Chapel Talk May 1967 #6

the individualist conception has managed to hold of obscured growth grope its ground even to recapture some important pp positions. The burden of proof or a committee is on the side of both and is as follows: "To dissolve Homer into a myth/much S? stronger acid would be needed than the Wolfian school has been xixxiz able to (is this a continuation of the quote?) supply./ Although the theory of unconscious growth presents itself with a formidable apparatus of scholarship it remains in many cases a product of the romantic imagination. The evidence it adduces is frag frequently not actual but hypothetical. The Faust legend and the William Tell saga had survived humbly until the end of the 18th century, but it would be a mockery to assert that they automatically assumed definite shape, that they got themselves written down somehow by scribes known as Goethe and Schiller." Professor Gerard says in the same book, "It is not denied that literature uses the same stuff, but it is claimed that folklore is turned into literature only through an individual act of conscious organization. A book is a piece of work, not an accident." Professor R. W. Chambers of London University was one of the great leaders in demoloshing this approach. He said in his book, / Man's Unconquerable Mind in 1939: "Fortunately twenty years ago that great teacher of English Sir Arthur Quiller Couch (sp?) gave his answer to the problem: "Gentlemen, I wish I could persuade you to xxxxxx remember xxxx that you are English xxxx and go always for the thing, casting out of your vocabulary all such words as **trendenex** the tendenex is the second 'tendencies', **tinuchud** ' influences', revivals 'tendencies,' 'influences,' 'reviwals,' 'revolts.' Tendencies did not write

the fix x mixer <u>Canterbury Tales</u>. Geoffrey Chaucerw wrote them. Influences did not make the <u>Faerie/Queene</u>. Edmund x Spenser made it?" And similarly Chambers and others have dealt with these theories and they today are "unquote" comparatively neglected. There are very few who still hold to these historicist theories. Now it max may not be obvious immediately--the **rism** relation of this to the Pentateuch- but actually the very foundation of Wellhausen's theory was the idea of a development which we trace through the J and the E and the D and the P documents. And it is interesting to note, as I have in going through