

AN EXEGETICAL INTERROGATION OF THE MULTIPLE AUTHORSHIP (DIVERSITY) THEORY OF THE BOOK OF ISAIAH

Dr. Emmanuel Nwachukwu Uzuegbunam
Department Of Religion and Human Relations
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka
Email: vendremma1234@gmail.com

Abstract

The tradition partitioning the Book of Isaiah into three segments namely, Proto-Isaiah, credited to Isaiah of Jerusalem, spanning chapters 1 to 39; Deutero-Isaiah, spanning chapters 40 to 55; and Trito-Isaiah, spanning chapters 56 to 66; has now endured, to the point that it has seemingly assumed the status of an indisputable fact. This theory presupposes that the identities of the authors of these other segments of Isaiah have been lost and for that reason, the works have been lumped together in the Isaiah collection. However, a closer look reveals that the grounds for this multiple authorship or diversity theory also exist in other prophetic books of the Old Testament, notably, Jeremiah and Amos, and yet no diversity theory has been advanced for these books. The assumption that the identities of the authors of the supposed later sections of Isaiah have been lost seems rather implausible, and in fact, some thread of unity is reasonably visible between the later and the earlier segments of Isaiah. This paper critically examines the multiple authorship (or diversity) theory in Isaiah, using hermeneutical and exegetical methods, and raises fresh grounds for appreciating the unity of the Book of Isaiah.

Introduction

It has become traditional to see the Book of Isaiah, one of the major prophets of the Old Testament, as a disparate assembly of three documents; one, a pre-exilic material credited to Isaiah of Jerusalem, spanning chapters 1 – 39; two, an exilic material credited to an unknown author called, for convenience, Deutero-Isaiah, spanning chapters 40 – 55; and three, an apocalyptic material credited to another unknown author called, for convenience, Trito-Isaiah, spanning chapters 56 – 66. This view is credited to Bernhard Duhm and has been held as consensus through most of the 20th century. According to this theory, the first section of the book, commonly called Proto-Isaiah (chapters 1 – 39), credited to Isaiah of Jerusalem, son of Amoz, contains the words of the pre-exilic 8th century BC prophet. Deutero-Isaiah, chapters 40 to 55 is believed to be the work of an anonymous 6th century BC author, and was composed during Exile. Trito-Isaiah, chapters 56 to 66, is believed to be composed after the return from Exile. StuhlmueLLer (1990) explains that;

Until the 18th Century, it was presumed that Isaiah of Jerusalem wrote all 66 chapters of the book under his name. There is only a single superscription with the name and date of the author, (Isa. 1:1); Isaiah 40 and 56 began with no separate introductions. All 66 chapters moreover are edited under several unifying themes. The tradition of single authorship was questioned by Ibn Ezra (ca 1167) but the vigorous attack came from J. C. Doderlein (1775) and J. G. Eichhorn (1780-88). These scholars maintained that chapters 40 – 66 were written by a different author, who lived some 150 years later during the Babylonian Exile. They named him Deutero or Second Isaiah. In 1892, B.

Duhm argued for a separate author of the suffering servant songs and of chapters 56 – 66 whom he called Tritio or Third Isaiah. Protestant scholars were generally convinced by the soundness of the new arguments. Catholics although with some hesitation tended to agree (e.g. A. Condamin, *Le Livre d'Isaie*, Paris, 1905). A negative response of the Pontifical Biblical Commission, June 29, 1908, precipitated by years of the Modernist Movement made Catholic scholars revert to an ultraconservative viewpoint of single authorship. (p. 329).

Grounds for Separate Authorship of Isaiah

Stuhlmüller (1990) explains the grounds for advancing the idea of separate authorship for the two other sections of the Book of Isaiah. First, it can be deduced that the addressee of chapters 40 – 55 of Isaiah are no longer the inhabitants of Jerusalem but the exiles in Babylon. Chapter 43:14 reads;

Thus says the Lord, Your Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel; for your sake, I have sent to Babylon and brought down their fugitives and the Chaldeans.

Also, 48:20 reads, “Go forth from Babylon; flee from the Chaldeans”.

Secondly, it can be seen here that at this time, Jerusalem had been destroyed, and was awaiting reconstruction; “That saith to Jerusalem, you shall be inhabited; and to the city of Judah, you shall be built”.

Thirdly, unlike the first section that mentions Davidic dynasty repeatedly, the second section mentions it only once, (55:3-5) and here transfers its privileges to the entire nation.

Fourthly, in the third section of Isaiah, Israel is back again in her own land and the problems are different from those envisaged in chapters 1 to 39. Here, it is observed that the setting is not Babylon but Palestine. The mood, formerly a shift from exalted hopes to discouragement now swings in chapters 56 to 66, from disappointment to a glorious future. Whereas in the past, the promise revolved around Israel, now it hinges upon the select faithful few (in a rather apocalyptic sense), with a provision this time for the Gentiles. Here also, temple worship is more concretized, in a rather more permanent sense.

What is known about the Man, Isaiah

The Jewish traditions, according to Ridderbos (1982) clearly identify a personality, יְשַׁעְיָהוּ, meaning Yahweh is salvation, son of Amoz (Hebrew אִמּוֹז) who lived in Jerusalem (Isaiah 7:1-3, 37:2). According to Jewish traditions, he was of royal blood and it has sometimes been inferred from the narratives and oracles of his book that he was of noble descent. As appears from the superscription of the book (1:1), he prophesied under four kings of Judah, namely, Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, spanning the period from 791 (790) BC to 687 (or 686) BC. He was called to be a prophet “in the year that king Uzziah died” (Isaiah 6:1), meaning around 740 or 739 BC. His last appearance which can be dated with certainty was at the time of Sennacherib’s campaign of 701 BC, (or around 688 BC, if we assume a second

campaign of Sennacherib against Jerusalem). Tradition has it that he was sawn asunder in Manasseh's reign.

Isaiah was married to a wife called prophetess (Hebrew נְבִיאָה) in Isaiah 8:3, a suggestion that she also prophesied. Two sons are mentioned, both of whom bear symbolic names namely, Shear-Jashub (Remnant will return), (7:3) and Maher-Shalhash-baz (Hasten booty, speed spoil), (8:1-4).

Isaiah and Micah were contemporaries (Cf. Isaiah 1:1 and Micah 1:1). Isaiah's prophecy was preceded by Amos and Hosea (Amos 1:1, Hosea 1:1). Amos and Hosea prophesied mainly against the Northern tribes while Isaiah and Micah concentrated their prophecies on Judah and Jerusalem (Isaiah 1:1).

Historical Background

In the first half of the 8th Century BC, both Israel (under Jeroboam II, 782-783) and Judah under Uzziah (Jeroboam II's contemporary) enjoyed a time of great prosperity. This was largely due to the weakness of the kingdom of Aram and to Assyria's non-interference in the West for a considerable period. Uzziah's reign may be considered the most prosperous time that Judah had known since the disruption of the monarchy by the division of Israel, after Solomon's death. Under Uzziah and Jotham, prosperity and luxury abounded in Judah, as reflected in Isaiah 2 – 4. But with the ascendance to power of Tiglath-Pileser III of Assyria (745 – 727 BC) Assyria began once more to impose her yoke on the Western lands. Pekah of Israel and Rezin of Damascus formed an anti-Assyrian coalition and tried to compel Ahaz of Judah to join them. Ahaz's refusal prompted them to threaten to depose him and place a puppet of their own on the throne (734 BC). Isaiah's prophetic oracles at this time are recorded in chapter 7 of Isaiah. Ahaz committed the sinful folly of asking the Assyrian king for assistance. In 732 BC, the Assyrians captured Damascus and annexed the territory of Israel North of the plain of Jezreel, leaving Hoshea to rule the remainder of the Northern kingdom as their vassal. Hoshea in any case revolted and Shalmanesser V of Assyria (727 – 722 BC) besieged Samaria, and his successor, Sargon II (722 – 705 BC) eventually captured Israel in the year of his rise of power. After this, there were some movements against Assyrian domination. On these occasions, Isaiah who had withdrawn for a time into a more secluded life after his fruitless protest against Ahaz's foreign policy in 734 BC, raised his voice again to warn Judah against participating in such movements, and particularly against relying on Egyptian aid. The Philistines, in the year of Ahaz's death, sent a delegation to Jerusalem to an anti-Assyrian alliance (Isaiah 14:28). On this occasion again, Isaiah uttered a warning (14:29-32).

Under Hezekiah, there were other movements, such as the revolt of Ashdod which was crushed by the Assyrians in 711 BC. Judah and Egypt were implicated in this revolt. Isaiah 18 should be dated about this period. After Sargon's death, there were widespread campaigns against his successor, Sennacherib (705 – 681 BC). Again, Judah was one of the states that revolted, and this resulted in Sennacherib's attack of 701 BC during which he overran Judah and besieged Jerusalem. Various oracles in chapters 28 to 31 may date from the years 705 to 701 BC, including the warnings against leaning on Egypt in Isaiah 30:1-7, 31:1-3. Chapters 36 to 37 of Isaiah record Sennacherib's threat to Jerusalem, Jerusalem's liberation and Isaiah's prophetic

oracles throughout this trying period. Chapters 38 to 39 of Isaiah would clearly relate to this period, and this brings to a close all that could be historically gleaned of the personality, Isaiah of Jerusalem, son of Amoz.

A Look at the Presuppositions to the Diversity Theory

1. Loss of the Identity of Deutero-Isaiah

Ridderbos (1982) has in fact argued that:

Deutero-Isaiah is taken to be one of the greatest prophets, if not the greatest prophet of Israel; it would be surprising indeed if every trace of this great prophet has been so thoroughly effaced from tradition that his very name is unknown to us. Secondly, the evidence of the New Testament naturally takes a special place in the testimony of tradition. The following passages from Chapters 40 – 66 are introduced in the New Testament by some such words as: “that which was spoken by the prophet Isaiah”; 40:3 (in Matt. 3:3); 42:1-4 (in Matt. 12:17-21); 53:1 (in John 12:38 and Rom. 10:16); 53:4 (in Matt. 8:17); 65:4 (in Rom. 10:20ff). To this, it may be added that those who deny chapters 40ff to Isaiah usually deny him chapter 13 on similar grounds, but the superscription of this chapter ascribes it to ‘Isaiah son of Amoz’. (p. 523 – 524).

By far the greatest grounds for ascribing Isaiah chapters 40 – 66 (at least, though some traditions would proffer a separate author for 56 – 66) to an unknown author, referred to, for convenience, as Deutero-Isaiah, is the fact that the identity of the prophet has been thoroughly defaced. This argument of loss of identity of the prophet is made in fact even more implausible by the fact that a large number of the scholars (N. H. Ridderbos, R. K. Harrison, O. T. Allis) agree that this prophet is of such notable grandeur that his identity could not have been lost with that ease. In other words, if another prophet other than Isaiah of Jerusalem, son of Amoz, wrote such a great treatise as Isaiah 40 to 66, then what happened to his identity, and why is there no trace of such identity in the annals of historic record?

On the plausibility of loss of identity of the author of such a prominent work as Isaiah 40 – 66, Harrison (1969) had this to say:

If this unknown exilic individual were to be regarded as anything more than a sheer figment of the critical imagination, it would be necessary to establish his place in the history of Hebrew thought and religious institutions. Despite his alleged exalted abilities, he was evidently completely unknown to Ezekiel and Daniel, and neither his name nor his theological contributions played any noticeable part in the representations of the post-exilic period by Haggai and Zechariah on the one hand, or by Ezra and Nehemiah on the other. The facts of the situation are that it was the thought of Ezekiel that influenced the nature of both Temple and Synagogue worship in the post-exilic Judea and the enthusiastic application of the Mosaic Torah by Ezra that gave Judaism its characteristic stamp of legalism. (p.792).

That the identity of the author of such profound work as Isaiah 40ff is completely lost seems most implausible. Harrison adds to the implausibility the fact that not even a passing reference to him is found in the theological works of exilic contemporaries,

Ezekiel and Daniel. Even the New Testament testimony further attests to the implausibility. The New Testament variously credits the various references to the collection to Isaiah of Jerusalem.

2. **The Irrepressibility of Revelation**

Old Testament scholars have now firmly established a tradition for critical analysis which completely denies the place of a revelation. The author of a certain event must have lived within the historical period of that event or beyond it. And this supposition is held even when the details confirming an experience of an event are completely lacking. In the case of Isaiah under discussion, the author is now addressing an audience in exile in Babylon, and must have experienced the exile. The tradition that completely denies a place for revelation as basis for arriving at certain conclusions is at best erroneous. Isaiah 40ff clearly does not contain such gory details of Babylon as to strengthen the argument that the author definitely experienced it, and to completely rule out a prophetic prevision of it. The same can be said of the reference to Cyrus in that section of the text. This point has already been vigorously canvassed by O. T.

Allis and E. J. Young. Harrison (1969) summarizes their position thus:

The second approach which is favoured by modern conservative scholars such as Allis and Young considers the references to be prophetic previsions of the work of Cyrus which in point of fact occurred over a century and half later. The centrality of Cyrus and his mission as depicted in chapters 40 – 48 received considerable emphasis being thought of in past, present and future contexts. Against this, it has to be remembered that he remained a foreign conqueror, and to all intents and purposes a political polytheist, as the Cyrus Cylinder indicates. Allis in particular accepted rather uncritically the view of Josephus (AJ. XI.I.I) that Cyrus had actually read Jewish copies of Isaiah that described his destiny as the restorer of Israel, and that he has responded to this by making a serious endeavour to fulfill all that had been written of him. (pp. 793-794).

This evidence in support of prophetic prevision cannot be brushed aside with a wave of the hand, particularly in the light of the testimony of Josephus Flavius the acclaimed historian of antiquity whose works are traditionally relied upon for validating the religious writings of the near East. The scholarly tradition that completely denies the place of prophetic prevision must be seriously interrogated. After all, the traditional role of a prophet (נביא) is in fact as a seer (רואה), one to whom the hidden mysteries of life, including the things to come, are revealed.

3. **A Repudiation of Redaction**

It has been strongly argued (O.T. Allis, R. K. Harrison) that if the grounds for positing a Deutero-Isaiah are finally sustained, then we can also in the same vein speak of Deutero-Jeremiah or even Deutero-Amos. For instance, Barre (1990) has said concerning Amos 9:11-15;

The majority of commentators agree that these verses are not part of Amos' message but were added by editors to form the conclusion of the book. The inclusion with chapter 1 is further evidence for this view. The perspective here seems to be that of the Babylonian exile in which the people long to return to

their homes and rebuild their lives. Thus, the positive tone of these final verses serves to counterbalance the unrelieved fatalism of Amos' message. (p. 215).

In other words, if we approach Amos with the same frame of mind as we have approached Isaiah, then we should be speaking of Deutero-Amos, an exilic author who lived beyond Amos and experienced the Babylonian and possibly Persian exiles. But this convention does not exist as yet among Old Testament scholars. Instead many are content to regard this as a redactional inclusion. Coming back to Isaiah also, it is possible to isolate the texts that refer to Babylon and to Cyrus in Isaiah 40ff and examine their value as redactional inclusions. In other words, to sustain the argument for a Deutero-Isaiah, we would have to altogether repudiate the possibility of a redactional inclusion. The grounds for such an outright repudiation are at best perfunctory, faulty and more or less discriminatory.

A Case for the Unity of Isaiah

1. Thematic Unity

A close look at Isaiah reveals a clear thematic unity that is at best graduated in line with the unfolding prophetic oracles. Is it not rather ironical that Baalism which obviously is a feature of the pre-exilic Canaan but was completely phased out in the exilic period, still features in chapters 40ff, the supposed exilic Deutero-Isaiah section? First, notice that the theme of Isaiah revolves around the place of Yahweh as the Holy One of Israel, amidst Israel's persistent sinful condition. This motif runs uninterruptedly through the entire work, (1:4; 5:6; 24; 8:14; 10:17; and in the second section, 41:14, 16, 20; 43:3,14f; 45:11; 47:4).

The second universal note of Isaiah is that Israel, by virtue of her perennial sinful condition does not deserve God's help, although, in His magnanimous justice, Yahweh is ever willing to help His people. Again this thread runs through the text uninterruptedly, spanning though the so-called divisions of the book, (3:1-4:1; 5:17; 8-24; 32:9-24, and in the second section 43:22, 44:2, 59:1-2, etc). This thematic unity in Isaiah no doubt makes an overwhelming case against the multiple authorship theory.

2. Prophetic Prevision

Right from the very outset of the book, the prophetic prevision motif, breaking into its universal orientation was established. This was done in the fact that one of the sons of Isaiah, named in the acclaimed pre-exilic section of the book (so called) was named Shear-Jashub, meaning Remnant will return (7:3). If we believe that the prophet had to necessarily experience this for it to be written, then we might as well believe that the entire book of Isaiah is exilic and post-exilic, and to do this, we would regard its earlier content as simply retrojective, a situation which creates far more problem than the one on hand.

Prophetic prevision derives from the fundamental definition and role of the prophet in Israel. The redactional interpretation in 1 Sam. 9:9 tells us that; "Before time in Israel, when a man went to inquire of God, thus he spake; come and let us go to the seer (רֹאֵה): for he that is now called a prophet (נְבִיא) was beforetime called a seer (רֹאֵה).

Vawter (1990) has attempted to clarify the functional relationship difference between the רָאָה, commonly translated seer, and the נָבִיא translated prophet, thus:

The ancient relation of the “Seer” (rō’eh) or hōzeh) to the nābī’ is uncertain. Etymologically, the seer would have been a visionary rather than an ecstatic, but it is not precluded that his visions would have been received as the result of ecstatic experience. Gad, a nābī’ is also called David’s hōzeh in 2 Sam. 24:11; 1 Chr. 21:9 (cf also 1 Chr. 25:5) which doubtless reflects the later identification of terms shown in 1 Sam. 9:9; (so also 1 Chr. 9:22; 26:28; 29:29). Although it is the seer’s role to prophesy (i.e. act the part of a nābī’, cf. Amos 7:12), still the seer is distinguished from the prophet in 2 Kgs. 17:13; Isa. 29:10; 30:10; Mic. 3:6-7, etc. Deut. 13:2-6 speaks of “prophets and dreamers of dreams,” in which case it is doubtless with the latter that the seer is to be identified. In looking to dreams as a source of divine revelation, ancient Israel continued to share the Near Eastern pattern of inspired men. (p. 189).

Regarding this Near Eastern pattern of inspired men which Ancient Israel also had a share in, Vawter gives some lucid insight;

From the earliest recorded time, a common pattern of seers and diviners existed throughout the Near East who were employed in ascertaining the mind of the protective divinity. “I lifted up my hand to Be’elshamayn and Be’elshamyn [spoke] to me through seers and through diviners. Be’elshamayn [said to me]: Do not fear, for I made you king and I shall stand by you and deliver you...” (ANET 501). While Amos was prophesying in Israel, an Aramean king was having these words inscribed on a stone in Syria. The explicit reference to seers and diviners clarifies the statements of Mesha, the king of Moab, made on 9th Century Moabite Stone: “Chemosh said to me, “Go, take Nebo from Israel:... Chemosh said to me, “Go down, fight against Hauronen”... (ANET 320-21). The Biblical parallel is in such passages as; “David inquired of Yahweh, ‘Shall I go and attack these Philistines?’ And Yahweh said to David, “Go and attack the Philistines and save Keilah” (1 Sam. 23:2). David was accompanied by his prophet, Gad, (1 Sam. 22:5) whose duty it was to make inquiries of Yahweh. (p. 187).

The basic presumption in positing that there must be a Deutero-Isaiah who not only experienced the exile in full, but also saw the end of it, and the post-exilic resettling of Israel in their homeland, is the total annulment of the possibility of prophetic prevision (divine revelation of the future) in the prophetic oracles. If this is so, in spite of the overwhelming evidence that the prophet נָבִיא combines in his functions the characteristics of a seer, רָאָה or הֹזֶה, (one who receives revelations from Yahweh), then that argument collapses. The prophet indeed has the divine capacity to see the future. Besides, it is evident in the part of Isaiah commonly called Deutero-Isaiah that even the exilic and post-exilic references are too skeletal and ephemeral, lacking in the gory details of one who may have truly experienced it but however, passing for a more prophetic reflection that a prevision (a revelation) could easily have provided.

3. **Order and Redactional Pattern**

It has been variously acknowledged (Uzuegbunam, 2016) that as a result of the incessant redaction of the Old Testament books, and for other reasons, the ordering of the materials is perfunctory. Isaiah is not an exception in this character. For instance, the invitation to repentance in the introductory collection (1:1-31), particularly 1:18-20) is not any different from the rather more elaborate invitation to repentance and right conduct in chapters 58-59. Similarly, the messianic prophecy in chapter 7:14; 9:6-7; is not any different from the elaborate description of the messianic personality in chapter 42, the Christological motif in chapter 53, and the messianic function in chapter 61. In fact an elaborate study of thematic unity in Isaiah clearly dislodges the multiple authorship theory.

On the subject of redaction in Isaiah, Harrison (1969) is willing to accept the reference to Cyrus (44:28; 45:1) as an editorial infusion. According to him, a plausible approach to interpreting the exilic and post-exilic material in Isaiah, especially in relation to the reference to Cyrus;

is to regard the references to Cyrus in Isaiah 44:28 and 45:1 as constituting explanatory glosses imposed upon the original text by a post-exilic copyist. It is of some significance that these two occurrences are the only instances in Isaiah where Cyrus is actually mentioned by name, and since they are found in such close proximity, it seems most probable that they comprise scribal additions inserted in order to explain what was thought to be the real significance of the prophecy. (p. 794).

Similarly, Torrey (1945) in a reaction against the Trito-Isaiah theory maintained that if the five or six references to Babylon and Cyrus could be interpreted as later insertions, then almost all of chapters 40 to 66 of Isaiah could be assigned to a Palestinian setting.

The point here is that if later insertions could be excused for Amos and Jeremiah, for instance, and have not given rise to theories such as those of Deutero-Amos and Deutero-Jeremiah, then there is no reason why the few exilic and post-exilic references in Isaiah could not be interpreted as later redactional infusions.

4. **Testimonies of Later Writers**

It is evident that there was never any tradition of the Deutero-Isaiah either among the Jews of the exilic period in Babylon or among the returned community of Judea. In either or both cases, if there was any such tradition, the real identity of the Deutero-Isaiah author would have been preserved. Instead, in both cases, Isaiah has always been venerated as author of the work, whereas in fact that section of the work credited to Deutero-Isaiah has always been known.

One of the earliest testimonies crediting Isaiah with authorship of the material now being credited to an unknown author called Deutero-Isaiah, is to be found in the 200BC work of Ben Sira, called Ecclesiasticus. In chapter 48:24f, Ben Sira records that Isaiah confronted those who mourned in Zion, showing the things that should be to the end of time before they even occurred. This testimony makes it quite clear that in the days of Ben Sira, 200BC, Isaiah was considered the author of the entire prophecy.

The second vital early testimony to Isaiah's authorship of the material in the Deutero-Isaiah section is to be found in the New Testament writings. Particularly, Mark, a clearly acclaimed AD 68 document states, in citing Isaiah 40:3f (Mark 1:2); *καθὸς γεγραφαὶ ἐν τῷ Ἐσαία* (Literally, as is written in Isaiah). Similar references are scattered all through the gospels. For instance, Luke 4:17ff makes reference to Jesus reading a portion of the scripture in the temple, and the portion is from Isaiah 61:1ff. and the text says; "And there was given unto him the book of the prophet Isaiah". Here again, an early 1st century AD document attests to Isaiah's authorship of the material now being credited to a certain 'unknown' author who for convenience is now being described as Deutero-Isaiah.

5. Linguistic Framework

Gitay (1985) has carefully studied the linguistic framework in Isaiah, and is satisfied to observe a thread of unity in the two segments of the book now commonly ascribed to different authors, thus;

On the other hand, we find specific linguistic usages common to both parts of the book. Thus, for instance, the combination, "Holy One of Israel" which is characteristic of First Isaiah, appears as well in Second Isaiah (41:14, 16, 20; 43:3, 14; 45:11; 47:4; 48:17; 49:7; 54:5; 60:9, 14). Also, the expression, "Thus says the Lord", an imperfect tense, appears in both books, instead of the regular perfect, "said" (1:11, 18; 33:10; 41:21; 66:9; cf. 40:1, 25). (p. 427).

This linguistic unity is particularly significant because, in a sense, it forms a vital part of the authorial identity, and distinguishes the author from other authors who may be writing around the same period. In the case of the prophet Ezekiel, the title, "Son of Man", distinguishes the author from all the other authors, including all his contemporaries.

Conclusion

The concern of this paper has been to examine the grounds on which the multiple authorship theory has been proposed and long upheld for the Book of Isaiah. A subjection of such grounds to critical scholarly appraisal has shown that they can hardly be sustained. Learning is an on-going expedition. It is therefore our considered opinion here that the acknowledged author of Isaiah Chapters 1-39, Isaiah of Jerusalem, son of Amoz, wrote the entire book, with later redactional inclusions here and there in the book. Revelation and prophetic prevision also account for some future references in the book which Isaiah of Jerusalem could not have experienced. Such references, properly examined, are even too skeletal to sustain the argument for later authors. The purpose of learning is to constantly examine the knowledge we profess, and to show if such knowledge remains valid in the light of newer and more contemporary information. True learning is an expedition in which issues are approached with a scholarly unfettered liberty and open-mindedness. In research, we must constantly reexamine the axioms that we hold, in the light of contemporary privileges of greater information. The essence of interrogating the earlier conclusions held on the book of Isaiah as done in this work is to subject such conclusions to scrutiny in the light of contemporary information, and it is our considered view that the grounds on which we

had appointed to the Book of Isaiah two extra imaginary authors can no longer be sustained.

References

- Abe, G. O. (2014). Old Testament Covenants. In E. D. Adelowo (Ed.) *Perspectives in Religious Studies*, Volume II, 1-25, Ado-Ekiti: HEBN.
- Andre, G. (2003). "Paqad". *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*. Vol. 12. Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Barre, M. L. (1990). Amos. In R. E. Brown (Ed.) *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Birch, B. C. et al (2005). *A Theological introduction to the Old Testament*. Nashville: Abingdon.
- Bullinger, E.W. (2003). *Figures of speech used in the Bible*. Michigan: Baker Book House.
- Burns, R. I. (1969). *Ezra-Nehemiah*. Collegeville Bible Commentary. Mumbai: St. Pauls.
- Gitay, Y. (1985). Isaiah, The Book of. In P. J. Achtemeier (Ed.) *Harper's Bible Dictionary*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Grayson, A.K. (1992). *History and Culture of Babylonian*, The Anchor Bible Dictionary. Vol. 4. London: Doubleday.
- Harrison, R.K. (1969). *Introduction to the Old Testament*. England: Inter-Varsity.
- Harrison, R.K. (2004). *Introduction to the Old Testament, including a comprehensive review of Old Testament studies and a special supplement of the Apocrypha*. Massachusetts: Hendrickson.
- Holladay, W.L. (Ed.) (1988). *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Michigan: William B. Eerdmans.
- Keel, O. (1997). *The Symbolism of the Biblical World. Ancient Near Eastern Iconography and the Book of Psalms*. Indiana: Eisenbrauns.
- Ndiokwere, N.I. (2010). *Prophecy and Revolution: The Role of Prophets in the Independent African Churches and in Biblical Tradition*. New Querri: Springfield.
- Ridderbos, W.H. (1982). Isaiah. In *New Bible Dictionary*, 2nd Edition. England: Inter-Varsity.
- Rowley, H. H. (Ed.) (1951). *The Old Testament and Modern Study*.
- Stuhlmüller, C. (1990). Detero-Isaiah and Trito-Isaiah. In *New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Torrey, C. C. (1928). *The Second Isaiah: A New Interpretation*.
- Ugwueye, L. E. (2004). *Studying Old Testament Theology*. Ekwulobia: Strong Tower.
- Ugwueye, L. E. & Umeanolue, I. L. (2010). Old Testament Scholarship in Africa. In *Journal of Religion and Human Relations*. 1, 3, 167 – 180.
- Uzuegbunam, E. (2016). *A Critical Introduction to Theology of the Old Testament*. Enugu: Rabboni.
- Uzuegbunam, E. (2017). *An Introduction to Old Testament Studies*. Enugu: Rabboni.
- Vawter, B. (1990). Introduction to Prophetic Literature. In *The New Jerome Bible Commentary*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.