

Rene Wellek of Yale University, says (Concepts of Criticism), The only reference to higher criticism is: The word criticism is so widely used in so many contexts from the ~~most abstract~~ most abstract of the criticism of a word an action to political, historical, social, musical, philosophical, higher and what-not criticism. We must confine ourselves to literary criticism if we are to arrive at of this thinking." Thus you see how the term higher criticism is just sort of an abberation == aberration. ~~xxxxxxx~~

I found a bound (?) book on higher criticism by a professor in Vanderbilt (?) College taking up various views of criticism in which there was one reference to h.c. He said, When we look at the marvellous, almost supernatural results of the h.c. in dividing up the Pentateuch into the original sources out of which it came, and when we look at the almost equally ~~miraculous~~ miraculous results of Homeric criticism in getting the original sources of Homer --- that merely shows how far behind this professor is as far as those features are concerned -- he said, we are not so interested in that as in the comparable study in the field of Shakespeare. Then he goes on for two pages discussing the h.c. of Shakespeare, and discussing one writer who seems to be outstanding among the divisive scholars who are in Shakespeare, and then he says, Most of his theories seem like balloons hanging in the air not very well every bit of ? That's this liberal scholar's idea of h.c. as applied to Shakespeare.

I wrote to a scholar in this field and asked his judgment about it and he answered, If you will just read a of about 10 Shakespearian scholars of about 30 years ago -- and he gave a listing, and said just read any of their writings == he gave a list of about 10 scholars of about 30 years ago, and said just read any of their writings and immediately you'll see the tremendous difference between the attitude of 40 years ago of deciding what Shakespeare wrote and what this other man wrote, and dividing it up, and the attitude of today that has practically given up that whole method of approach to Shakespeare.

When I found the term h.c. was not used in the literary sense at all, I said, Aren't these Biblical critics behind the times in giving us ~~h.c.~~ h.c. the way they do, but I found that I was the one who was behind the times. Because when I looked in Anderson's book and these others, they don't use the term h.c. either. It was the standard term 40 yrs. ago in Biblical studies and today the term has practically disappeared. They just say, This is literary criticism. This is historical criticism, it must be applied to the Bible. They hardly mention the word h.c. anymore. Actually it is the h.c. of the last century which is almost entirely different.

Here's another very interesting statement from Rene Wellek's Concepts of Criticism, pub. in 1963: Fifty and sixty years ago the concept of evolution dominated lit. criticism. Today at least in the west it seems to have disappeared almost completely." It's too much to hope that that will continue any longer, but in view of the great dominance of evolution in so many fields today it certainly is interesting they would say that about the developments in lit. criticism.

Here's an interesting statement by Ernest Scott, Prof. of N.T.