

M. J. APTHORP

PAPYRUS EVIDENCE IN FAVOUR OF SOME SUSPECTED LINES IN HOMER

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 82 (1990) 13–24

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



## Papyrus Evidence in Favour of Some Suspected Lines in Homer

It is by now quite well known among Homerists that the absence of a line from a papyrus text can be a sign that the line is an interpolation. Not so well known, or at any rate less often discussed, is the other side of this coin: that the presence of a line in a newly-published papyrus can help to establish the authenticity of a line previously suspected on the basis of other (but relatively slender) external evidence. In this article I shall discuss six passages, comprising five single lines and one couplet, which G.M. Bolling suspected of being post-Aristarchean interpolations but which I believe to be genuine: (1) *Il.* 1. 483; (2) *Il.* 3. 235; (3) *Od.* 17. 152; (4) *Od.* 17. 155-6; (5) *Od.* 17. 432; (6) *Od.* 16. 50.<sup>1</sup> In each case one or more recently-published papyri support the view that the passage is authentic, but only in cases (2) and (5) do the editors of the papyri in their collations draw attention to the presence of the line, and even here they do not explicitly discuss the question of authenticity, nor has any other scholar yet sought to bring the new papyrus evidence to bear on this question in any of these cases — though Bolling himself was aware that future papyrus publications could help to settle doubtful cases.<sup>2</sup> In each case I shall relate the new papyrus evidence to the rest of the external evidence and shall also discuss the internal evidence. When citing minuscule MSS. I shall use the sigla of T.W. Allen<sup>3</sup> except where otherwise stated.

### (1) *Il.* 1. 483

In *Il.* 1. 483 the Achaean ship plies its way back from Chryse to the Achaean camp:

ἡ δ' ἔθεεν κατὰ κῦμα διαπρήσσουσα κέλευθον.

In 1932 Barbara P. McCarthy,<sup>4</sup> a pupil of Bolling,<sup>5</sup> drew attention to the omission of this line by P. Rainer inv. 30048<sup>6</sup> (Pack<sub>2</sub> 613, saec. ii p.C.; at the time this was the only papyrus covering the passage). Arguing that the line is a dispensable στίχος διφορούμενος (repeated line) which recurs at *Od.* 2. 429, and that there is little homoiographic temptation to omission, she concluded that “the verse should be questioned as possibly a successful interpolation”. In 1944 and again in 1950 Bolling himself pointed his finger at this same papyrus omission and drew the same conclusion as McCarthy.<sup>7</sup>

However, it is misleading to call this line a διφορούμενος and to imply (as McCarthy does) that it could be an example of concordance interpolation.<sup>8</sup> Rather, the boot is on the other foot. It is true that *Il.* 1. 481 almost = *Od.* 2. 427, *Il.* 1. 482 = *Od.* 2. 428, *Il.* 1. 483 = *Od.* 2. 429, but *Od.* 2. 429 is omitted by a significant cluster of MSS. and is almost certainly itself an interpolation —

<sup>1</sup> This last line is out of natural sequence because it has some technical features in common with (5) and the two are best considered together.

<sup>2</sup> E.g. *AJPh* 37 (1916) p. 20: “The case must remain doubtful until other papyri are discovered.”

<sup>3</sup> *Iliad, editio maior*, Oxford 1931; *Odyssey*, O.C.T., 2nd ed. Oxford 1917.

<sup>4</sup> *CPh* 27 (1932) p. 154.

<sup>5</sup> See G.M. Bolling, *The Athetized Lines of the Iliad* (Baltimore 1944) p. 11.

<sup>6</sup> H. Gerstinger, *Archiv für Bibliographie* 1 (1926) p. 88 No. 3.

<sup>7</sup> *Athetized Lines* (above, n. 5) p. 17 n. 22; *Ilias Atheniensium* (Lancaster, Pa., 1950) ad loc.

<sup>8</sup> Loc. cit. (above, n. 4): “A 483 ... = β 429 as 482 = β 428.”

as Bolling himself has elsewhere noted.<sup>9</sup> I call the cluster of omitting MSS. “significant” because although it is fairly small, comprising only six MSS.,<sup>10</sup> these MSS. are almost entirely unrelated to one another,<sup>11</sup> and they include our earliest Odyssean MS., L4 (saec. x<sup>12</sup>). In addition, V1 (saec. xv) misplaces 429 after 430, and this misplacement reflects transference from the margin of an exemplar and thus ultimately omission.<sup>13</sup> No papyri covering the passage have yet come to light. It is worth noting that Dindorf’s scholia contain no comment on the line although they comment on nine of the ten preceding lines and four of the five following lines.<sup>14</sup> The line is certainly dispensable in the *Odyssey*, especially as it anticipates the similar *Od.* 2. 434, παννοχίη μὲν ῥ’ ἦ γε καὶ ἠὼ πείρε κέλευθον.<sup>15</sup> its function in the *Iliad* is not merely to state that the ship got going, which is adequately expressed in *Il.* 1. 481-2, but to look forward eagerly to its destination (cf. *Il.* 1. 484), which is precisely the function served by *Od.* 2. 434 (cf. the five following lines): this explains why the *Odyssey*-poet, fond though he is of *Iliad*-mimesis,<sup>16</sup> has *not* added *Il.* 1. 483 in spite of using the previous two lines: rather, he keeps the thought of it in reserve and adapts it a few lines later — πείρε κέλευθον has probably developed from διαπρήσσουσα κέλευθον partly through that sound-similarity which is such a fertile source of stylistic innovation in Homer.<sup>17</sup> Thus the accumulated weight of the external evidence against *Od.* 2. 429, combined with the dispensability of the line, the temptation to concordance interpolation and the absence of any homoiographic temptation to omission, makes it all but certain that this line is a post-Aristarchean interpolation. In other words, the interpolator of *Od.* 2. 429 based himself on a pre-existing *Il.* 1. 483, not the other way round. (This line occurs only in these two places.) Given that *Od.* 2. 429 is a highly successful interpolation, having spread to the vast majority of our minuscules by *contaminatio*, it must have had a relatively early start — probably at some stage in late antiquity. Thus the successful interpolation of *Od.* 2. 429 from *Il.* 1. 483 testifies to the presence of *Il.* 1. 483 in the interpolator’s text of the *Iliad*, and this testimony might be judged equivalent in weight to the presence of *Il.* 1. 483 in a papyrus of, say, the fourth or fifth century p.C. More importantly, if

<sup>9</sup> At *AJPh* 37 (1916) p. 453 he lists it as a “certain interpolation”, and he includes it in his “Conspectus of Vulgate Interpolations” in his *External Evidence for Interpolation in Homer* (Oxford 1925), p. 23. The line was also condemned by N. Wecklein, *Über Zusätze und Auslassung von Versen im homerischen Texte, Sitz. d. K. Bayerischen Akad. d. Wiss., Philos.-philol. u. hist. Kl.* 1918, 7. Abh. (Munich 1918), pp. 20-21; and V. Bérard omitted it from his text of the *Odyssey* (Paris 1924, 2nd ed. 1933). More recently, it has been bracketed in the text of P. Von der Mühl (Basle 1946) and omitted by Stephanie West in her edition (A. Heubeck, S. West and G. Aurelio Privitera, *Omero: Odissea* Vol. I [Milan 1981] ); she comments ad loc., “si tratta sicuramente di una tarda interpolazione.”

<sup>10</sup> See Allen, *Od.* (above, n. 3) ad loc.; N. Tachinoslis, *Handschriften und Ausgaben der Odyssee* (Frankfurt am Main 1984) p. 57.

<sup>11</sup> Tachinoslis (op. cit. [above, n. 10] pp. 43-4) finds a relationship between L4 and T, but concedes that it is not as strong in the first three Books as in the next seven.

<sup>12</sup> Saec. x-xi according to Allen and Tachinoslis, but A. Diller has argued that it should be placed squarely in the tenth century on p. 524 of “The Age of Some Early Greek Classical Manuscripts”, = pp. 514-24 of *Serta Turyniana* (Urbana, Illinois, 1974); so also N.G. Wilson, *Scholars of Byzantium* (London and Baltimore 1983) p. 138.

<sup>13</sup> However, V1 is admittedly descended from one of the omitting MSS., Pal.: see T.W. Allen, *PBSR* 5 (1910) pp. 20-21.

<sup>14</sup> W. Dindorf, *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Odysseam* (Oxford 1855) Vol. I pp. 116-17.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Wecklein, loc. cit. (above, n. 9): the line “erscheint vor 434 als unecht”.

<sup>16</sup> See e.g. A. Heubeck, *Der Odyssee-Dichter und die Ilias* (Erlangen 1954); R. Friedrich, *Stilwandel im homerischen Epos* (Heidelberg 1975).

<sup>17</sup> See e.g. *CQ* n.s. 27 (1977) p. 3.

*Od.* 2. 429 is itself interpolated, and is modelled on *Il.* 1. 483, the supposed source for an interpolated *Il.* 1. 483 is removed. Nearly every post-Aristarchean interpolation in Homer is a repeated line, or close to being one:<sup>18</sup> the bold originality of *Il.* 1. 483 is not the hallmark of such an interpolation.

Before we turn to the papyrus evidence itself, it is worth stressing the absolute unanimity of the mediaeval tradition in support of *Il.* 1. 483. It is present in all our minuscules; Eustathius cites it (139. 26) and comments on it (139. 35-8, 140. 2-3); it is also commented on in the bT scholia (which discuss κατὰ κῶμα) and in the D scholia (which gloss ἔθειν, κατὰ κῶμα, διαπρήσσοισα and κέλευθον); and there are elaborate notes on the line in the *Epimerismi Homerici*.<sup>19</sup> New evidence has recently emerged which shows that the line was known to and commented on by John Tzetzes.<sup>20</sup> The author of the *Etymologicum Magnum* probably has it in mind in quoting (or rather misquoting) διαπρήσοισα κελεύθου (sic) (687. 54), though it is not impossible that he already knows and is thinking of the interpolated *Od.* 2. 429.

The picture thus far presented is spectacularly confirmed by the new papyrus evidence. Since McCarthy wrote in 1932, six papyri (four texts and two collections of scholia minora) covering the passage have been published, and all six contain or comment on *Il.* 1. 483. The six, in approximate chronological order, are as follows:-

- (i) P.Monac. Gr. inv. 125 (text, saec. ii p.C.), published in 1974;<sup>21</sup>
- (ii) P.Mich. inv. 2810 (text, saec. ii p.C.), first published in full in 1975 and then again in 1982;<sup>22</sup>
- (iii) P.Soc. Pap. Alex. inv. 265 (text, saec. ii-iii p.C.), published in 1947<sup>23</sup> (Pack<sub>2</sub> 610);
- (iv) P.Oxy. XLV. 3238 (scholia, early third century p.C.), published in 1977, which includes glosses on two words of *Il.* 1. 483, ἔθειν and διαπρήσσοισα;
- (v) P.Ant. II. 70 (scholia, saec. iii p.C.), published in 1960 (Pack<sub>2</sub> 1167),<sup>24</sup> which includes glosses on three words of *Il.* 1. 483, ἔθειν, διαπρήσσοισα and κέλευθον;
- (vi) P.Vindob. G. 3085 (text, saec. vi-vii p.C.), published in 1973.<sup>25</sup>

Thus six papyri, from the second century p.C. to the sixth or seventh, testify in favour of the line.

<sup>18</sup> See Bolling, *Evidence* (above, n. 9) pp. 14-30.

<sup>19</sup> A.R. Dyck (ed.), *Epimerismi Homerici: Pars Prior* (Berlin 1983) pp. 230-31, 308; the editor dates the "earliest" epimerismi to the ninth century (pp. 5-7), and our earliest MS. of the work (P) is only a century later and contains the more elaborate comments on *Il.* 1. 483.

<sup>20</sup> A. Lolos (ed.), *Der unbekannt Teil der Ilias-Exegesis des Johannes Tzetzes (A 97-609): editio princeps, Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie Heft 130* (Königstein/Ts. 1981), p. 131 lines 4-20.

<sup>21</sup> Daniela Manetti, *Athenaeum* 52 (1974) pp. 16-22 with Plate II; re-edited by the same scholar with P.Monac. Gr. inv. 125a in A. Carlini (ed.), *Papyri letterari greci* (Pisa 1978), No. 35 (pp. 267-75) with Plate XV, and again in A. Carlini (ed.), *Die Papyri der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek, München: Griechische Papyri Band II: Papyri letterari greci* (Stuttgart 1986), No. 35 (pp. 69-74) with Fig. 17.

<sup>22</sup> Nancy E. Priest, *Homeric Papyri in the Michigan Collection* (Diss. Michigan, Ann Arbor 1975) No. 5 (pp. 31-49) and *ZPE* 46 (1982) pp. 58-69 (No. 5). The first two columns were first published in 1962 (see Pack<sub>2</sub> 599), but they contain only *Il.* 1. 308-75.

<sup>23</sup> J. Schwartz, *BIFAO* 46 (1947) pp. 33-4 (No. 3).

<sup>24</sup> This = H.J. Mette's Pap. Z8 at *Lustrum* 11 (1966) p. 37, but Mette assigns it the wrong serial number and the wrong date: "P. Antinoop. 69, s. 2 p."

<sup>25</sup> Giovanna Calvani and Graziella Fanan, *SCO* 22 (1973) pp. 34-6 with Plate I No. 4; reprinted with a few minor alterations in Carlini 1978 (above, n. 21), No. 16 (pp. 131-3) with Plate VII.

Is there any other early evidence in support of the line? I suggest that there is: it is highly probable that the line was known to both Herodian and Vergil.

As we have already stated, Tzetzes, in the newly-published part of his commentary on *Iliad* 1, comments on *Il.* 1. 483. The substance of his comment is that this line has misled Herodian into formulating an erroneous doctrine on the meaning of the word κέλευθος, viz. that κέλευθος means properly a journey over water (πλοῦς) rather than a ὁδός across dry land. Tzetzes then proceeds to polemicize against this doctrine.<sup>26</sup> Although this doctrine is not (as far as I can discover) to be found in the extant writings of Herodian, this does not constitute sufficient reason for doubting Tzetzes's reliability at this point: Tzetzes would have had access to more of Herodian than we do, and we should be grateful for this new testimonium on such a fragmentary author. Can we safely conclude, then, that (as Tzetzes implies) Herodian knew *Il.* 1. 483 and cited it in defence of his doctrine? This conclusion is highly probable but not absolutely certain: Herodian often quotes Homer without naming either the author or the work, trusting that the passage will be instantly recognized by his readers, and it is theoretically possible that he had in mind *Od.* 2. 429 rather than *Il.* 1. 483; but it is much more likely that his text of the *Odyssey* — which must have been essentially Aristarchean in its *numerus versuum* — was uncontaminated by the interpolated *Od.* 2. 429 at this early stage in the post-Aristarchean transmission. Even if we suppose that the interpolation had made its début as early as the time of Herodian, it must remain statistically highly unlikely that it would have found its way into Herodian's own copy of the *Odyssey*. In all probability, then, Herodian did cite *Il.* 1. 483.

With similar confidence — if again without absolute certainty — we can find an even earlier attestation of *Il.* 1. 483. Vergil, among his innumerable other Homeric imitations, offers a very close adaptation of this line at *Aeneid* 5. 862: *currit iter tutum non setius aequore classis*.<sup>27</sup> This reads as very stilted Latin until we see it for what it surely is — a virtual translation of *Il.* 1. 483: ἡ δ' - *classis*; ἔθειεν - *currit*; κατὰ κῦμα - *aequore*; διαπρήσσουσα κέλευθον - [*currit*] *iter tutum*. The conclusion that Vergil is here imitating *Il.* 1. 483 is supported by the parallelism between the two general situations: after death (*Il.* 1 : the plague-smitten Achaeans; *Aen.* 5: Palinurus) caused/prophesied by a god (*Il.* 1. 41 ff.: Apollo; *Aen.* 5. 814-15: Neptune), that same god, for the benefit of the same smitten group of people (*Il.*: Achaeans; *Aen.*: Trojans), produces/maintains safe conditions for sailing (*Il.* 1. 479, *Aen.* 5. 862-3, cf. 820-21) in line with an earlier favourable response to a plea from someone close to him (*Il.* 1. 450-57: Chryses and Apollo; *Aen.* 5. 779-813 and 862-3: Venus and Neptune). The conclusion is also somewhat strengthened by the fact that the immediately preceding lines in the *Iliad* (*Il.* 1. 479-82) also have their parallels a little earlier in Vergil (*Aen.* 5. 828-32), again as part of the parallel contexts outlined above. As with Herodian, it is theoretically possible that Vergil based *Aen.* 5. 862 not on *Il.* 1. 483 but on the interpolated *Od.* 2. 429, but as Vergil is writing two hundred years before Herodian he is even more likely to have had a text free of this post-Aristarchean intrusion.

<sup>26</sup> Lolos, loc. cit. (above, n. 20); this passage should be compared with Tzetzes's note on ὑγρὰ κέλευθα in *Il.* 1. 312 (Lolos p. 82 lines 14-20), where there is another reference to this doctrine of Herodian: ὑγρὰ κέλευθα] κατάχρησις ὁ τρόπος: κέλευθα γὰρ κυρίως ἢ διὰ γῆς ὁδός ..., κἂν Ἡρωδιανῶ οὐκ ἀρέσκη ... . Cf. Schol. D on *Il.* 1. 483 (= *Ep. Hom.* [above, n. 19] p. 308) κέλευθον] πλοῦν: ἄλλοτε δὲ τὴν διὰ τῆς γῆς ὁδόν; *Et. Gud.* 314. 6 κέλευθος] ἢ διὰ θαλάσσης ὁδός; *Et. Mag.* 502. 21-3 κέλευθος] ἢ ὁδός ... . τὸ δὲ “ὑγρὰ κέλευθα” [*Il.* 1. 312], ὃ σημαίνει τὴν διὰ θαλάσσης ὁδόν ... .

<sup>27</sup> Cf. G.N. Knauer, *Die Aeneis und Homer, Hypomnemata* Heft 7 (Göttingen 1964), p. 435, cf. p. 393.

Thus the isolated omission of *Il.* 1. 483 by the Rainer papyrus can now confidently be judged as no more than a meaningless copyist's slip.

What caused the copyist to slip? McCarthy comments, "... there seems to be no technical reason for the omission. The *κατά* which occurs in both lines 483 and 484 gives the only possible reason for haplography; but since it does not occur in the same position in both lines, the temptation would be very slight."<sup>28</sup> But does *κατά* occur in the papyrus's version of 484? A substantial minority of our extant minuscules do read *κατά* here (the reading of Aristarchus), but the majority have *μετά*; only one of the other papyri, P.Mich. inv. 2810 (saec. ii p.C.), provides evidence for the text of this part of the line, and it reads *μετά* with the majority of the MSS.<sup>29</sup> It is not clear from Gerstinger's brief description of the Rainer papyrus<sup>30</sup> just how much of line 484 it contains, but I have obtained a photograph<sup>31</sup> which shows that the right-hand edge of the papyrus passes through the *ν* of *ἴκοντο*: we are thus free to speculate on whether the papyrus read *κατά* or *μετά* in 484. Although under normal circumstances the statistics would favour the occurrence of *μετά*, we may care to argue that the omission of 483 favours a reading in 484 which could plausibly tempt a scribe to omit 483, viz. the homoiographic *κατά*. Although homoiomeson in two succeeding lines is more likely to lead to the omission of the second line than of the first, the reverse does also occur.<sup>32</sup> McCarthy is surely right in saying that the different position of *κατά* in the line would reduce the strength of a homoiographic temptation, but homoiographa in different parts of the line do sometimes lead to omission.<sup>33</sup> However, the main point to be made here is that the careless omission of a single line without any homoiographic temptation at all is not as rare a phenomenon as is sometimes supposed.<sup>34</sup> Thus whether or not the scribe of the Rainer papyrus wrote *κατά* in 484, there is no difficulty in assuming that the omission of 483 is purely accidental.

Homer, said Matthew Arnold, is rapid, plain, direct and noble: *Il.* 1. 483, where the Achaean ship runs down the road of the sea to complete its mission, has all these qualities, and it is gratifying that we have been able to salvage this splendid line for Homer.

<sup>28</sup> Loc. cit. (above, n. 4).

<sup>29</sup> Priest, locc. citt. (above, n. 22). P. Soc. Pap. Alex. inv. 265 (above, n. 23) reads ]α στρατόν ευρ[, which is of course compatible with either *κατά* or *μετά*.

<sup>30</sup> Loc. cit. (above, n. 6).

<sup>31</sup> I am very grateful to Dr. H. Harrauer of the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek for his prompt and helpful response to my request for a photograph of this papyrus.

<sup>32</sup> E.g. *Il.* 4. 501, omitted by Ludwich's Na (= Allen's U5, saec. xv) - homoiomeson 501 *ἐτάροιο*, 502 *ἐτέροιο* (see A. Ludwich [ed.], *Homeri Ilias* [Leipzig 1902-7] ad loc.); *Od.* 10. 532, omitted by P. Mich. inv. 3786 (Priest 1975 [above, n. 22] No. 35, pp. 175-80; saec. ii-iii p.C.): Priest alleges, "There is no apparent mechanical reason for the omission of this line", but this is incorrect: homoiomeson 532 *κατάκειτ'* (vel sim.), 533 *κατ]ακειῖται* (*sic* in this papyrus). Note also the omission of *Od.* 8. 182 by Allen's R6 (saec. xv), probably caused by the homoiomeson 182 *ἄλγεσι*, 183 *ἀλεγεινά*. All three lines are essential to the sense. For two other examples, *Od.* 13. 391 and Lucan 7. 90, see my *Manuscript Evidence for Interpolation in Homer* (Heidelberg 1980) pp. 27-8.

<sup>33</sup> E.g. *Il.* 13. 178, essential to the sense but omitted by P. Morgan (Allen's Pap. 60, Pack<sub>2</sub> 870, saec. iii-iv p.C.) - *ἔγχεῖ* fills the fifth foot of 177, *ἔγχος* starts the third foot of 178: see Vol. I of Allen's edition, p. 88.

<sup>34</sup> It is easy to cite examples from the transmission of the Homeric text: e.g. *Il.* 15. 155, omitted by Ludwich's P (= Allen's M8, saec. xiv); *Il.* 15. 705, omitted by Ludwich's Ub (= Allen's W3, saec. xiii-xiv). Both lines are essential to the sense.

**(2) Il. 3. 235**

From the walls of Troy Helen names four of the Achaean leaders for Priam and then continues (*Il.* 3. 234-6):

234 νῦν δ' ἄλλους μὲν πάντασ ὄρω ἑλίκωπας Ἀχαιοῦσ

235 οὔσ κεν ἐὺ γνοίην καί τ' οὔνομα μυθησαίμην·

236 δοιῶ δ' οὐ δύναμαι ἰδέειν κοσμήτορε λαῶν,

viz. her brothers Castor and Polydeuces (237-44).

On account of a slight weakness in the attestation of line 235 (which we shall presently examine) Bolling regarded the line as a possible interpolation,<sup>35</sup> but thought it more probable that the omissions were accidental and the line genuine, as it “can hardly be spared”.<sup>36</sup> G.S. Kirk,<sup>37</sup> though tacitly accepting the line as genuine, calls it “not strictly necessary”; but is this true? That depends largely on our interpretation of 234. If we think it means “I can see [not merely the four Achaeans I have already named but] all the other Achaeans, i.e. the whole army”, which seems to be the interpretation of Kirk<sup>38</sup> and W. Bergold,<sup>39</sup> then 235 becomes not merely “not strictly necessary” but a positive embarrassment, since it would be absurd to suppose that Helen could identify every single member of the Achaean army. However. Homeric idiom requires that ἄλλους μὲν with πάντασ be interpreted as at least partly anticipatory in such a way as to mean “all *except*”, the exception being spelt out in what follows.<sup>40</sup> Here this antithesis is sharpened by the exact semantic and syntactical opposition 234 ἄλλους μὲν πάντασ ὄρω - 236 δοιῶ δ' οὐ δύναμαι ἰδέειν. Now ἰδέειν in 236 clearly means “see with recognition”, “identify”; and the precise balance between 234 and 236 requires that ὄρω in 234 have the same meaning. Hence 235, interpreted as a defining relative clause, is essential to complete the thought of 234: it would not make sense for Helen to say (with 235 omitted) that she can see (i.e. identify) literally all the Achaeans except her brothers, because of course many of the nobles and nearly all the commoners would be unknown to her; what she needs to say is that she can see *all the Achaeans she knows* except her brothers, and this is precisely what she does say if we read 235.

There is a further point to 235: in this speech Helen is in danger of lapsing into a soliloquy,<sup>41</sup> and καί τ' οὔνομα μυθησαίμην in 235 restores her speech to its wider context as the last reply to a series of requests from Priam for identification of the most conspicuous Achaean leaders.

Finally, the line is thoroughly Homeric in style. At the end of a hexameter, with identical scansion, μυθησαίμην / μυθήσαιο / μυθήσαιτο / μυθήσασθε / μυθήσασθαι is frequent in Homer - there are 23 occurrences in addition to *Il.* 3. 235; for οὔνομα μυθησαίμην cf. *Od.* 9. 16 ὄνομα ... μυθήσομαι; and the correct use of epic τε is worth noting. However, though typically Homeric, the line comes nowhere near being a διφορούμενος but is a confident piece of free

<sup>35</sup> *Evidence* (above, n. 9) pp. 11, 17.

<sup>36</sup> Loc. cit. (above, n. 2) pp. 12, 20; cf. *Athetized Lines* (above, n. 5) pp. 16, 19 n. 30.

<sup>37</sup> *The Iliad: A Commentary* Vol. I (Cambridge 1985) ad loc. (p. 299).

<sup>38</sup> Op. cit. (above, n. 37) p. 298, top: “This ... allows her ... to scan the whole army, as she says at 234 ...”: of course she does scan the whole army, focussing on the leaders (cf. 236 κοσμήτορε), but I do not believe this is quite what she is saying in 234, even if it is implicit in what she does say.

<sup>39</sup> *Der Zweikampf des Paris und Menelaos* (Bonn 1977) p. 89: “Ihre Augen gehen weiter über alle anderen Achaier hinweg, die sie nun überblickt (νῦν δ'... ὄρω, Γ 234) ... .”

<sup>40</sup> Cf. *Il.* 1. 22 = 376, *Od.* 1. 11, 2. 82, 3. 86, 5. 110 = 133 = 7. 251, 8. 93, 532.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Bergold (above, n. 39) pp. 88-9.

composition: it is therefore very far from being the stuff of which post-Aristarchean interpolations are normally made.

Thus the internal evidence strongly favours the authenticity of the line. Is the external evidence compatible with this conclusion?

The line is omitted by the first hand of P. Lond. 126 (= P.Lit. Lond. 5, Allen's Pap. 3, Pack<sub>2</sub> 634, saec. iii p.C.) but added in the top margin by a second hand.<sup>42</sup> According to the second and third editions of the O.C.T. edited by D.B. Monro and T.W. Allen (1908, 1920) the line is also omitted by 05 (saec. xii) and M5 (saec. xiii). I have myself collated this part of M5 in microfiche; the line is indeed omitted from the text, though it is added in the margin by a second but contemporary hand.<sup>43</sup> Cf. Ludwich,<sup>44</sup> who records that the line is omitted from the text by Db1 but added in the margin by Db2: Ludwich's Db = Allen's M5 = Ambrosianus 355 (F 101 sup.). This was the sum total of the information available to Bolling when he discussed the line in 1916 and 1925.<sup>45</sup> But when Allen published his *editio maior* of the *Iliad* in 1931 he added a third minuscule to his list of omitting MSS., M11 (saec. xii-xiii). However, this is a plain error: I have also collated this MS. (= Ambrosianus 502 [L 116 sup.]) in microfiche, and the line is definitely present in the text, in the first hand and in its proper place and complete with its prose paraphrase in the adjacent column. The source of Allen's error is apparently a series of false equations between three of his sigla (M11, M10, M5) and three of Ludwich's (Db, Dc, Dd) on p. 270 of Vol. I of Allen's *editio maior*: after falsely identifying Ludwich's Db with his M11 (it actually = his M5: see above) he seems to have falsely translated Ludwich's "om. Db1" to "om. M11". So in reality we still know of only two minuscules, not three, which omit the line from the text.

But more significant is another fact. We now know that the line is read by an Oxyrhynchus papyrus of the second century p.C. published in 1973.<sup>46</sup>

Further, not only is *Il.* 3. 235 contained in our six earliest minuscules and all but two of the rest; it is commented on in the bT and D scholia, and it is quoted and elaborately discussed by Eustathius (409. 34, 409. 40 - 410. 5).

There is no reason why the absence of the line from one papyrus and two rather unimportant MSS. should not be due to a mere transcriptional error - one which arose at a relatively early stage of the post-Aristarchean transmission and had some influence on the later transmission.<sup>47</sup> There are other accidental omissions in the Homeric transmission which have spread even more widely than this, as we shall see in Sections (5) and (6) below. There is no *obvious* homoiographic temptation to omission, but, as we have already seen, single lines are sometimes omitted without any such temptation. However, it is possible that there is a slight temptation after all and that this omission was caused by a homoiographon of the type dubbed by Allen "heads and tails", i.e. "where the end of one line affects the beginning of the next, or *vice versa*"<sup>48</sup> - here OYΣ at the end of 234 and the

---

<sup>42</sup> See F.G. Kenyon, *Classical Texts from Papyri in the British Museum* (London 1891) pp. 81-92, esp. p. 89. For the date of the papyrus see *MS. Evidence* (above, n. 32) p. 30 n. 9.

<sup>43</sup> I am grateful to my colleague Dr. Pauline Allen for her help with the palaeography of this MS.

<sup>44</sup> *Op. cit.* (above, n. 32) ad loc.

<sup>45</sup> See above, notes 35 and 36.

<sup>46</sup> T.W. McKay, "A Papyrus of *Iliad* III", *BASP* 10 (1973) pp. 57-64.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. Bolling, loc. cit. (above, n. 2) p. 20. Bolling's alternative explanation of an "accidental coincidence" between the papyrus and the MSS. seems less likely in view of the absence of any really strong homoiographic temptation to omission (see below).

<sup>48</sup> Loc. cit. (above, n. 13) p. 70 n. 2.

beginning of 235. Cf. the omission of *Il.* 13. 482 by Ludwich's Db,<sup>49</sup> probably caused by the sequence αὐνῶς (end of 481) - Αἰνείαν (beginning of 482).

To summarize and conclude: the internal evidence demands the presence of the line, which is essential to the sense and thoroughly Homeric in style, and the external evidence is entirely compatible with the hypothesis of accidental omission, *a fortiori* in view of the presence of the line in a recently-published papyrus which also happens to be our earliest surviving witness to this part of the text.

**(3) and (4) *Od.* 17. 152, 155-6**

I print *Od.* 17. 151-9:

τοῖσι δὲ καὶ μετέειπε Θεοκλύμενος θεοειδής·  
 152 “ὦ γυναῖ αἰδοίη Λαερτιάδεω Ὀδυσῆος,  
 ἦ τοι ὄ γ’ οὐ σάφα οἶδεν, ἐμεῖο δὲ σύνθεο μῦθον·  
 ἀτρεκέως γάρ τοι μαντεύσομαι οὐδ’ ἐπικεύσω.  
 155 ἴστω νῦν Ζεὺς πρῶτα θεῶν ξενίη τε τράπεζα  
 156 ἰστίη τ’ Ὀδυσῆος ἀμύμονος, ἦν ἀφικάνω,  
 ὡς ἦ τοι Ὀδυσσεὺς ἤδη ἐν πατρίδι γαίῃ,  
 ἦμενος ἢ ἔρπων, τάδε πευθόμενος κακὰ ἔργα,  
 ἔστιν, ἀτὰρ μνηστῆρσι κακὸν πάντεσσι φυτεύει·

“There is much confusion in the scholia on p 147 ff.” So wrote Bolling,<sup>50</sup> rightly. One problem is: exactly which lines did Aristarchus athetize? The usual answer is: 16 lines, viz. *Od.* 17. 150-65. This answer is surely correct. But Bolling's own answer was: “sixteen lines 147-65 are athetized. Then three lines have been added to the passage since Aristarchus; they are probably lines 152 and 155-6.”<sup>51</sup> Surprisingly, this solution was accepted unquestioningly by D.L. Page.<sup>52</sup> But it has nothing to recommend it. There is no post-Aristarchean manuscript evidence against 152 or 155-6 or any of the other lines within the passage 147-65.<sup>53</sup> Further, Eustathius cites both 152 and 155-6 (Eust. 1813. 55-6, 58-60). Now there are a very few lines which we know to have been absent from the edition of Aristarchus but which have found their way into all our minuscules - e.g. *Od.* 11. 525, omitted only by a single papyrus;<sup>54</sup> but it is not to be expected that there should be more than a very few undetected post-Aristarchean interpolations as successful as this. It is extremely unlikely that within a passage as short as *Od.* 17. 147-65 there should be two such interpolations. Now when Bolling wrote (1925) no papyri covering this passage had been published except P.Oxy. IV. 782 (saec. iii p.C.), which breaks off at line 148 and does not resume till line 182; it includes both 147 and 148 in its text. However, we now have P.Berlin 13222, published in

<sup>49</sup> See Ludwich (above, n. 32) ad loc.; I have verified this reading in my microfiche collation of the MS.

<sup>50</sup> Evidence (above, n. 9) p. 214, where the relevant scholia are cited.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid. (above, n. 50).

<sup>52</sup> *The Homeric Odyssey* (Oxford 1955) p. 98 n. 7.

<sup>53</sup> Line 156 is omitted by Ludwich's H (= Allen's H3, saec. xiii) but added in the margin by a second hand: see A. Ludwich (ed.), *Homeri Odyssea* (Leipzig 1889-91) ad loc.; but this omission is almost certainly merely an isolated slip caused probably by the homoiarchon 155 ἴστω, 156 ἰστίη or possibly by the homoiomeson 156 ἰστίη τ’ Ὀδυσῆος, 157 ἦ τοι Ὀδυσσεύς (for parallels to the latter see above, n. 32).

<sup>54</sup> See MS. *Evidence* (above, n. 32) p. 4.

1974 and dated by its editor simply to “byz. Zeit”,<sup>55</sup> which contains *Od.* 17. 148-61 and 177-89 and includes all the lines of the printed vulgate in its text, including the lines suspected by Bolling, 152 and 155-6. Thus this latest papyrus evidence lends further support to the view that these three lines are all genuine.

This view is also supported by the internal evidence. The vocative line 152 immediately follows a speech-introduction containing the verb *μετέειπε*. Now when this and other *μετ-* verbs of speaking (*μετέφη* etc.) are used in Homer, those “among” whom the speaker speaks are usually also those to whom the following speech is directly addressed. However, when, instead, a single individual is addressed after one of these verbs, Homeric idiom demands a vocative to indicate who it is.<sup>56</sup> Line 152 supplies that vocative, and so is virtually essential. As for lines 155-6, one cannot claim that they are essential: that a sequence 154, 157 would be possible is shown by the parallel passage *Od.* 19. 268-70. However, although highly formulaic,<sup>57</sup> 155-6 are entirely suited to their present context. Indeed, 156 is more appropriate here than on its previous occurrence, *Od.* 14.159 (Odysseus to Eumaeus), where the beggar, still in Eumaeus’s hut, has not yet reached the “hearth of Odysseus”.<sup>58</sup> The oath of 17. 155-6 helps to set the solemn tone for the dramatic prophecy which follows, and it also has a persuasive function and is thoroughly in character for Theoclymenus, the anxious fugitive (cf. esp. 15. 271-8, 508-11): he has not yet established his credentials with Penelope as a prophet, and is keen to make a good impression (cf. 15. 529-34).

Thus internal and external evidence combine in support of the suspected lines.

#### (5) *Od.* 17. 432

I print *Od.* 17. 431-4 (from one of Odysseus’s false tales):

οἱ δ’ ὕβρει εἴξαντες, ἐπισπόμενοι μένεϊ σφῶ  
 432 αἶψα μάλ’ Αἰγυπτίων ἀνδρῶν περικαλλέας ἀγρούς  
 πόρθεον, ἐκ δὲ γυναικάς ἄγον καὶ νήπια τέκνα  
 αὐτούς τ’ ἔκτεινον

Line 432 is omitted by some of our MSS. and was listed by Bolling as a “probable interpolation” in 1916.<sup>59</sup> However, as I argued in 1974, this line is essential to the sense: “πόρθεον in 433 requires Αἰγυπτίων ἀνδρῶν περικαλλέας ἀγρούς in 432 as its object, and γυναικάς, τέκνα and αὐτούς (433 f.), considered together, require Αἰγυπτίων ἀνδρῶν in 432 as their point of reference. Moreover, the authenticity of the line is further guaranteed by the fact that 17. 427-41 = 14. 258-72, with 17. 432 = 14. 263.”<sup>60</sup> Hence the omission of the line by some MSS. must be seen as due to a copyist’s slip in a lost archetype of these MSS. There is no homoiographic

<sup>55</sup> K. Treu, pp. 433-4 (No. II) of “Kleine Klassikerfragmente”, *Festschrift Berl. Mus.* (Berlin 1974) pp. 431-40.

<sup>56</sup> I can find only one quasi-exception to prove the rule - *Od.* 17. 493-4, where there is a special reason for the absence of the vocative, because Antinous, the person nominally addressed by Penelope (494 σέ), is being cursed in *his absence* (he is in the μέγαρον, 493, and she is in her θάλαμος, 506) and her words are really meant for her maidservants (493, cf. 495-6) and Apollo (494, cf. 496).

<sup>57</sup> *Od.* 17. 155-6 = 14. 158-9, 20. 230-31, almost = 19. 303-4; cf. *Il.* 19. 258.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. Schol. Q on *Od.* 14. 159 (presumably Aristonicus giving a reason for an Aristarchean athetesis): μετενήνεκται ἀπὸ τῶν ἐξῆς ἐπὶ τῶν πρὸς τὴν Πηνελόπην λόγων (*Od.* 19. 304). οὐπω γὰρ ἀφίκται εἰς τὴν Ὀδυσσεῶς οἰκίαν.

<sup>59</sup> Loc. cit. (above, n. 2) p. 453.

<sup>60</sup> *Acta Classica* 17 (1974) p. 30 n. 68.

temptation to omission, but, as we have already seen, omission of a single line without such temptation is not uncommon.<sup>61</sup>

Just which MSS. omit line 432? We are told “om. X D Z” by Ludwich,<sup>62</sup> “om. a d l” by Allen, “om. C P1 R4 V4 U8” by Tachinoslis.<sup>63</sup> Only one of Ludwich’s MSS., D (= Allen’s P1), overlaps with any of the three families cited by Allen. Tachinoslis has collated only some of the MSS. cited here by Ludwich and Allen, but his collations, as far as they go, support the accuracy of the explicit information in both of his predecessors at this point, and he is able to add one additional omitting MS., U8, which was not cited here by either Ludwich (who did not use it) or Allen (who did). This might seem to add up to a large number of MSS. for an accidental omission; but when these MSS. are weighed rather than counted the total is in effect reduced by the links recently discovered by Tachinoslis between some of these MSS. In effect the line is omitted by two separate clusters of MSS. plus two individual MSS.:

(i) “om. a” Allen: this family comprises three MSS., one of which (L7) is not extant at this point; the remaining two, C (saec. xiv) and R4 (saec. xiii), omit the line. These two MSS. are “sehr eng verwandt”.<sup>64</sup> Two other omitting MSS., P1 (= Ludwich’s D, saec. xiii) and V4 (= Ludwich’s X, saec. xiii), are closely related not only to each other but also to C and R4;<sup>65</sup> and another omitting MS., R2 (saec. xv), is related to P1: the two comprise the only members of Allen’s small family 1. Thus all these MSS. can be put in a single cluster.

(ii) The line is also omitted by some<sup>66</sup> of the members of Allen’s large family d, consisting entirely of MSS. from the 15th and 16th centuries.<sup>67</sup>

(iii) Finally come the two individual omitting MSS., U8 (saec. xiv<sup>68</sup>) and Z (saec. xv-xvi).

Admittedly this total is still at the upper end of the normal range for an accidental omission in the Homeric MSS., but adequate parallels can be cited,<sup>69</sup> and we may note that our two earliest minuscules, L4 (saec. x<sup>70</sup>) and L8 (saec. xi), both contain the line, as indeed do the vast majority of our MSS.; and Eustathius cites and comments on the line (1826. 44-5).

New support for the line has now come from P. Oxy. XLIX. 3443 (saec. iii p.C.), published in 1982, which also contains the line. Attestation of the line at such an early date provides striking confirmation of our conclusion that it is genuine and its omission accidental.

---

<sup>61</sup> See above, n. 34.

<sup>62</sup> Op. cit. (above, n. 53) ad loc.

<sup>63</sup> Op. cit. (above, n. 10) p. 112.

<sup>64</sup> Tachinoslis (above, n. 10) p. 24, cf. p. 45.

<sup>65</sup> So Tachinoslis (above, n. 10) pp. 41-3, 45; see esp. p. 42 “Die Hss. C P1 R4 V4 sind eng verwandt in den Büchern 9-19”.

<sup>66</sup> No more than this can be deduced from Allen’s “om . . . d”: see loc. cit. (above, n. 60) p. 29 n. 65, *MS. Evidence* (above, n. 32) p. xxiv and now also Tachinoslis (above, n. 10) passim.

<sup>67</sup> R5, which Allen also assigns to this family in his edition (p. xiii), is saec. xiii-xiv but is not extant at this point.

<sup>68</sup> For the revised dating see e.g. Tachinoslis (above, n. 10) p. 31 n. 1.

<sup>69</sup> See loc. cit. (above, n. 60) pp. 30-31.

<sup>70</sup> For the dating see above, n. 12.

**(6) *Od.* 16. 50**

Eumaeus serves a meal to Telemachus and the disguised Odysseus:

49 τοῖσιν δ' αὖ κρειῶν πίνακας παρέθηκε συβώτης

50 ὀπταλέων, ἃ ῥα τῆ προτέρῃ ὑπέλειπον ἔδοντες

Line 50 is omitted by some MSS., and Bolling<sup>71</sup> believed it was probably an interpolation. Its status is of especial interest because the line has played a prominent part in what used to be called the Higher Criticism of the *Odyssey* - though I agree with Eisenberger that too much has been made of the line and illegitimate conclusions drawn from it.<sup>72</sup> However, neither the Analysts P. Von der Mühl<sup>73</sup> and R. Merkelbach<sup>74</sup> nor the Unitarian Eisenberger have made any attempt to come to terms with the weakness in the line's attestation or with Bolling's detailed discussion of the external evidence.<sup>75</sup>

When we put together the information provided by Ludwich,<sup>76</sup> Allen and Tachinoslis,<sup>77</sup> we find that the line is omitted by three groups of MSS.:

(i) some<sup>78</sup> of the members of Allen's family d (none earlier than saec. xv<sup>79</sup>);

(ii) some<sup>80</sup> of the members of Allen's family q (saec. xv and xvi), including Z;

(iii) the MSS. P1 R4 V4, all saec. xiii and all, as we have just seen in (5) above, related to one another.<sup>81</sup>

The combined weight of these omitting MSS. is no greater - in fact it is slightly less - than in the case of (5) above. As with (5), we can note that the line is read by the vast majority of our minuscules, including, once again, the two earliest, L4 and L8, and that, again, it is cited and discussed by Eustathius (1793. 67 - 1794. 3). Thus, again, the total of omitting MSS. is compatible with accidental omission. This time there is a very slight homoioteleuton, 49 -της, 50 -τες, which may have been enough to cause the accidental omission in the archetype.

There is also some weighty evidence from late antiquity in favour of the line. It was read by Plutarch, *Moralia* 704 A, = *Quaest. conv.* VII. 4. 6; and we now have P. Ant. III. 171 (saec. v p.C.), published in 1967, which also contains the line. Bolling<sup>82</sup> makes much of the fact that "Athenaeus (vi. 228 c) attests π 49 - but no more - for Aristophanes [of Byzantium]", but this does not in fact constitute evidence against line 50, because 49 was all that needed to be cited for the argument concerned.

Bolling, as we have seen, was inclined to regard the line as an interpolation, but he added, "My reason for hesitating is that the line is not a στίχος διφορούμενος."<sup>83</sup> Indeed it is not, and

<sup>71</sup> Loc. cit. (above, n. 2) p. 453; *Evidence* (above, n. 9) p. 213.

<sup>72</sup> H. Eisenberger, *Studien zur Odyssee* (Wiesbaden 1973) p. 23 n. 20, where the earlier literature is discussed.

<sup>73</sup> *RE Suppl.* VII (1940) 740.

<sup>74</sup> *Untersuchungen zur Odyssee, Zetemata* Heft 2 (Munich 1951, 2nd ed. 1969), pp. 67-8.

<sup>75</sup> *Evidence* (above, n. 9) p. 213.

<sup>76</sup> Op. cit. (above, n. 53) ad loc.

<sup>77</sup> Op. cit. (above, n. 10) p. 105 (collation), pp. 41-3, 45 (links between MSS.).

<sup>78</sup> See above, n. 66.

<sup>79</sup> See above, n. 67.

<sup>80</sup> See above, n. 66.

<sup>81</sup> See esp. n. 65 above.

<sup>82</sup> *Evidence* (above, n. 9) p. 213.

<sup>83</sup> *Ibid.* (above, n. 82).

this is a point which needs elaborating. It is in fact an original line not remotely similar to any other line and yet composed entirely in the Homeric style. For example, ἔδοντες, ἔδουσιν and ἔδονται are common in Homer and nearly always occur at the line-end, as here. But even more impressive is the use of ὀπταλέος. There can be no doubt that this word is authentically Homeric: cf. *Il.* 4. 345 and *Od.* 12. 396; in the latter place it starts its line, as here. But though demonstrably Homeric this word is rare in Homer — occurring only on these three occasions — and even rarer in later literature. Thus it is not the most obvious word to trip off the tongue (or pen) of an interpolator. As for τῆ προτέρη, cf. ἠοῖ τῆ προτέρη at *Il.* 13. 794. ὑπολείπω occurs in five other places in Homer;<sup>84</sup> in four of them the word starts at the same point in the line as here. Had Bolling lived to see this line attested by P.Ant. III. 171 he might well have changed his mind about its status.

University of Queensland

M.J. Apthorp

---

<sup>84</sup> *Il.* 23. 615, *Od.* 7. 230, 17. 276, 282, 19. 44.