THE ILIAD: A COMMENTARY

GENERAL EDITOR G.S. KIRK

Volume IV: books 13–16

RICHARD JANKO

This, the fourth volume in the six-volume Commentary on the *Iliad* being prepared under the General Editorship of Professor G. S. Kirk, covers books 13–16, including the Battle for the Ships, the Deception of Zeus and the Death of Patroklos. Three introductory essays discuss the role of Homer's gods in his poetry; the origins and development of the epic diction; and the transmission of the text, from the bard's lips to our own manuscripts. It is now widely recognized that the first masterpiece of Western literature is an oral poem; Professor Janko's detailed commentary aims to show how this recognition can clarify many linguistic and textual problems, entailing a radical reassessment of the work of Homer's Alexandrian editors. The commentary also explores the poet's subtle creativity in adapting traditional materials, whether formulae, typical scenes, mythology or imagery, so as best to move, inspire and entertain his audience, ancient and modern alike. Discussion of the poem's literary qualities and structure is, where possible, kept separate from that of more technical matters.

This volume will be an essential reference work for all students of Greek literature and of oral epic poetry. Those who study and teach in a wide variety of related disciplines – mythology, ancient history and Aegean archaeology, humanities courses and Indo-European linguistics – will also find that it contains material of value to them.

The Iliad: a commentary

Volume IV: books 13–16

THE ILIAD: A COMMENTARY

GENERAL EDITOR G. S. KIRK

Volume IV: books 13–16

RICHARD JANKO
PROFESSOR OF GREEK,
UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LONDON

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK http://www.cup.cam.ac.uk
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011–4211, USA http://www.cup.org
10 Stamford Road, Oakleigh, Melbourne 3166, Australia
Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain

First published 1994
Reprinted 1995, 1999

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data
Kirk, G. S. (Geoffrey Stephen)
The Iliad, a commentary.
Includes bibliographical references and indexes.
Contents: v. 1. Books 1–4 v. 4. Books 13–16 /
Richard Janko.
1. Homer. Iliad. 2. Achilles (Greek mythology) in
literature. I. Trojan War in literature. II. Janko,
Richard. III. Homer. Iliad.
PA4037.K458 1985 883'.01 84-11330

ISBN 0 521 23712 2 hardback
ISBN 0 521 28174 1 paperback

Transferred to digital printing 2003

AO

This volume
is dedicated to

† Milman Parry
Albert Lord
† Michael Ventris
John Chadwick

founders of modern Homeric scholarship

and

to the memory of my father

Charles Arthur Janko
28 VII 1914 – 10 V 1991

τέρεν κατὰ δάκρυον εἴβω
χήτεϊ τοιοῦδ' ἀνδρός, ἐπεί, πάτερ, ἤπιος ἦσθα.

CONTENTS

PREFACE

The aims of this commentary are laid down by its originator, Geoffrey Kirk, in vol. I (pp. ix–xi). I am grateful to him both for undertaking to fill this lacuna in classical scholarship and for asking me to share in his enterprise, which is all the more important at a time when bigotry worthy of Ptolemy Physcon has endangered the future of classical studies in my native land. Inspired by the late Sir Denys Page, I first began to investigate the diction of the Homeric poems in order to prove that they result from multiple authorship, but reached the opposite conclusion: that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were taken down by dictation, much as we have them, from the lips of a single eighth-century singer. In my view, one cannot do full justice to the songs of Homer without the benefit of many methods and approaches. These include Unitarianism, the view that each epic is a basically unified creation by a poetic genius; the proof by Parry and Lord that the epics belong to an oral tradition; the study of other such poems, both post-Homeric and from other traditional societies, especially in the Balkans; the recognition of Near Eastern influence on early Greece; the work of Burkert and the structuralists on myth; the work of Severyns and the Neo-Analysts on how Homer adapts traditional tales, especially those found in the post-Homeric Epic Cycle; Aristotelian and narratological literary theory; the decipherment of Linear B by Ventris and Chadwick; Greek dialectology and onomastics; Indo-European linguistics; Bronze and Iron-Age Aegean archaeology; the textual criticism of an oral-dictated poem, transmitted with oral and scribal variants in an open recension; van der Valk's work on Alexandrian scholarship; Erbse's edition of the scholia; and the recognition that our basic notions of 'literary' style have been decisively shaped by poems of oral origin. My vast debt to prior scholars and commentators will be plain to those who know.

A note on how to use this volume. I have tried to discuss more 'literary' questions in notes on whole blocks of text, and more technical items in notes on individual verses or small groups of verses, especially at the ends of notes. Thus, for example, the largest unit may be 14.153–353, then 153–9, and then 153–5. In this I have sought to help readers who know little or no Greek. At the same time I have not wished to stint on the full range of comment valuable to advanced students, particularly on the text and scholia; the radically oralist approach adopted here has revolutionary implications for Homeric textual criticism, and hence for the interpretation of many

passages. I have not been able to note explicitly all my disagreements with the OCT, but these will usually be evident from my comments. Lack of space has demanded that I write with Aristotelian brevity (and, no doubt, obscurity), using many cross-references; exclude all later echoes or imitations, literary or pictorial, unless they clarify the text itself; erase numerous details, perhapses and scholarly debts; and adopt many short-hand conventions which may mislead the uninitiated. Readers will need to be attentive. When I write '*pace*' someone, I imply not only disagreement but also that that scholar offers useful arguments and/or references; lack of citation does not prove that I have not profited from a work. Other important conventions are explained after the list of abbreviations.

Lastly, I must thank the people and institutions that have assisted in this book's painfully slow and nomadic genesis. I am grateful above all to the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation for the Fellowship which gave me a year free of teaching. I thank my collaborators for commenting on my drafts and for their help, especially Mark Edwards. I am grateful to my teachers, colleagues and students, in Cambridge, New York and now the University of California at Los Angeles, for inspiration, advice and friendship; and to many others who have helped in ways of which they may well be unaware. Egbert Bakker, John Chadwick, Michael Haslam, Steve Reece and Keith Stanley read parts of the manuscript. With financial support from the UCLA Academic Senate Committee on Research, the following graduate students helped prepare the MS: Laurel Bowman, Todd Compton, Christine Ferris, Julie Laskaris, Leslie Myrick and Steve Reece. Caroline Alexander of Columbia and Fiona Wilson of Cambridge also aided me in this. Michael Cohen and David Blank resolved computer problems; Dana Sutton of UC Irvine gave me a copy of his database 'Homer in the papyri'. I am still indebted to John Dawson and his staff at the Literary and Linguistic Computing Centre, Cambridge, for helping me in 1977 to create an invaluable concordance to the entire epos. I also thank Susan Moore of the Press for her skilful and erudite copy-editing, and the staff of the university libraries at Cambridge, Columbia, UC Davis, the Ecole Normale Supérieure, Stanford and UCLA.

I shall always be grateful to the late Lord William Taylour for many summers of archaeological work in Greece; to John Leatham for fostering my early love of all things Greek; and to the memory of William Cowper, who rendered to both Homer and my native fields an equally inspiring homage. *Farewell, dear scenes, for ever closed to me.* It is a privilege to have sat at the feet of John Chadwick and, when passing through the other Cambridge, of Albert Lord; my dedication expresses my gratitude to them for their knowledge and example. Finally, I must thank my wife Michele for

reading the manuscript, for help with the index at a difficult time, and for her staunch support and companionship during this epic journey; she may not always have wished to hear whether Aristarchus read οὕτω or οὕτως.

Westwood, California, April 4 1990 R. J.

ABBREVIATIONS

Books

A MS A of the *Iliad* (codex Venetus Graecus 822, 10th century)

AD the A- and D-scholia to the *Iliad*; see D

Ahlberg, *Fighting* G. Ahlberg, *Fighting on Land and Sea in Greek Geometric Art* (Stockholm 1971)

Albracht, *Kampfschilderung* F. Albracht, *Kampf und Kampfschilderung bei Homer* (Naumberg 1886–95)

Allen, *Ilias* T. W. Allen, ed., *Homeri Ilias* I–III (Oxford 1931, repr. New York 1979)

Allen, *Transmission* T. W. Allen, *Homer: the Origins and the Transmission* (Oxford 1924, repr. 1969)

Ameis–Hentze K. F. Ameis and C. Hentze, *Homers Ilias* (Leipzig 1913, repr. Amsterdam 1965)

ANET J. B. Pritchard, ed., *Ancient Near Eastern Texts relating to the Old Testament* (3rd edn, Princeton 1969)

Ap. Rhod. Apollonius Rhodius, *Argonautica*

Ap. Soph. *Apollonii Sophistae Lexicon Homericum*, ed. I. Bekker (Berlin 1833)

Apthorp, *MS Evidence* M. J. Apthorp, *The Manuscript Evidence for Interpolation in Homer* (Heidelberg 1980)

Arch. Hom. *Archaeologia Homerica: Die Denkmäler und das frühgriechische Epos*, edd. F. Matz and H.-G. Buchholz (Göttingen 1967–)

Arend, *Scenen* W. Arend, *Die typischen Scenen bei Homer* (Berlin 1933)

Arn Aristonicus, Περὶ σημείων (in Erbse, *Scholia*)

Atchity, *Homer's 'Iliad'* K. J. Atchity, *Homer's 'Iliad': the Shield of Memory* (Carbondale 1978)

B. A. Bernabé, *Poetae Epici Graeci* (Leipzig 1987)

Bannert, *Formen des Wiederholens* H. Bannert, *Formen des Wiederholens bei Homer* (Vienna 1988)

Barth, *Kallistratos* H.-L. Barth, *Die Fragmente aus den Schriften des Grammatikers Kallistratos zu Homers Ilias und Odyssee* (Diss. Bonn 1984)

Beekes, *Laryngeals* R. S. P. Beekes, *The Development of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Greek* (The Hague 1969)

Bolling, *External Evidence* G. M. Bolling, *The External Evidence for Interpolation in Homer* (Oxford 1925, repr. 1968)

Bouzek, *Aegean* J. Bouzek, *The Aegean, Anatolia and Europe: Cultural Interrelations in the Second Millennium B.C.* (Prague 1985)

Bowra, *Heroic Poetry* C. M. Bowra, *Heroic Poetry* (Oxford 1952)

Bowra, *Tradition and Design* C. M. Bowra, *Tradition and Design in the Iliad* (Oxford 1930, repr. Westport 1977)

Bremmer, *Soul* J. Bremmer, *The Early Greek Concept of the Soul* (Princeton 1983)

Bryce, *The Lycians* T. R. Bryce, *The Lycians* I (Copenhagen 1986)

bT the bT-scholia to the *Iliad* (in Erbse, *Scholia*)

Buffière, *Mythes* F. Buffière, *Les Mythes d'Homère et la pensée grecque* (Paris 1956)

Burkert, *Die orientalisierende Epoche* W. Burkert, *Die orientalisierende Epoche der griechischen Religion und Literatur*, *SHAW* 1984, Abh. 1

Burkert, *Religion* W. Burkert, *Greek Religion: Archaic and Classical* (Cambridge, Mass., and Oxford 1985); Engl. trans. by J. Raffan of *Griechische Religion der archaischen und klassischen Epoche* (Stuttgart 1977)

Calame C. Calame, *Alcman* (Rome 1983)

Carlier, *Royauté* P. Carlier, *La Royauté en Grèce avant Alexandre* (Strasbourg 1984)

Càssola, *Inni Omerici* F. Càssola, *Inni Omerici* (Rome 1975)

Cat. Hesiod, *Catalogue of Women* (fragments with numeration of M–W)

Chantraine, *Dict.* P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* (Paris 1968–80)

Chantraine, *Formation* P. Chantraine, *La Formation des noms en grec ancien* (Paris 1933, repr. 1979)

Chantraine, *GH* P. Chantraine, *Grammaire homérique* I–II (Paris 1958–63)

Coldstream, *Geometric Greece* J. N. Coldstream, *Geometric Greece* (London 1977)

Commentary *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*, vol. I, A. Heubeck, S. West and J. B. Hainsworth (Oxford 1988); vol. II, A. Heubeck and A. Hoekstra (Oxford 1989); [vol. III to appear]; an Engl. version of *Odissea*

Companion *A Companion to Homer*, edd. A. J. B. Wace and F. H. Stubbings (London 1962)

A. B. Cook, *Zeus* A. B. Cook, *Zeus* (Cambridge 1914–40)

Cook, *Troad* J. M. Cook, *The Troad: an Archaeological and Topographical Study* (Oxford 1973)

Crespo, *Prosodia* E. Crespo, *Elementos antiguos y modernos en la prosodia homérica* (Salamanca 1977)

Crouwel, *Chariots* J. H. Crouwel, *Chariots and Other Means of Land Transport in Bronze Age Greece* (Amsterdam 1981)

Cuillandre, *La Droite et la gauche* J. Cuillandre, *La Droite et la gauche dans les poèmes homériques* (Paris 1944)

D the D-scholia to the *Iliad*, in Σχόλια παλαιὰ τῶν πάνυ δοκίμων εἰς τὴν Ὁμήρου Ἰλιάδα, ed. J. Lascaris (Rome 1517)

D. M. Davies, *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Göttingen 1988)

de Jong, *Narrators* I. J. F. de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers: the Presentation of the Story in the Iliad* (Amsterdam 1987)

Delebecque, *Cheval* E. Delebecque, *Le Cheval dans l'Iliade* (Paris 1951)

Denniston, *Particles* J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles* (2nd edn, Oxford 1954)

Did Didymus, Περὶ τῆς Ἀριστάρχείου διορθώσεως (in Erbse, *Scholia*)

Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational* E. R. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1951)

Duckworth, *Foreshadowing* G. E. Duckworth, *Foreshadowing and Suspense in the Epics of Homer, Apollonius and Vergil* (Princeton 1933)

Düntzer, *De Zenodoti studiis* H. Düntzer, *De Zenodoti studiis Homericis* (Göttingen 1848, repr. Hildesheim 1981)

Dyck A. R. Dyck, *The Fragments of Comanus of Naucratis* (Berlin and New York 1988)

Edwards, *HPI* M. W. Edwards, *Homer, Poet of the Iliad* (Baltimore and London 1987)

G. P. Edwards, *The Language of Hesiod* G. P. Edwards, *The Language of Hesiod in its Traditional Context* (Oxford 1971)

Erbse, *Ausgewählte Schriften* H. Erbse, *Ausgewählte Schriften zur klassischen Philologie* (Berlin and New York 1979)

Erbse, *Götter* H. Erbse, *Untersuchungen zur Funktion der Götter im homerischen Epos* (Berlin and New York 1986)

Erbse, *Scholia* H. Erbse, *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem* I–VII (Berlin and New York 1969–88)

Erga Hesiod, *Works and Days*

Eustathius *Eustathii Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem Pertinentes*, ed. M. van der Valk (Leiden 1971–87)

Fenik, *Homer and the Nibelungenlied* B. Fenik, *Homer and the Nibelungenlied* (Cambridge, Mass., 1986)

Fenik, *TBS* B. Fenik, *Typical Battle Scenes in the Iliad* (Wiesbaden 1968)

Fernández-Galiano see *Odissea*

Ferrari, *Oralità* F. Ferrari, *Oralità ed Espressione* (Pisa 1986)

Festschrift Risch *O-o-pe-ro-si: Festschrift für Ernst Risch*, ed. A. Etter (Berlin and New York 1986)

FGH F. Jacoby, *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* (Berlin and Leiden 1923–58)

Fowler, *Lyric* R. L. Fowler, *The Nature of Early Greek Lyric Poetry. Three Preliminary Studies* (Toronto 1987)

Foxhall and Davies, *The Trojan War* L. Foxhall and J. K. Davies, edd., *The Trojan War: its Historicity and Context* (Bristol 1984)

Fränkel, *Gleichnisse* H. Fränkel, *Die homerischen Gleichnisse* (Göttingen 1921, repr. 1977)

Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Oxford 1972)

Fraser and Matthews, *Names* P. M. Fraser and E. Matthews, *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* I (Oxford 1987)

Frazer, *Apollodorus* J. G. Frazer, ed., *Apollodorus: the Library* (Cambridge, Mass., 1921)

French and Wardle, *Prehistory* E. B. French and K. A. Wardle, edd., *Problems in Greek Prehistory* (Bristol 1988)

P. Friedrich, *Trees* P. Friedrich, *Proto-Indo-European Trees* (Chicago 1970)

W.-H. Friedrich, *Verwundung* W.-H. Friedrich, *Verwundung und Tod in der Ilias* (Göttingen 1956)

Frisk H. Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg 1954–72)

Frisk, *Kleine Schriften* H. Frisk, *Kleine Schriften* (Göteborg 1966)

Gedenkschrift Güntert *Antiquitates Indogermanicae: Gedenkschrift für H. Güntert*, edd. M. Mayerhofer and W. Meid (Innsbruck 1974)

The Greek Renaissance *The Greek Renaissance*, ed. R. Hägg (Stockholm 1982)

Greenhalgh, *Warfare* P. A. L. Greenhalgh, *Early Greek Warfare* (Cambridge 1973)

Griffin, *HLD* J. Griffin, *Homer on Life and Death* (Oxford 1980)

h the *h* family of MSS of the *Iliad* (see p. 21)

Hainsworth see *Commentary*

Hdt. Herodotus, *Histories*

Heubeck see *Commentary*

Heubeck, *Kleine Schriften* A. Heubeck, *Kleine Schriften* (Erlangen 1984)

Heyne C. G. Heyne, ed., *Homeri Ilias* (London 1819)

Hoddinott, *The Thracians* R. F. Hoddinott, *The Thracians* (London 1981)

Hoekstra see *Commentary*

Hoekstra, *Modifications* A. Hoekstra, *Homeric Modifications of Formulaic Prototypes* (2nd edn, Amsterdam 1969)

Hoekstra, *SES* A. Hoekstra, *The Sub-Epic Stage of the Formulaic Tradition* (Amsterdam 1969)

Hoekstra, *Epic Verse before Homer* A. Hoekstra, *Epic Verse before Homer* (Amsterdam 1979)

Hohendahl-Zoetelief, *Manners* I. M. Hohendahl-Zoetelief, *Manners in the Homeric Epic* (Leiden 1980)

Horrocks, *Space and Time* G. C. Horrocks, *Space and Time in Homer* (New York 1981)

Householder and Nagy, *Greek* F. W. Householder and G. Nagy, *Greek: a Survey of Recent Work* (The Hague 1972)

Hrd Herodian, Ἰλιακὴ προσῳδία (in Erbse, *Scholia*)

Hsch. Hesychius Alexandrinus, *Lexicon*

Huxley, *GEP* G. L. Huxley, *Greek Epic Poetry from Eumelos to Panyassis* (London 1969)

HyDem, HyAp, HyHerm, HyAphr *Homeric Hymns* to Demeter, Apollo, Hermes, Aphrodite

Janko, *HHH* R. Janko, *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns* (Cambridge 1982)

Jouan, *Chants Cypriens* F. Jouan, *Euripide et les légendes des Chants Cypriens* (Paris 1966)

Kakridis, *Researches* J. T. Kakridis, *Homeric Researches* (Lund 1949)

Kakridis, *Homer Revisited* J. T. Kakridis, *Homer Revisited* (Lund 1971)

King, *Achilles* K. C. King, *Achilles* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1987)

Kirk, *Songs* G. S. Kirk, *The Songs of Homer* (Cambridge 1962)

KN *The Knossos Tablets*, edd. J. T. Killen and J.-P. Olivier (5th edn, Salamanca 1989)

Krischer, *Konventionen* T. Krischer, *Formale Konventionen der homerischen Epik* (Munich 1971)

Kullmann, *Quellen* W. Kullmann, *Die Quellen der Ilias (Troische Sagenkreis)* (Wiesbaden 1960)

Kurt, *Fachausdrücke* C. Kurt, *Seemännische Fachausdrücke bei Homer* (Göttingen 1979)

Lambert and Millard, *Atra-Ḫasīs* W. G. Lambert and A. E. Millard, edd., *Atra-Ḫasīs* (Oxford 1969)

Language and Background *The Language and Background of Homer*, ed. G. S. Kirk (Cambridge and New York 1964)

La Roche, *Textkritik* J. La Roche, *Die homerische Textkritik im Alterthum* (Leipzig 1866)

Latacz, *Freude* J. Latacz, *Zum Wortfeld 'Freude' in der Sprache Homers* (Heidelberg 1966)

Latacz, *Kampfdarstellung* J. Latacz, *Kampfparänese, Kampfdarstellung und Kampfwirklichkeit in der Ilias, bei Kallinos und Tyrtaios* (Munich 1977)

Leaf W. Leaf, *The Iliad* I–II (2nd edn, London 1900–2, repr. Amsterdam 1971)

Lehrs, *De Aristarchi studiis* K. Lehrs, *De Aristarchi studiis Homericis* (3rd edn, Leipzig 1882)

Lesky, *Gesammelte Schriften* A. Lesky, *Gesammelte Schriften* (Zurich 1966)

Leumann, *HW* M. Leumann, *Homerische Wörter* (Basel 1950)

LfgrE *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*, edd. B. Snell and H. Erbse (Göttingen 1955–)

LIMC *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*, edd. H. C. Ackermann and J. R. Gisler (Zurich 1981–)

Linear B *Linear B: a 1984 Survey*, edd. A. M. Davies and Y. Duhoux (Louvain 1988)

Linke K. Linke, *Die Fragmente des Grammatikers Dionysios Thrax* (Berlin and New York 1977)

Lloyd-Jones, *Justice of Zeus* H. Lloyd-Jones, *The Justice of Zeus* (2nd edn, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1983)

Lohmann, *Reden* D. Lohmann, *Die Komposition der Reden in der Ilias* (Berlin 1970)

Lord, *Singer* A. B. Lord, *The Singer of Tales* (Cambridge, Mass., 1960)

Lorimer, *HM* H. L. Lorimer, *Homer and the Monuments* (London 1950)

Lowenstam, *Death of Patroklos* S. Lowenstam, *The Death of Patroklos* (Königstein 1981)

Ludwich, *AHT* A. Ludwich, *Aristarchs Homerische Textkritik* I–II (Leipzig 1884–5)

LSJ H. G. Liddell, R. Scott and H. S. Jones, *A Greek–English Lexicon* (9th edn, Oxford 1940)

MacCary, *Childlike Achilles* W. T. MacCary, *Childlike Achilles* (New York 1982)

Macleod, *Iliad XXIV* C. W. Macleod, *Homer, the Iliad, Book XXIV* (Cambridge 1982)

MacQueen, *The Hittites* J. G. MacQueen, *The Hittites* (2nd edn, London 1986)

Maher, *Creation and Tradition* J. P. Maher, *Creation and Tradition in Language* (Amsterdam 1977)

Mazon P. Mazon, ed., *Homère, Iliade* (Paris 1937–8)

Meister, *Kunstsprache* K. Meister, *Die homerische Kunstsprache* (Leipzig 1921)

Mélanges Delebecque *Mélanges Edouard Delebecque* (Aix-en-Provence 1983)

Michel, *N* C. Michel, *Erläuterungen zum N der Ilias* (Heidelberg 1971)

Montanari F. Montanari, *I frammenti dei grammatici Agathokles, Hellanikos, Ptolemaios Epithetes* (Berlin and New York 1988)

Morris, *Burial* I. M. Morris, *Burial and Ancient Society* (Cambridge 1987)

Moulton, *Similes* C. Moulton, *Similes in the Homeric Poems* (Göttingen 1977)

Muellner, ΕΥΧΟΜΑΙ L. Muellner, *The Meaning of* ΕΥΧΟΜΑΙ *through its Formulas* (Innsbruck 1976)

Mühlestein, *Namenstudien* H. Mühlestein, *Homerische Namenstudien* (Frankfurt am Main 1987)

M–W R. Merkelbach and M. L. West, *Fragmenta Hesiodea* (Oxford 1967); new fragments included in F. Solmsen, R. Merkelbach and M. L. West, edd., *Hesiodi Theogonia, Opera et Dies, Scutum, Fragmenta Selecta* (2nd edn, Oxford 1983)

MY *The Mycenae Tablets IV. A Revised Transliteration*, ed. J.-P. Olivier (Leiden 1969)

Nagy, *BA* G. Nagy, *The Best of the Achaeans* (Baltimore 1979)

Neitzel S. Neitzel, *Apions Glossai Homerikai* (Berlin and New York 1977)

Nic Nicanor, Περὶ τῆς Ὁμηρικῆς στιγμῆς (in Erbse, *Scholia*)

Nickau, *Zenodotos* K. Nickau, *Untersuchungen zur textkritischen Methode des Zenodotos von Ephesos* (Berlin and New York 1977)

Niens, *Struktur* C. Niens, *Struktur und Dynamik in den Kampfszenen der Ilias* (Heidelberg 1987)

Nussbaum, *Head and Horn* A. Nussbaum, *Head and Horn in Indo-European* (Berlin and New York 1986)

OCT Oxford Classical Texts: *Homeri Opera I–V*: I–II (*Iliad*) edd. D. B. Monro and T. W. Allen (3rd edn, Oxford 1920); III–IV (*Odyssey*) ed. T. W. Allen (2nd edn, Oxford 1917–19); V (*Hymns*, etc.) ed. T. W. Allen (Oxford 1912)

Odissea *Omero, Odissea*, general editor, A. Heubeck (Rome 1981–6); see *Commentary*

Onians, *Origins* R. B. Onians, *The Origins of European Thought* (Cambridge 1951)

Owen, *The Story of the Iliad* E. T. Owen, *The Story of the Iliad* (Toronto 1946)

Page, *HHI* D. L. Page, *History and the Homeric Iliad* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1959)

Paley F. A. Paley, ed., *The Iliad of Homer* (London 1866–71)

Palmer, *The Greek Language* L. R. Palmer, *The Greek Language* (London 1980)

Parker, *Miasma* R. Parker, *Miasma* (Oxford 1983)

Parry, *MHV* Adam Parry, ed., *The Making of Homeric Verse: the Collected Papers of Milman Parry* (Oxford 1971)

A. A. Parry, *Blameless Aegisthus* Anne Amory Parry, *Blameless Aegisthus* (Leiden 1973)

Peters, *Laryngale* M. Peters, *Untersuchungen zur Vertretung der indogermanischen Laryngale im Griechischen* (Vienna 1980)

Pfeiffer, *Callimachus* R. Pfeiffer, ed., *Callimachus* (Oxford 1949, repr. 1985)

Pfeiffer, *Scholarship* R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford 1968)

PMG *Poetae Melici Graeci*, ed. D. L. Page (Cambridge 1962)

Pokorny, *IEW* J. Pokorny, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* I (Bern 1959–69)

Pollard, *Birds* J. Pollard, *Birds in Greek Life and Myth* (London 1977)

Porphyry *Porphyrii Quaestionum Homericarum Reliquiae* I–II, ed. H. Schrader (Leipzig 1880–90)

Powell, *Lexicon to Herodotus* J. E. Powell, *A Lexicon to Herodotus* (2nd edn, Cambridge 1938)

Prinz, *Gründungsmythen* F. Prinz, *Gründungsmythen und Sagenchronologie* (Munich 1979)

Pritchett, *The Greek State at War* W. K. Pritchett, *The Greek State at War* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1971–)

PY *The Pylos Tablets Transcribed*, edd. E. L. Bennett and J.-P. Olivier (Rome 1973–6)

RE *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, ed. G. Wissowa, W. Kroll, K. Mittelhaus and K. Ziegler (Stuttgart 1893–)

Redfield, *Nature and Culture* J. M. Redfield, *Nature and Culture in the Iliad* (Chicago 1975)

Reinhardt, *IuD* K. Reinhardt, *Die Ilias und ihr Dichter*, ed. U. Hölscher (Göttingen 1961)

Res Mycenaeae *Res Mycenaeae: Akten des VII. Internazionalen Mykenologischen Colloquiums*, edd. A. Heubeck and G. Neumann (Göttingen 1983)

Richardson N. J. Richardson, *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (Oxford 1974)

Risch, *Kleine Schriften* E. Risch, *Kleine Schriften* (Berlin 1981)

Risch, *Wortbildung* E. Risch, *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache* (2nd edn, Berlin and New York 1974)

Ruijgh, τε *épique* C. J. Ruijgh, *Autour de 'τε épique'* (Amsterdam 1971)

Russo, *Scutum* C. F. Russo, ed., *Hesiodi Scutum* (2nd edn, Florence 1965)

J. Russo see *Odissea*

S *Supplementum Lyricis Graecis*, ed. D. L. Page (Oxford 1974)

Sakellariou, *Migration* M. B. Sakellariou, *La Migration grecque en Ionie* (Athens 1958)

Sandars, *Sea Peoples* N. K. Sandars, *The Sea Peoples* (2nd edn, London 1985)

Schadewaldt, *Iliasstudien* W. Schadewaldt, *Iliasstudien* (3rd edn, Darmstadt 1966)

Schadewaldt, *Welt* W. Schadewaldt, *Von Homers Welt und Werk* (4th edn, Stuttgart 1965)

Scherer, 'Nichtgriechische Personennamen' A. Scherer, 'Nichtgriechische Personennamen der Ilias', pp. 32–45 in *Studien zum antiken Epos*, edd. H. Görgemanns and E. A. Schmidt (Meisenheim 1976)

Schmidt, *Weltbild* M. Schmidt, *Die Erklärungen zum Weltbild Homers und zur Kultur der Heroenzeit in den bT-scholien zur Ilias* (Munich 1976)

Schnapp-Gourbeillon, *Lions* A. Schnapp-Gourbeillon, *Lions, héros, masques* (Paris 1981)

Schoeck, *Ilias und Aithiopis* G. Schoeck, *Ilias und Aithiopis* (Zurich 1961)

Schwyzer, *Grammatik* E. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik* (Munich 1939–53)

Scott, *Simile* W. C. Scott, *The Oral Nature of the Homeric Simile* (Leiden 1974)

Segal, *Mutilation* C. Segal, *The Theme of the Mutilation of the Corpse in the Iliad* (Leiden 1971)

Severyns, *Cycle* A. Severyns, *Le Cycle épique dans l'école d'Aristarque* (Paris 1928)

Severyns, *Homère* A. Severyns, *Homère III: L'Artiste* (Brussels 1948)

SH *Supplementum Hellenisticum*, edd. H. Lloyd-Jones and P. Parsons (Berlin and New York 1983)

Shipp, *Studies* G. P. Shipp, *Studies in the Language of Homer* (2nd edn, Cambridge 1972)

Shipp, *Vocabulary* G. P. Shipp, *Modern Greek Evidence for the Ancient Greek Vocabulary* (Sydney 1979)

SIG *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, edd. W. Dittenberger and F. Hiller von Gärtringen (3rd edn, Leipzig 1915–24)

Silk, *Interaction* M. S. Silk, *Interaction in Poetic Imagery* (Cambridge 1974)

Slater, *Aristophanis Byzantii Fragmenta* W. J. Slater, ed., *Aristophanis Byzantii Fragmenta* (Berlin and New York 1986)

Snodgrass, *Dark Age* A. M. Snodgrass, *The Dark Age of Greece* (Edinburgh 1971)

Snodgrass, *EGA* A.M. Snodgrass, *Early Greek Armour and Weapons* (Edinburgh 1964)

Sowa, *Themes* C. A. Sowa, *Traditional Themes and the Homeric Hymns* (Chicago 1984)

Stella, *Tradizione micenea* L. A. Stella, *Tradizione micenea e poesia dell'Iliade* (Rome 1978)

Steph. Byz. Stephanus Byzantius, *Ethnica*, ed. A. Meineke (Berlin 1849)

Stith Thompson Stith Thompson, *Motif-Index of Folk Literature* (2nd edn, Copenhagen 1955–8)

Strasburger, *Kämpfer* G. Strasburger, *Die kleinen Kämpfer der Ilias* (Diss. Frankfurt 1954)

Studies Chadwick *Studies in Mycenaean and Classical Greek presented to John Chadwick*, edd. J. T. Killen, J. L. Melena and J.-P. Olivier (Salamanca 1987)

Studies Palmer *Studies in Greek, Italic and Indo-European Linguistics offered to Leonard R. Palmer*, edd. A. Morpurgo Davies and W. Meid (Innsbruck 1976)

SVF *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*, ed. H. von Arnim (Leipzig 1903–24, repr. Stuttgart 1964)

T the T-scholia to the *Iliad* (in Erbse, *Scholia*)

TH *The Thebes Tablets II*, edd. T. G. Spyropoulos and J. Chadwick (Salamanca 1975)

Thalmann, *Conventions* W. G. Thalmann, *Conventions of Form and Thought in Early Greek Epic Poetry* (Baltimore 1984)

Thompson, *Birds* D'A. W. Thompson, *A Glossary of Greek Birds* (2nd edn, London and Oxford 1936)

Thornton, *Supplication* A. Thornton, *Homer's Iliad: its Composition and the Motif of Supplication* (Göttingen 1984)

Trümpy, *Fachausdrücke* H. Trümpy, *Kriegerische Fachausdrücke im griechischen Epos* (Basel 1950)

Untermann, *Sprache* J. Untermann, *Einführung in die Sprache Homers* (Heidelberg 1987)

van der Valk, *Researches* M. van der Valk, *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad* I–II (Leiden 1963–4)

van der Valk, *TCO* M. van der Valk, *Textual Criticism of the Odyssey* (Leiden 1949)

van Leeuwen, *Commentationes Homericae* J. van Leeuwen, *Commentationes Homericae* (Leiden 1911)

Ventris and Chadwick, *Documents* M. Ventris and J. Chadwick, *Documents in Mycenaean Greek* (2nd edn, Cambridge 1973)

Vermeule, *Death* E. T. Vermeule, *Aspects of Death in Early Greek Art and Poetry* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1979)

von Kamptz, *Personennamen* H. von Kamptz, *Homerische Personennamen* (Göttingen 1982)

von Scheliha, *Patroklos* R. von Scheliha, *Patroklos: Gedanken über Homers Dichtung und Gestalten* (Basel 1943)

Wackernagel, *SUH* J. Wackernagel, *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer* (Göttingen 1916)

Wathelet, *Traits* P. Wathelet, *Les Traits éoliens dans la langue de l'épopée grecque* (Rome 1970)

West, *Catalogue* M. L. West, *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women* (Oxford 1985)

West, *Orphic Poems* M. L. West, *The Orphic Poems* (Oxford 1983)

West, *Theogony* M. L. West, *Hesiod, Theogony* (Oxford 1966)

West, *Works and Days* M. L. West, *Hesiod, Works and Days* (Oxford 1978)

S. West see *Commentary*

S. West, *Ptolemaic Papyri* S. West, *The Ptolemaic Papyri of Homer* (Cologne and Opladen 1967)

Westermann, *Genesis* C. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11: A Commentary*, trans. J. J. Scullion (London 1984)

Whitman, *HHT* C. H. Whitman, *Homer and the Heroic Tradition* (Cambridge, Mass., 1958)

Wilamowitz, *IuH* U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Die Ilias und Homer* (Berlin 1916)

Wilamowitz, *Kleine Schriften* U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Kleine Schriften* I–V (Berlin 1935–69)

Willcock M. M. Willcock, *The Iliad of Homer* I–II (London 1978–84)
Winter, *MNO* F. J. Winter, *Die Kampfszenen in den Gesängen MNO der Ilias* (Diss. Frankfurt 1956)
Wyatt, *ML* W. F. Wyatt, Jr, *Metrical Lengthening in Homer* (Rome 1969)
Zgusta, *Ortsnamen* L. Zgusta, *Kleinasiatische Ortsnamen* (Heidelberg 1984)

Journals

A&A *Antike und Abendland*
AC *L'Antiquité classique*
AJA *American Journal of Archaeology*
AJP *American Journal of Philology*
BCH *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique*
BSA *Annual of the British School at Athens*
CA *Classical Antiquity*
CJ *Classical Journal*
C&M *Classica et Mediaevalia*
CPh *Classsical Philology*
CQ *Classical Quarterly*
CR *Classical Review*
CRAI *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres*
G&R *Greece and Rome*
GRBS *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*
Gymn. *Gymnasium*
HSCP *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*
JHS *Journal of Hellenic Studies*
LCM *Liverpool Classical Monthly*
MH *Museum Helveticum*
Mnem. *Mnemosyne*
MSS *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft*
PCPS *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*
RA *Revue archéologique*
REA *Revue des études anciennes*
RFIC *Rivista di filologia ed istruzione classica*
RhM *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*
RIL *Rendiconti dell'Istituto Lombardo, Classe di lettere, scienze morali e storiche*
SBAW *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist. Klasse*
SHAW *Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist. Klasse*
SMEA *Studi micenei ed egeo-anatolici*
TAPA *Transactions of the American Philological Association*

WS	*Wiener Studien*
YCS	*Yale Classical Studies*
ZPE	*Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*
ZVS	*Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*

NOTE

My references to the narrator as 'the poet' or 'Homer' are narratologically imprecise, but save space. '*Il.*' means 'the *Iliad*', '*Od.*' 'the *Odyssey*', '*Hy.*' the Homeric Hymns, '*Cat.*' the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*, which is, I hold, genuinely by Hesiod (see p. 14 n. 21). The term 'epos' means all hexameter verse down to *c.* 500 B.C. Early epic fragments are cited from Bernabé *and* Davies, unless the numeration of these editions coincides. For the Hesiodic fragments, elegy and iambus I use (Merkelbach and) West's numeration; for lyric, Voigt and *PMG*; for the 'Orphica', Kern; for Pindar, Snell–Maehler; for the Presocratics, Diels–Kranz; for tragedy, Nauck and Radt; for comedy, Kassel–Austin; for Antimachus, Wyss; for Aristotle, Rose; for Callimachus, Pfeiffer and *SH*. Modern authors cited without initials appear in the bibliography.

Greek words found earlier in the same note are abbreviated to the first letter only, unless there is a risk of ambiguity. In discussions of formulae, the number of occurrences is given in the form '10× *Il.*, 6× *Od.*'; '10×' without qualification refers to the *Iliad*. The abbreviation 'etc.' in such references shows that the total includes all relevant terminations. Statements like '3/33×' mean 'thrice in a total of 33 instances'; the statistics are as accurate as I can make them. | marks the beginning or end of a verse. Greek names are transliterated following the rules laid down in vol. I, x. Mycenaean (Myc.) reconstructed forms found in the tablets are given thus: */wanax/*. Asterisks signal other reconstructed forms.

References to the scholia follow the system set out in vol. I, 41f.; thus Arn/A means 'Aristonicus in MS A', Did/AT means 'Didymus in MSS A and T', Nic/A means 'Nicanor in MS A' and Hrd/AbT means 'Herodian in MS A and in the bT scholia'. Aristarchus is cited from Arn/A *ad loc.* unless stated. 'Papyri' are MS fragments down to *c.* 600 A.D.; 'codices' are medieval MSS; the 'good MSS' are the early minuscules (see pp. 20–2). Ancient works whose authorship is doubtful have the alleged author's name in quotation marks, e.g. 'Plut.'; spurious attributions are indicated by brackets, e.g. [Plut.].

The northern Aegean

INTRODUCTION

1. The gods in Homer: further considerations

In two vital aspects, early Greek epic poetry exactly reflects the nature of Greek religion as far back as it can be known. The system is polytheistic, as in nearly all other ancient societies, with Zeus as merely the mightiest member of the divine family; and the gods are regarded as anthropomorphic. Both facets of this system have important moral implications, which first appear in Homer but pervade all Greek literature. The prehistory of 'Homeric religion' was discussed above (vol. II, 1–14), where it was shown that the Greeks tended to elevate and humanize the Mesopotamian beliefs which they largely adopted. Here I will focus on the literary and moral dimensions of these beliefs, and how they are reshaped for the poetic purposes of the *Iliad*.[1]

(i) The literary and religious aims of Homer's innovations

Like any Greek poet, Homer had the right to adapt myths as he wished, within the wide limits of the traditions he inherited. As Griffin has shown,[2] he de-emphasizes their bizarre and magical aspects, plays up their potential for humour and tragedy, and above all stresses his gods' human nature: they are exactly like us save for their greater power and knowledge, and their freedom from age and death (they can still alter their location and shape at will, but Homer avoids vouching in his own *persona* for their more bizarre metamorphoses). He widens the gulf between mortal and immortal, which not even Herakles or Akhilleus can cross; even the more optimistic *Odyssey* vividly depicts the insubstantiality of the souls in Hades, barely alluding to tales that Menelaos and Herakles enjoyed a better afterlife. In the Cycle mortals became gods far more readily: Athene nearly immortalized Tudeus, Dawn gained immortality for her son Memnon and Thetis conveyed Akhil-

[1] For excellent treatments of this topic and bibliography see Whitman, *HHT* 221–48; Lesky, *RE* Suppl. XI (1968) s.v. *Homeros*, 725–40; Griffin, *HLD* 81ff.; Erbse, *Götter*. For background Burkert, *Religion* is indispensable.

[2] *JHS* 97 (1977) 39–53.

leus to the White Isle. But in Homer even Zeus can do no better than grant his own son Sarpedon a heroic burial and, it is implied, a lasting hero-cult. It is telling that at *Erga* 143ff. Hesiod blends both ideas: his race of bronze perishes in internecine strife and goes to Hades, whereas the 'heroes who are called demigods' perish likewise but go to the 'isles of the blessed' (i.e. 'of the gods'). Homer's dead live out an eternal death under the earth, thirsty for offerings of blood (just as the Olympians above relish the smoke of sacrifices), but devoid of even human powers. Ancient rituals known to Aeschylus, like the mutilation of a murdered man to keep him from taking revenge, or his kinsmen's summoning of aid from the underworld, confirm that other ideas of the afterlife were current. Again, Homer has clarified the world-view of his tradition, to stress that, when life is gone, it is gone for ever.

The paradoxical result is that, precisely by widening the chasm between mortal and immortal, Homer exalts the dignity and responsibility of human beings, placed between god and beast and potentially sharing the natures of both.[3] We may attain divine achievements, with the aid of the gods themselves, but not a divine existence. The here and now, for all the prevalence of adversity over happiness, is the only life we have, and we must make the best of it. Unlike the gods' moral choices, human ones are not trivial, since they can have results fatal for oneself or others, whereas gods cannot truly suffer. Again it is Griffin[4] who has shown how Homer exploits the gods' interactions with mortals as a metaphor for, and a guide to, the response of the human audience. Divine spectators may dignify the battle below by deeming it worth watching, and may glorify a warrior by aiding him: thus it enhances Akhilleus' victory when Athene helps him kill Hektor. Divine involvement is a major sign of the significance of an event and of how we should view it. Conversely, when the gods turn away, bored by the trivial squabbling of these ephemeral creatures, the bloodshed gains in pathos. The gods' unknowability to the characters creates irony, their irresistible power evokes fear, their frivolous irresponsibility arouses humour, their deliberations and plots excite suspense, and their effortless superiority yields a truly tragic pathos. The gods' actions are thus used to evoke the whole range of emotions which Aristotle has taught us to expect from great literature.

It was traditional to ascribe to divine agency any otherwise inexplicable event, like a spear missing its mark, a bowstring breaking, the amazing skill of a warrior, speaker, poet or artisan, and even a sudden feeling or thought. In everyday life one could rarely specify the god concerned, and thus spoke of a θεός, θεοί or δαίμων, just as someone who speaks or acts oddly is ad-

[3] Cf. Redfield, *Nature and Culture* 131–6.

[4] *CQ* 28 (1978) 1–22; *HLD* 179–204. The germ of this approach is in [Longinus], *On the Sublime* 9.7ff. See also J. M. Bremer in *Homer: Beyond Oral Poetry*, Amsterdam 1987, 31–46.

dressed as δαιμόνιε; only seers or other gifted persons could state which god was involved and what must be done in consequence. Homer's heroes can even doubt whether a god has intervened, and cannot recognize particular deities, whatever shape they take, unless they let themselves be perceived – Athene has to lift the mist from Diomedes' eyes so that he can tell men from gods (5.127f.). It takes a Kalkhas to diagnose Apollo's wrath at 1.93ff. But the bard claims a special vision, and can always say which deity is involved, showing us the world through the eyes of the gods themselves.

(ii) 'Double motivation' and human responsibility

Even aside from obvious favouritism, like Athene's dealings with Diomedes in the *Iliad* and with Odysseus in the *Odyssey*, many divine interventions in Homer appear artificial to modern readers. What is one to make of, for example, how Aphrodite forces Helen to go to bed with Paris even when Helen is disgusted by his conduct in the duel with Menelaos (3.383ff.)? Is this a mere externalization of normal human feeling – although enraged at Paris, Helen still finds him irresistibly attractive? When Athene appears to Akhilleus at 1.194ff., is this merely an objectification of prudent second thoughts? Such cases have led many to doubt the reality of the gods for the poet and his audience, and to deem them just a manner of speaking or a useful poetic convention.[5] The view, advanced by B. Snell[6] and prevalent until recently, that early epic has no concept of the whole personality, and objectifies mental processes as the *noos*, *thumos* and so forth, might seem to find a perfect parallel here; instead of a person's *thumos* or *phrenes*, passion or reason, taking the decision, a god decides. But it was always risky to base a complex psychological theory on the loose but conveniently extended set of overlapping terms by which the tradition described mental processes, as Lloyd-Jones[7] has shown; and the poet always makes clear that the god physically exists. When Aphrodite breaks Paris' chin-strap so that Menelaos cannot drag him off to his death, this could be ascribed to chance; but not so her next action, Paris' bodily removal to Helen's room in Troy. Athene, equally physically, tugs Akhilleus' hair; objectified prudence might well persuade, but could not pull hair. So why does Athene urge Akhilleus to do what, given his portrayal elsewhere in the poem, he would be likely

[5] Cf. Lloyd-Jones, *Justice of Zeus* 10; Griffin, *HLD* 144ff.

[6] *Die Entdeckung des Geistes*, 4th edn, Göttingen 1975; trans. T. G. Rosenmeyer, *The Discovery of the Mind in Early Greek Philosophy and Literature*, Cambridge, Mass. 1953. Cf. Erbse, *Götter*; H. Fränkel, *Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy*, trans. M. Hadas and J. Willis, Oxford 1975, 75–85; MacCary, *Childlike Achilles*; T. Jahn, *Zum Wortfeld 'Seele-Geist' in der Sprache Homers*, Munich 1987.

[7] *Justice of Zeus* 9; cf. Griffin, *HLD* 144ff.; Bremmer, *Soul*; Fowler, *Lyric* 4ff.

to do anyway, i.e. refrain from killing his commander-in-chief? And why is Aphrodite needed to make Helen yield to what is clearly a recurrent weakness for Paris?

The answer, formulated by Lesky,[8] lies in the idea of 'double motivation' or 'overdetermination'; gods and men cause the same actions and impulses simultaneously, and both can be held responsible. In his 'apology' Agamemnon saves face by stating that a like misfortune once befell Zeus himself; thereupon he offers full restitution, '*since* I suffered *atē* and Zeus took away my wits' (19.86ff., 137f.). On the same pattern, Aphrodite's coercion matches Helen's desires in a psychological framework that is all too familiar, Akhilleus is already debating inwardly whether to kill Agamemnon (1.188ff.), and we understand why he is loth to do so, despite the provocation he has received. It is a remarkable paradox that nearly every important event in the *Iliad* is the doing of a god, and that one can give a clear account of the poem's entire action with no reference to the gods at all.

Let Patroklos' death serve as a further example. Who is responsible? Patroklos himself, who was so swept away by his victory over Sarpedon that he ignored Akhilleus' warnings? Akhilleus, whose compromise of sending his deputy into battle in his place was a disaster? Nestor, who devised that compromise? Hektor, who strikes the death-blow? Euphorbos, the first Trojan to wound Patroklos? Apollo, who strips off his armour? Or Zeus, who cast fatal blindness into him (16.685ff.), and foretold the whole sequence to Here (15.63ff.)? If the latter, Zeus' prediction still includes something he would hardly want, the death of his son Sarpedon. So is it a power higher than Zeus? Or is it all of these? Or is nobody responsible at all? Only the last question demands a negative. Moral responsibility is one of Homer's major themes. Since the *Iliad* is in the tragic mode, the responsibility is never clear-cut, as it is in the morally simpler *Odyssey*, where the gods proclaim at the outset, and the plot affirms at the end, that we increase our miseries by our own misdeeds.

(iii) Free will, fate and the gods

By leaving an undefined area between free will and supernatural forces, Homer achieves two goals: his characters are seen to suffer for their own choices, which is clearly tragic, and yet the whole outcome seems beyond their individual control or even pre-ordained, which is tragic in another way. The same dualism which applies to the heroes also applies to the gods themselves, including Zeus, who performs several roles.[9] First, he is a per-

[8] 'Göttliche und menschliche Motivierung im homerischen Epos', *SHAW* 1961 Abh. 4; cf. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational* 2ff.; Whitman, *HHT* 248.

[9] Cf. Erbse, *Götter* 209–56.

sonal god, the most powerful admittedly, who can be deceived and may use or threaten force to realize his wishes (Homer of course relegates this to reminiscences by the characters). He is concerned to punish perjurers and those who wrong suppliants and *xenoi* (strangers/hosts/guests); Paris' crime against Menelaos explains why he must ultimately back the Greeks against the Trojans. But there are signs that he cares about justice in a wider sense (16.384–93n.), and his will can be taken to represent that of his entire family, since the gods collectively are omniscient and omnipotent. One might expect that nothing could occur against his will; but he has to forgo saving even his own son Sarpedon, when he is reminded that this would be contrary to 'fate'.[10] This ancient idea is expressed by words for 'lot' or 'portion' – αἶσα, cf. Oscan *aeteis*, 'part', μοῖρα, μόρος, ἔμμορε, εἵμαρται, cf. μέρος, 'part'; πέπρωται, cf. Latin *pars*, 'portion'; κήρ, cf. κείρω, 'cut'. δαίμων, 'apportioner' (from δαίω), like 'kismet' (from Arabic *qasama*, 'divide'), reflects the same notion. The most universal aspect of one's lot is death, and so these words often connote death; indeed, μόρος has come to mean 'death', and βροτός (< **mṛtos*) must come from the same root (this has eluded the etymologists).

The idea that everyone has an allotted portion in life is very old; a formular verse preserves an ancient metaphor for this, that someone suffers 'what fate spun into the thread as he was born' (20.127f. etc.). Such fatalism is an inevitable and necessary response to harsh circumstances, as is its opposite, the idea of free will (which Homer never formulated, but projects onto his gods). Without reflecting upon their inconsistency, we still tend to waver between these views, as life's changing situations affect us; the epic tradition itself was little different. Homer exploits the poetic advantages of both perspectives without bringing them into direct confrontation; the tangled relation between fate, human freedom and the gods was left for later thinkers to unravel.

Nothing ever happens contrary to fate in the *Iliad*, save for the extraordinary hyperbole at 16.780, when the Greeks prevail 'beyond destiny' (ὑπὲρ αἶσαν); normally we hear that events would have happened 'contrary to fate', had not someone intervened (e.g. 16.698ff.). 'Beyond fate' is even replaced by 'beyond god' at 17.327, when the god is Zeus (cf. 331). At 16.431ff. Zeus ponders whether to save his son Sarpedon; Here agrees that he could do so, but objects that it would set a precedent for other deities. The question of Zeus's power relative to fate lurks behind her words, but receives no answer. Instead, the scene reveals the depth of Zeus's grief, and shifts the emphasis to a theme central to the *Iliad*, the unbridgeable chasm between mortal and immortal: even the ruler of gods and men knows the limits to his power and exercises self-control for the sake of universal order

[10] See further *ibid.* 259–93; Bremer, *art. cit.* in n. 4.

– an example of the leadership Agamemnon ought to have displayed. But in the *Odyssey* mortals can suffer beyond what is fated, because of their own wickedness. Similarly, Zeus's interest in justice among men is confined in the *Iliad* to a simile at 16.384ff., but the *Odyssey* often mentions his concern to defend justice and punish wrongdoers (e.g. 3.132ff.). Neither difference between the epics should be explained by positing a historical evolution towards a Hesiodic theodicy – as we shall see, the linguistic data are fully compatible with the view that both epics are the work of a single poet. Instead, these differences exactly reflect each poem's divergent viewpoint – the *Iliad* stresses the tragic aspect of life, where suffering predominates, whereas the *Odyssey* offers a simpler, moralizing view, whereby the gods are concerned to ensure that we will eventually suffer beyond our due if we misbehave. Both views of the world were traditional; the first is more apt for war, the second for peace. Homer's art is shown by the consistency with which he has adopted the one appropriate to each epic and excluded the other.

In the *Iliad*, it is hardly too simplistic to regard fate as simply 'what happens', almost the needs of the tale or of the tradition, over which not even the poet has full control: nobody ever dared to deny, for instance, that Troy fell. If it happened, it must have been fated to happen. But fate and divine interference are also different ways of explaining the same event, depending on which one the character speaking finds more consoling or the poet more dramatic. Thus at 9.410ff. Akhilleus says that he has a choice of fates – a short and glorious life, or a long and inglorious one; at 18.96 Thetis tells him that, if he chooses to kill Hektor, his own death must soon follow. The literary effect is clear: nothing arouses more pathos than a hero going clear-eyed to his doom. If stress is placed on the inevitability of an event, its importance in a character's life-story or the need to endure it, then fate is invoked; if the emphasis falls on an action's power or strangeness, then it tends to be the work of a god. What is never suggested is that an odd or significant event is mere chance; Homer has no word for this, and does not know the idea either.

These ways of looking at events were clearly part of common belief, but Homer exploits them for literary effect; both ineluctable fate and unpredictable divine intervention reinforce the sense of man as a plaything at the mercy of mightier powers. But the conclusion drawn from this is far from a negative or passive one; we must win honour within the limits set for us by our existence within a cosmos which is basically well-ordered, however hard that order may be to discern. When Odysseus is reduced to beggary, he does not lower his moral standards; when Akhilleus faces the inevitability of death, he is still determined to die gloriously. Homer adapts for his own poetic and moral ends ways of thinking which are potentially contradictory,

refining the myths and world-view of his tradition. All his art is mobilized to stress the need for intelligence, courage and moral responsibility in the face of a dangerous universe, wherein mankind has an insignificant and yet paramount role. It is this attitude which makes the Homeric poems so sublimely and archetypally humane.[11]

[11] See further Simone Weil, *The Iliad, or The Poem of Force*, trans. M. McCarthy, Wallingford, Pa. 1956; Griffin, *HLD*.

2. The origins and evolution of the epic diction

The artificial diction of the Homeric poems ('*Kunstsprache*') is in essence identical to that of the other poems in the same tradition of oral narrative song in hexameters, i.e. the remnants of the Epic Cycle, the Hesiodic poems and 'Homeric' Hymns, which extend well into the sixth century.[1] Linguistic differences between these poems are barely discernible save by subtle statistical tests; the striking fact of the tradition's unity constitutes an impressive testimony to its panhellenic appeal and to the pre-eminence of that Ionic branch of it represented by Homer. Brief hexameter inscriptions from continental Greece have been held to show that local poets maintained epic traditions in local dialect, but this is doubtful. Some local influence is visible in Hesiod, e.g. in the Attic formula λαμπράν τε σελήνην;[2] but his diction is largely identical to Homer's, and he is fully heir to the Ionian epic tradition. Greek genres tended to adopt different regional styles of speech, according to where the finest practitioners of each originated. From Homer onward, wherever epic poets came from, they used the same basically Ionic diction, containing forms derived from different times and dialects, or from no time or place at all, but invented.

(i) The artificial nature of the epic diction

This diction was never spoken anywhere, only sung;[3] its origins were for centuries an insoluble puzzle. Aristarchus deemed it an archaic form of Ionic, spoken by the Ionians' ancestors before they left Attica (13.195–7n.). Once Bentley had realized that the metrical effects of the lost *w*-sound (digamma, Ϝ) were often detectable in the poems, editors tried to restore an 'original' text, assuming that copyists had modernized it; but even the most

[1] For basic accounts see Palmer in *Companion* 75–178; Ruijgh in *Linear B* 143–90; Hainsworth in *Commentary* 1 24–32; West, *JHS* 108 (1988) 151–72. The fundamental works are Chantraine, *GH*; Risch, *Wortbildung*. For the laryngeal theory, without which our understanding would be seriously incomplete, see Beekes, *Laryngeals*; H. Rix, *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen*, Darmstadt 1976; Peters, *Laryngale*.

[2] See G. P. Edwards, *The Language of Hesiod*, especially 102f.; Janko, *HHH* 223ff. For West Ionic forms see below n. 34. There is no Doric influence, *pace* West, *art. cit.* 167f.: for ἐσσεῖται, τύνη, see on 13.317f., 16.64f. The rare ἁμός (7× Hom.) and ὑμός (5× Hom., *Theog.* 662) must be pre-Aeolic archaisms (Householder and Nagy, *Greek* 66). τεοῖο, τεῖν, π(ρ)οτί and verbs in -άζω or -ίζω with futures and aorists in -ξ- are surely archaisms preserved from the Aeolic phase of the tradition.

[3] For speculation as to the music see West, *JHS* 101 (1981) 113–29.

traditional scenes are so full of 'recent' forms that attempts like Fick's reconstruction of an Aeolic 'Wrath of Akhilleus' never carried conviction, any more than does Shipp's theory, based on his discovery that 'recent' diction is concentrated in the similes, that these are post-Homeric additions. Further progress came from the proof by Witte and Meister[4] that metrical factors encouraged the use of both artificial forms, e.g. εὐρέα for εὐρύν in the fifth foot, and divergent dialectal forms of the same word, e.g. Aeolic ἄμμες beside Ionic ἡμεῖς.

The decisive step came with Parry, who saw that 'as the spoken language changes, the traditional diction of an oral poetry likewise changes, so long as there is no need of giving up any of the formulas'.[5] Parry surveyed the dialectal constituents of the diction, showing that it is the product of an Ionic oral tradition which has adopted with rather little change a traditional diction largely Aeolic in origin but including Arcado-Cypriot features; the Aeolic elements are generally retained only where they offer a metrically indispensable alternative to the Ionic forms. Confirmation that this diction mixes forms of different date came with the decipherment of Linear B, which has shed a flood of light on Homeric phonology, morphology, onomastics and vocabulary; and Hoekstra has shown how Homer and later bards introduced phonetic modifications, notably quantitative metathesis (e.g. -εω for -ᾱο) and Ionic n-mobile (*nu ephelkustikon*), as they adapted old formulae.[6] But we still owe to Parry the explanation that such a linguistic mixture could only arise among many generations of poets, dependent to a greater or lesser degree on stereotyped phrasing to help them compose lengthy heroic narratives as they performed. Yet he was careful to insist that this diction was not just a matter of metrical utility; it also has the effect of distancing the tale from the everyday world, placing it more plausibly in the remote past and creating a suitably heroic tone.

(ii) The prehistoric origins of the *Kunstsprache*

The origins of the hexameter are obscure.[7] It was once thought to derive from the peoples who lived in Greece before Indo-Europeans arrived in

[4] K. Witte, *Zur homerischen Sprache*, Darmstadt 1972 (articles from *Glotta* 1–5, 1909–13); Meister, *Kunstsprache*. For studies antecedent to Parry's see Latacz (ed.), *Homer: Tradition und Neuerung*, Darmstadt 1979.

[5] *MHV* 331; his study occupies *MHV* 325–61.

[6] Thus a runover adjective or verb with movable nu before a consonant making the syllable heavy is often associated with modification (Hoekstra, *Modifications* 101–8). Statistics confirm that this is an innovation (Janko, *HHH* 64–8). For examples see 13.51, 13.78, 13.589, 13.705, 15.103, 15.280, 16.159.

[7] For recent surveys see M. Fantuzzi, *Materiali e discussioni* 12 (1984) 35–60, and Z. Ritoók, *Philologus* 131 (1987) 2–18; I refer below to Nagy, *Comparative Studies in Greek and Indic Meter*, Cambridge, Mass., 1974; West, *CQ* 23 (1973) 179–92; M. W. Haslam, *JHS* 96 (1976) 202; N. Berg, *MSS* 37 (1978) 11–36.

the late third millennium B.C. But the view has gained ground that, like other Greek verse-forms, it somehow descends from Proto-Indo-European verse, wherein the syllable-count was invariant (as it still is in 'Aeolic' verse-forms like the glyconic), but the scansion was fixed only towards the end of the verse; a relic of this is the freedom in syllabic weight seen in the opening syllables of many Aeolic rhythms. The hexameter arose from either the dactylic expansion of a single 'Aeolic' verse, the pherecratean (so Nagy), or, more probably, as a combination of two verses, whether hemiepes plus paroemiac, i.e. $-\cup\cup-\cup\cup-(\times)$ plus $\times-\cup\cup-\cup\cup--$ (so West, Haslam), or choriambic dimeter B plus pherecratean, i.e. $\times\times\times\times-\cup\cup-$ plus $\times\times-\cup\cup--$ (so Berg). Thus in tragedy and Corinna's poetry pherecrateans often end runs of glyconics. It is significant that some formulae with Vedic cognates, a sure sign of great antiquity, fit both Aeolic verses and hexameters. Phrases like ἱερὸν μένος (Sanskrit *iṣiréṇa ... mánasā*), κλέος ἄφθιτον (*ákṣiti śravaḥ, śrávo ... ákṣitam*) and ἀθάνατος καὶ ἀγήραος (*ajárā (a)mṛ́ta*) prove that traditions of heroic song share a common Indo-European heritage, which is also represented in Indic and Slavic verse-forms.[8]

The oldest *Greek* epic we can reconstruct, via its formulae, was already in hexameters;[9] many old formulae straddle the main caesurae, and many old formular systems facilitate starting at the masculine or feminine caesura as the poet wishes. The hexameter has also innovated in allowing one heavy to equal two light syllables in the second half of each of the first five feet. Mycenaean had many more light open syllables than was the case once the weakening of intervocalic *h* (< *s* and *y*) and eventually *w* (ϝ) had led to vowel contraction. This more open structure would favour the regularization of the long line into a dactylic pattern, while contraction would reinforce the tendency to equate one heavy with two light syllables. We cannot exclude the possibility that the hexameter antedates Mycenaean times.

Several dactylic formulae prove archaeologically the Mycenaean contribution to the tradition; φάσγανον/ξίφος ἀργυρόηλον, ἀσπίδος ἀμφιβρότης and σάκος ἠΰτε πύργον all reflect *early* Mycenaean weaponry, and the existence of martial epic by this date accords with visual depictions of sieges of coastal towns on the Thera fresco and the silver rhyton from Shaft Grave IV at Mycenae. The popularity of boars' tusk helmets and figure-of-eight shields in art down to 1200 B.C. suggests that such equipment already had a heroic aura; the bard with a lyre on a fresco in the throne-room at Pylos may well be performing a heroic song. The formulae for a sword with silver rivets, the shield that surrounds a mortal and the hide like a tower show

[8] For bibliography see West, *JHS* 108 (1988) 152n.; M. Finkelberg, *CQ* 36 (1986) 1–5.

[9] So Hoekstra, *Epic Verse Before Homer* 33–53; Ruijgh, *op. cit.* in n. 1; West, *CQ* 23 (1973) 156–9.

that phrases containing two successive dactyls are as old as the objects themselves.[10]

This is supported by the diction. A whole set of formulae proves the survival of Bronze Age syllabic *r̥* in the tradition's early stages.[11] ἀσπίδος ἀμφῐβρότης does not scan unless we restore **amphĭmr̥tās* (cf. Sanskrit *amr̥taḥ* = ἄμβροτος); ἀνδροτῆτα (16.857, 22.363, 24.6) will not scan save as **ănr̥tāta*; ἀβρότη (14.78) represents **ămr̥tā*; ἀβροτάξομεν (10.65) is for *ămr̥t-* (cf. ἤμβροτον = ἥμαρτον); Ἐνῡᾰλίῳ ἀνδρειφόντῃ (7.166) scans only if we restore **ănr̥g*^{w}*hontāi* – and this is half a hexameter. Again, in the old theriomorphic formula βοῶπις πότνια Ἥρη, *h-* is still felt as a consonant: cf. βέλος ἐχεπευκές (2×, < *hekhe-*),[12] ὑπείρεχε, σῡνεχές, ἀμφίεπον, ἐπιάλμενος, εἰνάλιος or εἰν Ἀΐδαο (< **sm̥wid-*), although some of these may be cases of metrical lengthening. Διὶ μῆτῐν ἀτάλαντος scans only if we restore Mycenaean *Διϝεὶ μῆτιν *h*ατάλαντος (< *sm̥-*): this too is half a hexameter, and contains a spondee. Hermes' epithet ἐριούνης, 'good runner', is linked with Mycenaean by a cognate verb for 'run' in the dialects of Arcadia and Cyprus, whither many Mycenaeans fled after the catastrophe of *c.* 1200 B.C.;[13] epic vocabulary surviving as everyday words in these areas surely goes back to this era, e.g. ἀσκηθής, ἠπύω, ἰδέ. Still more telling is Horrocks' proof[14] that the 'tmesis' of those adverbs which were to become prepositions, a device basic to formular composition and modification and paralleled in Vedic, is outmoded in Mycenaean, where tmesis is rare; this implies that bards inherited from before that time one vital way in which the epic diction maintains its flexibility. Another was the optional use of the augment, which appears in Linear B.[15] Hoekstra must be right that what he calls the *amplitudo*, elaborate

[10] See S. P. Morris, *AJA* 93 (1989) 511–35; C. O. Pavese, *SMEA* 21 (1980) 341–52; C. Watkins in *Studies in Honor of M. Gimbutas*, Washington 1987, 286–97; West, *loc. cit.* in n. 9. The argument over whether forms specific to the Mycenaean dialect persist in Homer (the 'Achaean' stratum) continues: in favour see Householder and Nagy, *Greek* 62–6, and Ruijgh, in *Linear B* 148ff.; contrast Peters in *Festschrift Risch* 303–19.

[11] P. Wathelet, in Y. Lebrun (ed.), *Linguistic Research in Belgium*, Wetteren 1966, 145–73; see now West, *loc. cit.* in n. 9. Syllabic *r̥* perhaps survived into Mycenaean, written *-o-ro-* or *-o-*, but this is hard to prove (Heubeck, *Kleine Schriften* 406–30; Mühlestein, *Namenstudien* 186f.). The vocalism ορ/ρο rather than αρ/ρα is Aeolic.

[12] Ruijgh, in *Linear B* 154–8; Crespo, *Prosodia* 72–4. Dissimilation of aspirates had not yet occurred in Mycenaean (Janko, *Glotta* 55 (1977) 1f.).

[13] Bowra, *JHS* 54 (1934) 54–74; Ruijgh, *L'Elément achéen dans la langue épique*, Assen 1957; Householder and Nagy, *Greek* 62–6. Note the possible Arcado-Cypriot forms (i.e. very late Myc.?) in 13.211–13, 16.173–5nn.

[14] *PCPS* 26 (1980) 1–11; *Space and Time in Homer*.

[15] Y. Duhoux (in *Studies Chadwick* 163–72) argues that use of the augment was typical of the Mycenaean lower classes – hence the presence of augments in 'special Mycenaean', gnomic aorists and usually in similes. L. Bottin (*SMEA* 10 (1969) 69–145) showed that its omission is an archaism, common in Aeolic forms like κάββαλε or duals. On the principle that poets make the *Kunstsprache* approximate to their vernacular, augments should be kept where our MSS have them, *pace* Aristarchus (see p. 25 n. 27).

formalized diction which can only have accompanied lengthy hexameter narratives, goes back to this era. Phrases like ἱερὸν μένος Ἀλκινόοιο do sound like Mycenaean courtly diction; compare 'His Royal Highness'.[16]

(iii) Trends of development in Homeric diction

The *Kunstsprache* was evolving before, during and after Homer's time; such development is a feature of all oral narrative poetry, since archaic phrases and forms which lose their original metrical shape tend to be replaced by an up-to-date metrical equivalent. Vernacular forms appear first in non-formular phrasing, then produce modified formulae and over time become fixed in set phraseology. In the extant poems, countless formulae are modified in line with recent developments. Thus μελιηδέα οἶνον (once *μελιϝᾱδέϝα ϝοῖνον) can become μελιηδέος οἴνου only after the loss of ϝ- and replacement of the genitive in -οιο by -ου; *μελιϝᾱδέϝος ϝοίνοιο will not scan. Similarly, phrases like *μειλιχίοισι ϝέπεσσι were changed to μειλιχίοις ἐπέεσσι; where there was no hiatus caused by the loss of ϝ-, bards did not innovate (e.g. χρυσέοισι νέφεσσι). Sound-changes led to the gradual replacement of old formulae, e.g. of (ϝ)ἑκάεργος Ἀπόλλων by Διὸς υἱὸς Ἀπόλλων or of (ϝ)εἴπέ τε μῦθον by φώνησέν τε. Obscure formulae like βοῶπις πότνια Ἥρη or νυκτὸς ἀμολγῷ came under pressure from intelligible equivalents, i.e. θεὰ λευκώλενος Ἥρη (with Aeolic θεᾱ) and νυκτὸς ἐν ὥρῃ.

The hexameter's complexity explains why Greek epic is more retentive of archaic diction than are similar traditions like Old English or South Slavic; if a bard needs to create phrases in so demanding a verse-form, he will more readily reuse or adapt pre-existing formulae than improvise from his vernacular. Even so, improvisation and adaptation were always vital to the tradition, which was clearly more fluid over a vast period than Parry thought, since he greatly overestimated the extent to which the poems consist of formulae. Not even the feeblest bards composed merely by stringing formulae together; poets always drew on their changing vernacular as they recreated and adapted the old tales, and their more striking or useful phrases entered the tradition, ultimately to become curious archaisms on the lips of singers hundreds of years younger.

In the complex blend of elements in Homeric diction, the most pervasive contribution is from the Ionic dialect spoken by the poet (η has replaced ᾱ in nearly every verse). Innovation is especially common in those parts of the poems, notably the extended similes, which we should associate with Homer himself. Attempts to assign different parts of the poems to different linguistic origins have never prospered; nor does the age of an object imply anything

[16] *Epic Verse before Homer* 81–9; cf. Ruijgh, in *Linear B* 158, and S. West on *Od.* 2.409.

about that of the scene where it is described – the boars' tusk helmet appears in a typically 'recent' passage (10.260ff.), and in fact its burglarious pedigree better befits an object looted from a tholos-tomb than an heirloom transmitted verbatim in a scrap of Mycenaean verse. Whereas neither context nor frequency can date a formula, the progress of archaeology and comparative philology enables us to assign relative or even absolute dates to many constituents of the amalgam; thus Κρόνου παῖς ἀγκυλομήτεω occurs 8× in Homer, εὐρύοπα Ζῆν only 3×, yet the former contains two 'recent' Ionian genitives, whereas the latter preserves the ancient accusative of Ζεύς and forms the basis for the modified formula εὐρύοπα Ζεύ(ς), which treats εὐρύοπα as a vocative or nominative and occurs 17×!

All agree that some elements are Mycenaean in origin, some Dark-Age and some Geometric; debate centres on how much each era contributed. On the *a priori* argument given above, one expects diction from the remotest epoch to survive to the smallest extent. Archaeologically provable Mycenaean phrases are rare; if Dark Age phrases (like ἀσπίδος ὀμφαλοέσσης) seem rarer, this is surely because the artifacts of this era are less distinctive, shield-bosses excepted (13.190–4n.). We cannot infer from the depressed culture of Dark Age Greece that poetry languished then – Kirk rightly argues the opposite.[17] But the Homeric poems are of Geometric date; not even the Catalogue of Ships is a Bronze Age survival or a Dark Age reconstruction, although it includes elements of both. The epics purport to recreate Mycenaean times, in a diction which seemed suitably archaic to bard and audience, but is largely post-Mycenaean.

This conclusion is confirmed by statistical study of the texts surviving from the tradition.[18] In a number of common features wherein younger forms replace older ones, as is proven by comparative philology, one can quantify the degree of change from one poem to the next. Whenever a bard has to use a given word or grammatical case, he may have to choose between a more recent form and an older one, seemingly unmetrical. He often keeps the older form, which is more convenient under the pressure of rapid composition; but to an increasing degree – even within the work of the same poet – newer forms enter the tradition. Thus pre-vocalic *w-* ceased to be sounded not long before Homer's time; its metrical effects are still felt 84% of the time in the *Iliad* (and almost always in the enclitic ἑ ἕο οἱ, where it survived longer: cf. on 13.163f., 561). Yet it was lost early enough for Homer to invent Ὀϊλεύς for Ϝιλεύς (13.66–7n.) and to misapply its metrical effects to ἑός (from **sewos*) by analogy with ὅς (**swos*): see 13.492–5n. Later

[17] *Songs* 105–56; *Homer and the Oral Tradition*, Cambridge 1976, 19–39.

[18] Janko, *HHH*, following Hoekstra and G. P. Edwards, *op. cit.* in n. 2; see also M. Cantilena, *RFIC* 114 (1986) 91–124. My figures for Ϝ- below are revised to exclude ἐρύκω.

poets increasingly ignore it, at least until the archaizing influence of far older texts fixed in writing begins to be felt in *c.* 600 B.C. Thus the *Odyssey* maintains the effect of ϝ- 83% of the time, the *Theogony* 66%, the *Erga* 62% and the *Hymn to Demeter* 54%; however, the *Shield of Herakles*, datable to *c.* 570 B.C., has a figure of 72%, which suggests that its poet learned much of his diction from hearing the Homeric and Hesiodic poems recited. So too Hellenistic poets archaize heavily, because they have acquired their diction from reading early epic. The same pattern of change appears in other equally common features.[19] My figures confirm the standard view that the *Iliad* is the oldest Greek poem we have, followed by the *Odyssey*, and then, after a gap, the *Theogony* and *Erga*.[20] Incidentally, the *Catalogue of Women* emerges as almost identical in diction to the *Theogony*, and must take its rightful place as a genuine early member of the tradition.[21]

It follows that the poems acquired fixed form at different stages in a single development; this has implications for how they came to be written down. The linguistic gap between the two Homeric epics is small, smaller than that between the two poems generally agreed to be by Hesiod; there is no linguistic evidence against the ancient view – and some in favour – that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are likewise the work of a single poet whose diction evolved with his years.[22] But what matters here is that the diction was evolving in

[19] It recurs in the tiniest details, e.g. the definite article (J. A. Scott, *The Unity of Homer*, Berkeley 1921, 90–2). Thus the old word τέκος, preserved mainly in formular phrases, is losing ground to τέκνον: its usage falls from 36/79× *Il.* (45%) to 15/49× *Od.* (31%), 2/23× in Hesiod (9%). θεῖος < θεΐος (cf. Myc. *te-i-ja* = */thehiā/*) is irresolvably contracted 1/26× *Il.*, 12/47× *Od.*, 4/8× Hes. Compounds in εὐ- are irresolvably contracted to εὑ- 52/532× Hom., 27/43× Hes. (cf. 16.104–6n.); the adverb εὖ, less well-embedded in formulae, is contracted more often, but shows the same trend (80/211× Hom., 11/13× Hes.). Myc. *e-u-* thus stands for *ehu-* (cf. Hittite *aššus* 'good').

[20] The fashion for dating Homer after Hesiod owes much to Burkert (*WS* 89 (1976) 5ff.), who thinks the mention of 'hundred-gated' Egyptian Thebes at 9.381–4 must refer to that city's glory under the 'Ethiopian' dynasty, 715–663 B.C., and not the New Kingdom; but cf. Heubeck, *Gymn.* 89 (1982) 442f. The allegedly 'recent' scansion of Αἰγυπτίος proves nothing: it will not scan otherwise, */Aiguptios/* is a Mycenaean name (KN Db 1105), and late language does not prove an object late. There is no reason why Egyptian Thebes cannot be a Mycenaean reminiscence, like Homer's references to the Sidonians (but these could also be Dark Age: see 23.740–9n.).

[21] West (*Catalogue* 130ff., 164ff.), ignoring the statistics, dates it to 580–520 B.C., but it certainly antedates the spurious *Aspis* of *c.* 570 B.C. (J. R. March, *The Creative Poet*, London 1987, 157–9). See further Janko, *HHH* 221–5, 248; *id.*, *CQ* 36 (1986) 42ff. M. Davies (*Glotta* 57 (1989) 89ff.) largely bases his sixth-century date for the Cycle on West's dating of *Cat.*, but the linguistic evidence is good enough only to give the Cycle a *terminus post quem* of around Hesiod's time.

[22] So [Longinus], *On the Sublime* 9.12–14. The greater frequency of abstract nouns in the *Odyssey* was once claimed to prove it the later poem, but Homer concentrates such nouns in speeches; as in Thucydides, most of the poems' moral commentary appears in speeches, of which the *Odyssey* has a higher proportion (cf. A. Shewan, *Homeric Essays*, Oxford 1935, 343ff.; Griffin, *JHS* 106 (1986) 36–57).

numerous ways of which bards cannot have been aware. On average, 13–20% of the diction was replaced or remodelled in the interval between the composition of the *Iliad* and that of the *Theogony*, which was at least a generation. If this rate of replacement applied throughout the period 1200–750 B.C., only 10–20% of the Mycenaean diction can have survived. But this is an unreliable yardstick. Formulae which will scan only when the Dark Age *o*-stem genitive singular in *-οο is restored, like ἀδελφειοῦ/ἀνεψιοῦ κταμένοιο (for *ἀδελφεόο etc.), Ἰλίου προπάροιθεν or Αἰόλου κλυτά δώματα (5.21, 15.66, 554, *Od.* 10.60), are rare, although they are valuable signs of the topics of heroic poetry in that era.[23] The pace of change may have increased during that great burst of Ionian creativity which Homer represents.

(iv) The Aeolic phase of the epic tradition

The greatest area of current dispute is over the Aeolic element in the diction. To understand the issues, we must briefly survey another controversy, the origins of the Greek dialects. Much of their differentiation postdates 1200 B.C., but the basic distinction between 'East' and 'West' Greek goes deep into the Bronze Age.[24] The Mycenaean stratum in Homer is widely held to derive from the palatial centres in the Peloponnese, Crete, Boeotia, Aetolia and S.E. Thessaly, areas prominent in heroic saga. From several of them (save Greece north and west of Thebes) we have Linear B archives in the same type of 'East Greek', whose basic feature is the shift of τι to σι (e.g. δίδωσι < -τι). As we know from its shared choices and innovations, Mycenaean is related to the dialects of Arcadia, Cyprus, and, less closely, Attica and Ionia. These 'East Greek' dialects originated in Southern Greece in the later Bronze Age. But the Aeolic dialects of Eastern Thessaly, Boeotia and Asiatic Aeolis (the last two influenced by Doric and Ionic respectively) seem essentially cognate with the Doric and N.W. Greek whose basic 'West Greek' traits arose north of the Corinthian Gulf. Aeolic looks like a blend between Mycenaean, spoken perhaps by the upper classes in S.E. Thessaly, and a

[23] So too the phrases κακομηχάνου ὀκρυοέσσης or ἐπιδημίου ὀκρυόεντος (6.344, 9.64) reflect this genitive and the adjective κρυόεις, ie. *κακομηχάνοο κρ-, ἐπιδημίοο κρ-; but we must not restore *-οο or *-οου with a diectasis (cf. δου), since the MSS may reflect ancient traditions of pronunciation, and *-οο was contracted well before Homer's time (Janko, *HHH* 87–94). Cf. too 2.518n.

[24] For recent surveys see A. Bartoněk, *SMEA* 26 (1987) 7–22; Y. Duhoux, *Introduction aux dialectes grecs anciens* (Louvain 1983). Palmer brings proto-Aeolic as far down as Corinth and puts proto-Attic-Ionic in Attica and Euboea, deeming Aeolic part of 'East' Greek (*The Greek Language* 57–80); this neglects Risch's proof that Lesbian is heavily influenced by Ionic (in *Language and Background* 90–106). Arcado-Cypriot was once spoken in Rhodes (cf. Chantraine, *Dict.* s.v. ἴγνητες, the Arcado-Cypriot name of the indigenous inhabitants).

local 'West Greek' vernacular. After 1100 B.C. Aeolic speech was borne by migrants, with varying degrees of intermixture, to Asiatic Aeolis and Boeotia, Ionic was taken via Athens to Ionia, while pastoralists from N.W. Greece moved into the Peloponnese and Crete.[25]

The epic diction contains many forms deriving from Asiatic Aeolic, e.g. ὄππως, ὁππότερος etc., by analogy with ὅττι (< **yod-k^{w}id*); ζα- from δια- in ζάθεος; or the vocalization of *w* in ἀπηύρα (for *ἀπ-έ-ϝρᾱ), εὕαδε for *ἔσϝαδε etc. (13.41–2n.). Other forms are shared with mainland Aeolic: the assimilation of original *σ to a following liquid or nasal, as in ἄμμες, ἔμμεν, ἔλλαβε, ἔμμορε or ἐρεβεννός, appears in Thessalian too; all three Aeolic dialects share the dative plural in -εσσι and the treatment of labiovelars (*k^{w}*, *g^{w}*) as labials even before *e* (e.g. Φῆρες for Θῆρες and perhaps πίσυρες for τέσσαρες, 15.68on.). Other shared Aeolisms are ἐρι- for ἀρι-, μάν for μήν, ἴα for μία, and the shift of *-ρι- to -ρε- seen in Νεστόρεος, Ἐκτόρεος, ἠνορέη (for *ἀνορία); indeed the last case, like metrically lengthened ἠνεμόεις for *ἀνεμόεις, shows that Ionic singers did not always recognize the Aeolic word, and therefore replaced ᾱ with η (contrast ᾱθάνατος). Other Aeolisms are extended artificially, e.g. Ἀγαμεμνονέος for -ιος, αἰσχροῖσ' ἐπέεσσι for *-οῖσι ϝέπεσσι.

It might seem easiest to assume that Mycenaean singers crossed the Aegean direct from the Peloponnese and Athens to the new Ionian settlements of *c.* 1000 B.C., maintaining their poetic traditions unbroken through the disruption and depopulation at the start of the Dark Ages, and that the Aeolic elements are borrowed from a nearby tradition or vernacular, which supplied many metrically convenient alternative forms.[26] Yet recent studies[27] of the linguistic data uphold Parry's view that there was a radical discontinuity in the tradition, not long before the time of the Homeric poems, when a diction based on the vernacular of Asiatic Aeolis passed into the Ionian ambit, whether by the (historically documented) northward spread in *c.* 800 B.C. of Ionians into Chios and Smyrna (the places most strongly linked with Homer), or by a southward drift of poets from Lesbos

[25] Chadwick has disputed the idea of a movement of Doric-speakers into the Peloponnese, holding that they were present there as a substrate population. But this has not won acceptance (see the essays by Chadwick, Risch, S. Hiller and R. A. Crossland in D. Musti (ed.), *Le Origini dei Greci*, Rome 1986). I think the lower classes there spoke proto-Attic-Ionic. Archaeological evidence for a movement from N.W. Greece in LH IIIB2 onward now exists – the handmade burnished 'barbarian' ware (K. Kilian in French and Wardle, *Prehistory* 133).

[26] So Kirk, *Songs* 148–56; Wyatt, Ἐπιστημονικὴ Ἐπετηρὶς τῆς φιλοσοφικῆς Σχολῆς τοῦ Ἀριστοτελείου Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης 14 (1975) 133–47; D. G. Miller, *Homer and the Ionian Epic Tradition*, Innsbruck 1982. Horrocks, in *Studies Chadwick* 269–94, rejects an Aeolic phase only because he mistakes the infin. in -έμεν for a post-migration innovation.

[27] Parry, *MHV* 342–61; Hoekstra, *Modifications* 145–53; Wathelet, *Traits*; Householder and Nagy, *Greek* 67–9; Palmer in *Companion* 83ff.; Janko, *HHH* 89ff.; Ruijgh, in *Linear B* 145ff., 164ff.; West, *JHS* 108 (1988) 162–5.

and Aeolian Cyme (the birthplace of Hesiod's father) into the zone of Ionic speech. This matches the fact that Aeolic vocabulary, commonest in the *Iliad*, declines in frequency later.[28]

Now Parry held that oral poets use the most recent form which still keeps the same metrical shape. The clearest proof of this principle is diectasis. The bardic form ὁρόω preserves the shape of ὁράω while introducing the vocalism of contracted ὁρῶ; the latter was standard in the vernacular, as many contracted forms in the poems prove. Verbs like τρωπᾶσθε (15.666) are a different compromise, to the same end, between original *τροπάεσθε and contracted *τροπᾶσθε: the alternative with diectasis, τροπάασθε, is attested at 16.95.[29] So too φόως is a cross between φά(ϝ)ος and φῶς (cf. 16.249–52n.), ἐείκοσι between *ἐϝῑκοσι and contracted εἴκοσι, ἔην between ἔεν and ἦν, ἐήνδανε between *ἐ(ϝ)άνδανε and ἤνδανε, ὄου between Dark Age *ὄο and contracted οὗ (cf. ἕης, 16.207–9n.).

From Parry's principle it follows that any tradition which inherited Mycenaean speech should preserve the most recent form which maintains the metre. Thus the epic should have kept Mycenaean */posi/* (cf. Arcadian πός), but in fact uses the 'West Greek' form ποτί beside πρός; indeed πρός can be proved to have largely replaced ποτί, which must be proto-Aeolic. The same replacement apparently occurred in Lesbian, which has πρός under Ionic influence: the formula προτὶ Ἴλιον ἱρήν, with Lesbian ἱρός, confirms this.[30] The Aeolic infinitive in -έμεν is a similar case: -έμεναι is a Lesbian mixture of the inherited form with Ionic -ναι. Instead of retaining Mycenaean */-ehen/* as seen in *e-ke-e /hekhehen/*, the bards still use -έμεν.[31] Likewise the Aeolic perfect participle κεκλήγων is replaced by -ώς save when the scansion differs, as in κεκλήγοντες (cf. 16.430n.).

Again, Ἑρμείας is a compromise between the Ionian vernacular Ἑρμῆς or -έης (via *-ήης) and old *Ἑρμᾶας (cf. Mycenaean *E-ma-a*$_2$ = */Hermāhāi/*). The Aeolic ending -ᾱς rather than -ης is inexplicable if the tradition ever contained *Ἑρμήης: the expected Ionism Ἑρμείης only appears later (2× Hes., 2× *Hy.*), when the Aeolic phase was far in the past. Likewise, the Ionic development of the *a*-stem genitives, nouns Ποσειδάων and λαός and

[28] ἷός, 'one', occurs 7× *Il.*, 2× *Od.*; μᾶν occurs 22× *Il.*, 2× *Od.*; τοίσδεσ(σ)ι occurs 1× *Il.*, 5× *Od.*; among cases of ἱρός/ἱερός, ἱρός occurs 30/83× *Il.* (36%), 17/77× *Od.* (22%). These Aeolisms vanish in post-Homeric epos. Wackernagel (*SUH* 17ff.) saw that the complementary distribution of μᾶν before vowels and Ionic μέν before consonants is another proof of an Aeolic phase (cf. Chantraine, *GH* I 15f.; Denniston, *Particles* 328f.).

[29] Note irresolvably contracted στρωφᾶτο, τρώχων (13.557, *Od.* 6.318). Chantraine (*GH* I 358) deems such verbs ancient, but all save νωμάω and πωτάομαι may be bardic creations.

[30] Beekes, *Mnem.* 26 (1973) 387–90; Janko, *Glotta* 57 (1979) 24–9; *contra*, Wyatt, *SMEA* 19 (1978) 89–124. Householder and Nagy (*Greek* 67–9) point out that βωτιάνειρα has both -τι- and an Aeolic treatment of metrical lengthening: cf. ὠλεσίκαρπος for οὐ-.

[31] Chantraine, *GH* I 492f.; Crespo, *Prosodia* 54f.

adverb ἕως was (i) -ᾱο, -άων, λᾱϝός (as in Mycenaean), *ἄϝος (cf. Sanskrit *yā́vat*); (ii) *-ηο, *-ήων, *ληϝός, *ἦϝος; (iii) after the loss of -ϝ-, *-ηο, *-ήων, ληός (in Hipponax and Herodotus), *ἦος; (iv) -εῳ, -έῳν, λεῴς and ἕως with metathesis of quantity and synizesis. Instead of offering the vernacular forms (iv) beside the older forms (iii) with the original scansion, as we would expect in a continuous Ionic tradition, the epic offers primarily (i), the Mycenaean and early Aeolic forms (Sappho and Alcaeus have contracted -ᾱ, -ᾶν), with an admixture of (iv). Thus the Aeolism λαός was kept; λεώς appears in the invented name Ἀγέλεως (*Od.* 22.131) and in Λειώκριτος (17.344, 2× *Od.*), which represents the usual compromise between inherited Λᾱο- and spoken Λεώ-, maintaining the scansion while modernizing the vowel-quality. Instead of *ἦος, our texts offer εἶως or ἕως scanned — — and — ∪ respectively, beside ἕως scanned –; the Ionian bards for some reason avoided *ἄος and adapted their vernacular form to fit the original scansion – they never knew *ἦος, which editors wrongly restore.[32] The only convincing explanation for these phenomena is that the intermediate forms were no longer in the vernacular and were never part of the traditional diction. Thus there was no continuous Ionic tradition.

Now both formular usage and the statistics show that the genitives -εῳ and -έῳν, and all other forms with quantitative metathesis, entered the tradition not long before Homer; they appear at about the same point in its prehistory as the short dative plurals of the *o*- and *a*-stems and the specifically East Ionic innovation Ζηνός.[33] The arrival of these Ionic forms in the diction, deduced by projecting back into prehistory the trends seen in the poems of Homer and Hesiod, marks the end of the Aeolic phase.[34] According

[32] So West, *Glotta* 44 (1966) 135–9; S. West and Hainsworth on *Od.* 4.90f., 5.123. As Parry says (*MHV* 353n.), 'the seeming vagaries of the manuscript tradition accord with the processes of oral poetry and thus bear witness to their faithfulness'. Cf. van der Valk, *TCO* 67ff.; *contra*, Hoekstra on *Od.* 13.315.

[33] This was identified by Wathelet, *Minos* 15 (1974) 195–225; genitives like Πηλέος are specifically Chian (15.339n.). These forms are missed by West (*JHS* 108 (1988)166), who thinks the poems lack East Ionic forms, and holds that in East Ionic we would expect κῶς etc. for πῶς etc.: the poems are in Central or West Ionic, with Euboea playing a central role in the Ionic phase. But forms like κῶς appear in inscriptions only at Erythrae, Asiatic Aegae and colonies of Phocaea (E. Sanmartí and R.A. Santiago, *ZPE* 68 (1987) 125); they were clearly not universal in East Ionic. There was certainly some Euboean influence, especially in the *Odyssey*; cf. Hesiod's performance at Chalcis (*Erga* 654ff.). See Wathelet, *AC* 50 (1981) 819–33, citing forms like μονωθείς and ξένος (for μουν-, ξείν- < ξένϝος); cf. too the rare ὧν for ἐών (14.271–4n.).

[34] Janko, *HHH* 87ff.; on the late date of quantitative metathesis cf. Crespo, *Cuadernos de Filología Clásica* 12 (1977) 188–219. Crespo, *Prosodia* 35–63, suggests that the prevalence of quantitative metathesis and contraction in the Ionic vernacular led to metrical anomalies like νηῶς (blending νηός and νεώς), κάνεων (blending κάνεον and κάνουν), Ἀλκίνοως (blending νόος and νοῦς), Ἵπποιϊν (blending -οιΐν and -οιν), and even Ἀσκληπϊοῦ δύο παῖδε (2.731) for * Ἀσκληπϊοω or -όου.

to my statistics, their appearance antedates the *Iliad* by a smaller interval than that which separates the *Iliad* from the *Theogony*, if the rate of linguistic change was constant. In absolute terms, if the *Theogony* dates to *c.* 700 and the *Iliad* to before 750 (a reasonable guess on the present evidence), the Ionic forms entered the tradition in *c.* 800 B.C. It is no obstacle to this theory that the statistics show that the loss of ϝ- goes slightly further back, since this also occurred in Asiatic Aeolic.[35]

Many forms found in Mycenaean, and often ascribed to an 'Achaean' substratum in the epics, are in fact archaisms shared by the ancestors of all later dialects, e.g. the genitives in -αο and -οιο, the demonstrative τοί, ταί or adjectives like Ποιάντιος, Τελαμώνιος. In the absence of evidence for the Bronze Age Greek of the mainland north of Thebes, it is risky to deny that these features were also in proto-Aeolic. Mycenaean diction and saga may have travelled direct from the Peloponnese to Asiatic Aeolis, especially if there is truth in the claims of the Penthilidai of Lesbos to descent from the house of Atreus. But much of the saga-material concerns northern and western Greece;[36] there are legends about Aetolia, Boeotia and Thessaly, as well as about Pylos with its Thessalian dynasty (the Neleids); Akhilleus is an Aeolian hero, the Catalogue of Ships gives Boeotia first place, and some of Homer's minor incidents and characters derive from the Theban Cycle (13.663–70n.). Phrases like προτὶ Ἴλιον ἰρήν or Ἑκτορέην ἄλοχον prove that Aeolic bards were already singing tales about a war at Troy. Local patriotism would give them good reason to develop old traditions of Mycenaean raids on the Asiatic coast; Lesbian ambitions on the Troad surely predated Pittacus' time. Contact with the indigenous inhabitants, or with local dynasts claiming descent from Bronze Age heroes, might encourage the portrayal of the Trojans as a worthy enemy. If anyone had good cause to glorify a panhellenic military enterprise in that area, it was the Aeolians. It cannot be coincidental that analysis of the epic diction points in the same direction.

[35] If the ϝ- was lost during the Aeolic phase, and Aeolic did not use *n*-mobile, this will also explain why the epos uses e.g. αἰσχροῖς ἐπέεσσι, not -οῖσιν ἔπεσσι, beside old datives like χρυσέοισι νέφεσσι or πολλοῖσι βέλεσσι (13.525, 555): cf. above p. 12 and 15.209–11n.

[36] So Hoekstra, *Modifications* 148ff.; Wathelet, *Traits* 375–9; West, *JHS* 108 (1988) 159–62. Νηλεύς is an *Aeolic* form (A. Q. Moreschini, *SMEA* 27 (1989) 255–67). On the relation of oral tradition to history see H. M. Chadwick, *The Heroic Age*, Cambridge 1926; Bowra, *Heroic Poetry* 519–36; Hainsworth in Foxhall and Davies, *The Trojan War* 111–35; J. Vansina, *Oral Tradition as History*, London 1985; R. Thomas, *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens*, Cambridge 1989.

3. The text and transmission of the *Iliad*

We know more about the textual history of the *Iliad* from *c.* 250 B.C. than of any other ancient work save the New Testament; yet the origin of our text and the nature of Alexandrian scholarship are still obscure and hotly disputed topics.[1] From the late sixth century B.C. the poem was the constant staple of Greek elementary education; this ensured its transmission, but also encouraged textual variation. The frequency and importance of memorized rhapsodic performances exacerbated this tendency; in its early stages the transmission was at least partly oral, whatever we conclude about how and when the poem was first written down. When we first encounter quotations (often from memory) in fourth-century Athenian authors, and scraps of manuscripts from third-century Egypt, the texts are often longer than ours and vary widely in wording. A medley of divergent MSS reached the Museum at Alexandria, where scholars worked to put them in order. Since we can follow the history of the text with confidence only from this point, we will begin there.

(i) The Roman and Byzantine vulgate

Fragments of over 600 MSS and myriads of quotations, not to mention the scholia and their lemmata, give us a clear view of the text which prevailed from about 150 B.C. to about A.D. 600.[2] This 'ancient vulgate' is close to that found in the 188 medieval codices of *c.* 900–1550.[3] Generally these preserve the text well; their variant readings and extra verses often go back to antiquity. But, although more carefully copied than most of the papyri, not all Byzantine MSS are of equal value. Without Allen's Herculean labours, we would know little about them, but the text he prints has serious faults.

[1] The best introductions are J. A. Davison, in *Companion* 215–33; Lesky, *RE* Suppl. XI (1968), s.v. *Homeros*, cols. 831–43; Chantraine, P. Collart and R. Langumier in Mazon, *Introduction à l'Iliade*, Paris 1943, 1–88. Bolling, *External Evidence*, van der Valk, *TCO* and *Researches*, Apthorp, *MS Evidence* and G. Pasquali, *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo*, 2nd edn, Florence 1952, 201–47, are basic; see also La Roche, *Textkritik*; Allen, *Transmission* 225–327; *id.*, *Ilias* I 191–216; Erbse, *Gnomon* 37 (1965) 532–9; S. West, *Commentary* I 33–48; B. Gentili, *Poetry and its Public in Ancient Greece*, trans. A. T. Cole, Baltimore 1988, 3–23, 223–33. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* 447–79, is excellent on Alexandrian scholarship.

[2] See H. J. Mette, *Lustrum* 19 (1976) 5ff., with earlier bibliography; Bolling, *External Evidence* 3–30; Apthorp, *MS Evidence* xif.; H. van Thiel, *ZPE* 79 (1989) 9–26.

[3] For details (and my sigla) see Allen's invaluable *editio maior*, *Ilias* I 11–55; Erbse, *Scholia* I xiii–xxxiii, describes those MSS with scholia. Allen's families of MSS, save *h*, do not survive Pasquali's criticism; cf. N. Tachinoslis, *Handschriften und Ausgaben der Odyssee*, Frankfurt 1984.

Pasquali stressed that the medieval tradition is almost totally contaminated; but he did not admit that, in such a tradition, the later codices are likely to be worse, as examination of their readings confirms. The twelfth-century and later MSS of the *h* family (U^4 etc.) derive many Alexandrian variants from a learned Byzantine recension.[4] The other late codices contain no otherwise unknown ancient readings; those which they do offer come from the scholia copied in their margins, as is obvious when (as often) such variants are added by another hand. Aristarchus' readings had more effect on the later medieval tradition than in antiquity, when commentaries were copied in separate rolls.[5] But Allen gave too much weight to the readings of the numerous late MSS and the post-Alexandrian plus-verses they contain.[6] Such late interpolations, usually limited to verses from elsewhere in Homer, often remedy what was felt to be a minor flaw, e.g. a missing verb, name, vocative or speech-introduction.[7] The extent of contamination is proved by how almost the whole medieval paradosis occasionally agrees in error against ancient sources.[8] Fewer learned marginal variants and minor additions have entered the early minuscule MSS, those of the tenth to twelfth centuries: in approximate order of date, Ve^1 A D B E^3 E^4 T Bm^1 C Et O^5 P^{20} V^{10} V^{12} V^{16}. But readings must be judged on their merits; the antiquity of a reading does not prove it correct – the papyri usually offer inferior texts. Many MSS, often with variants, survived the Iconoclastic period; the tradition was rich enough to ensure the survival, somewhere in the early codices, of all the readings and interpolations prevalent in later antiquity. In this volume, the 'good MSS' or 'good codices' means these sources, 'late MSS' are those of the fourteenth century onward, while 'the papyri' is shorthand for the ancient MSS, written for most of antiquity on papyrus-rolls.

[4] So Allen, *Ilias* I 128f., 210–16. K. Alpers dates *h* to the eleventh century (*Das attizistische Lexikon des Oros*, Berlin and New York 1981, 93n.); since the *h*-scholia draw on the lost archetype of the scholia in MS A, which was also used, under the name 'Apion and Herodorus', by Eustathius (Erbse, *Scholia* VII 267), the unique readings in *h* surely derive from lost scholia of Didymus and Aristonicus.

[5] So Allen, *Ilias* I 83–5; see I 200, 213–15 for how marginal variants enter the text in MS A.

[6] Thus he called the early minuscules 'barren of ancient readings' (*Ilias* I 216), by which he meant that they lack *Alexandrian* readings. Drawing on Bolling (*External Evidence*), Apthorp (*MS Evidence* xvii–xix) calculates that the OCT prints some 76 badly attested interpolations in the *Iliad*, and 94 in the *Odyssey*; he stresses the need for a new text. The other reason why one is urgently needed is van der Valk's radical re-evaluation of Alexandrian scholarship, which Allen had prized too highly. For the present, the best texts are those by Leaf and Mazon.

[7] See N. Wecklein, *SBAW* 1918, Abh. 7, 1–38. Thus books 13–16 contain post-Alexandrian interpolations to supply a verb or a name (13.316, 14.269, 16.129a, 16.381) or a speech-introduction (13.218a, 13.480), and concordance-interpolations from parallel passages at 13.422, 13.463a, 13.566a, 13.749, 14.70, 14.420, 15.481, 15.562, 15.578, 16.288a, 16.614f. and perhaps 16.689f. The risk that such interpolations have remained undocumented is higher in the *Odyssey*, where the evidence for the history of the text is vastly less.

[8] Thus at 13.745 only AE^4T and a few late MSS avoid ἀπῶτίσωνται; at 14.101 all early codices save O^5V^{10} read ἀποπτανέουσιν; at 14.172 only Ve^1 resists ἑδανῷ; at 16.766 all save E^3 read πολεμιζέμεν.