

pp. 216, 217 More disconcerting still to the separatist or evolutionary school, was the inability of its exponents to arrive at any agreed analysis, even of the processes which may be supposed to have gone on in the mind of a single composer active over a long term of years, still less of the relations between early and late in the saecular reworkings of a school of epic upon its traditional book or books. . . . The methods habitually employed by separatist critics rested indeed on highly subjective estimates and distinctions; their witness agreed not together; and it was difficult to avoid the conclusion that it was not by the traditional process of "interpreting Homer by himself" that an ultimate decision was to be reached as to who or what Homer himself was. Most devastating of all, other critics of a later generation . . . repeated the analysis of predecessors . . . and found that they had misstated the facts. This provoked replies exposing the lurid details from such scholars as Drerup, Shewan and Scott, and they did not themselves always avoid the sin of misrepresentation which they so rightly castigated.

p.220 Much of the poems' content had been shown to be consistent with the Mainland civilization of the pre-Hellenic period and with no other. The discoveries explained much that had been inexplicable, and pointed the way to the solution of many more seeming anomalies. For it could be seen that blurring in the narrative was caused by the combination of older and newer (but not always post-Mycenaean) equipment and practices. And if some datable objects were demonstrably Mycenaean, what was to be thought of the things which were undatable, either because they were common to all periods or because they were immaterial and left no visible traces? . . . Consequently it became an open question whether the naturalistic and vivid descriptions in the poems could refer to anything else than the Mycenaean culture.