In this article I shall argue that *Od*. 10. 456 is, as is generally assumed, an interpolation, and that – what has not been generally realized – 455 is almost certainly corrupt: I shall propose an emendation. I shall also argue that the passage 475–9, usually regarded as an interpolation, is almost certainly genuine. Moreover, in the course of my argument I shall discuss various questions which, while relevant to that argument, have in addition an importance of their own: the relationship between Odysseus and his companions; the relationship between the Nekyia and the rest of the *Odyssey*; the principles to be observed in the use of Eustathius as evidence for the *numerus versuum* of Homer; and the general question how likely the omission of a line or series of lines by a small group of our Homeric MSS. extending beyond a single family is to stem from scribal carelessness.

456 is omitted by the vast majority of our MSS., 475–9 by a few of them; I must therefore state at the outset what value I attach to external evidence of this kind. Here it will only be possible to outline briefly the assumptions which underlie the following discussion; I hope to defend them elsewhere, but meanwhile, as my general position is close to that of G. M. Bolling on the post-Aristarchean interpolations, I can simply refer the reader to his *External Evidence for Interpolation in Homer* (Oxford 1925, repr. 1968), esp. pp. 3–30, and to his earlier writings listed there on p. 7. I should add that, though these assumptions will play a part in my argument in the body of this article, acceptance of them is not an indispensable precondition for acceptance of the conclusions reached there. The assumptions are as follows: (1) The *numerus versuum* of our minuscule MSS. and of the vulgate post-Aristarchean papyri is that of the edition of Aristarchus, augmented by additional lines which have made their way into a greater or smaller proportion of our MSS. but from which the vulgate papyri are all but free. (2) Any significant weakness in the attestation of a line by these MSS. and papyri – any weakness, that is to say, which is not merely the product of transcriptional error – is an indication that the line in question was absent from the edition of Aristarchus. (However, I shall qualify this in (7) below.) (3) Of the additions to the *numerus versuum* of Aristarchus a few are *demonstrably* survivals from pre-Aristarchean times which have returned to the text (in most cases via the scholia), but it is probable that only a very small proportion of the remainder are as old as this. (4) Of these pre-Aristarchean survivals none is at all likely to be genuine: the evidence strongly suggests that Aristarchus, though he obelized freely, would not have omitted a line from his text unless he had very strong manuscript evidence.
against it, in which case it would normally almost certainly be spurious. (5) Can we qualify this? If Aristarchus regarded the internal evidence against a line as exceptionally strong, might he not have been prepared to excise it without manuscript authority? There is no firm evidence that he ever actually did this, and, on what we know of his modus operandi, it is most unlikely that he would have done so; but I shall allow for this as a faint possibility. (6) Thus a significant weakness in the attestation of a line by our MSS. will imply that it is almost certainly not merely an addition to the text of Aristarchus but an interpolation in the text of the Homeric poems. (7) However, unlike Bolling I would qualify (2) and (6) by allowing for the possibility (it is no more than a doubtful hypothesis) that occasionally some post-Aristarchean critic, bred in the Alexandrian tradition but lacking the caution of Aristarchus, excised a genuine line on the basis of the internal evidence alone; but such excisions would not have affected more than a very small proportion of our MSS.

I now print Od. 10. 455–7:

\[\text{ἡ δὲ μεν ἄγχι στὰσα προσημόδα διὰ θεάων·}
\]

\[\text{"διογυνεῖς Λαερτιάδη, πολυμῆχαν Ὅδυσσεῦ,}
\]

\[\text{μηκέτι νῦν θαλερὸν γόνον ὄρνυτε... "}\

The motive posited by Bolling for the interpolation of vocative lines – facilitation of exegesis¹ – is not everywhere equally plausible, and 456, whose singular vocative is followed by a plural imperative in 457, would serve only to complicate exegesis. If we suppose – as I believe to be more probable – that the motive was usually merely a feeling that a formal vocative line was the right and proper way to begin a Homeric speech, the insertion of the awkward 456 remains rather surprising (at least unless we posit the operation of an additional or alternative factor here). Perhaps one may wonder, then, whether it is a genuine line misguided excised by Aristarchus to rationalize the text: one may care to argue that he may have found this singular-plural juxtaposition so intolerably harsh that he was prepared to remove the line from the text without manuscript evidence against it. On the other hand, is the line a particularly crass example of the common phenomenon of concordance interpolation, due to the influence of 400f. (=455f.) and/or 487–9 (\[... \text{ἡ δὲ ... ἀμείβετo διὰ θεάων· • "διογυνεῖς Λαερτιάδη, πολυμῆχαν Ὅδυσσεῦ, μηκέτι νῦν ... μήνυε... "}\

1. He refers to the copyists’ ‘feeble effort[s] to improve the text – to ... show just who is ... addressed’ (External Evidence 15); and of such vocative lines as may have been interpolated ‘at an early time’ he says, ‘It [i.e. their interpolation] would be helpful for school exegesis’ (ibid. 9 n. 1).

2. For a list, divided into ‘omittunt’ and ‘damannt’, see Bolling, External Evidence 26: add V. Berard (L’Odyssee [2nd ed. Paris 1933]) to those who omit the line, and P. Von der Mühll (Homeri Odyssea [Basle 1946]) and Ameis-Hentze to those who condemn it.
who bracket it, but he argues ad loc. that 'it may well stand'; Van der Valk is silent on it, but he defends a number of other weakly-attested vocative lines, regarding them as erroneous excisions, probably by Aristarchus or 'the Alexandrians'; and Stanford prints the line without comment.

First, the external evidence. There is no mention of the line in the scholia. No papyri covering the passage 455–7 have come to light. There is no homoiographon to encourage omission, yet the vast majority of our MSS. omit the line completely: accidental omission and post-Aristarchean excision are thus both excluded. Most of the MSS. which record the line place it either in the margin or before 455 in the text, the misplacement indicating transference from the margin of an exemplar. The behaviour of Allen’s family e is instructive: the ancestor, U5, has the line in the margin; the first hand of Br originally omitted the line from the text but subsequently inserted it (after 455); and the remaining members have it in the text (after 455). All this most naturally suggests a post-Aristarchean interpolation gradually gaining ground; it would be compatible with a genuine line’s gradual return to the text after Aristarchean excision, but even on the external evidence alone the probabilities are, on my assumptions, very strongly against this.

Next, the internal evidence. We should begin by appreciating the extent of the awkwardness of 456. In itself the plural imperative after the singular vocative might not be objectionable if the rendering 'You and your companions' made sense here: cf. 488f. (where, however, the companions are not present, so that only Odysseus is actually addressed) and Od. 13. 38f. (for which, however, 36f. provide a special preparation); but at Od. 10. 453f. the tearful reunion is between the two groups of Odysseus’s companions (453 οἱ οἱ’), not between Odysseus and the companions formerly under Circe’s spell, with whom he was reunited earlier, at 397–9, where the weeping was in any case confined to the companions (as it was too when Odysseus rejoined the other group, 408–20). Thus it is peculiarly inappropriate for Circe to address

7. At any rate all those remaining members (presumably) which offer the line at all: Allen’s method of citing readings by families secures brevity at the expense of accuracy of detail. Cf. n. 65 below.
8. Unless πάντεσκοιν in 398 means ‘us all’ rather than ‘them all’; but the syntax (καίνοι, έκαστος in the previous line, of the companions only) strongly suggests, if it does not dictate, the latter interpretation.
Odysseus before exhorting his companions to stop crying. We may add that a translation such as that of E. V. Rieu (Penguin, 1946), “The goddess herself, coming up and addressing me by my royal titles, appealed to me to check this fit of weeping”, is simply not justified by the Greek.

Moreover, a similar difficulty is inherent, if somewhat less conspicuously, in 455. As the object of προσηνόθα some, omitting 456, may be inclined to understand σωφάς, i.e. the companions, on whom the preceding six lines are focussed. This suits the following context (Circe does in fact proceed to address the companions), but not the internal context of 455 itself in its present form, where both sense and syntax must be sacrificed. Why on earth should Circe approach Odysseus in order to speak to his weeping companions? And after με it is difficult to understand anything other than με as the object of προσηνόθα and almost impossible to understand σωφάς. (The possibility of the intermediate ἦμεσας will be considered presently.) This judgment is reinforced both by the shortly preceding identical line 400 and by the whole formulaic system of which 455 and 400 are part. In 400, where the narrator is again Odysseus and the subject of the clause is again Circe, it is absolutely certain that the object of προσηνόθα is an understood με. Now for the formulaic system. At the beginning of a line, followed by a verb of speaking, ἄγγος ἀ' ἡ ιστώμαινη occurs 18 times in the Iliad and 6 times in the Odyssey; where the sense excludes the ἀ' of this version, we have two solutions: ἄγγος ἡ ἐκτομουνη at II. 10. 508 and ἄγγος παρισσαμένη at Od. 10. 377; the Odyssey also has two examples, 4. 370 and 6. 56, which share the wording (in the latter case slightly altered) of the first half of 10. 400—455. At the end of a line, preceded by a verb of speaking, we have ἄγγος παρισσαμένη once in the Iliad and three times in the Odyssey. There are also three other examples with ἄγγος, and four (in addition to the one already

9. I take μηκατά νῦν... γόνον δρόμω to mean not ‘Stop arousing this wailing [in one another]’ but ‘Stop producing this wailing [in yourselves]’: the latter sense is the one most naturally suggested by the context, and is compatible with the verb’s basic meaning. The parallels would tend to support the former sense (though we may compare Od. 4. 183 ἄγγος ἰδέα [Μηνέλαος], τότε δέ πάνω ἐν ἅμοιρον δροσο γόνο, where τότε πάνω includes Menelaus himself, as is clear from 184–6); but we note the absence at Od. 10. 457 of the dative which is almost always present in this type of construction to denote the person(s) in whom the wailing etc. is aroused, usually in conjunction with a preposition (ἐν, ἐπί or μετά). However, even if we follow the former interpretation the action which Circe exhorts them to stop remains one in which Odysseus is not participating.

10. So also the translation of T. E. Shaw (New York 1932): ‘The Goddess approached me with: “Son of Laertes, do not permit longer indulgence in such grief.” ’

11. Someone may reply, ‘She wants to be next to Odysseus when addressing his companions so as to associate herself symbolically with him in the hope of investing her words with something of the authority and persuasiveness of their βασιλεύς;’ but this is of course facetiously.

12. ἀ' does occasionally introduce a main clause following a subordinate clause; Od. 10. 377 constitutes such a main clause, and here there is in fact a variant ἄγγος ἀ' ἡ ιστώμαινη. However, this variant would be awkward in a sentence of this structure, where Κηρύξ, the first word, is the subject of both clauses, and the subordinate clause is thus virtually a parenthesis.
mentioned) with ἐγγύς, ἐγγύθεν or ἐγγύθη, which I would include in this
formulaic system. The formulae and their substitutes within this system,
considered together in all their occurrences, will henceforth be referred to as the ἐγγύς
group. Now in 39 of the 41 examples the person addressed is, as we
should expect, the person near whom the speaker is said to stand. The two
remaining examples are II. 17. 10f. and Od. 10. 455. The context of the former
element as follows: Menelaus sees that Patroclus has fallen and goes up to
bestride the body in its defence (17. 1–8); from the Trojan side Euphorbus
comes up and warns Menelaus to withdraw from the body (9–17): οἶδ'... ἀμέλησει... Πατρόκλου πεσόντος ἁμύμωνος ἁγχίς δ' ἄρ' αὐτός ἔστη, καὶ προσέπεπεν ἄρρητως Ἑνελάον | "Ἀτρείδη Μενέλαιο,... | χάζεοι, λείπε δὲ νεκρόν, έα δ' ἐναρα βροτόκεντα" (9–13). Here there is indeed a significant
change of person: Euphorbus comes and stands near the dead Patroclus (αὐτός,
10) and proceeds to address Menelaus (11). However, this example has two

13. Of particular interest to the student of formulaic systems are ἐγγύθεν ἱστάμενος in the
middle of a line at II. 17. 582, where again the sense excludes the ἐγχίς ἵσταμενος;
and Od. 1. 120, where the reverse process operates and ἐγγύθη δὲ στὰς at the end of a line
replaces the usual ἁγχίς παραστάς. By lowering the qualifications for entry to the system one
could extend it still further (e.g. by admitting cases with a verb of speaking + παραστάς but
no ἁγχίς-/ἐγχίς-, such as II. 6. 75f., or cases with a verb of speaking + ἁγχίς-/ἐγχίς- but no (-)παρα-
verb, such as II. 11. 346), but one has to draw the line somewhere.

14. I say 'is said to stand'. I include not only cases where ἁγχίς-/ἐγχίς- governs an
expressed noun or preposition – i.e. Il. 7. 225, Od. 10. 400, and, presumably, Il. 6. 405, 17. 338, 23. 304 –
but also cases where the person 'near' whom the speaker stands is to be inferred from the
context.

15. In one of these cases – Il. 2. 790 – I take it that this formulation simply needs turning
into the plural as 'The people addressed are those near whom the speaker is said to stand'.
This seems clear enough from 786–9 Τροσίν δ' ἁγγελαῖ ήλθε... of δ'... πάντως ἀμφιχείρες, and Iris
does in fact proceed to address the Trojans in general: first Priam (795–801), then
"Εκτόρ, σοὶ δὲ μάλιστή', which implies that her instructions, while directed primarily to
Hector, are meant for the other Trojans too (cf. the formulation at Il. 1. 15f., Od. 13. 36–9).
The switch to the singular μνὲ as the object of ἰποθέη at 795 (for μνὲ is probably never plural
in Homer), taking up the Πρώμοι of 791 (Iris as Priam's son addressing his father), while of
course formulaically convenient is justified by the opening ἂ γέρον κ.τ.λ., 696–801. K. F.
Ames and C. Hentze in their edition of the Iliad ad loc. (Band 1 Heth 1, 6th ed. Leipzig 1903)
take the object of ἰποθή in 790 to be 'μνὲ, wie 795, d.i. Priamos', but acknowledge that 'die
Beziehung auf Πρώμοι 788 sehr erschwert ist': on this interpretation (which strikes me as
very forced) ἐγγύς would presumably mean 'near Priam' and the singular formulation of
my rule would apply without alteration.

At Il. 16. 537 there is some ambiguity, but there is no reason to suppose that ἐγγύς and
προσφέρα govern different (understood) nouns: presumably the meaning is either that
Glaucus comes and stands near, and addresses, Hector, the Trojan named immediately before
the speech-introduction (536) and addressed immediately after it ("Εκτόρ,..., 538–43) (and
then the vocative φίλοι in 544 widens the address to include all Trojans within earshot); or –
and this I regard as more probable – that Glaucus finds Hector and Aeneas together (cf. 17.
483ff., where the same two warriors are addressed) and then addresses both, first Hector
(538–49) and then the two of them jointly (ἀλλὰ, φίλοι, πάρτοτι... 544–7). In either
event, exhortation in similar terms addressed to Poultydamas and Agenor (535), and perhaps
other unspecified Trojan leaders, will be understood from the context, including the parallel-
ism between 532f. and 534–6: in view of the new start βῆ δὲ in 536 we cannot suppose that
all four Trojans named are together.
important features which mark it off from the interpretation of *Od*. 10. 455 under consideration. First, the change of person from Patroclus to Menelaus is not merely left to the understanding but is made completely explicit: προσέτεκεν at *II*. 17.11 has an object expressed, to mark the change, whereas προσηνίδα at *Od*. 10. 455 does not. Second, whereas there is no good reason why Circe should be said to come and stand near Odysseus before addressing his companions, there is every reason why Euphorbus should be said to come and stand near the dead Patroclus before addressing Menelaus: he is eager to gain access to the body and its armour (9–13, quoted above) and considers he has a special right to the spoils as the first Trojan to have struck Patroclus (13–16); Menelaus merely happens to be in the way. Thus it is not legitimate to use *II*. 17. 10f. in support of this interpretation of *Od*. 10. 455: the former example serves only to illustrate the conditions which would need to be present in the latter to justify the interpretation but which are in fact lacking.

We should next consider whether προσηνίδα can govern an understood ημέας as a sort of extension of the expressed μεν, either with or without 456. Ameis-Hentze, who regard 456 as an interpolation and apparently understand ημέας rather than σφέας with προσηνίδα, explain, ‘Kirke trat hier nahe zum Odysseus (455), weil dieser sich unter seinen Gefährten befand.’ With σφέας this explanation would border on the absurd; but even with ημέας it still serves only to point up the awkwardness of 455. What worries Ameis-Hentze about 456 is that elsewhere this vocative line is always followed by words addressed specifically to Odysseus himself; but a similar objection applies to 455: nowhere else within the δύκα group does a speaker come and stand near an individual and then immediately address a group; nowhere else do δύκα–/ευγγ– and the verb of addressing govern different nouns (expressed or understood) except in one case where, unlike here, the change of person is made explicit; and although an understood ημέας as the object of προσηνίδα is a less abrupt change from μεν than σφέας would be, the syntax of the line, the identical line 400 and the whole ευγγ group combine to create a strong expectation that the object will be με. Moreover, why should Circe approach Odysseus himself (for that is what the Greek naturally suggests) only to address the group as a whole? The answer ‘Because he is the leader of the group’ is unsatisfactory in view of

16. It seems probable that at 17. 9–17, as W. Leaf believes (*The Iliad* 12nd ed. London 1900–02, repr. Amsterdam 1960) ad loc., the poet thinks of Patroclus’s armour as still on his body, in spite of 16. 793–804 and 815: note the references to Hector’s subsequent stripping of the armour at 17. 125, 186f., 205f., 19. 412, 22. 322f., and see F. M. Combellack, *TAPA* 96 (1965) 47–51. At any rate, at 17. 13 and 91f. Menelaus is represented as defending both the body and its armour, so that both must at least be in roughly the same spot; and even if the dead Patroclus is no longer clothed in his armour, Euphorbus may desire to carry off not only the armour but also (as the Trojans certainly desire later) the body itself. However, it is sufficient for the purposes of the argument in my text to note the way in which Euphorbus himself closely associates the body and its armour at 17. 13.

the context: Circe starts, "μηχεττι νυν θαλερδν γον δρντε" – but Odysseus is the only member of the group who is not crying; and this brings us back to an earlier point: Circe is not addressing the group as a whole, i.e. Odysseus and his companions, but only his companions; hence ημετας is unacceptable because it would include με, and exclude it in such a way as to give it considerable emphasis through the expressed με. It follows that ημετας is even more unacceptable in this respect if one gives further emphasis to the με by reading 456: so Richmond Lattimore in his translation (New York 1965): ‘But she . . . came close and said to us: “Son of Laertes . . ., no longer raise the swell of your lamentation.”’ Cf. Merry: line 456 ‘may well stand, for Odysseus shows, by using ημιν in v. 466, that he feels himself included in the address.’

Of course if his companions are to remain with Circe, Odysseus must agree too, and I can concede that her speech is meant to be overheard by him; but its structure and content make it clear that the whole of it, and not merely its opening clause, is actually addressed only to the weeping companions, whom she is trying to cheer; she offers them her sympathy, diagnoses their condition and prescribes a remedy. Syntactically and logically, everything flows from that opening μηχεττι νυν θαλερδν γον δρντε – which, as we have seen, cannot be applied to Odysseus.

Circe rightly assumes that the companions’ present emotion can be seen as a manifestation of a constantly overwrought state stemming from the terrible sufferings of the past, the memory of which constantly haunts them and renders them αθυμοι (457–65). I do not think it is over-subtle to interpret her generalization as partly an attempt to exculpate herself from her own contribution to their low morale. However, her diagnosis, as far as it goes, is correct. It should therefore be interpreted in the light of the whole of Odysseus’s story thus far (9. 12–10. 454); to confine ourselves to what Circe has herself directly observed would be an artificial kind of realism, especially as she explicitly professes to know of their past sufferings and accurately summarizes them (457–9).

Now I think it is worth suggesting – though this point is not central to my case – that the αθυμια which Circe describes (461–5) corresponds far more closely to the state of the companions than to that of Odysseus himself. Of course Odysseus is not immune to despondency himself, but throughout the Aeaea episode so far the poet has contrasted his courage, initiative and control with the timidity,
pessimism and abandoned emotionalism of his companions.\textsuperscript{21} We have already mentioned the three tearful reunions 397–9, 408–20, 453f.: on each occasion the companions' tears are brought on by an overwhelming sense of relief; they mark a release of tension, and the intensity of the companions' emotion is a measure of the fear, anxiety, distress and low morale which have possessed them before the reunions and which, though they stem immediately from the actions of Circe, have become a habitual state of mind as a result of earlier sufferings – the storms at sea (9. 67–83, 10. 46–55), a long and gruelling spell of rowing (10. 78–80) and their encounters with the Cicones (9. 39–66), the Cyclops (9. 106–566) and the Laestrygonians (10. 81–134). Of the three reunions the one between Odysseus and the companions who have not been turned into pigs (10. 408–20) is actually the most poignant, and brings out most clearly the contrast between Odysseus and his companions, while illustrating the extent of their dependence on him: they react to his reappearance as though they had reached their native Ithaca, and are likened to lowing calves frisking round their returning mothers. Conversely, even before Eurylochus's ominous report (251–60), the mere mention by Odysseus that he has seen smoke in the middle of the island – a hint that he deems it necessary to seek help from whoever lives there – is enough to conjure up all the terrors of the past in his companions: \textit{τοῦτων δὲ κατεκλάσθη φίλον ἦτορ} \textit{μνησιμένοις ἔργαν Λαιαστρυγόνος ᾽Αντιφάτου | Κύκλωπός τε βίης μεγαλήτορος, ἄνδροφύγου} (198–200);\textsuperscript{22} as Circe says, they are \textit{ἀθυμοι}, \textit{αἰὲν ἀληθῆς χαλεπῆς} \textit{μεμημένοι} (463f.; cf. 459 [οἶδα] ἦδ' δ' ἀνάροιοι ἄνδρες ἐθηλήσαντ' ἐπὶ χέρσου). But while his companions are paralysed by the past, Odysseus retains control of himself and of the situation and looks constructively to the future, exploring the island (144–50), expressing optimism (174f.) and organizing an expedition to Circe's house (151–5, 187–208).\textsuperscript{23} Moreover, the poet marks Odysseus off from his companions by making him assume a role towards them in 172–84 which is similar to that assumed by Circe in 457–65: as usual, the companions' morale is low (note the implications of \textit{ἐκ δὲ καλοψάμενοι} in 179); Odysseus, like Circe, cheers them with words, provides them with food and encourages them to eat and drink. On both occasions it is the companions rather than Odysseus who need the mothering. Finally, Odysseus has shown plenty of

\textsuperscript{21} Admittedly the poet tells the story here through the mouth of Odysseus, but we have no reason to suppose that Odysseus distorts the truth in order to present himself in a favourable light at the expense of his companions - note e.g. his acknowledgment of his own despondency at \textit{Od}. 10. 49–54, and see Merry (above, n. 3) on 10. 97; and if we do suppose that he is colouring the story in his own favour, then the natural presumption is that this colouring would tend to persist in 10. 455–65, i.e. that Odysseus would wish to depict Circe as applying her diagnosis of \textit{ἀθυμία} only to his companions: in other words, the speech of Circe which we must interpret is the speech as narrated, like the whole of the \textit{Apologoi}, by Odysseus.

\textsuperscript{22} Cf. Eurylochus's reference to the Cyclops at 435–7.

\textsuperscript{23} The speech of Odysseus at 189–97 should not be regarded as totally pessimistic: I shall discuss its interpretation in \textit{Acta Classica} 18 (1975).
spirit in his dealings with Circe: note especially 321f. ἐγὼ δ' ἔδρα ὥσπερ ἐρυσόμενον παρὰ μηροῦ | Κήρη ἐπήξα ὡς τε κτάμεναι μενεάνον.

Enough has now been said, I trust, to show that neither 455f. nor 455 alone gives a satisfactory sense.

Let us now consider a number of possible solutions to the difficulty:

(1) The poet mechanically repeats two lines already used a little earlier (at 400f.), without being conscious of their inappropriateness here, or without bothering about it (and the weak attestation of 456 is due to excision by Aristarchus); or he mechanically repeats only the first line (455), the second being an interpolation.

Now it is a commonplace of present-day Homeric criticism that the formulaic method of composition, with its tendency for 'the general [to] take precedence over the particular', sometimes leads the poet to use a familiar expression or idea in a context where it is less than fully appropriate; but the inconsistency here seems too glaring, and of the wrong kind, to be naturally explained by this principle, whether we read 455f. or only 455. The poet knows that Circe is about to address the weeping companions, and is perfectly capable of saying so, and ordinary carelessness is not likely to lead him to tell us that she is about to address Odysseus, still less that she prefaces her speech with the vocative "...Οὖορσεί".

Before proceeding I should state that I regard it as certain that Od. 10. 456 is an interpolation. The external and internal evidence combine in support of this conclusion, and the external evidence makes it highly probable that the line entered the text for the first time after Aristarchus. If the interpolation is deliberate, the purpose of the interpolator was presumably to improve the text by assimilating the environment of 455 to the sequence 400f. and/or 487–9. It is possible, however, that the accession of 456 is accidental: then either, under the influence of 400f., it will be one of those 'unconscious glidings into familiar combinations' posited by Bolling; or else it will be due to one of those confusions where a copyist's eye, probably during the process of correction, has strayed from one line to a similar one not far away with results such as H. 13. 567a=543 (homoioiteleuton 567, 542), Od. 11. 266a=261 (homoioarchon 266, 260), Od. 12. 240a=237 (homoioteleuton 240, 236, perhaps aided by homoioarchon 241, 238), Od. 8. 348a=353, 13. 339a=343, 17. 577a=581

24. F. M. Combellack, TAPA 96 (1965) 49.
25. An adequate defence of this statement would require far more space than I can permit myself within the confines of this article. However, a necessary qualification can be made here: where the incongruity of a formula is, in strict logic, gross, it is liable to be much less gross, and sometimes even trifling, in terms of the formulaic style: thus, for example, the phrase πόντων μῆτηρ is a fixed, frequently-used combination (21 times in H., 13 times in Od., always at the end of a line) which for the poet is hardly more than a metrically longer semantic equivalent of the simple μῆτηρ: hence at Od. 18. ᾃ, where the beggar Irus is given a πόντων μῆτηρ, the carelessness is easy to understand. However, the incongruity at Od. 10. 455 remains harsh and difficult to account for.
(homoioiteleuta), though the gap between Od. 10. 455 and 400 is too wide for this explanation to be more than a slight possibility.

In the 'possible solutions' which follow, the omission of 456 will be taken for granted.

(2) How can the poet adapt the formula \[ \delta \varepsilon \mu \varepsilon \varphi \eta \chi \varphi \sigma \tau \rho \sigma \alpha \sigma \alpha \], with minimum alteration, for use when someone other than the narrator is approached? By substituting \( \mu \alpha \lambda \) for \( \mu \varepsilon \varepsilon \), as he does at Od. 6. 56. We may wonder, then, whether we should read \( \delta \varepsilon \mu \varepsilon \varphi \eta \chi \varphi \sigma \tau \rho \sigma \alpha \sigma \alpha \) at Od. 10. 455: the corruption would have occurred very early, by unconscious assimilation to the wording of 400. This may at first seem satisfactory enough; it is entirely normal in the \( \varphi \eta \chi \varphi \sigma \tau \rho \sigma \alpha \sigma \alpha \) group for both the object of the verb of speaking and the person near whom the speaker stands to be omitted, both being understood from the context, and with this emendation it would be clear that the noun to be supplied was in both places 'the companions', understood from the lines immediately preceding. However, though the original difficulty is now removed, a new one is created: the companions – all 45 of them – are presumably scattered through the hall, and it makes little sense to say that Circe 'stood very close to them [all]'. Moreover, within the \( \varphi \eta \chi \varphi \sigma \tau \rho \sigma \alpha \sigma \alpha \) group of formulae it is rare for the speaker to approach and address a group rather than an individual. I think there is sufficient force in these objections to render this solution unlikely.

(3) Bérard deserves credit for having seen the awkwardness of the traditional text: he suggests \( \varphi \varepsilon \chi \varphi \rho \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \sigma \tau \rho \sigma \alpha \sigma \alpha \), whether standing for \( \varphi \varepsilon \chi \varphi \rho \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \sigma \tau \rho \sigma \alpha \sigma \alpha \) or \( \varphi \varepsilon \chi \varphi \rho \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \), would include Odysseus as one of those addressed; the emphasis given to him by \( \varepsilon \mu \varepsilon \varepsilon \) would be removed and the degree of illogicality substantially reduced, but the switch from the third (453f.) to the first person plural would be surprising in the circumstances. Moreover, Bérard's proposal is open to the same objections (though admittedly in a milder form) as those which I raised against \( \mu \alpha \lambda \) \( \varphi \eta \chi \varphi \sigma \tau \rho \sigma \alpha \sigma \alpha \).
(4) If we are to have an ἀγχι formula, the most apposite version would be ἄγχοι δ' ἵσταμένη προσεφώνει δία θεῶν (=Od. 5. 159). Unlike Bérard’s ἀμμ’, this would appropriately exclude Odysseus: the reference would be to his weeping companions (449–54). The formula is further from the paradosis than Bérard’s conjecture, but the corruption could have occurred easily enough in the process of oral transmission. However, as we have seen, an ἀγχι formula is not particularly appropriate here.44

(5) I believe that what the poet himself is most likely to have said is η δ’ ἐν μέσσῳ στόα σωτήρα δία θεῶν, which recurs at 12.20. Interestingly enough, and I believe significantly, in a sequence which has much in common with 10.455ff.: Circe is again in the presence of Odysseus’s party; there is a similar appeal to eat and drink (10.460=12.23, only here in Homer), a similar willingness to do so (10.466=12.27) and similar feasting (10.468–12.30; 10.476ff. =12.29ff.); note also the close structural parallelism between 10.467–9 and 12.29–31). Then in both passages night falls and the companions go to sleep (10.478=12.31; 10.479, cf. 12.32), while Circe briefs Odysseus on the immediate future (10.480ff., cf. 12.33ff.); then comes dawn (10.541=12.142) and departure (11.6–10=12.148–52,35 which as a sequence occurs only here in Homer46). I have assumed here that 10.475–9 are authentic, at least in the sense of being not later than the incorporation of the Nekyia into the Odyssey; the question will be debated below. However, even if we suppose that the lines are a late interpolation, there still remain sufficient similarities between the two sequences, especially between 10.455–74 and 12.20–32, to justify my insistence on the parallelism.) Much of the repetition, when one looks at it in isolated chunks, is formulaic; what needs stressing is the overall sequence of ideas (and thus, to a lesser extent, of lines) common to both passages. Considered on its own, this evidence would strongly suggest that one passage was to a considerable extent modelled on the other, or at any rate that the two were conceived as a pair; and if we are persuaded by other evidence that the Underworld episode was incorporated into the Odyssey — whether by the Odyssey-poet

34. I confine to a footnote two negative points:

(a) The unmetrical variant ἄγχι παρατάσσᾳ found in some MSS. does not provide us with any positive help in our search for the true text.

(b) Ludwich (above, n. 27) states ad loc.: ‘455...γρ’ ἔναντα’, ἀπενενηκὼς Μα (η μὲν ἔναντα στα—? η δὲ μ’ ἔναντα στα—? an ad 453 referendum?)’ (Ma refers to the scholia in Ven. Marc. 613. = Dindorf’s Μ). It should be noted that the first two interpretations suggested by Ludwich do not get rid of the awkward reference to Odysseus, and the first omits the essential connective; but it is virtually certain that his third explanation is the correct one, particularly in view of the fact that Dindorf’s V scholia note on 453 ἀπένενηκαν ἔναντα ἀπενενηκος: in both the M and V scholia, incidentally, ἔναντα may well be a slip for the ἐν τούτῳ found at 453 in some MSS., mentioned as a variant by Schol. H, and now accepted as the correct text. The M scholiast, then, does not help us to establish the text of 455.

35. Except for the first word of 11.9, 12.151.

36. Moreover, three of the five lines are not found anywhere else in Homer (and I do not count 11.10 = 12.152, which in two other places is used in the plural of a whole fleet and is clearly a formula).
himself (however we define him) or by someone else – after the composition of most of the remainder of the poem, then our judgment is both confirmed in general and needs refining in details; we shall then be inclined to hold some such view as the following: the later insertion starts at 10.490 and ends at about 12.38, and originally the poet passed from 10.489 to 12.39 (or to 12.37 συ δ’ ἄκουσον) via a few transitional lines; then 12.20–35 will be modelled on 10.455–89; the conception of a long nocturnal private conversation in which Circe tells Odysseus of the future, followed by dawn and departure, will be original at 10.480–89 + 12.39–152, derivative at 10.490–11.10; and I think we can still say that whoever incorporated the Underworld episode into the Odyssey did conceive the two longer sequences 10.455–11.10 and 12.20–152 as a pair. It follows from all this – and particularly from the close verbal correspondences between 10.455–79 and 12.20–35 – that both sequences may well have commenced with the same line: more precisely, if we have reason to believe that 10.455 is corrupt, 12.20 is the natural place to turn to for a remedy. The elaborate demonstration of the parallelism has been necessary because at present the line 12.20 occurs nowhere else in Homer: it cannot be taken for granted that the line (or even its first four feet) is a ready-made formulaic expedient, and the parallelism appreciably increases the chances that it once stood at 10.455. Its inherent appropriateness for this position is obvious: it removes the difficulties of our present text without creating any new ones; ἐν μέσῳ καὶ μετηνόδα, while placing Circe in an appropriate position, continue


38. So (with the συ δ’ ἄκουσον version) U. von Wilamowitz, Homeri sche Untersuchungen (Berlin 1884) 144 (except that he allowed for the possibility that the ‘original’ portion of our present Book 10 ends somewhat earlier than line 489 [pp. 143ff.]). There are of course variations on this theory. The reader should be warned, however, that the summary of scholars’ opinions given by G. Bona, Studi sull’Odissea (Turin 1966) 55 n. 4, contains some misrepresentations. First, Bona says that according to Wilamowitz (loc. cit) ‘Originariamente ... a κ 489 seguivano μ 38–142, cioè alla richiesta di Odisseo di partire seguivano subito le istruzioni di Circe’. Bona gives us no hint that Wilamowitz posited some intervening material, now lost, between 10.489 and 12.37 συ δ’ ἄκουσον: ‘Auf κ 489 folgte der Überleitende gedanke “gewiss sollst du morgen abfahren; das führt aber zu neuen gefahren” ’ (Wilamowitz loc. cit.). This makes an important difference to the plausibility of Wilamowitz’s thesis. Secondly, Bona says that W. Theiler, Museum Helveticum 7 (1950) 105, ‘ha proposto di far seguire immediatamente a κ 489 μ 23’. However, Bona omits to tell us that Theiler (p. 106) envisages after 10.489 an immediate continuation which has little in common with our 12.23–36. Thirdly, Bona rejects the idea of excising κ 476–479, che mancano in alcuni manoscritti, presumably echoing Theiler’s ‘476–479 mit einem Zweig der Überlieferung ... zu streichen, ist nicht zulässig’. Both statements give a misleading impression of the manuscript tradition: there are manuscripts which omit 475–9, but none which omit only 476–9. This point is relevant to our subsequent discussion of the authenticity of 475–9.

39. Except that 12.145f. at least must postdate the introduction of the Nekyia: the departure-scene is here adapted to the circumstances described in 12.32–4. Originally, 12.142 may perhaps have been followed by 10.542–50 or 546–50. Cf. Wilamowitz (above, n. 38) p. 144.

40. The only parallel to this line with μέσῳ (and it is not a particularly close one) is ii.7.384 στὰς ἐν μέσῳ μετεφώνειν ἡπότα κηρυ. 22
the reference of 449-54 to the companions, and with the omission of 456 and the content of 457 it is quite clear that it is they who are addressed.\textsuperscript{41} The corruption of 455 is easy to account for: ἐὰν δὲ ἐν μέσῳ στάσα μετημύδα διὰ θέαν ὁν ἡ ἡ δὲ μεν ἀγχι στᾶσα προσημύδα διὰ θέαν, into which it was unconsciously altered, through a recollection of the shortly preceding line 400, at a very early stage of the transmission, though whoever incorporated the Nekyia into the Odyssey (and composed 12. 20–37) presumably knew the line in its original form. The nature of the corruption and the fact that it is found in all the extant MSS. make it easier to account for if we assume that it arose during the pre-written stage of the transmission. In any event, it is likely that the confusion of 455 with 400 was partly caused by the similarity between the content of 453f. and that of 397–9.

We now come to the question of the genuineness of Od. 10. 475–9. By ‘genuine’ in this context I mean ‘either inserted at the stage when the Nekyia was incorporated into the Odyssey, or present in the Odyssey before this’;\textsuperscript{42} ‘interpolated’ will consequently mean ‘inserted at a later date’ – and on the external evidence the natural assumption will be that, if the lines are interpolated, they did not enter the text until the period after Aristarchus. The further question whether the lines, if genuine, antedate the incorporation of the Nekyia will be discussed subsequently.

I now print Od. 10. 471–85:

\begin{quote}
καὶ τότε μὴ ἐκκαλάσαντες ἔφαν ἐρήμες ἑταῖροι·

δαμόνι, ἡδὴ νῦν μεμνήσκει πατρίδος οἶχος,

εἰ τοῖς ἠθεοφατόν ἔστι σαιωθήναι καὶ ἱκέσθαι

οἶκον ἐκτίμησον καὶ σὴν ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν.

\end{quote}

475 ὁς ἔφαν, αὐτάρ ἐμοὶ γα' ἐπεπείθετο θυμὸς ἀγήνωρ.

ὁς τότε μὲν πρόκαν ἡμαρ ἐς ἡδίλλον καταδότα

ἡμεθα, δαινύμενοι κρέα τ' ἀσπετα καὶ μέθυ ἦδό-

ἡμος δ' ἡδίλλοι κατέδυ καὶ ἐπὶ κνέφας ἡλθεν,

οἱ μὲν κοιμήσαντο κατά μέγαρα σκιόντα,

480 αὐτάρ ἐγὼ Κύρκης ἐπίθας περικαλλέος εἰπής·

481 γούν τίνα ἐλλητίνεος, ἦν δὲ μοι ἐκλευεν αὐδής·

483 "ὁ δ' Κύρκη, τέλεσθαν μοι ὑπόσχεσθαι ἂν περ ὀπέστης,

οἴκῳ δὲ πεμψμενα· θυμὸς δ' μοι ἔσσυται ἦδη,

485 ἦδ' ἄλλων ἑταῖρων . . . ."

482 καὶ μὲν φανήσας ἐπεὶ περόντα προσημύδων om. codd. nonnulli.\textsuperscript{43}

\textsuperscript{41} After μετημύδα and other μετ- verbs of speaking there is often no vocative when the people actually addressed are the same as those “among” whom the speaker speaks.

\textsuperscript{42} See, however, n. 80 below.

\textsuperscript{43} This line is almost certainly a post-Aristarchean interpolation: see G. M. Bolling, ‘On the Interpolation of Certain Homeric Formulas’, CP 17 (1922) 213–21, and note that the early MSS. L4 Pal. U5 (Allen’s sigla) are among those which omit the line.
This time we can conveniently start with the internal evidence. Bolling and many others regard the passage as an interpolation. Blass says, 'Die Aussonderung der Verse geht ganz glatt; ich wundere mich, dass Kirchhoff sie für den Zusammenhang nicht missen zu können glaubt'; but Merry comments ad loc., 'Perhaps they were inserted as a stop-gap; the transition from 474 to 480 being decidedly abrupt. We should expect an answer from Odysseus to the remonstrance made by his comrades.' The transition would indeed be 'decidedly abrupt', and this abruptness, with its satisfactory removal by 475-9, can be used in favour of the genuineness of the passage if we do not regard the limited external evidence against it as decisive. What we actually expect immediately after 474 is, first, a formula such as ἀξιὸν ἔργον to mark the end of the quotation – some such formula is virtually universal in Homer where the quotation is not immediately followed by an answering-formula; and next, a statement from Odysseus, whether to his companions or direct to his Phaeacian audience, telling us explicitly whether or not he agrees with the feeling expressed by his companions: 475 tells us explicitly that he does, and implies that he communicates his agreement to his companions; there is no need for him to quote the words of his reply. Moreover, 476-9 are entirely appropriate: as the whole year (467f.), so the last day of it, but after 471-5 we are aware that a turning-point has been reached and assume that departure is imminent, and from their context 476-9 take on an air of finality, almost poignantly backward-looking yet at the same time full of expectancy; and the expectancy is reinforced by the syntactical build-up (τότε μὲν ... ἐξ ἕλαυν

---

44. For a list see Bolling, External Evidence 26: add Von der Mühll (above, n. 2) and Ameis-Hentze, Anhang (above, n. 17) to those who condemn the lines.

45. F. Blass, Die Interpolationen in der Odyssee (Halle 1904) 119; his reference is to A. Kirchhoff, Die Homeri sche Odyssee (Berlin 1879) p. 221.

46. Op. cit. (above, n. 3). Cf. Ameis-Hentze, Anhang (above, n. 17) ad loc.: 'Die Verse scheinen ... eine zur vorausgehenden Erzählung unpassende Ergänzung einer alten Lücke zu sein. Denn man vernimmt hier die Antwort des Odysseus und was nach derselben bis zum Vortrag der Bitte an Kirke geschehen ist'.

47. Though I have not conducted an exhaustive search, it is perhaps worth reporting that I have come across only three significant exceptions: (1) Il. 21. 435 (the external evidence indicates that 434 is an interpolation): the harsh transition can perhaps be seen as characteristic of the author of the Theomachy, if the passage 21. 385–513 is indeed a post-Homeric intrusion: see Leaf (above, n. 16) Vol. II p. 382 and his notes on lines 434 and 480; (2) and (3) Od. 1. 360 = 21. 354, where ἢ μὲν θαμβήσασα πάτρινον ἰχθύς βρέθηκε immediately follows Telemaeactus's speech: here however it is just conceivable that the poet allowed himself to omit the concluding formula because of the explicit reference to Telemaeactus's speech in the next line, παῦετος γὰρ μύθον πεπνυμένον ἔθεσεν θυμόν (1. 361 = 21. 355). In the other exceptions which I have noted there is an obvious special justification for the omission of the concluding formula: e.g. Od. 18. 405 is, in the circumstances, roughly equivalent to an answering-formula: cf. Il. 14. 109, Od. 11. 342; there is no concluding formula after Od. 2. 330, but 324–36 are conceived as a unit – the typical remarks of the suitors – and there is such a formula at 337; cf. Od. 21. 396–404, Il. 10. 277–95; at Il. 12. 317–21 the speech is hypothetical (ἀπαντᾷ τις ἰδίᾳ) and the usual concluding formula would not be appropriate.

48. I confess that I feel none of the “surprise” which Bérard (above, n. 2) ad loc. declares it is impossible not to feel at the repetition of 468 at 477.
καταδύνα... ἦμος δὲ ἤξιος κατέδυ... οἱ μὲν... ἀνάρ ἐγώ...). Θείλερ
objects that 'nach ἐμοί γ' ἐπεπείθετο θυμός πασιν ὀς τότε μὲν πρόπαν ἠμαρ
... ἡμεθα σχελετρείδες νιχ';49 but this objection cannot be sustained: the
μὲν-clause of 476f. looks forward to the answering δὲ-clause of 478, a temporal
clause which itself looks forward to the main clauses of 479–81; and the 479
μὲν-clause looks forward to 480ff. ἀνάρ ἐγώ... where Odysseus actually
approaches Circe with his request to be sent home. 476–9, then, serve as
preparation for 480ff., and the double μὲν emphasizes their preparatory charac-
ter. It is true that the ὀς ('And so...') of 476, in the places where the formulaic
sequence 476–8 recurs, forges a direct logical link between what has gone before
and the τότε μὲν... clause itself,50 but on this occasion it looks further ahead,
as the syntax certainly entitles it to do;51 the thought in 467–86 is roughly:
'We spent a whole year there feasting; then my companions suggested to me
that it was time I was heading for home. I was persuaded; and so, when the sun
had set on our final day of feasting, and my companions had gone to bed, I
went to Circe's bed and begged her to send me home.' 478f. provide the proper
preparation for 480ff. by marking nightfall, putting the companions to bed and
separating Odysseus from them, as at 12. 31–3; moreover, I think it is worth
pointing out that these are parallels between the two passages 10. 455–11. 10
and 12. 20–152 which we miss if 10. 475–9 are omitted: that is to say, if in the
first passage we find the sequence A B C D E F, I think the natural presumption is that
we should remove the question-mark after the D in the first passage. In any case, the mention
of nightfall at 10. 478 is virtually indispensable: Circe's speech ends at dawn in
our present Odyssey (10. 541), as presumably the speech which replaced it
(mainly 12. 39–141) in the posited earlier Odyssey without the Nekyia would have ended: 10. 541=12. 142.52 Moreover, at dawn, in our present poem,
Odysseus rouses his companions from their sleep (10. 548 "Μηκέτι νῦν ἔθοντες
ἀνατείνα γλυκὸν ὕπνον"), and may well have done the same soon after 12. 142
before the Nekyia was added, perhaps even using the same words;53 and this
not only strengthens the case for the necessity of 10. 478 but also makes it

49. Loc. cit. (above, n. 38). However, Theiler regards 475 as 'original' and 476–9 as part
of an 'Übergangsstück' designed to join the Nekyia to the Circe-story.
50. Od. 9. 161f. with 168, 556–8, 10. 183–5, 12. 29–31; and, with variation, Od. 19. 424–6,
ll. 1. 601f. with 605; but on Od. 12. 29–31 see also below, n. 51.
51. Cf. 12. 29ff.: here the ὀς of 29 does link the τότε μὲν... clause of 29f. with 23f., but
it is presumably still active in 33–6, which introduce Circe's instructions to Odysseus (37–141)
as promised in 25–7.
52. 10. 480, if it were not preceded by 475–9, might tend to suggest that the action takes
place at night, but would not in itself demand this interpretation: cf. the almost identical line
347, where it is day. Thus I do not give 480 the same weight in my argument as 541–9. More-
over, whether or not 480 presupposes nightfall, it would certainly not do the job of the explicit
mention of nightfall at 478: the absence of such a time-reference in these circumstances
would be very surprising in the Homeric epic.
53. Cf. n. 39 above.
desirable that the companions’ going to bed should have been mentioned, as it is at 479. The internal evidence, then, shows not merely that 475–9 are entirely appropriate to their context but also that they are virtually indispensable to it, and gives us no reason to suppose that the lines we actually have are an interpolated replacement for lost genuine lines which once stood there. We should conclude that 475–9 are almost certainly genuine — if the slight weakness in the attestation can easily be reconciled with this conclusion.

The lines are omitted only by Allen’s H3 (saec. xiii)44 and by all or some of the four members (all saec. xv) of his family f.55 In other words, only a tiny fraction of the seventy or so extant MSS. containing Book 10 omit the lines. There are no papyri. There is no comment on the lines in the scholia, but this hardly tells against them in view of their formulaic nature and the fragmentary state of the Odyssean scholia.

The oft-repeated assertion that Eustathius ‘omits’ the lines56 is an error:

(1) There are many lines in Homer, found in all our MSS., which Eustathius does not quote, paraphrase, summarize or comment on. Into this class frequently fall transitional lines, formulaic lines and even sequences of formulaic lines. Thus, e.g., (a) Eustathius makes no reference to Od. 17. 1–4. (b) The ‘typical scene’ beginning χέρνιβα δ’ ἀμφίπολος προχόφῳ ἐπέχειν φέρονος, describing preparations for a meal, occurs (with some slight variation) five times in the Odyssey in all our MSS. and a sixth time (10. 368–72) in about two-thirds of them. At the first occurrence, 1. 136–43, Eustathius gives an exhaustive commentary. At 4. 52–8 he makes no reference to the lines. The only reference to 7. 172–6 is contained in a note on 7. 166 (at 1576. 16), where χαρπομένη παρεόντος of 176 is cited in a comment on ἐνδον ἔννοιαν of 166. He makes no reference at all to 10. 368–72, 15. 135–9 or 17. 91–5: the first of these three passages is almost certainly an interpolation, as the weak attestation, including omission by a papyrus, indicates, but in view of Eustathius’s practice elsewhere the statement ‘omittit Eustathius’ by Ludwich, Allen and Bérard is of minimal value, if not positively misleading: ‘non memorat Eustathius’ would be more accurate.57 (c) We now come to the passage under discussion. First, Od. 10. 475 is an instance of a formulaic line whose constant elements are ὅς ἔφαγεν + a dative pronoun + ἐπεπάθετο θυμός ἀγήνωρ. This formula occurs in eight other places in Homer, all of them in the Odyssey. Of these eight examples Eustathius paraphrases the first, Od. 2. 103 (at 1436. 17), but completely

---

54. Op cit. (above, n. 6). A second hand has added the lines in the margin: see Ludwich’s edition (above, n. 27) ad loc.
55. Cf. n. 7 above and n. 65 below.
56. This assertion is made by Ameis-Hentze, Anhang (above, n. 17), Ludwich (above, n. 27), Merry (above, n. 3), Blass (above, n. 43), Allen (above, n. 6) and Bérard (above, n. 2).
57. Incidentally, the same criticism applies to the assertion, made by all those listed in n. 56 above, that Eustathius omits 10. 482 (cf. n. 43 above). In fact Eustathius is completely silent on 480f. as well.
ignores the remaining seven.\textsuperscript{58} Secondly, how does Eustathius deal with the sequence 10. 476–9 at the places in the Odyssey where it recurs?\textsuperscript{59} At 9. 162f., 168f., the first two lines are quoted, but there is no reference to the second two. At 9. 556–9 there is only a brief mention of the whole sequence 9. 556–66 with a reference to lines περὶ δακτός καὶ ήπνου καὶ ἀπόσπασμα and to their ‘cento-like’ character. There is no reference at all to 10. 183–6. Of 12. 28–32, only the last line is referred to. 19. 424–7 are summarized.

Now in fact Eustathius, having quoted and commented on Od. 10. 472–4, immediately goes on to deal with Odysseus’s speech to Circe. However, we have said enough to show that this is entirely compatible with his reading 475–9 in his text.

(2) Fortunately, however, we can go further than this; for there is positive evidence that Eustathius did read 475–9. He does not deal with the passage as a whole; but 10. 477 = 10. 468, and in commenting on the (apparent\textsuperscript{60}) synecdoche διανύσμενοι . . . μέθεν ἆδιδ in 468 he says: πινοντες δηλαδὴ ὅ δὲ καὶ μετ’ ὀλίγα Ὑστέρας κείται, τότι δὲ τὸ ἐντελές πρὸ ὀλίγου ἐν τῷ “ἐσθίει τε βρώμην καὶ πιέτε οἴνον” (1664. 42–6). That is to say, just as he refers back to 10. 460, eight lines earlier (πρὸ ὀλίγου), so he refers forward to 10. 477, nine lines later: μετ’ ὀλίγα cannot refer to any other line, for apart from 477 nothing resembling 468 occurs until 12. 30, 776 lines later in the Wolfian printed vulgate.\textsuperscript{61} Therefore Eustathius read 477. Therefore his text could not have omitted the passage 475–9. The establishment of this fact is of some importance, primarily because it shortens the already short list of MSS. which omit the passage, but also for another reason, to be explained presently.

Even though the number of MSS. which omit the passage is small, the external evidence is in itself entirely compatible with the hypothesis that the passage entered the text only after Aristarchus: there are other post-Aristarchean interpolations which have found their way into nearly all our MSS. However,
particularly in view of the internal evidence, our question must be whether the external evidence is open to other explanations, based on the hypothesis that the lines are genuine, and how plausible these explanations are.

(1) On the assumptions outlined in my introduction, the chances that the external evidence reflects Aristarchus’s omission of a genuine passage which has re-entered the text are minimal. There is the added consideration here that Aristarchus would be most unlikely to omit a passage which looked so necessary to the context.

(2) In view of the fact that only a very few MSS. omit the passage, the weakness in the attestation may possibly reflect erroneous post-Aristarchean excision by some rash and incompetent amateur critic who had absorbed a smattering of Alexandrian critical principles: in this case 475–9 would have been regarded as a spurious repetition, with minimum adaptation, of 12. 28–32.62 Just how plausible one finds this thesis will depend largely on what one makes of the evidence (such as it is) for post-Aristarchean excision in general. This is a question which I hope to discuss elsewhere.

(3) However, I believe that the omission is most likely to be a mere transcriptional error. The error would probably have arisen in some such way as the following. A scribe read 474 in his exemplar and cursorily glanced at (or perhaps, without deliberate observation, simply half-noticed) the first half of 475. If the observation was deliberate, we can see a particular reason why he might want to look beyond the end of 474 before copying it: it is a formulaic line which occurs frequently in the Odyssey, almost like a refrain, both in exactly this form and in very similar forms,63 and would have presented no difficulty to his memory. He then wrote 474 in his apograph, then turned back to his exemplar, and a temptation to link an imperfect recollection of 475 aÚîatp Ò¡ot (or even a correct recollection of aÚîatp alone) with 480 aÚîatp ëgtå may have been strengthened by the slight homoiarchon 474 Ò¡ot Ëúxtimµ, 479 Ïìêv Ìµìµ. The extent of the homoiarchon, and hence the likelihood of accidental omission, is somewhat reduced if at 474 we read, with most MSS., Ò¡ot Ëúxtìµò; it may thus be significant that the MSS. which omit 475–9 are among the minority which read Ò¡ot Ëúxtìµòv. Eustathius reads Ëúxtìµò Ëúxtìµò without even mentioning a variant, but the allegation that he omits the lines has already been refuted. From Ludwich’s editions64 Bolling has gleaned nearly all the examples of accidental omission of a line or group of lines and listed them in AJP 37 (1916) 2–7 (Iliad) and 452–4 (Odyssey). As examples of omission of a group of lines extending from the line after the first

62. Cf. e.g. the scholium (H) on Od. 13. 398–401 giving the reason for Aristarchus’s athenesis of the lines: ãîçêëîçëåíò ìàèò çîòëåðèñîêîâ ëÀ êê òîâ ëêëìç [430–3] ìåòåííàìèíîâîâ — though in these two passages in 13, just as in 10. 475–9 and 12. 28–32, the repetition is not exact.

63. I list only the examples which have occurred before 10. 474: 4. 476, 5. 42, 115, 6. 315, 7. 77, 9. 533.

64. See above, n. 27.
leg of a homoiarchon to the line containing the second (as with the homoiarchon at *Od.* 10. 474, 479) one may cite *Il.* 23, 283f., *Od.* 1. 279–92, 2. 120f., 7. 89–91, 9. 169f., 12. 265–70, 13. 435f., 17. 491–3, 19. 331–3, each omitted by one of Ludwich’s MSS.; *Od.* 24. 28–31, omitted by two of Ludwich’s MSS., each from a different Allen family; and *Od.* 21. 334f., omitted by one of Allen’s families. In all these cases the homoiarchon is more pronounced than that in *Od.* 10. 474, 479, but I am assuming that the omission of 10. 475–9 was caused at any rate primarily, and perhaps solely, by the other homoiographon (in 475, 480). What homoiographa can we find resembling 10. 475 ... aιτηρ ἐμι, 480 αὐτῷ ἐγὼ, and leading to the omission of a group of lines extending from the line containing the first leg of the homoiarchon to the line before the second?

We can first cite a case where the presence of a special factor has probably drawn the scribe’s attention to a word in the line after the one he is about to copy: in the middle of *Od.* 8. 434 the word τρίσοδος occurs, and the scribe of Ludwich’s P (= Allen’s Pal.) presumably noticed that it recurred immediately below it in the middle of the next line (435 τρίσοδος); after writing 434 he returned to his exemplar and the τρίσοδος in the middle of 437 caught his eye; hence he next wrote 437, omitting 435f. Cf. the omission by Ludwich’s (= Allen’s) W of *Od.* 18. 92f. from its text: 91 ἐλάσσει ὡς μν, 92 ἦε μν ἦκ ἐλάσσει, 94 ἦκ ἐλάσσει, ἴναι μή μν, though we cannot be certain that 91 has played a part in the process leading to the omission. To return to *Od.* 10. 475–9: if the scribe deliberately looked at the beginning of 475 before writing 474, we may wonder why the opening ὡς ἐφαν did not stick in his mind. The answer is probably that this phrase was so unemphatic, routine and expected, amounting to little more than our closing quotation-marks, that it was taken for granted and made little impression on his memory. In any case, it is interesting that there is a very close parallel in the omission of *Il.* 4. 401f. from the text of Ludwich’s Db (= Allen’s M11): 401 begins ὡς φάετο, τὸν δ’ and 403 begins τὸν δ’.

Finally, an example with two homoiographa which I think comes fairly close to *Od.* 10. 475–9 is *Od.* 11. 29lf., omitted from the text of Ludwich’s P (= Allen’s Pal.): 290 ἐκ Ψυλάκης ἐλάσσει, 292 ἐξελάν; 291 ἄργαλεας, 293 ... ἄργαλεον; the

65. The family, q, comprises 11 MSS. Two are not extant at this point; and from the ‘om. q’ in Allen’s apparatus we can deduce no more than that a substantial proportion of the remainder omit the lines; cf. the lists of specimens of agreement within the various families (especially the larger ones) given by Allen in ‘The Text of the Odyssey’, Papers of the British School at Rome 5 (1910) 1–85. (A qualification of this sort will be taken for granted in my subsequent references to omissions by Allen’s families.) The homoiarchon which led to the omission of *Od.* 21. 334f. is actually 333 ἀνδρός, 335 ἀνδρός (not πατρός), read by (among others) Allen’s L8, the ancestor of his family g, and g = q minus L8.

66. *Od.* 19. 331–3 may be an exception – 330 τὸ, 333 τοῦ – but the operative homoiographon is probably wider than this: we have 329f. ὡς ... αὐτῷ ἐγὼ καὶ ἄμμον ἐίδη, | τὸ and 332f. ὡς ... αὐτῷ ἐγὼ καὶ ἄμμον ἐίδη, | τοῦ.

67. It is possible that the word πῦρ also played a part in the process leading to the omission, even though it occurs in a different part of the line each time: 434 ... πῦρ ... τρίσοδος ... , 435 ... τρίσοδος ... πῦρ ... , 437 ... τρίσοδος πῦρ ... .
first homoiographon presumably operates partly because of its semantic content as distinct from its appearance (cf. 10. 475... ἀντὶ ἐμοί, 480 ἀντὶ ἑγῶ.

Of course the fewer MSS. omit a given line (or group of lines), the more likely the omission is to be accidental (and that was my main reason for refuting the allegation that Eustathius omits Od. 10. 475–9): what examples can be cited of accidental omission by a small group of MSS. not confined to a single Allen family? We run into a certain difficulty here, in that Ludwich, who regularly records accidental omissions, uses about a third as many MSS. for his Odyssey, and a little under half as many MSS. for his Iliad, as Allen does for his editions respectively, and Allen hardly ever records obviously accidental omissions. Nevertheless, we do have enough information to be in a position to demonstrate that the size and composition of the group of MSS. omitting 10. 475–9 is compatible with the hypothesis of accidental omission. In the case of 10. 475–9 the homoiographa are not so strong that the actual mistake of omission (as distinct from the copying of the resultant defective text) would be likely to occur more than once: our most valuable parallels, then, will be cases where there is little or no homoiographic temptation to omission. In this category we may mention Od. 20. 83, absolutely essential to the sense but omitted by two of Allen’s families plus another MS.; Od. 17. 432, essential to the sense but omitted by three of Allen’s families and two other MSS.; Od. 12. 441, omitted by two of the three members of Allen’s family h, one other MS., and probably also Pap. Rylands 53 (saeC. iii–iv p.C.), which has space for only two lines between 438 and 442; Od. 8. 430–32, omitted by Allen’s U8

68. ‘om. a d l’ Allen, ‘om. X D Z’ Ludwich, but only one of the MSS. cited by Ludwich belongs to a family cited by Allen. Bolling at AJP 37 (1916) 453 curiously lists the line not as an accidental omission but as a ‘probable interpolation’, but in fact πόρος in 433 requires ἀλουπείαν ἄνδραν περικόλασα ἄργος in 432 as its object, and γυναῖκας, τάχα, and αὐτοῖς (433f.), considered together, require ἀλουπείαν ἄνδραν in 432 as their point of reference. Moreover, the authenticity of the line is further guaranteed by the fact that 17. 427–41 = 14. 258–72, with 17. 432 = 14. 263.

69. Here it has been possible to clarify the information in Allen’s apparatus (‘om. h’) by reference to Papers (above, n. 65) 41.


The omission must be accidental: the line was present in the edition of Aristarchus, the ancestor of the numerus versuum of our MSS. (see Schol. H ad loc.); it is quoted by Strabo 44); and it is virtually indispensable to its context: δή in Homer does occasionally introduce the main clause following a temporal clause, but here the sense requires that the time defined by 439f. be the time when the wood reappears (441) rather than the time when Odysseus lets go of the fig-tree (442), an action which is merely a natural consequence of the reappearance.
(saec. xv) and Z (saec. xvi), each from a different family; and probably Od. 20. 46, omitted by Allen's R2 and four members of his family q. As an example where the temptation to omission is moderate, one may cite II. 9. 659, essential to the sense but omitted by two of Ludwich's MSS., one from an Allen family and one from Allen's 'contaminated MSS.' Omissions by a group of MSS. (from more than one family) where the temptation is strong include II. 1. 486, 6. 381–5, 18. 222, 21. 213, Od. 24. 28–31.

In all probability, then, Od. 10. 475–9 are genuine. Perhaps the internal evidence in favour of the lines is not so overwhelmingly strong as to rule out the hypothesis of interpolation as utterly impossible, but I believe it is strong enough to render it extremely unlikely.

My main concern is merely to show that the lines are almost certainly 'genuine' in the sense defined. My argument has not completely excluded the possibility that both 10. 475–9 and 12. 28–32 were composed only at the stage when the Nekyia was incorporated into the Odyssey; but I can now elaborate a view which I have already put forward indirectly, viz. that it is more likely than not that 10. 475–9 were in the poem before this stage (if we assume that the Nekyia is in fact a later addition).

I have already posited (above, p. 21ff.) as a useful working hypothesis that, if the Nekyia is a later addition, the whole sequence 10. 475–89 antedates its insertion. This sequence follows naturally on 471–4 and provides the kind of

---

71. There can be little doubt that the omission is accidental. The lines are not absolutely indispensable to their context, but after the other chieftains have responded to Alcinous' exhortation to bring gifts (8. 390–93, 417–28) we should certainly expect Alcinous to add a gift of his own. Incidentally, the parallelism between the thought of Alcinous (431f. ἐν πατρίδ. γαῖᾳ | μνήμην ἐμεῖς) disappears if 430–32 are removed. The lines are far from being, like the vast majority of post-Aristarchean interpolations, ὁμορροφομενον: the thought is similar to that in Od. 4. 591f., and its expression has something in common with those lines, but the general arrangement of the words is quite different: 8. 430–32 is a piece of free composition, and is thoroughly Homeric in style. The lateness of the two MSS. which omit the lines should be noted; and there is a comment on 430 in the scholia (H).

72. See Papers (above, n. 65) 56: Allen's apparatus mentions q but not R2. The line is not indispensable to its context, though I think its omission would impoverish the text, inter alia by removing the acat explicit antithesis between θηρός (46) and ῥής (47). The line is a ὁμορροφομενον (= H. 18. 363), and some suspicion may attach to it on that account; but it is at any rate of pre-Aristarchean origin, being attested by the third-century B.C. Pap. Hibeh 23. It is just possible that it was omitted from the text of Aristarchus through lack of manuscript authority and subsequently re-interpolated, but the chances are against this, partly for reasons connected with my assumption (3) (above, p. 11), partly because of the lateness of the MSS. which omit the line (none is earlier than saec. xv). If we assume that erroneous post-Aristarchean excision, made on the grounds that the line ὁρᾶσθαι or ὀλεσθαιπών ἐν Ὑλίδι καταθητισμοί, is a possibility, that explanation would also serve to support the genuineness of Od. 10. 475–9; cf. above, p. 28, (2).

73. I do not count a third MS. which omits 660 as well: that error was caused by a quite separate homoiographon.

74. For details see Bolling's list at AJP 37 (1916) 7.

75. See above, p. 29.

76. Cf. also p. 25f. above on 10. 478f. On the lateness of 482, however, see above, n. 43.
introduction to a series of instructions from Circe on the next stage of Odysseus's journey which would be as natural and necessary in a poem which lacked the Nekyia as it is in one which contains it. There is no reason to suppose that the choice of night as the time for Circe's instructions of 12. 39ff. was made only when the Nekyia was added; and as our 475–9 mark nightfall appropriately, the natural presumption is that they antedate the insertion of the Nekyia. Bérard argues that 476–9 were introduced to prepare for the Elpenor episode, and Theiler argues that this is the purpose of 476f.: 'Das Trinken ist notwendig zur Vorbereitung des Unfalls des Elpenor 552ff.' In fact, however, no reference to drinking is necessary before 555 oμοβαρείον, and in any case before 477 we have the identical line 468, which no one (as far as I know) has suspected of lateness, and which, with its δανύμενοι . . . μέθυ ήδου, provides adequate preparation for 555ff.; and there is no reason why the mode of Elpenor's death should not have been inspired partly by a pre-existing 477. On the other hand we cannot rule out as impossible the hypothesis that whoever introduced the Nekyia chose to insert a further reference to drinking and expanded and altered an earlier description of nightfall in order to do so. I argue only that, particularly in view of the presence of 468, there would not have been a strong motive for doing this, and that 476f. do not need the ensuing Elpenor episode to justify their presence.

If 10. 480–86 (minus the post-Aristarchean 482), or merely 480ff., are late – i.e. were composed at the stage when the Nekyia was introduced – our view that 475–9 are probably early (i.e. pre-Nekyia) may well be thrown into considerable doubt in view of the close cohesion of the passage 475–86; hence it seems worth examining the criticisms which have been levelled against 480–86. First, Page objects en passant to 483f., 'Circe ... had made no such promise.' However, the facts are stated more accurately by Stanford: 'Homer has not mentioned this promise before'; and, as Merry observes, 'As we have the doings of a whole year unrecorded, there was plenty of oppor-

77. About 489 itself, however, one may well feel more doubt: it would suit a Nekyiaeless Odyssey well enough, but it is possible that in its place Circe originally spoke a line which was unsuited to the version with the Nekyia (e.g. with the sense 'You can set off for Ithaca tomorrow').
78. Cf. n. 48 above.
79. Cf. n. 49 above.
80. I am assuming that the Elpenor episode (10. 552–60, 11. 51–83, 12. 9–16) does not postdate the introduction of the Nekyia into the Odyssey. The main function of Elpenor in our present poem seems to be to link the Nekyia with the Circe episode, in much the same way as the Intermezzo (11. 333–84) is designed to place the Nekyia securely within the broader framework of Odysseus's story to Alcinous: it seems likely, then, that both links were forged at the stage when the Nekyia was first incorporated into the Odyssey. However, if we suppose that the Elpenor episode is later than this, the terminus ante quem for 10. 475–9 in their present form will have to be brought forward accordingly, and corresponding alterations made in my definitions of the terms 'genuine' and 'interpolated' on p. 23 above.
82. Op cit. (above, n. 5) ad loc.
tunity for the promise to have been made." We must bear in mind the synoptic brevity which characterizes much of the narrative of the Apologoi. Secondly, Theiler complains that youvrov άπέρ ψυχής καθ γούνων σ' τε τοκήνων, to which one should add Achilles's reply, μή με, κόν, γούνων γουνάζεο μηδε τοκήνων (345), where the preposition is absent. However, as Odysseus in his speech at 10. 483ff., unlike Hector at II. 22. 338, does not actually say, 'I beseech you by your knees', it is better to follow Leaf on II. 9. 451 ή δ' ατέν έμε λισσέσκετο γούνων: 'It is a pregnant construction, and we must supply λαβών or the like from λισσέσκετο.' Leaf's opinion is confirmed by Od. 22. 333ff., where Phemius wonders whether he should take refuge at the altar of Zeus or γούνων λύσσοτο προσατίζεις 'Οδυσσή (337): he plumps for the second alternative: έδε δέ οι φρονεούν δούσατο κέρδον είναι, | γούνων άγασθη λατεριάδεω 'Οδυσσής (338f.): here we have a virtual equation γούνων λύσσοσθαι = γούνων άγασθαι λίσσοσθαι. The pregnant construction may have arisen out of the hyperbata II. 6. 45 λαβών έλλίσσετο γούνων, 21. 71 έλαν έλλίσσετο γούνων, Od. 6. 142 γούνων λύσσοτο λαβών. 'Merkwürdig' this construction may be, but it is certainly not unparalleled, and cannot be taken as an indication of lateness. Thirdly, Theiler objects that at Od. 10. 481 θέε δέ μοι έκλευεν αύδης is 'nur als flüchtige Wiederholung von 311 erklärbar; dort wo Odysseus an der Türe ruft, ist die Wendung treffend'. One has considerable sympathy with this objection, though what conclusion can be drawn from the facts is questionable. At 311 the meaning must be simply 'heard'; at 481 it must be "listened" - probably 'I made my plea to her, while she listened', though αύδης, 'voice', is not quite the right word: we should expect something like μῦθον, or simply μεν (cf. κλήθη μεν, II. 1. 37 etc., κέκλυτε μεν, II. 3. 86 etc., κέκλυτε μεν μούθον, Od. 12. 271, 340); or else the meaning is 'listened' in the sense 'and she gave my plea an attentive and sympathetic hearing' (as often of gods' 'hearing' mortals when they pray, e.g. II. 1. 43, 218), though with this interpretation I think the incongruity of αύδης becomes somewhat more obtrusive. With either interpretation, we can simply take this as a rather careless re-use of a clause used a little earlier, or we may speculate that the poet considered saying θέε δέ μοι έκλευεν ἀρρής (as at Od. 4. 767, with of for μοι) - possibly a formula - but rejected ἀρρής as unsuited to the circumstances - Circe was not the kind of goddess to whom one addressed a 'prayer', least of all while sharing her bed - and lamely substituted αύδης, recollected

83. Op. cit. (above, n. 3) ad loc.
84. Loc. cit. (above, n. 38).
85. Op. cit. (above, n. 16). So also Ameis-Hentze on Od. 10. 481 in their edition: 'γούνων bei den Knieen, sc. λαβών.'
from 10. 311. In either event, this type of re-use, with slight inappropriateness, of a phrase used earlier is not uncommon in the Homeric epic and need not be taken as an indication of lateness. As for the position of ἔθα δὲ μοι ἔκλαιεν αὐδὴς, i.e. between the verb of beseeching and the beginning of the speech, cf. II. 16. 231ff. ἔχθετ' ἐπείτα σὺς μέσῳ ἔρκει, λείβε δὲ οἶνον | οὐρανὸν εἰσανιδῶν: Δία δ' οὖ λάθε τερπικέρανυν: "Ζεῦ...", with which one should compare the line (249) which immediately follows the speech, ὡς ἔφυτ' εὖχόμενος, τοῦ δ' ἐκλωκεν μητίστα Ζεῦς. Against the evidence of αὐδὴς in 481 we should weight a consideration mentioned earlier – that 475–89 provide the kind of introduction to a speech from Circe which would be not only natural but necessary in an Odyssey without the Nekyia.

86. Cf. p. 19 above.
87. I should like to thank Mr. K. L. McKay, who read a draft of this article and made some helpful comments.
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