

You pick up one of these higher critical books and it will say, Higher criticism is not a term of reproach it is simply and ordinary term of literature used in all literature in examining questions of origin, source, etc. So I went to the library and look up recent books on literary criticism. There is Prof. Rene Welleck, Prof. of Literature at Yale University, Concepts of Criticism. Here is Stanly Edgar Hyman, A Study in the Methods of Modern Literary Criticism. I've already look ed into a dozen or so of these books. I want to look into 20 or 30 more. before I finish this present investigation. I have looked into them to see what literary critics today say about the higher xxx criticism as a part of the study of literature. And I've found that as far as I've gone, one of them has even mentioned it as a term in relation to anything exceptthe Bible!

Prof. Welleck who was prof. at Yale University in his book Concepts of Criticism says, The word criticism is so widely used in so many contexts from the most lonely and abstract in the criticism of a word to social, historical, musical, philosophical, biblical, higher and what not criticism that we must confine ourselves to literary criticism." You see higher criticism is just a natural type of literary criticism. He says "biblical, higher, and what not criticism." You see what he thinks of it. It was nonsense to Wellek. d Today it is a vestige, but it is being distributed more widely han ever before as far as the Bible is concerned. Well here is Stanley Edgar Hyman. He takes a little different attitude. He hasn't looked at the biblical criticism. He hasn't looked into the criticism of Homer. He's quite out of date on that. See what he thinks of it. See if he thinks it is ordinary methods of literary criticism. He says "With the miracles ofbiblical and semetic scholarship . . . of both dboth higher criticism which has largely succeeded in unravealing the innumerable documents and revisions and editing that go to make up our sacred books, and the only slightly less miracululous feats of Homeric and Greek scholarship, that have become a job in identifying the bevy of fragments and incrustations we know as Homer." As far as the Bible is concerned Hyman is 50 years behind time. Be- cause this is practically given up as far as Homer is concerned.

But he says it is ~~miraculous~~ miraculous the way they figure out these documents. He says, We need not concern ourselves here with them. We're going to look a little into Shakespeare. Then he points out there is one Shakespearan critic -- very few of them left -- who se this method in Shakespeare.

He says Dover Wilson is a typical case of a intelligent and conservative textual critic. One of the editors of the valuable sometimes bigger(?) New Cambridge Dictionary . . . and then he goes on to tell about it, and he says, Wilson's theories are the ~~xxx~~ carrerings of a not too captive baloon in a high wind." That's what he thinks of thes regarding Shakespeare. Yet his method has been given up regarding other words practically, is being extended and presented more widely than ever before, in relation to the Bible. Satan does not want us to use the light to our feet and light to our path. He wants us to wander in darkness and fall into his clutches.

Back in 1924 there was a young couple who was having their honeymoon trip in the ~~xxxxxx~~ Grand Canyon. They needed . . . They were not like my wife and when when we went for our honeymoon in the Grand Canyon. We walked. But they went by boat. They came to a bridge across the Colorado River. The only bridge in the . . . There there is a U.S. Govt. water measuring station. They stopped there and talked to them a little and went on. A few days later their boat drifted out to Lake Mede(?) some hundreds of miles further down.