

MICHAEL J. APTHORP

NEW LIGHT FROM MOUNT SINAI ON THE TEXT OF THE *ILIAD*

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 127 (1999) 141–148

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



## NEW LIGHT FROM MOUNT SINAI ON THE TEXT OF THE *ILIAD*

### 1. Introduction

In an accidental discovery on 26th May 1975 a spectacularly vast collection of manuscripts was unearthed from the rubble filling a damaged and disused cell in the Monastery of St. Catherine on the upper slopes of Mt. Sinai.<sup>1</sup> Among these manuscripts were some leaves of a codex containing the text of the *Iliad* (with an interlinear prose paraphrase) written in an interesting transitional script midway between uncial and minuscule dated by Politis to c. A.D. 850.<sup>2</sup> Politis stated (*ibid.*) that there were four such leaves, published a photograph of the recto of one of them (Plate 8b) and actually transcribed the first seven lines of this page, which includes the text of *Il.* 4.367-76. However, in the course of this short transcription Politis made one significant error, as we shall see. D.F. Sutton, in his useful computerized database *Homer in the Papyri*,<sup>3</sup> lists this MS. as Pap. 568 in his continuation of the Allen-Collart-Mette lists of Homeric papyri, but does not cite any of its readings; H. van Thiel, in his recent edition of the *Iliad* (Hildesheim 1996), ignores the MS. completely; and M.L. West, in his fine new Teubner edition of *Iliad* 1-12 just published (December 1998), gives this MS. the siglum X (pp. X-XI), falsely asserts (p. XI, cf. p. LIX) that Politis's photograph reproduces the *first* leaf (something nowhere claimed by Politis himself), and includes in his apparatus criticus readings garnered from his own independent collation of Politis's photograph - a notable advance, this, though in citing one reading West makes the same mistake as Politis. Both Sutton and West follow Politis in stating that there are four leaves of this MS. altogether, which will turn out to be a considerable understatement.

Unbeknownst to both Sutton and West, a photograph of another page of this MS. was published elsewhere in 1980.<sup>4</sup> This page starts with the latter half of the paraphrase of *Il.* 1.486 and goes on to give text and paraphrase of 1.487-95, the text of 496 and a paraphrase of its opening. As far as I am aware, no one has so far published any collation of the text of this second photograph,<sup>5</sup> and I shall provide one in the course of this article. At one point in particular this photograph would have been grist to West's mill, as it supports his text of *Il.* 1.496 against that of van Thiel and nearly all the other MSS. (see 2 (g) below).

---

<sup>1</sup> For general accounts of the discovery see S. Agourides and J.H. Charlesworth, "A New Discovery of Old Manuscripts on Mt. Sinai: A Preliminary Report", *Biblical Archeologist* 41 (1978) pp. 29-31 (though some of the details here are inaccurate); J.H. Charlesworth, "St. Catherine's Monastery: Myths and Mysteries", *ibid.* Vol. 42 (1979) pp. 174-9; *id.*, "The Manuscripts of St. Catherine's Monastery", *ibid.* Vol. 43 (1980) pp. 26-43; L. Politis, "Nouveaux manuscrits grecs découverts au Mont Sinai: Rapport préliminaire", *Scriptorium* 34 (1980) pp. 5-17 with Plates 1-9; H. Kunst with B. and K. Aland, "Die neuen Sinai-Funde", *Bericht der Hermann Kunst-Stiftung zur Förderung der neutestamentlichen Textforschung für die Jahre 1977 bis 1979* (Münster/Westfalen 1979) pp. 46-58; B. Aland, *Bericht ... (as above) ... für die Jahre 1982 bis 1984* (Münster/Westfalen 1985) p. 76 (brief but authoritative, summarizing in German a paper in Greek by Archbishop Damianos of Sinai). I thank my colleague Professor Michael Latke for drawing the reports of the Hermann Kunst-Stiftung to my attention.

<sup>2</sup> Politis (*above*, n. 1) p. 14.

<sup>3</sup> Scholars' Press (Atlanta 1992); now on the Internet in a revised version (January 1998) as *Homer and the Papyri* (<http://eee.uci.edu/~papyri/>).

<sup>4</sup> Charlesworth 1980 (*above*, n. 1) p. 32, where he also reproduces a photograph of the page to be found in Politis. He also states (*ibid.*), "It is reported that at least six other leaves of the *Iliad* were found in St. Catherine's", and this comes closer to the truth (see further below).

<sup>5</sup> According to Charlesworth 1980 (*above*, n. 1) p. 29, "Professor Ihor Sevcenko of ... Harvard University will publish a critical study of these folios and their content in the near future"; and according to I. Vassis, *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der sogenannten Psellos-Paraphrase der Ilias* (Hamburg 1991) p. 27 n. 116, P. Nikolopoulos is working on a critical edition of the Sinai *Iliad*-paraphrase; but as far as I can ascertain neither work has yet appeared.

But we have not yet listed all the passages actually covered in the preserved leaves of this MS. Ideally it would be preferable at this point to cite direct from the Catalogue of the newly-discovered Greek Sinai MSS. prepared by P. Nikolopoulos, but although I have come across several references to its allegedly imminent appearance<sup>6</sup> it is clear that this work has suffered from intractable problems and interminable delays along the road to full publication. In 1991 Vassis was able to refer to the printer's proofs of Nikolopoulos's Catalogue, of which Nikolopoulos had sent him photocopies in August 1983, but over seven years later the printed Catalogue had still not appeared,<sup>7</sup> and as far as I can discover this is still the state of affairs today; but fortunately Vassis, from his inspection of Nikolopoulos's proofs, has been able to inform us that the surviving leaves of the MS. (inv. ΜΓ26) cover the following passages: *Il.* 1.319-38, 477-96, 608-11; 2.1-15, 118-42; 4.50-69, 111-29, 345-90, 458-78; 5. 105-27, 169-89, 626-50.<sup>8</sup> So excluding the title-page (also extant, albeit in a damaged state) there must be twelve leaves altogether and at least one fragment. For the present, however, our detailed knowledge of these leaves must remain confined to the two photographed pages mentioned above. They, at least, have both long since been in the public domain, and merit a little more attention than they have so far received. However, this article may not entirely fulfil the promise of its title: the light thrown on the text by these two short fragments will be at best fitful and at worst a mere will-o'-the-wisp - *quale per incertam lunam sub luce maligna / est iter in silvis* rather than μάλ' αἴθρη | πέπταται ἀνέφελος, λευκή δ' ἐπιδέδρομεν αἴγλη. But for us dull sublunary lovers of the minutiae of the Homeric text there may be just enough of interest revealed to make the investigation worth while.

In the collations and discussions that follow I shall ignore the grossest spelling errors and other slips (e.g. *Il.* 1.490 πολεσκετο for πωλέσκετο) as well as minor variations in the use of diacritical marks (e.g. *Il.* 1.488 παρ'ήμενος, cf. Α παρ'ήμενος) and focus mainly on the more significant readings; and my aim will be to supplement and (where necessary) correct the information in West's new edition, not to repeat what he has already accurately reported. I should also acknowledge at the outset that I have made extensive use throughout this article of the valuable lists of testimonia for the text provided by West ad locc. as well as his even more valuable citations of a mass of new papyrus evidence.

## 2. *Il.* 1.487-96

This is the passage whose photograph was published by Charlesworth but whose readings have not yet been excerpted.

(a) Sinaiticus line 2 (*Il.* 1.487) has δε σκιδνῶντο (a slip for σκιδναντο), not δ' ἐσκιδναντο. There is no word-division in this MS., but wherever the final vowel of a word is elided - and there are twelve such places on this page and four on the *Il.* 4 page - the elision is marked with an apostrophe. So the absence of an apostrophe here shows that σκιδνῶντο is thought of as lacking the augment.<sup>9</sup> This is very much a minority reading: the vast majority of our minuscules have δ' ἐσκιδναντο. So does the glossary of P. Oxy. 45.3238 of the early third century A.D., which has the lemma εσ[κι]δναντο at this point; so also the Epimerismi Homerici of the ninth century;<sup>10</sup> so also, "ut videtur", West's unpublished Oxyrhynchus papyrus (= his Pap. 792; date not stated). The other relevant papyri either have

<sup>6</sup> E.g. Politis (above, n.1) p. 6; H. Kunst with B. and K. Aland, "Die neuen Handschriftenfunde auf dem Sinai", *Bericht ...* (as above, n. 1) ... für die Jahre 1979 bis 1981 (Münster/Westfalen 1982) pp. 33-5, esp. p. 34; and see also below in my text.

<sup>7</sup> Vassis (above, n. 5) pp. 27-8, esp. p. 27 n. 116.

<sup>8</sup> Vassis (above, n. 5) pp. 27-8.

<sup>9</sup> It is true that there is no grave accent on the ε of δε, but accentuation in this MS. is only sporadic.

<sup>10</sup> See A.R. Dyck (ed.), *Epimerismi Homerici: Pars prior* (Berlin and New York 1983) p. 232; for the dating see his pp. 5-7.

this part of the line within a lacuna or contain texts which do not mark elisions or accents and hence naturally fail to distinguish between the two versions. Our Sinai MS. is the earliest explicit testimony for the unaugmented version; among our minuscules the earliest testimony for this version comes from T.W. Allen's E4 = West's F, from the eleventh century. Sinaiticus may here reflect (however indirectly) Aristarchus's frequent preference for unaugmented forms: cf. e.g. Schol. A on *Il.* 1.162, informing us that Aristarchus here wrote *πολλὰ μόγησα*, not *πόλλ' ἐμόγησα*<sup>11</sup> (the latter reading is found in all but one of our sources, including four papyri,<sup>12</sup> but the former version has now been discovered by West in one of the unpublished Oxyrhynchus papyri, = his Pap. 743). We may perhaps compare the reading of Sinaiticus at *Il.* 4.367, viz. the unaugmented pluperfect *εστήκει* (*sic*, = *ἔστηκει*), also present in a large and respectable minority of our MSS. - a reading which Didymus (in Schol. A and T ad loc.) explicitly tells us was patronized by Aristarchus, though of course we should not think of him as having invented it - cf. the equally Aristarchean *ἔστηκει* at *Il.* 12.446 (Didymus in Schol. A), again present in only a minority of the post-Aristarchean MSS., but also present in a pre-Aristarchean text of the second century B.C.<sup>13</sup>

(b) Sinaiticus line 5 (*Il.* 1.489) has *πηλεως υἱος* (with synizesis of *εω*): this is the reading of the majority of the mediaeval MSS., of Plutarch in his citation at *Moralia* 465e (as M.L. West points out - though one could add that *Πηλέος* is a poorly supported *varia lectio* here), and of our earliest source, Pap. 53 (= PSI XV.1.1454 = Pack<sup>2</sup> 614), of the second century B.C.<sup>14</sup> This is the reading printed by van Thiel. R. Janko<sup>15</sup> argues for *Πηλέος* (also with synizesis), found in a substantial minority of the MSS.; this reading is printed by Ludwich and some earlier editors. M.L. West (with most other modern editors) prints *Πηληῆος υἱός* (with shortening of the *υι* of *υἱός*), for which he argues on p. XXXIV.<sup>16</sup> While, among our minuscules, this last reading is found only in nine late MSS., it is also found in Pap. 379 (= P. Mich. inv. 2810 = Pack<sup>2</sup> 599), of the second century A.D.,<sup>17</sup> so that Janko's statement that "-ῆος is in only a few late MSS each time" needs qualification.

(c) Sinaiticus line 9 (*Il.* 1.490) starts [ο]ύτε, surely rightly (cf. *Il.* 1.226-7), with nearly all our sources, including the same quotation by Plutarch (*Mor.* 465e), two papyri and our earliest minuscules; οὐδέ is found only in a small minority of our later minuscules and in all the MSS. of the pseudo-Plutarchean *De Homero* (? c. A.D. 200), 2.142.3 Kindstrand (Teubner, 1990, = the so-called *De vita et poesi Homeri*).

<sup>11</sup> This parallel is not chosen entirely at random but rather because, like *δὲ σκίδναντο* in *Il.* 1.487, it occurs in the *second* foot of the verse - a point which may perhaps gain some relevance if one studies the metrical theories on Aristarchus's absent augments to be found in J. La Roche, *Die Homerische Textkritik im Alterthum* (Leipzig 1866, repr. Hildesheim 1992) pp. 423-8, and P. Chantraine, *Grammaire homérique* Vol. I (Paris 1958) pp. 479-84. For a brief modern discussion of the issues see West's new edition pp. XXVI-XXVIII.

<sup>12</sup> I rely here on West's apparatus criticus, but through an oversight his siglum "h17" has been omitted from the explanatory table of sigla on p. LV of his Preface: it actually refers (at this point of the text) to P. Strasb. inv. 33 (Pack<sup>2</sup> 1163), which contains glosses on *Il.* 1.148-361 and has been re-edited on a lavish scale by A. Henrichs at *ZPE* 7 (1971) pp. 119-48. Further, West errs in stating under "h15" (on p. LV again) that P. Turner 13 contains glosses on *Il.* 1.83-361: it actually contains glosses on *Il.* 1.83-158 only. This remains true even though (and this is the source of the confusion) the end of P. Turner 13 overlaps with the beginning of P. Strasb. inv. 33, both being parts of the same roll, and even though J. Schwartz, the editor of P. Turner 13, has quite rightly used the beginning of P. Strasb. inv. 33 to supplement his transcription of the end of P. Turner 13.

<sup>13</sup> See Stephanie West, *The Ptolemaic Papyri of Homer* (Cologne and Opladen 1967) pp. 118-31, esp. p. 121.

<sup>14</sup> See esp. S. West (above, n. 13) pp. 32-5.

<sup>15</sup> *The Iliad: A Commentary* Vol. IV (Cambridge 1992) p. 318, on *Il.* 16.21.

<sup>16</sup> See also W. Leaf ad loc. and Chantraine (above, n. 11) pp. 223-4.

<sup>17</sup> See N.E. Priest, *Homeric Papyri in the Michigan Collection* (Diss. Michigan 1975) pp. 31-49, esp. p. 40 (Πηληῆος), and *ZPE* 46 (1982) pp. 58-69, esp. p. 64, where the dot under the second η of Πηληῆος has now been removed. Van Thiel's apparatus erroneously states that this papyrus has Πηλέως. M.L. West's apparatus is correct.

(d) Sinaiticus line 12 (*Il.* 1.491) again starts [ο]υτε, rightly; this time οὐδέ is found in only three MSS. (two saec. xiii, one saec. xv).

(e) Sinaiticus continues (*ibid.*): [ο]υτε ποτ' ἐς [*sic*: grave accent, no breathing] πολεμον: ἐς, not εἰς, is the reading of nearly all modern editors,<sup>18</sup> and is presumably correct: the *varia lectio* εἰς is presumably a corruption under the influence of the immediately preceding line, which starts similarly; εἰς in 491 violates the law that Homer uses the shorter form of this preposition (even if not quite always of the corresponding prefix) wherever it is metrically possible for him to do so. Of course in the earliest texts of Homer both versions would have been written ΕΣ,<sup>19</sup> but the orthography of the paradosis as a whole may well reflect an authentic performance tradition. As for *Il.* 1.491 itself, I cannot state with any confidence whether ἐς or εἰς is the majority reading. A casual glance at the editions of Leaf and Ludwich, which give only the (allegedly relatively limited) manuscript support for εἰς, might suggest that ἐς was the majority reading; but Allen's apparatus simply states, amazingly (and wrongly), "εἰς codd. uv." This is certainly a gross exaggeration, even though it is clear from the editions of van Thiel and West that most of the *early* minuscules (including A) *do* have εἰς. Most, but not all: not T (saec. xi) or D (saec. xii at this point), which both have ἐς, as does Eustathius (140.31). My own microfiche collations of two MSS. not used by either West or van Thiel (but used by Ludwich and Allen) go some way towards supporting Ludwich (but hardly Allen): Ambrosianus 502 (L116 sup., saec. xiii)<sup>20</sup> has εἰς, as correctly reported by Ludwich, while Ambr. 486 (L73 sup., saec. xiii-xiv) has ἐς, as possibly implied by Ludwich but not explicitly stated by any editor. As for the papyri cited by West, two of them have ἐς, while one, Pap. 53, our earliest source for this passage (saec. ii a.C.), has εἰς.<sup>21</sup> As for the testimonia, Aristonicus in Schol. A on *Il.* 1.488 (citing 491) has ἐς; so do most of the MSS. at Plutarch *Mor.* 465e, though some early ones have εἰς, including the earliest of all, Laur. Pl. 69.13 (saec. x). To sum up, Sinaiticus can at least claim the distinction of preserving the correct reading here against substantial opposition, some of it early.

(f) Sinaiticus line 16 (*Il.* 1.492) regrettably has the unmetrical πολεμον τε with nearly all our other sources. On perusing the *Iliad* editions it is hard to glean positive reports of MSS. with πτόλεμόν. Ignoring corrections, I find only A and (on the authority of van Thiel) Vaticanus 26 (saec. xiii). Ludwich has no list at all for πτόλεμόν, and his list of those of his MSS. which have πόλεμόν is certainly not exhaustive: to it I can add, from my own collation, Ambr. 486 (L73 sup., saec. xiii-xiv), = Ludwich's Dd. On the other hand πτόλεμόν is certainly present in the text of at least one more minuscule, Ambr. 502 (L116 sup., saec. xiii), as my own collation has revealed. Unfortunately the end of this line falls within a lacuna in each of the relevant published papyrus texts and so we do not know whether they read πτόλεμόν or πόλεμόν, and the same is apparently true of West's two unpublished Oxyrhynchus papyri. But what picture do the testimonia present? On the one hand, it is gratifying to be able to report that Plutarch has πτόλεμόν at *Pyrrhus* 13.2 and *Agis and Cleomenes* 55.3, and that the Teubner editors can also print, on quite good manuscript authority, πτόλεμόν at *Mor.* 465e (though there is also strong support among the early MSS. for πόλεμόν). On the other hand, all the MSS. of the pseudo-Plutarchean *De Homero* (*ibid.* - see (c) above ad fin.) have πόλεμόν, and so does the exegetical T scholium on *Il.* 18.125 (numbered *b*<sup>1</sup> in Erbse) when quoting *Il.* 1.492.<sup>22</sup> To conclude, the external

<sup>18</sup> But not J. van Leeuwen (*Ilias* Vol. I [Leiden 1912]), who prints εἰς.

<sup>19</sup> See e.g. Janko (above, n. 15) pp. 33-4 Section 3.

<sup>20</sup> On this MS. (and its date) see further *ZPE* 111 (1996) p. 147 n. 19.

<sup>21</sup> For this last papyrus see further (b) above with n. 14.

<sup>22</sup> On the face of it, at least, West is misleading in including this T scholium among those of his testimonia which read πτόλεμόν. This scholium is transmitted *only* in T, and both E. Maass (Oxford 1888) and H. Erbse (Berlin 1975) report in their editions that the MS. has πόλεμόν: Erbse does print π(τ)όλεμόν (*sic*), but confirms in his apparatus that the supplement of the τ is his own. But perhaps West, who has himself collated the text of T, has spotted a τ in the scholium here which eluded Maass and Erbse. I have not seen the MS. myself.

evidence for the undoubtedly correct πτόλεμόν remains disconcertingly slender. There is an important moral here: that it is perfectly possible for our sources for the Homeric text to agree almost unanimously in certain error, particularly through the replacement of an archaic form with a more modern or “normal” one. This should be borne in mind throughout the discussion of Section (g) immediately below.

(g) Sinaiticus line 29 (*Il.* 1.496, where Thetis emerges from the sea) has ἀλλ’ ἢ γ’ ἀνεδύσετο κύμα θαλάσσης, i.e. the so-called Homeric “mixed aorist” ἀνεδύσετο. This reading is printed by almost all modern editors (but not by van Thiel, as we shall see), although support for it in our sources is embarrassingly thin: it is found (i) in the Epimerismi Homerici of the ninth century,<sup>23</sup> where the form ἀνεδύσετο is guaranteed by the very explanation given here, viz. that it is an imperfect (παρατατικός); (ii) in an A scholium (not bT, as alleged by West ad loc.) which is closely based on these Epimerismi; (iii) as an interlinear variant or correction in A; (iv) in Eustathius;<sup>24</sup> and (v) in the text of a few other MSS., some of them very late: of these the earliest are Allen’s V10 (saec. xii), L16 (saec. xiii) and V4 (A.D. 1292). So the extra support given to the form ἀνεδύσετο by Sinaiticus is both significant and welcome - at any rate if one is inclined to believe that this is what Homer sang and that the alternative form ἀνεδύσατο is a *lectio facilior* which has spread to the majority of the MSS. by corruption.<sup>25</sup> And indeed this is precisely what the Homeric paradosis as a whole, on this and similar passages, very strongly suggests. First, the form δύσετο (+ δύσετ’, δύσεθ’), without an augment, is always attested thus (-ετο) either unanimously or almost unanimously wherever it occurs: *Il.* 6.136, 7.465, 13.241, 16.729, 17.552, 19.368; *Od.* 2.388, 3.487, 497, 5.482, 6.321, 7.289, 8.417, 11.12, 15.185, 296, 471, 22.113. Evidently the absence of the augment immediately marked the form as peculiarly “Homeric” and alerted the scribes to the presence of a further “oddity” (-ετο after -σ-), and it was this signpost that protected the reading from distortion. Once this signpost was removed by the addition of an augment (ἐδύσετο, ἀνεδύσετο, κατεδύσετο, κατεδύσεθ’, ὑπεδύσετο), the verb took its chances, and mostly it did not fare particularly well. It did survive completely unscathed at *Il.* 21.515 (ἐδύσετο), where all MSS. without exception have the form in -ετο; but nowhere else has it done as well as this. At *Il.* 10.517 (κατεδύσετο) and *Od.* 6.127 (ὑπεδύσετο) the -ετο form is found in *most* of the MSS., including most of the *early* MSS. Then comes quite a large group of lines where the -ετο forms are found only in a minority of the MSS., but a minority leavened by at least one or two (and often more) very early sources: *Il.* 2.578, 3.328, 4.86, 7.103, 9.596, 15.120, *Od.* 4.425, 570, 5.352, 17.336, 23.366 - to which, of course, we must now add *Il.* 1.496 itself. Finally, there are three places where the corruption has penetrated most of the MSS. and the residue is *not* particularly early: *Il.* 11.16, *Od.* 5.337,<sup>26</sup> 11.253. But the paradosis as a whole - especially its ubiquitous and almost unanimous support for unaugmented δύσετο, but also the weight of the early evidence in favour of the -ετο forms elsewhere - must make us strongly doubt whether ἐδύσατο is a possible Homeric form anywhere. Nevertheless van Thiel has argued that at *Il.* 1.496 we should read ἀνεδύσατο κύμα θαλάσσης for reasons of euphony, in order to retain the repetition of the υ and α sounds in -δύσατο κύμα, and this view has been sympathetically

<sup>23</sup> See op. cit. (above, n. 10) p. 234.

<sup>24</sup> Eust. 140.46-7. The Stallbaum edition (Leipzig 1827-30) prints ἀνεδύσατο, but van der Valk’s edition (Leiden 1971-87), based on Eustathius’s autograph, prints ἀνεδύσετο, while his apparatus criticus carries the note “L. [= Eust.’s autograph] ἀνεδύσετο - σε ss. σα”.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. e.g. Chantraine (above, n. 11) pp. 416-17, and Stephanie West in A. Heubeck, S. West and J.B. Hainsworth, *A Commentary on Homer’s Odyssey* Vol. I (Oxford 1988) p. 117, on *Od.* 1.330.

<sup>26</sup> It may not be irrelevant to note here that this line was absent from most of Aristarchus’s best MSS. - οὐκ ἐφέρετο ἐν τοῖς πλείοσι, say the scholia (HPQ Dindorf) - and has often been regarded as spurious, most recently by R.D. Dawe, *The Odyssey: Translation and Analysis* (Lewes, Sussex, 1993) p. 238 ad loc. See further F. Dirlmeier, *Die Vogelgestalt homerischer Götter*, *Sitz. d. Heidelberger Akad. d. Wiss., Philos.-hist. Kl.* 1967.2 (Heidelberg 1967) p. 26, and also G.M. Bolling, *The External Evidence for Interpolation in Homer* (Oxford 1925, repr. 1968) pp. 234-5, with my *Manuscript Evidence for Interpolation in Homer* (Heidelberg 1980) pp. 49-50, 106-7 n. 24.

received by Janko.<sup>27</sup> Now I would be the last to deny the presence of alliteration and assonance in Homer's style,<sup>28</sup> and would even be prepared to allow that the precise morphological form chosen by the poet could sometimes be influenced by such factors. Thus I would be perfectly happy to print (e.g.) the unaugmented ἀνακυμβαλίαζον at *Il.* 16.379, with our earliest and best sources - Aristarchus, Pap. 370 (Pack<sup>2</sup> 933, saec. v p.C.),<sup>29</sup> Pap. 9 (the Syriac Palimpsest, saec. vi p.C.), the Venetus A (saec. x) - even though nearly all our other sources have the augmented ἀνεκυμβαλίαζον: whatever the precise meaning of this hapax,<sup>30</sup> the former reading, in both rhythm and sound, seems superior to the latter,<sup>31</sup> and - whether from considerations of euphony or Aristarcholatry or early manuscript testimony - it is in fact the version printed by most modern editors, including van Thiel. But this immediately raises another problem for van Thiel's ἀνεδύσατο at *Il.* 1.496: if the repetition of alpha-sounds was so significant for the poet here, why did he not go the whole hog and sing ἀναδύσατο, with absence of augment? - a form for which there is no evidence at all in the MSS. at this point. Further, the version ἀνεδύσετο κῦμα θαλάσσης here (with Sinaiticus) gains strong support from the closely parallel passage at *Il.* 6.136, δύσεθ' ἄλως κατὰ κῦμα, where virtually all our MSS. have δύσεθ', even though a profusion of alphas follows: only Allen's very late Vi4 (saec. xv) has δύσαθ'.<sup>32</sup> But the final and most powerful objection must remain the strong doubt about whether Homer would even have regarded the forms δύσατο, ἀνεδύσατο etc. as morphologically possible: if my analysis of the paradosis above is correct, the evidence suggests very strongly that he would not. It is one thing to choose one of two possible authentically Homeric forms (e.g. ἀνακυμβαλίαζον vs. ἀνεκυμβαλίαζον) for reasons of euphony; it would be altogether a different matter to conjure up a bogus or alien grammatical form for such a purpose. That sort of thing could sometimes be forced on the bards by the iron laws of metre: it would surely not be done merely *euphoniae gratia*.

### 3. *Il.* 4.367-76

As explained above, my aim here is to supplement and correct the information in M.L. West's new edition, not to draw attention anew to the readings of Sinaiticus which he has accurately reported.

(a) Sinaiticus line 6 (*Il.* 4.368) appears in Politis's edited transcription<sup>33</sup> as follows: καὶ μὲν τὸν νεῖκεσσ' ἐπιδὼν κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων. A variant νεῖκεσσ' ἐπιδῶν is otherwise unattested. It should be stressed immediately that in the original MS. there is no word-division, no apostrophe after the second σ of νεῖκεσσ-, and no breathing over the following ε.

M.L. West, in his apparatus, gives Sinaiticus's text as follows: νεῖκεσσ ἐπιδῶν. One could perhaps start by making the rather pedantic point that West omits the acute accent visible over the first ε of νεῖκεσσ- and the grave accent visible over the ω of -ων. But the main point to be made here is that both

<sup>27</sup> H. van Thiel (ed.), *Homeri Odyssea* (Hildesheim 1991) pp. VI-VII (in German), = xxiv-xxv (in English); R. Janko, *Gnomon* 66 (1994) p. 290.

<sup>28</sup> See D.W. Packard, "Sound-patterns in Homer", *TAPA* 104 (1974) pp. 239-60; M.W. Edwards, *The Iliad: A Commentary* Vol. V (Cambridge 1991) pp. 57-8; J.B. Hainsworth, *ibid.* Vol. III (Cambridge 1993) p. 305 (on the alliteration in *Il.* 11. 756); and also the entries under "alliteration" and "assonance" in the Indexes of (a) Vols. I, II, IV, V and VI of the same Cambridge commentary, (b) each of the two volumes of W.B. Stanford's *Odyssey* (2nd edn. London 1958-9, repr. 1964-5); (c) Vol. III (1992) of the new three-volume Oxford commentary on the *Odyssey*; and (d) ("alliteration" only) A.F. Garvie's edition of *Odyssey* VI-VIII (Cambridge 1994).

<sup>29</sup> See my transcription at *ZPE* 81 (1990) p. 4 with n. 22.

<sup>30</sup> See my discussion *ibid.* (above, n. 29) p. 6 n. 33 Section (4); also now Janko (above, n. 15) ad loc.

<sup>31</sup> Even in late antiquity this word was felt to be onomatopoeic: Schol. bT βομβῶδες ὄν τὸ ῥῆμα ἔδωκεν ἔμφασιν τῆ ἀνατροπῆ.

<sup>32</sup> Firmicus Maternus 6.8 (saec. iv p.C.) and two late MSS. have δύσεν.

<sup>33</sup> Politis (above, n. 1) p. 14.

Politis and West err in transcribing a  $\pi$  here: their  $\pi$  is actually a  $\nu$ ,<sup>34</sup> thus (diplomatic transcription with word-division added):  $\nu\acute{\epsilon}\iota\kappa\epsilon\sigma\sigma\epsilon\nu\ \acute{\iota}\delta\acute{\omega}\nu$ . But one can see what has led these two scholars into their error: there is a faint linear mark (not writing) extending from the top right-hand corner of the final N of  $\nu\acute{\epsilon}\iota\kappa\epsilon\sigma\sigma\epsilon\nu$  to a little beyond (and below) the diaeresis on top of the following iota. This is probably merely a natural blemish of the surface of the leaf; at any rate, there are similar stray linear markings elsewhere, most obviously below line 3 of the *Il.* 1 page. But this cannot possibly be the horizontal of a  $\Pi$ , for the following five reasons:- (i) Nowhere else within these two pages does a  $\Pi$  horizontal extend so far to the right as to invade the space of the next letter like this (and I count 68  $\Pi$ s). (ii) The right-hand end of the lower loop of the last E of  $\nu\acute{\epsilon}\iota\kappa\epsilon\sigma\sigma\epsilon\nu$  is very close indeed to the bottom of the left upright of the following N (almost touching it). This happens quite often with the EN sequence in Sinaiticus - on the *Il.* 1 page, in lines 8, 13, 15, and 21; on the *Il.* 4 page, in lines 3, 8, and 16 (end of line); it *never* happens with the E $\Pi$  sequence (which occurs 12 times over the two pages). (iii) There is every bit as much of the diagonal of this N visible as in many of the other Ns in this MS. (iv) The diaeresis has only two functions within this MS.: either (a) (usually over an iota) to mark the separation of two vowels which could otherwise be mistaken for a diphthong (this occurs 5 times altogether), or (b) (always over an iota) to mark the beginning of a new word: this use occurs 7 times altogether (excluding the line in question). Both uses are illustrated in line 11 of the *Il.* 4 page:  $\delta\alpha\acute{\iota}\phi\rho\nu\nu\nu\sigma\ \acute{\iota}\pi\rho\delta\alpha\mu\iota\nu$ . So the diaeresis over the iota in  $\nu\acute{\epsilon}\iota\kappa\epsilon\sigma\sigma\epsilon\nu\ \acute{\iota}\delta\acute{\omega}\nu$  shows that a new word begins here. (v) This sequence cannot be construed as  $\nu\acute{\epsilon}\iota\kappa\epsilon\sigma\sigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\delta\acute{\omega}\nu$  because if that were the text the scribe would have written an apostrophe to mark the elision, as he has done in all other such places (there are 16 of them); and there is no such apostrophe here.

Finally, if anyone thinks the reading  $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\delta\acute{\omega}\nu$  is supported by the gloss  $\theta\epsilon\alpha\sigma\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu\nu\sigma$  at this point of the prose paraphrase, a short answer is possible:  $\epsilon\theta\epsilon\alpha\sigma\alpha\mu\eta\nu$  is used on the very same page (lines 25-6) to gloss plain  $\acute{\iota}\delta\acute{\omega}\nu$  (*Il.* 4.375).

So, as it turns out, Sinaiticus has the same reading here as the rest of the paradosis. This is just as well, because plain  $\acute{\iota}\delta\acute{\omega}\nu$  is certainly right here: cf. the parallel passages within the tightly constructed and highly formulaic Epipoleis: *Il.* 4.232 and 240  $\acute{\iota}\delta\acute{\omega}\iota$ , 255, 283, 311 and 336  $\acute{\iota}\delta\acute{\omega}\nu$ .

(b) The presence of *Il.* 4.369 in Sinaiticus (correctly reported by West) merits further discussion, but this is a matter to which I plan to return in my next article in a wider context.

(c) Sinaiticus line 13 (*Il.* 4.371) has  $\sigma\pi\pi\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ , not  $\acute{\omicron}\pi\pi\tau\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ . West has no entry at all for this line in his apparatus, possibly because he believes the case for the former reading to be overwhelming. It is, but it is nevertheless worth pointing out that this reading is present only in a small minority of our MSS., and that the majority reading  $\acute{\omicron}\pi\pi\tau\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  was regularly printed by editors until around the middle of the 19th century. Even A. Pierron's edition (Paris 1869) has  $\acute{\omicron}\pi\pi\tau\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ . But the minority of the MSS. with  $\sigma\pi\pi\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ , though small, is select: it includes all six of our MSS. from the tenth and eleventh centuries (I include C, saec. xi-xii) and two from the next century, Allen's d (i.e. the twelfth-century supplement to his D)<sup>35</sup> and V12,<sup>36</sup> while the carelessly written Pap. 4 (saec. i p.C.,<sup>37</sup> Pack<sup>2</sup> 697), according to Kenyon, distorts the word into  $\acute{\omicron}\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\tau\epsilon\nu\epsilon\varsigma$  (*sic*) - but at least this version also lacks a  $\tau$ . Turning now to the lexica, we find that Apollonius Sophistes in his Homeric Lexicon also writes this word without a  $\tau$  (121.30-31 Bekker):  $\acute{\omicron}\pi\pi\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \pi\epsilon\rho\iota\beta\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ : " $\acute{\omicron}\pi\pi\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \delta\grave{\epsilon}\ \gamma\upsilon\nu\alpha\acute{\iota}\kappa\alpha\varsigma$ " (cf. *Od.* 19.67):  $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \pi\alpha\rho\theta\epsilon\nu\nu\sigma\pi\acute{\iota}\pi\alpha\varsigma$  (cf. *Il.* 11.385)  $\acute{\omicron}\ \pi\alpha\rho\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\nu\sigma\ \pi\epsilon\rho\iota\beta\lambda\epsilon\pi\acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon\nu\nu\sigma$ . Of course this reminds us that the correctness of the form  $\acute{\omicron}\pi\pi\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  (i.e. without  $\tau$ ) is guaranteed by the vocative  $\pi\alpha\rho\theta\epsilon\nu\nu\sigma\pi\acute{\iota}\pi\alpha$  at

<sup>34</sup> I should like to thank my papyrologist colleague Dr. J.E.G. Whitehorne for kindly examining the photograph of this page and allowing me to report here that he agrees with my judgment that this letter is a N, not a  $\Pi$ .

<sup>35</sup> Allen himself, presumably through one of his many oversights, fails to include this MS. in his list at this point, and I rely on the combined authority of Leaf, Ludwig and van Thiel.

<sup>36</sup> Allen's inclusion of this MS. in his list here is certainly correct: I have verified the reading from a photograph.

<sup>37</sup> For the date see my *Manuscript Evidence for Interpolation in Homer* (Heidelberg 1980) p. 30 n. 7.

*Il.* 11.385. Hesychius also writes the verb without a τ, echoing the wording of Apollonius. The Suda likewise writes ὀπιπέω. On the other hand the Etymologicum Gudianum (421.16-20) does write ὀπιπέω, as does the standard version of the Etymologicum Magnum (627.55-7), which has influenced Eustathius's comment on this line (Eust. 483.37, 43); but Eustathius does write ὀπιπέσας at *Il.* 7.243 (Eust. 679.11),<sup>38</sup> and the V codex of the Et. Mag. also favours the spelling ὀπιπέω (Gaisford app. crit. 1784 B). As for the other testimonia, Plutarch quotes the line at *Mor.* 540e, where his MSS. are divided between the two readings but the majority - including most of the *early* MSS. - have ὀπιπέεις. Finally, Schol. T quotes the line with ὀπιπέεις in a comment on *Il.* 4.297-9, and also writes the word thus three times in two comments on *Il.* 4.371-2, one of them from Nicanor. To conclude: although ὀπιπέεις at *Il.* 4.371 is only a minority reading, it has the support of our earliest MSS. - which now include Sinaiticus - and also the earliest lexicographers - Apollonius Sophistes, Hesychius, the Suda. This is really a textbook case of *codices vetustiores meliores, recentiores deteriores*.<sup>39</sup>

(d) It is reassuring that Sinaiticus line 16 (*Il.* 4.372) has πτωσκαζέμεν, with virtually all our sources, not πτωκαζέμεν. Amazingly, the latter reading was all the rage among the editors of the 17th, 18th and early 19th centuries (possibly because, as Heyne suggested, the word was perceived as being related to πτώξ πτωκός "hare" as a symbol of timidity) even though even now it has still only been reported as being present in four *Iliad* MSS., one of them from the 13th century and three of them from the 15th, and as a *varia lectio* in the Suda, where most MSS. have πτωσκαζέμεν but two have πτωκ-, one of them saec. xiii and the other saec. xv. With the suspicion that the πτωκ- variant in the MSS. of Homer might have been underreported I examined this part of the text in five other MSS. - Allen's V12 (saec. xii), V9 (s. xiii), M5 (s. xiii), M11 (s. xiii) and M10 (s. xiii-xiv). In the first four of these the reading is πτωσκαζέμεν, but in the fifth - Ambrosianus 486 (L73 sup.) - it is πτωκαζέμεν. So we now have an additional MS. with the πτωκ- variant, but it is doubtless significant that it is the latest of the five I have collated. So πτωκαζέμεν appears to have no support earlier than the 13th century, and this should be judged another case of *vetustiores meliores*.<sup>40</sup>

#### 4. Conclusion

It is not easy to generalize about the varying quality of this testimony. Valuable and much-needed confirmations of good minority readings rub shoulders with the grossest errors, while some sound majority readings are also reassuringly (if unexcitingly) confirmed.

University of Queensland

Michael J. Apthorp

<sup>38</sup> I.e. in van der Valk's edition of Eust.'s autograph, but not in Stallbaum, where it has been "corrected" to ὀπιπέσας - a *Verschlimmbesserung* which has misled Ludwig and Mazon ad loc. Cf. n. 24 above.

<sup>39</sup> The MSS. are similarly divided between ὀπιπέσας and ὀπιπέω at *Il.* 7.243, with the earliest of them once again favouring the former reading; and there are also rather similar divisions among the MSS. of Hesiod at *Op.* 29 and 806 - in the latter passage it is striking that our three earliest MSS., including a fourth-century parchment codex, all have ὀπιπέοντα (I rely on M.L. West [ed.], *Hesiod: Works & Days* [Oxford 1978]). But as recently as 1897 the 8th edition of Liddell & Scott only had an entry for ὀπιπέω and could blithely assure us that "A later form is ὀπιπέω".

<sup>40</sup> For discussion see C. Hentze, *Anhang zu Homers Ilias: Schulausgabe von K.F. Ameis Heft II* (Leipzig 1882) ad loc. Ludwig ad loc. finds *both* forms (πτωσκαζέμεν and πτωκαζέμεν) in Eustathius; this was based on a careful reading of the Stallbaum edition, but van der Valk's edition reveals that Eustathius actually wrote the -σ- form both times: 483.45 πτωσκαζέμεν, 484.2 πτωσκάζω; cf. notes 24 and 38 above.