The second verse may have ended with *σοφόν* or *καλόν*.[6] These verses are otherwise unknown. Could they be part of Aristophanes' pervasive commentary on the rival genre, to which literary critics like Aristotle would owe so much? He often uses *οἱ θεώμενοι* of the audience,[7] and the versification is consistent with his style.[8] Alternatively, they could derive from a play that considered tragedy at length, like Antiphanes' *Ποίησις*.[9] Olympiodorus could have obtained the quotation via Theophrastus, who also wrote on comedy.[10]

University of Michigan RICHARD JANKO
rjanko@umich.edu
doi:10.1017/S0009838809000214

[6] Cf. Cratin. *Pyt.* fr. 203 Kassel–Austin, *ὕδωρ δὲ πίνων οὐδὲν ἂν τέκοι σοφόν*; Men. *Sent.* 538, *νόμου <δὲ> χωρὶς οὐδὲν ἐν βίῳ {γίνεται} καλόν*; *Com. Adesp.* fr. 1209,2 Kock = *TrGF* Adesp. 26 Snell, *οὐδὲν ἂν πάντῃ καλόν / οὐδ' αἰσχρόν*.

[7] Cf. *Ach.* 496, *Ran.* 2, 132 (nom.); *Pax* 658 (acc.); *Pax* 964 (gen.); *Vesp.* 59, *Eccl.* 888, *Plut*. 798 (dat.); cf. *Vesp.* 1287, 1475, *Pax* 543, *Nub.* 518, *Ran.* 926, 1110, 1475, and in the singular *Eq.* 327, 704, *Ran.* 16. Antiphanes uses it in his *Ποιήσεις* in the dative plural (fr. 189,16 Kassel–Austin), and it is also in *Adesp. com.* 276,2.

[8] *κλαύσωμεν* falls in the same metrical *sedes* at *Eq.* 9, and *ἐπόησε* at *Eq.* 1180, Men. *Asp.* 394. *τραγῳδία* fills this *sedes* at *Ach.* 412, *Vesp.* 1511, *Pax* 148, *Thesm.* 450, *Ran*. 1120, fr. 392,1 Kassel–Austin; it is elsewhere at *Ach.* 400, 464, *Av.* 101, 1444, *Ran*. 90, 95, 798, 802, 834, 862, *Lys.* 138, *Plut*. 423, Men. *Sicyon.* 264 and *Com. Adesp.* fr. 1051,1 Kassel–Austin, and in other metres at *Eq.* 401, *Ran.* 913, 935.

[9] Cf. fr. 189 Kassel–Austin.

[10] F 709–11 Fortenbaugh.

ZENODOTUS' TEXT OF HESIOD

Zenodotus of Ephesus was the first librarian in Alexandria and active as a literary scholar in the early decades of the third century B.C.E. Best known for his much-reviled *διόρθωσις* of Homer, Zenodotus also produced an innovative alphabetical glossary (*Γλῶσσαι*) and worked on the texts of poets, including Pindar, Hesiod and Anacreon. While citations of Zenodotus' readings by later Hellenistic and Roman writers reveal much about his scholarship on the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* (over 400 readings of his are preserved), little evidence remains of his work on Hesiod's poetry.[1] In fact, only once do the Hesiodic scholia provide information about the readings of his text.[2] A single thirteenth-century manuscript (*Marc. gr.* 464), in the hand of Demetrius Triclinius, contains this unique comment: *Σ* ad Hes. *Th*. 5 – *Περμησσοῖο*: *… ἐν δὲ τοῖς Ζηνοδοτείοις γράφεται Τερμησσοῖο*. In the first modern edition of the

[1] On Zenodotus' Hesiodic studies, cf. G.J.C. Muetzell, *De emendatione Theogoniae Hesiodeae libri tres* (Leipzig, 1833), 281; C. Göttling, *Hesiodi Carmina*, (Gotha, 1843[2]), lxvi–lxvii; H. Flach, *Glossen und Scholien zur hesiodischen Theogonie mit Prolegomena* (Leipzig, 1876), 110–11; F. Jacoby, *Hesiodi Theogonia* (1930), 46–8, 74–5; J. Schwartz, *Pseudo-Hesiodeia: Recherches sur la composition, la diffusion et la disparition ancienne d'œuvres attribuées à Hésiode* (Leiden, 1960), 280–1, 614; N.A. Livadaras, *Ἱστορία τῆς παραδόσεως τοῦ κειμένου τοῦ Ἡσιόδου* (Athens, 1963), 35–6; R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship: From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford, 1968), 117; K. Nickau, *RE* 10a (1972), 22, 38; and M.L. West, *Hesiod: Works and Days* (Oxford, 1978), 64.

[2] *Σ* ad Hes. *Th*. 116 c (Di Gregorio) attributes an explanation of *Χάος* to a Zenodotus, but this is evidence for exegesis, not a text, and at any rate it is not certain Zenodotus of Ephesus is meant.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838809000226 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Hesiodic scholia (1814–23), Thomas Gaisford printed the reading of the manuscript, *ἐν δὲ τοῖς Ζηνοδοτείοις*.[3] A decade after the publication of Gaisford's edition in Germany, Wilhelm Muetzell suggested emending *τοῖς* to *ταῖς*.[4] Ten years later Karl Göttling followed Muetzell's suggestion, with the specification that *διορθώσεσι* be understood with *ταῖς*.[5] The emendation was taken up by Hans Flach in his edition of the scholia to the *Theogony* where he maintained that Þkd¾sesi should be understood rather than Göttling's *διορθώσεσι*.[6] Lamberto Di Gregorio followed Flach in the most recent edition of the *Theogony* scholia.[7] Muetzell's emendation of *ταῖς* for *τοῖς* is predicated on understanding that Zenodotus' text of Hesiod's poems was called by later scholars either a *διόρθωσις* or an *ἔκδοσις*, though there is no evidence for this. A third possibility, one that would support the scholion's reading in the manuscript, is that ancient scholars referred to Zenodotus' copy of Hesiod's poems as an *ἀντίγραφον*. In fact, the Homeric scholia twice use the phrase *ἐν δὲ τοῖς Ζηνοδοτείοις* / *Ζηνοδότου* to refer to Zenodotus' text of Homer's *Iliad* as though *ἀντίγραφον* is meant: *Σ*A ad Hom. *Il.* 13.808 a (Erbse) – *ἀλλ' οὐ σύγχει θυμὸν <ἐνὶ στήθεσσιν Ἀχαιεν>*: *… καὶ ὁ Ἀρίσταρχος περὶ τοῦ στίχου οὕτως λέγει ὅτι ἐν τοῖς Ζηνοδοτείοις ἐφέρετο*; and *Σ*A ad Hom. *Il.* 19.26 a (Erbse) – *εὐλὰς ἐγγείνωνται … ἡ διπλῆ δέ, ὅτι ἐν τοῖς Ζηνοδότου 'ἐγγίνωνται' διὰ τοῦ ῑ γέγραπται*.[8] These parallels confirm that *ἐν δὲ τοῖς Ζηνοδοτείοις* (sc. *ἀντιγράφοις*) is the correct reading for the scholion in *Marc. gr.* 464 and discredit Muetzell's emendation.

What this scholion preserves for us is the precious information that Zenodotus read *Τερμη(σ)σοῖο* for *Περμησσοῖο* in his text of Hesiod's *Theogony*. A number of late medieval manuscripts of the *Theogony* (for example, *Vat. gr.* 915, *Laur. conv. suppr.* 158, *Paris gr.* 2833) still retain Zenodotus' variant *Τερμη(σ)σοῖο* or a form of it. There are at least three explanations for the origin of Zenodotus' reading *Τερμη(σ)σοῖο*. One possibility is that the confusion between *Τερμη(σ)σοῖο* and *Περμησσοῖο* reflects some copyist's spelling error since *Π* and *Τ* are orthographically quite similar. Another solution was offered by Felix Jacoby, who imagined that Zenodotus had discovered the form *Τερμη(σ)σοῖο* in an ancient text of the poem (*in libris antiquioribus*) and included it in his own copy.[9] But Martin West has provided the most convincing explanation for the different names when he observed that the scholion records alternative spellings of the river's name as reflected in two different Greek dialects: 'If the initial consonant represents an original labio-velar, *Π-* will be correct for Boeotia, while Attic and koine would have *T-*'.[10] In other words, Hesiod and speakers of Boeotian and other Aeolic dialects would call the stream on Mt Helicon 'Permessos', while speakers of Attic and related dialects (such as Ionic) would refer to the same stream as the 'Termessos'.[11]

[3] T. Gaisford, *Poetae Minores Graeci*, 2 vols (Oxford, 1814; Leipzig, 1823), 2.463.

[4] Muetzell (n. 1), 281.

[5] Göttling (n. 1), lxvi.

[6] Flach (n. 1), 111, 209.

[7] L. Di Gregorio, *Scholia vetera in Hesiodi Theogoniam* (Milan, 1975), 4.

[8] Eustathius (on *Iliad* 2.568, 289.38) offers a similar phrase: *Ἂν τοῖς Ζηνοδότου εὕρηται*; cf. Pfeiffer (n. 1), 117, n. 5; K. Nickau, *Untersuchungen zur textkritischen Methode des Zenodotos von Ephesos* (Berlin and New York, 1977), 5, n. 16; and M.L. West, *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the Iliad* (Munich and Leipzig, 2001), 55, n. 23.

[9] Jacoby (n. 1), 75.

[10] M.L. West, *Hesiod: Theogony* (Oxford, 1966), 153.

[11] On the changes of initial labio-velars into *T-* or *Π-* before front vowels, cf. C.D. Buck, *The Greek Dialects* (Chicago, 1955), 61–2; R. Schmitt, *Einführung in die griechischen Dialekte* (Darmstadt, 1977), 69–70, 76, 81.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838809000226 Published online by Cambridge University Press

A recent theory may confirm West's dialectal explanation for the spelling *Τερμη(σ)σοῖο* in the text of Zenodotus, and allow for a clearer understanding of his copy of Hesiod's *Theogony*. In his study of the transmission of the *Iliad*, West has suggested that Zenodotus brought to Alexandria from his native Ephesus an Ionian rhapsode's copy of Homer's poems which he used as the 'base copy' for his διόρθωσις.[12] According to West's model, Zenodotus notated the rhapsode's copy of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* with critical marks but without altering the underlying text, perhaps including variant readings in its margins. An important clue to the origins of Zenodotus' text is the inclusion of 'various neo-Ionic or hyper-Ionic forms', which he took as evidence of its production in Ionian surroundings.[13] West's suggestion has met with enthusiastic, if not universal, acceptance.[14] West's proposed solution is simple and elegant, and neatly explains the puzzling and seemingly arbitrary readings in Zenodotus' text of Homer.

If while still a young man in Ephesus Zenodotus had procured and annotated a copy of Homer which he later brought with him to Alexandria, we can well imagine that he did the same with a personal copy of Hesiod's poems. Zenodotus' text of Hesiod could thus have been a rhapsodic exemplar which contained the Attic–Ionic spelling *Τερμη(σ)σοῖο*, reflecting what was actually recited in Ephesus and thus differing from the Aeolic–Boeotian *Περμησσοῖο*. If this is the case, a rhapsodic exemplar of Hesiod which shows dialectal traces of its production in Asia Minor would have been the 'base copy' for Zenodotus' text of the *Theogony*. While this is only a hypothesis, it explains the variant dialectal spelling attributed to Zenodotus by the scholia to the *Theogony*, and accords well with the most satisfactory theory about his διόρθωσις of Homer.

If the suggestion that a rhapsode's copy of the *Theogony* found its way from Ephesus to Alexandria is accepted, further evidence of the Ionian background of Zenodotus' text comes to light. The medieval manuscripts of the *Theogony* transmit the Attic form of the pronoun *ἑαυτῇ* in line 126, but a second-century citation (Theophilus Apol. *Ad Autolycum* 2.6.11) and a fourth- or fifth-century papyrus (*P. Achmîm* 3) contain instead the neo- or hyper-Ionic form *ἑωυτῇ*.[15] A papyrus fragment of the *Catalogue of Women* (fr. 45 M–W = fr. 37 Hirschberger) contains the similar form *ἑωυτῆς*. The Hesiodic scholia are silent on whether *ἑαυτῇ* or *ἑωυτῇ* stood in the Alexandrian copies of Hesiod's *Theogony* (and there are unfortunately no scholia to the *Catalogue of Women*), but the scholia to Homer indicate that Zenodotus read the neo- or hyper-Ionic form *ἑωυτήν* in his διόρθωσις of the *Iliad*: *Σ*A ad Hom. *Il*. 14.162 b (Erbse) – *ἓ αὐτήν*: *ὅτι Ζηνόδοτος γράφει 'ἑωυτήν'. οὐχ ἁρμόζει δὲ αἰτιατικῇ πτώσει τὸ οὕτως συναλείφειν· διαλύεται γὰρ εἰς τὸ ἓ καὶ αὐτήν. ἀγνοεῖν δὲ τὴν διαγορὰν αὐτόν φησιν Ἀρίσταρχος*.[16] The neo- or hyper-Ionic form in Zenodotus'

[12] West (n. 8), 33–45; id., 'Zenodotus' Text', in F. Montanari (ed.), *Omero tremila anni dopo* (Rome, 2002), 137–42.

[13] West (n. 8), 43.

[14] F. Montanari, 'Alexandrian Homeric philology. The form of the *ekdosis* and the *variae lectiones*', in M. Reichel and A. Rengakos, *Epea Pteroenta: Beiträge zur Homerforschung – Festschrift für Wolfgang Kullmann zum 75 Geburtstag* (Stuttgart, 2002), 119–40, at 123; R. Janko, 'Seduta di Chiusura', in Montanari (n. 12), 653–66, at 658; id., review of West (n. 8), in *CW* 97 (2003), 100–1, at 100. A. Rengakos argues against the hypothesis in his review of West (n. 8), in *BMCR* 2002.11.15: http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/bmcr/2002/2002-11-15.html.

[15] West (n. 10), 81 argues that the correct reading is *ἑωυτῇ*. Cf. Buck (n. 11), 79–80; Schmitt (n. 11), 103.

[16] Cf. *Σ*A^{im} ad Hom. *Il*. 1.271 a (Erbse): *<κατ' ἔμ' αὐτόν:> ὅτι Ζηνόδοτος γράφει 'κατ' ἐμωυτόν'. τὸ δὲ πλῆρες ἐμὲ αὐτόν*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838809000226 Published online by Cambridge University Press

διόρθωσις of the *Iliad* is the same as the variant dialectal form in *Theogony* 126 and the reading of the papyrus of the *Catalogue of Women*. We might therefore suspect, and with good reason, that the neo- and hyper-Ionicisms that existed in the texts of Homer and Hesiod stem from copies produced by rhapsodes in an Ionian setting, and that *Τερμη(σ)σοῖο*, *ἑωυτῇ* and *ἑωυτῆς* all once appeared in Zenodotus' copy of Hesiod's poems. The methods by which Zenodotus' readings have passed into papyri of the *Theogony* and the *Catalogue*, medieval manuscripts of the *Theogony* and the Hesiodic scholia are opaque; yet taken together they point to the fact that ancient scholars who came after Zenodotus took an interest in preserving his readings and thoughts – if only to disagree with them. This theory about an Ionian rhapsodic copy of Hesiod in third-century Alexandria has the additional conclusion that Zenodotus' text of Hesiod contained both the *Theogony* and the *Catalogue of Women*.[17] This may serve as another reminder that ancient views on the authenticity of Hesiod's poems differ from our own.

Cornell University C.M. SCHROEDER
chad.matthew.schroeder@gmail.com
doi:10.1017/S00098388090000226

[17] Schwartz (n. 1), 280–1 hints in this direction, following the suggestion about the Ionian background of Zenodotus' text of Homer made by G. Pasquali in *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo* (Florence, 1934), 240–1.

THE DISUNION OF CATULLUS' *FRATRES UNANIMI* AT VIRGIL, *AENEID* 7.335–6

That Virgil presents the Latin War of *Aeneid* 7–12 as, among other things, a civil war between proto-Romans, has been noted by many readers of the poem.[1] The language of civil war becomes prominent in his account of the outbreak of war in Book 7. Here it is the typology of familial discord as a reflection of civil discord that Virgil employs most conspicuously. At 7.323–40 Juno commissions the Fury Allecto, the embodiment of familial strife (*odit et ipse pater Pluton, odere sorores | Tartareae monstrum*, 7.327–8), to stir up discord between eventual son-in-law Aeneas and father-in-law Latinus. Juno's pitting of these two against one another (*hac gener atque socer coeant mercede suorum: | sanguine Troiano et Rutulo dotabere, uirgo*, 7.317–18) recalls – and so thematically prefigures – a later Roman civil war, that between father-in-law Caesar and son-in-law Pompey, a conflict highlighted by Anchises in the previous book (*aggeribus socer Alpinis atque arce Monoeci | descendens, gener aduersis instructus Eois*, 6.830–1).

Warring fathers and sons, we learn from Juno, are to be accompanied by battling brothers. At 7.335–40 Juno gives Allecto her formal assignment:

[1] On civil war in the *Aeneid*, see e.g. S.J. Harrison, 'Virgil as a poet of war', *PVS* 19 (1988), 48–68, esp. 63–6; F. Cairns, *Virgil's Augustan Epic* (Cambridge, 1989), 85–108; P. Hardie, 'Tales of unity and division in imperial Latin epic', 57–71, in J.H. Molyneux (ed.), *Literary Responses to Civil Discord* (Nottingham, 1993); and N.M. Horsfall, *A Companion to the Study of Virgil* (Leiden, 1995), 155–61, with further bibliography.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838809000226 Published online by Cambridge University Press