



Finglass, P. J. (2006). The ending of Iliad 7. *Philologus*, 150(2), 187-97. <https://doi.org/10.1524/phil.2006.150.2.187>

Peer reviewed version

Link to published version (if available):
[10.1524/phil.2006.150.2.187](https://doi.org/10.1524/phil.2006.150.2.187)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)
PDF-document

This is the accepted author manuscript (AAM). The final published version (version of record) is available online via De Gruyter / Akademie Verlag at DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1524/phil.2006.150.2.187>. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available: <http://www.bristol.ac.uk/pure/user-guides/explore-bristol-research/ebr-terms/>

THE ENDING OF *ILIAD* 7

“Ὡς οἱ μὲν τοιαῦτα πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀγόρευον·
δύσετο δ' ἠέλιος, τετέλεστο δὲ ἔργον Ἀχαιῶν. 465
βουφόνεον δὲ κατὰ κλισίας καὶ δόρπον ἔλοντο·
νῆες δ' ἐκ Λήμνοιο παρέστασαν οἶνον ἄγουσαι
πολλαί, τὰς προέηκεν Ἰησονίδης Εὐνήος,
τόν ῥ' ἔτεχ' Ὑψιπύλη ὑπ' Ἰήσони ποιμένι λαῶν·
χωρὶς δ' Ἀτρείδης, Ἀγαμέμνονι καὶ Μενελάῳ, 470
δῶκεν Ἰησονίδης ἀγέμεν μέθυ, χίλια μέτρα.
ἔνθεν ἄρ' οἰνίζοντο κάρη κομόωντες Ἀχαιοί,
ἄλλοι μὲν χαλκῶ, ἄλλοι δ' αἴθωνι σιδήρῳ,
ἄλλοι δὲ ῥινοῖς, ἄλλοι δ' αὐτῆσι βόεσσιν,
ἄλλοι δ' ἀνδραπόδεσσι· τίθεντο δὲ δαῖτα θάλειαν. 475
παννύχιοι μὲν ἔπειτα κάρη κομόωντες Ἀχαιοὶ
δαίνυντο, Τρῶες δὲ κατὰ πτόλιν ἠδ' ἐπίκουροι·
παννύχιος δὲ σφιν κακὰ μήδετο μητίετα Ζεὺς
σμερδαλέα κτυπέων. τοὺς δὲ χλωρὸν δέος ἦρει,
οἶνον δ' ἐκ δεπᾶων χαμάδις χέον, οὐδέ τις ἔτλη 480
πρὶν πιεῖν, πρὶν λειψαὶ ὑπερμενεί Κρονίωνι.
κοιμήσαντ' ἄρ' ἔπειτα καὶ ὕπνου δῶρον ἔλοντο.

“466-81 fort. Athenis additi, cf. Wack. Unt. 154-6”. Thus West, in the apparatus to his editionⁱ. His discussion of the passage in his investigation into early interpolation in the *Iliad* also refers readers to Wackernagelⁱⁱ. The Swiss scholar did indeed detect an Attic interpolation hereⁱⁱⁱ, though unlike West he suspected only 467-75^{iv}. The purpose of this article is to reassess the authenticity of the ending of *Iliad* 7. Is an interpolation likely? If so, how large was it? And can we detect its origin?

Wackernagel’s case rests on a single problematic word, ἀνδραπόδεσσι in 475. This term does not recur in Homer, and is absent from other archaic literature. Its next appearance is in Herodotus, and it then occurs in Thucydides, Aristophanes, Antiphon and Andocides. This on its own is not enough to raise suspicions: as Aristarchus pointed out, there are many *hapax legomena* in Homer^v. On the other hand, slavery is hardly an uncommon idea in the Homeric poems. The regular term for slaves in Homer is δμῶες, δμωαί. The δουλ– stem is less common, with only seven occurrences (three times in the fixed expression δούλιον ἡμαρ); but nevertheless it certainly exists. If ἀνδράποδον was a term available to Homer, it is surprising that he used it only once. Similar considerations may have been in the minds of ancient scholars as well as Wackernagel. The scholia on the line in which it appears inform us that ἀθετεῖται, ὅτι νεωτερικὴ ὀνομασία τοῦ ἀνδράποδον· οὐδὲ γὰρ παρὰ τοῖς ἐπιβεβληκόσιν Ὀμήρω νοεῖται (ΣΑ 7.475a = ii. 294.49-50 Erbse). Another scholium (ΣΤ 7.475c = ii. 294.57 Erbse) attributes the deletion to Aristarchus. He may not have been the first scholar to notice the difficulty, however: according to Eustathius, ἡ δὲ τῶν ἀνδραπόδων λέξις νεωτερικὴ ἐστὶ κατὰ τοὺς παλαιούς· διὸ καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης καὶ Ζηνόδοτος ἠθέτουν τὸ ἔπος, ἐν ᾧ κεῖται ἡ λέξις αὕτη (692.21 = ii. 504.4-6 Van der Valk).^{vi}

The real problem with the term is not so much that it is an *hapax*, but that it denotes a concept which does not fit in the world of the *Iliad*. Whereas δμῶς and δοῦλος denote a slave as opposed to a free man, and θεράπων is used for a servant or attendant whether he be slave or free, ἀνδράποδα refers to people considered as property, often (as would be the case here) through their having been captured in war (cf. Lazzeroni 1970, 168-9). Homer is aware of the practice (cf. *Il.* 18.28 δμῶαὶ δ' ἄς Ἄχιλεὺς ληίσσατο Πάτροκλός τε, 20.193-4, *Od.* 1.398; Beringer 1961, 268-84), but elsewhere limits the possession of such prisoners to the leaders of the army. Thus ἀνδραπόδεσσι “is as remarkable for the term itself as for the idea of war-captives belonging to ordinary troops” (Kirk 1990, on 7.473-5). The democratic spirit which this mass ownership of prisoners-of-war implies is at odds with the aristocratic emphasis of the epics. Moreover, the casual trading of prisoners for wine suggests that captive-taking remains a common and widespread practice in the *Iliad*. Yet within the poem itself “prisoners are not taken on the Iliadic battlefield (except, for an evil purpose, at 21.26ff.)” (Hainsworth 1993, on 11.111); the purpose of this omission “is to concentrate attention as exclusively as possible on the position of the hero ... either he must kill or be killed, dying a heroic death” (Griffin 1980, 91).^{vii} It makes little sense for Homer on the one hand to abolish the taking of prisoners on the battlefield in order to sharpen the contrast between life and death, and on the other to present us with a military economy whose very existence relies on this practice.

The word itself is generally thought to derive from τετράποδα by analogy^{viii}. Each word appears to have begun as *plurale tantum*, and only later have developed a singular form. As τετράποδα is already found in Mycenaean (qe-to-ro-po-pi), this does

not help us to date ἀνδράποδα. More interesting is the morphology of its dative plural ending in our passage. In its later occurrences the word declines as a thematic stem, giving ἀνδραπόδοις in Attic (cf. Ar. *Eccl.* 593) and ἀνδραπόδοισι in Ionic (cf. Hdt. 3.129.3)^{ix}. Here, however, it ends in –εσσι, which is the expected form given its derivation (“durchaus normal”, according to Wackernagel^x; cf. πόδεσσι). This need not mean that the word is of any great antiquity, however. Most Greek speakers outside Boeotia, Thessaly and Lesbos did not have a dative plural in –εσσι, and hence when they read or listened to Homer this ending will have sounded particularly characteristic of epic to them. Hence if such a speaker were to compose a passage for interpolation into the Homeric text, he could have used such a form even though (or rather, because) it was not part of his own lexicon^{xi}. Thus the ending tells us nothing about the age of the word. As Penney notes in a different context, “apparent archaism may in fact result from rampant innovation” (1999, 268).

Wackernagel goes too far, however, in claiming that the word must be an Attic interpolation^{xii}. True, it is absent from Ionian epic and iambus; but it is found in Herodotus, and it begs the question to say (with Wackernagel) that Herodotus must have borrowed it from Attic. Wackernagel is on stronger ground when he points to the prominence of the Euneid γένος in Athens (1916a, 315 = 1916b, 155)^{xiii}, and the general importance of Lemnos for the Athenians^{xiv}, who controlled it from about 500 B.C. as an important stage on the way from the Black Sea in their grain-ships. On the other hand, Lemnos is mentioned in the *Iliad* elsewhere (2.722, 8.230-4, 14.230), as is Euneos himself, son of Jason and Hypsipyle (21.40-1, 23.745-7)^{xv}. If there is an interpolation here it may well be Attic in origin, but this is by no means certain.

Following Zenodotus and Aristophanes, Bolling (1944, 105-6) deleted line 475 and accepted the rest of the passage as Homeric. But as Roemer saw (1911, 288), this makes for an awkward connexion between 474 and 476, whereas τίθεντο δὲ δαῖτα θάλειαν (they set out the rich feast) is naturally followed by παννύχιοι μὲν ἔπειτα κάρη κομόωντες Ἀχαιοὶ δαίνυντο (then the flowing-haired Achaeans dined all night). 475 also fits well with what precedes (with its repeated ἄλλοι), whereas it would be hard to identify a motive for this single-line interpolation. It is more likely that the problematic word ἀνδράποδεσσι is part of a larger addition to the Homeric text. On the other hand, many would feel justifiably hesitant to postulate (with Wackernagel) a nine-line interpolation as a result of a single *hapax*. If there was an interpolation on such a scale, we would hope to have more signs of it than this.

One such sign may be found in line 466, immediately before the passage athetised by Wackernagel. The verb βουφονέω is not only an Homeric *hapax*: it is not attested anywhere in surviving Greek literature, excepting scholia and other commentaries on this passage. Given the number of times that oxen are slaughtered in Greek literature, this is surprising. Moreover, the likely sense of the word is problematic. According to Kirk, the φον– root “always implies slaughter with the implication of murder”^{xvi}; it is thus “an unexpected term for the butchering of oxen either in a normal religious or in a secular context” (1990, on 7.466).^{xvii} Such a formulation is a little too strong, however, as the root is also used of killings in battle, which can hardly be described as “murder” (cf. Bechert 1964, 8-10). Bechert’s more nuanced conclusion makes better sense of the root: “ἔπεφνον und seine Sippe

entsprechen ... nicht der Sache nach, wohl aber dem Gefühlswert nach unserem
'modern', 'Mord' »^{xviii}.

Bechert 1964 attempts to justify the choice of vocabulary in this passage. He points out that the gods have just been finding fault with the Greeks for not offering hecatombs (literally, sacrifices of a hundred oxen) before building the wall round their camp (7.442-63)^{xix}. Given the absence of a sacrifice, “war ein Wort notwendig, welches das Töten von Rindern und das Rinderopfer voneinander zu trennen geeignet war und nur das Töten selbst ausdrückte. Dieses Wort ist βουφονέω” (1964, 6). This verb, which Bechert translates as “Rinder töten, ohne daß dies für ein Opfer geschieht” (1964, 13), is thus a unique creation for a unique situation, and hence neither its rarity nor its meaning should offend us. In making this argument Bechert elaborates a point already found in the scholia: βουφονεῖν ἐστὶν οὐ τὸ θύειν θεοῖς (ἄτοπον γὰρ ἐπὶ θυσίας φόνον λέγειν), ἀλλὰ τὸ φονεύειν βοῦς εἰς δείπνου κατασκευήν (ΣAbT 7.466 = ii. 293.32-4 Erbse).

Though ingeniously argued, Bechert’s case is ultimately improbable, for two reasons. First, the gods are concerned with a failure to perform the due sacrifices before the building of the wall. The sacrifice of oxen as a preliminary to the evening meal has nothing to do with this divine hostility. Hence there is no need for a verb with the sense which Bechert advocates. Secondly, the sense of the word cannot be simply “kill oxen without sacrificing them” (as Bechert claims). This is apparent from the title of Buphonia, the prominent Athenian festival^{xx}. There the –φον– part of the name indicates not that the festival has a secular character, but rather reflects the unpleasant and disturbing aspects of animal sacrifice^{xxi}. The rite thus includes a “trial” aimed at

finding the person responsible for the killing of the animal. In such a context the φον– root is eminently suitable. By contrast, it has no such function in our passage, and therefore is suspicious. So also at Hom. *Od.* 23.329 ἦδ' ὡς Ἡελίοιο βόας κατέπεφνον ἑταῖροι (cited by Bechert) the φόν– root is used not because Odysseus' companions killed the oxen without sacrificing them. They did sacrifice the beasts (cf. 12.340-65), though little good it did them. The verb rather points to how the killing of these sacred cattle was in itself an offence against the Sun god.

Henrichs 1992 tries a different approach. He argues that there is no problem in the use of words from the φον– root for sacrifices to the gods. According to him, this group of words “bezeichnet ... seit dem frühen Epos nicht nur das gewaltsame Töten von Menschen, sondern häufig auch das rituelle Schlachten von Opfertieren” (1992, 155). On inspection, however, his “häufig” turns out to be an exaggeration, and his list of supposed instances of this sense (1992, 155-6 n. 84) does not stand up to scrutiny. His only other pre-classical parallel is found at line 436 of the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes*, where Apollo addresses Hermes as βουφόνε μηχανιώτα, translated by West as “you kill-cow, you ingenious inventor” (2003a, 147). According to Henrichs, the term βουφόνε refers to Hermes' earlier sacrifice of the oxen which he had stolen from Apollo (lines 111-29). But Apollo's interest is in the fact that his cattle were “stolen and slaughtered” (Beck 1982b); the purpose for which they were slaughtered is irrelevant to him. His speech begins with a series of criticisms (modelled on *Il.* 3.39 = 13.769 Δύσπαρι, εἶδος ἄριστε, γυναιμανές, ἠπεροπευτά), before in the end he moves to a more conciliatory tone. As Radermacher says, “Apoll beginnt mit Worten, die aus Scheltrede bald zu Anerkennung und Bewunderung übergleiten” (1931, 150).

Henrichs’s case must therefore rest on later evidence: on a mere three parallels from the classical and Hellenistic periods^{xxii}. These are [Aesch.] *PV* 529-31 μηδ’ ἐλινύσαιμι θεοὺς ὀσίαις / θοίλαις ποτινισομένα / βουφόνους παρ’ Ὀκεανῶ πατρὸς ἄσβεστον πόρον, where the daughters of Ocean “talk in human terms of making sacrifice to the gods” (Griffith 1983, on 530-1); Pind. *N.* 6.39-41 πόντου τε γέφυρ’ ἀκάμαντος ἐν ἀμφικτιόνων / ταυροφόνῳ τριετηρίδι Κρεοντίδαν / τίμασε Ποσειδάνιον ἄν τέμενος, where the victor’s relative Creontidas is said to have been honoured at the Isthmian games^{xxiii}; and Call. fr. 67.5-6 Pfeiffer ἦ γὰρ, ἄναξ, ὁ μὲν ἦλθεν Ἰουλίδος ἢ δ’ ἀπὸ Νάξου / Κύνθιε, τὴν Δήλω σὴν ἐπὶ βουφονίην, which describes how Acontius and Cydippe both came to Delos for the sacrifice in honour of Apollo. Yet if the βουφον– stem was available as a term for “sacrifice” during this period, it is incredible that we can list only three possible instances of it (including Pindar’s ταυροφόνος). These examples are so much later than Homer, and so few in number despite their describing an act that is so common, that it is most economical to regard them as *recherché* terms influenced by this very passage^{xxiv}. They thus cannot be used as independent evidence for φον– in the sense of “sacrifice”.

We might argue that the prominence of the Buphonia rite in Athens, coupled with the near-absence of related words in other context, lends further support to Wackernagel’s case that the interpolation is due to an Attic source. On the other hand, there was a month called Buphonia on Delos, Tenos and Carystus^{xxv}, which suggests that the tradition may have had a wider currency than we can now tell. Again, *interpolatio Attica* is a possible though by no means compelling theory.

Such is the linguistic case: enough to raise suspicions, though on its own perhaps not sufficient to justify wholesale deletion. Yet concentration on individual words, important though they are, may have blinded scholars to a further difficulty, this time connected with content rather than language. The passage is concerned with the import of wine from Lemnos for the Greek army: an innocent enough topic, one might think. But in the context of the scope of Homer's narrative there can be few more startling episodes in the poem. This is the only passage where Homer deals with the problem of how the Greek army was supplied with food and drink for ten years in a foreign country.^{xxvi} Elsewhere he carefully avoids this question: such a practical problem could not be answered within the boundaries of the heroic world as he chooses to draw them. Homer's reluctance to deal with this aspect of life at Troy forms one aspect of his well-known tendency to provide a heavily stylised presentation of everything to do with food and eating in the poem. When he does deal with such matters, he aims to convey the social or moral significance of dining rather than to provide a realistic account of the diet and eating-habits of the troops at Troy^{xxvii}. The unheroic bartering by the Greek army of ox-hides, captives and other items for imported wine is a world away from Homer's vision.

The contrast with the Epic Cycle on this point is illuminating. The *Cypria* takes great interest in the difficulties of supplying the army: according to its account, the Greeks are fed by the daughters of Anius, Oeno, Spermo and Elais, who could produce at will unlimited quantities of wine, seed and oil for the Greek soldiers^{xxviii}. The presence of people with magical powers is typical of the Cycle; so also however is the "pedantic desire to work out problems implicit in the *Iliad*" which the episode

illustrates^{xxix}. Contrasting the *Cypria*'s attitude with that of the *Iliad*, Griffin declares “for [Homer] of course the problem of commissariat is not interesting, except for the good wine which Jason's son sent them from Lesbos [sic]”^{xxx}. But he does not say why Homer should have chosen to abandon his usual practice in this passage and no other. Displaying as it does the characteristics of the Cycle rather than the *Iliad*, its status within the poem would be questionable even without the linguistic difficulties adduced above^{xxxi}.

Some scholars have attempted to justify the passage by reference to the wider context. For Kirk, “the lively *genre* scene of the wine-ships and the bartering can now be seen as preparing the way for a powerful and brilliant *dénouement*, as night-long thundering from Zeus makes a sinister accompaniment to the feasting and fills the troops with fear” (1990, on 7.476-82). In similar vein Wilamowitz, looking forward to the battle of the following book, praises its location on the grounds that “mit dem Θ beginnt der Schlachttag, der den Achäern eine Niederlage bringt. Es ist doch wohl ein löblicher Einfall, ihm die friedliche Szene der Bestattung und den lustigen Abend vorauszuschicken” (1916, 52 ≈ 1910, 394). But such a contrast between the worlds of war and peace hardly required an excursus into the problems of army supplies. A simple dining scene would have been a much more effective method of achieving this aim, as well as being truer to Homer's practice elsewhere. Talk of impressive juxtapositions does not solve our problems. Kirk even calls the passage a “*genre* scene”, as if bartering for wine were a common occurrence rather than a unique aberration from a well-chosen norm.

Taplin's more nuanced analysis of the structure of this part of the poem (1992, 289) significantly does not even mention the disputed lines, even though he writes without reference to the question of authenticity. He points out the rapid succession of scenes involving the divine in response to the impiety of the Greeks: so "the divine assembly of 7.443 ff. leads into Zeus' all-night planning in 7.478-82, which leads into the Olympian gathering at 8.2 ff." This impressive focus on the gods' anger and its consequences is rudely and unnecessarily broken by 466-75, giving us an absurd contrast between divine wrath on the one hand and the practicalities of the wine trade on the other. The lines are also out of place at a human level, where as Taplin notes "the sequence of meetings and diplomacy towards the end of 7 anticipates the rejoining of battle". Here too the purposeless emphasis on the source of the Achaean wine supply interrupts a carefully patterned part of the poem.

A final problem confronts us in 476-7. The all-night feast enjoyed by both Greeks and Trojans is blatantly inconsistent with line 482 κοιμήσαντ' ἄρ' ἔπειτα καὶ ὕπνου δῶρον ἔλοντο^{xxxii}. It is also unparalleled in the epic^{xxxiii}. At 8.545-54 the Trojans bring provisions from the city and stay up all night on the plain, but there is no suggestion that they eat throughout the hours of darkness. Rather, they stay awake to prevent a Greek retreat (cf. Hector's orders at 8.505-16). In our passage there is no cause for such carousing: quite the opposite, one might have thought.

The combination of these difficulties suggests an interpolation. The passage contains two significant linguistic difficulties, purposelessly brings to light an aspect of life at Troy which Homer elsewhere is keen to avoid, breaks up the carefully arranged structure of this part of the epic, and introduces an abnormal and inconsistent reference

to that day's evening meal. One of these charges alone could perhaps be overlooked: but taken together they point to a real problem. The most economical solution is to remove 466-77. West (n. 1 above) suggests deleting 466-81, but there is nothing objectionable about 478-81. Moving straight from 465 to 478 gives an effective transition, while the reference to libations by the whole army in 480-1 may have provoked the interpolation in the first place, given that it explains how the troops acquired their wine.

As for the origin of the interpolation, an Attic source is consistent with the above argument, but is not demanded by them, and we must be content to leave the question open. What is certain is that by concentrating on a single word, Wackernagel seriously understates the case against these lines.

All Souls College

University of Oxford

Oxford, OX1 4AL

United Kingdom.

Bibliography

- F. R. Adrados et al. (eds.), *Diccionario Griego-Español*, Madrid 1980–.
- W. Arend, *Die typische Scenen bei Homer (Problemata 7)*, Berlin 1933.
- D. Aubriot, *Prière et conceptions religieuses en Grèce ancienne jusqu'à la fin du V^e siècle av. J.-C.* (Collection de la Maison de l'Orient méditerranéen 22, Série littéraire et philosophique 5), Lyon 1992.
- W. Beck, βουφονέω, *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*, vol. 2, Göttingen 1982, 91.
[1982a]
- W. Beck, βουφόνος, *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*, vol. 2, Göttingen 1982, 91.
[1982b]
- J. Bechert, βουφονέω, *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 17, 1964, 5-17.
- W. Beringer, *Zu den Begriffen für "Slaven" und "Unfreie" bei Homer*, *Historia* 10, 1961, 259-91.
- A. Bernabé (ed.), *Poetae Epici Graeci. Testimonia et Fragmenta: Pars 1*, Stuttgart and Leipzig ²1996 (¹1987).
- E. Bethe, *Homer: Dichtung und Sage*, Berlin 1914-27.
- G. M. Bolling, *The Athetized Lines of the Iliad*, Baltimore 1944.
- G. W. Bond (ed.), *Euripides: Hypsipyle*, Oxford 1963.

- W. Burkert, *Homo Necans: the Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth*, transl. P. Bing, London, Berkeley, Los Angeles 1983.
- W. Burkert, Orpheus, Dionysos und die Euneiden in Athen: Das Zeugnis von Euripides' *Hypsipyle*, in A. Bierl and P. von Möllendorff (eds.), *Orchestra: Drama, Mythos, Bühne* (Festschrift Flashar), Stuttgart and Leipzig 1994, 44-9.
- W. Burkert, *Homo Necans: Interpretationen altgriechischer Opferriten und Mythen* (Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten 32), Berlin and New York ²1997 (¹1972).
- D. L. Cairns (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Homer's Iliad*, Oxford 2001.
- A. B. Cook, *Zeus. A Study in Ancient Religion*, Cambridge 1914-40.
- M. Davies (ed.), *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Göttingen 1988.
- M. Davies, Feasting and Food in Homer: Realism and Stylisation, *Prometheus* 23, 1997, 97-107.
- L. Deubner, *Attische Feste*, Berlin 1932.
- H. Erbse (ed.), *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem*, Berlin 1969-87.
- S. Fogelmark, *Studies in Pindar with Particular Reference to Paean VI and Nemean VII*, Lund 1972.
- D. E. Gerber, Pindar, *Nemean Six: a Commentary*, HSCP 99, 1999, 33-91.
- D. Giordano (ed.), *Chamaeleontis Heracleotae Fragmenta* (Edizioni e saggi universitari di filologia classica 45), Bologna ²1990 (¹1977).
- J. Griffin, The Epic Cycle and the uniqueness of Homer, *JHS* 97, 1977, 39-53 (= Cairns 2001, 365-84).
- J. Griffin, *Homer on Life and Death*, Oxford 1980.

- M. Griffith (ed.), *Aeschylus: Prometheus Bound*, Cambridge 1983.
- J. B. Hainsworth (ed.), *The Iliad: a Commentary. Volume III: Books 9-12*, Cambridge 1993.
- A. Henrichs, Gott, Mensch, Tier: Antike Daseinsstruktur und religiöses Verhalten im Denken Karl Meulis, in F. Graf (ed.), *Klassische Antike und neue Wege der Kulturwissenschaften. Symposium Karl Meuli (Beiträge zur Volkskunde 11)*, Basel 1992, 129-67.
- R. Kannicht (ed.), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta, volume 5. Euripides*, Göttingen 2004.
- R. Kassel and C. F. L. Austin (eds.), *Poetae Comici Graeci*, Berlin and New York 1983–.
- G. S. Kirk (ed.), *The Iliad: a Commentary. Volume II: books 5-8*, Cambridge 1990.
- K. Latte (ed.), *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon [A – O only]*, Copenhagen 1953-66.
- R. Lazzeroni, Etimologia e semantica del greco ἀνδράποδον, *Studi e saggi linguistici* 10, 1970, 165-73.
- S. D. Olson (ed.), *Aristophanes: Peace*, Oxford 1998.
- R. C. T. Parker, *Athenian Religion: a History*, Oxford 1996.
- R. C. T. Parker, *Polytheism and Society at Athens*, Oxford 2005.
- J. H. W. Penney, Archaism and Innovation in Latin Poetic Syntax, in J. N. Adams and R. G. Mayer (eds.), *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry (Proceedings of the British Academy 93)*, Oxford 1999, 249-68.
- R. Pfeiffer (ed.), *Callimachus*, Oxford 1949-53.

- R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship. From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age*, Oxford 1968.
- L. Radermacher (ed.), *Der homerische Hermeshymnus* (Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Philosophisch–Historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte Band 213 Abhandlung 1), Vienna and Leipzig 1931.
- S. L. Radt (ed.), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, volume 3. Aeschylus, Göttingen 1985.
- A. Rengakos, *Homerische Wörter bei Kallimachos*, *ZPE* 94, 1992, 21-47.
- E. Risch, *Les traits non homériques chez Homère*, in: *Mélanges de linguistique et de philologie grecques offerts à Pierre Chantraine* (Études et Commentaires 79), Paris 1972, 191-8. [= 1981, 346-53]
- E. Risch, *Kleine Schriften*, Berlin and New York 1981.
- A. Roemer, *Der angebliche Einheitlichkeits– und Gleichheitsfanatismus in der Homerkritik und Homeregeese Aristarchs*, *RhM n.F.* 66, 1911, 275-355.
- R. Schmitt, *Dichtung und Dichtersprache in indogermanischer Zeit*, Wiesbaden 1967.
- A. Sideras, *Aeschylus Homericus: Untersuchungen zu den Homerismen der aischyleischen Sprache* (Hypomnemata 31), Göttingen 1971.
- M. Sotiriou, *Pindarus Homericus: Homer-Rezeption in Pindars Epinikien* (Hypomnemata 119), Göttingen 1998.
- O. P. Taplin, *Homeric Soundings: The Shaping of the Iliad*, Oxford 1992.
- C. Theodoridis (ed.), *Photii Patriarchae Lexicon*, Berlin and New York 1982–.
- M. Van der Valk, *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad*, Leiden 1963-4.

- P. Von der Mühl, Kritisches Hypomnema zur Ilias (Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 4), Basel 1952.
- J. Wackernagel, Miscellen zur griechischen Grammatik, KZ 30, 1890, 293-316. [= 1953-79, i. 656-79]
- J. Wackernagel, Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer, Glotta 7, 1916, 161-319. [1916a; = 1916b, 1-159]
- J. Wackernagel, Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer (Forschungen zur griechischen und lateinischen Grammatik 4), Göttingen 1916. [1916b]
- J. Wackernagel, Kleine Schriften, Göttingen 1953-79.
- F. Wehrli (ed.), Die Schule des Aristoteles: Texte und Kommentar. Heft IX: Phainias von Eresos. Chamaileon. Praxiphanes, Basel and Stuttgart ²1969.
- M. L. West, Frühe Interpolationen in der Ilias, Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen I. Philologisch–Historische Klasse, Nr. 4, Göttingen 1999, 181-91.
- M. L. West (ed.), Homerus: Ilias, Stuttgart, Leipzig, Munich 1998-2000.
- M. L. West, Studies in the Text and Transmission of the *Iliad*, Munich and Leipzig 2001.
- M. L. West (ed.), Homeric Hymns. Homeric Apocrypha. Lives of Homer, London and Cambridge, Mass. 2003. [2003a]
- M. L. West (ed.), Greek Epic Fragments, London and Cambridge, Mass. 2003.
- M. L. West, *Odyssey* and *Argonautica*, CQ N.S. 55, 2005, 39-64.

- S. R. West, The Transmission of the Text, in A. Heubeck, S. R. West, and J. B. Hainsworth (eds.), A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey. Volume I. Introduction and Books I-VIII, Oxford 1988, 33-48.
- U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Über das Θ der Ilias, Sitzungsberichte der Königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 21, Berlin 1910, 372-402.
- U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Die Ilias und Homer, Berlin 1916.

I am grateful to Professor Martin West, Dr Adrian Kelly and the editors of *Philologus* for helpful comments. None of them should be assumed to agree with my argument: Dr Kelly certainly does not.

ⁱ West (1998-2000) i. 224-5.

ⁱⁱ West (1999) 187.

ⁱⁱⁱ Wackernagel (1916a) 314-16 = (1916b) 154-6. For Attic interpolation in Homer see West (1999) 185-7; id. (2001) 12 n. 25; S. R. West (1988) 38.

^{iv} Wackernagel (1916a) 315 = (1916b) 155: “mit H 475 gehört die ganze Versreihe von 467 an zusammen”.

^v πολλά δέ ἐστὶν ἄπαξ λεγόμενα παρὰ τῷ ποιητῇ (ΣΑ II. 3.54a = i. 369.82-3 Erbse); cf. Pfeiffer (1968) 229 with n. 4.

^{vi} See further Van der Valk (1963-4) 449 n. 342, who doubts whether Eustathius was right to attribute the athetesis to the two earlier scholars.

^{vii} Compare passages such as 21.76-83 which show that captive-taking used to take place in the past, and thereby highlight by contrast the bleaker world of the present conflict.

^{viii} Cf. e.g. Risch (1972) 194 n. 9 = (1983) 349 n. 9, Adrados (1980–) s.v. ἀνδράποδον. Lazzeroni (1970) 166 points out that we would expect τετράποδα to give rise to δίποδα by analogy rather than ἀνδράποδα. However, although other languages have many examples of a binary opposition between terms for “four-footer” and “two-footer” (e.g. Sanskrit and Umbrian: cf. Lazzeroni 1970, 169-71), “finden wir keine Spuren dieser festen Verbindung im Griechischen” (Schmitt 1967, 212).

^{ix} ἀνδράπόδοισι would be metrically permissible in this context, and Aristarchus’ text had this form (ΣΑ 7.475b = ii. 294.52-3 Erbse).

^x Wackernagel (1890) 298 = (1953-79) i. 661.

^{xi} Cf. Wackernagel (1916a) 314 = (1916b) 154 “daran ändert die äolische Endung –εσσι nichts. Die konnte auch ein Spätling jedem Worte anhängen, das nach der III. Deklination ging”.

^{xii} So also Von der Mühl (1952) 142-3: “mit ἀνδραπόδεσσι sind wir eben in den attischen sprachlichen Bereich geführt worden”.

^{xiii} This argument was previously used by Bethe (1914-27) i. 220 n. 4 “Euneos ... paßt vortrefflich für einen attischen Homeriden”. For the Euneid γένος in Athens see Parker (1996) 297-8, Eur. *Hyps.* fr. 64 col. ii. 98-101 Bond = 759a.1619-22 Kannicht (with Bond’s edition, p. 20), Cratinus, *Euneidae* with Kassel–Austin (1983–) iv. 157, Burkert (1994), Hesych. ε 7007 = ii. 230 Latte, Photius ε 2258 = ii. 215 Theodoridis.

^{xiv} For Lemnos in Athenian life and culture cf. the reference to Lemnian wine at Ar. *Pax* 1162 with Olson (1998) on 1161-5; also Aeschylus’ *Cabiri* (fr. 95-7a Radt).

^{xv} For the Argonautica story in early Greek poetry see West (2005) 40.

^{xvi} Cf. the definition of the Diccionario Griego-Español, “*matar reses para comer*” (Adrados 1980–, s.v. βουφονέω).

^{xvii} Kirk misses 23.776, where πέφνεν refers to the sacrifice of oxen at the funeral of Patroclus. But as Bechert (1964) 11 points out, the word there is probably chosen to denote “die ganze Schlächtereier” at the funeral, which went beyond animal sacrifice to include the killing of Trojan prisoners (23.161-83). It also ensures variation with ἀποκταμένων in the previous line.

^{xviii} Beck’s sweeping claim that the word is “prob[ably] chosen here for compactness of expression and metr[ical] reasons ... [it] scarcely merits further speculation based on neg[ative] connotations attributed to root –φεν–, φον–” (1982a) shows a nice mixture of desperation and complacency.

^{xix} For the offence committed by the Greeks in failing to do this see Aubriot (1992) 528 n. 51.

^{xx} Cf. Cook (1914-40) iii. 570-90, Deubner (1932) 158-74, Burkert (1983) 136-42 = (1997) 153-60, Henrichs (1992) 153-8, Parker (2005) 187-91.

^{xxi} Cf. Parker 2005, 191: “the issue of the morality of sacrifice is ... elaborately emphasized”.

^{xxii} Henrichs’s other two examples can be ruled out straight away. The hexameter riddle preserved by Chamaeleon fr. 34 Wehrli = 34.4-7 Giordano (*ap.* Athen. 456c) is unlikely to be by Simonides, despite Chamaeleon’s attribution: as Wehrli says (1969, 83), “daß diese von Simonides stammen sollen, macht der im allgemeinen anonyme Charakter der Rätselüberlieferung wenig glaubhaft”. At Diod. Sic. 4.12.15

τῶν δὲ Κενταύρων οἱ μὲν πεύκας αὐτορρίζους ἔχοντες ἐπῆσαν, οἱ δὲ πέτρας μεγάλας, τινὲς δὲ λαμπάδας ἡμμένας, ἕτεροι δὲ βουφόνους πελέκεις the list of offensive weapons ends with a bang if we translate βουφόνους πελέκεις as “ox-slaying axes”, but with a whimper if we render it with the weak “sacrificial axes”.

^{xxiii} Gerber *ad loc.* notes that the adjective ταυροφόνος “is rare and not found again until the Hellenistic period” (1999, 70).

^{xxiv} Pindar’s ταυροφον– rather than βουφόν– may still show Homeric influence: as Fogelmark (1972) 30 notes, “though Pindar may be very Homeric in spirit, he seldom takes over conventional phrases without giving them a touch of his own”. See further Sotiriou (1998) 83-99 on Pindar’s adaptation of non-formulaic Homeric expressions. Sideras (1971) says nothing about the *Prometheus* passage. For Callimachus’ use of Homeric *hapaxes* see Rengakos (1992).

^{xxv} Cf. Burkert (1983) 143 n. 32 = (1997) 161 n. 32.

^{xxvi} At first sight there is a parallel passage at 9.71-2, where Nestor reminds Agamemnon that πλεῖαί τοι οἴνου κλισίαι, τὸν νῆες Ἀχαιῶν / ἡμάτια Θρήκηθεν ἐπ’ εὐρέα πόντον ἄγουσι. Yet Nestor is speaking of a supply of wine delivered to Agamemnon, which constitutes a special mark of honour for the βασιλεύτατος among the βασιλεῖς, and which he is here encouraged to share with his fellow leaders. Nestor’s words thus provide a parallel for lines 470-1 of book 7: but they are quite different from the passage which follows (7.472-5) and its concern with the realities and practicalities of army supply.

^{xxvii} Cf. Griffin (1980) 14-17; Davies (1997).

^{xxviii} Cf. *Cypria* fr. 19 Davies = 29 Bernabé = 26 West

^{xxix} Cf. Griffin (1977) 41 = Cairns (2001) 369.

^{xxx} Griffin (1977) 41 = Cairns (2001) 369.

^{xxxi} Kirk’s defence of the passage on the grounds that it “conveys a feeling of accomplishment after the day-long task of building wall and trench” (1990, on 7.466-82) is too sanguine, and does not attempt to deal with the above problem.

^{xxxii} I owe this point to Professor West.

^{xxxiii} For a list of meals taken by armies in Homer see Arend (1933) 75 (“Mahl der Heere mit Gelage”).