

evidence when we find it. But one hundred years ago, it was done. And very readily done. And it was done in every field and so they began dividing up the Bible. This device of approach was applied to one book after another book aBter another book and the whole Bible was just divided up into little sections supposed to be written by many individuals. The Penetuch is divided up into the writings which we call J, E, and D and T but then if you look in almost any biblical book you will find that J is not an ^{author} office. J is a whole series of authors. There is J 1 , J2, J3, J4, There is E1 , E2, E3, and so on. There is a whole series of authross and all these different sections ^{got} ~~that~~ put together to make a J document and these others and E document and then J and E got put together to make one document and then you have a lot of different sections who went together to make each of your others and eventually they were all put together. You have dozens of different writers, writng the different fragaments which all go toghteher in this way. It was the ^{deviceive (10 1/2)} ~~dividing up~~ approach and was very very common in the last century. It is today given up regarding everythng except the Bible. It still lingers through a slight extent regarding Homer. But comparatively slight. It is very interesting to take the Cambridge Ancient History published about 40 years ago and to take the volumnes on thas perido of History and to read in the introduction to it he says that English readers will be greatly surprised to find two things in this book. First that the old idea that Moses wrote the Peneteuch is now completely given up by scholars and actually many different writers wrote it at different times and the fragaments have been put together this way but on ~~the~~ other hadn the old idea that Homer is just a series of different writers which have come together in the hands of the different Greeks ¹¹⁷² abarge is something which is mostly given up and that the integrity and unity of the book is generally accepted. Tha t you will find in the introduction ^{to this} ~~of thas~~ volume of the Cambridge Anciety History. You see what happened was that both theories were advanced about 1 800. And in the case of Homer as that ¹² mixup of intrepretation