JETS 65.2 (2022): 289–306

PROPHETIC INSPIRED REDACTION AND RAYMOND B. DILLARD'S UNDERSTANDING OF DEUTERO-ISAIAH

JOHN J. YEO*

Abstract: *Inspired redaction was employed by Old Testament scholars within the Old Princeton-Westminster tradition to explicate the presence of anachronistic statements and obsolete toponyms within the Old Testament canon. Foundationally, the concept requires that individual divinely inspired prophets had written authoritative revelatory texts that were subsequently updated by one or more divinely inspired prophets during the canonical period. In contrast to his predecessors, Dillard was the first to assert that the concept of inspired redaction could be applied to an anonymous prophet who lived during the Babylonian exile. This study demonstrates that Dillard adopted the critical theory of Deutero-Isaiah by a radical revision of the evangelical concept of inspired redaction while positing a school of Isaianic disciples and propagating the notion of a divinely inspired canonical process through multiple Isaianic authors. Moreover, it shows that Dillard published his views on Deutero-Isaiah in spite of his inability to procure the necessary biblical evidence.*

Key words: *Isaianic authorship, inspired redaction, Deutero-Isaiah, evangelical scholarship, call narrative, Old Testament canon*

The concept of inspired prophetic redaction has been employed by Old Testament scholars within evangelical scholarship in general and within the Old Princeton-Westminster tradition in particular as a way to clarify the presence of anachronistic statements and obsolete toponyms within the Old Testament canon.[1] Michael Grisanti helpfully defines the parameters of inspired redaction with the following salient points: (1) Each Old Testament biblical book possessed canonical status from its preliminary form, which was written by the inspired prophet, until its final form, which may have been updated by a later inspired prophet during the canonical period when God was giving his Word to his people. (2) The close of the Old Testament canon serves as the dividing line between inspired editorial activity (such as modernizations and explanatory glosses) and uninspired scribal activity (which belongs to the discipline of textual criticism). (3) The Israelite covenant community permitted only recognized prophetic figures to make adjustments to the

* John J. Yeo is Professor of Old Testament at Southern California Seminary, 2075 East Madison Avenue, El Cajon, CA 92019. He may be contacted at john.yeo@socalsem.edu.

[1] For claims of inspired redaction, see the following evangelical works: Walter C. Kaiser Jr., *A History of Israel: From the Bronze Age to the Jewish Wars* (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1998), 61; Eugene H. Merrill, *Kingdom of Priests: A History of Old Testament Israel*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 87; J. Scott Redd, "Deuteronomy," in *A Biblical-Theological Introduction to the Old Testament: The Gospel Promised*, ed. Miles V. Van Pelt (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2016), 134; Merrill Unger, *Archaeology and the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1954), 116–17.

biblical text.[2] Moreover, Grisanti affirms that the inspired updates were "limited in scope" and were considered "maintenance changes" in order "to make a given text more intelligible to a later generation of readers."[3] Two of the most recognized biblical examples of inspired redaction include Genesis 14:14, a possible updating of a city name from Laish to Dan, and the last eight verses of Deuteronomy 34, which is allegedly a textual addition of Moses's death notice.[4]

Inspired redaction thus necessitates that individual, divinely inspired prophets wrote (or recorded via amanuenses) authoritative revelatory biblical texts that may have been subsequently updated by one or more divinely inspired prophets during the canonical period.[5] In contrast to source-critical theories, the concept does not allow for the wholesale inclusion of documents, but merely light editorial revisions and additions that were, by nature, limited in scope. In general, this held true for every tradent within the Old Princeton-Westminster trajectory from Archibald Alexander to Raymond B. Dillard and Tremper Longman III.[6] Provocatively, however, Dillard was the first to allege that the concept of inspired redaction could be applied to an anonymous prophet who lived during the Babylonian exile and was putatively Deutero-Isaiah.

---

[2] Michael A. Grisanti, "Inspiration, Inerrancy, and the OT Canon: The Place of Textual Updating in an Inerrant View of Scripture," *JETS* 44.4 (2001): 579–80. Geisler and Nix curiously denounce the notion of "inspired redactors," but then equivocally assert: "What the evidence does show is that there was a continuing prophetic community that preserved, arranged, and even updated names and places, sometimes adding new revelations, but never making content changes in former revelation. A divinely inspired and inerrant writing has no mistakes in it to correct." Norman L. Geisler and William E. Nix, *From God to Us: How We Got Our Bible*, rev. ed. (Chicago: Moody, 2012), 113–14. It is apparent that Grisanti would have no substantive disagreements with their observations. In fact, Geisler and Nix's understanding of the prophetic additions and editorial changes comes quite close to Grisanti's definition.

[3] Grisanti, "Inspiration, Inerrancy and the OT Canon," 579–80.

[4] Garrett notes, "One may confidently assume that the work [of Genesis] has undergone post-Mosaic redaction. The main reason such a redaction would have taken place was not to substantially change the book in any way but in order to make it intelligible to a later generation of readers.… In addition, the location of geographical settings by names that were common in a later period is an indication of redaction. The most well-known example is the reference to Dan as a place name in Genesis 14:14, an obvious anachronism. But it proves no more than that the text has undergone some revision. The same may be said of the reference to Israelite kings in Genesis 36:31." Duane Garrett, *Rethinking Genesis: The Source and Authorship of the First Book of the Pentateuch* (1991; repr., Fearn, Ross-shire, UK: Christian Focus, 2000), 81.

[5] Carl F. H. Henry, "The Spirit and the Written Word," *BSac* 111.444 (1954): 305–14; John N. Oswalt, "Is There Anything Unique in the Israelite Prophets?," *BSac* 172.685 (2015): 79–84; John C. Peckham, "The Canon and Biblical Authority: A Critical Comparison of Two Models of Canonicity," *TrinJ* 28.2 (2007): 240–42; Merrill F. Unger, "The Inspiration of the Old Testament," *BSac* 107.428 (1950): 432–38. Regarding the human authors of Scripture who did not possess the office of prophet per se, but possessed the gift of prophecy, see Gilbert B. Weaver, "The Doctrine of Revelation and Inspiration in the Old Testament," *Grace Journal* 6.1 (1965): 20–22.

[6] For historical accounts of the Old Princeton-Westminster tradition, see Darryl G. Hart and John Muether, *Fighting the Good Fight* (Philadelphia: Orthodox Presbyterian Church, 1995); John W. Hart, "Princeton Theological Seminary: The Reorganization of 1929," *Journal of Presbyterian History* 58.2 (1980): 124–40; Bradley J. Longfield, *The Presbyterian Controversy: Fundamentalists, Modernists, and Moderates* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991); Edwin H. Rian, *The Presbyterian Conflict* (Philadelphia: Orthodox Presbyterian Church, 1992); Ned B. Stonehouse, *J. Gresham Machen: A Biographical Memoir*, 3rd ed. (Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth Trust, 1987).

This study will demonstrate that Dillard (and peripherally Longman) adopted the historical-critical notion of Deutero-Isaiah by a radical revision of the evangelical concept of inspired redaction while positing a school of Isaianic disciples and propagating the notion of a divinely inspired canonical process through multiple Isaianic authors. Moreover, it will show that Dillard, decided to publish his unsubstantiated views on Deutero-Isaiah in spite of his inability to procure the necessary biblical evidence.[7]

I. THE CONCEPT OF INSPIRED REDACTION IN THE OLD PRINCETON-WESTMINSTER TRADITION

1. *Inspired redaction and the Old Princeton-Westminster trajectory.* The Old Princeton-Westminster tradition employed the concept of inspired redaction since its inception. Princeton Theological Seminary's first professor, Archibald Alexander, had originally proposed the idea as early as 1817. Alexander specifically noted that later inspired prophets had edited the Old Testament texts "before the lamp of inspiration was entirely extinguished."[8] Marion Ann Taylor elucidates,

> Alexander cites four examples of authentically "inspired" later additions and corrections: (1) the account of the death of Moses in the last chapter of the Book of Deuteronomy; (2) additional notes which seem to be added to "almost all the sacred books intended to render plain what would otherwise have been obscure"; (3) the modernizing of obscure ancient names; and (4) books written after the death of Ezra before the age of *Simon the Just*.[9]

Moreover, William Henry Green, Chair of Biblical and Oriental Literature at Princeton Seminary, noted that the trivial amount of later inspired editing would not have affected the authorship of the Pentateuch as being, in essence, the product of Moses. Green wrote,

> It should further be observed, that even if it could be demonstrated that a certain paragraph or paragraphs were post-Mosaic, this would merely prove that such paragraph or paragraphs could not have belonged to the Pentateuch as it came from the pen of Moses, not that the work as a whole did not proceed from him. It is far easier to assume that some slight additions may here and there have been made to the text, than to set aside the multiplied and invincible proofs that the Pentateuch was the production of Moses.[10]

---

[7] This article is an updated and modified presentation of material found in John J. Yeo, *Plundering the Egyptians: The Old Testament and Historical Criticism at Westminster Theological Seminary (1929–1998)* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2010), 232–39, 244–52, 280–82.

[8] Marion Ann Taylor, *The Old Testament in the Old Princeton School (1812–1929)* (San Francisco: Mellen Research University Press, 1992), 20.

[9] Taylor, *The Old Testament in the Old Princeton School*, 20–21. For Alexander's views, Taylor cites the student lecture notes belonging to Charles Hodge, "Critica Sacra, or Biblical Criticism, Princeton. Decem. 31st 1817," APTS (Princeton, NJ), n.p.

[10] William Henry Green, *The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1895), 51–52.

Robert Dick Wilson, who had taught at Princeton Theological Seminary for twenty-nine years before leaving for the newly established Westminster Theological Seminary,[11] noted that "the Pentateuch as it stands is historical and from the time of Moses; and that Moses was its real author though it may have been revised and edited by later redactors, the additions being just as much inspired and as true as the rest."[12] In contrast to the historical-critical position of unknown redactors who allegedly employed various historical traditions and putative sources, Wilson appealed to "later redactors" who wrote under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. These later hands were responsible for only minor additions and revisions made to the Pentateuch since the Pentateuch as a whole was deemed by Wilson to have been of Mosaic origin.[13]

Oswald T. Allis, who faithfully served at Princeton Seminary for nineteen years and at Westminster for seven years, was more cautious about the unproven anachronisms than his colleague R. D. Wilson.[14] Though Allis believed that there were a limited number of divinely inspired additions such as the last eight verses of Deuteronomy 34,[15] he also noted that historical-critical "scholars have differed and still differ as to these alleged anachronisms," which was, in his mind, "an indication that the case against Mosaic authorship of these passages is not proved."[16] Two of the passages in question include the phrase "before any king reigned in Israel" (Gen 36:1) and the mention of the city "Dan" (14:14). Allis asserted that these were not necessarily anachronistic and may have been authored by Moses.[17]

Allan A. MacRae, a colleague of O. T. Allis for seven years at Westminster, also affirmed and specifically referenced R. D. Wilson's "later inspired redactions":

> Some writer might insert a sentence, one hundred, two hundred, or three hundred years later, speaking of the condition remaining as it became at that time. Such an insertion at a later time does not disprove the Mosaic authorship of the book as a whole. Dr. Robert Dick Wilson expressed this in his book on the scientific introduction to the Pentateuch. He explained what he considered Mosaic authorship to be. I find his definition quoted in other books, showing that most feel that he expressed it very well.[18]

MacRae's colleague, Edward J. Young, who taught at Westminster Seminary for thirty-two years, likewise followed W. H. Green and R. D. Wilson in their approach to inspired redactions.[19] For example, Young taught that the reference to Dan in Genesis 14:14 was "no argument against Mosaic authorship. It may not be

---

[11] Yeo, *Plundering the Egyptians*, 10–11.

[12] Robert Dick Wilson, *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament*, rev. ed. (Chicago, IL: Moody, 1959), 12.

[13] Yeo, *Plundering the Egyptians*, 18.

[14] Yeo, *Plundering the Egyptians,* 154–55n9.

[15] Oswald T. Allis, *The Five Books of Moses* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed, 1949), 12.

[16] Allis, *The Five Books of Moses*, 306n16.

[17] Allis, *The Five Books of Moses*, 306n16.

[18] Allan A. MacRae, *JEDP: Lectures on the Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch*, ed. S. T. Hague and R. C. Newman (Hatfield, PA: Interdisciplinary Biblical Research Institute, 1994), 54.

[19] Yeo, *Plundering the Egyptians*, 95.

the Dan of Judges 18:29, or, if it is, is it not possible that in the course of repeated copying the later, more familiar name may have been inserted?"[20] Regarding Deuteronomy 34, Young, in lockstep with his Old Princeton-Westminster forebears, wrote, "It is perfectly legitimate to regard this brief account of Moses' death as having been written by a later hand under divine inspiration and then appended to the book of Deuteronomy."[21]

2. *Inspired redaction revised according to Raymond B. Dillard.* Dillard and Longman also embraced the concept of inspired redaction that their predecessors in the Old Princeton-Westminster tradition had employed and promulgated.[22] Longman, who taught at Westminster Seminary for eighteen years,[23] authored the chapter on Genesis in *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, which he co-authored with his former teacher and senior colleague, Raymond B. Dillard.[24] In that chapter, Longman wrote about the alleged non-Mosaic passages found in the Pentateuch:

> The most obvious of these so-called post-Mosaica is Deuteronomy 34, the narrative of the death of Moses. Although even this chapter has been attributed to Moses by some, most conservatives argue that it was a later addition, possibly added by Joshua …, though more probably at a later date. Other passages that show indication of post-Mosaic origins include Genesis 11:31, which associated Abraham's Ur with the Chaldeans … and Genesis 14:14, which mentions Dan, an ancient city known by this name only much later.… Since there are what appear to be obvious later additions, many conservatives speak in terms of "essential authorship" of Moses. This expression vigorously affirms Moses as the author of the Torah, while also leaving open the possibility of later canonical additions.[25]

Dillard taught at Westminster Seminary for twenty-four years. He similarly held that there were "post-Mosaica" or "a-Mosaica" in the Pentateuch.[26] In his chapter on Deuteronomy, Dillard asserted, "These were viewed as isolated insertions into the text by later editors who added a comment here and there to update or clarify geographical (2:10–11, 20–23; 3:9, 11, 13b–14) or historical (10:6–9) information.… Obviously Moses was not responsible for the account of his own death (chap. 34)."[27] It is important to note that, for Deuteronomy, Dillard believed that the inspired redactions were limited in scope. They did not consist of wholesale documents but were "isolated insertions" that were added "here and there to

---

[20] Edward J. Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949), 59.

[21] Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 105.

[22] Yeo, *Plundering the Egyptians,* 267n156.

[23] Yeo, *Plundering the Egyptians,* 219–20.

[24] Raymond B. Dillard and Tremper Longman III, *An Introduction to the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994); Tremper Longman III and Raymond B. Dillard, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2006). In the second edition, the order of Dillard and Longman's names is switched due to the former's death and the latter having revised every chapter in the volume.

[25] Dillard and Longman, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, 39–40.

[26] Yeo, *Plundering the Egyptians,* 208.

[27] Dillard and Longman, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, 93.

update or clarify geographical or historical information."[28] When it came to his understanding of Deutero-Isaiah, however, his definition of "inspired redaction" was modified to the point that it put him at odds with his Old Princeton-Westminster predecessors.

II. RAYMOND B. DILLARD'S DEUTERO-ISAIAH THEORY AND HIS REVISED CONCEPT OF INSPIRED REDACTION

In his chapter on Isaiah in *An Introduction to the Old Testament* (1994), Dillard argued for the notion that an anonymous, divinely inspired disciple/prophet of Isaiah wrote the second half of the book (i.e., chapters 40–66) during the Babylonian exile and subsequently appended it to the original prophecies (i.e., chapters 1–39) of the eighth-century prophet of Jerusalem, Isaiah, son of Amoz.[29] In order to do so, Dillard rationalized his view of Deutero-Isaiah by employing a fundamental revision of the concept of inspired redaction.

1. *Isaiah 40–66 as inspired redaction by an anonymous prophet.* Cognizant that his controversial approval of Deutero-Isaiah cut against the grain of the earlier views of his Old Princeton-Westminster predecessors, Dillard attempted to justify his acceptance of the Deutero-Isaiah theory by postulating that an analogous situation was present in the anonymous, post-Mosaic redaction of Deuteronomy 34. Accordingly, Dillard asserted that the two cases of redactional activity found in Deuteronomy 34 and Isaiah 40–66 were parallel because in both instances an unknown author/redactor had appended inspired text to the foundational writings of an earlier recognized prophet. He maintained that since most evangelicals regarded the last chapter of Deuteronomy describing Moses's death as not having been written by Moses himself, evangelicals should be receptive theoretically to the possibility that Isaiah 40–66 may also have been written by an unknown, inspired author, one who lived during the Babylonian exile.[30] Dillard wrote,

> Whatever one concludes about the historical relationship between Moses and Deuteronomy, it is clear that Moses did not write the account of his own death (Deut. 34:1–8); the person who wrote this final section of the book lived at a time when a number of prophets had come and gone, but none like Moses (Deut. 34:10–12). This is to say that the setting presumed by this chapter (a time

---

[28] Dillard and Longman, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, 93.

[29] Dillard and Longman, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, 275. Although Richard Schultz affirms that Dillard and Longman viewed the theory of Deutero-Isaiah as acceptable, he notes that "Dillard and Longman do not state a clear preference for this compositional theory." Richard Schultz, "How Many Isaiahs Were There and What Does It Matter? Prophetic Inspiration in Recent Evangelical Scholarship," in *Evangelicals and Scripture: Tradition, Authority and Hermeneutics*, ed. Vincent Bacote, Laura C. Miguélez, and Dennis L. Okholm (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2004), 152; Schultz, "Isaiah, Isaiahs, and Current Scholarship," in *Do Historical Matters Matter to Faith? A Critical Appraisal of Modern and Postmodern Approaches to Scripture*, ed. James K. Hoffmeier and Dennis R. Magary (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2012), 260–61. It will be shown below, however, that not only did Dillard and Longman embrace and attempt to justify the Deutero-Isaiah theory, but that scholars—both for and against the view—generally understand them as accepting it as well.

[30] Yeo, *Plundering the Egyptians*, 233.

> after the death of Moses) precludes Moses' having written it. Although the New Testament cites Deuteronomy and attributes it to Moses (24:1–3 in Mark 10:4; 2:4 in 1 Cor. 9:9), no one would seriously argue that this includes Deuteronomy 34. *Recognizing that the setting of Deuteronomy 34 requires an author living later than Moses, the author traditionally assigned to the book, is not materially different from recognizing that the background of Isaiah 40–66 presumes an author living during the Exile. Isaiah is not mentioned in the second half of the book. However, the reality of prophetic inspiration is not thereby eliminated: an author living later in the Exile foresaw through divine inspiration what God was about to do through Cyrus, just as Isaiah foresaw what God would soon do with Tiglath-pileser III (Isa. 7). This later author saw in Isaiah's prophecies of exile and a remnant events that were transpiring in his own day, and he wrote to develop and apply Isaiah's preaching to his fellow exiles. Although the anonymity of this great prophet is a problem, it is no more unusual than the anonymity of the historical books or the book of Hebrews.*[31]

It is apparent, therefore, that Dillard presumed that an anonymous, exilic, divinely inspired prophet employed the original prophecies of [First] Isaiah much like an allegedly later, anonymous, post-Mosaic prophet did when he appended the last eight verses to Deuteronomy 34.

In contrast to what Wilson and Young had earlier defined, Dillard's use of inspired redaction in the case of Isaiah 40–66 was qualitatively and quantitively different. In his application of inspired redaction to the book of Deuteronomy, Dillard claimed that the instances were: (1) isolated insertions, (2) limited in scope, (3) not consisting of wholesale documents, and (4) added "here and there to update or clarify geographical or historical information."[32] Yet when it came to Isaiah 40–66, Dillard held that inspired redaction could be expanded qualitatively to adopt a prophet unknown to history who had purportedly written some of the most significant texts in all of the Hebrew Scriptures (including Isaiah 52:13–53:12) and quantitatively, with the wholesale addition of twenty-seven lengthy chapters.

2. *Dillard's search for "II Isaiah."* Upon closer examination, it is apparent that Dillard's conclusion of an anonymous exilic prophet named Deutero-Isaiah was built upon a precarious foundation. In his lecture notes on the Prophets, Dillard compared the various divine "call narratives"[33] and included a hypothetical section labeled "II Isaiah":[34]

---

[31] Dillard and Longman, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 275, emphasis mine.

[32] Dillard and Longman, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 275.

[33] On the purpose and features of the prophetic call narrative, see Victor H. Matthews and James C. Moyer, *The Old Testament: Text and Context* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997), 113.

[34] Raymond B. Dillard, "OT 311: Prophets," Lecture Notes 1-B-1, Fall Semester 1992–1993, Westminster Theological Seminary.

Outline:	Moses	Gideon	Jeremiah	Isaiah	Ezekiel	"II Isaiah"
	Exodus	Judges				
Divine Confrontation	3:1–4a	6:11b–12a	1:4	6:1–2	1:1–28	-----
Introductory Word	3:4b–9	6:12b–13	1:5a	6:3–7	1:28–2:2	40:1–2
Commission	3:10	6:14	1:5b	6:8–10	2:3–5	40:3–6a
Objection	3:11	6:15	1:6	6:11a	2:6, 8??	40:6–7
Reassurance	3:12a	6:16	1:7–8	6:11b–13	2:6–7	40:8–11
Sign	3:12	6:17–21	1:9–10	-----	2:8–3:11	-----

In his form-critical investigation of Deutero-Isaiah's "call narrative" in 40:1–11, Dillard stated,

> We only stop to look at what has been called a call narrative in Isa 40:1–11 because it is so important to higher critical arguments regarding the authorship of the book. Setting aside the matter of vaticinium ex eventu as a principal philosophical reason for the notion of an exilic 2 Isa, the presence of a second call narrative in Isa 40 constitutes perhaps the strongest argument for the diversity of authorship of the book.[35]

In his analysis proper, Dillard wrestled with the exegetical arguments "for" and "against" the notion of a second call narrative in Isaiah 40. Dillard finally concluded that one could not be positively identified: "The precise speakers and the roles of the speakers are not clear—the changes in imperatives, the absence of a clear indication of the divine council, etc. leave the identification of the passage as a call narrative in doubt.… The absence of the theophany—even though immediately expected also means that the most we could possibly speak of would be 'fragments' of a call narrative."[36] Consequently, in his own words, Dillard could not find precise exegetical evidence for a legitimate "call narrative" for the putative exilic prophet in Isaiah 40:1–11. Curiously though, when it came time to publish his views in the *Introduction*, Dillard was decidedly in favor of the Deutero-Isaiah theory.

3. *Dillard's Isaianic school of prophetic disciples.* Another major reason for Dillard's controversial move to accept Deutero-Isaiah was the possibility of a prophet having a school of disciples. Dillard held that the evidence from Scripture justified this notion. In his lecture notes, Dillard observed:

> The accounts about Jesus were remembered differently and arranged differently and put to varying purposes by the different disciples. Jesus, the great prophet,

[35] Dillard, "OT 311: Prophets," Lecture Notes 1-B-1.

[36] Dillard, "OT 311: Prophets," Lecture Notes 1-B-1. For more of Dillard's justifications of a conjectural Deutero-Isaianic call narrative, see Yeo, *Plundering the Egyptians*, 236.

> was remembered by his disciples, under the inspiration of God to be sure. *The prophets of the Old Testament also appear to have had disciples*. The relationship between the man and the book, so familiar to NT studies as an issue in the search for the historical Jesus, is likewise an issue in the prophetic literature. Not only is it possible that the prophets did write, it is also possible that some never wrote themselves. The evidence for these "circles" of disciples is clear in a few passages: the case of Baruch would be obvious in his relation to Jeremiah. But consider also Isa. 8: 16–17+18—some similarly use Isa 50:4, though it is more difficult in that case. Again, … we walk our familiar tension again of negating both extremes: the extreme that the prophets were solitary individuals functioning always as their own scribes, and also that the prophets were only remembered in oral transmission over a long period so that what is recorded does not really reflect their messages and the events of their own times. Some prophets may have written and had disciples—some may not have had followers ("schools").[37]

Again, unlike his predecessors who held to the single author view, Dillard suggested that the prophet Isaiah had "disciples" in accordance with Isaiah 8:16–18 (and possibly 50:4), much like the prophet Jeremiah who had a known disciple named Baruch (cf. Jer 36). Deutero-Isaiah was, therefore, a disciple of his teacher, the eighth-century-BC Isaiah of Jerusalem, and carried on his words by anonymously writing chapters 40–66 approximately 150 years later during the exilic period.

Tremper Longman, in the second edition of the *Introduction* (2006), parenthetically added to Dillard's section on Isaiah by affirming John Goldingay's multi-authorship view of Isaiah: "Goldingay provides an excellent example of an evangelical commentary that argues for multi-authorship."[38] In his commentary on Isaiah, Goldingay hears four human voices in the book.[39] These include: the Ambassador, the Disciple, the Poet, and the Preacher. A disciple was responsible for redacting the other voices together. These voices correspond to the three critical sources including First Isaiah, Second Isaiah, and Third Isaiah.[40] Later, in 2010, Longman unequivocally asserted: "In the 540s B.C., Isaiah 40 was written to comfort and encourage the Israelite exiles in Babylon through the prophet's announcement of their impending release from captivity (Is 40:1–11)."[41] Thus, his unambiguous endorsement of Deutero-Isaiah reveals Longman's evident acceptance of the theory.

---

[37] Dillard, "OT 311: Prophets," Lecture Notes III-3, emphasis mine.

[38] Longman and Dillard, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 311.

[39] John E. Goldingay, *Isaiah*, NIBC 13 (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2006), 5.

[40] Goldingay, *Isaiah*, 5.

[41] Richard F. Carlson and Tremper Longman III, *Science, Creation and the Bible: Reconciling Rival Theories of Origins* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2010), 75. In the same year, Longman is listed as contributing notes on Isaiah in *HCSB Study Bible*, ed. E. Blum and J. R. Howard (Nashville: Holman Bible Publishers, 2010). In the introduction to Isaiah the comments on authorship acknowledge controversy about chapters 40–66 and say, "The book presents itself as the writing of one man, Isaiah son of Amoz.… For those who believe that God knows the future and can reveal it to His servants, it is not problematic that God through Isaiah predicted the rise of Babylon, its victory against Judah, the exile, and the return" (1124).

Conspicuously, Dillard never responded in depth to the contrary views of his predecessors within the Old Princeton-Westminster tradition regarding Isaianic disciples as authors/editors. He sidestepped the works of Joseph A. Alexander,[42] Oswald T. Allis,[43] and, especially, Edward J. Young,[44] who had uncompromisingly argued for the single Isaiah authorship view.[45] Young, in particular, was very familiar with the historical-critical theory that Isaiah's disciple(s) had redacted and produced the canonical final form of the book, and he criticized it for its inherent subjectivity, claiming that it was based upon conjecture and speculation. He asserted,

> If the editors collected so many utterances which really were spoken by various persons, and issued them under the name of Isaiah, they did a very dishonest thing. For the heading (1:1) which these editors prefixed to the book is, as we have seen, very specific, and gives the impression that the entire book is the vision which Isaiah the son of Amoz saw concerning specific subjects and at a specific time.[46]

Even moderate and liberal scholars who hold to the multi-authorship view, such as H. G. M. Williamson,[47] Peter R. Ackroyd,[48] and R. E. Clements,[49] have effectively challenged the idea of an Isaianic school of disciples. John N. Oswalt, a conservative evangelical scholar, also opposed the Isaianic "disciple(s)" concept stating that the thematic unity found in Isaiah is the primary reason most scholars posit a "school" for Isaiah in order to account for it.[50] On the passage often employed to justify the presence of Isaiah's disciples, Oswalt states, "[Isaiah] 8:16,

---

[42] Joseph Addison Alexander, *The Prophecies of Isaiah Translated and Explained*, 2 vols. (New York: Charles Scribner & Co., 1870).

[43] Oswald T. Allis, *The Unity of Isaiah: A Study in Prophecy* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 1980).

[44] Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*; Young, *The Book of Isaiah: The English Text, with Introduction, Exposition, and Notes,* 3 vols. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972); Young, *Who Wrote Isaiah?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1958).

[45] On attempts to refute Old Princetonian views related to Mosaic and Isaianic authorship done by scholars affiliated with Westminster Theological Seminary, see Peter Enns, "William Henry Green and the Authorship of the Pentateuch: Some Historical Considerations," *JETS* 45.3 (2002): 385–403; John Halsey Wood Jr., "Oswald T. Allis and the Question of Isaianic Authorship," *JETS* 48.2 (2005): 249–61. Enns is a former student of Dillard, while Wood is a former student of Enns at Westminster Theological Seminary. For arguments in defense of Allis's position against the views of Wood, see G. K. Beale, *The Erosion of Inerrancy in Evangelicalism: Responding to New Challenges to Biblical Authority* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2008), 155–59; and Schultz, "Isaiah, Isaiahs, and Current Scholarship," 243–47.

[46] Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 208. In agreement, Oswalt remarks, "It is significant that there is almost no specific historical detail in chapters 40–66 apart from the one glaring exception, the naming of the deliverer, Cyrus. This would be consistent with the historical Isaiah having written these chapters, having a general idea what the future would hold but no specific knowledge. If those chapters were written in those actual times, then we must believe that later editors stripped the details out in order to heighten the impression that Isaiah wrote them." John N. Oswalt, *Isaiah*, NIVAC (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2003), 18n1.

[47] H. G. M. Williamson, *The Book Called Isaiah: Deutero-Isaiah's Role in Composition and Redaction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 8.

[48] Peter R. Ackroyd, "Isaiah 1–12: Presentation of a Prophet," in *Congress Volume: Göttingen 1977*, ed. John Emerton, VTSup 29 (Leiden: Brill, 1978), 28–29.

[49] R. E. Clements, "The Prophecies of Isaiah and the Fall of Jerusalem," *VT* 30.4 (1980): 436.

[50] John N. Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 1–39*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), 19.

'Bind up the testimony, seal the teaching among my disciples,' is frequently referred to as the impetus for the founding of a school. But this is hardly reason enough. In fact, the context makes it plain that the reference is to Isaiah's predictions concerning the outcome of the Syro-Ephraimite War."[51] Oswalt continues, "This is far from demonstrating that what he gave them was the equivalent of a dozen chapters that they and fifteen generations of their descendants developed into the present sixty-six chapters…. The idea is not credible."[52]

4. *Dillard's inspired canonical process against the one-prophet view.* As part of Dillard and Longman's modification of Wilson's and Young's understanding of "later inspired redactors," which now included the additional weight of anonymous authors, Dillard no longer believed that the focal point of divine inspiration was a single prophetic author, but the entire historical process of inscripturation, composition, and subsequent redactional activity. In his lecture notes for the course "Introduction to the Old Testament," Dillard disputed R. Laird Harris's traditional view that the criterion for canonicity in the Old Testament was prophetic authorship.[53] Dillard's rejection of the prophetic-apostolic criterion for canonicity is revealing. First, Dillard objected to Harris's expansion of the term "prophet." Dillard sought to retain a strict definition for the office of the prophet, since to include every inspired writer would make anyone a prophet. Second, books such as Chronicles, Job, Esther, Song of Songs, and Ecclesiastes do not readily present themselves as prophetic in origin, not to mention the question of how one would know if these books were written by prophets. And third, Dillard, though recognizing that prophetic and apostolic authorship characterizes the Bible as a rule, claimed that Harris's view did not sufficiently account for all the anonymous books and that it would be wrong for the church to distinguish whether or not a prophet or an apostle had written them. In other words, Dillard took the exceptions that related to the anonymous books and made them the rule by denying those inspired canonical authors who possessed the gift of prophecy but did not hold the prophetic office in the technical sense.

To Dillard, the essential element of the canon was not that it was written to "express the words of prophets and apostles, but rather it is found in the fact that it embodies the word of God's revelation."[54] This placed divine inspiration not on an individual prophet, but on the entire canonical process. As a result, Dillard's objections dislodged the authority of the Bible from the prophetic-apostolic offices to the notion of an inspired canonical text that, in essence, has "no external tests," but

---

[51] Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah*, 19n8. Cf. J. Alec Motyer, *The Prophecy of Isaiah* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1993), 30–33.

[52] Oswalt, *Isaiah* (NIVAC), 35. See also Schultz, "How Many Isaiahs Were There and What Does It Matter?," 167–70.

[53] Raymond B. Dillard, "OT 113: Old Testament Introduction," Lecture One: I:C:3 "Part One: The Canon of the Old Testament," Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, second semester, 1988–1989. Cf. R. Laird Harris, *Inspiration and Canonicity of the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1957), 154–79.

[54] Dillard, "OT 113: Old Testament Introduction," Lecture One: I:C:3 "Part One: The Canon of the Old Testament."

that is only "given, self-authenticating, calling all men to account, but judged by no one."[55]

Prior to Dillard, LaSor, Hubbard, and Bush had made explicit what Dillard had implied in his lecture notes:

> The production of prophetic books was a much more prolonged and complex process than the inspiration of a speaking prophet. It is now recognized that behind prophetic literature lies the work of editors and arrangers and circles who preserved oral traditions and presented them to later generations of God's people.… To speak of inspiration, as one must to be true to the Bible, there has to be an acknowledgement of God's inspiring providence so that the written word eventually reflected the divine intention.… It was within the community of Israel and in response to its successive needs that the books of the Old Testament gradually grew to their present form. Neither a single prophetic author nor a final redactor may be credited with a monopoly on inspiration.[56]

Richard Schultz states that LaSor, Hubbard, and Bush's "canonical process" view reflects "the influence of Brevard Childs of Yale University in their description of the work of Isaiah's disciples who carried out this canonical process within the context of the believing community."[57]

Schultz, whose *Doktorvater* at Yale was Brevard S. Childs, writes against the canonical process view.[58] He concedes, "There is no inherent reason why the Holy Spirit could not have inspired any number of writers and editors who contributed to the composition of a given biblical book. In canonical books such as Psalms and Proverbs, this was clearly the case: the superscriptions in these books explicitly acknowledge the involvement of multiple authors."[59] But Schultz asserts that "the issue is whether we can legitimately posit a series of inspired authors or editors when the involvement of multiple prophets is *not* acknowledged in the text and when one of the reasons for positing such a complex compositional process is the claim that the Spirit of God *could not* (or at least *did* not) reveal the diversity of contents identified in the book of Isaiah to just one individual."[60] On the contrary, Schultz makes clear that "if we are to read the book of Isaiah on its own terms, it is necessary to take its superscriptions [1:1; 2:1; 13:1] seriously."[61] He continues, "There is no reason to restrict this divinely imparted vision to just one section of the book, nor is there any justification for positing numerous helping hands who later confirmed the accuracy of this vision by adding historical detail or even saving

---

[55] Dillard, "OT 113: Old Testament Introduction," Lecture One: I:C:3 "Part One: The Canon of the Old Testament."

[56] William Sanford LaSor, David Allan Hubbard, and Frederic William Bush, *Old Testament Survey: The Message, Form, and Background of the Old Testament*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 594–95.

[57] Schultz, "How Many Isaiahs Were There and What Does It Matter?," 155.

[58] Richard L. Schultz, *The Search for Quotation: Verbal Parallels in the Prophets*, JSOTSS 180 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 10.

[59] Schultz, "How Many Isaiahs Were There and What Does It Matter?," 161.

[60] Schultz, "How Many Isaiahs Were There and What Does It Matter?," 161, his emphasis.

[61] Schultz, "How Many Isaiahs Were There and What Does It Matter?," 169.

it by reinterpretation."[62] In substantial agreement, Oswalt declares, "So where did these books come from? The Bible maintains (long before the rise of philosophical idealism), that these books are the inspired work of individuals.… This fact argues strongly against a socio-religious community's producing the prophetic books."[63]

In opposition to Childs's canonical process, Carl F. H. Henry defended the author-centered model of divine inspiration by pointing to the Scripture's self-attestation with regard to its divine origin (cf. 2 Tim 3:16–17; 2 Pet 1:20–21). Henry astutely contrasted the evangelical view of the composition and canonization of Scripture to Childs's understanding:

> In expounding the emergence of Scripture, evangelical scholarship finds less reason for departing from canonically-indicated authors of the component biblical books. It leans more heavily on the factor of divine revelation and prophetic-apostolic inspiration, without on that account minimizing the biblical writers' personality differences and stylistic peculiarities or excluding their use of sources. By contrast, Professor Childs stresses a reformulated canonical content reflecting the work of editors. He does not view the canon, therefore, as aiming to preserve a pure prophetic-apostolic text. Hence he must relate divine revelation and inspiration to the canon in non-traditional ways. But if ancient materials embodied in the canon are no longer identifiable as specifically prophetic or apostolic, then the prophetic-apostolic autographs are in principle levelled to the same non-normative plane as are the ephemeral P-D-Q critical sources.[64]

Likewise, the following critique by Henry effectively applies to Dillard's statement that "the essential element of canon is … found in the fact that it embodies the word of God's revelation."[65] Henry averred,

> Evangelicals resist any notion of canonicity that locates scriptural authority merely in the fact that in these writings the church continues to hear the Word of God. The fact that a canonical text functioned as Scripture did not objectively validate the Bible's divine authority in the early Christian community. The achievement of a canon whose authority an interacting community acknowledges and to which it submits does not in and of itself guarantee its divine authority.[66]

---

[62] Schultz, "How Many Isaiahs Were There and What Does It Matter?," 169–70.

[63] Oswalt, "Is There Anything Unique in the Israelite Prophets?," 83.

[64] Carl F. H. Henry, "Canonical Theology: An Evangelical Appraisal," *Scottish Bulletin of Evangelical Theology* 8 (1990): 79. Henry also astutely noted that "many evangelicals appeal to special divine providence to explain the compilation and preservation of the canon. If one asks why providential divine sovereignty could not have been equally operative through dialectical canon-formation [the position of B. S. Childs], the response is that apostolicity is a more compelling principle than dialectical process to account for the reception of the canonical books as authoritative" (86). Cf. Stephen B. Chapman, "Reclaiming Inspiration for the Bible" in *Canon and Biblical Interpretation*, ed. Craig G. Bartholomew et al., Scripture and Hermeneutics 7 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2006), 177.

[65] Dillard, "OT 113: Old Testament Introduction," Lecture One: I:C:3, "Part One: The Canon of the Old Testament."

[66] Henry, "Canonical Theology," 106–7.

The quote from Henry calls Dillard's statement into account. Although Dillard claimed that the canon was "judged by no one" because it was "self-authenticating," the question remains as to who then made the final decision to canonize a particular book. It is very doubtful that the covenant community would have recognized a book as canonical and divinely inspired unless it had been closely associated with the authoritative prophetic or apostolic offices. Grisanti concurs: "Only recognized individuals, that is, prophetic figures whose adjustment of the biblical text would have been accepted by the Israelite community of faith, would have been able to participate in this 'updating' process."[67]

Although Dillard recognized that the Old Testament had a long and complex pre-history, he aspired to interpret the inspired text within its canonical context as the "Word of God." Thus, in his mind, Deutero-Isaiah as the anonymous, inspired author was not identical to the Deutero-Isaiah of modern-critical scholarship. As made evident, Dillard reasoned that inspiration was not solely based upon the prophetic office (i.e., the "single-authorship" view) but on the entire process of the book's canonical formation. Therefore, according to Dillard, his use of Deutero-Isaiah did not impinge upon his understanding of a "high view of Scripture" since "the essential element of canon is … found in the fact that it embodies the word of God's revelation."[68] Nevertheless, his expansive concept of "later inspired redactors" and his placement of divine inspiration within the overarching historical canonical process, ultimately allowed him to accommodate his use of a historical-critical inspired Deutero-Isaiah theory.

III. A CRITIQUE OF DILLARD'S VERSION OF INSPIRED REDACTION

Dillard's revision of Wilson's and Young's concept of "later inspired editors" in order to validate his multi-authorship view of Isaiah did not go unnoticed. A former Old Testament department colleague of Dillard's at Westminster Seminary, O. Palmer Robertson, contends that Dillard improperly compared Isaiah 40–66 with Deuteronomy 34, since the two texts are disparate literary genres. In essence, Dillard was proverbially "comparing apples with oranges." Robertson states,

> While arguments have been made repeatedly for the distribution of materials in the book of Isaiah among the preexilic, exilic, and post-exilic eras, the case made by Dillard and Longman is not particularly strong, especially given their premise regarding the divinely revealed character of the book. Paralleling the question regarding the authorship of Isaiah to the recording of Moses' death in Deuteronomy ignores the difference in genre between the two writings. The record of Moses' death comes as a historical prologue dealing with matters of succession

---

[67] Grisanti, "Inspiration, Inerrancy, and the OT Canon," 580. On the necessity of prophetic authorship as a criterion for canonicity, see Josephus, *C. Ap.* 1.7–8; Paul D. Wegner, *The Journey from Texts to Translations: The Origin and Development of the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1999), 117; Stephen G. Dempster, "The Old Testament Canon, Josephus, and Cognitive Environment," in *The Enduring Authority of the Christian Scriptures*, ed. D. A. Carson (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016), 342–45.

[68] Dillard, Lecture Notes, "Part One: The Canon of the Old Testament," Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, second semester, 1988–1989.

> in a covenant-renewal document. As such, this material can be expected to conform to the scriptural conventions related to historical writings. For this elemental reason, it may be assumed that the Pentateuch did not intend to represent Moses as the person who recorded the circumstances of his own death and the ensuing funeral procedures, for historical writings do not as a standard rule describe events in advance of their occurrence. *But Isaiah 40–66 appears as an entirely different literary genre. This material possesses all the characteristics of prophetic writings that anticipate events and circumstances of the future. In this case, it is quite natural to expect authorship to reside with someone who lives prior to the age being anticipated. For this reason, Isaiah ben Amoz would not be automatically eliminated from consideration as the author of this material as is Moses with respect to the historical record of his own decease.*[69]

Moreover, Wilson and Young viewed these alleged inspired additions and revisions as quantitatively minimal in extent. Iain M. Duguid, professor of Old Testament at Westminster Theological Seminary, explicates Wilson's and Young's position on inspired redaction of the Pentateuch in the following manner:

> There is no room in their conception for substantial (inspired) additions "in the spirit of Moses" which cover subjects that Moses never addressed. Nor could the Pentateuch itself be dated much later than Moses, since for Young the repeated ascriptions in the Book of Joshua to "the book of the Law of Moses" are part of his case for Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch (*I[ntroduction to the Old] T[estament]*, p. 44). The parallel with the gospels is apt. No one doubts that the Gospel writers, under the inspiration of the Spirit, framed their report of the words of Jesus to suit their own narrative goals. Nonetheless, conservatives would assert that the Gospels were composed from the evidence of eyewitnesses, close in time to the events themselves. Moreover, in shaping their material the gospel writers never invented new sayings, which they then attributed to Jesus, nor did they so selectively quote Jesus as to misrepresent what he actually said. The Gospels are therefore an accurate historical record of what Jesus really said. *Likewise, for Young and Wilson, the Pentateuch is an accurate historical record of what Moses really said. In principle, then, we are all agreed on the two points asserted by Young and Wilson, that the Pentateuch as it stands is essentially the work of Moses and that there are inspired revisions and editorial additions. For Young and Wilson, those details were demonstrably small and of minor significance.*[70]

Hence, despite the obvious dissimilarities between Deuteronomy 34 and Isaiah 40–66 in genre as well as in amount of inspired redactional material,[71] Dillard transformed Wilson's and Young's minor editorial revisions and additions into twenty-seven lengthy chapters. In effect, Dillard converted their "inspired redactor(s)" into an outright prophetic author who wrote about 41% of the chapters found in the book. To Wilson and Young, however, the idea would have been inconceivable.

---

[69] O. Palmer Robertson, *The Christ of the Prophets* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2004), 228–29, emphasis mine. Robertson devotes eight pages (pp. 228–35) to counter Dillard and Longman's Deutero-Isaiah view.

[70] Frank J. Smith, ed., "Westminster OT Profs Not Sure Who Wrote the Books of Moses," *Presbyterian and Reformed News* 6.1 (2000): 13, emphasis mine.

[71] Robertson, *The Christ of the Prophets,* 228–29.

The central issue, then, relates to Dillard's understanding of the identity and function of the "inspired, anonymous author." Was he "the great unknown prophet" commonly designated as "Deutero-Isaiah"? Or was he an inspired editor who faithfully collected Isaiah's prophecies and then framed them in the present canonical form? Richard Schultz observes, "A contemporary editor or group of editors could legitimately frame and order Isaiah's oracles, adding brief explanatory comments whenever they considered them to be necessary. But is there any inherent reason why 'an unknown prophet of the exile' who chose not to identify himself should share in Isaiah of Jerusalem's divinely bestowed authority?"[72] Similarly, Robertson inquires, "All these major prophets we know. But who is this Deutero-Isaiah?"[73] To Dillard, however, the mystery of Deutero-Isaiah's identity was insignificant since the same could be said about the authorship of the book of Hebrews.[74] But as his Old Princeton-Westminster predecessors acknowledged: (1) the book of Isaiah has an unambiguous superscription attesting to one Isaiah, and (2) the New Testament confirms Isaiah to be the only author of the entire work.[75]

In the final analysis, however, Dillard did not regard the issue of Isaianic authorship as a theological *shibboleth* (Judg 12:6) nor a litmus test for orthodoxy.[76] Marvin E. Tate approvingly wrote, "The conservative scholars R. B. Dillard and T. Longman III have put the matter well in their introduction to the Old Testament. They reject the thesis that the book of Isaiah is the work of Isaiah of Jerusalem: a 'later author saw in Isaiah's prophecies of Exile and a remnant events that were transpiring in his own day.'"[77]

Moreover, Dillard's assertions surrounding Deutero-Isaiah appear to repeat conclusions stated earlier by William S. LaSor, David A. Hubbard, and Frederic W. Bush of Fuller Theological Seminary in their *Old Testament Survey*.[78] The claims of "an unknown prophet of the Exile," the view that "Isaianic authorship should not be made a test of orthodoxy," and the insistence that the anonymity of Deutero-Isaiah is analogous to the book of Hebrews were all affirmed in that work.[79] It is evident, therefore, that Dillard was in general agreement with the Fuller Old Tes-

---

[72] Schultz, "How Many Isaiahs Were There and What Does It Matter?," 167.

[73] Robertson, *Christ of the Prophets*, 233.

[74] Longman and Dillard, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 310.

[75] Cf. Alexander, *The Prophecies of Isaiah Translated and Explained*, 1:13–14; Allis, *The Unity of Isaiah*, 39–43; Allan A. MacRae, *The Gospel of Isaiah* (Chicago: Moody, 1977), 176–77; Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament,* 205–7.

[76] Longman and Dillard, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 311. Bruce K. Waltke, while holding to the single authorship of Isaiah, also affirmed that "the authorship of these chapters [40–66] should not be a test of orthodoxy." Bruce K. Waltke with Charles Yu, *An Old Testament Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2007), 67.

[77] Marvin E. Tate, "The Book of Isaiah in Recent Study," in *Forming Prophetic Literature: Essays on Isaiah and the Twelve in Honor of John D. W. Watts*, ed. James W. Watts and Paul R. House, JSOTSS 235 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 52.

[78] LaSor, Hubbard, and Bush, *Old Testament Survey*, 281–88. The first edition of the book was published in 1982. For an account of Fuller Seminary's movement from conservative to moderate, see George M. Marsden, *Reforming Fundamentalism: Fuller Seminary and the New Evangelicalism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995); Harold Lindsell, *The Battle for the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976), 106–21.

[79] LaSor, Hubbard, and Bush, *Old Testament Survey*, 281–88.

tament faculty in their acceptance of a hypothetical, critical theory and its unconfirmed conclusions without requisite biblical or historical evidence.[80] In this manner, LaSor, Hubbard, and Bush had paved the way for Dillard to promote his comparable views for a more conservative, evangelical readership.

IV. CONCLUSION

Unlike those in the Old Princeton-Westminster tradition who defended the single-author view of the book of Isaiah, Raymond B. Dillard was the first in that tradition to acknowledge and propagate the Deutero-Isaiah theory. Dillard's acceptance of Deutero-Isaiah was the result of two significant steps: (1) He fundamentally broadened Wilson's and Young's idea of "later inspired editors" (as in the case of the Pentateuch) and applied it to the redactional history of Isaiah. (2) He eliminated the notion of a single inspired author associated with the prophetic office in order to place the emphasis of divine inspiration on the historical process of inscripturation, composition, and redaction. Moreover, Dillard expanded Wilson's and Young's concept in two prominent ways: (1) qualitatively, in regard to the function and identity of the "later inspired redactor," which now included an anonymous, developed prophetic figure, and (2) quantitatively, in terms of the large amount of inspired text that had been written and appended to the original work. Thus, Dillard's understanding of inspired redaction was a radical transformation of Wilson's and Young's minimalist definition in order to justify the acceptability of the historical-critical theory of Deutero-Isaiah.

On October 1, 1993, Raymond Dillard died unexpectedly at the age of 49, before publication of the *Introduction*.[81] Lamentably, it was impossible for him to respond to criticisms from the evangelical, scholarly community as detailed within this study. Whether Dillard would have changed his mind regarding Deutero-Isaiah is difficult to ascertain, but a concession of this possibility is duly acknowledged.

Due to its significance within the Old Princeton-Westminster trajectory in particular and evangelical scholarship in general, Dillard's decision to publish his uncertain views on Deutero-Isaiah without providing sufficient factual evidence set a negative precedent. That he did not address the arguments defending the one-Isaiah view of his Old Princeton-Westminster predecessors as well as the works of other conservative evangelicals gives the regrettable impression that conjectural assertions are enough to favor the acceptability of unproven critical theories. One

---

[80] G. K. Beale writes, "It is noteworthy that in almost as brief a period as thirty years, there has arisen in American evangelical scholarship a willingness to accept formerly liberal, higher critical views of the Bible's claim about authorship of particular books such as Isaiah, though some contemporary Old Testament evangelical scholars still hold to the traditional view about this book." Beale, *The Erosion of Inerrancy in Evangelicalism*, 124. A footnote to this statement cites Dillard and Longman's *Introduction to the Old Testament*, pages 268–74, as an example of concession to the historical-critical view of Deutero-Isaiah.

[81] Peter Enns, "Raymond B. Dillard, 1944–1993: A Brief Remembrance," *Patheos*, 1 October 2013, https://www.patheos.com/blogs/peterenns/2013/10/raymond-b-dillard-1944-1993-ea-brief-remembrance/.

may reasonably assume that the constraints of an introduction did not give him the necessary platform to elaborate, or that he was unable to make a credible case for its acceptability as he noted in his lectures.