

I went up to Lehigh University to speak to the Inter-Varsity (a few years ago). I went for supper with one of the fellows. He said there is quite a movement that engineers should not know specific facts, they should also have some ideas of liberal arts. So he said, We're required to take a course in liberal arts. The course he was taking was a course in which the HC was being presented as a proof of scholarship. It just shows what we have to meet today, and most of us are in a very poor position to meet it because we don't know what it is and how subtle it is that we are trying to meet.

This development which has swept through the educated Christian world, this development comes from two distinct forces or backgrounds. There were two distinct movements. There was one which continued and laid the foundation for all of this which was in the studies of a few scholars for many many decades and had very little influence. It was == the world at large knew nothing about it. It was a movement which was not confined to the Bible, but which dealt with all literature and went to great lengths in the way that it handled other literature. Then in other fields, they turned completely against that approach~~xxx~~ and today it is completely forgotten in the field of literature where it began. But in the Biblical field in any seminary I know of that is more than a few decades old, and in just about every university of the world, it is taught as established fact.

Although the source it came from has abandoned it. Now that, I believe, it would not have had much influence if it were ~~k~~ not for the second group and that is the movement of Darwinian evolution. This movement came along, and the earlier one was twisted around, completely changed, and under the influence of the evolutionary theory it secured a vote(?) throughout the Christian world. Today it is a tremendous anti-Christian force that it is.

I'd like to say a little about these two different aspects of it. But first ==The first would ~~xxxx~~ think it as the movement== it is where the term criticism comes from. If you would pick up almost any Christian book that touched on the critical theory of a few decades ago, you would find that it said Higher Criticism is nothing wrong with Higher Criticism because HC as compared with Lower Criticism is simply the attempt to examine a book and see what is its background, what is its author, what are the questions of its unity, etc. It is the approach that is taken ~~xxxxx~~ toward all literature. That is HC as compared to LC which deals with being sure of the exact words and what these words mean and all ~~th~~ of the more detailed questions.

That was contained in most Christian books that touched upon the subject. I believe the Editor of Christianity Today (a few years ago) had that idea of it. When he asked me to write an article on the HC for the magazine, and his idea of the article as was quite evident after speaking to him a little was to point out that HC is perfectly alright and it is perfectly proper for a Christian to work in HC, but of course any sort of HC that denies any Biblical statement is necessarily wrong. There is wrong HC and there is right HC. That might have been true a century ago. Perhaps even 60 years ago. But today the term HC is completely abandoned in the literary world. Fifteen years ago I went through every book that I could find in the U. of PA library on developments in literary criticism.