TWO TEXTUAL NOTES ON THEODOTUS

SUPPLEMENTUM HELLENISTICUM 757.3

The Hellenistic Jewish poet Theodotus locates at least part of an epic at the city of Shechem. He writes,

> ἡ δ' ἄρ' ἔην ἀγαθή τε καὶ αἰγινόμος χὐδρηλή,
> οὐδὲ μὲν ἔσκεν ὁδὸς δολιχὴ πόλιν εἰσαφικέσθαι
> ἀγρόθεν, οὐδέ ποτε δρία λαχνήεντα πονεῦσιν. (757, 1–3)

The meaning of πονεῦσιν (as well as its syntax) is quite mysterious and debated. Holladay writes, 'nor were there ever dense thickets for laborers'[1] and takes πονεῦσιν to refer to farmers.[2] This is a stretch for πονεῦσιν. Fallon has, 'nor even leafy woods for the weary'.[3] Similarly, Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, 'nec (erant) saltus impervii defessis (viatoribus)?'[4] Others take the verb to be third person plural rather than the participle, for example, 'nirgends macht dorniges Gestrüpp (dem Wanderer) Mühe';[5] also Lloyd-Jones and Parsons (n. 4) (though apparently preferring not to have a neuter plural noun with a plural verb), 'nec saltus impervios (incolae) laboriose transeunt (vel colunt)?' All these renditions strain the sense or the use of πονέν. In addition, the form is a bit of a surprise since we might expect to find πονοῦσιν (whether the finite verb or the participle).[6]

A palaeographically simple emendation gives us a regular form and a straightforward unambiguous sense. For πονεῦσιν read τομεῦσιν (= 'cutters, pruners').[7] Corruptions from τ to π and μ to ν are both easy and common. The -ευσιν ending is regular. The sense is appropriate and the clause is tied closely to the preceding οὐδέ clause, 'the journey from the country to the city was not long nor were there ever dense thickets for pruners' (i.e. that needed to be cleared away). The noun τομάς is found of a 'clearing in a forest' (*LSJ*).[8]

[1] C. R. Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, vol. 2 (Atlanta, 1989), 107.

[2] This is apparently what A. Ludwich's paraphrase also represents (*De Theodoti Carmine Graeco-Iudaico* [Regimontii, 1899], 6): Die Feldarbeit wird durch kein Gebüsch beeinträchtigt.

[3] F. Fallon in J. H. Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol. 2 (New York, 1985), 790.

[4] H. Lloyd-Jones and P. Parsons, *Supplementum Hellenisticum* (Berlin, 1983), 363.

[5] N. Walter, 'Theodotos der Epiker', in *Jüdische Schriften aus Hellenistisch-Römischer Zeit*, vol. 4.3 (Gütersloh, 1983), 165.

[6] The form πονεῦσι apparently occurs first in the second century A.D. (Aretaeus Medicus, *De causis* 4 [=2].6.6 [Hude, p. 73]); also ps.-Oppian, *Cyneg.* 4.354). The use of ευ for ου in the third person plural of εω-contracts occurs a few times in Homer (*Il.* 9.384, ἐξοιχνεῦσι; West rejects it; also, *Od.* 3.322, 9.120: [εἰσ]οιχνεῦσι). See P. Chantraine, *Grammaire Homérique*, vol. 1 (Paris, 1958), 58–63, especially 62.

[7] Although τομεύς is mostly used of objects, it (and its compounds) are occasionally used personally, e.g. Philo, *Quis heres* 166, 180 (of God; cf. Philo's use of τεχνίτης of God: *Quis heres* 225); also ἰατροτομεύς of a surgeon. -ευς nouns are commonly used of craftsmen and professionals, e.g. γραμματεύς, βαφεύς, γραφεύς.

[8] *IG* 5 (2) 343A 6 and 12 (fourth century B.C., Orchomenus in Arcadia). κωλοτομέω is used of reaping grain (*Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* [ed. Davies] p. 110, fr. 21; *Supplementum Hellenisticum* fr. adesp. 1139). τομή is used = 'pruning'. With respect to my conjecture here, *CQ*'s reader comments that it would be rash to claim more than a measure of general plausibility for it. I would not disagree.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000328 Published online by Cambridge University Press

SUPPLEMENTUM HELLENISTICUM 759.5–6

ἀλλὰ τότ' οἷος / ἤνασσεν Συρίης, νεηγενὲς αἷμα λελογχώς.[9]

νεηγενές is unmetrical and so R. Stephanus suggested the spelling νειηγενές. There is no evidence for the word so spelled, but ει for ε for metrical purposes is not unusual. Most commentators recognize that νειηγενές is hard to explain in context. A variety of explanations exist, for example, 'possessing newborn blood', that is, having very young children.[10] But, as the immediately following lines show, his children are of marriageable age. Gifford thinks it refers to new-born sons, presumably born many years after his daughters, and thus explains why he rules alone. But, one presumes, he would rule alone even if his male children were grown. Equally important, it is not at all clear that the Greek can bear this sense; the expression αἷμα λελογχώς refers to ancestors, not to descendants (e.g. Lucian, *Alex*. 11). Lloyd-Jones and Parsons print the transmitted text and obelize.

It is time to resurrect Ludwich's emendation εὐηγενές. Nearly all scholars ignore it completely. If it is ever mentioned, it is only to be dismissed out of hand, for example, with Holladay's[11] 'less apt' and that is it.[12] In fact, it gives good sense, is contextually appropriate, and its corruption is easily explained. The phrase εὐηγενὲς αἷμα λελογχώς means straightforwardly, 'He possessed a distinguished lineage.' Essentially the same sense is present in a very similar phrase at the Orphic *Argonautica* 81, when Jason describes himself, πανέξοχον αἷμα λελογχώς, 'I possess a pre-eminent lineage.'

The corruption of εὐηγενές to ἐνηγενες was simple and the inversion of εν to νε to give a real word may have been inevitable, even immediate.[13]

University of Illinois, Urbana HOWARD JACOBSON
doi:10.1017/S0009838807000328

[9] P. 361.

[10] E.g. E. H. Gifford, *Eusebii Pamphili Evangelicae Praeparationis Libri XV*, vol. 3.1 (Oxford, 1903), 458, 'who alone o'er Syria ruled, his sons as yet new-born'; K. Mras, *Eusebius Werke*: *Die Praeparatio Evangelica*, vol. 8.1 (Berlin, 1954), 513, ap. crit., 'dessen Kinder noch jung waren'. See Holladay (n. 1), 166–7 for other attempts at making sense of the line.

[11] Holladay (n. 1), 166.

[12] Ludwich (n. 2), 4. Ludwich was in some degree responsible for the neglect of his emendation, since he simply printed it in his text and said not one word in its defence, limiting himself to a statement that νειηγενές did not give sense (p. 5).

[13] I am indebted to David Sansone for helpful discussions about these texts. I am also grateful to *CQ*'s referee for valuable comments and criticisms.

ALICARIA IN PLAUTUS, FESTUS AND POMPEII

Near the beginning of Plautus' *Poenulus*, the virtuous prostitute Adelphasium, who will turn out to be freeborn, attempts to dissuade her less respectable sister Anterastilis from going to the temple of Venus for a festival in honour of the goddess. Adelphasium's reluctance to be present at these sacrifices arises from her disgust at the crowd that will be in attendance: common prostitutes, the sort of women who smell bad and try to cover it up with cheap perfume, the type who go with millers/bakers and slaves rather than respectable free clients:

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000328 Published online by Cambridge University Press