(?) and so there I think we can say this - that it was applied in the last century to practically all literabure that was studied, in the last are (?) century. But there is a little group of people who were interested in deciphering ancient texts that were just discovered in newly-deciphered languages. And this little *t* group was interested in figuring out what these texts mean, working in the larger field of literature. And if this little group and was not had been doing that a century ago they probably & would have been so influenced by that trend that they would immediately have **said** set to work to do that. But they came along after that trend had reached its peak and was in the dat decline. And consequently it just didn't occur to them to do it. Just as it does not occur to many people today, even to specialized OT° scholars; it occurs to very few of them today to devote themselves to trying to decide which/wart of a certain chapter are P, and which are J, which are E, or trying to prove that they should be divided a little differently than others have. And if you take a book like Dr. \$ Speiser's book on Gen°; and he adopts the Well° theory right straight through it. And occasionally he points out how wrong it is on some is particular point (2nd) - something they said was E he says/ definitely J; something they said was P he says can't be P. But he assumes the whole theory in so doing. He criticizes it only in specific points, and they are f very few compared to his book as a whole. His book has no four-document theory. It is he the standard three-document Well° theory - it just follows it. I think it's very unfortunate he did. But I don't think he did any first-hand work in it. He simply is took what the different ones said, and then, occasionally, where they in view. had differences, followed one or the other, and once in a while - (?) went his own fixing way. But on all the main things he just followed - (?) . And that 's all.