The Higher Critical Assault upon the Scriptures

What the authors of these books fail to realize is that in non-Biblical literary study these methods of the Higher Criticism have now been almost entirely abandoned. Thus, in the introduction to his translation of the Odyssey, which was first published in 1946 and has been reprinted many times since that date, E. V. Rieu says: "Homer's <u>Iliad</u> and <u>Odyssey</u> have from time to time afforded a first-class battleground for scholars. In the nineteenth century in particular, German critics were at endless pains to show, not only that the two works are not the product of a single brain, but that each is a piece of intricate and rather ill-sewn patchwork. In this process Homer disappeared.

"By now he has been firmly re-established on his throne and his readers may feel as sure that they are in one man's hands as they do when they turn to <u>As You</u> Like It after reading King John."

As these remarks indicate, there are today many scholars who hold strongly to the entire unity of the <u>Iliad</u> and the <u>Odyssey</u>. Others deny this position but are themselves far nearer to it than to the views of Lachmann, which they tend to dismiss with scorn. Professor Albert Guérard, of Stanford University says, "To dissolve Homer into a myth or a committee, much stronger acid would be needed than the Wolfian 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 of rude cabins in the course 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 learned scholars at the University 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 should not be assumed, without evidence, that these