

MICHAEL J. APTHORP

HOMER'S WINGED WORDS AND THE POPYRI:
SOME QUESTIONS OF AUTHENTICITY

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 128 (1999) 15–22

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

HOMER'S WINGED WORDS AND THE PAPYRI: SOME QUESTIONS OF AUTHENTICITY

Towards the end of his tragically short life Milman Parry wrote an important article (published posthumously) on the situations in which Homer uses the formula ἔπεα πτερόεντα.¹ In rejecting Calhoun's view that the formula indicates heightened emotion, animation or urgency,² Parry argued (convincingly, I believe) that Homer has no whole-line formula *without* ἔπεα πτερόεντα meaning (in essence) "and he said"³ (without naming the subject, who has already been named in the preceding lines) and that it is solely these grammatical, metrical and formulaic considerations which determine when Homer's words are winged.⁴ But if this is so, it raises a further question, once we start to study Homer's "winged words" formulae in any detail: just when (if ever) does Homer feel he needs to add a whole line stating "and he said" (e.g. καί μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα) when he has already stated (e.g.) that a character "rebuked" or "urged on" or "besought" another (νείκεσε, ὄτρυνε, ἐλλίσσετο, etc.), using "not a simple verb of saying but a verb or phrase which either merely implies speaking, or indicates in addition the tone, the contents, or the purpose of the speech"⁵? Of course Homer can be pleonastic in such matters, but is he pleonastic in precisely this way? Bolling, in a 1922 article,⁶ concluded that sometimes Homer is and sometimes he is not. We have, first, the "brief formulas", with *no* winged words, e.g. *Il.* 3.38-9 τὸν δ' Ἐκτώρ νείκεσεν ἰδὼν αἰσχροῖς ἐπέεσσιν· Ἰ "Δύσπαρι ...". But alongside these we also have the "full formulas" *with* winged words (or with other expressions containing speech-formulae), e.g. *Il.* 4.336-8:

336 τούς δὲ ἰδὼν νείκεσεν ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων
337 καί σφραγ φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα·
338 ὦ νιὲ Πετεῶο ..."

After considering these and many other examples Bolling concluded "that both types of formulas [i.e. the 'brief' and the 'full'] are common in the poems, and that in very many of the passages the types might be interchanged without causing any difference that we can appreciate. It is therefore our duty to accept in each case whatever the external evidence indicates as the reading of the archetype of the manuscripts and of Aristarchus."⁷

But we are now in a position to refine Bolling's conclusion significantly (at any rate as far as the "rebuking" formulae are concerned) and to show that in some important ways Homer's procedure is less haphazard than Bolling thought. This is not intended as a criticism of Bolling, since the reason for our being able to make these refinements is precisely the expansion of the external evidence since Bolling's day. And the main reason for *this* (in the present context) is the recent work of M.L. West.

¹ "About Winged Words", *CPh* 32 (1937) pp. 59-63, repr. in A. Parry (ed.), *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry* (Oxford 1971) pp. 414-18.

² G.M. Calhoun, "The Art of Formula in Homer: ἔπεα πτερόεντα", *CPh* 30 (1935) pp. 215-27. E.V. Rieu expresses a similar view on p. 18 of the Introduction to his 1946 Penguin translation of the *Odyssey*.

³ I follow Parry's deliberate simplification here; later in the same article he acknowledges the by-forms "and she said", "and I said", and his initial more technical formulation does not exclude those verses (a small minority) where there is no connective at all and the line means not "and he said" but simply "he said" - e.g. *Il.* 19.20.

⁴ Parry's arguments seem to me to be impervious to the interesting assault made on them by P. Vivante, "On Homer's Winged Words", *CQ* 25 (1975) pp. 1-12; but to argue this here would take us too far from the main point of this article.

⁵ The formulation is that of G.M. Bolling on p. 213 of "On the Interpolation of Certain Homeric Formulas", *CPh* 17 (1922) pp. 213-21.

⁶ Op. cit. (above, n. 5).

⁷ Op. cit. (above, n. 5) pp. 213-15.

It should be stressed that the appearance of Vol. I of West's splendid new Teubner edition of the *Iliad*, published in December 1998, is a major event in the history of both Homeric studies and papyrology. Its main value lies in West's Herculean and highly successful efforts to expand our knowledge of the earliest sources for the text - not only the testimonia but also (and more significantly) the papyri. It is remarkable that thanks to West's labours the known evidence for the *numerus versuum* itself has often increased dramatically since even the very recent works of D.F. Sutton⁸ and H. van Thiel.⁹ The main reason for this is West's collation of hundreds of completely unpublished Oxyrhynchus papyri in the Ashmolean Museum. To cite just one example, Sutton knows of five papyri which omit *Il.* 1.265,¹⁰ van Thiel knows of six, but West can add four more from the Ashmolean. Of especial interest are the few places where West's additional collations have led him to bracket lines not previously suspected - lines which were previously known to have a very slight weakness in their attestation but where that weakness was either totally ignored by editors and other Homerists or else put down to a mere accident of copying. Now West has been able to report that these lines are also omitted by one, two or even three of the unpublished Oxyrhynchus papyri. Of these lines only one concerns us here, *Il.* 4.337 *καί σφραγ φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα*, the very line cited above within our indented quotation as immediately following a line with *νείκεσσεν*. Actually this particular line does not *entirely* fit the category described above - it *was* suspected by Nauck in 1877, but without any external evidence against it. It was not until 1956 that the first external evidence against the line emerged,¹¹ in the form of a Milan papyrus from Madinet Madi which was republished in 1965 as P.Mil.Vogl. III.111 (Pap. 472 Mette, Pack² 720) and was dated then (in 1956 and 1965) to the first century B.C. but redated in 1993 by A.F. Moretti to the end of that century or the beginning of the next.¹² Even with this slight downdating the earliness of this papyrus - its relative closeness in time to the edition of Aristarchus (c. 150 B.C.) - should be stressed. So should the fact that the papyrus has undergone revision by a second hand, which has diligently restored a group of three lines omitted by accident (329-31: homoioteleuton 328 and 331 -ς ἀϋτήης) *and yet* has *not* made any attempt to insert line 337.¹³ Sutton rightly reported the omission of line 337 by this papyrus in his 1992 database, but van Thiel, even though he has used this database (see p. XV of his Preface), has chosen not to report the omission in his apparatus criticus. M.L. West does report it in his apparatus, where we are also informed that no fewer than three of the unpublished Oxyrhynchus papyri also omit the line. It is true that the line is included by two other unpublished Oxyrhynchus papyri, as also by Pap. 4 (Pack² 697, saec. i p.C.¹⁴) and all our minuscules. Unfortunately West does not assign dates to any of his hundreds of unpublished Oxyrhynchus papyri (though I would guess that all are likely to be post-Aristarchean), but in any case omission by as many as four papyri altogether from two different sites should surely be regarded as clear enough evidence of interpolation. West does well to bracket the line. Admittedly this interpolation must have been made very early in the post-Aristarchean period, but the same is true of a number of other interpolations of "winged words" lines and other speech-formulae designed to introduce an explicit verb of speaking (e.g. *προσηύδα*, *προσέφη*, *προσεφώνεε*) immediately before a quota-

⁸ *Homer in the Papyri* (a computerized database distributed by Scholars' Press, Atlanta 1992), now on the Internet in a revised version (January 1998) as *Homer and the Papyri* (<http://eee.uci.edu/~papyri/>).

⁹ *Homeri Ilias* (Hildesheim 1996).

¹⁰ Through an oversight Sutton has omitted P.Oxy. III.537 (Pack² 589, = Pap. 122 Collart; not in Allen); van Thiel and West rightly include this papyrus.

¹¹ A. Gianformaggio, *Acme* 9.3 (1956) pp. 76-7.

¹² *Tyche* 8 (1993) p. 94.

¹³ Cf. Moretti (above, n. 12). The editors of P.Mil.Vogl. III divided the restoration of the three omitted lines between m. 1 and m. 2, but according to Moretti all three were added by the same second hand.

¹⁴ For the date see my *Manuscript Evidence for Interpolation in Homer* (Heidelberg 1980) p. 30 n. 7.

tion: note especially *Il.* 3.389, 13.480, 17.326 and 21.73.¹⁵ Later interpolations made with the same intent are legion (see n. 15).

Further grounds for believing *Il.* 4.337 to be interpolated lie in Homer's usage in similar situations elsewhere. This point has been briefly made by West ad loc. through his list of Iliadic parallel passages where some form of the verb *νεικέω* is used to introduce a speech directly, i.e. *without* being followed by an intervening "winged words" line. This list is similar to one of Bolling's.¹⁶ But there is scope for a more analytical assessment of the relevant *νεικέω* examples and also an extension of the discussion to the relevant instances of the verb *ἐνίπτω*, which has almost exactly the same meaning as *νεικέω* and functions in much the same way but has not been considered by West or, adequately, by Bolling. We also need to consider the relevant occurrences of both verbs in the *Odyssey*.¹⁷

We may start with a group of lines where *νεικέω* or *ἐνίπτω* is used with *ἐπέεσσιν* (*vel sim.*) in the same line and where, therefore, any need for another line with *ἔπεα* (i.e. *ἔπεα πτερόντα*) would (one might think) be completely ruled out - and so it turns out to be. We find, followed immediately by direct speech, in the *Iliad*, 3.38 = 6.325 τὸν δ' Ἐκτωρ νείκεσεν ἰδὼν αἰσχροῖς ἐπέεσσιν, 4.241 τοὺς μάλα νεικείεσκε χολωτοῖσιν ἐπέεσσιν and 12.267-8 ... ἄλλον στερεοῖς ἐπέεσσιν | νείκεον, ὃν τινα πάγχυ μάχης μεθιέντα ἴδοιεν, and similarly, in the *Odyssey*, 17.374 ὡς ἔφατ', Ἀντίνοος δ' ἔπεσιν νείκεσσε συβώτην, 22.225 νείκεσεν δ' Ὀδυσῆα χολωτοῖσιν ἐπέεσσιν, and the similar 22.26 (but in three of these places - *Il.* 4.241, 12. 267-8, *Od.* 22.26 - various syntactical and contextual complexities [e.g. the iterative in the first example] would in any case have created difficulties for the standard "winged words" formulae).¹⁸ *ἐνίπτω* is not used with *ἐπέεσσιν vel sim.* (dative plural) in the *Iliad*, but in the *Odyssey* we find 18.326 ἢ ῥ' Ὀδυσῆ' ἐνένιπεν ὀνειδείοις ἐπέεσσιν and also, seven times, formulae along the lines of Ἀντίνοος/-ον δ' ἐνένιπεν ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζεν - at 16.417, 18.78, 19.90, 21.84, 167, 287, 23.96; and this latter type of formula also occurs once in the *Iliad* (at 15.552). All these lines are likewise immediately followed by quotations.

Let us next consider the rather similar lines which contain some form of *νεικέω* or *ἐνίπτω* (or other words denoting rebuke) plus, at the end of the line, the word *μῦθος* (or *μῦθον*). Here again one would think the *ἔπεα* of a "winged words" line unnecessary after *μῦθος* at the end of the preceding line, and so Homer thought too - and yet after *Il.* 10.190 τοὺς δ' ὁ γέρων γήθησεν ἰδὼν θάρσυνέ τε μῦθος someone has inserted 191 καὶ σφραγς φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόντα προσηύδα, which is omitted by most of our earliest MSS. (there are still no papyri covering this passage) and is widely (and rightly) regarded as an interpolation. But elsewhere the following "rebuking" lines are immediately followed by direct speech in all our sources: after *νεικέε μῦθος*: *Il.* 2.224; after *ἠνίπαπε μῦθος*: *Il.* 2.245, 3.427, 17.141, *Od.* 20.17, 303; after *ὀνειδείον φάτο μῦθον*: *Il.* 21.393 (21.471 will be considered later).

¹⁵ For these interpolations, and many similar ones of somewhat later date, see Bolling (above, n. 5) and op. cit. (above, n. 14) pp. 147-52, 195-6. For my disagreement with Bolling's outright condemnations of *Il.* 3.319 and 13.46 see *ibid.* pp. 17-18; it is pleasing to be able to report that on the former line West has now been able to add the testimony of another papyrus (an unpublished one in the Ashmolean), which also contains the line. Additions to the evidence cited in my *MS. Evidence* on two of the lines mentioned above in my text should be made as follows: *Il.* 3.389: see West's edition, and note esp. the omission of this line by two of his unpublished Oxyrhynchus papyri; *Il.* 13.480: see the edition of van Thiel (above, n. 9), who rightly adds that the line is also present in Pap. 481 (Pack² 789, saec. iv p.C.).

¹⁶ Op. cit. (above, n. 5) pp. 213 (foot) and 214 (top).

¹⁷ Bolling (above, n. 5) ignores virtually all examples of *ἐνίπτω* in both poems; and of the *Odyssey* examples of *νεικέω* he lists only 22.26. The occurrence of *ἐνένιπεν* at *Il.* 15.546 and 552 is disguised by Bolling through being rather misleadingly listed (p. 215) under the heading of the preceding and merely preparatory *κἄλε(σ)ε* of line 545.

¹⁸ I have omitted *Il.* 21.480 from this list (*νεικέσεν ἰοχέαιραν ὀνειδείοις ἐπέεσσι*) because it is a post-Aristarchean interpolation: it is absent from all our sources earlier than the 13th century (including two papyri), while the excerpts from Aristonicus in Schol. A bT Ge on *Il.* 21.479 also show that it was unknown to Aristarchus (see further op. cit. [above, n. 14] pp. 183-4 n. 69); but in any case the interpolation follows the same pattern as the genuine lines with forms of *νεικέω*.

We come now to the crux of the matter - lines where forms of *νεικέω* or *ἐνίπτω* are *not* accompanied by *ἐπέεσσιν* or *μύθῳ*. If ever a “winged words” line were to follow a “rebuking” line, these would surely be among the likeliest places to look. And what do we find?

- (a) *Il.* 5.471: ἔνθ' αὖ Σαρπηδὼν μάλα νείκεσεν Ἴκτορα δῖον· | “Ἴκτορ ...”
- (b) *Il.* 10.158: ... ὄτρυνέ τε νείκεσέ τ' ἄντην· | “ἔγρεο ...”
- (c) *Il.* 16.626: ὡς φάτο, τὸν δ' ἐνένιπε Μενoitίου ἄλκιμος υἱός· | “Μηριόνη ...”
- (d) *Il.* 23.473: τὸν δ' αἰσχρῶς ἐνένιπεν Ὀϊλῆος ταχὺς Αἴας· | “Ἴδομενεῦ ...”
- (e) *Od.* 19.65: ἦ δ' Ὀδυσῆ' ἐνένιπε Μελανθῷ δεύτερον αὐτίς· | “ξείν' ...”
- (f) *Od.* 22.212: πρῶτος τήν γ' ἐνένιπε Δαμαστορίδης Ἀγέλαος· | “Μέντορ ...”

In all six of these places it would have been semantically and grammatically possible for Homer to insert the line *καί μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα* between the *νείκεσε(ν)/ἐνένιπε(ν)* line and the start of the quotation, but in none of these places has he done so. And this is perfectly logical: the verbs mean “he/she rebuked”, and “rebuked” implies “said”, so there is no need for Homer to add another line stating “and he/she said”.¹⁹ Thus the early post-Aristarchean transmission, Homeric practice elsewhere and *ratio et res ipsa* all combine in support of the view that *Il.* 4.337 is an interpolation.

But - it may be asked - is there no evidence at all on the other side - divergences from the Homeric practice so far described which might provide parallels for the “winged words” line at *Il.* 4.337? The short answer is “No”, but in its defence a little more explanation will be necessary.

First, we find two examples, *Il.* 15.546-52 and *Od.* 18.321-6, where, after a first line introducing a rebuke (*ἐνένιπε(ν)*), there follow four or five lines of syntactically complex digression introducing either the object or the author of the rebuke (*Il.*: Melanippus; *Od.*: Melanthis), after which a resumptive speech-introduction immediately before the speech itself is syntactically essential (*Il.* 15.552 τὸν ῥ' Ἴκτορ ἐνένιπεν ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζεν, *Od.* 18.326 ἦ ῥ' Ὀδυσῆ' ἐνένιπεν ὀνειδείους ἐπέεσσιν).²⁰ The situation here, with the many digressive lines intervening before the speech starts, is of course utterly different from the situation at *Il.* 4.336-8, where there is no such digression; and so the resumptive and essential *Il.* 15.552 and *Od.* 18.326 do not constitute parallels to the superfluous *Il.* 4.337.

Secondly, we find two places where the “rebuking” speech-introduction occupies *two* lines, but the second line, *unlike Il.* 4.337, is not designed merely (if at all) to add “and (s)he said” but (a) *explicitly* carries on the concept of *rebuke*, and also (b) clearly adds some specific extra detail. This is particularly clear in the case of *Od.* 17.215-16, where the goatherd Melanthis is about to revile Eumaeus and the disguised Odysseus: τὸς δὲ ἰδὼν νείκεσεν ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζεν | ἔκπαγλον καὶ ἀεικές, ὄρινε δὲ κῆρ Ὀδυσῆος· | “νῦν μὲν δὴ ...”. But *Il.* 21.470-71 will need a little more discussion. The context is the Theomachy: Apollo has just succeeded in avoiding a fight with Poseidon, only to be reproached by Artemis for cowardice: τὸν δὲ κασιγνήτη μάλα νείκεσε, πότνια θηρῶν, | Ἄρτεμις ἀγροτέρη, καὶ ὀνειδείων φάτο μῦθον· | “φεύγεις δὴ, ἐκάεργε ...”. We should note, first, that

¹⁹ However, G.S. Kirk (*The Iliad: A Commentary* Vol. I [Cambridge 1985] p. 365) has argued that *Il.* 4.337 “might appear superfluous, but the fact is that *νεικέω* is not regarded as in itself a verb of speaking, at least prospectively, and needs bolstering by *μύθῳ*, *ἐπέεσσιν* or the like (as at e.g. 2.224, 3.38), or at least by the addition of a verb like *ὀτρύνω* (at 10.158). Here it receives an entire verse of address to supplement it.” That Kirk’s “fact” is not a fact at all is proved conclusively by Example (a) in my text above. Moreover, we should compare the use of *νεικέω* outside the context of introductory speech-formulae: sometimes here too it is indeed used with *ἐπέεσσιν* (e.g. *Il.* 2.277 *νεικεῖν βασιλῆος ὀνειδείους ἐπέεσσιν*), sometimes not (e.g. *Il.* 4.359 *οὔτε σε νεικείω περιώσιον οὔτε κελεύω*).

²⁰ These two lines were of necessity also considered above, within the category of *ἐνίπτω* + *ἐπέεσσιν* or *ἔπος τ' ἔφατ'* + immediate direct speech.

Aristarchus athetized 471 (Ἄρτεμις ...) ²¹ - so he *may* have had manuscript evidence against it, ²² and in any case it may well be an interpolation: as Aristonicus says, reflecting the views of Aristarchus, it is superfluous after πότνια θηρῶν in 470: τίς δὲ κυνηγετικὴ θεὸς εἰ μὴ ἡ Ἄρτεμις; (Schol. A) - to which we may add that Apollo does not exactly have a whole gaggle of sisters (470 κασιγνήτη) among whom Artemis has to be singled out. On the other hand Homer is not averse to explicitly naming sister-goddesses elsewhere: e.g. in introductory speech-formulae (as here) at *Il.* 18.356 Ζεὺς δ' Ἥρην προσέειπε κασιγνήτην ἄλοχόν τε and the similar *Il.* 16.432, and (albeit not in a speech-formula) again of Artemis herself at *Il.* 20.70-71 Ἥρῃ δ' ἀντέστη χρυσηλάκατος κελαδεινὴ | Ἄρτεμις ἰοχέαιρα, κασιγνήτη ἑκάτοιο; and while πότνια θηρῶν (21.470) or “mistress of animals” as a periphrasis for Artemis has become a modern cliché, it is important to remember that this is the only place in Homer where the phrase occurs. ²³ In any case, our argument need not depend on branding 471 as an interpolation, since (whoever its author) it was obviously added primarily in order to name Artemis rather than to insert “and she said” before the speech. After 470 it would have been perfectly possible to add the line καὶ μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (cf. *Il.* 4.337), but the line which we actually have (471) is significantly different.

Finally, however, we need to consider an example which, *at first sight, does* constitute an *exact* parallel to *Il.* 4.336-8, viz. *Il.* 4.368-70:

368 καὶ τὸν μὲν νείκεσσαν ἰδὼν κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων
 369 καὶ μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα·
 370 “ὦ μοι, Τυδέος υἱὲ ...”

I say “at first sight” because 369, like 337, actually has a weakness in its attestation and has likewise been bracketed by West; and of course if 369 is itself spurious its presence here cannot legitimately be used as an argument for the authenticity of the similar 337. Admittedly the external evidence against 369 is not as strong as that against 337; but on the strength of this limited evidence the line was condemned as an interpolation by Bolling in various treatments between 1914 and 1950. ²⁴ Bolling knew that the line was omitted by Pap. 32 (Pack² 722, saec. iii p.C.) and by A (in its text - the line has been added in the margin); and he also knew that the line was present in all our other minuscules and in Pap. 4 (Pack² 697, saec. i p.C. ²⁵). Since Bolling's time the external evidence against the line has not expanded but the external evidence in its favour has. First, in 1951 the line turned out to be present in Pap. 396 Mette ²⁶ (Pack² 1176, saec. ii-iii p.C.); and in 1980 I assessed the evidence then available as follows: “In my opinion the evidence for and against the line is fairly evenly balanced. On the one hand the omission could well be accidental, the product of the homoiarchon κοί in 368 and 369: Allen ad loc. states flatly ‘om. ... ex homoearch.’ On the other hand, the line could well be an early post-

²¹ Aristonicus in Schol. A ad loc. and also in Schol. A T on *Il.* 21.511. See further D. Lührs, *Untersuchungen zu den Athetesen Aristarchs in der Ilias* (Hildesheim 1992) pp. 68-9.

²² As M. Haslam correctly states, “It is ... clear that Aristarchus did at least on occasion have manuscript authority for his atheteses” (I. Morris and B. Powell [edd.], *A New Companion to Homer* [Leiden 1997] p. 76). The evidence for this is assembled in *MS. Evidence* (above, n. 14) pp. 49-53 with notes on pp. 102-9. R. Janko is misleading when he writes that “the Alexandrians athetised suspect verses, ... rather than omitted them, only when they *lacked* external evidence against them” (*JHS* 118 [1998] p. 207). But G.M. Bolling doubtless overstates the case on *Il.* 21.471 (*The Athetized Lines of the Iliad* [Baltimore 1944] p. 173): “It is hardly possible that this verse was in all of Aristarchus' MSS. Indeed he could have had no reason except bad attestation for his athetesis, since the line is, as Leaf says, ‘quite inoffensive’.”

²³ So N. Richardson, *The Iliad: A Commentary* Vol. VI (Cambridge 1993) ad loc.

²⁴ For a full list of references see op. cit. (above, n. 14) p. 30 n. 6; Bolling's discussions include op. cit. (above, n. 5), esp. pp. 217-19.

²⁵ See above, n. 14.

²⁶ See H.J. Mette, *RPh* 29 (1955) p. 195 with p. 202 (on Pap. Q). This item has been renumbered h48 by Sutton (above, n. 8), who is followed by West (op. cit. p. LV); it is misleadingly described by Sutton as “paraphrase of Δ 349-73 with explanations” and similarly by West as “paraphr. Δ 349-73 cum explicationibus”. In fact this item contains, in order, (a) a *prose paraphrase* of *Il.* 4.349-63; (b) the *full text* of 364-73; (c) a *glossary* on 364-71.

Aristarchean interpolation: it is far from essential to its context; ... we know that other speech-formulae of this type were interpolated early in the post-Aristarchean era; and it is noteworthy that the only minuscule which omits the line is the earliest we possess (Allen's D is not extant at this point). However, I would regard the evidence in favour of the line as strong enough, and early enough, to *slightly* outweigh the evidence against it."²⁷ Since then the line has also turned out to be present in Pap. 568 Sutton (= West's X = the Sinai leaves, c. A.D. 850) and now in Pap. 965, one of West's unpublished Oxyrhynchus papyri (date not stated). So should we not now regard the total evidence in favour of the line's authenticity as being a lot more solid than in 1980?

If the evidence gathered by West against the authenticity of the very similar line 337 had never emerged, the answer "Yes" would have seemed very inviting; but as it is, the answer must be "No", for the following four reasons:-

(1) It is best to regard the limits of our evidence against 369 as a matter of chance: of the four papyri which omit 337, none are still extant to testify on the text of 368-70: e.g. Pap. 472 peters out (infuriatingly!) after line 367. If these four papyri were less fragmentary, there is a good chance that all or most of them would also testify to the absence of 369. Conversely, Pap. 965, which *contains* 337, is extant to testify on 369, which, unsurprisingly, it also contains. As for the recently published Pap. 568, its date (saec. ix) is so much later than is usual for an uncial that the presence in it of 369 should not be regarded as enormously significant when we know that other speech-formulae of this type were interpolated early in the post-Aristarchean era.

(2) From considerations based on the number of lines (25, = the usual number) in the *text* of the Venetus A on this page, J. van Leeuwen has argued (convincingly) that line 369 was also absent from the lost *exemplar* of A.²⁸ If it had been present in the exemplar but *accidentally* omitted by the scribe of A through the influence of the homoiarchon καί, there would have been only 24 lines in the text on this page of A, whose scribe is in the habit of copying the layout of his exemplar, starting and ending his own pages where the exemplar did - and the exemplar (we can deduce) consistently had 25 lines of text per page. We can take a further step and argue that it is also most unlikely that 369 was present even in the margin of A's exemplar, since the scribe of A is in the habit of incorporating such marginal addenda into his text (thereby producing occasional 26-line pages), which he has not done here. What is the significance of this? (a) It takes the evidence against 369 back to a period earlier than the date of A itself; and (b) it shows that the omission of 369 *by the scribe of A* was at any rate *not* a mechanical error *on his part*. This evidence is therefore entirely compatible with the thesis that the absence of 369 from the text of A is evidence of its spuriousness. (Admittedly, however, we cannot completely exclude the possibility that the omission of the line was caused by an accident in an *ancestor* of A.)

(3) In trying to assess whether the omission of 369 by two early sources is accidental or significant, we cannot ignore the internal evidence. The addition of a "winged words" line (369) by Homer after a verb of rebuking in the previous line would break a pattern which we have shown above to be universal elsewhere in the Homeric corpus, throughout the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey* and even the *Doloneia*. This consideration must constitute strong grounds for construing the omission of 369 by these two early sources as significant.

(4) Finally, we need to consider the structure of the Epipoleis, the section of Book 4 where Agamemnon reviews his troops, passing from one group to another (220-421: 231 and 250 ἐπεπωλεῖτο σίχλας ἀνδρῶν).²⁹ While there is plenty of variety within this episode, it has a clearly-defined structure

²⁷ Op. cit. (above, n. 14) p. 17.

²⁸ "Homeric XXIII: De Iliadis codice A", *Mnemosyne* n.s. 32 (1904) pp. 447-50, esp. p. 450 with n. 1; see further *ZPE* 111 (1996) pp. 146-7.

²⁹ For brief treatments of the structure of the Epipoleis see W. Arend, *Die typischen Szenen bei Homer* (Berlin 1933, repr. 1975) pp. 29-30, and Kirk (above, n.19) p. 354; for a more detailed treatment see K. Stanley, *The Shield of Homer: Narrative Structure in the Iliad* (Princeton 1993) pp. 67-74, esp. the charts on pp. 69 and 73.

centred on the imperial gaze of the commander-in-chief (ἴδοι/ιδών, 7 times). There are two classes of warrior on whom his gaze falls, the active and the inactive; the former are praised, the latter rebuked. The contrast is explored first at the general level (with iteratives and optatives) and then at the particular level; and the structure is signposted with appropriate verbal repetition and contrast. In outline, it goes like this:

A (general): He *sees* some warriors *bustling* and *encourages* them.

B (general): He *sees* others *slacking* and *rebukes* them.

A (particular):

(1) He *sees* the bustling Cretans, *rejoices*, and *addresses* their leader with honeyed words.

(2) He *sees* the bustling Aiantes, *rejoices*, and *addresses* them with winged words.

(3) He *sees* the bustling Nestor, *rejoices*, and *addresses* him with winged words.

B (particular):

(1) He *sees* the inactive Menestheus and Odysseus and *rebukes* them.

(2) He *sees* the inactive Diomedes and *rebukes* him.

While some of the verbal parallels occur as Agamemnon first approaches the different groups³⁰ and others as he moves on from one group to another,³¹ those most relevant to our present purpose occur as he prepares to deliver his (first) speech to each group or leader. At the preliminary or general level, the parallels and contrasts are simple and straightforward: 232-4 καὶ ῥ' οὐς μὲν σπεύδοντας ἴδοι ..., | τοὺς μάλα θαρσύνεσκε ... · | “Ἀργεῖοι ...”, 240-42 οὐς τινὰς αὖ μεθιέντας ἴδοι ..., | τοὺς μάλα νεικεῖσκε ... · | “Ἀργεῖοι ...”. At the particular level, the echoes are a little more complex. Within each of the three sections where Agamemnon addresses the active troops, we start with a line containing (a) τοὺς/τόν, (b) ἰδὼν γήθησεν/γήθησεν ἰδὼν, (c) ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων/κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων, thus:

255 τοὺς δὲ ἰδὼν γήθησεν ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων

283 καὶ τοὺς μὲν γήθησεν ἰδὼν κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων

311 καὶ τὸν μὲν γήθησεν ἰδὼν κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων

Then, since each of these lines lacks a verb of speaking, a line follows containing προσηύδα:

256 αὐτίκα δ' Ἴδομενήα προσηύδα μελιχίοισιν

284 καὶ σφραγ φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα

312 καὶ μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα

When we pass from the active to the inactive troops we find, similarly, (a) τοὺς/τόν, (b) ἰδὼν νεῖκεσεν/νεῖκεσεν ἰδὼν, (c) ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων/κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων, the only significant difference being the substitution of νεῖκεσεν for the previous γήθησεν:

336 τοὺς δὲ ἰδὼν νεῖκεσεν ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων

368 καὶ τὸν μὲν νεῖκεσεν ἰδὼν κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων

But since νεῖκεσεν, unlike γήθησεν, is a verb of speaking, we do not need an extra line of introduction after 336, nor do we find one, if we are willing (as we surely must be) to accept the testimony of the four very early witnesses. But if there is no authentic “winged words” line after 336, then surely Homer would not have added one, quite gratuitously, after 368: to do so would be to obscure, rather than enhance, the parallel with 336, which is required in order to highlight the contrast with the three γήθησεν lines printed above. Further, it may not be fanciful to see a contrast between the leisurely pace of a delighted Agamemnon in expansive mood over *two* lines (255-6, with 255 γήθησεν *and* 256

³⁰ Above, Section A (particular), (1) 251-2 ἦλθε δ' ἐπὶ Κρήτεσσι κίων ἀνά οὐλαμὸν ἀνδρῶν · | οἱ δ' ... θωρήσοντο, (2) 273-4 ἦλθε δ' ἐπ' Αἰάντεσσι κίων ἀνά οὐλαμὸν ἀνδρῶν · | τῷ δὲ κορυσσέσθη.

³¹ (a) As Agamemnon leaves the *first* and *last* groups of *active* troops - above, Section A (particular), (1) and (3) - the same “joyful” line marks his departure each time, 272 = 326 ὡς ἔφατ', Ἀτρείδης δὲ παρῶχετο γηθόσυνος κῆρ, with the double γηθόσυνος here taking up the threefold opening γήθησεν of 255, 283 and 311; (b) as he moves on to the last *active* group and (later) to the last *inactive* group, the same line marks this transition each time, 292 = 364 ὡς εἰπὼν τοὺς μὲν λίπεν αὐτοῦ, βῆ δὲ μετ' ἄλλους.

μειλίχισιν, 283-4, 311-12) and the curt, businesslike one-line introductions to the two speeches of sharp rebuke (336, 368). Be that as it may, the structure of the Epipoleis requires that 337 and 369 stand or fall together; 337 certainly falls (on account of the four omitting papyri), and so 369 must go with it, even though Chance has not allowed us to hear quite as many witnesses against it as against 337.

Let us briefly summarize our conclusions. Milman Parry was right to judge that “winged words” lines are Homer’s way of saying “and he said”. But after verbs of rebuking introducing speeches (νεικέω, ἐνίπτω) Homer never adds a “winged words” line because he does not need to add “and he said”, since “he rebuked” already implies “he said”. There are two places where this rule appears at first sight to be broken, *Il.* 4.337 and 369; but thanks to the huge advances made by M.L. West in examining and publishing our earliest evidence for the Homeric text, both these “exceptional” lines can now be shown to be bogus. The effect has been to refine our understanding of when Homer does and does not use one of his commonest and most frequently discussed formulae, and why. A more consistent, methodical and intelligible Homer has emerged as a result.