

Order: Record-keeping, Standardization, and the Development of Accounting in the Ancient Near East, International Scholars Conference on Ancient Near Eastern Economies IV Bethesda 2004.

Nathan Wasserman

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Martin L. West (ed.), *Homeri Ilias*. Recensuit / testimonia conguessit. Volumen prius, rhapsodias I-XII continens. Stuttgart and Leipzig: Bibliotheca Teubneriana, 1998. lxii + 372 pp. ISBN 3 519 01431 9.

Martin L. West (ed.), *Homeri Ilias*. Recensuit / testimonia conguessit. Volumen alterum, rhapsodias XIII-XXIV continens. Munich and Leipzig: K.G. Saur, 2000. viii + 396 pp. ISBN 3 598 71435 1.

Martin L. West, *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the Iliad*. Munich and Leipzig: K.G. Saur, 2001. 304 pp. ISBN 3 598 73005 5.

The new Teubner edition of the *Iliad* by Martin L. West, as well as the *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the Iliad* (henceforth, *Studies*) by which it was accompanied, have generated such a wide array of responses and counter-responses that it is difficult for a reviewer who joins the discussion at this late stage to contribute something new or original.¹ In view of this, it would perhaps be wiser to concentrate not so much on the scholarly discussion as such but rather on the point of view of the consumer, whether a scholar or a student, who is about to decide whether this is indeed the text of Homer to be taken with him/her into the 21st century.

Each page of the new Teubner *Iliad* is laid out in a triple pattern: the text, the testimonia, and the apparatus criticus; the widespread practice of starting each new book on a separate page is abandoned. These are the two most salient features distinguishing the layout of West's edition from those of its predecessors, most notably T.W. Allen's *editio maior* (1931), whose text corresponds to the universally used Oxford Classical Texts edition.² In the newly introduced separate middle section of testimonia West updates previous collections of Homeric quotations, particularly that by A. Ludwich (1898), and brings them down to the ninth century C.E. The collection is restricted to verbatim quotations, thus excluding, to use West's own words, 'mere allusions and general references from which nothing could be inferred about the reading in the text' (*Studies*, 166). The result is the fullest collection of the ancient quotations of Homer available.

The apparatus criticus occupies the lower section. The sources are cited in the following order: ancient scholars, papyri, quotations, medieval manuscripts. West studied 1543 papyri, no fewer than 840 of them unpublished papyri from Oxyrhynchus in the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford. This can only be appreciated in full when we take into account that Allen in his 1931 Oxford edition was able to make use only of 122 papyri. As the critics of the New Teubner edition emphasized, its apparatus dramatically enhances our knowledge of the textual tradition of the *Iliad*: 'This [the new material] is of paramount importance for the establishing of the numerus versuum: West's documentation throws new light on the problem of weakly-attested lines, for whose inauthenticity the papyrological evidence was proved by Bolling and confirmed by Apthorp to be the main external criterion when corroborated by internal evidence. Accordingly,

¹ See esp. R. Janko, *CR* 50, 2000, 1-4; G. Nagy, *BMCR*, 2000.09.12; J.-F. Nardelli, *BMCR*, 2001.06.21; West's response to Nagy and Nardelli, *BMCR*, 2001.09.6; A. Rengakos, *BMCR*, 2002.11.15; G. Nagy, *Gnomon* 75, 2003, 481-501; West's response to Rengakos and Nagy, *BMCR*, 2004.04.17.

² T.W. Allen, *Homeri Ilias*, 3 vols., Oxford, 1931; D.B. Monro and T.W. Allen, *Homeri opera*, vols. I-II, Oxford, 1908; 3rd edn. 1920.

the Teubner apparatus will remain for long a major tool' (Nagy, above n. 1); 'The unity of the Roman and medieval vulgate becomes even clearer' (Janko, above n. 1).

What working habits should be developed by the student of Homer approaching the New Teubner apparatus? Take for example *Iliad* 18.104, ἀλλ' ἦμαι παρὰ νηυσὶν ἐτώσιον ἄχθος ἀρούρης, 'but I sit here by the ships, a useless burden on the earth', Achilles' words to Thetis which were partly paraphrased and partly quoted by Socrates in Plato's *Apology* (28d). In the section of the testimonia we find that this verse was also quoted by Aristides, Plutarch, Lucian and others. However, the version which Plato gives, παρὰ νηυσὶ κορωνίσιν ἄχθος ἀρούρης, is unique. This is why it reemerges in the lower section, that of the apparatus criticus, whose entry for *Iliad* 18.104 looks as follows: '104 ἐτώσιον 9 11 tt* Ω (-σι) κορωνίσιν Plato'. The numbers refer to the list of the papyri adduced in volume I (xxxviii-liv); 'tt' stands for 'testimonia'; asterisk for 'testimonia cetera';³ Ω for the 'Omega' family of manuscripts; and 'Plato' for the deviating quotation referred to in the testimonia. In Allen's *editio maior* we only find: '104 νηυσὶ κορωνίσι Plato *apol.* 28 D (= A 170 al.)'.

As far as the text itself is concerned, its constitution is determined by the editor's strategic decision to bring it as close as possible to the putative Ionian original fixed in writing somewhere in the middle of the seventh century B.C.E. This above all affects the so-called 'atticisms', that is, the numerous Athenian forms embedded in the Homeric textual tradition. In so far as these are textual variants, the corresponding Ionic form is consistently preferred. If however a non-Athenian variant is not attested, the solution is more nuanced. Take, for example, such a well-known Homeric feature as the Attic -ντο for the Ionic -ατο in the third-person plural of consonant stems. While the transmitted μαχέοιντο at 1.344 is replaced in West's edition with Bentley's μαχέοιαι, a conjecture whose additional merit is elimination of the hiatus μαχέοιντο Ἀχαιοί (cf. *Studies*, 162, 174, κείντο at 21.426, whose analogous 'Ionization' would result in a grammatical form which is itself abnormal,⁴ remains untouched. West's discussion of μαχέοιντο seems to be pertinent here: 'We must, therefore, consider all variants on their merits, judging them in the light of our knowledge of Homeric usage and of the vicissitudes of the transmission, especially the tendency to modernize, and applying the standard canons of textual criticism' (*Studies*, 162).

The accompanying volume, *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the Iliad*, falls into two major parts: (I) The Transmission (1-170), treating such topics as the pre-Alexandrian transmission, Zenodotus' text, Didymus and his sources, the papyri, the early medieval transmission and the New Teubner edition, and (II) The Text (171-285), consisting of editor's notes on individual passages. Part I is a scholarly monograph in its own right. It is especially important for its new assessment of the Alexandrian Homeric scholarship. Ever since Friedrich August Wolf it has been generally assumed that the Alexandrian critics, first and foremost Aristarchus of Samothrace (second century B.C.E.), prepared their editions on the basis of the collation of the available manuscripts, just as modern philologists do. West convincingly argues that this practice cannot be attested before the grammarian Didymus (first century B.C.E.). The text of Zenodotus of Ephesus (third century B.C.E.), notorious for its omissions and for neo-Ionic and other late forms, was actually a fourth-century Ephesian rhapsode's copy, whereas all Aristarchus' readings differing from the medieval vulgate are mere conjectures. 'It is entirely unjustified to project his [Didymus'] methods back onto Aristarchus or Zenodotus, or to assume that all the various copies available to Didymus in the time of Augustus were already part of the library's holdings in the early third century' (*Studies*, 36). These are indeed far-reaching conclusions, so that it is small wonder that they have already become the subject of much controversy (see esp. Rengakos, above, n. 1).

³ Cf. *Studies*, 166: 'When the testimonia are divided between two readings I specify the authors who support the one variant and put simply t* or tt* for the rest'.

⁴ Cf. G.P. Shipp, *Studies in the Language of Homer*. 2nd edn, Cambridge, 1972, 11.

An unexpected benefit of the tardy submission of this review is that I had the opportunity to use the New Teubner *Iliad* in my Homer class. The advantages that its apparatus brings to the more demanding students are hard to overestimate. Instead of simply observing individual variants and conjectures, the students became exposed to the entire history of the transmission of the text, from the fourth-century quotations and the Ptolemaic papyri to the Roman papyri and the Byzantine grammatical tradition. The encounter with the new Teubner *Iliad* not only allowed them to acquire first-hand experience of what Homeric scholarship is about but also served as the most illuminating demonstration of the paramount importance of the Homeric poems in Graeco-Roman antiquity. So far as the present reviewer is concerned, this is what above all makes West's edition an absolute must for every student and teacher of Homer.

Margalit Finkelberg

Tel Aviv University

Gunnel Ekroth, *The Sacrificial Rituals of Greek Hero-Cults in the Archaic to the Early Hellenistic Periods. Kernos Supplément 12*. Liège: Centre international d'étude de la religion grecque antique, 2002. 429 pp. ISSN 0776 3824.

As is well-known, the traditional view of Greek sacrifice insists on a strict dichotomy between sacrifice to gods and to heroes: besides observations regarding the type of altar used (*bomos* for gods, *eschara* for heroes), the color of the victims, and even the direction of the victim's head at the time of slaughter, tradition would have the victims completely destroyed in ordinary heroic sacrifice (should they be consumed, a ritual of *theoxenia* would be involved); in ordinary divine sacrifice the victims would, on the other hand, be consumed in a sacrificial meal. This view, though modified and questioned over the years, has never been systematically challenged. Ekroth's substantial and systematic study now does much to dispel many of the misconceptions the traditional view involves. In doing so, the author reaches what some may see as another extreme. She concludes that gods and heroes did not constitute ritually distinct categories: the ordinary sacrificial ritual for heroes was not different from the ordinary sacrificial ritual for gods. It did not consist in the destruction of the victim but rather, as in ordinary divine sacrifice, the consumption of the victim. Moreover, and here I suspect Ekroth might face substantial opposition, her work seriously calls into question, as a natural outcome of her conclusions, the connection, usually taken for granted, between hero cult and the cult of the dead.¹

¹ I regret very much that I could not make use of this work in my *Greek Sacred Law: A Collection of New Documents*, Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, 2005 [2004] (henceforth *NGSL*). Ekroth discusses two of the documents included in my corpus: 1: The Calendar of Thorikos, *SEG* XXXIII 147 (*NGSL* no. 1; Ekroth reproduces the text as no. 1 in her Appendix); 2: The Law from Selinus, *SEG* XLIII 630 (*NGSL* no. 27). I allow myself two comments: 1) The Calendar of Thorikos: regarding the puzzling ΕΠΑΥΤΟΜΕΝΑΣ in lines 14 and 47, I note with satisfaction that Ekroth (218-19) favors the reading ἐπ' Αὐτομένως, *Automenai* being a place name (the original author of this reading is 'un ami' in G. Daux, 'Le calendrier de Thorikos au musée J. Paul Getty', *AntCl* 52, 1983, 150-74 at 172). As for the provision of an *ariston* to the attendant by the priest (lines 15-16), Ekroth's emphasis (*ibid.*) on the need for a meal in the uneaten sacrifice supersedes my very tentative association of the *ariston* with a possible trip (cf. the calendar of Eleusis, *LSCG* 7.3-7) to the place of sacrifice. As she notes, finances are operative here: the priest, not the deme, is responsible for the *ariston*. 2) The law from Selinus: in respect of Ekroth's discussion of the burning of one of the nine parts in a sacrifice to the polluted Tritopatores 'as to heroes' (A 9-13; Ekroth 235-8), I note a point that may support her main argument regarding heroic sacrifice and the destruction of meat. The three attestations of the verb *εἰνατεω*, which document this practice in credible contexts, *LSCG* 96, *LSCG Suppl.* 63, and *IG* XII Suppl. 353 (J. Pouilloux, *Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes de Thasos I*, Paris, 1954, 82-5 no. 10a seems too dubious to me to add anything) do not explicitly mention burning of the ninth part, as Ekroth (220)