

MICHAEL J. APTHORP

DID ATHENE HELP TYDEUS TO WIN THE CADMEAN GAMES (*ILIAD* 5.808)?

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 131 (2000) 1–9

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

DID ATHENE HELP TYDEUS TO WIN THE CADMEAN GAMES (*ILIAD* 5.808)?

1. Introduction

Did Aristarchus actually omit *Il.* 5.808 from his edition of the text¹ or did he merely athetize it?² The question is a vital one in the continuing debate about the authenticity of the line, since although Aristarchus *athetized* rather freely he did not actually *omit* lines unless they were absent from the vast majority of his MSS. It was for long widely believed, on the basis of the scholia alone, that Aristarchus *did* omit the line; but G.M. Bolling, having discovered that our earliest MSS. and post-Aristarchean papyri of Homer (c. 150 B.C.-A.D. c. 1100) reflect the *numerus versusum* of Aristarchus, yet not knowing of any such sources without this line, concluded—after a rather forced and convoluted interpretation of the scholia—that the line “stood in the second edition of Aristarchus (at least) and was there athetized”.³ Since then, however, more and more early evidence against the line has gradually accumulated. For example, when I discussed the question in 1980 I was able to cite two papyri which omitted the line, one published in 1947 and the other in 1954. Now the apparatus criticus of M.L. West’s new Teubner edition of the *Iliad* (Vol. I publ. Dec. 1998) states that a third papyrus also omits it, while his Preface (p. XLII) states just as definitely that this same papyrus *contains* the line—a self-contradiction which has necessitated a fresh examination of the papyrus itself. West’s apparatus also contains a questionable statement about the D scholia, and ignores (as did Bolling) an important discovery about the exemplar of the Venetus A made by van Leeuwen in 1904. But in the end West’s new edition—here as in so many other places—will be found to have made a most valuable contribution. Still, there is scope for some clarification and supplementation of the information he has provided, and the main purpose of this article will be to offer a fuller, clearer and more up-to-date account of the external evidence on this line than has been given hitherto. To complete the picture, an assessment of the internal evidence—i.e. the incompatibility of the line with its context—will also be given. The conclusion will be that the line is certainly an interpolation. This conclusion will be in conformity with the general verdict of the 19th century, but against the trend of most 20th-century criticism.⁴

¹ In favour of Aristarchean omission are D.B. Monro (ed.), *Homer, Iliad, Books I-XII* (3rd edn., rev., Oxford 1890) ad loc.; A. Ludwich (ed.), *Homeri Ilias* Vol. I (Leipzig 1902) ad loc., and *Aristarchs Homerische Textkritik* (Leipzig 1884-5) Vol. II pp. 142, 397-8 n. 342 ad fin., 398 n. 344; V. Martin (ed.), *Papyrus Bodmer I: Iliade, chants 5 et 6* (Cologny-Geneva 1954) p. 80; M. van der Valk, *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad* (Leiden 1963-4) Part Two pp. 492-3 (p. 492 “E 808 was not written by Arist[archus]”, p. 493 “he ... removed E 808 from the text”; in n. 56 on p. 492 van der Valk says “athetised”, but this seems to be a careless misuse of the verb); my *Manuscript Evidence for Interpolation in Homer* (Heidelberg 1980) pp. 4-6 with notes pp. 11-12, followed by G.S. Kirk, *The Iliad: A Commentary* Vol. II (Cambridge 1990) p. 143, tacitly correcting his “Aristarchus ... athetized 5.808” in Vol. I of the Cambridge Commentary (1985), p. 370, on *Il.* 4.389-90; M.L. West (ed.), *Homerus: Ilias* Vol. I (Stuttgart and Leipzig, Teubner, 1998) ad loc.

² In favour of Aristarchean athetesis are E. Drerup, *Das fünfte Buch der Ilias* (Paderborn 1913) pp. 313-14 n. 3; G.M. Bolling, *AJPh* 37 (1916) pp. 25-6, cf. *The External Evidence for Interpolation in Homer* (Oxford 1925, repr. 1968) pp. 89-90; and (tentatively) H. Erbse, *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem* Vol. II (Berlin 1971) p. 109. Several other critics use vague language suggestive of athetesis (e.g. “verworfen”) but without actually using the technical term. D. Lührs (*Untersuchungen zu den Athetesen Aristarchs in der Ilias* [Hildesheim 1992]) seems uncertain: he first states without qualification (p. 196), “Aristarch athetierte E 808”, but on pp. 197-8 proceeds to put forward a strong case for the thesis “daß Vers 808 nicht in der Ausgabe Aristarchs stand, daß Aristarch den Vers also womöglich nicht bloß athetieren, sondern sogar tilgen wollte”. It is a serious deficiency of Lührs’s treatment that he nowhere considers the papyrus evidence against the line, and the same criticism applies to van der Valk (above, n. 1).

³ Bolling 1916 (above, n. 2) p. 25.

⁴ The line has been bracketed or otherwise downgraded (omission, small type) by the following editors: Wolf (1804), Payne Knight (1820), Bekker (1843 and 1858), Dindorf (3rd edn. rev. 1850), Paley (1866), Pierron (1869), Faesi-Franke (5th edn. 1871), Nauck (1877), Ameis-Hentze (numerous edns.), Monro (1890), Ludwich (1902), van Leeuwen - Mendes da

2. II. 5.808 in its context

Diomedes's wound is causing him some distress, and he is taking a brief rest. Athene appears before him and spurs him on by contrasting him unfavourably with his father Tydeus, reworking a point made in Book 4 by Agamemnon: both tell the same story of Tydeus's heroic solo diplomatic mission to Thebes (4.365-400, 5.800-813), albeit from different viewpoints and with different and even conflicting details. I now cite Athene's speech in Book 5, bracketing the disputed 808 and underlining some key sections which will feature in the later discussion:

“ἢ ὀλίγον οἱ παῖδα ἐοικότα γείνατο Τυδεύς.	800
Τυδεύς τοι μικρὸς μὲν ἔην δέμας, ἀλλὰ μαχητῆς·	
καί ῥ' ὅτε πέρ μιν ἐγὼ πολεμίζειν οὐκ εἶασκον	
οὐδ' ἐκπαιφάσσειν, ὅτε τ' ἤλυθε νόσφιν Ἀχαιῶν	
ἄγγελος ἐς Θήβας πολέας μετὰ Καδμείωνας·	
<u>δαίνυσθαί μιν ἄνωγον ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν ἔκηλον·</u>	805
αὐτὰρ ὁ θυμὸν ἔχων ὄν καρτερόν, ὡς τὸ πάρος περ,	
κούρους Καδμείων προκαλίζετο, πάντα δ' ἐνίκα	
[ῥηϊδίως· τοίη οἱ ἐγὼν ἐπιτάρροθος ἦα].	808
σοὶ δ' ἦτοι μὲν ἐγὼ <u>παρὰ θ' ἴσταμαι ἠδὲ φυλάσσω,</u>	
<u>καί σε προφρονέως κέλομαι Τρώεσσι μάχεσθαι·</u>	810
ἀλλὰ σευ ἢ κάματος πολυαῖξ γυῖα δέδυκεν,	
ἢ νύ σέ που δέος ἴσχει ἀκήριον· οὐ σύ γ' ἔπειτα	
Τυδέος ἔκγονός ἐσσι δαίφρονος Οἰνείδαο.”	

3. The external evidence: scholia, MSS., papyri

The Aristarchean scholia state explicitly that line 808 was completely absent from both the editions of Aristarchus: e.g. Schol. bT (Didymus) οὐ καθόλου δὲ εὐρέθη ἐν ταῖς⁵ Ἀριστάρχου. The A scholium on 807 (Aristonicus) not only tells us that Zenodotus added a line after 807 (= our 808) but likewise implies by its wording that Aristarchus did not admit the line to his own text.⁶ And as Zenodotus is specially singled out here, the most natural implication is surely that his text was the only one known to Aristarchus which contained the line—though we cannot completely exclude the possibility that there were a very few others as well.⁷ But the wording of the Aristonicus scholium certainly implies that the

Costa (3rd edn. 1906), J.C. Bruijn - C. Spoelder (1937), Bolling (*Ilias Atheniensium* [Lancaster, Pa., 1950]) and M.L. West (1998). Within these editions note also the discussions by Pierron, Faesi-Franke and Monro in their commentaries, and also the Ameis-Hentze *Anhang* ad loc. (I have used the 2nd rev. edn. of Vol. II, Leipzig 1882). See also the comment ad loc. in the edition of W. Leaf (Vol. I London 1900). The line has also been regarded as spurious by H. Duentzer (*De Zenodoti studiis Homericis* [Göttingen 1848] p. 157), Bolling 1925 (above, n. 2) loc. cit., and M.W. Haslam in I. Morris and B. Powell (edd.), *A New Companion to Homer* (Leiden 1997) p. 97. On the other side—defending the authenticity of the line—are Drerup (above, n. 2) pp. 311-14; V. Hebel, *Untersuchungen zur Form und Funktion der Wiedererzählungen in Ilias und Odyssee* (diss. Heidelberg 1970) pp. 85-7; Ø. Andersen, *Die Diomedesgestalt in der Ilias* (Oslo 1978) pp. 78-80; I. de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad* (Amsterdam 1987) p. 277 n. 19; Kirk 1990 and 1985 (above, n. 1) locc. citt.; Lührs (above, n. 2) p. 197 n. 166, p. 198. I shall not attempt to list all the 20th-century editors who print the line, unbracketed, but they include M.M. Willcock (Vol. I London 1978) and H. van Thiel (Hildesheim 1996). Most 20th-century English translations also include the line, e.g. all five listed in n. 31 below, but an honourable exception is that of Robert Graves (*The Anger of Achilles: Homer's Iliad* [London 1960]), as would be expected of one who set intelligibility as his aim above all else.

⁵ ταῖς: Maass's emendation for Schol. T's τοῖς: the parallel A scholium has ταῖς here (= the usual Didymean formulation, sc. ταῖς ἐκδόσεσσι). The b family here has simply παρὰ Ἀριστάρχῳ.

⁶ I cite and discuss the scholia at greater length in *MS. Evidence* (above, n. 1) loc. cit.; see also Lührs (above, n. 2) pp. 195-8.

⁷ Cf. Ludwich, *AHT* (above, n. 1) Vol. II p. 142.

line was absent from the vast majority of Aristarchus's sources; and this would be in conformity with the other evidence for his extreme conservatism in establishing his *numerus versusum*.⁸

But the attention drawn to the line by Aristarchus and his followers had the unintended side-effect of leading to its reinterpolation on a grand scale: *before* Aristarchus (as we have seen) the line must have been present in only a tiny fraction of the MSS., but *after* him it eventually spread to virtually the entire tradition, so that when Walter Leaf came to prepare his commentary in 1900 he could say ad loc. that "there is no trace of omission in the MSS."—a point which had already been made by Arthur Ludwich in 1885: "Der Vers ... fehlte ... in den Ausgaben Aristarch's: trotzdem haben ihn die bis jetzt collationirten Codices alle ohne Ausnahme, auch der Ven. A."⁹ Note the wistful hope implied in Ludwich's "bis jetzt": as though in answer to his prayer T.W. Allen set off on his annual Italian collating pilgrimages (1888-94) and came back with the news that two MSS., one in Rome and the other in Florence, did in fact omit the line, respectively his V16 (saec. xii) and L9 (A.D. 1452).¹⁰ But are these omissions significant or are they meaningless scribal slips caused by the slight homoiographa?¹¹ Is there any way we can tell? We shall return to these questions below, while noting first that they are of only minor importance in comparison to the much more significant evidence of the papyri, to which we must now turn.

In 1980¹² I was able to report that two papyri, published too recently to be taken into account by Bolling, omit the line: (a) Pap. 408 Mette, = Pack² 765, saec. ii p.C., published in 1947, and (b) Pap. 400-401 Mette, = Pack² 736, saec. iii-iv p.C., published in 1954. These omissions are of first-rate importance, as they prove that the early post-Aristarchean tradition did indeed omit the line, thereby vindicating all those scholars who have taken the scholia at face value and believed their assertions that the line was absent from the editions of Aristarchus. It was mainly the apparent absence of any early post-Aristarchean manuscript evidence against the line that had so troubled Bolling and had led him to conclude that it must have been present in the text of Aristarchus after all: had he known of these two papyri he would undoubtedly have changed his mind.

But there is also a third extant papyrus to be considered here, Pap. 295 (sometimes called Pap. 183 + 295), = Pack² 755, saec. ii-iii p.C. This Vienna papyrus was published by H. Gerstinger in 1926 by description and collation.¹³ It comprises a series of separate fragments from the latter half of a roll of *Iliad* 5. The portion that concerns us here is Gerstinger's Section 11, inv. Gr. 26761, comprising four adjacent fragments together covering (he claims) lines 808-17. Now if a scholar of Gerstinger's standing tells us, without any qualification, that Gr. 26761 contains "E ... 808-817", it is a reasonable inference that it actually contains the line with which it is said to start, 808. This was certainly the inference drawn by Bolling, who had an opportunity to return to the issue in 1950; in fact it (understandably) entrenched him further in his view that the line was read by Aristarchus, since he was still unaware of any papyri which omitted it.¹⁴ That Gerstinger's papyrus included 808 was also accepted by

⁸ See my *MS. Evidence* (above, n. 1), esp. pp. 47-56 with notes pp. 102-10.

⁹ Op. cit. (above, n. 7) Vol. II p. 398 n. 344.

¹⁰ See the 1902 O.C.T. edn. of *Iliad* I-XII (also 2nd edn. 1908, 3rd edn. 1920) by D.B. Monro and T.W. Allen ad loc. For Allen's Italian peregrinations see his *editio maior* of the *Iliad* (Oxford 1931) Vol. I (Prolegomena) p. 271.

¹¹ I discuss the homoiographa in *MS. Evidence* (above, n. 1), p. 5 and p. 12 n. 14. Bolling (*AJPh* 37 [1916] p. 26) thought the homoiographa probably accounted for the omissions; so (more definitely) did Allen in 1931, op. cit. (above, n. 10) Vol. II ad loc.; while Haslam in the *New Comp.* (above, n. 4) p. 97 n. 127 writes that the omissions are "surprising" and are "perhaps due either to Aristarchus-induced excision or to homoiomeson": while the former explanation is interesting and just possible, I regard it as unlikely in the light of my 1980 conclusion that "the evidence for post-Aristarchean excision ... is meagre and ambiguous" (*MS. Evidence* [above, n. 1] p. 29).

¹² *MS. Evidence* (above, n. 1) p. 5.

¹³ *Archiv für Bibliographie, Buch- und Bibliothekswesen* Vol. I (1926) pp. 88-9 No. 8.

¹⁴ Bolling 1950 (above, n. 4) p. 4 n. 10; see also my *MS. Evidence* (above, n. 1) p. 5.

me in 1980,¹⁵ by van Thiel in 1996¹⁶ and by Haslam in 1997.¹⁷ Similarly, in 1998 M.L. West states in the Preface to his new Teubner edition (p. XLII, Pap. 183) that the papyrus contains (*inter alia*) “E ... 808-53”. Against this, however, his apparatus criticus states that this same papyrus *omits* line 808. Obviously one of these two contradictory entries is an error. Which one?

Thanks to the generous and expert help of the Director and staff of the Papyrussammlung of the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek—more specifically Dr. Hermann Harrauer, Dr. Amphilochos Papathomas and the restorer Frau Andrea Donau—and the photographs they have kindly prepared and sent, I am now in a position to answer this question by transcribing the first five lines of this section, i.e. more than enough to prove that the first line is 807 and the second 809, and that line 808 is absent:¹⁸

1	κουρους καδ]μ[ειων] πρ[οκαλιζετο παντα δ' ενικα	807
2	σοι δ' ητοι μ]εν ε[γω] παρ[α] θ' [ισταμαι ηδε φυλασσω	809
3	και σε προφρ]ονεως κε[λο]μαι τρ[ωεσσι μαχεσθαι	810
4	αλλα σευ η] κ]αματος πολυαϊξ [γνια δεδυκεν	811
5	η νυ σε που] δεος ισχει ακηριον [ου συ γ' επειτα	812

(After this, the remains of the middles of lines 813-17 are also clearly discernible.) I have inspected and assessed the remains of line 1 very carefully, and I am fully satisfied that, paltry as they are, they cannot possibly fit line 808, but fit line 807 perfectly. And it is absolutely certain that 807 is immediately followed not by 808 but by 809 ff.¹⁹ So while the entry in West’s Preface is wrong, the entry in his apparatus is correct, and he deserves credit for his initiative in inspecting the papyrus anew instead of resting content with Gerstinger’s exiguous and (as it turns out) inaccurate description and collation. The result? We now know that all three of the extant papyri omit line 808 (instead of only two of the three, as previously believed), and this significantly strengthens the testimony against the line in the early post-Aristarchean tradition.

But there is more to come. In 1904 J. van Leeuwen²⁰ made an important (but unjustly neglected) discovery: that wherever the Venetus A has a page with 26 lines (instead of the normal 25), this is because the scribe has incorporated into his text a line which was present only in the margin of his exemplar. Thanks to the work of Bolling and recent papyrus publications, we can now see, more clearly than van Leeuwen himself was able to, that the main reason for the absence of such lines from the text

¹⁵ Loc. cit. (above, n. 12).

¹⁶ Op. cit. (above, n. 4) ad loc.

¹⁷ Haslam in *New Comp.* (above, n. 4) p. 97 n. 127.

¹⁸ I provide a diplomatic transcription (with word-division added); I have printed elision-marks within the lacunae since the apostrophe after the θ in line 2 is visible and Gerstinger has told us that this roll includes apostrophes (loc. cit. [above n. 13] p. 88). I should like to thank my papyrologist colleague Dr. John Whitehorne for expertly and patiently helping me to improve my transcription.

¹⁹ It should be noted that the primary source for the first two lines is now (regrettably) no longer the papyrus itself but a photograph taken some time ago by the Papyrussammlung (let us call it Photo 1). In Photo 1, the μ, π and ρ in line 1 are all well enough preserved to be clearly identifiable. However, since the time when Photo 1 was taken, a small strip has broken off at the top of the papyrus and been lost, decapitating both the π and the ρ (but leaving the μ intact), and a second loss, of a tiny scrap after the θ in line 2, has removed the following apostrophe. (This is Murphy’s First Law of Papyrology at work with a vengeance, which states that the chances that any given section of a papyrus will be well preserved are in inverse proportion to its potential importance.) Further, within Photo 1, the narrow left-hand fragment (48 mm. × 11 mm.) has been wrongly positioned, one line too low. After I had pointed this out to Dr. Harrauer, the left-hand fragment was repositioned correctly, some further more general restoration-work was done on the papyrus by Frau Donau, and a new photograph was then taken and sent to me (we shall call this Photo 2). On the whole, the rearrangement, restoration-work and new photography have significantly improved legibility, in places spectacularly so. But any future study of this papyrus will need to use *both* Photo 1 *and* Photo 2 to get the full picture.

²⁰ “Homerica XXIII: De Iliadis codice A”, *Mnemosyne* n.s. 32 (1904) pp. 447-50.

of A's lost exemplar is that they are interpolations which were absent from Aristarchus's text.²¹ Now on the page containing line 808, viz. folio 78a (= recto), there are in fact 26 lines, 787-812. None of these lines has any reason whatever to be considered non-Aristarchean except 808: it must have been this line that was absent from the text of the exemplar, as van Leeuwen himself argued.

Two pieces of circumstantial evidence perhaps tend to support this conclusion, though I put both forward very tentatively, especially the second one. (a) Of the two minuscules which omit line 808, one is Allen's V16 (= Vat. gr. 1319, saec. xii), which he classifies among his "independent MSS."²² Now M.L. West has succeeded in establishing numerous links between this Vatican MS. (which he labels W) and the Venetus A.²³ Given this relationship, it is tempting to argue that the visible absence of 808 from the Vatican MS. strengthens still further the already strong case for the deduced absence of the line from the exemplar of A. (b) If we inspect the Venetus A itself, we see that after writing line 807 the scribe must have paused, at least for a few moments, since by the time he resumes he has either sharpened his pen or switched to a new and much finer one. Why stop at this particular moment, only a few lines before the foot of the page, when his pen still seems to be in pretty good shape? Any number of mundane reasons could be plausibly suggested, but could it not be that he was uncertain how to proceed—i.e. whether he should put the marginal extra line into his text—and wished first to consult one or two other MSS.? But then again, this could well be just a meaningless coincidence.

West's apparatus also states that Didymus had 808 in his own text. Lührs has argued the opposite, citing the Didymean bT scholium on 807-8, οὐ καθόλου δὲ εὐρέθη ἐν ταῖς Ἀριστάρχου τὸ "ῥηϊδίως· τοίη οἱ ἐγὼν ἐπιτάρροθος ἦα" (808)· ἐναντίον γὰρ ἔστι τοῖς προκειμένοις: "Die Tatsache, daß Vers 808 zitiert wird, kann nur heißen, daß dieser Vers in der Ausgabe, die Didymos vor Augen hatte, nicht im Text war."²⁴ But why should this follow? While Didymus doubtless expected his readers to study his work in conjunction with a copy of the Homeric text, he needed to take the trouble to orientate them clearly in an age when there was no agreed system of line-numbering. When his work was later epitomized and transferred to the margins of the poems themselves, the need for such whole-line lemmata and quotations would have lessened, and doubtless there were many more of them in the original Didymus than in the truncated versions of our scholia. Indeed, to some extent we can see this process at work within the extant scholia themselves: e.g. the more elaborate Didymean A scholium on *Il.* 1.108 quotes the whole line, while the brief bT version does not. Thus, on a straightforward reading, it would be perfectly possible to interpret the scholium quoted above as referring to "the line 'ῥηϊδίως ...' [which I find in my text here]": so, presumably, West. But in the scholia things are not always straightforward; and though it is indeed wrong to say (as Lührs does) that Didymus's quotation of the line "can *only* mean" that it was absent from his own text, it is surely *compatible* with its absence from his text, i.e. if we suppose that in this case τὸ "ῥηϊδίως ..." does not mean "the line in *my* text" but rather "the line that *Zenodotus* included here". Of course there is no explicit reference to *Zenodotus* in the (abbreviated?) version we happen to have in the scholia, but there could well be a good reason for this: although Didymus and Aristonicus often covered much the same ground as each other, their epitomator liked to avoid (or at any rate reduce) unnecessary repetition: see e.g. Schol. A on *Il.* 8.535-7: [after a citation from Aristonicus] τὰ αὐτὰ δὲ λέγει περὶ τῶν στίχων τούτων ὁ Δίδυμος ἃ καὶ ὁ Ἀριστόνικος· διὸ οὐκ ἐγράψαμεν τὰ Διδύμου; likewise Schol. A on *Il.* 15.86: [again, after a citation from

²¹ I have discussed the evidence for this in some detail at *ZPE* 111 (1996) pp. 146-7.

²² Allen 1931 (above, n. 10) Vol. I pp. 177-8.

²³ Op. cit. (above, n. 1 ad fin.) p. XV, esp. n. 31.

²⁴ Lührs (above, n. 2) p. 197. I agree with Lührs (pp. 197-8) and Erbse (above, n. 2) that this version is more likely to reflect Didymus's own wording at the crucial point than is the version in A, which puts the bT version into indirect speech dependent on a vague φασίν and changes the citation of 808 into τοῦτον τὸν στίχον—an appropriate enough formulation when the scholium is placed immediately to the left of line 808, where it stands in A. But see also n. 5 above.

Aristonicus] ταὐτὰ ὁ Δίδυμος τῷ Ἀριστονίκῳ λέγει περὶ τῆς γραφῆς.²⁵ In both these cases the epitomator, after excerpting Aristonicus, refrains from repeating himself more than necessary when he comes to the similar statement in Didymus. Here too, on *Il.* 5.807, after dealing in some detail with the note of Aristonicus, which was specifically designed to account for the διπλῆ περιεστιγμένη (signalling disagreement with Zenodotus) attached to that line in the edition of Aristarchus (as it is in A), the epitomator may well feel he can at least avoid repeating himself on Zenodotus when he comes to the corresponding note in Didymus. At any rate, Didymus would certainly have known that it was Zenodotus's text which added the extra line, and he could hardly have avoided saying so in the fuller original version of his comment: there are of course dozens of other scholia to prove that his work faithfully reflected Aristarchus's own special interest in the text of Zenodotus.

So on the question of whether Didymus had the line in *his own* text, the verdict has to remain *non liquet*. But even if he *did* find the line in his text, this would not be incompatible with its absence from *Aristarchus's* text, since a number of other lines were first interpolated very early in the post-Aristarchean era, and a few of them were apparently already present in the texts of Didymus and/or Aristonicus²⁶—and the fact that this interpolation has so thoroughly penetrated the later tradition proves that it too must have got off to a very early start.

But we must now move on to consider an even more questionable entry in West's apparatus: he alleges of 808, "negl[exit] sch^D". Would that this were so! For all I know it may even be so, in some sense. But what can West mean? As I understand it, the two earliest and best complete MSS. of the D scholia are (a) West's Z, late 9th century, one half in Rome and the other in Madrid, = de Marco's C, representing the left-hand side of the latter's stemma, and (b) de Marco's V, Vat. gr. 33, late 11th century, representing the right-hand side of his stemma, on which Janus Lascaris based his *editio princeps* (Rome 1517).²⁷ West has evidently carefully collated his Z, but elsewhere (as far as I can see) he cites its readings with the siglum Z (as one would of course expect), not "sch^D"; so the entry in his apparatus at this point can hardly be a reference to this MS. Furthermore, Lascaris's edition of the D scholia (based on the MS. V) *does* contain *two* glosses on line 808, viz. ἐπιτάροθος· βοηθός· ἦα· ἦν, ὑπῆρχον.²⁸ Finally, it is, I suppose, just possible that West is thinking of the glossary P. Oxy. 44.3158, published in 1976: at the relevant point in this papyrus (column ii) only a thin strip of the middles of the lines is preserved, and between the lemmata ἐκπαῖ[φάσσειν (803) and ἀναχ[άζομαι (822) there are only pitifully meagre remains of two lines, in the first of which νοῦκ[is discernible and in the second no identifiable letters at all. The editor, M.W. Haslam, does not attempt to expand νοῦκ[, but it could perhaps represent 812 ἀκήριον· οὐκ [ἀνδρείον (*vel sim.*). At any rate, it does not look like anything to do with 808—a point worth making, though the sparseness of the preserved glosses hereabouts means that this particular *argumentum ex silentio* would carry only very limited weight. But in any case West can hardly be meaning to refer to this papyrus here, as he has assigned it a siglum, h55 (p. LVI), which he uses elsewhere in his apparatus but not here. To conclude: further clarification is called for here to elucidate West's rather puzzling entry.

²⁵ See also the similar Schol. A on *Il.* 7.255-7. I have here grossly oversimplified a much more complex argument to be found in Ludwich, *AHT* (above, n. 1) Vol. I pp. 51-4 (Section 14), esp. pp. 52-3.

²⁶ See my *MS. Evidence* (above, n. 1) pp. 4, 167 (*Od.* 11.525), p. 9 (*Od.* 8. 142), pp. 147-52 (*Il.* 21.73: a possible example).

²⁷ See West (above, n. 1 ad fin.) p. XI; F. Montanari, *Studi di filologia omerica antica* I (Pisa 1979) pp. 4-27, esp. 8-9, 27; A. Henrichs, *ZPE* 7 (1971) pp. 107-8; N.G. Wilson, *ZPE* 23 (1976) pp. 61-2, esp. 62, correcting Henrichs on an important point.

²⁸ The *editio princeps* of the Iliadic D scholia has become a rare book, and I am very grateful to Professor Donald J. Mastronarde for kindly consulting the copy in the Bancroft Library of the University of California at Berkeley on my behalf to check the accuracy of my 1834 reprint at this point. It may also be worth reporting here that my own microfiche collation of a MS. of the text of the *Iliad*, Ambrosianus 486 (L 73 sup., = Allen's M10, saec. xiii-xiv), has revealed that, above ἦα in 5.808, the first hand has inserted the same gloss ὑπῆρχον.

We may appropriately end this survey of the external evidence by returning (as promised) to the two minuscules which omit 808. As I have suggested above, it is tempting to link the absence of the line from V16 with its (deduced) absence from the exemplar of A, now that West has found so many links between A and V16 (= his W); in any case V16 is early enough (saec. xii) to make it probable that its omission is significant, and its status as one of Allen's "independent MSS." also helps to make this hypothesis plausible. That leaves only Allen's L9 still to be discussed. This MS. was written in Florence in 1452 by John Skoutariotes and is a member of Allen's family f. Another member of this family is Allen's V22 (saec. xv), also written by Skoutariotes. Allen judges that another Laurentian MS., L17 (saec. xiv), "appears to be the parent of L9 and V22", at any rate in this part of the poem. Now if 808 is present in the parent of the omitting L9 and in its sibling V22 (written by the same scribe!), and also in another very closely related MS., O6 (saec. xv-xvi), and (apparently) in all the other members of this "large and inconsistent family" (Allen),²⁹ are we not forced to conclude that the omission by L9 is unlikely to represent direct descent from the Aristarchean text and much more likely to be merely a freakish coincidence, an isolated and meaningless copyist's slip stemming from the slight *homoiographa*? Yes, if Allen is right; but I am not entirely convinced that the last stemmatological word has necessarily been said on this family. For example, could it perhaps be that, rather than being the parent of L9 and V22, as Allen has argued, L17 may instead be their elder brother, all three having been copied from a much earlier MS. no longer extant (which we shall call λ), possibly even the lost 11th-century archetype of this whole family posited by Allen in 1931 (in his table of stemmata at the end of Vol. I)? If 808 was absent from the text of λ but added in its margin, that would satisfactorily account for the inconsistent treatment of the line among the three extant MSS. Furthermore, if 808 was absent from the text of a MS. as old as λ , direct descent from Aristarchus would become more plausible. A more detailed study of this family, and even revised collations, might help to clarify the situation. But obviously the argument for the non-Aristarchean status of 808—relying as it does mainly on the solid evidence of the scholia and papyri and secondarily on the deduced absence of the line from the exemplar of A—does not depend primarily on our decision on the true reason for its absence from a MS. produced only a few decades before the appearance of the printed *editio princeps*.

Our demonstration from the scholia and the early post-Aristarchean transmission that Aristarchus did not have *Il.* 5.808 in his text has important implications, since we can show that he omitted only lines which were absent from the vast majority of his MSS.; and any such line would almost certainly have been spurious.³⁰

Further, we need to be careful about the language we use of such Aristarchean editorial activity and of our own response to that activity. It is misleading for defenders of 808 to protest that "we should not reject the line", as though it already had some well-established claim to authenticity: the question is rather whether we are entitled to foist it on to the text when we know that it was absent from nearly all Aristarchus's sources—MSS. which the Ptolemies' agents had laboriously gathered from all the far-flung corners of the Greek world, ranging from Sinope in the far east to Marseilles in the far west. Equally misleading, for the same reasons, are claims that Aristarchus "deleted" the line: rather, he refrained from inserting it against the manuscript evidence.

4. The internal evidence

Only occasionally are we able to show not merely that an interpolation is superfluous or lame or mildly inappropriate but that it actually clashes so violently with its immediate context that Homer could not possibly have composed it—and yet this is certainly what the internal evidence loudly proclaims here. Yet of all the defences of the line that have been penned—some of them merely rather silly, some of

²⁹ On all this see Allen 1931 (above, n. 10) Vol. I p. 20 No. 36; p. 21 No. 44; p. 48 No. 160; pp. 111-18, esp. 111-13.

³⁰ For the details of this argument see my *MS. Evidence* (above, n. 1), esp. Ch. IV.

them misguidedly ingenious—there is not a single one that does not fall foul of the structure and syntax of Athene’s speech. Only by ignoring or distorting the obvious meaning of the text have these scholars been able even to begin to mount their defences.

Athene’s speech contrasts Diomedes unfavourably with his father Tydeus. Its introduction and conclusion state this point succinctly (800, 812-13); lines 801-7 speak of Tydeus (like 800, all in the third person: Τυδεύς at end of 800 and beginning of 801—emphatic repetition further emphasized by τοι in 801; emphatic resumption in 806 ἀντάρ ὁ), while 809-13 speak directly to Diomedes in the second person (809 σοὶ δ’ emphatic by position and context, introducing the second half of the antithesis, then σε 810, σευ 811, σέ and σύ 812). In contrast to Diomedes, who (Athene alleges) is standing idle through either weariness or fear (811-12), Tydeus was a brave and successful warrior (801 μαχητής, 807 ἐνίκᾳ, 813 δαίφρονος³¹) whose habitual hyperactive pugnacity (806-7) not even Athene could check (802-7): she explicitly *forbade* him to fight or show off (802 πολεμίζειν οὐκ εἴασκον, cf. 805), but he did so all the same (806-7). *By contrast* (809 σοὶ δ’), she *actually* (809 ἦτοι μὲν ἐγὼ) stands by Diomedes’s side, protects him and *commands* him to fight (809-10, esp. 810 κέλομαι ... μάχεσθαι), but he is nevertheless idle (811-12 ἀλλά σευ ..., not only contrasting with 809-10 but also counterbalancing 806-7 ἀντάρ ὁ ...: i.e. “Tydeus courageously fought in spite of my opposition, whereas you weakly refrain from fighting in spite of my support”). This is the crux of the matter: the antithetical structure and syntax undoubtedly imply that Athene did *not* stand by *Tydeus’s* side and protect *him* when he chose to take on the Thebans—he was on his own. Just as the *second* point after σοὶ δ’—“I eagerly *command* you to *fight* the Trojans”—contrasts with the *prohibition* of lines 802-3 and 805, so the *first* point after σοὶ δ’—the help offered by Athene to Diomedes (809)—must contrast with the *absence* of such help for Tydeus (implied by 802-7).³² This is why 808—which absurdly alleges that Athene *did* help Tydeus—is impossible here. “Ah!” say the defenders of 808; “Yes, Athene forbade Tydeus to behave pugnaciously; yes, he disobeyed her; but she was so fond of him and so impressed with his audacity that she helped him all the same.” But the trouble with this interpretation is that it is simply incompatible with Homer’s syntax, as I hope I have succeeded in showing above. What more can one say? I suppose there may perhaps be some slight value in further stressing some of the details of the syntax and structure. As Alexander Pope saw long ago, “This speech of *Minerva* to *Diomed* derives its whole force and efficacy from the offensive comparison she makes between *Tydeus* and his son.”³³ At line 809 Athene has finished with Tydeus and is about to start on Diomedes—so δ’ in σοὶ δ’ must mean “*But* as for you” and must introduce the second half of the antithesis, as indeed it does: first “I stand by you and protect you” (809), then “I eagerly command you to fight the Trojans” (810): each point occupies exactly a single line, and each is semantically on a par with the other because joined to it by “and” (καί) and falling equally within the same ἦτοι μὲν ἐγὼ section. Now κέλομαι ... μάχεσθαι (810) certainly stands in contrast to πολεμίζειν οὐκ εἴασκον (802); so παρά θ’ ἴσταμαι ἠδὲ φυλάσσω (809) must stand in contrast to the absence of such help which an impartial reading of 802-7 would in any case naturally suggest; and the contradictory and very weakly attested 808 must be an interpolation. If I have laboured the point, it is because the weight of the

³¹ Astonishingly, five recent English translations obscure this point by wrongly applying the adjective δαίφρονος not to Tydeus *but to Oeneus*: “the doughty Oeneus” (Rieu, 1950), “wise Oineus” (Lattimore, 1951), “warrior Oineus” (M. Hammond, 1987), “the gallant, battle-hardened Oeneus” (R. Fagles, 1990), “sharp old Oeneus” (S. Lombardo, 1997). Of course the name “Oeneus” itself does not even occur in the Greek here—there is only “Oeneides”, which is (so to speak) Tydeus’s surname. The point is of some importance: Homer does not allow Athene to weaken her focus by prattling about the bravery of *Oeneus* (Lattimore’s “wise” is of course also wrong here: see e.g. Kirk 1990 [above, n. 1] p. 78, on *Il.* 5.181). Earlier ages knew better, and put it in rollicking metre: “Nimmer in Zukunft | Scheinst du von Tydeus erzeugt, dem *feurigen* Sohne des Öneus” (Voß, 1793).

³² The underlining in my Greek text above, Section 2, should help to make these contrasts clear.

³³ See the new Penguin edition of Pope’s *Iliad* prepared by S. Shankman (1996) p. 288.

argument from structure, sense and syntax has not so far been adequately appreciated by the line's defenders.

But of course all this really amounts to little more than a paraphrase of the Aristarchean scholia and the 19th-century scholars who have followed Aristarchus. Cf. Schol. A (Aristonicus) on 807: 808 is inconsistent with its surroundings: ἡ γὰρ Ἀθηνᾶ οὐ φησι παροτρύνειν, ἀλλὰ κωλύειν: so Monro ad loc.: the line is “not in place here, where the point is that Tydeus did so much *without* Athene” (and similarly Ameis-Hentze [Anhang] and Leaf ad loc.); so also, more generally, Schol. bT (Didymus) on 807-8: ἐναντίον γὰρ ἐστὶ τοῖς προκειμένοις. Another A scholium (on 808) explicitly brings the following (not just the preceding) context into play as well: καὶ γὰρ ἀντιπράττει καὶ πρὸς τὸ “δαίνυσθαί μιν ἄνωγον ...” (805), καὶ οὐχ οἷόν τε ἐπιφέρειν “σοὶ δ' ...” (809):³⁴ this is echoed by Faesi-Franke ad loc.: line 808 “passt ... hier weder zu dem, was Athene vorher sagt (802 πολέμιζεν οὐκ εἴασκον), noch zu dem was nachfolgt (σοὶ δ' ἢ τοι μὲν ἐγὼ κτέ)”.

Why was the line interpolated? It could well be simply a mindless concordance interpolation triggered by the similar sequence in *Il.* 4.389-90 ἀλλ' ὅ γ' ἀεθλεύειν προκαλίζετο, πάντα δ' ἐνίκαι ῥηϊδίως· τοίη οἱ ἐπίρροθος ἦεν Ἀθήνη, as Aristarchus argued (Schol. A [Aristonicus] on *Il.* 4.390 and 5.807), with some help also from *Il.* 5.828 τοίη τοι ἐγὼν ἐπιτάρροθός εἰμι (so Faesi-Franke). But there may have been a further motive—a desire to eliminate the apparent contradiction with *Il.* 4.389-90 (quoted above) in the parallel passage, where Agamemnon says that Athene *did* help Diomedes to win the games.³⁵

5. Conclusion

Each of the arguments against the line—the argument from the external evidence (above, Section 3) and the argument from the internal evidence (above, Section 4)—is, on its own, unusually strong. In combination, the two arguments are devastating. To garland this gate-crasher at Homer's banquet and cloak it with a bogus respectability is to do the poet of the *Iliad* a grave disservice.

University of Queensland

Michael J. Apthorp

³⁴ However, as Lührs (above, n. 2) has rightly pointed out (pp. 197-8), there is some doubt whether the latter argument goes back to Aristarchus himself.

³⁵ The “contradiction” is indeed apparent, not real—or, more precisely, while Athene's version does indeed contradict Agamemnon's, Homer does not contradict himself, since he assigns to Agamemnon and Athene degrees of knowledge entirely appropriate to (respectively) their human and divine natures: i.e. Agamemnon, not knowing the inside story as Athene herself does, *presumes* that Athene (as usual!) would have helped Tydeus: the revelation of 5.802-7 (*without* 808!) thus adds further piquancy and humour to her tongue-in-cheek rebuke. But Andersen actually uses this “contradiction” to argue in favour of 808: Athene's help for the family is a “Hauptmotiv der Diomedeskonzeption”, a sort of “Leitmotiv”, and “Vers ... 808 darf man schon deswegen nicht athetieren”—and this, surprisingly, from a scholar who is acutely aware of the different slants given to the two stories by their being told by different narrators (Andersen [above, n. 4] pp. 78-81, esp. 79; cf. Drerup [above, n. 2] p. 313; on the narratological aspect see also de Jong [above, n. 4] pp. 155-7).