

doubt as to other sections of Isaiah. You would naturally have about forty Isiahs rather than just two Isaiahs--it is a matter of many different writers. You could take a statement ~~from~~ these different great classical writers but that is very very different from a book like Isaiah. You might find some sections that seem speaking of a different subject, etc. but you will find that there is a unity about the book and it is the talent of one writer. Over and over you hear about the Assyrian and how the Assyrian is going to be protected and then there is the one great remarkable prediction in ch. 39 and it is not to Assyria but Babylon as going into exile and Babylon is a city subject to Assyria fighting for its independence from Assyria and it is very unlikely that Babylon is a ~~city~~ going to be a region that will conquer the world and it would be the same as saying that Vienna would conquer the world during the last war. Now Vienna has been taken over and 150 years ago Vienna was a great conquering center, one of the vital capitals of Europe. No one would ever think that Babylon becoming a great and powerful center.

Prophets #191. It seems like a very simple thing but it doesn't work out that way. Practically no one that considers 1-39 a unified whole that believes that someone else wrote the second part of Isaiah. Then the great bulk of scholars since 1890 have come more and more to the conclusion that if you separate from 40 on, you must separate 52 ff. from what it precedes and it soon becomes a very complex process and not the simple thing that it at first seemed.

2. There seems to be no stopping of the application of the divisive principle if its validity is recognized. It proves something definite otherwise. If you are going to have 100% proof of a thing before you do anything, you will never do anything. There are some people who say that one should have absolute certainty about anything before doing something. I think those people ought to stop eating, because there is never a time when you have absolute certainty that the food which you are eating is absolutely good. There is always a possibility of harm in the food that you are eating. You never have absolute certainty that your system will use this special kind of food and as to proving whether it absolutely necessary to live anyway--there is no method of logical proof to prove it. We have many cases but not absolute proof of it. You can act like an ostrich and put your head in the sand and say I thought things were this way and I know they are; assuming a certainty that doesn't exist doesn't get us anywhere. The fact of the matter is that we are in a world where we have to balance factors to find out what the truth is and the great bulk of things that enter our lives, the great