

MICHAEL J. APTHORP

NEW EVIDENCE FROM THE SYRIAC PALIMPSEST ON THE *NUMERUS*  
*VERSUUM* OF THE *ILIAD*

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 110 (1996) 103–114

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



## NEW EVIDENCE FROM THE SYRIAC PALIMPSEST ON THE *NUMERUS* *VERSUUM* OF THE *ILIAD*

When, perhaps around A.D. 800, the monk Simeon set about transcribing the Syriac version of Severus's long theological tract *Against Grammaticus* for Daniel the future Bishop of Edessa, he used, for his first volume, palimpsest vellum leaves from parts of three different Greek codices: first 50 leaves from a Gospel of St. Luke, then 59 leaves from an *Iliad*, and finally five leaves of Euclid. It is the Iliadic leaves which concern us here. Together they constitute Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 17210, the "Syriac Palimpsest", alias *Il. P*<sup>9</sup> (saec. vi p.C.), and henceforth "Syr."<sup>1</sup> Syr. contains roughly half of the text from *Il.* 12. 273 to 24. 483, viz.:-

12. 273-471 (= end of Book).
13. 133-265, 333-98, 465-530, 663-728, 797-837 (= end).
14. 1-20, 156-419.
15. 158-223, 356-421, 491-557.
16. 199-264, 331-97, 664-731, 798-862.
18. 93-358, 426-92.
19. 136-268, 335-424 (= end).
20. 1-172, 306-503 (= end).
21. 1-397, 465-611 (= end).
22. 1-113, 181-378.
23. 57-323, 457-589, 656-788, 856-97 (= end).
24. 1-20, 285-483.

The many substantial lacunae are not due to the loss of any part of the Syriac volume: rather, the scribe Simeon used only some of the Iliadic leaves for the job in hand. In spite of the faintness of the partly erased Greek script, those leaves which he did use are very well preserved for an uncial of this age. The vast majority of the 3,870 Iliadic lines which they contain are legible *in toto*; a small minority are only partly legible, and only 23 are totally illegible.

But in this article I aim to focus not so much on these well-preserved extant leaves (which have already received a fair amount of attention) as on the text of the lost leaves. I shall argue that considerations of space based on the contents of the extant leaves create strong arguments for the absence, within some of the lost leaves, of certain lines weakly attested in the rest of the post-Aristarchean manuscript and papyrus tradition. In other words, I shall argue that the external evidence against the authenticity of certain lines already widely regarded as non-Homeric intruders in the post-Aristarchean tradition can now be usefully augmented from Syr. Further, I shall argue that similar spatial considerations support the *presence* in Syr.'s lost leaves of several lines whose authenticity has previously been doubted or denied on the basis of very slender external evidence but which I regard as certainly or (in one case) probably genuine, or at any rate Aristarchean.

While the whole concept of trying to establish the probable presence or absence of lines within lacunae may at first seem rather recondite to some readers, it is actually nothing new in

---

<sup>1</sup> W. Cureton (ed.), *Fragments of the Iliad of Homer from a Syriac Palimpsest* (London 1851); see esp. pp. v-xi. This is a *de luxe* edition with a complete transcription, a collation with Heyne's edition, and facsimiles of six pages.

Homeric textual criticism. For example, as long ago as 1911 A.S. Hunt, in his edition of a vellum codex of the *Odyssey*, P.Ryl. I. 53 (*Od.* Ɔ<sup>28</sup>, Pack<sup>2</sup> 1106, saec. iii p.C.<sup>2</sup>), commented as follows on *Od.* 15. 127, the last line of Folio 24 verso, a page of which only this last line (with the bottom margin) is extant: “Since the preceding page ended with l. 91 and the pages hereabouts do not contain more than thirty verses, it may be inferred that the codex agreed with PH, &c., and the text used by the Scholiast of P.Amh. 18 in omitting ll. 113-19. This reduces the present page to the normal number of twenty-nine lines” (p. 170, cf. p. 114). This calculation has in fact provided important evidence on the status of *Od.* 15. 113-19 as a post-Aristarchean interpolation.<sup>3</sup>

Of course Hunt’s argument here was especially persuasive because of the length of this omission (seven lines). With omissions of single lines - the commonest form of post-Aristarchean interpolation - calculations of this sort will be most persuasive where the scribe is absolutely consistent in the number of lines he writes per column or page. For this reason we are fortunate that the scribe of Syr. has written exactly 33 lines of the *Iliad* on each of the 113 extant normal pages. Four pages containing the end of one Book and the beginning of another have 28 lines, and one page containing the end of a Book but *not* the beginning of another has 29 lines, but all the other extant pages have exactly 33 lines each.<sup>4</sup> It is therefore virtually certain that each of the lost leaves which did not include a Book-ending also comprised two pages of exactly 33 lines each; and this assumption will underlie all the calculations which follow.

But before we examine the lacunae we need to take a brief look at the extant pages to see what the quality of their *numerus versusum* is. Can they be relied on to omit obvious post-Aristarchean interpolations? Do they insert many additional lines? How often do they omit lines accidentally? Obviously the more reliable the *numerus versusum* of the extant pages is, the more weight will be carried by calculations on the contents of the lacunae. For example, if we were to find several lines accidentally omitted on almost every page of the extant sections, it would be virtually impossible to proceed.

Our first step must be simply to list all the lines omitted from the extant pages of Syr. in comparison with the text of the modern printed vulgate, whose line-numbering reflects that of the 1804 edition of F.A. Wolf. I am aware of six previous attempts to list all such omissions, but none of them is entirely complete and accurate.<sup>5</sup> Further, Allen’s *editio maior* contains a number of

<sup>2</sup> For the system of papyrus-numbering used in this article see my *Manuscript Evidence for Interpolation in Homer* (Heidelberg 1980) pp. xi-xii.

<sup>3</sup> See further op. cit. (above, n. 2) pp. 200-216. Against the notion of A. Hoekstra that this passage was probably known to Stesichorus (in A. Heubeck and A. Hoekstra, *A Commentary on Homer’s Odyssey* Vol. II [Oxford 1989] p. 239, cf. p. 242) see S. Reece, “Homeric Influence in Stesichorus’ Nostoi”, *BASP* 25 (1988) pp. 1-8, esp. 6-7, and *The Stranger’s Welcome* (Ann Arbor 1993) pp. 94-6, esp. 95-6 n. 30. R. Janko is misleading in citing Reece’s *BASP* article in support of the view that “This interpolation antedates Stesichorus”, *Gnomon* 66 (1994) p. 293 n. 17. To return to the more general level, it is also worth noting here that the technique of identifying omissions within lacunae has long since been applied in New Testament textual criticism as well: see e.g. F.G. Kenyon, *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts* (5th edn. rev. A.W. Adams and G.R. Driver, London 1958) p. 199, on the inferred absence of John 7. 53 - 8. 11 (the story of the Woman Caught in Adultery) within a two-leaf lacuna of the Codex Alexandrinus (saec. v): this passage is also omitted by both of the two relevant extant papyri (? early third century) and most of the early parchment uncials and is widely regarded as an early interpolation.

<sup>4</sup> For detailed argument establishing this point see my previous article, “*Iliad* 14. 306c Discovered in the Syriac Palimpsest”, *ZPE* 109 (1995) 174-176.

<sup>5</sup> Cureton’s own 1851 list (op. cit. [above, n.1] p. xviii) neglects to include *Il.* 12. 374, 13. 255, 16. 381 and 23. 273, even though these omissions were correctly recorded in his collation ad locc. (pp. 119-27). Further, in an even worse oversight, neither his list nor his collation makes any mention of Syr.’s omission of 21. 158, even though Heyne’s edition, which Cureton used for his collation, contains the line while

errors and omissions in its reports of Syr.'s line-omissions.<sup>6</sup> Here, then, is a complete list of Syr.'s omissions:-

*Il.* 12. 374; 13. 255; 14. 157-8, 269; 15. 551; 16. 381, 689-90; 18. 200-201, 427; 19. 177; 20. 44-6, 312, 316-17, 447; 21. 148, 158, 480, 510; 23. 273, 283-4, 565, 746, 864; 24. 290.

Thus there are omissions, at 24 points, of 31 lines altogether.

It is to Syr.'s credit that its omissions include the following interpolations against which there is strong evidence in other papyri and/or in the early MSS., and sometimes in the scholia as well: *Il.* 13. 255, 14. 269, 16. 381, 689-90, 19. 177, 20. 312, 447, 21. 158, 480, 510, 23. 565, 864. Syr. also omits two other passages against which there is some other evidence in both papyri and MSS., 18. 200-201 and 427, and these are probably also interpolations. All 16 of these lines were already listed in Bolling's "Conspectus of Vulgate Interpolations" as long ago as 1925,<sup>7</sup> and since then the papyrus evidence against some of them has expanded.

Of debatable significance are Syr.'s omissions of 15. 551, 20. 316-17 and 21. 148.

On the other hand there are seven omissions, comprising eleven lines altogether, which are certainly mere scribal slips: *Il.* 12. 374 (homoioteleuton 373 and 374 ἴκοντο), 14. 157-8 (homoioteleuton 156 and 158 θυμῶ), 20. 44-6 (homoiomeson 44 ὑπήλυθε, 47 ἦλυθον), 23. 273 (homoiomeson 273 ἄεθλα, 274 ἀεθλεύοιμεν),<sup>8</sup> 23. 283-4 (homoiarchon 282 χαιτάων, 284 χαίται), 23. 746 (homoioteleuton 745 δῶρον ἔδωκαν, 746 ὄνον ἔδωκε), 24. 290. Thus we have to bear in mind that Syr. exhibits a certain tendency to skip lines occasionally. However, as a proportion of

Cureton's own transcription (p. 73) omits it. This was an oversight which misled every other 19th-century scholar who attempted to compile a complete list of Syr.'s omissions, starting with Bekker in 1852, whose list also wrongly claimed that Syr. omitted *Il.* 12. 461: as Cureton's collation correctly recorded, it was only the word δέ which was omitted here, not the whole line (I. Bekker, *Monatsbericht Berl. Akad.* 1852, pp. 433 ff., repr. *Homerische Blätter* Vol. I [Bonn 1863] pp. 114-22: see esp. p. 117). The list produced by "B.S." at *RhM* N.F. 8 (1853) p. 475 is still the most accurate to date: it includes all the omissions except 21. 158 and contains no other errors (see further *ZPE* 81 [1990] p. 2 n. 7). K.W. Kayser, *Philologus* 10 (1855) pp. 146-9, corrected Bekker's error on *Il.* 12. 461 but succeeded in introducing two of his own: on p. 147 he claims that Syr. omits 14. 290 (read 24. 290) and on p. 148 he claims that Syr. omits 23. 200-201 (read 18. 200-201). J. La Roche, *Die homerische Textkritik im Alterthum* (Leipzig 1866) p. 457, introduces a different error, alleging that Syr. omits 12. 364 (read 374). Further, neither Kayser nor La Roche included 21. 158 in his list, even though J. Classen had drawn attention to the absence of this line from the text in 1852 (*Philologus* 7 [1852] p. 186). V. Bérard, *Introduction à l'Odyssée* Vol. I (Paris 1924) pp. 57-9, does include 21. 158 in his list but makes no mention of 12. 374, 16. 381 or 23. 273, and writes "X 283-284 et 746" when he means "Ψ 283-284 et 746".

<sup>6</sup> T.W. Allen (ed.), *Homeri Ilias* (Oxford 1931). Since Allen's general policy is to ignore omissions caused by homoiographa (Vol. I p. 272) I do not criticize the fact that he makes no mention of Syr.'s omission of e.g. *Il.* 23. 746. However, whatever one makes of the external evidence against *Il.* 18. 200-201, Allen should certainly have mentioned the omission of this couplet by Syr. since he does mention its omission by  $\mathfrak{P}^{11}$  and two mediaeval MSS. Further, he misleadingly states that Syr. omits *Il.* 20. 317 (read 316-17). His statement that Syr. omits 22. 363 is another error: Syr. contains the line, which is, however, omitted by P. Fay. 211 ( $\mathfrak{P}^{255}$ , Pack<sup>2</sup> 995, saec. i-ii p.C.), though Allen does not say so or even include the papyrus in his general list although it was published as early as 1900. His statement in his apparatus on 23. 757 that Syr. adds 757abc in the margin is another error: it is not  $\mathfrak{P}^9$  (= Syr.) but  $\mathfrak{P}^{13}$  which adds these lines (see on lacuna (22) below, Section (e)). Finally, Allen twice says (Vol. I pp. 64, 86) that Syr. omits 24. 291: this is an error for 24. 290, and the line is therefore not "dispensable" as he twice alleges but essential to sense and syntax.

<sup>7</sup> G.M. Bolling, *The External Evidence for Interpolation in Homer* (Oxford 1925) pp. 16-30.

<sup>8</sup> For homoiomesa which operate like this see *ZPE* 82 (1990) p. 17, esp. n. 32.

the nearly 4,000 lines covered by the extant leaves of Syr. the accidental omissions are in reality very few.

In spite of omitting 16 lines which we have judged to be certain or probable interpolations, Syr. does actually contain a few Wolfian lines which were either certainly or probably absent from the edition of Aristarchus: *Il.* 13. 480, 18. 441, 20. 135, 21. 73, 22. 316 and 363. Syr. also contains *Il.* 14. 12, which *may* also be a post-Aristarchean interpolation. However, most of these lines clearly entered our vulgate early enough to have spread to either all or the vast majority of the mediaeval MSS., so that their presence in as late an uncial as Syr. is not particularly surprising. The only exception is 20. 135, present in only a minority of our MSS., including, however, the tenth-century A.

Syr. also contains three non-Wolfian interpolations: *Il.* 14. 306abc,<sup>9</sup> 21. 96a and 22. 10a. (None of these lines recurs in any other papyrus or MS.) However, Syr. is free of all the other non-Wolfian plus-verses interpolated in post-Aristarchean papyri and MSS. - e.g. 12. 424a, 13. 218a, 15. 409ab, 19. 361a, to name just a few.

Finally, a single isolated quirk: at one point, and one point only, Syr. repeats at the top of a page a line already written at the foot of the previous page.<sup>10</sup>

Thus our general impression of Syr. is that it is, all things considered, a sound and reliable MS. in its *numerus versuum*, if not an infallible one. There are some errors – a few accidental omissions, a few interpolations – but these are rare when we bear in mind that Syr.'s extant leaves cover a quarter of the *Iliad*. We have here an adequate basis for calculations on the contents of the lacunae, provided we proceed with due caution and do not claim a higher degree of certainty than we are entitled to. An inferred omission will never be quite as certain as a visible one, and sometimes nothing even approaching a firm conclusion will be possible. Usually the shorter the lacuna, the less scope for accidents and the more weight our calculations will carry. But even with the single-leaf lacunae we shall be dealing in probabilities (albeit often very strong probabilities), not certainties. For example, even if it looks as though a missing leaf could have contained 66 lines only if it omitted a particular weakly-attested line, it is still possible – *just* possible – that in fact it *contained* the weakly-attested line and accidentally omitted another one. But to argue that this was the usual or the most likely explanation would be perverse, especially given the tendencies we have just documented in the extant leaves - viz. that Syr. is more likely to omit than to contain weakly-attested lines, and that copyist's slips involving whole lines are few and far between. Further, even though our conclusions will be probable rather than certain, the argument will still be worth making, especially as the existing papyrus evidence against some weakly-attested lines is still slender or even non-existent (as we shall see). Finally, just as Bolling in his *Conspectus* included the papyrus evidence against *non*-Wolfian post-Aristarchean plus-verses, so I shall give the inferred readings of Syr. against such lines wherever such calculations are possible. To some this may seem unnecessary: does anyone still think such weakly attested additional lines may be genuine? Answer: yes: H. van Thiel's new edition of the *Odyssey* wrongly includes nine such plus-verses in its text, unbracketed.<sup>11</sup> Since any such trend should be discouraged, any external evidence against such lines is still worth citing.

We shall now proceed to consider each of the 25 major lacunae in Syr., i.e. the spaces between the extant passages listed at the outset of this article. Where I argue that Syr. provides

<sup>9</sup> See op. cit. (above, n. 4).

<sup>10</sup> See op. cit. (above, n. 4) p. 175, n. 8.

<sup>11</sup> *Homeri Odyssea* (Hildesheim 1991). The lines are *Od.* 2. 107a, 10. 310a, 11. 343a, 638a, 12. 153a, 16. 412a, 18. 111a, 21. 353a, 22. 43a; see also pp. XIII and xxxi of his preface. Cf. R. Janko, *Gnomon* 66 (1994) pp. 289-95, esp. 289, 292-3; also my own review, *CR* 43 (1993) pp. 228-30.

evidence for or against a line, I shall set this evidence in context by linking it with the other diplomatic evidence on the line, often adding a few words on the internal evidence as well.

(1) *Il.* 13. 1-132. Two leaves are missing here: 33 lines × 4 pages = 132 lines, which is also the total of the Wolfian printed vulgate here. This implies that, in all probability, Syr. *included Il.* 13. 46, a line wrongly designated a post-Aristarchean interpolation by Bolling. I argued in defence of this line in 1980,<sup>12</sup> and it is gratifying now to find this additional external evidence in its favour. The line is virtually essential to its context, and its omission by  $\mathfrak{P}^{10}$  (Pack<sup>2</sup> 899, saec. i p. C.) and one very late MS. (Allen's L5, A.D. 1465) must be an accident due to the strong homoiarchon – both line 46 and line 47 start with the word Αἴωντε. Line 46 is present in all our other minuscules and in  $\mathfrak{P}^{85}$  (Pack<sup>2</sup> 900, saec. i a.C. - i p.C.) and  $\mathfrak{P}^{60}$  (Pack<sup>2</sup> 870, saec. iii-iv p.C.).

(2) *Il.* 13. 266-332. One leaf is missing here: 33 × 2 = 66 lines. But 266-332 = 67 lines of the Wolfian printed vulgate. Therefore one of these 67 lines was presumably absent from Syr. Which one? Almost certainly 13. 316. In 1980 I argued, rather tentatively, that this line was probably a post-Aristarchean interpolation,<sup>13</sup> and now R. Janko seems to have no doubts about its spuriousness.<sup>14</sup> It is omitted by  $\mathfrak{P}^{10}$  (Pack<sup>2</sup> 899, saec. i p.C.),  $\mathfrak{P}^{36}$  (Pack<sup>2</sup> 906, saec. ii-iii p.C.),  $\mathfrak{P}^{60}$  (Pack<sup>2</sup> 870, saec. iii-iv p.C.),  $\mathfrak{P}^{481}$  (Pack<sup>2</sup> 789, saec. iv p.C.) and apparently also  $\mathfrak{P}^{47}$  (Pack<sup>2</sup> 903, saec. i a.C.).<sup>15</sup> It is also omitted by six of our seven earliest minuscules. (It is present in the late  $\mathfrak{P}^{435}$  [Pack<sup>2</sup> 904, saec. v-vi p.C.], Eustathius, and most of the later minuscules.)

Note also that there appears to be no space in this lacuna for another interpolation, the vocative 13. 266a, present only in the margin of Allen's D in a late hand and in the text of his very late 07 (saec. xv-xvi) and omitted by  $\mathfrak{P}^{47}$ ,  $\mathfrak{P}^{10}$ ,  $\mathfrak{P}^{60}$ ,  $\mathfrak{P}^{481}$  and  $\mathfrak{P}^{435}$  (for further details on these papyri see the previous paragraph).

(3) *Il.* 13. 399-464. One leaf is missing here, 33 × 2 = 66 lines, and this lacuna also = 66 lines of the Wolfian vulgate. This implies that Syr. in all probability *included* 13. 422, which Janko has recently suggested “may well be a concordance-interpolation from 8. 333” on the basis of its omission by a single MS., the tenth-century A.<sup>16</sup> This is not impossible, but the apparent presence of the line in Syr., together with its certain presence in  $\mathfrak{P}^{10}$  and  $\mathfrak{P}^{60}$  (details above), makes this hypothesis unlikely. One might wish to argue that Syr. could have *omitted* 422 and *included* the interpolation 463a/464a, found in a few MSS. of the 13th, 14th and 15th centuries, but this is highly unlikely, as this interpolation is omitted by  $\mathfrak{P}^{10}$ ,  $\mathfrak{P}^{60}$  (details above), P. Laur. IV. 130 (saec. iv-v p.C.) and P. Laur. IV. 129 (saec. vi-vii p.C.) and by all MSS. of the tenth, eleventh and twelfth centuries.

(4) *Il.* 13. 531-662. Two leaves are missing here: 66 × 2 = 132 lines. This is also the Wolfian total here. Therefore Syr. presumably *excluded* the two different lines 13. 566a (present in several

<sup>12</sup> Op. cit. (above, n. 2) pp. 16, 18.

<sup>13</sup> Op. cit. (above, n. 2) pp. 145-7.

<sup>14</sup> *The Iliad: A Commentary* Vol. IV (Cambridge 1992) ad loc.

<sup>15</sup> This last point - the line's apparent absence from the text of  $\mathfrak{P}^{47}$  - has not, as far as I know, been argued before. The editors of  $\mathfrak{P}^{47}$  (= BKT 5. 1 p. 5 Inv. Nr. 46) state, “Die Kol. hat 26 Zeilen. N 184-209. 210-235. 236-262 (255 fehlt). 263-288. 289-314. 317-341. 345-367 ... .” It is clear from this description that each of the first four columns has exactly 26 lines. The fifth column will also have exactly 26 lines if we suppose that 314 is the last line of the column (i.e. not just the last extant line). The short lacuna will then occur at the top of the sixth column, which will originally have contained 315-41 (if we assume that 341 was likewise the last line of the column), a passage of - again - the regular 26 lines *if line 316 was absent!* Then the seventh and last column will originally have contained the 26 lines 342-67. In other words the distribution of the lines among the columns, as reported by the editors, strongly suggests that 316, which falls within a short lacuna, was absent from the original text of the papyrus.

<sup>16</sup> Op. cit. (above, n. 14) ad loc.

minuscules) and 567a (present only in Allen's Bm4, saec. xv). Both lines are also omitted by  $\mathfrak{P}^{10}$ ,  $\mathfrak{P}^{60}$  and  $\mathfrak{P}^{481}$  (details above, lacuna (2)).

(5) *Il.* 13. 729-96. One leaf is missing here:  $33 \times 2 = 66$  lines. But  $729-96 = 68$  lines of the Wolfian printed vulgate. Therefore lines 731 and 749 were almost certainly both absent from Syr.

Since we already know that Aristarchus omitted 731, its absence from a large part of the post-Aristarchean tradition is only to be expected, and its absence from Syr. adds little of significance. For further discussion see the excellent note in Janko ad loc.<sup>17</sup>

More significant is the inferred absence of 749, ἀτύκτα δ' ἐξ ὀχέων σὺν τεύχεσιν ἄλτο χαμῶζε (said of Hector). This line is absent from A (saec. x) but present in D (of the same century). All MSS. of the eleventh century include it, but it is omitted by a substantial minority of the MSS. of the next two centuries. It seems to be present in all the MSS. of the 14th century, but is absent from a small minority of those of the 15th century. There is only one papyrus covering the passage,  $\mathfrak{P}^{60}$  (Pack<sup>2</sup> 870, saec. iii-iv p.C.), which omits the line. Given the relatively high degree of support for the line in the early mediaeval MSS. and the limited papyrus evidence against it, its inferred absence from Syr. constitutes significant additional external evidence against it. When we also bear in mind that there are no scholia on the line and that there are no homoiographa to provoke accidental omission, we have to conclude that the accumulated external evidence against it is very strong. Moreover, the external evidence is strongly supported by the internal evidence, as the line is incompatible with its context: Hector does not have his chariot with him here, as Homer has been at pains to point out in an elaborate and memorable episode (12. 50-87). In fact 13. 748-9 = 12. 80-81, so that 13. 749 can be seen as a typical concordance interpolation; and 12. 80-81 are the very lines which Homer has used to describe Hector's acceptance of Polydamas's advice to proceed on foot – would Homer have forgotten *this*? Viewed as a whole, then, the evidence is more than sufficient to condemn 13. 749 as a post-Aristarchean interpolation.

(6) *Il.* 14. 21-155. Two leaves are missing here:  $66 \times 2 = 132$  lines. But the passage covers 135 Wolfian lines. Therefore three lines will have been omitted – presumably (a) line 70, a post-Aristarchean interpolation omitted by  $\mathfrak{P}^{60}$ , both tenth-century MSS. and many others, and (b) two other lines, probably omitted by accident (e.g. maybe a couplet such as 35-6 or 36-7, homoiarchon 35 τῶ ῥα, 37 τῶ ῥ', or 41-2, homoioteleuton 40 and 42 Ἀχαίων). However, the arithmetic here is too uncertain to enable us to claim significant additional evidence against line 70.

(7) *Il.* 14. 420 - 15. 157. This lacuna comprises four leaves, but the arithmetic is a little more complicated than previously because one of the eight pages includes the end of Book 14 and the beginning of Book 15. I have started the lacuna with 14. 420, following the Wolfian vulgate, but it so happens that this line is weakly attested, being omitted by all three papyri which cover the passage,  $\mathfrak{P}^{10}$  (Pack<sup>2</sup> 899, saec. i p.C.),  $\mathfrak{P}^{60}$  (Pack<sup>2</sup> 870, saec. iii-iv p.C.) and  $\mathfrak{P}^1$ , the "Ambrosianus Pictus" (saec. iii-vi p.C.: dating disputed<sup>18</sup>), and also by A (saec. x) and eight other MSS. Further, this is the *only* weakly-attested line falling within this lacuna. In spite of the length of this lacuna, it is a remarkable fact that if we posit the absence of 14. 420 (and no other line) from the original text of Syr. and suppose that the first page of the lacuna started with line 421, each page will have its normal number of lines. Page 1 will have contained 14. 421-53 (33 lines), p. 2 454-86 (33 lines), p. 3 487-519 (33 lines). Page 4 will have started with the last three lines of Book 14 (520-22) followed by the usual five-line space to allow for the subscriptio (Ξ) at the end of the

<sup>17</sup> Op. cit. (above, n. 14).

<sup>18</sup> See esp. W.H. Willis, "A Parchment Palimpsest of Plato at Duke University and the Ilias Ambrosiana", *Akten des XIII. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses* (Munich 1974) pp. 461-7 with Tafeln 6, 7 and 8. Willis is inclined, very tentatively, to favour the earlier dating.

Book and the superscriptio (O) at the beginning of the next Book; then will have followed the first 25 lines of Book 15, and the total for the page will be the usual 28 lines for a page containing both a Book-ending and a Book-beginning (see above). Pages 5-8 will have contained 15. 26-157, a total of 132 lines (= 33 x 4). The next page (extant) does in fact start with 15. 158! So it does seem likely that Syr. omitted 14. 420. There are no scholia on this line, and there are no homoiographic temptations to omission. It is almost certainly a post-Aristarchean interpolation. For further discussion see Janko ad loc.

(8) *Il.* 15. 224-355. This lacuna comprises 132 lines of the Wolfian vulgate, none of which are weakly attested. This is the correct total for the two leaves which are missing here:  $66 \times 2 = 132$ . This confirms our impression of the general reliability of Syr.

(9) *Il.* 15. 422-90. This one-leaf lacuna ( $33 \times 2 = 66$  lines) covers 69 lines of the Wolfian vulgate. Presumably line 481, omitted by  $\mathfrak{P}^{60}$ ,  $\mathfrak{P}^{48}$  and the vast majority of our MSS., was absent, as well as two other lines. Which ones? There are a few other isolated omissions in this section in some of the other papyri and MSS., but these are either certainly or probably accidental rather than significant. It is possible that Syr. accidentally omitted the couplet 479-80 (homoioteleuton: ἔθηκεν ends both 478 and 480), as does Ludwig's *Ec*<sup>19</sup> (= Allen's *Bm*4, saec. xv); but of course this is entirely uncertain. The lack of an exact correspondence means that we cannot legitimately claim any significant additional evidence against 481 (cf. lacuna (6) above, a very similar case).

(10) *Il.* 15. 558 - 16. 198. Six leaves altogether are missing here. It will be best to start with the latter half of this lacuna, 16. 1-198. Since these 198 lines are a multiple of 66 -  $66 \times 3 = 198$  - and there are no weakly-attested Wolfian lines in this passage, it is highly likely that Book 16 started at the top of a new page and that lines 1-198 fully occupied the last three leaves of the lacuna. Then Syr. will have omitted the non-Wolfian line 16. 129a, present in 15 MSS. but omitted by all sources earlier than the twelfth century, including *P. Oxy.* 36. 2748 (saec. ii p.C.), *P. Oxy.* 47. 3323 (saec. ii-iii p.C.) and  $\mathfrak{P}^{60}$  (Pack<sup>2</sup> 870, saec. iii-iv p.C.).

As for the first half of the lacuna, *Il.* 15. 558-746 (= end), these lines will have occupied the first three leaves, with some extra space near the foot of the sixth page. Because the last line of Book 15 will in any case have been written well before the normal end of a page, we cannot prove that Syr. omitted the two weakly-attested lines 15. 562 and 578.

(11) *Il.* 16. 265-330. One leaf is missing here, and it covers exactly 66 lines of Wolf's edition. None of these lines are weakly attested. Therefore the non-Wolfian interpolation 16. 288a, present only in Allen's *P12* (saec. xiv) and absent from  $\mathfrak{P}^{60}$  (see (10) above) and  $\mathfrak{P}^{435}$  (Pack<sup>2</sup> 904, saec. v-vi p.C.), was presumably absent from Syr.

(12) *Il.* 16. 398-663. Four leaves are missing here. These must have contained  $66 \times 4 = 264$  lines. But the lacuna covers 266 lines of the Wolfian vulgate, of which therefore Syr. presumably omitted two. Which two? Almost certainly 16. 614-15. This couplet is omitted by all four papyri covering the passage - *P. Oxy.* 49. 3440 (saec. ii-iii p.C.),  $\mathfrak{P}^{486a}$  (= *P. Ant.* III. 158, saec. iii p.C.),  $\mathfrak{P}^{228}$  (Pack<sup>2</sup> 937, saec. iii-iv p.C.), *P. Berl. Inv.* 21195 (*Fest. Berl. Mus.* [1974] p. 387 No. 22, saec. iv-v p.C.). Janko exaggerates in claiming ad loc. that "this addition ... postdates Eustathius", at any rate if Allen is right in stating that the couplet is present in his *E4* (saec. xi), but it *is* omitted by all other MSS. earlier than the 13th century and is present in only a small minority of the later MSS. Moreover, the internal evidence against it is unusually strong, since the line merely repeats, extremely feebly, what has just been stated in 611-13. It is obviously a post-Aristarchean concordance interpolation based on the parallel passage in Book 13: 16. 610 = 13. 503, 16. 614-15 = 13. 504-5. The particularly inane tautology led even R. Lattimore, who did not omit or bracket any other Wolfian lines, to bracket these in his 1951 translation.

<sup>19</sup> W. Ludwig (ed.), *Homeri Ilias* (Leipzig 1902-7) ad loc.

(13) *Il.* 16. 732-97. This lacuna covers 66 lines of the Wolfian vulgate, none of which are weakly attested. This is the correct total for the one leaf which is missing here. This provides further confirmation of the general reliability of Syr.; cf. lacuna (8) above.

(14) *Il.* 16. 863 - 18. 92. This enormous lacuna comprises 13 leaves - obviously far too many for meaningful calculations to be made. If my calculations are correct (and they suppose that the two Book-ending-and-beginning pages contained the usual 28 lines each), then Syr. here contained eleven lines fewer than the Wolfian vulgate. Among these omissions were presumably the weakly-attested *Il.* 17. 219, 326, 455 and 585, but I do not claim that the arithmetic allows any significant case against them.

(15) *Il.* 18. 359-425. This one-leaf lacuna (66 lines) covers 67 lines of the Wolfian vulgate. So one of Wolf's lines was presumably absent – almost certainly 18. 381. I argued in 1980 that this line was probably a post-Aristarchean interpolation,<sup>20</sup> and I am now in a position to give a fuller account of the very considerable papyrus evidence against it. It is omitted by  $\mathfrak{P}^{11}$  (Pack<sup>2</sup> 953, saec. i-ii p.C.), P. Mich. Inv. 2 + 2755a + 3160<sup>21</sup> (saec. ii-iii p.C.) and P. Oxy. 52. 3663 (saec. iii p.C., published in 1984). It was probably also omitted by  $\mathfrak{P}^6$  (Pack<sup>2</sup> 952, saec. ii-iv p.C.)<sup>22</sup> and by the text used by the scholiast of P. Ryl. I. 25 (Pack<sup>2</sup> 1202, saec. ii p.C.), which comprises fairly detailed scholia minora on *Il.* 18. 373-86: although, in the vicinity of line 381, the scholia provide abundant glosses on the immediately preceding and following lines - two notes on 379, one on 380, two on 382, one on 383 – they contain no note on 381 itself, even though a note on at least ἀργυρόπεζα would be expected if the line were present: cf. the same scholiast's gloss on λιπαροκρήδεμνος in 382 and the glosses on ἀργυρόπεζα at *Il.* 1. 538 by Schol. D, Schol. A and Schol. bT: the D scholium is especially relevant since, as A.S. Hunt (the editor of P. Ryl. I) has pointed out, this papyrus “stands in close relationship [to] the so-called Scholia Didymi”. The line is also omitted by our earliest minuscule, A (saec. x; D is not extant at this point), and by a small but fairly weighty minority of the remaining MSS. (e.g. most of those of the twelfth century). The inferred omission of the line by Syr. provides a significant addition to the early evidence against it.

(16) *Il.* 18. 493 - 19. 135. Four leaves are missing here. In this section there are two lines – one Wolfian, the other non-Wolfian – which we might expect Syr. to have omitted. The Wolfian line is *Il.* 18. 604/5 μετὰ δέ σφιν ἐμέλλετο θεῖος ἀοιδὸς | φορμίζων, which is absent from the entire direct tradition (including six papyri) and is known only from a discussion in Athenaeus 181 C-D, on the basis of which Wolf inserted it into his text.<sup>23</sup> The other line is *Il.* 19. 39a, added by a small minority of the mediaeval MSS. but absent from the text of all those earlier than the 13th century; as far as I know, there are no extant papyri covering this part of the text. Now it is a fact of some interest and significance that the spacing in the lacuna is exactly right for a text which omits these two lines. The first three pages of the lacuna will have contained 33 lines each: p. 1, *Il.* 18. 493-525; p. 2, 526-58; p. 3, 559-91. Page 4 will have contained the last 25 lines of Book 18 (i.e. 592-617 without Wolf's additional line, 604/5), then a five-line space, then the first three lines

<sup>20</sup> Op. cit. (above, n. 2) pp. 137-40, 153-5. For a different view see M.W. Edwards, *The Iliad: A Commentary* Vol. V (Cambridge 1991) ad loc.

<sup>21</sup> N.E. Priest (ed.), *Homeric Papyri in the Michigan Collection* (Diss. Michigan, Ann Arbor 1975) No. 31 (pp. 123-64).

<sup>22</sup> See op. cit. (above, n. 2) p. 137 with p. 181 notes 31 and 32.

<sup>23</sup> See op. cit. (above, n. 2) pp. 160-65. One of the five papyri I listed there,  $\mathfrak{P}^{108}$  Allen (= 239 Collart, Pack<sup>2</sup> 958, saec. ii-iii p.C.), has now been re-edited by Priest (loc. cit. above, n. 21) as part of her Pap. 31; the *editio princeps* of a sixth papyrus, P. Macquarie Inv. 100 verso (saec. ii p.C.), is still forthcoming - I am very grateful to Dr. S.R. Pickering for allowing me to see a photograph of the papyrus and the draft of his publication and to Macquarie University in Sydney for permitting me to mention the papyrus here. See also Edwards (above, n. 20) ad loc.; H. van Thiel, *Iliaden und Ilias* (Basle 1982) p. 472.

of Book 19 (= the usual 28-line Book-ending-and-beginning page).<sup>24</sup> The next two leaves will have contained  $66 \times 2 = 132$  lines, viz. 19. 4-135 (without the plus-verse 19. 39a). As the first line of the next extant leaf is in fact 19. 136, the natural implication is that Syr. omitted both these additional lines.<sup>25</sup>

(17) *Il.* 19. 269-334. There are no weakly-attested lines within this single-leaf lacuna, which appropriately covers exactly 66 lines of the Wolfian vulgate, thereby providing further evidence of the general reliability of Syr. (cf. lacunae (8) and (13) above).

(18) *Il.* 20. 173-305. Two leaves are missing here, therefore  $66 \times 2 = 132$  lines. But the lacuna covers 133 lines of the Wolfian vulgate, and therefore presumably omitted one Wolfian line of unknown identity and also the non-Wolfian *Il.* 20. 223a/224a found in a few MSS., though because of the lack of an exact correspondence the evidence against the latter in Syr. is negligible. It is scarcely worth speculating *which* Wolfian line Syr. omitted - maybe 20. 225, accidentally omitted by two of Ludwich's MSS. (homoiarchon 225 and 226 αὶ δ'), maybe 273 (homoioteleuton 272 and 273 ἔρχοις), maybe 287, omitted by A (saec. x) and Allen's V1 (saec. xiii) and just possibly a concordance interpolation (cf. *Il.* 5. 302-4, and note that there is no scholium on the line), though the sense is assisted by its presence and the omission is probably accidental (homoiomeson?) - unfortunately there are still no papyri covering this line.

(19) *Il.* 21. 398-464. This one-leaf lacuna covers 67 lines of the Wolfian vulgate. Therefore one Wolfian line was presumably omitted by Syr. - almost certainly *Il.* 21. 434, which is omitted by both our tenth-century MSS. (A and D), four of our five eleventh-century MSS., over half our twelfth-century MSS. (if we accept some recent redatings), a third of our 13th-century MSS. and a substantial minority of the later MSS. There is no scholium on the line. All this constitutes a typical pattern for a post-Aristarchean interpolation. There are no papyri covering this passage, so the inferred absence of the line from Syr. is especially valuable as early evidence against its authenticity.

(20) *Il.* 22. 114-80. This is another one-leaf lacuna covering 67 lines of the Wolfian vulgate, so once again one of these lines was presumably absent from Syr. - almost certainly line 121, which is absent from both our tenth-century MSS. (A and D), two of our twelfth-century MSS. and ten of the later MSS. There is no scholium on the line, but it was read by Eustathius.<sup>26</sup> According to the editors of P. Oxy. 3. 558 (=  $\mathfrak{P}^{27}$ , Pack<sup>2</sup> 989, saec. ii-iii p.C.), "121 was apparently omitted." However, it is present in the late  $\mathfrak{P}^{107}$  Allen (= 254 Collart, Pack<sup>2</sup> 988, saec. v-vi p.C.), in all five eleventh-century MSS. and the vast majority of the later MSS. As the two extant papyri are divided in their allegiance the additional evidence against the line from Syr. is especially valuable. There is no homoiographic temptation to omission, and the external evidence, when weighed rather than merely counted, is sufficient to brand the line as a post-Aristarchean interpolation, albeit an early and particularly successful one. Furthermore, the external evidence is strongly supported by the internal evidence. After line 118, line 121 is embarrassingly tautologous. It is a particularly inept concordance interpolation: 120, cf. 18. 511; 121 = 18. 512.

<sup>24</sup> For this layout cf. esp. Cureton's p. 57, which contains the last 24 lines of Book 19, then a five-line space, then the first four lines of Book 20.

<sup>25</sup> Syr. here also testifies against the numerous plus-verses found in  $\mathfrak{P}^{51}$  (Pack<sup>2</sup> 962); though slightly post-Aristarchean in date (saec. i a.C.) this papyrus is a survival of the pre-Aristarchean or "eccentric" type of papyrus text. See further op. cit. (above, n. 2) pp. 160-61.

<sup>26</sup> The statement by Allen (above, n. 6) ad loc. that Eustathius omits the line is an error. The line was evidently in the text used by Eustathius: see 1261. 53-4. Ludwich (above, n. 19) says correctly that Eustathius reads the line.

(21) *Il.* 22. 379 - 23. 56. Three leaves are missing here. None of the lines in this lacuna are weakly attested, and once again the reliability of Syr. is shown by the fact that the spacing is exactly right for a lacuna containing all these Wolfian lines. The first four pages ( $33 \times 4 = 132$ ) will have contained the 132 lines 22. 379-510. Page 5 will have contained the last five lines of Book 22 (511-15), then the usual five-line space, then the first 23 lines of Book 23. Page 6 will have contained the next 33 lines of Book 23, lines 24-56. The next extant leaf does indeed start with 23. 57.

(22) *Il.* 23. 324-456. Two leaves are missing here. They cover 133 Wolfian lines, one more than we should expect, given that none are weakly attested. So one line was presumably omitted by accident. But the main point to be made here is that Syr. provides no support for the ill-conceived notion of Bolling that lines 359-61 are probably a post-Aristarchean interpolation,<sup>27</sup> inasmuch as Syr. omits only one Wolfian line here, not three. The Aristarchean status of 359-61 is assured by the following considerations:- (a) A reading of Aristarchus in line 361 is cited by Schol. A ad loc. (Bolling's inclination to disbelieve the scholium is special pleading). (b) Line 361 is well attested for the early post-Aristarchean period, being discussed by both Ptolemy of Ascalon and Herodian (see Schol. A ad loc.). (c) 359-61 are present in all our MSS., in Eustathius, in  $\mathfrak{P}^{107}$  Allen (above, lacuna (20)) and now also in a tiny fragment of P. Berl. Inv. 11913 (c. saec. vi p.C.).<sup>28</sup> (d) The lines are original composition, not the tired repetition of lines and half-lines out of which post-Aristarchean interpolations are almost always composed. (e)  $\mathfrak{P}^{13}$  (Pack<sup>2</sup> 998, saec. i a.C.) is not extant at this point, and the fact that 757abc (= 359-61) are added in the top margin of this papyrus need not mean, as Bolling supposes, that the same three lines were omitted after 358 - after all, since 757 = 358 it would be most natural simply to explain 757abc as a typical concordance interpolation. (f) Bolling's arguments on the basis of the stichometry are unconvincing. His assumption that the stichometric numbers are "taken over from the text copied"<sup>29</sup> is unargued and not particularly likely, and if we suppose instead that the numbers are based on the text of the apograph itself before correction we can note that the total of 890 lines for Book 23 provided by the scribe at the end of the Book (vs. the Wolfian 897) would be correct for this text if, to the documented omissions of the six lines 39, 565, 626, 804, 864 and 892 in the extant parts of the papyrus, we were to add the omission of *one* other line within a lacuna, not the three lines required by Bolling's theory. Further, the stichometric mark opposite line 502 (for 500) is only one line out given the actual omission of line 39 by the first hand in the extant section; and another isolated one-line accidental omission (like that of 39 and 892) in the huge lacuna covering 23. 80-401 would render the stichometric mark exactly right. Thus it is again the omission of *one* line, rather than Bolling's posited three (359-61), which is required. In any case, stichometry is often inexact,<sup>30</sup> and a certain amount of confusion within this very papyrus can be demonstrated.<sup>31</sup> So now (g) the the inferred presence of 23. 359-61 in Syr. can be added to the already overwhelming evidence for the presence of these lines in the Aristarchean text.

(23) *Il.* 23. 590-655. This one-leaf lacuna covers 66 lines of the Wolfian vulgate. Therefore Syr. presumably *contained* line 626. This is not exactly welcome news if one believes it highly

<sup>27</sup> *AJPh* 37 (1916) pp. 18, 21; op. cit. (above, n. 7) p. 13 n. 1, p. 22; and he omits the passage from his text in *Ilias Atheniensium* (Lancaster, Pa., 1950).

<sup>28</sup> H. Maehler, W. Müller and G. Poethke, *APF* 24-25 (1976) p. 38. This is a fragment of a papyrus codex. Only one line is at all legible on the → side, *Il.* 23. 359, but that this is indeed 359 and not the identical 757a (see below, Section (e) in my text) is proved by the presence of 23. 324-6 on the ↓ side.

<sup>29</sup> *AJPh* 37 (1916) p. 21.

<sup>30</sup> See *ZPE* 81 (1990) p. 5.

<sup>31</sup> See F.G. Kenyon in *P.Lond.* I pp. 100-101.

likely (as I do) that this line was absent from Aristarchus's text: the Aristarchean A scholium (Aristonicus) on 627, (ἡ διπλῆ,) ὅτι ἀπὸ τοῦ γάρ ἤρκεται, τὸ αἰτιατικὸν [i.e. the causal particle] προτάξας, virtually demands a text without 626, since if 626 were present in Aristarchus's text 627 would naturally refer back to it, and to interpret the γάρ of 627 as an anticipatory "since" referring *forward* to the εἴθ' ὡς ἠβώοιμι clause of 629 ff. would be extraordinarily perverse.<sup>32</sup> Moreover, 626 is omitted by  $\mathfrak{P}^{13}$  (Pack<sup>2</sup> 998, saec. i a.C.) and Allen's V1 (saec. xiii); and the repeated mid-line vocatives τέκος (626) and φίλος (627) are awkward. However, it is not particularly surprising to find Syr. containing the line, since this must be a very early post-Aristarchean interpolation, having spread to almost the entire manuscript tradition (including P. Ant. III. 165, saec. iv p.C.) and even receiving an exegetical b-scholium. The presence of the line in Syr. is paralleled by the presence of a few other very early post-Aristarchean interpolations in the extant parts of Syr. (see above).

There is one other post-Aristarchean interpolation falling within this lacuna, the non-Wolfian 23. 628a, but as this is found only in one rather late MS., Ludwig's Ub = Allen's W3 (saec. xiii-xiv),<sup>33</sup> no one would want to argue that Syr. contained it and omitted 626.

(24) *Il.* 23. 789-855. This one-leaf lacuna covers 67 lines of the Wolfian vulgate. Therefore one line will have been absent from Syr. – presumably 804, which is also omitted by  $\mathfrak{P}^{13}$  (Pack<sup>2</sup> 998, saec. i a.C.), by both our tenth-century MSS. (A and D) and by a minority of the later MSS., and was clearly unknown to Nicanor. Here the external evidence is such as would normally point to post-Aristarchean interpolation, but for once the usual elegant correlation between external and internal evidence is lacking, since 804 is essential to the sense. Hence my suggestion<sup>34</sup> that the omission of the line from the extant witnesses to the early post-Aristarchean tradition must be due to a very rare case of accidental omission from a very early and very influential transcript of Aristarchus's edition *before* this edition became the basis for the booksellers' *numerus versuum*.

(25) *Il.* 24. 21-284. This lacuna covers 264 Wolfian lines, none of which are weakly attested. This is the correct total for the four leaves which are missing here: 66 x 4 = 264. This provides further confirmation of the general reliability of Syr.

We are now in a position to summarize our findings.

(i) Five of the lacunae, Nos. (8), (13), (17), (21) and (25), containing a total of eleven leaves and 721 lines, cover passages which do not include any weakly-attested Wolfian lines and have not been augmented by any non-Wolfian plus-verses in part of the post-Aristarchean tradition. A priori we might have expected Syr. to have contained all these lines, and as far as our evidence goes it did, without omitting any lines and without adding any. This perhaps unexciting result nevertheless provides valuable confirmation of our earlier conclusion, on the basis of the extant pages, that Syr. is generally reliable in its *numerus versuum*, and will strengthen the force of our conclusions in (ii) and (iii) below.

(ii) In three lacunae, Nos. (1), (3) and (22), the evidence strongly suggests that Syr. *contained* three passages which have either been condemned as, or fallen under suspicion of being, post-Aristarchean interpolations, viz. *Il.* 13. 46, 13. 422 and 23. 359-61. As I believe on other

<sup>32</sup> Thus this example is different from other passages also commented on by Aristarchus where γάρ in the second line of a speech *cannot* logically refer back to the first line, e.g. *Il.* 7. 328, or at any rate is *more naturally* taken as anticipatory, e.g. *Il.* 17. 221. This point has been missed by H.-L. Barth, *Die Fragmente aus den Schriften des Grammatikers Kallistratos zu Homers Ilias und Odyssee* (Diss. Bonn 1984) p. 258. Cf. op. cit. (above, n. 2) pp. 8-9 and M. Huys, *Ancient Society* (Louvain) 19 (1988) pp. 66-7.

<sup>33</sup> Opp. cit. (above, notes 19 and 6) ad loc. Presumably Ludwig's version of the wording of the extra line is right and Allen's wrong.

<sup>34</sup> Op. cit. (above, n. 2) pp. 128-33, 178.

grounds that these lines are, or are likely to be, genuine, or at any rate Aristarchean, I regard the testimony of Syr. in their favour as welcome.

(iii) In eleven lacunae, Nos. (2), (4), (5), (7), (10), (11), (12), (15), (16), (19) and (20), the evidence points to the probable *absence* from the text of Syr. of ten Wolfian lines (one couplet and eight single lines) and six non-Wolfian lines which I believe, primarily on other grounds, are certainly or probably non-Aristarchean and spurious. The ten Wolfian lines are *Il.* 13. 316, 731, 749, 14. 420, 16. 614-15, 18. 381, 604/5, 21. 434, 22. 121. The six non-Wolfian lines are *Il.* 13. 266a, 566a, 567a, 16. 129a, 288a, 19. 39a. Once again, I regard the testimony of Syr. against these lines as welcome. Especially welcome is its testimony against 21. 434, which occurs in a part of the text not covered by any extant papyri, and against 13. 749 and 22. 121, each omitted by only one papyrus.

(iv) One case, in lacuna (24), is *sui generis* – the apparent omission by Syr. of a genuine line, *Il.* 23. 804, also omitted by many other early witnesses, evidently as a result of an exceptionally influential accidental omission at the very start of the post-Aristarchean transmission.

(v) In lacuna (23) we have noted the presence of *Il.* 23. 626, almost certainly a post-Aristarchean interpolation; but as this is evidently a *very early* post-Aristarchean interpolation its presence in Syr. is hardly surprising. Moreover, this turns out to be the *only* place in any of the lacunae where we have had reason to suppose that Syr. contained a post-Aristarchean interpolation.

(vi) Finally, there are four lacunae - Nos. (6), (9), (14) and (18) - where we might have hoped to find evidence against weakly-attested lines, and where indeed it seems more likely than not that the text did lack these lines, but, because the text here *also* lacked *other* lines, no exact arithmetical correspondence with the presumed Aristarchean text can be demonstrated and therefore the evidence cannot be pressed. Certainly most, and quite likely all, of these other lines were omitted through meaningless copyist's slips like the few which we have observed in the extant pages of Syr. In the enormous lacuna (14), comprising 13 leaves, the lack of an exact correspondence is not in the least surprising. On the contrary, it is to Syr.'s credit that only in four of the 25 lacunae have we had to posit accidental omissions.

Also to be noted is that nowhere in the lacunae have we had to posit the presence of any non-Wolfian plus-verses. On the contrary, wherever we were aware of the presence of such a plus-verse in part of the post-Aristarchean tradition, the evidence tended to support the *absence* of the line from the lacuna. Here we may add that *all* the relevant *pre*-Aristarchean non-Wolfian plus-verses, whether known from Ptolemaic papyri, the scholia or quotations, were (as far as we can tell) also absent from the lacunae, just as they are from the extant pages of Syr. To cite just one example, there is no space in lacuna (3) for the three lines *Il.* 13. 433abc which Schol. T says τινὲς ... ὑποτάσσουσι.<sup>35</sup>

To summarize very briefly and conclude: the most important results of our investigation are that Syr., within its lacunae, very probably (a) *included* three passages (= five lines *in toto*) whose authenticity has been doubted or denied on very slender grounds, and thereby testifies in their favour (see (ii) above), and (b) *omitted* 16 lines already shown by other evidence to be probable or certain interpolations, thereby increasing the evidence against them, sometimes very significantly (see (iii) above).<sup>36</sup>

University of Queensland

Michael J. Apthorp

<sup>35</sup> For an example from the Ptolemaic papyri see above, n. 25.

<sup>36</sup> I should like to thank my former Research Assistant, Mrs. Elizabeth Boldy, who provided valuable help with some of the early groundwork for this article.