

Prof. Gardner in the book, *The Business of Criticism*, written 1959 makes a statement about the change that has come over literary attitudes saying, In field after field composite authorship . . . different strata . . . The kind of an that was once thought to be the particular duty of literary criticism is now largely out of fashion. The assumption today is more in favor of single authorship ~~zba~~ unless there is clear external evidence to the contrary, and taking works as they stand and not postulating earlier versions to account for inconsistencies."

Prof. Rene Wellek, Prof. of American ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ Literature in Yale U., in a book on the Theory of Literature pur. a few years ago has said, In Chaucer there is a wide differentiation of style, between the individual stories of *Canterbury Tales* ~~xnax~~ ~~worxxxxixndixffaxenaxpxaxixdaxx===~~ and more generally between his works of different periods and lived in different countries (?) He points out the great difference in ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ Goethe's style at different times in his life and the styles of the same writer in other pieces where they know it was the same writer.

In his books, *History of Four Great Books of History of Modern Criticism*, Prof. Wellek says about the *Nibelunglied* the famous German epic which during the last century scholars were so fond of dividing into sections ~~wanax~~ as they did Homer. He speaks of August Wilhelm Schlegel, and he says, Unfortunately he was so deeply impressed by Wolf's theory on the origins of the Homeric epics that he suggested the long aberration of *Nibelungenlied*'s authorship which was concerned ~~XXXXXX~~ with speculations about collective authorship and composition ~~abnax~~ from individual ballads by a later collector.

Any writer about the English *Beowulf* epic 70 years ago would attempt to show its different sources and how the different lays were put together to write the *Beowulf*. Today most writers speak of the *Beowulf* author though we do not know who he was. One writer has said, When you consider the stately style of the *Beowulf* and the way it all fits together, the idea it was made up as most scholars tried to prove 70 yrs. ago from a lot of different lays is like taking a lot of motorcycles and putting them together and getting a big truck out of them. He said the nature of the smaller work and of the larger work is so different, and the apparent unity of the whole is so very evident.

One thing I thought rather interesting was to look up the word "higher criticism". Right there I made a I did not expect at all. Thirty years ago --- 40 yrs. ago Dr. Wilson wrote his book, *Is the Higher Criticism scholarly?* At that time the discussion was *Is the Higher Criticism properly to be applied to the Bible or not?* When I was in seminary I was taught, higher criticism had nothing wrong in itself. It was simply the established manner (?) of form criticism; lower criticism deals with questions of the text; higher criticism deals with questions of authorship, and unity. It is regular literary criticism. So I thought, Let's find out whether the term is being used today in books of literary scholarship. So we looked in 30 - 40 different books -- looked for "higher criticism" in the index to see what they said. We found one book written by