The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Zenodotus, Aristophanes, and the Modern Homeric Text

T. W. Allen

The Classical Review / Volume 14 / Issue 05 / June 2010, pp 242 - 244

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00082639, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00082639

How to cite this article:

T. W. Allen (2010). Zenodotus, Aristophanes, and the Modern Homeric Text. The Classical Review, 14, pp 242-244 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00082639

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

ZENODOTUS, ARISTOPHANES, AND THE MODERN HOMERIC TEXT.

IN the number of this *Review* for December 1899 a calculation was offered of the extent to which Aristarchus' readings have found a place in the mediaeval Homeric text. The present article extends the enquiry to Aristarchus' two principal predecessors.

I adopt the same classification as in the case of Aristarchus, omitting however one or two categories; the readings are divided according as they are found (1) in all MSS. (2) in the majority, (3) in the minority, (4) sporadically, (5) in none.

As before I omit atheteses, rearrangements of lines, and questions of accentuation.

	(3) 32	= 1
	(4) 114	= 1
	(5)	= 4
		Θ
	(1) 113, 349	= 2
	(2) 378	= 1
	(3)	= 0
	(4) 290, 526	= 2
	(5)	= 15
		I
	(1)	= 0
	(2) 128 (?), 564	= 2
	(3)	= 0
	(4)	= 0
	(5)	= 14
		K
	(1)	= 0
	(2)	= 0
	(3)	= 0
	(4) 317	= 1
	(5)	= 9
		Λ
	(1) 437	= 1
	(2) 219, 368, 439, 799	= 4
	(3) 86, 94	= 2
	(4) 101, 104, 348, 754	= 4
	(5)	= 17
		M
	(1)	= 0
	(2) 161, 231, 340	= 3
	(3) 342	= 1
	(4) 246	= 1
	(5)	= 17
		N
	(1)	= 0
	(2) 423, 449	= 2
	(3) 447	= 1
	(4) 172, 245, 485, 551	= 4
	(5)	= 22
		Ξ
	(1)	= 0
	(2)	= 0
	(3) 16, 118, 208, 249, 310, 400, 437	= 7
	(4) 40, 95, 223, 236, 274, 276, 322,	
	351, 412, 445, 505	= 11
	(5)	= 17
		O
	(1)	= 0
	(2) 139, 179, 459	= 3
	(3) 79, 138, 179, 301	= 4
	(4) 134, 377, 470	= 3
	(5)	= 13
		Π
	(1)	= 0
	(2) 188	= 1
	(3) 161, 507	= 2
A		
(1) 97	= 1	
(2) 260	= 1	
(3) 393	= 1	
(4) 24, 80, 83, 86, 198, 271, 367 (?),		
400, 600	= 9	
(5)	= 23	
B		
(1)	= 0	
(2) 12, 53, 448	= 3	
(3) 196	= 1	
(4) 239, 302, 318	= 3	
(5)	= 29	
Γ		
(1)	= 0	
(2)	= 0	
(3) 211	= 1	
(4) 51, 57, 74, 152 (?), 206, 280	= 6	
(5)	= 13	
Δ		
(1)	= 0	
(2)	= 0	
(3) 277	= 1	
(4) 161	= 1	
(5)	= 5	
E		
(1)	= 0	
(2) 293, 466	= 2	
(3) 156, 227	= 2	
(4) 31, 638	= 2	
(5)	= 11	
Z		
(1)	= 0	
(2)	= 0	
(3)	= 0	
(4) 366	= 1	
(5)	= 7	
H		
(1)	= 0	
(2) 451	= 1	

(4) 710	=1		Φ	
(5)	=12	(1)		=0
		(2)		=0
(1)	=0	(3)		=0
(2) 171	=1	(4) 335 (?)		=1
(3)	=0	(5)		=4
(4) 173, 392	=2		X	
(5)	=12	(1)		=0
		(2)		=0
(1)	=0	(3)		=0
(2) 34	=1	(4)		=0
(3) 198, 400, 477, 563	=4	(5)		=1
(4) 385, 424, 576	=3		Ψ	
(5)	=19	(1)		=0
		(2) 307		=1
(1)	=0	(3)		=0
(2)	=0	(4) 753		=1
(3)	=0	(5)		=4
(4) 26, 342	=2		Ω	
(5)	=3	(1)		=0
		(2) 486		=1
(1)	=0	(3)		=0
(2) 11, 138	=2	(4) 293, 512, 550, 725		=4
(3)	=0	(5)		=0
(4) 484	=1			
(5)	=4			

The totals may be exhibited in a table :

	A	B	Γ	Δ	E	Z	H	Θ	I	K	Λ	M	N	Ξ	O	Π	P	Σ	T	Υ	Φ	X	Ψ	Ω
Total	34	35	19	7	17	8	7	18	16	9	23	22	29	35	23	16	15	27	5	7	5	1	6	5
All	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Majority..	1	3	0	0	2	0	1	1	2	0	4	3	2	0	3	1	1	1	0	2	0	0	1	1
Minority..	1	1	2	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	7	4	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sporadic..	9	3	6	1	2	1	1	2	0	1	4	1	4	11	3	1	2	3	2	1	1	0	1	4
None	12	28	11	5	11	7	4	13	14	8	17	17	22	17	13	12	12	19	3	4	4	1	4	0

And to sum up :

Total	.	.	.	385
all MSS.	.	.	.	4
majority	.	.	.	29
minority	.	.	.	29
sporadic	.	.	.	64
none	.	.	.	259.

Considering the powerful opposition that Zenodotus' choices had almost immediately to withstand, it is perhaps remarkable that even a third of them should have in one form or another survived. I can offer no explanation of the resistance of the 4 readings which are found in all MSS. and the 29 which are found in the majority, except that, as I have suggested elsewhere, Zenodotus paid more regard to the *κοινή*, and coincided with it more often, than ancient critics generally. He is explicitly stated to agree with it by the scholia on B 53, © 349.

The sporadic survivals, which may very possibly be increased by further collation, cannot be due to this cause. I hope before long to offer an explanation of their origin.

I do not find that these considerations are covered by the article of Adolf Römer, *Ueber die Homerrecension des Zenodot.* Abh. d. I. Cl. d. k. Bayerischen Akad. d. Wiss. 1884 xvii. 641, and I presume they are not by the older book of Düntzer (1848) which I have not seen. Pusch, *Quaestiones Zenodoteae* 1889, does not concern himself with Homer.

For Aristophanes it may be sufficient if we summarise the results at once :

Readings peculiar to Aristophanes	81
in all MSS.	2
in the majority	9
in the minority	16
in sporadic MSS.	8
in none	46

The lowness of all these figures compared with those in the case of Zenodotus, is striking. Aristophanes was less original than his predecessor, fell more into the stream of *ἐκδόσεις*, and therefore was absorbed, or nearly so, by Aristarchus. The scarcity of sporadic survivals, which is

remarkable, is perhaps to be accounted for by the unkindness of tradition, which will have unduly merged Aristophanes in the gulf of *τινές*, *ἐνιοί*, *γράφεται* and the like. A notorious case is at Φ 217 where it was left for 'Ammonius' to restore to Aristophanes his *πελάσας*, hitherto the property of *τινές*.

In Nauck's book on Aristophanes (1848) his readings are analysed according to their intrinsic merit.

It should perhaps be stated explicitly that in this article I have taken account only of the absolutely peculiar readings of Zenodotus and Aristophanes; I have omitted the cases where they agree with one another, with any of their predecessors, and where the reading of either or both of them has been accepted by Aristarchus.

I append a list of Alexandrian and post-Alexandrian critics whose readings have found their way into manuscripts:

Antigonus Ψ 319 (a few).
Apollonius I 153 (a few).
Callistratus Ξ 255 (one MS.).
Crates Φ 558 (one MS.).
Demetrius Ixion B 127 (?) (one or two MSS.).
Epaphroditus Σ 313 (two MSS.).
Heracleo A 298 (majority).
Hermias II 207 (minority).
Menecrates Δ 94 (all).
Nicias E 203 (majority).
Ptolemy Ascalonites H 177 (MSS. divided).

T. W. ALLEN.

POSTSCRIPT.

The MS. which was quoted in my review of 'Ammonius,' February 1900, as 'Ven. 459' is more correctly 'Ven. 458.' Its scholia have been published by Prof. Ludwig in his 'Homericæ' 1893. I add a few points to his account. (1) The two MSS. Ven. 458 and Par. 2766 are identical not only in their scholia but in their text: they are both members of the 'L Lips.' or *h* family. For Par. 2766 I refer to Dr. Leaf, *Journ. Phil.* 1892, p. 246. These scholia are however not common to the *h* family as a whole; the other members either want scholia or possess scholia of a different character. (2) The mention of Dionysius Thrax, Timarchus and Aristotle on *ἐνταυθοί* (Φ 122) remains the principal peculiarity of Ven. 458 Par. 2766; even 'Ammonius' has only Dionysius. Timarchus, whose name occurs nowhere else, is perhaps Timachidas, a commentator active in the Aristophanes scholia. On Φ 163 Ptolemy Pindarion occurs nowhere else, but his name may perhaps be introduced into 'Ammonius' at the top of col. vii. (3) The quotation from Alcaeus on X 338 is to be found in T (on 332): on the other hand the following morsel of Ibycus, which I do not find ap. Ludwig, seems new. Ψ 533 *πρόσσοθεν. συνέσταλται τὸ ὦ καὶ ἔστιν ὁμοιον τῷ παριβυκῷ κύματος ἔξωθεν ἄκρου πᾶσα καλῶς ἀσινῆς (sic.)*.

DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS AS AN AUTHORITY FOR THE TEXT OF THUCYDIDES.

(WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THUCYD. VIII. 64 § 5 AS QUOTED IN EP. AD AMMAEUM II. 11.)

The passage of *Ep. ad Amm.* ii. runs thus in the text edited last year by Usener and Radermacher (*Dionysii Halicarnasei Opera*, vol. I pp. 430, 431): 'Εν οἷς δὲ τὰς πτώσεις τῶν ὀνομάτων καὶ τῶν προσηγοριῶν καὶ τῶν μετοχῶν καὶ <τῶν> συναπτομένων τούτοις ἄρθρων ἐξαλλάττει τοῦ συνηθοῦς, οὕτως σχηματίζει [τῇ φράσει] 'σωφροσύνην γὰρ λαβοῦσαι αἱ πόλεις καὶ ἄδειαν τῶν πρᾶσσομένων ἐχώρησαν ἐπὶ τὴν ἀντικρὺς ἐλευθερίαν, τῆς ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ὑποῦλου εὐνομίας οὐ προτιμήσαντες.' οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἀκολούθως τῇ κοινῇ συνηθείᾳ σχηματίζοντες τὴν φράσιν τῷ τε θηλυκῷ γένει τῆς προσηγορίας τὸ θηλυκὸν ἂν ἔξευξαν μόριον, καὶ τὴν πτώσιν [τῆς μετοχῆς] τὴν αἰτιατικὴν <ἂν>

ἀντὶ τῆς γενικῆς ἔταξαν τὸν τρόπον τόνδε· 'σωφροσύνην γὰρ λαβοῦσαι αἱ πόλεις καὶ ἄδειαν τῶν πρᾶσσομένων ἐχώρησαν ἐπὶ τὴν ἀντικρὺς ἐλευθερίαν, τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ὑποῦλου εὐνομίας οὐ προτιμήσαντες.' οἱ δὲ τὰ ἄρρενικὰ τοῖς θηλυκοῖς συντάττοντες, ὥσπερ οὗτος πεποίηκεν, <καὶ> τὰς γενικὰς ἀντὶ τῶν αἰτιατικῶν πτώσεων παραλαμβάνοντες σολοικίζουσιν ἂν ὑφ' ἡμῶν λέγουτο.

'Sometimes Thucydides gives an unusual turn to the cases of proper names, and common nouns, and participles, and the articles attached to them. He will then frame such a sentence as this: *σωφροσύνην...τῆς ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ὑποῦλου εὐνομίας οὐ προτι-*