were two different men by the name of Isaiah who lived 150 years apart--Isaiah said this and Isaiah said that but you wouldn't say Isaiah says and Isaiah says again. You might say William Cook said this, and William Cook the younger said this and William Cook again said and you certainly wouldn't put it in the above form if you were speaking of the two men as different men. Then in Acts 8:28 there you read about the Ethiopian eunuch reading Isaiah the prophet. In Acts 28:25 we have another quotation from the first Isaiah and the Ethiopian eunuch was reading from the second Isaiah. In Rom. 9: 27 and 29 we have quotations from the first Isaiah but in Rom. 10:16, 20 you have the second and third Isaiah.

# 199. He simply says Isaiah says in Rom. 10:16 and then he again says Isaiah and quotes from the first, second and third Isaiah and thus quotations are taken from different sections of the book and there are these three sections of Isaiah, and not merely from the book but says that he speaks or says or says again, or Isaiah prophesys and it certainly would not have been necessary that these phrases be used. It would have been perfectly easy to just have side-stepped the issue but it has not been side-stepped but deliberately put down that all this is from Isaiah the prophet. If of course is not necessary that the ~~prophet~~ Holy Spirit could tell us all the information that would fill many ency. about ancient times. He has not told us who wrote second Sam. or who wrote Hebrews and there are various books that he has not given us information about but it is clearly shown that it was the mind of the Spirit to make it emphatic and clear to us that the first, second and third sections are all what Isaiah the prophet spoke. I think that it is important that we not use this simply as a means for deciding who wrote the book--that is not so tremendously important in itself, though the Holy Spirit thinks that it is important enough to make it clear. From a detached viewpoint I think that we would say that is isn't so important as to who wrote the book but the important place is that here at the place where the argument is strongest, where there is more reason than anywhere else, to think of a composite authorship, where there is more reason to question the unity of the book that anywhere else--this is not the place to end it but is the channel so many use to lead up into the wide area of taking the whole ~~of the~~