

And those who said, No this is like the first Isaiah were quoting from 56 to 66. Because the fact is that in from 40 to 55 he puts himself in imagination in Babylon to which they go in exile and comforts them. The background is Babylon. But from 56 on ~~xxxx~~ ~~xxxx~~ the background is Palestine again. So the critics have practically all given up the idea of two Isaiahs. Now they say there are three! The second one is 40-56; from 56 to 66 is the third one which is back in Palestine c. 100 yrs. later. Of course if you can't believe in predictive prophecy you have to make some sort of a hypothesis. But then the difficulty comes that if you make such an hypothesis ~~xxxx~~ then you find that the evidences that you used to prove 40 ~~is~~ and following to be late, also apply to many chs. between one and 39!

In this trial in Seattle, the professor from Harvard said -- they were questioning him on that, and he said, Of course the author of the First Isaiah, we know when he lived, we know what he believed and taught, etc. I asked the lawyer -- I handed him a little slip and said, Ask him if he can tell what Isaiah taught from Isaiah 13. So he asked him that and you should have seen the fellows face! He said, Unlike ~~xxx~~ most scholars I think there are a few vv. in Is. 13 that did come from Isaiah. (Laughter) You see your idea of Isa. 1, 2, and 3 does not work out because the evidence you give for 3 and 2 divide Is. One into all kinds of a patchwork, so actually what you've got is a wonderful unity with great complexity in it and many strands as God reveals various aspects of truth (either you have that) or else if you're going to divide it up, you have to divide it up into 100 difereent instead of 2 or 3. Yes?

Question: What reaction did the DSS bring from the liberals

Answer: The first reaction was to deny them. Dr. Albright and a few others affirmed that they were authentic and true but the bulk of liberal scholars said they are late, not early. Then the linen cloth in which they were found was examined atomically and pretty well proved to be from the time of Christ. The evidences are pretty ~~xxxx~~ strong to show they do come from the time of Christ, a little after or a little before. Now there are a few scholars, one or two. But now most scholars, not all there are one or two, believe that == there are one or two left who think they are late mideaval things. One Jewish scholar said they are not worth the paper they are written on. But most people think that's nonsense to talk that way. Most think they are original. Most admit they are early and show that our text has been marvellously preserved. Manuscripts were several centuries later - most of them - until we found these. Marvellously preserved. But the anti-Christian scholars go on to say that in these we find the Teacher of Righteousness who they say is the man from whom ideas were taken and Jesus was imagined on the basis of these ideas. So they try to use them as an attack on Christianity and Wilson's book presenting that has been trans. into a dozen langauages, but there's no factual foundation for that, and this book of Millar Burrows definitely denies that whole business. He says, The connection between the DSS -- that is the non-biblical scrolls -- and Christianity is far less than the connection between the rabbinic writings and Christianity. Actually they do not show anything about the foundations of Christianity, and it's purely immaginary. But there are a few who are carried away by their immagination. Burrows is a liberal scholar, but he is a very careful, solid scholar and he definitely denies that sort of thing. He says you cannot see any origin of Christianity as being based upon the DSS. That I thought was one of the excellent things about his two books, and clearly brought out.