

sections of First, Second, and Third Isaiah. Each of the three has many chapters, paragraphs, or even individual verses, which are separated out from it and are said to be interpolations or insertions from another time. This being the case it would be very difficult to apply a statistical method today.

Offhand it would impress me that it might be of great value simply to study the First and Second Isaiahs as generally accepted by critics fifty years ago. Again it might be of value if those sections which most critics today consider to belong to First Isaiah, those which most consider to belong to Second Isaiah, and those which most consider to belong to Third Isaiah were to be compared as to vocabulary and types of expression. Such an effect as this might well be very illuminating. It impresses me that one might be more hopeful of valuable results here than in the study of the Pentateuch with the method you have suggested; yet I confess that I am not too hopeful in either case because of the way the criticism has moved.

It is true that the criticism got its first big start from the widely circulated idea that there were two large main sections, whether in the Pentateuch or in Isaiah, and that these could be proven to be distinct in style. Right at that point a good statistical analysis might have nipped the criticism in the bud. Now the criticism has gone much further and I doubt if a study from that viewpoint would have much effect.

#### LETTER 63

### **FACTS ABOUT THE J.E.D.P. THEORY**

During the past 2000 years many a theory that was not founded on fact has gained wide acceptance, but has later been shown to be without foundation and has completely disappeared. One