

QUESTION: Do you say in relation to the higher critics then that higher criticism has been given up in other literary fields. ~~Zkakzdxzmaxsazxin~~
~~zazpoxszkoxzkan~~. What has been the response to that when you say that.

REPLY: ~~My~~ My contacts with these people was largely before I knew that. At this Hermeneutics meeting I mentioned that. They gave me very little time there. I mentioned that. The writer of the paper said there was nothing to it. Absolutely not. It's in all the fields. I did not have opportunity to give these facts. What I read is but a small part of what I have. I have not found a great deal of evidence, but I have found a few very strong statements and the biggest evidence is the fact that it isn't there any more. It was all the rage until about 1930.

There was one writer even after that who thought he could still tell every part of Shakespeare what its origins were. Now of course there are many things we can tell where Shakespear got that. But to tell as some say now that Shakespeare never wrote any sentence that was of lower quality than any other sentence is absurd. And that we can tell what parts Shakespeare did take old ~~pays~~ plays and work over them. That ~~which~~ we can tell which is which-- there have been these other cases where it is quite evident that it is not so.

That does not mean that we should not demolish frauds whenever we find them. It is possible to find evidence, but if you are going to find sources you have got something else with which to compare it. The idea of dividing Isaiah as critics do among various writers, nothing in those writers with which to compare it for style. The way some will say, This is a P word, this is a J word. You would have to say were a writing in different languages. Because they will say this is a J section but it has this word in it; well that's a P word, that was put in it by the Redactor. Well it's absurd if it's the same language. They may use one word more commonly but if it's a word in the language and they use it somewhere else it does not prove ~~it~~ other sources..

In other literature this was carried to a tremendous extreme. Sometimes it goes under the title of historicism. The idea that you can explain on the basis of development you can explain everything. They used to think all ballads were written because they came out of the minds of the populace and people would dance and as they danced somebody would think of a line, somebody else would think of another line, somebody else of another. Thus these ballads developed. Now these literary scholars, most of them, would just laugh at any such idea. But it was accepted by practically all literary scholars 60 years ago. Today they recognize that if there is a writing there is a writer. If there is a writing of high quality, there is a man of unusual ability, back of it. He may get it from different sources, but he puts it through his mind. He arranges it in his own vocabulary, his own approach.

The extent to which they carry it is really amazine. You read those books of 60 years ago and you read the writings today and they don't even know there was such a thing. It's amazing. And the Biblical scholars don't know this has occurred at all. As I said, I never dreamed of it until I began looking for it.

Well, I guess your questions are all exhausted, or else you are all exhausted.