

630 Some scholars today hold strongly to the entire unity of the Iliad and the Odyssey. Others deny this position but ^{are themselves} come far nearer to it than to the views of Lachmann, which they tend ^{with some} scornfully to dismiss. Professor ~~Albert~~ Albert Guérard, of Stanford Univ^o says, "To dissolve Homer into a myth or a committee, much stronger acid would be needed than the Wolfian ~~sch~~ school has been able to supply." He continues, "A book is a piece of work, not an accident." He remarks further: "No process of accretion could account for the grand unity of theme, development, character, spirit and style which we find in Homer. We might as well imagine that the Parthenon results ^{from} the chance conglomeration ~~x~~ of rude cabins in the course ~~of~~ of centuries." It is hard to see how one could feel much different about the book of Genesis.

Early in the present century a group of ~~learn~~ learned scholars at the Univ.^o of London strongly attacked the divisive theories. Professor R. W. Chambers, for instance, pointed out the inherent improbability of the divisive theories of the Beowulf epic, and said: "It ~~w~~ should not be assumed, without evidence, that these lost lays of heathen times ~~w~~ were of such a character that an epic could easily be made by fitting them together. Half a dozen motorcycles cannot be combined to make a ~~Rolly~~ Rolls-Royce." ~~car~~

Even a quick comparison of the discussions of Shakespeare written ~~forty~~ 40 years ago with those of today is enough to indicate the great difference of attitude in ~~x~~ literary circles. One or two critics still cling to the older methods. ^{but} Most of the present ~~writers~~ writers recognize that even Shakespeare