

MICHAEL J. APTHORP

ILIAD 18. 200-201: GENUINE OR INTERPOLATED?

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 111 (1996) 141–148

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

ILIAD 18. 200-201: GENUINE OR INTERPOLATED?

I Introduction

Scholarship over the past 80 years has somehow conspired to conceal and understate the true extent of the papyrus and manuscript evidence against the authenticity of *Il.* 18. 200-201. T.W. Allen, in his *editio maior* of 1931, suppressed much of the manuscript evidence against 18. 201 and part of the papyrus evidence against the whole couplet; an important discovery about the exemplar of the MS. A made by J. van Leeuwen in 1904 has been unjustly ignored both by Allen and by other Homerists; the fact that P. Oxy. 52. 3663 (published in 1984) testifies against the couplet has not been pointed out by the editor of the papyrus or by anyone else; and the possible relevance of P. Ant. III. 165 (published in 1967) needs further exploration. But even when all the external evidence has been assembled, the question of its interpretation remains to be answered. Both 18. 199 and 201 end with the word πολέμοιο. So is the omission of 200-201 in some of our sources a mere mechanical error stemming from this strong homoioteleuton? Or is it a sign of interpolation? Is there any way we can tell? And what of the internal evidence: does it speak in favour of authenticity or against it? How well do the lines suit their context? We shall start, ὕστερον πρότερον Ὀμηρικῶς, with the internal evidence, and then proceed to assemble the external evidence and consider how to interpret it. There is no scholarly consensus on these matters; a detailed examination of the whole question is long overdue, and will, I believe, reward us with an answer which, while falling short of absolute certainty, will nevertheless carry a very high degree of probability.

II The internal evidence

In *Iliad* 11 Hector is on the rampage, and in spite of some temporary setbacks he and the Trojans succeed in killing or wounding many Achaeans. When Achilles, standing on the stern of his ship, spots Nestor's chariot carrying a wounded man out of the battle he asks Patroclus to go and check whether it really is Machaon, as Achilles suspects (598-615). Nestor replies to Patroclus with bitter irony: why does Achilles exhibit this sudden surge of sympathy for the wounded Achaeans? The best of the Achaeans - including Diomedes, Odysseus, Agamemnon and Machaon - are lying wounded by the ships, but in reality Achilles couldn't care less (655-68): Δαναῶν οὐ κήδεταί οὐδ' ἐλεαίρει (665). This reference to Achilles's lack of genuine pity takes up the reproach of Ajax in Book 9 that Achilles is utterly without pity (9. 632 νηλής, and note the very strong language of 628-42 as a whole). However (Nestor continues), Patroclus may still be able to persuade Achilles: ἀγαθὴ δὲ παραίφασις ἐστὶν ἐταίρου (11. 790-92). But if Achilles himself is inhibited from returning to battle by some prophecy, then (Nestor suggests) let him implement Plan B:

ἀλλὰ σέ περ προέτω, ἅμα δ' ἄλλος λαὸς ἐπέσθω	796
Μυρμιδόνων, αἴ κέν τι φῶς Δαναοῖσι γένηαι·	
καί τοι τεύχεα καλὰ δότω πολεμόνδε φέρεσθαι,	
αἴ κέ σε τῷ ἴσκοντες ἀπόσχωνται πολέμοιο	
Τρῶες, ἀναπνεύσωσι δ' ἀρήιοι υἴες Ἀχαιῶν	800
τειρόμενοι· ὀλίγη δέ τ' ἀνάπνευσις πολέμοιο.	

At the beginning of Book 16 Patroclus arrives at Achilles's hut in tears. Achilles pities him (5 ὄκτιρε), but exhibits little sympathy for the Achaeans in general, who he says are dying ὑπερβασίης ἔνεκα σφῆς (18). Patroclus proceeds to paint a pathetic picture of their plight (22-9) and to reproach Achilles for his lack of pity (33 νηλεές): he is so hard-hearted (ἀπηνής) as to be sub-human and even

inanimate: his parents are not Peleus and Thetis but γλαυκὴ ... θάλασσα | πέτραι τ' ἠλίβατοι (33-5). This language is hardly less harshly reproachful than that of Ajax in Book 9, and it also echoes that of Nestor in Book 11: all three refer to Achilles's lack of pity (9. 632 νηλής, 11. 665 οὐδ' ἐλεαίρει, 16. 33 νηλεές). Then, taking up Nestor's proposal, Patroclus continues (16. 38-43):

ἀλλ' ἐμέ περ πρόες ὦχ', ἅμα δ' ἄλλον λαὸν ὄπασσον
 Μυρμιδόνων, ἣν πού τι φόως Δαναοῖσι γένωμαι.
 δὸς δέ μοι ὄμοιιν τὰ σὰ τεύχεα θωρηχθῆναι, 40
 αἶ κέ με σοὶ ἴσκοντες ἀπόσχωνται πολέμοιο
 Τρῶες, ἀναπνεύσωσι δ' ἀρήιοι υἷες Ἀχαιῶν
 τειρόμενοι· ὀλίγη δέ τ' ἀνάπνευσις πολέμοιο.

Of course 16. 38-41 almost = 11. 796-9 (quoted above), and 16. 42-3 = 11. 800-801 exactly. The last two lines of each passage are highly relevant to the dominant theme of pity vs. pitilessness: the pity for their hard-pressed (τειρόμενοι) fellow-Achaeans which motivates both Nestor and Patroclus stands in contrast to the pitilessness of Achilles - though Patroclus, by exhibiting his own empathy with his suffering compatriots, is hoping to enlarge the tiny vestige of concern which Achilles's interest in the wounded Machaon has betrayed.

In the modern printed vulgate of the *Iliad* the last two lines of the above two passages occur a third time, as *Il.* 18. 200-201. By now Patroclus is dead and Achilles has accepted the inevitability of his own imminent end. His sole passion now is to avenge his dear friend's death by killing Hector (18. 90-93, 98-106, 114-15) and as many other Trojans as possible (note the brutal focus on the surviving *womenfolk* who will mourn his victims' deaths, 122-5). He desires to win glory, yes (121 κλέος ἐσθλὸν ἀροίμην), but he thinks of himself as achieving this glory not so much by helping his friends as by harming his enemies: even if the harming of his enemies *implies* the helping of his friends, it is the harming, not the helping, with which he is now obsessed. The only exception is the already dead Patroclus, whom he can still help (albeit in a very limited sense) by rescuing his body from the Trojans, as Iris urges him to do, focussing (good psychology, this) on the pre-eminent role of Hector in the attempt to drag the corpse away and the indignities he allegedly desires to heap on it (166-80). Achilles protests that he has no armour in which to rejoin the fight (187-95), to which Iris replies (197-201):

εἶ νυ καὶ ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν ὅ τοι κλυτὰ τεύχε' ἔχονται· 197
 ἀλλ' αὐτως ἐπὶ τάφρον ἰὼν Τρῶεσσι φάνηθι,
 αἶ κέ σ' ὑποδείσαντες ἀπόσχωνται πολέμοιο
 [Τρῶες, ἀναπνεύσωσι δ' ἀρήιοι υἷες Ἀχαιῶν 200
 τειρόμενοι· ὀλίγη δέ τ' ἀνάπνευσις πολέμοιο.]

Of course 200-201 = 11. 800-801 and 18. 42-3. However, while this couplet was eminently suited to its earlier function, in the mouths of Nestor and Patroclus, of evoking pity for the hard-pressed Achaeans, it is totally irrelevant here: Iris's very limited function is to urge Achilles to rescue the body of Patroclus in this dire emergency (170-80); and as Leaf well puts it, "Achilles is not to be roused into action by any sympathy for the weariness of the Greeks, but only by the desire to save his friend's body"¹ – a judgment supported by our examination above of Achilles's present state of mind. K.W. Kayser was fully justified in concluding, 140 years ago, "so sind die beiden verse 200 und 201 nicht nur überflüssig, sondern sogar störend, weil sie weder der lage des helden entsprechen, noch den rücksichten, mit

¹ W. Leaf (ed.), *The Iliad* (2nd edn. London 1900-02) ad loc. See also K.W. Kayser, *Philologus* 10 (1855) pp. 148-9; K.F. Ameis and C. Hentze (edd.), *Homers Ilias* Vol. II. 2 (4th rev. edn. Leipzig 1908) ad loc. It is worth noting that the two lines were suspected or rejected (Heyne, Payne Knight) even before any manuscript evidence against the couplet as a whole (as opposed to line 201 alone) was known; but Kayser's assessment of the internal evidence was made against the background of the then newly-published Syriac Palimpsest, which omits both lines.

welchen der dichter die äusserungen der Iris scharf bemessen hat.”² Those who defend the lines can only do so by ignoring their real difficulties. Thus A. Pierron in his edition (Paris 1869) ad loc. says only that an ancient would not have taken offence at the pointless repetition of which Payne Knight complained, and Edwards merely asserts, “There is no reason to omit 200-1 here; Iris’ speech would be unusually brief without them The repetition might well be thought significant, as Akhilleus is at last about to obey the injunction.”³ As for the brevity of Iris’s speech, this argument cannot be taken seriously when she has just delivered another three-line speech (184-6) in reply to Achilles’s one-liner (182).

But - one might object - what about *Il.* 18. 128-9, where Thetis, in response to Achilles’s ἀντίκα τεθναίνην speech, says ναὶ δὴ ταῦτά γε, τέκνον, ἐτήτυμον· οὐ κακόν ἐστι | *τειρομένοις* ἐτάροισιν ἀμυνέμεν αἰπὸν ὄλεθρον? Does this not lend some support to the argument for the authenticity of the couplet 200-201, with its οἴεσ Ἀχαιῶν | *τειρόμενοι*? Answer: no. The lines of Thetis just quoted are almost as heavily loaded with dramatic irony as her more famous 18. 72-7: “My child, why are you weeping? Zeus has fully answered your prayer that all the Achaeans should be driven back to their ships through lack of you and suffer terribly.” Now “How true! It is no bad thing to ward off death from your hard-pressed comrades” – which can only rub salt into Achilles’s wounds. Thetis means “It is a good idea to return to battle”, but her words echo Achilles’s own οὐκ ἄρ’ ἔμελλον ἐταίρω | κτεινομένῳ ἐπαμύναι (98-9, cf. 102-3) and can only succeed in reminding him of his *failure* to “ward off death from his hard-pressed companions”, above all Patroclus. Thetis’s call to him to defend his friends’ lives can surely only elicit in Achilles’s mind an agonized “Too late!”. And now his agony of regret for what might have been, if only he had been there, translates (as we have seen above) not into a calm, dutiful and quietly repentant “Well, from now on I suppose I had better start helping my friends after all”, as Thetis would have it, but rather into a passionate lust for revenge. At 18. 35-77 the dramatic irony arose because Thetis did not *know* what had happened; now she knows, but we see that she does not fully *understand*. In much the same vein is the passage *Il.* 1. 415-16, where Thetis seems to see the ideal life for Achilles at Troy as one of cheerful inactivity by the ships: αἶθ’ ὄφελος παρὰ νηυσὶν ἀδάκρυτος καὶ ἀπήμων | ἦσθαι, ἐπεὶ νύ τοι αἶσα μίνυθ’ ἀπερ, οὐ τι μάλα δήν.⁴ This all adds up to fine poetry – a consistent characterization of Thetis and a striking and effective development of dramatic irony. Thetis is a devoted mother; she comes when Achilles calls; she wants to help him; but in her constant self-absorbed grief, occasioned as much by her forced marriage to a mere mortal as by the fate of her son, she fails to understand him fully. So 18. 128-9 cannot be taken at face value: the lines certainly do not imply that Achilles was really, or was likely to be, motivated at this stage by an altruistic desire to make life easier and safer for his exhausted fellow-Achaeans. Moreover, the profundity of 128-9 is well suited to the crisis caused by Achilles’s discovery of Patroclus’s death and the deep and sombre introspection which this provokes, whereas in the later scene – the visit of Iris to Achilles (166-202) – the focus is much more limited and the plot more mechanical: everything revolves around the urgent attempt to procure Achilles’s immediate intervention to help save Patroclus’s corpse.

Next, a minor but not totally negligible point: in the first two occurrences of the repeated couplet in question the word Τρῶες (11. 800, 16. 42) is absolutely essential to the sense, but at 18. 200 it is otiose

² Kayser (above, n. 1) p. 149.

³ M.W. Edwards, *The Iliad: A Commentary* Vol. V (Cambridge 1991) ad loc. The lines are printed, without brackets and without comment, by M.M. Willcock (ed.), *The Iliad of Homer Books XIII-XXIV* (London 1984). They are also treated unquestioningly as part of the genuine text by W.T. MacCary, *Childlike Achilles* (New York 1982) p. 220, and by I.J.F. de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad* (Amsterdam 1987) p. 283 n. 84. H. van Thiel, *Iliaden und Ilias* (Basle 1982) p. 454, finds the content of the lines objectionable on the same grounds as Leaf but attributes them *not* to an interpolator (who would be Q in his sigla) but to R, the Redaktor (“d.h. der Verfasser unserer Ilias” - p. 29).

⁴ G.S. Kirk may well be right in seeing some confusion in Thetis’s thinking here (*The Iliad: A Commentary* Vol. I [Cambridge 1985] ad loc.), but the irony in what she actually says was presumably intended by Homer and not lost on his audience.

and awkward, since here the Trojans have already been named (198 Τρώεσσι). Such redundancy is a generic characteristic of post-Aristarchean interpolations: cf. e.g. *Il.* 16. 614-15, which merely repeat what has already been said in 611-13; *Il.* 22. 121, which merely repeats the content of 118; *Od.* 2. 429, which awkwardly anticipates 434.⁵

Finally, there is the obvious but important point that *Il.* 18. 200-201 can easily be seen as a typical concordance interpolation: 18. 199 resembles 11. 799 and 16. 41, especially in its ending (the features common to all three lines are αἴ κέ ... -ντες ἀπόσχονται πολέμοιο), and the temptation to add one or both of the follow-up lines from the earlier contexts would have been strong.

III The external evidence

(i) Sources which omit both lines (18. 200-201)

Edwards avers that “the omission [of 200-201] in a papyrus and a few MSS may be due to homoeoteleuton”,⁶ and he is not the only one to hold such an opinion. At first glance this hypothesis may seem an attractive one, but the further and deeper we look the less plausible it will become.

But to start with the superficially attractive side, let us turn to the parallel passages in Books 11 and 16 quoted above. The homoioteleuton πολέμοιο of course occurs there too: does it lead any MSS. to omit 11. 800-801 or 16. 42-3? Yes: *Il.* 11. 800-801 are omitted by two closely-related 15th-century MSS., Paris gr. 2766 (= Leaf’s P = Ludwich’s Yb = Allen’s P11) and Vindobon. phil. 5 (= Leaf’s L = Ludwich’s Hb = Allen’s V11),⁷ while 16. 42-3 are omitted by several MSS., one saec. xv (Mus. Brit. Harl. 1771, = Leaf’s J = Ludwich’s Ec = Allen’s Bm4) and none (as far as we know) earlier than saec. xiii;⁸ further, Pap. 60 (Pack² 870, = “P. Morgan”, saec. iii-iv p.C.) has the two lines in the order 41, 44, 42, 43, 45, and this shows that 42-3 were once omitted and have re-entered the text in the wrong place via a marginal correction. No one would dispute that *these* are accidental omissions stemming from the homoioteleuton πολέμοιο. While bearing these facts in mind (we shall return to them later), let us proceed to list the MSS. and papyri which omit *Il.* 18. 200-201 (i.e. *both* lines). Or rather, let us start with an impartial investigation of *all* our sources earlier than the tenth century which cover this passage or may otherwise shed some light on it. We shall consider these sources (mostly papyri) in approximate chronological order.

(1) Pap. 11 (Pack² 953, saec. i-ii p.C.). This papyrus omits the lines. Moreover, the lines have *not* been added in the margin, even though all the obviously accidental omissions have been inserted in this way (18. 132, 141-2, 360, 459, 508, 577, 609).⁹ This point needs stressing in the light of the erroneous statement sometimes made that “200-201 ... are added ... by a second hand”.¹⁰

⁵ See *ZPE* 110 (1996) pp.109. 111; *ZPE* 82 (1990) pp.13-15.

⁶ Op. cit. (above, n. 3) ad loc.

⁷ Leaf (above, n. 1) Vol. I pp. xxviii-xxix and Vol. II ad loc.; W. Ludwich (ed.), *Homeri Ilias* (Leipzig 1902-7) Vol. I p. XI and Vol. II ad loc.; T.W. Allen (ed.), *Homeri Ilias* (Oxford 1931) Vol. I pp. 35, 53, 122. The dates of saec. xiii-xiv given by Ludwich and saec. xiv given by Allen for Paris gr. 2766 are both wrong; the 15th-century date, based primarily on the watermarks, was already known to Leaf, but see further I. Vassis, *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der sogenannten Psellos-Paraphrase der Ilias* (Hamburg 1991) p. 46.

⁸ Unfortunately Ludwich’s “om. ... Yp” is meaningless, as there is no Yp among his sigla.

⁹ See E.M. Thompson and G.F. Warner, *Catalogue of Ancient Manuscripts in the British Museum, Part 1: Greek* (London 1881) pp. 1-6, esp. p. 1 col. 1.

¹⁰ G.M. Bolling, *AJPh* 42 (1921) p. 254 n. 3. Bolling’s evident attempt to correct this error (*The External Evidence for Interpolation in Homer* [Oxford 1925] p. 21 n. 1) is unfortunately ambiguous and could easily be misinterpreted as a confirmation rather than a retraction.

(2) Pap. 6 (Pack² 952, saec. ii-iv p.C.).¹¹ This papyrus is not extant at this point; but since it has the stichometric mark $\bar{\alpha}$ opposite 18. 100 and $\bar{\epsilon}$ opposite 505, G.M. Bolling has plausibly argued that it probably omitted 200-201 and three other weakly-attested lines, viz. 381, 427 and 441.¹² This is an attractive hypothesis, though for various reasons it cannot be regarded as certain.

(3) P. Oxy. 52. 3663 (saec. iii p.C., published in 1984 by Helen M. Cockle). This papyrus testifies against 18. 200-201, even though it is not extant at this point; but this has not hitherto been argued. The key lies in the regular length of the columns. Helen Cockle states (p. 74), “There were probably 32 lines to a column”, but this can be asserted with even greater confidence after a careful examination of the distribution of the lines among the partially extant columns. Col. 1 of Book 18 is totally lost, but must have contained lines 1-32, since the first line of the extant Col. 2 is 33. Col. 2 accidentally omits line 42, and breaks off after line 58; it will have contained 33-65, = 32 lines without line 42, since the first line of the next column must have been 66: Col. 3, totally lost except for the end of line 73, will have contained 66-97, = 32 lines, since (a) line 73 is positioned opposite the eighth line of Col. 4 and will therefore presumably have been the eighth line of its own column (66-73 = 8 lines) and (b) the next column starts with line 98. Col. 4 contains 98-123 and then breaks off: let us suppose that it contained 98-129, = 32 lines. Col. 5 is totally lost: let us suppose that it contained 130-61, = 32 lines. Then Col. 6 will have contained 162-93, = 32 lines. The foot of Col. 6 is extant (182-93), and it does in fact end with line 193, thereby validating the 32-line totals we have just posited for all three columns (4, 5 and 6). Since Col. 6 ends with 193, Col. 7 (whose first *extant* line is 206) must have started with line 194; the bottom margin is extant here, and the last line of the column is 227; and 194-227 = 32 lines *if, and only if, lines 200-201 were absent!* If 200-201 were present the total would be an irregular and impossibly large 34 lines. The next column (Col. 8) is completely lost, but since Col. 7 ends with 227 and Col. 9 starts with 261 we can deduce that Col. 8 covered 228-60. This = 33 lines of the standard text, but in all probability one of these lines was accidentally omitted (like line 42 in Col. 2) - maybe 228 or 229 (homoiarchon τρίς), maybe 230 or 231 (homoioteleuton: 229, 230 and 231 all end in -οι). Col. 9 contains 261-77 and then breaks off: since the next column starts with 293, Col. 9 must have contained 261-92, = 32 lines. Col. 10 contains 293-309 and then breaks off: since Col. 11 starts with 325, Col. 10 must have contained 293-324, = 32 lines. Col. 11 contains 325-42 within Fragment 7 and then breaks off, but resumes in Fragment 8 with the remains of a single line, the end of 355, positioned opposite the penultimate line of Col. 12 and therefore = the penultimate line of its own column, which must therefore have contained 325-56, = 32 lines. The top of Col. 12 is missing, but since the last line of Col. 11 was 356 Col. 12 must have started with 357. The foot of the column is extant, and contains 375-89, omitting (with many other witnesses) 381 (probably an interpolation). So Col. 12 will have contained 357-89 minus line 381, a total, once again, of 32 lines. (The last extant column, Col. 13, breaks off after line 408, so we are in no position to calculate its total.) The only irregularity of any kind in the arithmetic concerns Col. 8, but since this column is lost *in toto* and since we have already observed an accidental omission in Col. 2 (line 42) with only very slight homoiographic temptation (homoiarchon 41 and 42 κ-, as Cockle suggests, + homoiomeson 41 and 42 ... καὶ ... καὶ ...), the most probable hypothesis by far is that Col. 8 also lost a line through a similar or stronger homoiographon. At any rate, our ability to demonstrate totals of 32 lines with virtual certainty for ten columns (Cols. 1-6, 9-12) and to posit the same total plausibly enough for an eleventh (lost) column (Col. 8) makes it highly likely that the only remaining column, Col. 7, also contained 32 lines, omitting 200-201, not 34 lines, with 200-201.

(4) P. Ant. III. 165 (saec. iv p.C.), published by J.W.B. Barns in 1967. This papyrus does not cover the text in the immediate vicinity of these lines, but it does include the beginnings of 18. 177-85, and Barns comments in his collation, “After 182, an additional line beginning Τρωες α[. Mrs. Stephanie

¹¹ For the date see my *Manuscript Evidence for Interpolation in Homer* (Heidelberg 1980) p. 181 n. 31 and for its contents *ibid.* p. 137 and p. 181 n. 32.

¹² *AJPh* 35 (1914) p. 141; more briefly *PhW* 48 (1928) cols. 1017-18.

West suggests that this is xviii. 200 displaced; having been omitted in a previous copy and put at the top or bottom of a column, it was copied in this position by a scribe who was unaware that it was out of order.” This ingenious suggestion is, I believe, likely to be right. If it represents the truth, then (a) it is significant that only 200 is to be found here, not the whole couplet 200-201, the favoured candidate for accidental omission because of the strong homoioteleuton; (b) 201 is in all probability absent because it was completely unknown to this fourth-century scribe: compare the omission of the same line by many mediaeval MSS. (to be discussed in Section (ii) below); (c) the earlier absence of 200 from the text which its misplacement here attests was almost certainly not an accidental omission but a significant one, the accession of the line being due to *contaminatio*, since in a text without 201 there would be no homoiographa to provoke accidental omission of 200 and since there is so much other early evidence for the absence of the line; on these points, and on the two stages in the interpolation of 200-201, see further below, esp. Section (ii).

However, while West’s suggestion is eminently plausible, it is not the only hypothesis possible. We should obviously start by asking: are there any other lines in Homer starting Τρῶες α-? And could any of them conceivably stand after 18. 182? There are only three Homeric lines with this beginning, *Il.* 11. 468, 19. 412 and 21. 528, of which only 19. 412 shows any promise. It is just possible that an interpolator found Achilles’s one-line response to Iris’s alarming news and rousing exhortation too calm, bald and trite (182 Ἴρι θεά, τίς τάρ σε θεῶν ἐμοὶ ἄγγελον ἤκε;) and sought to provide some *immediate* reply to her urgent exhortation (170-71 ὄρσεο, Πηλεΐδη, ... | Πατρόκλω ἐπάμυνον κ.τ.λ.) along the lines of “I can’t - the Trojans have got my armour” (cf. 188) by adding the line originally spoken to Achilles by the horse Xanthus, Τρῶες ἀπ’ ὄμοιῖν Πατρόκλου τεύχε’ ἔλοντο (19. 412). Just possible, but hardly probable: it would show rather more (misplaced) ingenuity than post-Aristarchean interpolators usually exhibit. And yet it is a strange coincidence that one of these three other Τρῶες α- lines can actually be made to yield some sort of sense here. Still, on balance I prefer West’s hypothesis.

What we are left with, then, is the following entweder-oder: *either* (a) the Antinoopolis papyrus is of no relevance whatsoever for the text of *Il.* 18. 199 ff. or (b) it testifies indirectly to the absence of 201 from its own text and of 200 from the text of its ancestors. I regard (b) as more likely than (a). If correct, it will yield no more support for 200 than a *terminus ante quem* for its interpolation.

(5) Pap. 9, the “Syriac Palimpsest” (saec. vi p.C.).¹³ This MS. omits *Il.* 18. 200-201. Moreover, the lines are not added in the margin, even though some of Syr.’s accidental omissions are supplied in this way (20. 44-6, 23. 283-4, 746, 24. 290): cf. (1) above. Allen’s apparatus neglects to record this omission.

(6) The exemplar of A. In 1904 J. van Leeuwen made an interesting and important discovery.¹⁴ On the vast majority of its pages the MS. A (saec. x) contains 25 lines, but on a few it has 26 or 27. Van Leeuwen argued convincingly that the reason for the extra lines is that on certain pages the exemplar of A had, in addition to the regular 25 lines of its text, one or two extra lines absent from its text but present in its margin; the scribe of A incorporated these marginal addenda into his own text but retained the general layout of the exemplar by increasing the number of lines on the corresponding pages of the apograph. For example, van Leeuwen argued that the following lines, which all occur on 26-line pages, were present only in the margin of A’s exemplar: *Il.* 5. 808, 17. 219, 18. 441, 20. 135; and in 1906 he rightly added 8. 383 to his list.¹⁵ As it happens, the papyrus evidence against each of these lines has expanded (or grown from nothing) since van Leeuwen wrote, and Bolling’s work now enables us to see that in all probability these lines were all absent from the edition of Aristarchus and are all spurious.¹⁶

¹³ W. Cureton (ed.), *Fragments of the Iliad of Homer from a Syriac Palimpsest* (London 1851).

¹⁴ “Homeric XXIII: De Iliadis codice A”, *Mnemosyne* n.s. 32 (1904) pp. 447-50.

¹⁵ J. van Leeuwen and M.B. Mendes da Costa (edd.), *Ilias* (3rd edn. Leiden 1906) ad loc., cf. pp. XL-XLI.

¹⁶ A total reappraisal of van Leeuwen’s argument is now desirable in the light of Bolling’s demonstration of the relationship of the *numerus versus* of the early post-Aristarchean tradition to the edition of Aristarchus. Further, van

So when we find Folio 242b of A containing the 27 lines *Il.* 18. 176-202 instead of the usual 25, we should judge van Leeuwen's explanation – that A's exemplar omitted 200-201 from its text and had these lines in the margin – to be almost certainly correct.

Let us summarize our findings so far. Of the six texts earlier than A which we have investigated, two (Nos. (1) and (5) above) visibly omit both 200 and 201, two (Nos. (3) and (6)) almost certainly omitted the two lines, while the stichometry of one (No. (2)) favours the omission of the couplet, and, finally, No. (4) may well have omitted 201 - and, if it did, its ancestors must have omitted 200 as well. Thus all of these six early witnesses testify against both lines, albeit with varying degrees of emphasis. This amounts to considerably more early hostile testimony than the "omission in a papyrus" of which Edwards speaks;¹⁷ and this testimony is unanimous, i.e. not counterbalanced by any equally early evidence in favour of the lines. So when pondering the question whether or not the omission of 200-201 is a mere mechanical error due to the homoioteleuton, we should contrast the unanimous, relatively voluminous and therefore weighty early evidence against these lines with the chance omission of *Il.* 11. 800-801 and 16. 42-3 by a few mostly late MSS.

To complete the picture, we should add that *Il.* 18. 200-201 are also omitted by a few mediaeval MSS.: according to both Ludwich and Allen, by Ludwich's N = Allen's U4 (saec. xii¹⁸) and by Ludwich's J = Allen's M7 (A.D. 1276); according to Leaf, by his Par. c (= Allen's P15, saec. xiii). (We shall return to these MSS. at the end of Section (ii) below.) We should also note that there are no scholia on the lines.

(ii) Sources which omit only 18. 201

Quite apart from the papyri and MSS. which omit both 200 and 201, there are many others which contain 200 but omit 201 alone. Allen's apparatus grossly understates the number of such MSS.: he mentions only D (saec. x), T (saec. xi) and S (saec. xv-xvi). Although this brief list significantly includes two of our earliest and most important MSS., it needs supplementing with six others cited by Ludwich, his Db (saec. xiii), R (saec. xiv), C, Ec, Qd (all saec. xv) and Y (saec. xvi), of which I can confirm Db (= Ambr. 355, F 101 sup.) from my own microfiche collation. My own collations have also revealed that 201 is omitted by Ambr. 502 (L 116 sup., saec. xiii¹⁹), though I have not seen this stated in any edition. (However, the statement sometimes made²⁰ that 201 is ignored by Eustathius is an error: see Eust. 1137. 35-9.)

Could the omission of 201 in all these MSS. be purely accidental? This is not totally out of the question, but seems highly unlikely, as this is a relatively large and weighty group of MSS.; and the case against accidental omission will become even stronger if S. West's very plausible interpretation of the Antinoopolis papyrus (above, III (i) (4)) is right, as this would establish the absence of 201 as early as the fourth century p.C. Further, the homoiographic temptation to omit 201 alone is slight: early in 200 ἀναπνεύσωσι, late in 201 – ἀνάπνευσις thus a homoiomeson of sorts, but with the repeated letters less

Leeuwen underestimated the number of purely accidental omissions in the exemplar of A and also made a few simple errors. But the passage of time and the progress of scholarship have made the core of his argument more relevant, not less. On *Il.* 5. 808 see op. cit. (above, n. 11) pp. 4-6, on *Il.* 17. 219 *ibid.* p. 150, on *Il.* 18. 441 *ibid.* pp. 142-5. As for *Il.* 20. 135 and 8. 383, each is omitted by five of our seven earliest minuscules, by many later MSS. and by one papyrus, the former by Pap. 435, published in 1949 (Pack² 904, saec. v-vi p.C.) (though Pap. 9 [above, n. 13, saec. vi p.C.] contains the line) and the latter by the only papyrus covering this part of the text, Pap. 399, published in 1947 (Pack² 729, saec. ii-iii p.C.).

¹⁷ Op. cit. (above, n. 3) ad loc.

¹⁸ Dated saec. xii-xiii by both Ludwich and Allen, but the most recent dating is saec. xii: see Vassis (above, n. 7 ad fin.) p. 111.

¹⁹ The date of this MS. is given as saec. xii-xiii by Ludwich and Allen but as saec. xiii by Vassis (above, n. 7 ad fin.) p. 83. This MS. = Allen's M11 and Ludwich's Dc; on Allen's confusion between different Milan MSS. see *ZPE* 82 (1990) p. 19.

²⁰ E.g. by Kayser (above, n. 1) p. 148.

temptingly in different parts of the line. The slightness of this temptation is confirmed by the fact that, as far as we know, no MSS. at all omit the single parallel lines *Il.* 11. 801 or 16. 43 in spite of the presence of the identical homoiomeson, in striking contrast to the many which omit *Il.* 18. 201. So the absence of 201 from these MSS. is best interpreted as evidence of interpolation, and it looks as though 18. 200-201 were added in two stages: first 200 alone, then, at a later stage, 201 in some of the MSS. which already had 200.²¹

Note also that, if 201 is a late interpolation, then during the early period when our papyri were omitting *both* lines, 200 and 201, the strong homoioteleuton πολέμοιο in 199 and 201 which has been thought of as explaining this omission *would not have existed*, because the second half of the homoioteleuton (in 201) *would have been absent!* Or rather (for we must qualify this statement slightly), the chances that 201 was known at all to any given copyist during the period saec. i-vi p.C. would be very slight, and at the beginning of this period infinitesimal. Thus the evidentiary value of the accidental omission of the parallel lines *Il.* 11. 800-801 and 16. 42-3 in a few MSS. turns out to be almost completely illusory. Further, in texts which lacked 201 there would be no other homoiographa of any kind to provoke accidental omission of 200: no graphical similarities between 199 and 200, none between 200 and 202. So the strong tendency of our earliest sources to omit both 200 and 201 makes it almost certain that both lines are spurious.

As for the omission of both lines by the three MSS. from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, this is most naturally explained as further evidence of their spuriousness, although, since by now 201 (with its homoioteleuton) is present in part of the tradition, we cannot completely exclude the possibility of accidental omission here; but in any case the testimony of these MSS. is not central to our argument in the light of the much earlier and much weightier evidence against the lines which we have already adduced.

IV Conclusion

The external evidence cries out against the authenticity of both 201 and 200 and indicates that both lines are almost certainly post-Aristarchean interpolations. While at first sight it may be tempting to suppose that these lines' weak attestation is due entirely to accidental omissions under the influence of homoiographa, on closer examination this hypothesis turns out to be highly implausible. Moreover, the external evidence is strongly supported by the internal evidence, and the Homer who emerges from this study is precisely what we should expect: a subtle master of plot, characterization and dramatic irony who tends to pay close attention to the differences between one context and another superficially similar one and knows what is - and what is not - likely to motivate his carefully delineated characters at any given moment, even if he sometimes deliberately constructs characters (such as Thetis) who do not. Homer may indeed occasionally nod, but we should not foist on to his text, against our earliest and best evidence for its contents, an expanded version which has him loudly snoring.

University of Queensland

Michael J. Apthorp

²¹ Cf. G.M. Bolling, *AJPh* 35 (1914) p. 141.