

- p. 43,44 The main argument advanced by Wolf for doubting the unity of Homer (in regard to writing) has now been abandoned . . .
- p. 95 This agreement is surprising, even if it had not been an argument of higher criticism that the difference is so great as to make unity of authorship impossible.
- p. 98 Wilhelm Meyer wrote a dissertation on the use of the Homeric patronymics which was at once hailed as a classic by the higher critics. (In 1907 there were no credited Homeric critics other than higher critics.)
- p. 100 I have never taken up the investigation of any assumedly important difference between the language of the Illiad and the Odyssey and found that the underlying statements were true. I do not regard as of any importance the fact that the Iliad mentions beans and the Odyssey does not, or that words for wounds and wounding abound in the Iliad, while they are rarely or never used in the Odyssey. The observation that the Iliad has more references to storms, snows, and the phenomena of heaven, an observation which was hailed by the critics as if it were the discovery of a new planet, made little impression on me, so little that I did not answer the argument when it first appeared, because the answer was so easy that I thought the writer thereof would see it and receive the credit of retraction without outside suggestion; but the author did not see that the reason for the fewer references in the Odyssey is because the action of that poem is mostly under roof, while the Iliad and its setting are out of doors, with warriors in the field. . . . The less frequent references to the phenomena of heaven do not show any less "sensitivity to natural phenomena" but do show that Homer knew that storms, clouds, and the sky mean more to men living in ~~camp~~ camps or in the fields than they do to inhabitants of the towns.

. . . . All these proofs once widely accepted as sufficient evidence of diverse authorship have utterly broken down, because, when tested by the facts, they have been found to rest on false assertions and false statistics.

. . . . In ten years no higher critic has tried to reestablish one of these demolished arguments. The only counter attack is a feeble remonstrance that, although the assertions we have attacked are false, perhaps these errors may have sprung up in some other way; they the critics hope to shift the attack and to set up a new science which will not expose the errors of higher criticism, but will waste itself in discussion of the genesis of these errors.

- p. 102 Higher criticism committed suicide when it fretted at being a cult and aspired to become a science.
- p. 104 . . . . for about a century, Homeric criticism has lived apart from Homer. Each new theory is accepted as an addition to human knowledge, with no attempt to test it by the evidence of the poems themselves. The best possible proof that higher critics have made no real study of Homer is furnished by the fact that not a single one of them has ever independently detected any of the errors to which I have called attention above. . . .  
Van Leeuwen, the great Hellenist of Holland, and for a generation one of the leading destructive critics of Homer, just as he was laying down his life's work, wrote these pathetic words (Mnemosyne, 1910, 341):  
"I recognize the error in which I have long been involved, since now I see the better way. The fault was in our teachers who taught us the