

things they thought were true, which we in turn presented to our pupils. I now proclaim openly my belief. The context of the Iliad and the Odyssey cannot be loosed without the ruin of the whole. Each is a single poem, conceived, elaborated, composed by a single poet. The poetry of Homer will continue to live so long as we permit it to remain entire, but it will die, pass away, and slip through our fingers, if we undertake to dissect it or to tear it apart.

p. 119 Modern separatists have laid great stress on the fact that the Odyssey shows a marked advance in the notions of piety and holiness, and in the words expressing these ideas. This is no proof for diverse authorship. Shakespeare in his earlier plays never uses the word "pious," though in Hamlet and subsequent plays that word is found no less than eleven times.⁹ We may say of any passage of poetry that such a word or idea was used, but we cannot assume that the idea omitted or left unsaid was not known.



The poet of the Odyssey mentions the palm tree, the poet of the Iliad does not, but we cannot argue that this tree became known to the Greeks in the interval between the creation of the two poems. The Iliad mentions the grasshopper, cranes, eels, maggots, swans, sparrows, sparlings, the ass, and many other forms of common animal life which are not named in the Odyssey, yet must have been known to the author of that poem.

p. 120

p. 120 The Iliad has roughly 1500 words which are not found in the Odyssey but which must have been perfectly familiar to educated people at the time the Odyssey was composed. We can argue absolutely nothing from the silences of the poem, unless we have some external proof that what is not mentioned is also not known. It is a strange and a most remarkable fact that Homer never describes the setting of a ring nor carved stones, although nothing in the art of the age he is portraying is more characteristic or shows greater skill than the carving of these settings. . . .

ring

We must exercise great caution in drawing arguments from silence or from the comparative frequency with which words are used. We know, for example, that Emerson was not acquainted with the kodak, not because he does not use that word, but because we have independent evidence that both the instrument and the word came into being after his time, but we are not justified in drawing a like conclusion if the word is not found in the writings of Stephen Phillips or Alfred Noyes. Homeric silences similarly, when unsupported by external evidence, furnish no proof of the poet's choice or of his knowledge. We must know from some outside source that Homer was ignorant of ~~these~~ the things he did not mention before we can draw any important conclusions therefrom.

p. 135 It is a great pleasure to quote the words of Wace, whose high standing is guaranteed by the fact that he has been for several years and still is the director of the British School of Archaeology at Athens. He wrote in a recent number of the Edinburgh Review (July, 1919) as follows:

"The Wolfian cloud still hangs over the study of Homer. It has had a blighting effect on Homeric study which otherwise, thanks to the advance of Archaeology, might have made surprising progress. . . . We must abandon the Wolfian theory and all it entails. The Iliad and the Odyssey were written down when composed, and the text has not been substantially altered since."

This complete change of attitude on the part of unprejudiced investigators is due to the fact that a few years ago scholars wearied of their efforts to build a worthy structure out of the assumptions of the higher critics and in their weariness turned once more to the study of Homer.