

I looked for the term HC and I did not find in any book written in the previous 30 years a single case where the Index referred to HC except for three or four cases where it was used to refer to Biblical Criticism. And recently I looked at the Encyclopedia Britannica, the one that came out about 10 years ago, this new set of it, I looked up HC and it said see Biblical Criticism. The word is just abandoned as far as literary study is concerned.

That movement of dividing up documents into its alleged original sources which is so common in Biblical studies today is simply forgotten in literary studies in the source ~~form~~ from which it came.

This all began about 1800 when there was a very famous German professor named Wolf who presented a theory that the Iliad and the Odyssey, the great works of Homer which had been so studied and so highly thought of through the centuries, that actually they were composed of different sources, a number of different sources, that had been combined over a long period of time and as the result of the efforts of many people had eventually produced those great masterpieces. Wolf was such an outstanding lecturer that the great German poet Goethe asked Wolf's daughter to hide him behind a curtain in Wolf's classroom so that he could listen to Wolf's lecture without embarrassing Wolf as it would be for him to have this famous literary man of Germany listening to what he was saying.

Goethe was very thrilled with ~~Wolf's~~ Wolf's theory. But toward the end of his life, Goethe wrote completely reversing his position, and saying that he realized more and more as he studied Homer's works that there was one great mind behind each of these writings, possibly the same mind behind both of them. There might be small insertions here and there of course, but that there was a unity to it, and there was a mind behind this production and that the Wolfian theories were definitely not correct. But Goethe was ahead of his time in turning against it.

These theories as I say, were largely confined to the classroom. Confined to the study of a few scholars. These scholars during the last century presented a theory of the coming together of books the books of the Bible, the different parts of the first five books which ~~were~~ of course they said, Moses had not written. They had come together by this process. And the same approach was made until about 1925 ~~to~~ to all literary ~~to~~ to Homer, to the Nibelungenlied, to ~~his~~ even sometimes to Goethe's own writings. Made to just about any writing of any high standing. Of course there have been books like that but usually you can recognize fairly easily the fact. And though you can recognize easily the fact you usually cannot divide it into the sources from which it came.

C. S. Lewis wrote an article which was reproduced in Christianity Today about 15 years ago, in which he discussed this. Lewis said something like this: I have read repeatedly when I have published a book, I have read an article by some scholar reviewing my book in which he has told exactly how I formed, what my sources were, how I came to do, how I produced this book. He said, Not in a single case has anyone of them come anywhere near the actual fact.

I have some papers here, but won't take time now to select the right one to read to you, but an interesting case was of certain famous English literary men 200 years ago who met in a club. They wrote the writings of Martin Scriverius.