This latter approach,which was very strong among Biblical critics for a time, found expression in the widely accepted Wellhausen theory, as we shall see later on.

Early in the present century a reaction against the whole divisive criticism appeared among literary scholars, who began to insist that a great work of art must have a single author, though, of course, this author may draw ideas from many sources. Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch urged his Cambridge students to cast out from their vocabularies all such words as "tendencies," and "influences," saying: "Tendencies did not write The Canterbury Tales; Geoffrey Chaucer wrote them. 'Influences' did not make The Faerie Queen; Edmund Spenser made it." Professor R. W. Chambers of the University of London scoffed at the idea that "those lost lays" were of such a character that an epic could be made by fitting them together. He said: "Half a dozen motor-bikes cannot be combined to make a Rolls-Royce car."

In his Preface to World Literature (1940), Professor Albert Guerard of Stanford University gave his evaluation of the Homeric controversy, saying: "Internal evidence, of a convincing nature, reveals a commanding artistic personality. To dissolve Homer into a myth or a committee, much stronger acid would be needed than the Wolfian school has been able to supply."

In 1962 George Steiner included irony in his description of the changing attitude toward the divisive theories. He wrote: "In the late nineteenth century dismemberment was all the rage. In a single chapter of Luke, textual analysis revealed five distinct levels of authorship and interpolation. The plays attributed to that illiterate