

Philologus	152	2008	1	5–17
------------	-----	------	---	------

ADRIAN KELLY

THE ENDING OF *ILIAD* 7: A RESPONSE\*

δύσετο δ' ἠέλιος, τετέλεστο δὲ ἔργον Ἀχαιῶν. 465  
 βουφόνεον δὲ κατὰ κλισίας καὶ δόρυπον ἔλοντο·  
 νῆες δ' ἐκ Λήμνιοι παρέστασαν οἶνον ἄγουσαι  
 πολλαί, τὰς προέηκεν Ἴησονίδης Εὐνήος,  
 τὸν ῥ' ἔτεχ' Ὑψιπύλη ὑπ' Ἴησονι ποιμένι λαῶν·  
 χωρὶς δ' Ἀτρεΐδης, Ἀγαμέμνονι καὶ Μενελάωι, 470  
 δῶκεν Ἴησονίδης ἀγέμεν μέθυ, χεῖλια μέτρα.  
 ἔνθεν ἄρ' οἰνίζοντο κάρη κομόωντες Ἀχαιοί,  
 ἄλλοι μὲν χαλκῶι, ἄλλοι δ' αἴθωνι σιδῆρωι,  
 ἄλλοι δὲ ῥινοῖς, ἄλλοι δ' αὐτῆισι βόεσσιν, 475  
 ἄλλοι δ' ἀνδραπόδεσσι· τίθεντο δὲ δαῖτα θάλειαν.  
 παννύχιοι μὲν ἔπειτα κάρη κομόωντες Ἀχαιοί  
 δαίνυντο, Τρῶες δὲ κατὰ πτόλιν ἠδ' ἐπίκουροι·  
 παννύχιος δὲ σφιν κακὰ μήδετο μητίετα Ζεὺς  
 σμερδαλέα κτυπέων. τοὺς δὲ χλωρὸν δέος ἦριε,  
 οἶνον δ' ἐκ δεπῶων χαμάδις χέον, οὐδέ τις ἔτλη 480  
 πρὶν πιέειν, πρὶν λείψαι ὑπερμενέι Κρονίωι.  
 κοιμήσαντ' ἄρ' ἔπειτα καὶ ὕπνου δῶρον ἔλοντο.

In a previous issue of this journal, Patrick Finglass argued that several linguistic and socio-economic anomalies at the end of *Iliad* 7 raise serious questions over the passage's authenticity, and he concluded that 7.466–77 is an interpolation<sup>1</sup>. This article will suggest, in response, that these features are not anomalous, and do not comprise sufficient grounds for suspicion of the passage, much less its deletion.

Along the way, I hope also to demonstrate that the textual criticism of Homer must have equal regard for two factors: the first is that Homeric poetry is traditional, the result of an extended process of linguistic, material and social appropriation and

\* I am grateful to Dr Bill Allan and Dr Patrick Finglass for their help on this article. They are not of course responsible for the argument or its shortcomings. I am particularly indebted to Dr Finglass for allowing me to see his article on the matter before publication. All citations are from (Martin West's edition of) the *Iliad* unless otherwise specified.

<sup>1</sup> Finglass (2006).

recreation stretching back in some form at least into the Mycenaean period<sup>2</sup>. It is therefore very difficult to define an anomaly – linguistic or otherwise – and still appreciate that diachronic quality and its potential to generate such features. Indeed, because of this potentiality, individual or even internally inconsistent elements are not for that reason alone to be condemned as inauthentic. The second factor, perhaps more important for this article than the first, is the poet’s freedom to individuate his narrative, to pick and choose from all the possibilities offered by this heroic world in order to emphasise certain qualities and themes over others. In short, the textual critic must be prepared to accept the synchronic and diachronic aspects of Homeric poetry, to countenance the entire texture of both poems, and to be very cautious before wielding the editor’s knife.

Finglass invokes linguistic and thematic arguments in his challenging and detailed treatment, though he does not place much weight on the former, for he is well aware that any passage in Homer will throw up more than its fair share of apparently anomalous forms<sup>3</sup>. Thus, for example, his discussion reveals the overstatement in Wackernagel’s case that ἀνδραπόδεσσι (7.475) must be an Atticism. Instead, the focus of his argument is thematic:

The real problem with the term (sc. ἀνδραπόδεσσι) is not so much that it is an *hapax*, but that it denotes a concept which does not fit the world of the *Iliad* ... ἀνδράποδα refers to people considered as property, often ... through their having been captured in war<sup>4</sup>.

Finglass concedes that Homer knows of this practice, but he notes that it is limited to the army’s leaders, and so 7.475 is “at odds with the aristocratic emphasis of the epics”, while “the casual trading of prisoners for wine suggests that captive-taking remains a common and widespread practice in the *Iliad*”<sup>5</sup>. The taking of prisoners only occurs at 21.26–32 (in a setting hardly auspicious for their survival), and Finglass relates this to Griffin’s notion that Homer is concerned above all with the idea of “kill or be killed, dying a heroic death”, concluding that

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Latacz (2004) for a review of the entire question. Finkelberg (2006) 1–15 provides a nuanced statement of the relationship between the Homeric world and Greek history, though her own fascinating application of Hittite kingship patterns to the *Odyssey* does not perhaps consider fully the incoherencies produced by recreation within a specifically Greek context. For a classic discussion of the Homeric social amalgam, with particular regard to marriage customs, cf. Snodgrass (1974); *contra* Morris (1986) ~ (2001).

<sup>3</sup> For this reason, I will not discuss in detail his treatment of βουφόνεον (7.466) and ἀνδραπόδεσσι (475), except with regard to the latter to remark (as Finglass (2006) 189 observes) that the word τετράποδα (on the model of which ἀνδράποδα is generally held to have been formed) is already known in Mycenaean, and that the later declension of ἀνδράποδα is thematic. This does not make ἀνδραπόδεσσι Mycenaean, of course, but one cannot argue that it is a later interpolation on linguistic grounds; cf. also below, p. 12 f.

<sup>4</sup> Finglass (2006) 188.

<sup>5</sup> Finglass (2006) 188.

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<sup>6</sup>.

But does Homer abolish the practice and, if so, why? This is not a trivial question, for it is important that the *Iliad* and its characters be able to contrast their own narrative with that of previous and future stories<sup>7</sup>. For example, Akhilleus is constantly shown to have a past in which his anger was not so great as it becomes during the course of this poem. When Andromakhe refers to his honourable treatment of her father's corpse (6.415–22), the audience is surely intended to note that earlier practice in preparation for his coming intractability towards Hektor, thus magnifying the terrible extent of his wrath at Patroklos' death. The same purpose is evident in the many references to Akhilleus' previous habit of taking prisoners and selling them, stressed notably during his encounter with Lykaon in Book 21 (e.g., 40–6, 57–9, 76–9)<sup>8</sup>. Lykaon even attempts to use Akhilleus' earlier action as precedent (76–9), only to be met with an explicit contrast between past and present (100–5):

πρὶν μὲν γὰρ Πάτροκλον ἐπισπεῖν αἴσιμον ἦμαρ,  
τόφρα τί μοι περιδέσθαι ἐνὶ φρεσὶ φίλτερον ἦεν  
Τρώων, καὶ πολλοὺς ζωοὺς ἔλον ἠδ' ἐπέρρασσα·  
νῦν δ' οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅς τις θάνατον φύγοι, ὄν κε θεός γε  
Ἰλίοο προπάρουθεν ἐμῆς ἐν χερσὶ βάλῃσιν  
καὶ πάντων Τρώων, πέρι δ' αὖ Πριάμοιό γε παίδων.

The poet could hardly be more clear; the *Iliad* is heightened and individual in its violence<sup>9</sup>, but the practice of taking prisoners and selling them as slaves is an ordinary part of its world<sup>10</sup>. Indeed, Menelaos almost accepts a supplication (an institution similarly in abeyance for most of the poem) from Adrestos for the sake of ransom, before Agamemnon steps in and ruins it (6.45–65). So the evocation of a different

<sup>6</sup> Finglass (2006) 188–9, quoting Griffin (1980) 91.

<sup>7</sup> This is of course not the only dynamic between the *Iliad* and the rest of heroic myth; cf., e.g., Kullmann (1992) 219–42; Taplin (1992) 83–109. Andersen (1990) shows that the poet and his characters differentiate between past and present (within and without the *Iliad*) for contextually driven purposes: “there is no source for the past beyond the oral tradition so there is no need for the tradition except in the present situation. And for Homer ... the present situation will always make a contribution to the presentation of the past but also ... every occasional version will be for the moment the only valid version, perhaps rather more self-contained and idiosyncratic than we often tend to think.” (43)

<sup>8</sup> Cf. van Wees (1992) 239–41.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Segal (1971).

<sup>10</sup> For other indications of slave-trading in the *Iliad*, cf. 21.451–5, 22.44–5, 24.751–3; in the *Odyssey*, cf. 1.430–2, 14.449–52, 15.384–8, 15.425–9, 17.249–50, 20.381–3. If Melanthios can threaten someone else with this fate, or if Eumaios (himself a slave) can purchase another slave for his own use (14.452), then it is not unhomeric for the ordinary troops in *Iliad* 7 to have slaves; cf. van Wees (1992) 239–41. I have not made more of the *Odyssey* in my argument because Finglass makes almost no use of it in his.

past – sometimes through its near-intrusion into the present – is a significant element within the poet's construction of his world; captive-taking does not have to occur in the *Iliad* itself for it to be considered a thoroughly typical part of heroic life.

But one does not need to acknowledge this strategy to see the purely practical weakness in Finglass' case, for the *Iliad* poet actually mentions other prisoners in the camp taken during previous expeditions or periods of fighting. Agamemnon's threat to Akhilleus that he will take ἢ τεὸν ἢ Αἴαντος ἰὼν γέρας ἢ Ὀδυσῆος (1.138) makes it clear that Briseis and Khryseis are not unique in this respect, and the same figure can offer by way of restitution to Akhilleus women taken from Lesbos (9.128–30 ~ 270–2), whilst Akhilleus himself puts up such captives as prizes during the Funeral Games (23.263, 704–5). There is, in short, a perfectly pragmatic explanation for the presence of slaves in the Greek camp at the end of Book 7, even though no 'long-term' prisoners are actually taken during the course of the poem.

The practice of captive-taking is thus an accepted element in the world of the *Iliad*, its temporary restriction part of a 'suspending' strategy with a definite poetic purpose, and the presence of slaves from previous expeditions easily paralleled and explained. So, on these grounds, the activity assumed by ἀνδραπόδεσσι is thoroughly Homeric. Apparently less justifiable is the extension of this practice beyond the control of the βασιλεῖς into the world of the λαός, and this should not be understated. Most activity, indeed much of the poem, is characterised by its focus on the actions and motivations of a few members of an elite. When non-elite figures like Thersites speak, it is usually to be thrust back into the undifferentiated mass, whose opinions are neither worth seeking nor generally sought<sup>11</sup>. Despite this aristocratic emphasis, however, these groups do persist in making their presence felt.

Consider, for example, scholarship's growing preoccupation with the importance of the *laos* in Homeric battle<sup>12</sup>. Usually the poet emphasises the killing abilities of the army's leading figures; indeed, once Akhilleus returns to the fray, the poet allots no one else a victory. Nonetheless, he does allow groups to play not merely a background role, as in the case of the Lokrian archers (13.709–22), whose combined efforts cause such devastation in the Trojan ranks that it would have resulted in a retreat to Troy, had it not been for Poulydamas' intervention and advice to Hektor. This is a rare event, for a group without its leader (13.712–17) explicitly achieves something usually confined to its *basileis*.

Such a glancing regard for the proletariat is not confined to battle; another example is the sacrifice carried out by the army in Book 2 before the beginning of the first day of fighting (398–401):

<sup>11</sup> On Thersites, cf. Thalmann (1988); *contra* Marks (2005).

<sup>12</sup> The classic work is Latacz (1977), though cf. also Pritchett (1985) 7–32; van Wees (1994), (1997) *inter al.* Criticisms of Latacz's theory may be found in Snodgrass (1993); Singor (1991), (1994); Hellmann (2000). For an examination of the *laos* from a broader socio-political perspective, cf. Haubold (2000).

ἀνσάντες δ' ὀρέοντο κεδασθέντες κατὰ νῆας,  
 κάπνισσάν τε κατὰ κλισίας καὶ δεῖπνον ἔλοντο.  
 ἄλλος δ' ἄλλοι ἔρεξε θεῶν αἰειγενετῶων.  
 εὐχόμενος θάνατόν τε φυγεῖν καὶ μῶλον ἼΑρηος.

Followed by a sacrifice and meal for the γέροντες in which Agamemnon takes the lead (402–41), this small scene may not be the only occasion in the *Iliad* on which the ordinary troops sacrifice<sup>13</sup>, but it is the only sacrifice where they are explicitly differentiated from the *basileis* in the process<sup>14</sup>. Again, the poet here depicts a group performing an action otherwise restricted to the *basileis*. One might also point to the fact that this is the same circumstance – meal and propitiation of the divine – in which the poet chooses to locate the army's activities and concerns in the commissariat of Book 7.

This parallel shows just how inappropriate it is to characterise the ownership of slaves by the ordinary troops as showing a 'democratic spirit'<sup>15</sup>. In Book 2, the individuals of the army sacrifice and pray just before Zeus rejects Agamemnon's following sacrifices (2.419–20) and prayer (411–18). Much more space and emphasis is allotted in this sequence to Agamemnon, for Zeus' response is directed towards his actions and words, not those of the army as a whole. Similarly, at the end of Book 7, the ordinary troops engage in trade with the Lemnian ships, whilst Agamemnon and Menelaos in particular (χωρίς 7.470) are given a special and rather large gift by the leader of the community whence they come (δῶκεν Ἴησονίδης ἀγέμεν μέθυ χεῖλια μέτρα 471)<sup>16</sup>. The men have to exchange items of plunder for the Lemnian wine; Agamemnon and Menelaos receive it as a gift. The *laos* and its *basileis*, then, engage in the same activity, but the latter again maintain their pre-eminence in the process.

Finally, it should be noted that Lemnos is not only well-known to the *Iliad* (e.g. 2.722, 14.230), but seems to be associated throughout the poem both with wine and the slave-trade. Agamemnon refers to boasts made by the army in their cups on Lemnos (8.229–34), Lykaon is sold on Lemnos and redeemed for a considerable sum (21.40–1, 58, 78–9, 23.741–7), and many of Priam's sons have been sold in slave markets there (24.751–3). It is therefore unsurprising that its ruler Euneos (7.468–9) is elsewhere mentioned precisely in the context of slaving (21.40–1, 23.745–7). The number and consistency of these references led Kullmann to conclude that

<sup>13</sup> Cf. 8.548–52, a passage fraught with textual difficulties; Kirk (1990) ad loc., 340; Pötscher (2000); Kelly (2007) 403–6.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Latacz (2003) ad loc., 120.

<sup>15</sup> Finglass (2006) 188.

<sup>16</sup> For other such international gifts directed, once more, to Agamemnon, cf. 11.19–23 (a corselet from Kinyres of Kypros), 23.296–9 (a mare from Ekhepolos of Sikyon). One might also compare the wine given by Maron to Odysseus to help persuade him to spare his family in the sack of Ismaros (*Od.* 9.196–211).

die gesamten Achaier auf der Insel Lemnos Station machten, zu der sie später auch von der Troas aus Beziehungen unterhielten und von der sie sich Wein kommen ließen, bzw. nach der sie Kriegsgefangene als Sklaven verkauften<sup>17</sup>.

Therefore, on many grounds, the activity behind ἀνδραπόδεσι is neither so individual nor so democratic as to warrant doubts over its authenticity: (i) slave-trading is a well-known economic activity, and (ii) characteristically linked with Lemnos; (iii) the taking of prisoners is frequently referred to, and purposely delimited from, the *Iliad* for the sake of contrast and self-definition; (iv) the presence of prisoners in the camp is assumed elsewhere in the *Iliad*; (v) the participation of the *laos* in actions otherwise confined to their leaders is explained by the poem's emphasis on its elite characters; (vi) nonetheless, the commissariat illustrates the primacy of Agamemnon and Menelaos in the economics of exchange and barter, as does the parallel hierarchy in the sacrifice scene of Book 2. In sum, ἀνδραπόδεσι cannot support a theory of interpolation in the way Finglass suggests.

A broader but connected issue, to which Finglass turns after discussing the unusual word βουφόνεον (7.466), is the idea of commissariat as a whole:

... 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. 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<sup>18</sup>.

Finglass goes on to point out that Homer's meals are concerned with the moral and social importance of eating as an heroic institution, with which this 'bartering' of items does not fit, and characterises the concern with supplying the army as more appropriate to the 'Cycle' than Homer. The argument is open to criticism on several levels. To begin with, the latter differentiation is conducted as though the cycle is simply post-Homeric in both form *and* content. However, whatever its limitations, Neoanalysis has surely proven at a minimum that the poems we think of as 'cyclic' do in fact reflect pre-Homeric stories; whilst great(er) caution must be practised in reconstructing those stories and applying them to the Homeric poems, it is no longer sufficient to separate Homer from everything else in this kind of way<sup>19</sup>.

Furthermore, there are problems with the way in which Finglass characterises the commissariat as cyclic. It is certainly true that the relevant fragment of the *Kypria* (F 29 Bernabé) evinces a most unhomeric mythological explanation for the army's supply, viz. magical production by the daughters of Anios (Oino, Spermo and Elais),

<sup>17</sup> Kullmann (1960) 270 (cf. also 293–7). Finglass (2006) 190 lists these passages, but is more concerned there with a theory of Attic interpolation advanced by Wackernagel (about which he is rightly sceptical).

<sup>18</sup> Finglass (2006) 193.

<sup>19</sup> On Neoanalysis, cf. most recently Burgess (2001); Allan (2005); Kelly (2006). For the sake of argument, the following paragraph will nonetheless treat the cycle on Finglass' terms.

but the type of fantastic story told there is hardly comparable to the passage from Book 7. Indeed, it would seem to indicate a major difference between them, for Homer feels no need to resort to the fantastic in order to explain what is, for him, a fairly mundane matter. On this ground, the commissariat is actually rather unlike the cycle, but this is not quite the point Finglass seeks to make:

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<sup>20</sup>.

No further example is given, though the quote is footnoted to Jasper Griffin’s well-known article on the epic cycle<sup>21</sup>. Griffin, who did not question the commissariat’s authenticity, gives only two examples of this ‘pedantic desire’, both concerned with explaining Khryseis’ capture – despite the fact that Khryse does not seem to have been sacked or even besieged – by reference to a journey to Thebe where she was taken (*Kypria* arg. 65, F 28 Bernabé). This story certainly does seem rather pedantic and abrupt, given the character’s relative anonymity in the rest of the epic tradition, but it does account for a prominent matter driving the motivation of the *Iliad*, viz. the presence of a named figure in a certain specific circumstance<sup>22</sup>. The commissariat hardly exhibits this type of motivational specificity. Furthermore, whilst Homer never explains Khryseis’ presence in Thebe, he was well aware of the army’s provisioning (as we shall see). Thus, pedantic supplementation may be proposed as a motive for the *Kypria*’s story, but hardly for the Homeric passage. On this ground as well, the ending of *Iliad* 7 does not appear particularly cyclic. In fact, by eschewing the fantastical, it constitutes a considerable argument for the opposite conclusion.

A much more serious difficulty than this, however, is that Finglass’ description of the Homeric practice is oversimplified, for the commissariat is not the only passage in which Homer reveals a concern for, or knowledge of, the issue of the army’s supply. At the start of Book 9, for example, Nestor refers explicitly to ‘daily trips’ from Thrace by ships bringing – once more – wine (πλεῖαί τοι οἴνου κλισίαι, τὸν νῆες Ἀχαιῶν | ἡμάτιαι Θρήικηθεν ἐπ’ εὐρέα πόντον ἄγουσιν 9.71–2). Finglass mentions this parallel in a footnote, but he restricts the wine-importing entirely to Agamemnon as “a special mark of honour for the βασιλεύτατος among the βασιλεῖς”<sup>23</sup>, admitting however that it is thus a parallel for 7.470–1 (i.e. the gift to Agamemnon and Menelaos), but not for the rest of the passage<sup>24</sup>.

This is both unconvincing and self-defeating. Firstly, even the fact of that parallel undermines a theory of interpolation, for it supports the claims to authenticity at least

<sup>20</sup> Finglass (2006) 193.

<sup>21</sup> Griffin (1977) 41 = (2001) 369.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Taplin (1992) 85–6 for a review of the question, and a modern explanation.

<sup>23</sup> Finglass (2006) 193 n. 26.

<sup>24</sup> Finglass (2006) *ibid.* When determining the full extent of the interpolation, he makes no reference to this earlier concession.

of the wine's conveyance from Lemnos (7.467–71). Therefore, and secondly, if the detail from Book 9 is paralleled by 7.470–1, then this would suggest not that Agamemnon was the only figure to benefit from this economic activity in Book 9, but that he was specially marked out (χωρίς 7.470) within a larger activity in which the *laos* also participated<sup>25</sup>. Thirdly, Nestor does not make it clear that he is talking about a special mark of honour. The opportunity was clearly there for the poet to do so, as he does e.g. of Aias at the end of his duel with Hektor at 7.321–2, or of Nestor at 11.624–7. Nor, finally, does Nestor say that Agamemnon alone received the wine, though the mention of such gifts at 11.19–23 and 23.296–9 shows that the poet could have specified this limitation as well. Instead, Nestor says merely that his tents are 'full of wine which the Greek ships bring daily from Thrace'. Are we really to believe that Agamemnon – and no one else – received daily shipments of wine?

Furthermore, Nestor's comment is not an isolated reference to the army's provisioning within the poem. The many expeditions conducted by the Greeks around Troy (9.328–9) had at least something to do with the flocks possessed by the cities in question, as Aineias tells Apollo (20.91–2 ὅτε βουσὶν ἐπήλυθεν ἡμετέροισιν, | πέρσε δὲ Λυρνησσὸν καὶ Πήδασσον). These animals, presumably, were the same creatures kept by the army and constantly on hand for sacrifice and consumption<sup>26</sup>. The importance of provision is also confirmed in the flock kept by the besieging army depicted on the shield of Akhilleus (18.520–40), and considered by the besieged citizens in that vignette to be of sufficient military worth as to warrant an ambush. That this resource could be an objective in itself is reflected in Hesiod's statement that the Theban wars were fought μήλων ἕνεκ' Οἰδιπόδαο (*Works and Days* 163), and in the *Odyssey's* frequent concern with resources, their pilfering, replenishing and consumption<sup>27</sup>.

It remains true, of course, that a reference to the practicalities of supply is unusual in the *Iliad*, but it can be paralleled and located within the economic world outlined and assumed by the poem, even if one leaves aside the other texts of early epic. If the poet does not focus on the issue elsewhere, it must be because it does not interest him<sup>28</sup>. But considerably more argument than Finglass provides is required to show that he consciously avoids the issue, let alone (which would be much more persuasive) that he is ignorant of it.

In so far as it rests on these twin thematic pillars, then, of democratic slavery and unheroic trading within the context of the army's supply, the argument that the ending of *Iliad* 7 is interpolated is unpersuasive. The two linguistic oddities in the passage (ἀνδραπόδεσσι and βουφόνεον) are obviously not enough on their own to

<sup>25</sup> This remains true regardless of the authenticity of 472–5 (or indeed 466–9).

<sup>26</sup> This would seem to explain the military significance of Aias' destruction of the flocks in the *Little Iliad* (arg. 4–5 Bernabé).

<sup>27</sup> Cf., e.g., van Wees (1992); Raaflaub (1997). On the *Odyssey*, cf. above, n. 10.

<sup>28</sup> Griffin (1977) 41 = (2001) 369 (quoted by Finglass 2006, 193 and n. 29).

support the deletion of the commissariat, for they could most economically be accounted for by the simple deletion of 466 and 475. In any case, Finglass is well aware of the inherent weakness in using *hapax legomena* as the sole criterion for deletion, and so he broadens his argument with the contention that the depiction of trade within the context of *Iliad* 7 is unsuitable for the development of the narrative, and that it breaks a thematic progression which would be much crisper if 466–77 were removed. Responding to the analyses of Kirk and Wilamowitz, who found an effective contrast between the worlds of men and gods, war and peace, Finglass counters:

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, and truer to Homer's practice elsewhere<sup>29</sup>.

As the fate of Analysis makes pungently clear, literary criteria are uncertain supports for a textual argument: *quot homines, tot sententiae*. Given that the immediately preceding scene detailed Poseidon's concern over the Greeks' failure to observe the τιμή of the immortals (7.445–53) – as well as a private nigger about the relative reputation of his own work on Troy – a scene showing the relative disparity in the τιμή of the Greek army and its leaders is far from inappropriate. In the light of this imbalance, and this theme, the commissariat is also deeply ironic, for the ramifications of Agamemnon's offence against Akhilleus' prize are about to come home, for the first time, to the individuals of an army who had no determinative role in their argument. Furthermore, Zeus' speech at 7.459–63 picks up on the extra-Iliadic reference to the destruction of the Greek wall (foreshadowed by the poet at 12.17–33), for not only does Homer refer to the Argonaut story in 7.468, but he also gives a picture of human existence and activity with its source beyond the immediate scope of this poem. On these grounds the scenes fit very well together, and express the contrast both Kirk and Wilamowitz had appreciated.

Continuing his thematic condemnation, Finglass also finds fault with the way in which the commissariat seems to interrupt the poet's build-up of divine anger and power at the end of Book 7 and the opening of Book 8:

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<sup>30</sup>.

However, coming as it does between Poseidon's disgruntled comments and Zeus' hostile thundering, does not the depiction of life's mundanities make this divine anger seem all the more frightening? As the mortals go about their usual practices, pre-

<sup>29</sup> Finglass (2006) 194.

<sup>30</sup> Finglass (2006) 194, quoting Taplin (1992) 289.

erving their relative hierarchies even at this dangerous moment, they proceed unaware of the compact between Thetis and Zeus. Their ignorance is strikingly paralleled in Poseidon's concern with his *time* in the preceding scene, for his preoccupation reveals an ignorance about the future of the Greek wall, but more importantly the direction in which Zeus is to push the fighting in fulfilling his promise to Thetis. This scene-pairing tremendously increases the foreboding power and mystery of the *Dios Boule*, which gods and mortals struggle to come to terms with, and which will continue to confuse and impede these groups as the next day dawns and proceeds. As such, the scene-pairing can only add to the progression of Zeus' power, and its effect is explicitly confirmed when Zeus himself thunders through the night at the end of the commissariat (478–81). Again, literary considerations are not a persuasive argument against the authenticity of the passage; a defect from one scholar's perspective becomes a virtue from another's.

Finglass' last two points against the commissariat are, firstly, the apparent contradiction between 7.476–7 (the Greeks παννύχιοι ... | ... δαίνυντο) and 482 (κοιμήσαντ' ἄρ' ἔπειτα καὶ ὕπνου δῶρον ἔλοντο) and, secondly, the fact that an all-night feast is "unparalleled in the entire epic"<sup>31</sup>. Let me deal with these in reverse order.

On the individuality of the all-night feasting, one should note that there are several other unparalleled παννύχιος actions in the *Iliad*, with the best example being the way in which the winds blow on Patroklos' pyre whilst Akhilleus pours libations παννύχιος (23.217–18), though he is then found sleeping only a few lines later on (231–2), before being woken by the approach of the other *basileis*. This type of 'inconsistency', if we can really call it that, is the result of the poet's typical use of παννύχιος [a] in order to foreshadow a contrasted nocturnal episode or episodes [b] which motivate(s) or contextualise(s) the action of the coming day [c]<sup>32</sup>. For example, whilst the other gods and mortals sleep παννύχιοι [a] (2.1), Zeus plots how to bring about his design and opts to send the dream to Agamemnon [b], whose instructions to the king drive the new attack on Troy [c]. At the end of Book 8, Hektor orders his troops παννύχιοι (8.508) to burn fires [a] (fulfilled at 554) so as to prevent the Greeks from slipping away without a serious fight, and this sets the scene for the embassy in Book 9 [b] (as well as the *Doloneia* in Book 10), which foreshadows the renewed Trojan offensive on the next day [c]. At the close of the central third day of battle, the *per noctem* lamentation of the Greeks [a] (18.315, 354) is contrasted to a brief scene between Here and Zeus [b] (356–68) and then the making of the arms by Hephaistos [b] (369–617), conveyed to Akhilleus immediately after dawn breaks on his day of vengeance [c] (19.1–4). Lastly, at the end of Hektor's ransom, everyone else sleeps παννύχιος [a] but Hermes (24.678–9), whose awakening of Priam leads into the journey back to Troy [b] and the funeral of the hero on the next day [c].

<sup>31</sup> Finglass (2006) 194.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Kelly (2007) 356.

In the context of Book 7, then, the poet has combined the end-of-day sequence with a *παννύχιος* action so as to foreshadow the hostility which Zeus is to show to all sides in the fulfilment of his obligation to Thetis. At the opening of Book 8 he will forbid the other gods from intervening in the battle in rather strong terms, which he will repeat with more precision at its end. Though it is more immediately apparent that his hostility is directed against the Greeks, there are several signs throughout the second day of battle that he has not abandoned them (8.31–40, 245–50), and the position into which Hektor is being enticed will of course prove disastrous for him and his city. To prepare for this turn of events on the next day [c], the poet links the meal of the Greeks and Trojans [a] (*παννύχιοι* 476) with the threat inherent in Zeus' thundering (*παννύχιος* 478), before they react fearfully [b] (479) and try unsuccessfully to avoid his anger (480–1). This sequence is very brief, indeed much briefer than the contrasted episodes in the other cases, but this is entirely in keeping with, and proleptic of, the contracted nature of the coming second day's battle<sup>33</sup>.

Finally, I come to the contradiction between 7.476–7 and 482, pointed out long ago by Wecklein<sup>34</sup>. This is the strongest argument for a problem in the entire passage, but could be dealt with most economically by the deletion of 482. To support the excision, one might point first to Zenodotos' omission of 7.482 and 8.1, and his translation of 8.1 after 8.52<sup>35</sup>. One could then argue that the verse's repetition at 9.713 and *Od.* 19.427, and the repetition of the second hemistich at *Od.* 16.481, does not quite justify Kirk's claim that it is "a standard way of marking the end of a day's action"<sup>36</sup>. These arguments should, nonetheless, at least have been made; one suspects they were not made because Finglass wanted to keep 7.482 at the expense of 466–77. But I would not omit the verse anyway: three examples in Homeric epic do make a *prima facie* case for the formularity of *κοιμήσαντ' ἄρ' ἔπειτα καὶ ὕπνου δῶρον ἔλοντο*, and the well-known phenomenon of inconsistencies arising from formulaic usage would therefore account for its resulting contradiction with 476–7<sup>37</sup>.

\* \* \*

Finglass' discussion of the ending of *Iliad* 7 should force every textual critic to look very closely at the passage, and this can only be a welcome development. Nonetheless, there are no good reasons for suspecting the commissariat along the lines suggested in his treatment. The Homeric economy is thoroughly acquainted with the institution of slave-trading, its apparently anomalous extension to the *laos* one of several such broadenings of the poem's aristocratic focus, and the poet is well aware

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Schadewaldt (1966) 96–127; Willcock (1995).

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Wecklein (1918) 65.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Nickau (1977) 202–3.

<sup>36</sup> Kirk (1990) ad loc., 292.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. Janko (1998); also Gunn (1970).

that the army needed supplies and resources. ἀνδραπόδεσσι in 475 can hardly be considered a serious problem in the light of the economic background outlined earlier<sup>38</sup>, while the contradiction between 7.476–7 and 482 is supplied with an alternative explanation which is at least as likely as interpolation (and, if there is an interpolation, 482 itself should come under suspicion sooner than the preceding passage). Of Finglass' arguments against the commissariat, there only remains the *hapax* βουφόνεον in 466. One *hapax* does not an interpolation make, and it is therefore unjustifiable to suspect the authenticity of 7.466–77.

The ramifications of the current study go beyond defending the ending of *Iliad* 7, for I have tried to demonstrate that the textual criticism of Homer must come to terms with the variegated nature of the poem and its tradition. A more extensive heroic world is assumed by the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* than that which lies within the poet's immediate focus. One must fully acknowledge that background, and the complex process by which the Homeric world has come into being, before seeking to determine what is or is not authentic.

### Bibliography

- W. Allan, Arms and the Man: Euphorbus, Hector and the Death of Patroclus, CQ 55, 2005, 1–18.  
 Ø. Andersen, The Making of the Past in the *Iliad*, HSCP 93, 1990, 25–45.  
 A. Bernabé, Poetarum Epicorum Graecorum Testimonia et Fragmenta: Pars I, Leipzig 1987.  
 J. Burgess, The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle, Baltimore 2001.  
 P. J. Finglass, The Ending of *Iliad* 7, Philologus 150, 2006, 187–97.  
 M. Finkelberg, Greeks and Pre-Greeks: Aegean Prehistory and Greek Heroic Tradition, Cambridge 2006.  
 J. Griffin, The Epic Cycle and the Uniqueness of Homer, JHS 97, 1997, 39–53 (also in: D. Cairns (ed.), Oxford Readings in Homer's *Iliad*, Oxford 2001, 365–84).  
 J. Griffin, Homer on Life and Death, Oxford 1980.  
 D. Gunn, Narrative Inconsistency and the Oral Dictated Text in the Homeric Epic, AJP 91, 1970, 192–203.  
 J. Haubold, Homer's People: Epic Poetry and Social Formation, Cambridge 2000.  
 O. Hellmann, Die Schlachtszenen der *Ilias*, Stuttgart 2000.  
 R. Janko, The Homeric Poems as Oral Dictated Texts, CQ 48, 1998, 1–13.  
 A. Kelly, Neanalysis and the Nestorbedrängnis: A Test-Case, Hermes 134, 2006, 1–25.  
 A. Kelly, A Referential Commentary and Lexicon to Homer *Iliad* VIII, Oxford 2007.  
 G. Kirk, The *Iliad*, A Commentary; Volume II: Books 5–8, Cambridge 1990.  
 W. Kullmann, Die Quellen der *Ilias*, Wiesbaden 1960.  
 W. Kullmann, Homerische Motive: Beiträge zur Entstehung, Eigenart und Wirkung von *Ilias* und *Odyssee*, Stuttgart 1992.  
 J. Latacz, Kampfpäranese, Kampfdarstellung und Kampfwirklichkeit in der *Ilias*, bei Kallinos und bei Tyrtaios, Munich 1977.  
 J. Latacz, Homers *Ilias*, Gesamtkommentar: Band II: Zweiter Gesang, Munich 2003.  
 J. Latacz, Troy and Homer, Oxford 2004 (trans. [with author's revisions] by K. Windle and R. Ireland, of id., Troia und Homer, Stuttgart 2001).  
 J. Marks, The Ongoing Neikos: Thersites, Odysseus and Achilleus, AJP 126, 2005, 1–32.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. above, n. 3, for the linguistic aspect of the question.

- I. Morris, *The Use and Abuse of Homer*, CA 5, 1986, 81–138 (repr. with extensive alterations in: D. Cairns (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Homer's Iliad*, Oxford 2001, 57–91).
- K. Nickau, *Untersuchungen zur textkritischen Methode des Zenodotos von Ephesos*, Berlin 1977.
- W. Pötscher, *Die umstrittenen Verse Hom., Il. 8, 548ff. und ihr religionsgeschichtlicher Hintergrund*, ACD 36, 2000, 3–10.
- W. K. Pritchett, *The Greek State at War: Part IV*, Berkeley 1985.
- K. Raaflaub, *The Homeric Economy*, in: I. Morris and B. Powell (eds.), *A New Companion to Homer*, Leiden 1997, 624–48.
- W. Schadewaldt, *Iliasstudien*, Berlin<sup>3</sup> 1966.
- C. Segal, *The Theme of the Mutilation of the Corpse in the Iliad*, Leiden 1971.
- H. W. Singor, *Nine against Troy*, *Mnemosyne* 44, 1991, 26–31.
- H. W. Singor, *ENI PROTOISI MACHESTHAI: Some remarks on the Iliadic image of the battlefield*, in: J.-P. Crielaard (ed.), *Homeric Questions*, Amsterdam 1995, 183–200.
- A. M. Snodgrass, *An Historical Homeric Society?*, *JHS* 94, 1974, 114–25.
- A. M. Snodgrass, *The 'Hoplite Reform' revisited*, *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne* 19, 1993, 49–56.
- O. Taplin, *Homeric Soundings*, Oxford 1992.
- W. Thalmann, *Thersites: Comedy, Scapegoats and Heroic Ideology in the Iliad*, *TAPA* 118, 1998, 1–28.
- N. Wecklein, *Über Zusätze und Auslassung von Versen im Homerischen Texte*, Munich 1918.
- H. van Wees, *Status Warriors*, Amsterdam 1992.
- H. van Wees, *The Homeric Way of War*, *G&R* 41, 1994, 1–18, 131–55.
- H. van Wees, *Homeric Warfare*, in: I. Morris and B. Powell (eds.), *A New Companion to Homer*, Leiden 1997, 668–93.
- M. L. West, *Homerus: Ilias* (2 vols.), Leipzig 1998–2000.
- M. M. Willcock, *The Importance of Iliad 8*, in: Ø. Andersen and M. Dickie (eds.), *Homer's World*, Bergen 1995, 113–21.

Balliol College  
University of Oxford  
OX1 3BJ

### Abstract

This article replies to an attempt by P. J. Finglass (*The Ending of Iliad 7*, *Philologus* 150, 2006, 187–97) to cast doubt on the authenticity of *Il. 7. 466–77*, by addressing his arguments on Homeric technique and language, and placing the passage within the broader social and economic contexts of the epic world.