

^{argued} which agreed that most of the writings that have come down to us from ancient times were actually composed long after their alleged date. These scholars began to insist on very stringent proof, before accepting any ancient writings as genuine. As a result of their efforts, the writings of Homer, as well as other classical works, were divided up into alleged sources, supposed to have come from different writers at different times. This treatment was given to most of the ancient writings, ~~that had come down to us,~~ including many portions of the Bible. Today, the advance of scholarship has led to the adoption of an entirely different attitude. An ancient document is now considered true unless it can be proven to be false. Few if any present-day scholars would think themselves capable of taking an ancient document and dividing it up into earlier sources from which it would be said to have been derived, when not a trace of these earlier sources was actually available. Such an approach has been practically given up in relation to all ancient writings except the Bible. Here it has been preserved because of having been combined with the theory of evolution and the idea that everything has resulted from purely natural developments, without any supernatural intervention.

The movement of the higher criticism of the Bible resulted in the claim that most of the books of the Bible were not written by the men whose names they bear, and that they were composed long after the supposed events described in them. This movement began with the attempt to divide up the book of Genesis into various sources alleged to have been used by Moses in compiling his book. Later on the alleged sources were extended to the rest of the Pentateuch, and the idea of Mosaic authorship was given up. Eventually the number of sources increased and increased