

but there is much variation of opinion as to which material belongs to J and which to E. This is natural enough because J and E are both composed of narrative material. If the critics agreed as to what belongs in J and what belongs in E it would be very profitable to take the J and E documents and compare them by the statistical method you have suggested. The critics have tried to make a division between the two which will put all that is typical of one into one document and all that is typical of the other into the other document. They do not succeed in this, but there is nothing like the unanimity of opinion among the critics regarding the division between J and E that there is regarding the division between P and JE.

Thus the value of comparing a large section of J with a large section of E is questionable because there is so much difference among the critics as to where the distinction between the two lies. Yet to take a section of J or of JE and compare it with a large section of P is probably also of little value because P is actually a different type of material, dealing, on the whole, with a different type of subject matter.

I would incline to feel that this might be of more real utility in connection with the study of Isaiah than with that of the Pentateuch, since in the book of Isaiah there is less difference in type of material than in the Pentateuch. Yet, again in Isaiah the process has gone much further than a few years ago. At first Isaiah was divided by the critics into two parts, the First and Second Isaiah. However, almost immediately a good many chapters of the First Isaiah were said either to be interpolations or actually to belong with the Second Isaiah. Leaving out these portions, one would still have a good many chapters between Isaiah 1 and 39 which could be considered as First Isaiah, and the great bulk of the material from chapter 40 to 66 could be considered a Second Isaiah. These two sections could have been compared statistically and I am sure that the results would have been extremely enlightening. The critics have said much about great differences of style here, but actually the similarities are far greater than the differences, and such differences as there are can easily be explained by a difference in the time of Isaiah's life when it was written, or in the general subject with which he is dealing.

However, few critics of standing hold any longer to a Two Isaiah theory. Practically all hold to a Third Isaiah which begins at about Isaiah 56. And very few actually hold to any large