known in Solon's age contained the parts of the epic which a critic like Adolf Kirchhoff has distinguished as the most recent: the Telemachia and with it the first book. Kirchhoff's analysis of the Odyssey seemed logically so conclusive to modern scholars like Wilamowitz and Schwartz that they based their own analytical efforts largely on his results. They supposed that the first book of the Odyssey belonged to a much later time than it would now appear from its imitation in Solon's elegy. Their conclusions must be revised in the light of the facts mentioned above, as has been promptly recognized by Rudolf Pfeiffer in his penetrating review of the books of Wilamowitz and Schwartz on the Odyssey in Deutsche Literaturzeitung 1928, pp. 2364 and 2366. F. Jacoby, in Die Antike IX, 160, adds reasons for believing in an even earlier terminus ante quem for the Odyssey."

Note 2 from page 421

"2. This controversy started on a large scale with the publication of F. A. Wolf's famous Prolegomena ad Homerum in 1795. This work followed almost immediately upon the rediscovery of the ancient Alexandrian theories of the epos and the later critical tradition that has come down to modern times through the scholia found in the oldest Venice manuscripts of Homer, first published by the Marquis de Villoison in 1788."

Note 3 from page 421

book Homerische Untersuchungen to his great work Homer und die Ilias and the late monograph Die Heimkehr des Odysseus, show this new historical trend. He tried throughout to compare the development of the epic to the archaeological monuments and to what little we know about the historical background of early Greek poetry. See also his lecture !Das homerische Epos'in Reden und Vortraege, Bd. I. The books on Homer by E. Bethe and Ed. Schwartz follow the same path. But the same tendency prevailed also among contemporary