The *Iliad* and Its Ancient Commentators: Some Textual Notes

M. van der Valk

A FEW YEARS AGO Professor Erbse brought to a close his imposing edition of the scholia to the *Iliad*.[1] The remarks that follow are occasioned by the publication of the final volume of this edition, which provides an excellent basis for further progress in Homer studies.

1. *Iliad* 23.597–600

A 'locus conclamatus' (see Erbse 456f): when Antilochus apologizes, Μενελάου θυμὸς ἰάνθη ὡς εἴ τε περὶ σταχύεσσιν ἐέρση. The difficulty is that when dew is warmed, it melts and disappears. Erbse comments, "in Ap.Rh. (3,1018–20) simile bene esse interpretatum." Apollonius has ἰαίνετο δὲ φρένας εἴσω, τηκομένη κτλ. The intent here, as often in the Alexandrian poets, was to refine and clarify Homer's expression. While Homer did not say so expressly, Apollonius thinks that the warming of the heart makes it melt and soften: in this way Menelaos is softened and therefore yields. The same interpretation is offered by modern scholars.[2] Nevertheless, the expression θυμὸς (or κῆρ) ἰαίνεται or φρεσὶν ἰαίνεται, in Homer as well as other archaic poets (Alcman, Pindar), means 'be glad, rejoice', but not 'melt'.[3] Indeed, this metaphor of compassion would have little place in the harsh world of the heroes, with its brutal treatment of fallen enemies, or in the primitive representation of the psychology of decision-making that we find in Homer. In keeping with this, Menelaus' reaction is pride in his advantage: in this way he rejoices and his heart is made warm. Leaf rightly compared 17.112, a heart frozen with fear (ἦτορ παχνοῦται):[4] likewise a heart is warmed because of joy.

---

[1] H. ERBSE, *Scholia graeca ad Homeri Iliadem* V (Berlin 1976), cited hereafter by the author's name alone.

[2] See LSJ *s.v.* ἰαίνω I.2a, "to melt," invoking our passage. Mazon translates "il sent fondre son coeur." W. Leaf, *The Iliad* II (London 1902) 513, comments however that the passages of Homer and Apollonius cannot be put on a par.

[3] See LSJ I.3 ("warm, cheer") for testimonies; *Il.* 24.119 is especially telling.

[4] See Leaf (*supra* n.2) 225. *Cf.* R. Onians, *The Origins of European Thought* (Cambridge 1951) 46 n.6; but the strange interpretation here offered of *thymos* as 'vapour' is completely unlikely.

Homer presents a simile in which Menelaos' heart ($\theta\nu\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$) is likened to dew on ears of grain being warmed at sunrise. This simile, however, as so often, compares two items not strictly identical—as the scholia and Eustathius observed already.[5] When dew is warmed by the rising sun, it melts and disappears, but at the same time it invigorates the ears of grain.[6] When the *thymos* of Menelaos has been warmed, it does not melt but rather invigorates Menelaos.

2. *Iliad* 23.533

For the constitution of the Homeric text here, the text and views of the Alexandrian critics provide interesting evidence. In 23.533 the MSS. give $\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\acute{\nu}\nu\omega\nu$ $\pi\rho\acute{o}\sigma\sigma o\theta\epsilon\nu$ $\ddot{\iota}\pi\pi o\nu\varsigma$: the form $\pi\rho\acute{o}\sigma\sigma o\theta\epsilon\nu$, rather than the usual $\pi\rho\acute{o}\sigma\omega\theta\epsilon\nu$, is found only here. The difficulty is avoided if we accept, as does Duentzer, the text of Zenodotus, $\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\acute{\nu}$-$\nu\omega\nu$ $\dot{\omega}\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\varsigma$ $\ddot{\iota}\pi\pi o\nu\varsigma$. Inasmuch as Erbse (449) offers without comment Duentzer's extensive notice, one assumes that he accepts this text and solution. In my view, however, Zenodotus' readings are mostly subjective conjectures of his own.[7] In the present instance, I submit, it is obvious that $\pi\rho\acute{o}\sigma\sigma o\theta\epsilon\nu$ was rightly accepted by the MSS., editors, and commentators, for the evidence of the epics makes clear that Homer now and again permitted himself liberties of form occasioned by metrical necessity.[8] Zenodotus tried to eliminate the objectionable form by means of a conjecture.

3. *Iliad* 17.54

The editors (*e.g.* Mazon, Allen, Leaf) here print $\dot{\alpha}\nu\alpha\beta\acute{\epsilon}\beta\rho o\chi\epsilon\nu$, which again is a reading of Zenodotus, as the scholia state.[9] On the other hand, nearly all the Homeric MSS. give $\dot{\alpha}\nu\alpha\beta\acute{\epsilon}\beta\rho\nu\chi\epsilon\nu$. Here too Erbse (343) presents with apparent approval a note of Duentzer, who

---

[5] Eust. 1318.23–37; it is likely (see Erbse 456f) that Eustathius here relied in part on a scholium deperditum. I hope to discuss the point in the fourth volume of my edition of Eustathius.

[6] C. J. Ruygh, *Autour de* $\tau\epsilon$ *épique* (Amsterdam 1971) 622f, wishes to supplement the active $\iota\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu\omega$. In fact the ears are invigorated and one might expect Homer to say that the dew does this. But the first idea that presents itself to the poet's mind is that the dew is made warm ($\iota\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$); only then does it invigorate the ears. Leaf followed a reading $\dot{\epsilon}\acute{\epsilon}\rho\sigma\eta$ found in a few MSS.; he rightly admits, however, that these MSS. are not authoritative. The reading is obviously incorrect. Moreover, with the nominative $\theta\nu\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ we expect a nominative $\dot{\epsilon}\acute{\epsilon}\rho\sigma\eta$ which is likened to it.

[7] M. van der Valk, *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the* Iliad II (Leiden 1964) ch. 10.

[8] See M. Lejeune, *Les adverbes grecs en -$\theta\epsilon\nu$* (Bordeaux 1939) 331, "(attestée au vers Ψ 533) analogique du type $\pi o\theta\epsilon\nu$"; Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique* 942f, "par commodité métrique"; Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik* I 628.

[9] Likewise Ruygh (*supra* n.6) 471 accepts $\dot{\alpha}\nu\alpha\beta\acute{\epsilon}\beta\rho o\chi\epsilon\nu$.

takes the view that ἀναβέβροχεν was also the reading of Aristophanes of Byzantium and Aristarchus: these critics, he thinks, realized that ἀναβέβρυχεν would be metrically impossible here because the *upsilon* is long. If in fact Zenodotus' ἀναβέβροχεν offers the correct text, two explanations are possible: (a) Zenodotus found the correct text of the *Iliad* in the MSS. he consulted, or (b) he restored the true text by means of a felicitous emendation.[10] I think it unlikely, however, that ἀναβέβροχεν was given also by Aristophanes and Aristarchus. For there is not only no notice of this fact in the scholia, but the reading itself occurs in only two MSS. of the *Iliad*. If it had been offered by the three important Alexandrians, we should expect to find it in more MSS., especially as it seems a possible reading.[11] Rather the two critics did not accept Zenodotus' reading, doubtless because they took exception to his mistaken explanation connecting the word with ἀναβρόξειε.

As to the reading itself, one expects a verb ἀναβρύω to have as its perfect ἀναβέβρυκεν. But a semantic point is also in question here. βρύω occurs with the meaning 'burst forth', and is so used of water (*cf.* LSJ *s.v.* 3). It is well known that the soil of Greece does not abound in water. The passage in question describes an olive sprig that is thriving. For this one wants a place that is moist by the nature of the terrain, and one finds such where the water in the soil 'bursts forth'. The prefix ἀνα- is pertinent: the water of the soil bursts upwards. If we read ἀναβέβροχεν, 'is moistened', one might think rather that the water is due to rain, and for this one might expect καταβέβροχεν. Accordingly, taking into account the evidence of the Homeric text and the import of the words, I think that we must retain ἀναβέβρυχεν: Homer here offered a perfect of ἀναβρύω that uses χ and short υ.[12]

4. *Iliad* 22.45

Priam here says that his sons were sold by Achilles νήσων ἐπὶ τηλεδαπάων (so also 21.454), the reading of all the MSS. and without

---

[10] Zenodotus himself offered a false explanation, for he connected ἀναβέβροχεν wrongly (*cf.* 17.54c schol. A) with ἀναβρόξειε (*cf. Od.* 12.240), whereas it derives in fact from ἀναβρέχω. This fact, however, does not diminish the value of the reading, if Zenodotus found it in his MSS. or made a correct conjecture even with a false explanation.

[11] Readings that seem attractive and that were presented by Aristarchus were often accepted by part of the MSS.: see M. van der Valk, *Textual Criticism of the* Odyssey (Leiden 1949) 174f; (*supra* n.7) 583.

[12] Ruygh (*supra* n.7) already compared the form ὑπόβρυχα. I may add that, in response to a letter giving my view, Ruygh has written, "After all the safest course is to follow the vulgate" — *i.e.*, the reading ἀναβέβρυχεν. As to the short υ, he refers to the later form ἐλήλυθε as compared with the older ἐλήλουθε.

doubt the correct reading.[13] In both instances the scholia report that the city-editions (*politikai*) read θηλυτεράων. In my opinion, the city-editions presented subjective corrections, characterized in most cases by a pedantic goal of greater accuracy.[14] In the *Iliad* we hear of only one son of Priam who had been sold by Achilles, Lykaon (7.468f, 21.40–44, 22.746f), sold on Lemnos, which is however not far from Troy. I suggest that the emendation θηλυτεράων owes its genesis to the fact that Lemnos was notorious for its women and their crimes. Callimachus twice offers θηλύτατον in passages that require the meaning 'fertile' (frr.384.27 and 548 P.). From this we can conclude that Callimachus owed the word to the reading of the city-editions and that these accordingly were already then to be found in the library at Alexandria.[15] As a true Alexandrian Callimachus availed himself of this rare piece of information offered him by the *politikai*. I believe however that the interpretation 'fertile' is due to Callimachus himself[16] and does not reflect the view of the *politikai*.[17] His interpretation is understandable, for Homer himself speaks of οὖθαρ ἀρούρης and women who bear offspring are called 'fertile'.[18] The emendation of the *politikai* is not only ingenious, but it can be traced to their desire for accuracy and credibility: for it would seem unlikely that Achilles sold his captives in islands that were far away. In reality, however, the epic poet in this way heightened the pathetic character of this point of Priam's.[19]

[13] See also R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship* (Oxford 1968) 139.

[14] See Valk (*supra* n.11) 14, (*supra* n.7) 608. Sometimes these emendations are characterised by a pedantic accuracy, to which the Homeric text was subjected. Thus in 23.206 the MSS. say that the gods went Αἰθιόπων ἐς γαῖαν. The *politikai* offer ἐς δῆμον, for they wished to show that in reality the gods went to the δῆμος which offered them the sacrifices of which they partook. 23.856 (see Erbse 500) says of the victor that he must bring his prize οἴκονδε: schol. A says ἐν ἄλλῳ "κλισίην δέ." This time the reading must not be attributed to the *politikai*, but it shows again a pedantic accuracy: in reality the victors did not live in Troy in houses but in tents.

[15] In *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the* Iliad I (Leiden 1963) 253 n.263 I wrongly called this fact into doubt. Thus Erbse 272 rightly says "frustra obloquitur Valk."

[16] Pfeiffer *ad loc.*, wrongly in my view, thinks that Callimachus owed the interpretation to explanatory notes on the Homeric text. From all appearances, the *politikai* presented only the text and did not offer any notes.

[17] One might argue that in 21.454, where Laomedon threatens to sell the gods in such islands, the idea 'more womanish' is unnecessary and does not leap to mind. We may conceive, however, that the ingenious conjecture was first devised for 22.45 and then applied also to 21.454.

[18] Note too that in tragic authors the mother who bears children is often compared to an ἄρουρα, cf. P. Groeneboom, *Aeschylus' Zeven tegen Thebe* (Groningen 1938) 213 *ad Sept.* 754.

[19] In the *Odyssey* (15.427–29) Eumaios had in fact been sold in an island that was far away.

5. *Iliad* 24.304

A difficult question with regard to the text of the *politikai* occurs in the description of Priam's preparations for his mission to Achilles. Before departing, he washes his hands (24.304, *cf.* Erbse 574). Our MSS. read χέρνιβον ἀμφίπολος πρόχοόν θ' ἅμα χερσὶν ἔχουσα. The word χέρνιβον for 'basin' is a *hapax* in Homer, who elsewhere always employs λέβης for this sense.[20] Now according to schol. T the *Massaliotike* read instead of πρόχοον ... ἔχουσα the words ταμίη μετὰ χερσὶν ἔχουσα. Two solutions are possible. (a) Erbse takes the view that the *Massaliotike* altered the text "quod duo vasa commemorari noluit." It must be admitted, however, that by "vasa" he indicates two objects that are by no means identical, *viz.* a basin and a jug. (b) Accordingly, I think that another explanation may be preferable. Perhaps the critic in the *Massaliotike* took exception to the *hapax* χέρνιβον and replaced it with χέρνιβα, a word commonly found in Homer (as he will have known), indicating water for washing. In this case he had also to alter part of the following line, for in the other passages we find either χέρνιβα ... προχόῳ (1.136) or χέρνιβα ... ἐν λέβητι (3.440), but nowhere χέρνιβα and λέβητα or χέρνιβα and πρόχοον. It would moreover be strange and ridiculous to say "water for washing and a ewer" (χέρνιβα ... πρόχοόν θ'), for of course water for washing is contained in a ewer. I think that in this case we must admit here the hiatus that Erbse stated.[21]

6. *Iliad* 23.806

The scholiast on 23.806 (see Erbse 491) comments on the single combat that is a contest in the funeral games: victory, says Achilles, will be obtained by the competitor who ψαύσῃ δ' ἐνδίνων. One can understand why the Alexandrian critics, not accustomed to the rude manners of the Homeric age, athetised this line.[22] In *Etym. Orionis*

---

[20] For χέρνιβον in this sense see LSJ *s.v.*, where the earliest instance (this Homeric passage apart) is of the fourth century B.C. This meaning persisted, see *e.g.* Greg. Nys. at Migne, *PG* 44.1172. Compare Ath. 498B; schol. *Od.* 3.440; Eustathius 1400.60; Ph. Koukoules, Θεσσαλονίκης Εὐσταθίου τὰ Λαογραφικά I (Athens 1950) 225f. Erbse rightly takes the position that at 24.304 the Homeric text in fact had χέρνιβον.

[21] "De lectione editionis Massaliensis ipse scholiasta dubitat"; the scholiast says εἰ μὴ ἄρα ἐνικῶς ἐνθάδε γραπτέον "χέρνιβον ἀμφίπολος." These words make it likely that the *Massaliotike* read in fact χέρνιβα. The later scholiast is uncertain not about the text of the *Massaliotike* (as Erbse thinks), but about its meaning: he wrongly thought that in the *Massaliotike* χέρνιβα had the meaning 'basin, ewer'.

[22] See also Valk (*supra* n.7) 150. I note that Eustathius (1331.2) offers the correct interpretation "to hit the entrails" (ἔνδινα = ἐντόσθια), living as he did in the age of the tournaments introduced by the Crusaders.

52.16f, however, we read ἔνδινα· Ἀρίσταρχος ἐτυμολογεῖ "ἔνινα"[23] τὰ ἐντὸς τῶν ἰνῶν. Lehrs rejected the notice, because Aristarchus had already athetised the line. It is well known, however, that Aristarchus sometimes offered emendations in or observations on lines that he athetised.[24] Moreover, the interpretation here ascribed to Aristarchus is in keeping with his mentality, and it is the better of the two false interpretations reported (τὰ ἐντὸς τῶν ἰνῶν and τὰ ἐντὸς τῶν ὅπλων).[25] For unlike the second, the first presents an etymology and interpretation that are ingenious as well as satisfactory (at least in the eyes of an ancient critic). τὰ ἐντὸς τῶν ἰνῶν, "that which is within the sinews": in this contest it is sufficient if for the present the victor penetrates only the skin.

7. *Iliad* 22.110

According to the text of our MSS. Hector says here ἠέ κεν αὐτῷ ὀλέσθαι ἐϋκλειῶς πρὸ πόληος. Erbse (291), however, accepts the text offered by a papyrus (12), ἢ αὐτῷ πρὸ πόληος ἐϋκλειῶς ἀπολέσθαι. In this he follows Pasquali; but Erbse further suggests that a lost scholium of Didymus contained the papyrus reading.[26] It is true that the occurrence of κεν in the MSS. version here has been criticised. Several points may be made in its defense, however. (a) Pasquali calls the MSS. text "la tradizione medievale." But in fact it was already read by Aristonicus (see schol. A), and indeed was the only version known to him. (b) The version without κεν is found only in papyrus 12. We may surmise that if Aristarchus had found this text in his MSS. (or some of them), he would have given it preference, for he sometimes took exception to a Homeric text offering κέν (ἄν).[27] Therefore Erbse's suggestion that a scholium of Didymus on this line once existed is unlikely. Moreover, one might have expected at least a few MSS. to take up a reading of Aristarchus.[28] (c) The MSS. version

---

[23] The codex has ἔνια, but Lehrs (see Erbse) made this convincing emendation on account of *Etym.Gudean.* 186.25f (ἔνδινα . . . ἢ ἐνινά τινα ὄντα).

[24] See Valk (*supra* n.7) 16 and n.84.

[25] The first is reported (anonymously) also at schol. 23.806b (Erbse 491.92f), ἐνδίνων δὲ ἀκούει τῶν ἔνδον τοῦ χρωτός: this shows that it was an important interpretation (of Aristarchus, as I think).

[26] G. Pasquali, *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo*[2] (Florence 1962) 242. In Valk (*supra* n.7) 566f I tried to defend the text of the MSS. I admit that Erbse presents his suggestion only with great reserve: "non liquet, num schol. (Didymi?) fuerit" etc.

[27] See Friedländer, quoted by Erbse 291, on 22.110a.

[28] Neither does Eustathius, who often preserves notices from scholia deperdita and who likes to present variant readings of the Homeric MSS., mention our passage, although this is of course not decisive.

with κεν can be justified grammatically,[29] for it replicates the use of ἄν just before in 10.108, as Leaf already suggested.[30] The reading of papyrus 12 must be seen as a simplification of the text.

8. *Iliad* 24.413

In Hermes' speech to Priam the editors here read with the vulgate of the MSS. (see Erbse 590) δυωδεκάτη δέ οἱ ἠὼς κειμένῳ. As to ἠώς, two variants occur in the MSS.: (a) ἦδε, found in a number of MSS., in papyrus 13 (I B.C.), and mentioned by Eustathius (1356.27f); (b) ἤδη, found in one MS. (*cf.* Allen), in papyrus 14 (II A.D.), and mentioned as a variant in U[4], which says <ἦδε> γρ. καὶ ἤδη, γρ. καὶ ἠώς. Erbse thinks that in U[4] we are dealing with a so-called h-scholion, which occurred in the commentary ApH but has this time been preserved only by U[4] and is also presupposed by Eustathius.[31] Although Erbse was right to call attention to these h-scholia, nevertheless caution is in order. Thus on schol. A to 24.566d Erbse (613) says of Eustathius 1365.44–46 "fort. ex hyparchetypo Iliadis." Eustathius, however, here follows an A-scholion, while his first words (καὶ ποιητικῶς φυλακοί), which do not occur in the scholion, are his own addition, for he often observes on his own account that words are ποιητικοί.[32]

As to 24.413, δυωδεκάτη ἠώς given by the vulgate of the MSS. certainly presents the genuine reading, for δυωδεκάτη or a kindred ordinal is twice connected with ἠώς in identical expressions: so 1.493 and especially *Od.* 19.192, and compare ἠοῖ τῇ προτέρῃ (*Il.* 13.793) and ἤματι τῷ προτέρῳ (21.5). These examples show that Homer could use these two terms interchangeably, which for metrical reasons was very easy, and that he sometimes used ἠώς where we might have expected ἦμαρ.[33] The reading ἦδε is a conjecture dating already

---

[29] See D. B. Monro, *A Grammar of the Homeric Dialect*[2] (Oxford 1891) 295; P. Chantraine, *Grammaire homérique* II (Paris 1953) 311.

[30] Leaf (*supra* n.2) 438. Ruygh has expressed to me his agreement that the text of the MSS. must be accepted. He further refers to *Od.* 8.570 τὰ δέ κεν θεὸς ἢ τελέσειεν ἢ κ' ἀτέλεστ' εἴη, remarking that the first κεν has its proper place before the ἤ ... ἤ construction, while the second is a repetition and thus strictly speaking superfluous, as in our passage. He also calls attention in 22.110 to αὐτῷ, where one might have expected αὐτόν. The dative is used, I believe, as being in similar close agreement with 108 ἐμοὶ δέ κεν.

[31] On the h-scholia see H. Erbse, *Beiträge zur Überlieferung der Iliasscholien* (Zetemata 24 [1960]) 204; see also K. Alpers, *Das attizistische Lexikon des Oros* (Berlin 1981) 92f n.36. By ApH is meant the commentary that forms the main part of the A-scholia and which was used also by Eustathius; on it see Valk (*supra* n.15) ch. 1.

[32] See M. van der Valk, *Eustathii Commentarii ad Iliadem* II (Leiden 1976) xxxv n.2.

[33] Thus schol. β1 (I 72.22–25 Dindorf) enumerates among the meanings he attributes to ἠώς: καὶ τὴν ὅλην ἡμέραν. It was on account of such Homeric passages, I

from early antiquity, as is evident from papyrus 13.[34] It is easy to understand why ancient critics took exception to ἠώς, which seemed here to mean 'day' and which, unlike the passages mentioned above, could be removed by a slight conjecture. The reading ἤδη, in turn, presents a further conjecture, seeking to make the text more elegant than ἤδε.

Erbse apparently takes the view that U[4] uses an ancient scholion (of Didymus, one imagines), which was also known to Eustathius, who mentions two readings. Erbse is inclined to think that when Eustathius mentions two Homeric readings, he may have derived one of them from a scholion, *viz.* a scholion deperditum.[35] My own conclusion from the evidence is rather that Eustathius normally used a particular MS. of the *Iliad*, his personal possession, now of course lost; but as a careful critic he now and again consulted other MSS. of the *Iliad* and so transmitted other readings.[36] As for this notice of U[4], we should be cautious in attributing it to an ancient scholion, for as I have tried to show, Eustathius did not use a scholion here. Moreover, Didymus usually mentions only one variant, whereas U[4] reports two. And, if Didymus is the source, we should have to conclude that over against the genuine ἠώς, Aristarchus apparently read ἤδε (thus U[4]): but a reader so well versed in Homer as Aristarchus will have known that ἠώς recurs elsewhere with the same meaning and so does not need correction. Perhaps in fact the source of U[4] consulted other Homeric MSS. and so added the notice in question.

9. *Iliad* 24.553

Sometimes the correct text cannot be guaranteed by means of the evidence of the MSS. or the scholia, and other factors must be taken into account. So at 24.553 the vulgate of the MSS. and Eustathius read μὴ μέ πω ἐς θρόνον ἵζε, whereas Allen and Mazon read with a number of MSS. μὴ πώ μ' ἐς θρόνον ἵζε and thus avoid the hiatus. Here I believe however that the vulgate reading is the correct one, for in it the first foot presents a dactyl and thus the whole line is dactylic. This

---

believe, that Theocritus used ἠώς to mean 'day' at 7.35; see also A. S. F. Gow, *Theocritus* II (Cambridge 1950) 140.

[34] Erbse rightly says "varia lectio antiqua." Leaf (*supra* n.2) 565 wrongly prefers ἤδε; he is right, however, in saying that ἤδε is grammatically unobjectionable.

[35] On this point see my review, *Mnemosyne* IV.28 (1975) 305. Erbse himself must sometimes admit that in these circumstances Eustathius consulted not scholia but manuscripts (see 568 *ad* 24.264, 285 *ad* 22.83b).

[36] Accordingly the second reading he offers is often the better, for in such cases he consulted MSS. often preferable to his own copy.

will be intentional on the poet's part, for the effect of the rhythm is to give expression to the nervousness and emotion of Priam at this moment.

10. *Iliad* 23.565 and 24.558

These lines have in common the fact that they were athetised by the Alexandrian critics. At 23.563ff (*cf.* Erbse 453) the last assistant in the chariot race, Eumelos, receives his prize; line 565 adds Εὐ-μήλῳ δ' ἐν χερσὶ τίθει. ὁ δὲ δέξατο χαίρων. The line is missing in a number of MSS. and in two papyri.[37] Erbse says "non liquet num nota fuerit de versu Ψ 565"; but I believe the question can be answered. 565 is the last line of a passage, and it can be omitted without any damage to the context; the information provided by 563–64 is sufficient in itself. But we know that Homer is often circumstantial, whereas the Alexandrian poets preferred a style that was pointed and concise.[38] Accordingly they sometimes took offence at the circumstantial manner of the epic poet. Here, in my view, Homer wishes to show by line 565 that even the limping Eumelos, who only because of his accident had to forego the first prize, is in fact content with his prize. Thus the audience learns that at these important games conducted by Achilles everyone is content and rejoices. As to the textual situation, I take the view that in this instance Aristarchus did not athetise 565 but omitted it altogether from the text,[39] as he was accustomed sometimes to do.[40] As a result neither Didymus nor Aristonicus had any occasion to comment on the line, which in my opinion is nevertheless genuine.

In this connection we may examine 24.558.[41] One must admit first that ἐᾶν (557) can be used without an object: so 24.684, which is nearly identical and says only ἐπεί σ' εἴασεν Ἀχιλλεύς. Moreover, 20.312 is missing in a number of MSS. and a papyrus, and here too the preceding line has ἥ κεν ἐάσῃς. 24.557 therefore might well be sufficient. On the other hand one may observe that, like 23.565 discussed above, 24.558 is the last line of a discourse and could

---

[37] See Allen and Erbse *ad loc.*; Leaf (*supra* n.2) 511 this time also accepts the athetesis.

[38] See Valk (*supra* n.7) 455.

[39] Aristarchus may have been prompted to omit the line also because according to 553 Eumelos' hands were already occupied by his chariot and horses.

[40] See Valk (*supra* n.7) 221 n.611, 483f *ad* 10.458–61.

[41] *Cf.* Erbse 613. On this line see especially G. Beck, *Philologus* 109 (1965) 11. I attempted to defend the line in Valk (*supra* n.7) 218–21. Erbse rightly corrected my error on papyrus 14, for 24.558 is missing in it.

therefore have been easily cancelled, omitted by Aristarchus from the Homeric text. The first part of the line, αὐτόν τε ζώειν, also is found in the *Odyssey* at 13.360 (here likewise dependent from ἐᾶν, which occurs in the preceding sentence) and 16.388, while nearly the whole line appears in 10.498. One might object, however, that in *Iliad* 24.558 αὐτόν is not functional. For to judge from the testimonies this is a formular line or is constituted from two parts that are formular. In accordance with the *parallelismus membrorum* frequent in archaic style, the line is couched in two parallel expressions which make up a hexameter.[42] The subject of the formular line is a person who may or may not live.

I take the view that two solutions are possible, the choice of which I leave open. (a) Aristarchus had already athetised the two preceding lines in Priam's speech (24.556f), because he considered them unworthy of the king. This athetesis is incorrect, as I think most critics will admit.[43] 24.558, which I consider to be genuine, was not athetised but rather omitted by Aristarchus. This explains why it was omitted in a number of MSS. and a papyrus and was obviously unknown to Herodian and probably to Trypho (see the scholion). Didymus likewise either did not know the line or took no account of it.[44] In the same way, I believe, Aristarchus omitted 20.312 from his text. (b) The line is in fact spurious, in keeping with the objection that αὐτόν in 24.558 seems not to be functional. But as we have seen, this is a formular line, and the evidence of the Homeric poems sufficiently shows that such lines do not always entirely suit the Homeric text in which they were taken over. If we take the line as unauthentic, we must assume that a rhapsodic line was interpolated into the Homeric text even after the age of Herodian. I note further that in 24.684f, where Hermes when awakening Priam again uses the words ἐπεί σ' εἴασεν Ἀχιλλεύς, no additional line like 24.558 occurs. But this fact can be explained easily, for Hermes is shown as being in a

---

[42] Note that Sophocles more than once used trimeters containing two parallel verbs: *e.g. OC* 21, 30, 80, 90, 103.

[43] See Leaf (*supra* n.2) 576. The older critics still mostly followed the athetesis of Aristarchus, *cf.* Ameis/Hentze, *Homers Ilias* Anhang 8 (Leipzig 1886) 132. Aristarchus among other things took offence because Priam's wish for Achilles' safe return implied the sack of Troy. But the king pronounces a general wish without details, and the audience of this oral poetry will not have deduced this particular implication, not being so wary and sophisticated as the literate critic who is intent on ruminating each point.

[44] On this point see Erbse; Valk (*supra* n.7) 221. That Eustathius 1364.59–64 (*cf.* Erbse) does not mention the line has no significance: this proves only that the MS. that he was accustomed to use (see *supra* 300) did not contain the line, and in this instance he was unaware that it did occur in other MSS.

hurry, and he loses no time with unnecessary observations. In 556–58, in contrast, Priam is a suppliant and therefore undertakes to stress Achilles' clemency as much as possible.

11. *Iliad* 23.897

Elsewhere I have argued that Erbse sometimes wrongly prefers over **T** the version of **b**, which in my view is only a secondary version of the exegetical commentary **T**.[45] A curious instance can be adduced in 23.897 (see Erbse 506). Agamemnon, who is the last participant in the contest, receives as prize a wash-basin; then, we read, Ταλθυβίῳ κήρυκι δίδου περικαλλὲς ἄεθλον. The scholion of **T** says δῶρον δηλονότι. οὐ γὰρ ἐπὶ τῷ ἀπαγαγεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλικὴν σκηνήν. Erbse accepts the version of **b**, in which the words δῶρον and οὐ γὰρ ἐπί have been omitted. In fact it is obvious that this is the meaning of the Homeric text. That, however, is not the view of the exegetical commentary. The Homeric critics liked to take account of the *aprepes*, and they took special offence at μικροπρέπεια on the part of the great heroes.[46] Therefore the exegetical commentary asserts that the great king did not take home a wash-basin, but rather gave it as a present to his servant Talthybius. Eustathius (1334.46) was acquainted with this interpretation, for he says ὡς δῶρον αὐτὸν [Talthybius] ἔχειν, μεγαλοψύχως καὶ βασιλικῶς, and hence had read this in his copy of **T**.

PAPENDRECHT, THE NETHERLANDS
October, 1982

---

[45] See van der Valk (*supra* n.35).

[46] See *e.g.* schol. *Od.* 13.215: Odysseus eagerly counts the gifts of the Phaeacians to see if anything is missing. The scholiast says οὐχ ὡς μικρολόγος; see also Plut. *Mor.* 27B–D.