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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. 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. 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 II. 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, 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. This page starts with the latter half of the paraphrase of II. 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, 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 II. 1.496 against that of van Thiel and nearly all the other MSS. (see 2 (g) below).


2 Politis (above, n. 1) p. 14.

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

4 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).

5 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 Ilia (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 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, 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. MT26) 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. 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’ αἰθρή | πέπττοτι ἀνέφελος, λευκὴ δ’ ἐπιδιδρομεν αὔγλη. 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 πολέσκετο for πολέσκετο) as well as minor variations in the use of diacritical marks (e.g. Il. 1.488 παρ’ ἡμενος, cf. A παρ’ ἡμενος) 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 σκιδνωντο (a slip for σκιδνωντο), 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 σκιδνωντο is thought of as lacking the augment. 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[κ]δναντο at this point; so also the Epimerismi Homerici of the ninth century;10 so also, “ut videtur”, West’s unpublished Oxyrhynchus papyrus (= his Pap. 792; date not stated). The other relevant papyri either have have
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 πολλάδι μόγγισα, not πόλλα ἐμψύχησα (the latter reading is found in all but one of our sources, including four papyri, 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 ἔστήκει (sic, = ἔστήκετ), 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 ἐστήκει 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.13

(b) Sinaiticus line 5 (Il. 1.489) has πηλέως ύιος (with synizesis of ψω): 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 Πηλέως is a poorly supported varia lectio here), and of our earliest source, Pap. 53 (= PSI XV.1.1454 = Pack2 614), of the second century B.C.14 This is the reading printed by van Thiel. R. Janko15 argues for Πηλέως (also with synizesis), found in a substantial minority of the MSS.; this reading is printed by Ludwig and some earlier editors. M.L. West (with most other modern editors) prints Πηλήος ύιος (with shortening of the ω of ύιος), for which he argues on p. XXXIV.16 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 = Pack2 599), of the second century A.D.,17 so that Janko’s statement that “-νος 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).

11 This parallel is not chosen entirely at random but rather because, like δέ σκιδονατο 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. Chantreine, 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.

12 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 (Pack2 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.


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


16 See also W. Leaf ad loc. and Chantreine (above, n. 11) pp. 223-4.

17 See N.E. Priest, Homeric papyri in the Michigan Collection (Diss. Michigan 1975) pp. 31-49, esp. p. 40 (Πηλήος), and ZPE 46 (1982) pp. 58-69, esp. p. 64, where the dot under the second η of Πηλήος 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 (II. 1.491) again starts [o]ντε, rightly: this time οὐδὲ is found in only three MSS. (two saec. xiii, one saec. xv).

(e) Sinaiticus continues (ibid.): [o]ντε ποτ’ ἐξ [sic: grave accent, no breathing] πολέμον: ἐξ, not ἐξ, is the reading of nearly all modern editors,18 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,19 but the orthography of the paradosis as a whole may well reflect an authentic performance tradition. As for II. 1.491 itself, I cannot state with any confidence whether ἐξ or εἰς is the majority reading. A casual glance at the editions of Leaf and Ludwig, which give only the (allegedly relatively limited) manuscript support for εἰς, might suggest that ἐξ was the majority reading; but Allen’s apparatus simply states, amazingly (and wrongly), “ἐξi 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 ἐξ, as does Eustathius (140.31). My own microfiche collations of two MSS. not used by either West or van Thiel (but used by Ludwig and Allen) go some way towards supporting Ludwig (but hardly Allen): Ambrosianus 502 (L116 sup., saec. xiii)20 has εἰς, as correctly reported by Ludwig, while Ambr. 486 (L73 sup., saec. xiii-xiv) has ἐξ, as possibly implied by Ludwig but not explicitly stated by any editor. As for the papyri cited by West, two of them have ἐξ, while one, Pap. 53, our earliest source for this passage (saec. ii a.C.), has ἐξ.21 As for the testimonia, Aristonicus in Schol. A on II. 1.488 (citing 491) has ἐξ; so do most of the MSS. at Plutarch Mor. 465ε, 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 (II. 1.492) regrettably has the unmetrical πολέμον τε with nearly all our other sources. On perusing the Iliad editions it is hard to glean positive reports of MSS. with πολέμον. Ignoring corrections, I find only A and (on the authority of van Thiel) Vaticanus 26 (saec. xiii). Ludwig has no list at all for πολέμον, and his list of those of his MSS. which have πολέμον is certainly not exhaustive: to it I can add, from my own collation, Ambr. 486 (L73 sup., saec. xiii-xiv), = Ludwig’s Dd. On the other hand πολέμον 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 πολέμον or πολέμον, 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 πολέμον at Pyrrhus 13.2 and Agis and Cleomenes 55.3, and that the Teubner editors can also print, on quite good manuscript authority, πολέμον at Mor. 465ε (though there is also strong support among the early MSS. for πόλεμον). On the other hand, all the MSS. of the pseudo-Plutarchean De Homero (ibid. - see (c) above ad fin.) have πολέμον, and so does the exegetical T scholium on II. 18.125 (numbered b1 in Erbse) when quoting II. 1.492.22 To conclude, the external

19 See e.g. Janko (above, n. 15) pp. 33-4 Section 3.
20 On this MS. (and its date) see further ZPE 111 (1996) p. 147 n. 19.
21 For this last papyrus see further (b) above with n. 14.
22 On the face of it, at least, West is misleading in including this T scholium among those of his testimonia which read πολέμον. 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 πόλεμον: Erbse does print π(ολέμον) (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 πόλεμόν 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 (II. 1.496, where Thetis emerges from the sea) has ἁλάς ἥ γ’ ἀνέδουςτο κώμα θαλάσσης, i.e. the so-called Homeric "mixed aorist" ἀνέδουςτο. 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 Homericici of the ninth century,23 where the form ἀνέδουςτο is guaranteed by the very explanation given here, viz. that it is an imperfect (παραστατικός); (ii) in an A scholium (not B T, 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;24 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 ἀνέδουςτο 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 ἐνεδύστη is a lectio facilior which has spread to the majority of the MSS. by corruption.25 And indeed this precisely is the Homeric paradox as a whole, on this and similar passages, very strongly suggests. First, the form δύστετο (+ δύστετ’, δύστεθ’) without an augment, is always attested thus (-eto) either unanimously or almost unanimously wherever it occurs: II. 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" (-eto after -σ-,), and it was this signpost that protected the reading from distortion. Once this signpost was removed by the addition of an augment (ἐνεδύστη, ἀνέδουςτο, κατεδύστη, κατεδύσθεθ’, ῥυπέδουςτο), the verb took its chances, and mostly it did not fare particularly well. It did survive completely unscathed at II. 21.515 (ἐδύστετο), where all MSS. without exception have the form in -eto; but nowhere else has it done as well as this. At II. 10.517 (κατεδύστη) and Od. 6.127 (ὑπέδουςτο) the -eto form is found in most of the MSS., including most of the early MSS. Then comes quite a large group of lines where the -eto 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: II. 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 II. 1.496 itself. Finally, there are three places where the corruption has penetrated most of the MSS. and the residue is not particularly early: II. 11.16, Od. 5.337, 26 11.253. But the paradox as a whole - especially its ubiquitous and almost unanimous support for unaugmented δύστετο, but also the weight of the early evidence in favour of the -eto forms elsewhere - must make us strongly doubt whether ἐνεδύστη is a possible Homeric form anywhere. Nevertheless van Thiel has argued that at II. 1.496 we should read ἀνέδουςτο κώμα θαλάσσης for reasons of euphony, in order to retain the repetition of the ν and α sounds in ἄνεδουςτο κώμα, and this view has been sympathetically

---

23 See op. cit. (above, n. 10) p. 234.
received by Janko.\textsuperscript{27} Now I would be the last to deny the presence of alliteration and assonance in Homer’s style,\textsuperscript{28} 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 ἀνεκυμβαλλάζον at \textit{Il.} 16.379, with our earliest and best sources - Aristarchus, Páp. 370 (Pack\textsuperscript{2} 933, saec. v p.C.),\textsuperscript{29} Páp. 9 (the Syriac Palimpsest, saec. vi p.C.), the Venetus A (saec. x) - even though nearly all our other sources have the augmented ἀνεκυμβαλλάζον: whatever the precise meaning of this hapax,\textsuperscript{30} the former reading, in both rhythm and sound, seems superior to the latter,\textsuperscript{31} 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 ἀνέδησατο at \textit{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 ἀναδησατο, with absence of augment? - a form for which there is no evidence at all in the MSS. at this point. Further, the version ἀνέδησατο κύμα θαλάσσης here (with Sinaiticus) gains strong support from the closely parallel passage at \textit{Il.} 6.136, δύσηθ᾿ ὄλλας κατὰ κύμα, where virtually all our MSS. have δύσηθ᾿, even though a profusion of alphas follows: only Allen’s very late Vi4 (saec. xv) has δύσηθ᾿.\textsuperscript{32} But the final and most powerful objection must remain the strong doubt about whether Homer would even have regarded the forms δύσηστο, ἀνέδησατο 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. ὀνεκυμβαλλάζον vs. ὀνεκυμβαλλάζον) 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 \textit{euphoniae gratia}.

\section*{3. \textit{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 (\textit{Il.} 4.368) appears in Politis’s edited transcription\textsuperscript{33} as follows: καὶ μὲν τὸν νεικεσσάτο ἐπιδῶν κρείσων ἀγαμέμνον. A variant νεικεσσατο 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 νεικεσσα-, and no breathing over the following τ.\textsuperscript{34}

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

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{29} See my transcription at \textit{ZPE} 81 (1990) p. 4 with n. 22.
  \item \textsuperscript{30} See my discussion ibid. (above, n. 29) p. 6 n. 33 Section (4); also now Janko (above, n. 15) ad loc.
  \item \textsuperscript{31} Even in late antiquity this word was felt to be onomatopoeic: Schol. bΤ βομβώδες ὁν τὸ ῥῆμα ἔδωκεν ἐμφασιν τῇ ἀντιρησίᾳ.
  \item \textsuperscript{32} Firmicus Maternus 6.8 (saec. iv p.C.) and two late MSS. have δύσηθ᾿.
  \item \textsuperscript{33} Politis (above, n. 1) p. 14.
\end{itemize}
Politis and West err in transcribing a π here: their π is actually a ν,\(^{34}\) thus (diplomatic transcription with word-division added): νέικεσσεν ἵδων. 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 νέικεσσεν 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 \(\text{II.}\ 1\) page. But this cannot possibly be the horizontal of a Π, for the following five reasons:- (i) Nowhere else within these two pages does a Π horizontal extend so far to the right as to invade the space of the next letter like this (and I count 68 Πs). (ii) The right-hand end of the lower loop of the last E of νέικεσσεν 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 \(\text{II.}\ 1\) page, in lines 8, 13, 15, and 21; on the \(\text{II.}\ 4\) page, in lines 3, 8, and 16 (end of line): it never happens with the ΕΠ 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 \(\text{II.}\ 4\) page: δείσρονος ἵπποδαχμοι. So the diaeresis over the iota in νέικεσσεν ἵδων shows that a new word begins here. (v) This sequence cannot be construed as νέικεσσ’ ἔπιδων 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 ἔπιδων is supported by the gloss θεοσαμένος at this point of the prose paraphrase, a short answer is possible: εθεοσαμὴν is used on the very same page (lines 25-6) to gloss plain ἵδων (\(\text{II.}\ 4.375\)).

So, as it turns out, Sinaiticus has the same reading here as the rest of the paradosis. This is just as well, because plain ἵδων is certainly right here: cf. the parallel passages within the tightly constructed and highly formulaic Epipolesis: \(\text{II.}\ 4.232\) and \(240\) ἵδων, 255, 283, 311 and 336 ἵδων.

(b) The presence of \(\text{II.}\ 4.369\) 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 (\(\text{II.}\ 4.371\)) has ὀπιστέεις, not ὀπιστεῦεις. 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 ὀπιστεῦεις was regularly printed by editors until around the middle of the 19th century. Even A. Pierron’s edition (Paris 1869) has ὀπιστεῦεις. But the minority of the MSS. with ὀπιστεῦεις, 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)\(^{35}\) and V12,\(^{36}\) while the carelessly written Pap. 4 (saec. i p.C.,\(^{37}\) Pack2 697), according to Kenyon, distorts the word into ὀπιστεῦες (sic) - but at least this version also lacks a τ. Turning now to the lexica, we find that Apollonius Sophistes in his Homeric Lexicon also writes this word without a τ (121.30-31 Bekker): ὀπιστεῦεις - περιβλέπεις - “ὀπιστεῦεις δὲ γυναικῶς” (cf. \(\text{Od.}\ 19.67\)) - καὶ παρθένοπάς (cf. \(\text{II.}\ 11.385\)) ὁ παρθένους περιβλεπόμενος. Of course this reminds us that the correctness of the form ὀπιστεῦεις (i.e. without τ) is guaranteed by the vocative παρθένοπα at

\(^{34}\) 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 Π.

\(^{35}\) 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.

\(^{36}\) Allen’s inclusion of this MS. in his list here is certainly correct: I have verified the reading from a photograph.

\(^{37}\) 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 ὀπιτεύω. On the other hand the Etymologicum Gudianum (421.16-20) does write ὀπιτετεύω, as does the standard version of the Etymologicum Magnum (627.55-7), which has influenced Eustathius’ comment on this line (Eust. 483.37, 43); but Eustathius does write ὀπιτετεύςας at Il. 7.243 (Eust. 679.11),38 and the V codex of the Et. Mag. also favours the spelling ὀπιτεύω (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 ὀπιτεύεις. Finally, Schol. T quotes the line with ὀπιτεύεις 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 ὀπιτεύεις 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 lexica - Apollonius Sophistes, Hesychius, the Suda. This is really a textbook case of codices vetustiores meliores, recentiores deteriores.39

(d) It is reassuring that Sinaiticus line 16 (Il. 4.372) has πτωσκαξέμεν, with virtually all our sources, not πτωκοξέμεν. 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 πτός 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 πτωσκαξέμεν 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 πτωσκαξέμεν, but in the fifth - Ambrosianus 486 (L73 sup.) - it is πτωκοξέμεν. 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 πτωκοξέμεν appears to have no support earlier than the 13th century, and this should be judged another case of vetustiores meliores.40

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.
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38 I.e. in van der Valk’s edition of Eust.’s autograph, but not in Stallbaum, where it has been “corrected” to ὀπιτετεύςας - a Verschlimmbesserung which has misled Ludwig and Mazon ad loc. Cf. n. 24 above.

39 The MSS. are similarly divided between ὀπιτετεύςας and ὀπιτετεύςας 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 ὀπιτετεύςας (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 ὀπιτεύω and could blithely assure us that “A later form is ὀπιτεύω”.

40 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 (πτωσκαξέμεν and πτωκοξέμεν) 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 πτωσκαξέμεν, 484.2 πτωκόξεμεν; cf. notes 24 and 38 above.