


Marta Cardin and Filippomaria Pontani

Hesiod's Fragments in Byzantium


ἀλλ' οὐ μόνος ταῦτα σὺ οὐδὲ κατ' ἐμοῦ μόνου, ἀλλὰ πολλοὶ καὶ ἄλλοι τὰ τοῦ ὁμοτέχνου τοῦ ἐμοῦ Ὀμήρου κατακνίζουσι λεπτὰ οὕτω κομιδῇ καὶ μάλιστα μικρὰ ἄττα δεξιὰ  (Cv. Hes. 5)¹

1 Foreword: Hesiod in Byzantium

‘Tell me, then... do you prefer Homer’s poetry or Hesiod’s? or that of any other poet beyond these both? “Homer’s”, I know you will reply, “and then Hesiod’s”, unless I totally misunderstand your nodding; and you are perfectly right to extol these two as the wisest of all poets. But would you then let the young study the language on their poetry? I see that you agree with that too’.

This is how Theodore Prodromos (ca. 1100–1158/70), a prolific and renowned writer of the Comnenian age (ca. 1081–1185), addresses the protagonist of the satire called ‘*An ignorant, or a self-proclaimed professor*’ (no. 144 Horänder).² Through these and similar questions, he attempts to unmask the insufficient preparation and the unsatisfying dialectical skill of his silent interlocutor; in order to drive him into an embarrassing *impasse*, he casts doubts on the *communis opinio* that regards the study of the works of the two greatest poets as most useful: Plato, he argues, banned Homer’s epic from education, and Hesiod is of no use even to sailors and peasants, who are not capable of understanding his teachings, clad as they are in meter and poetry.³ The self-proclaimed teacher has no answer, whence Theodore invites him to go back and study grammar

¹ Hesiod speaks: ‘You are not alone in this, nor am I the only victim. Many others pick the poetry of my fellow-craftsman Homer utterly to pieces, pointing out similar niggling details, the merest trifles’ (transl. Koning 2010, 94–95).

² Ἀμαθῆς ἢ παρὰ ἑαυτῷ γραμματικός, ll. 95–101 Migliorini (2010, 29–51; formerly ed. Podestà [1945] 242–252, here 246.13–247.1, and AO III 222–27 Cramer, here 225.15–22; see also Romano 1999, 298–309):  ἐπεὶ Cramer Podestà] τοιγαροῦν... Ὀμήρου ἀποδέχῃ ποιήσιν ἢ Ἡσιόδου; ἢ παρ’ ἄμφω τῷ ἀνδρὲ ἄλλου του; Ὀμήρου εὖ οἶδ’ ὅτι λέγεις καὶ μετ’ αὐτὸν Ἡσιόδου, εἰ μὴ παντάπασι καταψεύδομαί σου τῆς κεφαλῆς, καὶ εὔγε ποιεῖς τοὺς σοφωτάτους τῶν ἄλλων ὑπερτιθέμενος. ἄρα γοῦν καὶ τοῖς τούτων ποιήμασιν ἐγγυμνάσαις τοὺς νέους; καὶ τοῦτο μόγις κατένευσας.

³ Ll. 101–116 Migliorini (p. 247.1–14 Podestà = AO III 225.22–226.7). References are to Plat. R. 10.606e-8b and Lg. 7.801c-2c; Hesiod is considered here for his practical *opheleia* in the *Erga*.

from the very beginning, evoking the famous Hesiodic *dictum* that the gods have placed sweat before virtue (289–90).⁴

With his penetrating irony, Theodore gives us a glimpse of the reception of Hesiod in 12th-century Byzantium, the ‘Homeric century’ that witnessed an important Renaissance of Classical studies. In this period, the comparison between Homer and Hesiod was still among the favourite topics for erudites: while Hesiod regularly came second – both in scholastic and in scribal practice – his works were nonetheless quite widespread. This can be appreciated by consulting the *apparatus comparandorum et testimoniorum* in the editions of Alois Rzach and Martin West, as well as the indices and the *apparatus fontium* of some of the main works of Comnenian literature.

An historian such as Niketas Choniates (ca. 1155/7–1217), for instance, did not hesitate to blend into the same *iunctura* a line from the *Works and Days* (442) with a verset of *Isaiah* (58.7), in order to indicate that Isaac Angelos was expected to give bread to his Norman prisoners.⁶ In the novel *The love story of Hysmine and Hysminias* by Eustathios Makropoulos (12th c.), we find several consecutive Hesiodic echoes in the *ekphrasis* of the paintings of the twelve months: a peasant bent on the grain-spikes wears on his head *πίλον ἀσκητὸν καθ’ Ἡσίοδου*, ‘a well-made felt cap, as Hesiod says’ (*WD* 545–546); another one marks the time for ploughing *ὄν καὶ τις σοφὸς ἐκ τῶν Πληιάδων ... ἦκριβώσατο*, ‘that a wise man determined exactly ... from the Pleiades’ (see *WD* 383–384); the winter is the old man *ὁ τῆι ἰστίηι ἐμπελαδόν*, ‘near the hearth’

⁴ LL 116–136 Migliorini (pp. 247.14–248.15 Podestà = *AO* III 226.8–32). On the *Nachleben* of 9–292 in an educative context see Koning (2010) 144–149 and Hunter (2014) 93–100. Basil of Caesarea describes these lines as τὰ ἔπη ἃ πάντες αἰδοῦσιν (*Ad adul. de ut.* 5.8–15 Boulenger); Ioannes Tzetzes in his scholium *ad loc.* (p. 198.1–8 Gaisf.) gives as an example precisely the toil of whoever chooses to acquire ἀρετή in the art of grammar (the text is that of Cardin’s forthcoming edition): τυχὸν γάρ τις ἐθέλει γραμματικὴν ἀρετὴν ἐπικτήσασθαι, καὶ οὐκ εὐθέως αὐτῆς γίνεται μέτοχος, ἀλλὰ πρότερον αὐτὸν ἐκδίδωσι τοῖς στοιχειώδεσι γράμμασιν, εἶτα ταῖς συλλαβαῖς καὶ τῆι λοιπῇ προπαιδείᾳ, ἔπειτα τῆι Διονυσίου βίβλωι (cf. Uhlig 1883, vi, 3) προσέχει καὶ τοῖς Θεοδοσίου κανόσι (cf. Hilgard [1894] vii) καὶ ποιηταῖς, εἶτα σχεδιογραφίας ἀπάρχεται· καὶ πολλὰ πολλοῖς μογήσας τοῖς χρόνοις, μόγις τὴν ἀρετὴν ἐπικτάται.

⁵ See Kaldellis (2007) 225–316 (‘The twelfth was... a Homeric century’, p. 243), and (2009); Flusin (2008) 390–395; Pontani (2015) 366–394. Homeric studies in the 12th century investigated especially by Basilikopoulou-Ioannidou (1971); Browning (1975) and (1992a); Pontani (2005) 159–178; Cullhed (2014) 27–89. On Hesiod’s role in the Byzantine scholastic curriculum (commentaries, editions, etc.), see Krumbacher (1897) 505; Browning (1992b) 134; Wilson (1996²) 24. Hesiod is particularly present in the work of Prodomos: *WD* 158 and 737–738 are taken up in the tetrasticha on the Holy Scriptures (248b4 e 264b2): see Magnelli (2003) 193–194.

⁶ *Hist.* 12.3, p. 364.3 van Dielen (τρύφος ἄρτου διαθρύπτειν ὀκτάβλωμον), with the note *ad loc.* by Pontani (1999) 695–696.

(*WD* 734), because ὁ ... χειμῶν διὰ κόρης ἀπαλόχρους οὐ διάησι, τρόχαλον δὲ ἄροντα τίθησι, ‘the winterly wind “does not blow through the soft-skinned maiden”, “but it makes the old man curved like a wheel” ’ (*WD* 518–519).⁷ And more examples could be added.⁸

To the same period we owe the first instances of systematic commentaries to the Hesiodic poems, a clear sign of their being taught in schools and of the attention devoted by erudites to their text: Ioannes Tzetzes (born around the 1110s and died after the mid-1160s) is the author of an exegesis on the *Works and Days*, and probably also of a peculiar recension of the scholia to the *Aspis* – both preserved in the important collection of ancient poetry and erudite literature represented by ms. *Ambr. C 222 inf.* (end of the 12th c.) – as well as of a popular *vita Hesiodi* (contained in his *prolegomena* to the *Works*), and of a brand-new *Theogony* in political verse, overtly inspired by that of Hesiod.⁹ To all this, one should

⁷ (Translations of these lines, here and elsewhere, are mostly by G. W. Most). References are to *Hysm. amor.* 4.9.2, 4.9.10, 12 and 13 (pp. 40.5–6, 45.4–6, 16 and 18–20 Marcovich). On authorship and date of this novel see Hunger (1978) II 137–142, and *ODB* II 1273 s.v. (A. Kaldellis); more parallels can be detected, e.g. *WD* 24 in 9.2.3 (p. 110.1–2) Marcovich.

⁸ The story of Hesiod's reception in Byzantium has yet to be analysed in a systematic study. Recent inquiries have been carried out on his reception in antiquity (Koning 2010), especially of the two main poems (Hunter 2014 for the *Works and Days*, Scully 2015 for the *Theogony* – the latter also alludes to Byzantine reception: pp. 162–163). Information on the abiding interest in Hesiod's work after Late Antiquity can be gathered from scattered hints in West (1966) 69–72 (*Th.*), and (1978) 69–71 (*Op.*); Russo (1965²) 52–57 (*Scut.*); Schwartz (1960) 47–62 (fragments); as well as from the reference works on Byzantine philology and literature, esp. Wilson (1996²) (p. 3 on the quotation of *WD* 240 in a letter of Alexios III to the Republic of Genoa in 1199) and Pontani (2015) (p. 368 on the quotation of *WD* 343 in a letter of Michael Italikos to Alexios Komnenos).

⁹ On ms. *Ambr. C 222 inf.* and its dating, see Mazzucchi (2000, 2003 and 2004); on the scholia to the *Aspis*, and on Tzetzes' possible intervention, see Martano (2002), esp. 162–166. In the last years of the 12th c. (or in the early years of the 13th) was produced ms. *Messanensis* F.V. 11, a key witness of the early spreading of Tzetzes' commentary to the *WD* in Southern Italy: see esp. Colonna (1953) 30–31; Mioni (1965) 139–141 no. 74; Lucà (1993) 85–86. On these mss. also Pontani (2015) 393–394, 396. On Hesiod's life and Tzetzes' *Theogony* see also below, § 2.1. Tzetzes' exegesis to the *Works and Days* – as the ms. witnesses indicate – circulated in the form of a commented edition; see for a comparable case the *Iliad* edition prepared by Isaac Porphyrogenitos ('Par. gr. 2862 is a unique manuscript, in that it preserves a true "edition" of the *Iliad* produced from the beginning to the end by a single identifiable Byzantine scholar... a neat and careful copy of the manuscript originally conceived and produced by Isaac Porphyrogenitos, including a preface, a text with copious scholia and an appendix designated to "integrate" the Homeric account of the Trojan war': Pontani (2006) 556).

add a Neoplatonic commentary to the *Theogony* compiled by an obscure figure known by the name of Ioannes Diakonos Galenos.¹⁰

Finally, the 12th century is also the last moment when scholars deal with the conspicuous ancient erudite material (of both mythographical and lexicographic-grammatical nature) concerning the fragments of the minor works of the Hesiodic *corpus*.¹¹ Key figures in this process are the aforementioned Ioannes Tzetzes and Eustathios the archbishop of Thessalonike (ca. 1115 – 1195/96), who were also the most important Homerists of their time, and who will keep us busy in §§ 2 and 3:¹² to them we owe, *inter alia*, the transmission of several Hesiodic fragments (for some of which they are only witnesses), coming from the *Catalogue of Women*, but also from the *Melampodia*, the *Astronomy*, the *Aigimios*, and many others *incertae sedis*. The erudite output of these two outstanding scholars, however inspired by very different, indeed sometimes almost opposite approaches to Hesiod's poetry, represents, together with the lexicographical and grammatical tradition (whose long roots may in fact tell us less about the culture of the age than the ancient sources employed by the compilers), the most important source of information on the Hesiodic *corpus* in the entire Byzantine millennium.¹³

Of course, this lively presence of our poet in the 12th century would have been impossible without some continuity of transmission over the earlier ages. We still have important traces of the reception of Hesiod between the 9th and the 11th centuries in manuscript witnesses of both the three main poems and the related ancient exegesis, as well as in references and allusions in literary and sub-literary works. The second half of the 10th century is the age of an es-

¹⁰ Ed. Flach (1876) 294–365. The dating of this is uncertain, but recent studies agree in placing him in the lively environment of the Comnenian age: see Cullhed (2014) 65–67; Roilos (2014); Pontani (2015) 376–377. On the novelty of Byzantine commentaries to the great classics of pagan literature, see Kaldellis (2009); Pontani (2015) 375–378.

¹¹ On the Hesiodic *corpus*, see now Cingano (2009).

¹² Morgan (1983) 165 terms Ioannes ‘the leading interpreter of Homer’ and Eustathios ‘the leading commentator on Homer’.

¹³ Admittedly, this interest is not confined to the 12th century. Fr. 286 (= 221 Most: two lines from the *Great Ehoiai*) appears in an anonymous commentary on the *Nicomachean Ethics* (CAG XX, 222.22–26 Heylbut): the second line, relating Aeneas' death, is mentioned without attribution by Aristotle (*EN* 5.8; later proverbial, see e.g. *Summa* at 165 Adler), and is evoked in the 12th century by Isaac Porphyrogenitus in his short work on the Trojan stories not narrated by Homer: οὕτως δίκην ὁ Ἀχιλλεύς προσήκουσαν ὠφλησε τῆι περι τὸν Ἐκτοῦ οὗτου ἀπανθρώπων καὶ ἀτεράμονι μῆνιδι φιλοσόφως τοῦ ποιητοῦ φάσκοντος ὡς εἰ καὶ τις ἅ κ' ἔρεξε, δίκη τ' ἰθεῖα γένοιτο (p. 70.19–24 Hinck). The Aristotelian commentator Michael of Ephesus clearly knew the Hesiodic authorship of the line (CAG XXII.3, p. 31.31–32 Hayduck: ἔστι δὲ τὸ ἔπος Ἡσιόδου).

sentinal codex for the transmission of the *Works and Days* and its scholia, namely *Par. gr. 2771* (in which Hesiod is flanked by another pillar of didactic literature, namely Diogenes Laërtius' *Periegetes' Orbis descriptio*).¹⁴ To the same turn of years should be dated a single parchment sheet containing 52 lines of the *Aspis* (now kept in ms. *Par. suppl. gr. 663*);¹⁵ from the 11th c. (or early 12th) stem other sheets now gathered in the same *Par. suppl. gr. 663*, carrying passages from the *Theogony* and the *Aspis*, and copied by the same hand who wrote scholia to both *Theogony* and *Works and Days* in a bifolium of ms. *Par. suppl. gr. 679*;¹⁶ finally, to the second half of the 11th c. should be dated ms. *Laur. Plut. 31.39*, containing both the *Works* and Oppian's *Halieutica*.¹⁷

Large excerpts from the text and the scholia of the three poems are inserted in the 9th-century lexicon known as *Etymologicum Genuinum*, where they have been accommodated (with slight adjustments) through a first-hand collection from one or more codices equipped with glosses and scholia (i.e., they were not inherited wholesale from the pre-existing lexicographical tradition): in the case of the *Works and Days*, this lost Hesiodic model represents a line of transmission that is clearly different from the one witnessed in the aforementioned *Par. gr. 2771*.¹⁸ From the 10th c. onwards, erudite materials in the *Etymologica* preserve passages of lost works attributed to Hesiod: e.g. the words Χαρίτων ὕγματ' ἔχουσα, ascribed by *Etym. Genuinum* α 589 L.-L. to the *Catalogue of*

14 On this ms., see Pertusi (1950) 528–544; Tsavari (1990) 55; Pontani (2015) 348. On the history of the medieval and humanist manuscript tradition of Hesiod's main works, see West (1964) and (1974); on the *Aspis*, see Corrales Pérez (1994). On the manuscripts with scholia to the three Hesiodic poems, see Schultz (1910) and (1913), as well as Pertusi (1950), (1951), (1952) (*Works and Days*), Di Gregorio (1971–1972) (*Theogony*), Martano (2002), (2005), (2006), (2008) (*Aspis*). There are approximately (see West 1974, 161 and the *Pinakes* database) 260/270 manuscripts of the *WD*, 70/80 of the *Theogony* and just about 60 of the *Aspis*.

15 This new dating (formerly: 11th or early 12th c.) is suggested on palaeographical grounds by Stefec (2014) 223 n. 41.

16 On the relationship between these mss., see Corrales (1997) (already Corrales Pérez 1994, 66–67); Menchelli (2001); Ronconi (2007) (who has also suggested the idea that the various fragments should in fact belong to one and the same codex). *Par. suppl. gr. 663* also contains the *Battle of Frogs and Mice*, and excerpts from the *Iliad*: see West (2001) 141–142. Both the dating to the 11th c. (rather than the 12th) and the exact geographical provenance (Mt. Athos? another province?) remain uncertain, but if the folia of the two mss. belonged to one and the same codex, this codex would constitute a complete Hesiodic collection, equipped with scholia (which were transcribed à *pleine page* separately from their respective poems).

17 On this ms. we find hand B of the so-called 'circle of Ioannikios' (see Degni 2008, 184 and 233), although the ms. was certainly not produced in this milieu; a provincial, perhaps South Italian provenance, is quite possible (Wilson 1983, 164).

18 See West (1974) 162–163, 183; Pertusi (1953) 180; Di Gregorio (1975) xvi–xvii; Martano (2006).

Women, are now attested in four papyrus fragments.¹⁹ The lexicon of *Suda* (η 583 Adler = p. 1 Solmsen = T 1 Most) preserves the only existing biography of Hesiod if we except the one by Ioannes Tzetzes.

Furthermore, the writings of the intellectuals of this age also attest to the popularity and to the good degree of *auctoritas* attained by the Askran poet: in a speech held in front of emperor Leo VI the Wise (on July 20th, 902), archbishop Arethas (ca. 850 – post 932), discussing the possibility that his work might be left unfinished, juxtaposed τὴν Ἡσιόδου κορώνην – the crow screaming her bad omen from the roof of an unfinished house (*WD* 746–747) – to the words of Christ in Luke 9.62.²⁰ In his *De thematibus*, Constantine Porphyrogenitus (905–959), quotes three lines of ‘Hesiod the poet’ on the genealogy of the eponymous hero of Macedonia (*Cat. fr.* 7 M.-W. = 3 H = 7 Most), which we do not know from any other source.²¹ Poets such as John Geometres (ca. 935/940–1000) and Christopher of Mytilene (first half of the 11th c.) echo and re-use several expressions from the hexameters of the *Works and Days*.²² A polygraph like Michael Psellos (1018–1092/3) refers to Hesiod as παιδευτικώτατος on the ground of the inimitable force of his myth of the Ages,²³ only later to contrast his misleading pagan teachings with the far more reliable Christian truths.²⁴

This continuity in the study and reading of Hesiod made possible his ‘rediscovery’ in the 12th century: the conspicuous materials prepared in this age were then handed over to the other great season of Byzantine philology, namely the so-called early Palaeologan Renaissance²⁵. In Palaeologan Byzantium, Hesiod is the poet – no less ancient than Homer – who has been initiated

19 ‘Hes.’ *Cat. fr.* 43a.4; 70.38; 73.3; 196.6 M.-W. = 37.4; 31.38; *2.3; 104.6 H = 69.4; 41.38; 47.3; 154a.6 Most.

20 *Or.* 61, II 24.16–20 Westerink, on which see Wilson (1996²) 131 (see also p. 126 for another quotation, this time of *WD* 295). The same rhetorical use of Hes. *WD* 746–747 about an unfinished work can be found already in Dexipp. in *Aristot. Cat.*, *CAG* IV.2, 64.6–8 Busse, and in Tz. in *Herm.*, *AO* IV 126.22 Cramer. Pertusi (1953) 181 suggests Arethas may have had a role in the preparation of the codex from which *Par. gr.* 2771 was copied: see Lemerle (1971) 226. In a scholium to Lucian’s *Hesiod* (p. 240.13–15 Rabe), Arethas shares in a criticism to the Askran poet: see Russo (2012) 49, 261.

21 *De them.* 2.1–5, pp. 86–87 Pertusi.

22 Compare Jo. Geom. *Carm.* 300.14 van Opstall (ῥεῖα δ’ ἀρίζηλα καὶ εὐθετα πᾶσιν ιδέσθαι) with *WD* 14, and Christ. Mityl. *Carm.* 17.12 De Groot (τρεις θέρεος μηνας καματώδεος εὔρετο ὦρη) with *WD* 584 and 664.

23 Psell. *or. paneg.* 11.62–76 Dennis.

24 The typical pattern is: ὁ μὲν μῦθος... οἱ δὲ τῆς ἀληθείας λόγου: see *or. hagiogr.* 4.14–17 Fisher (with the reference to Dike in Hes. *WD* 256–260) and *or. funebr.* 2.3.44 Polemis (with the reference to the Giants in Hes. *Th.* 664–686).

25 See e.g. Fryde (2000); Mergiali (1996); Pontani (2015) 403–34.

by the Muses: in one of his speeches, the great intellectual Nikephoros Choumnos (1250/5–1327) stumbles upon a reference to Hesiod in (Ps.-)Plato (*Epin.* 990a.5–6), and presents him as ‘the one after Homer, the laurel-eating creature of the Muses, whose poetry did not proceed from human teaching, but was generated autodidactically by the intervention of the Muses’.²⁶

Although this age ‘non contemplò Omero fra i suoi autori principali’,²⁷ we still come across a great number of manuscripts of pagan authors, including the epic poets; amongst them, the fruits of philological activity on the text of the three Hesiodic poems, i.e. the famous manuscripts *Laur.* 32.16 (ca. 1280–1283), belonging to the circle of Maximos Planudes (1255–1304/5), and *Marc. gr.* 464 (a. 1316–1319), written by Demetrios Triklinios (early 14th c.).²⁸ Whether or not they were conceived for use in schools, one should not forget Planudes’ scholia to the *Works and Days* and the commentary to the same poem by his pupil Manuel Moschopoulos (ca. 1265 – post 1316),²⁹ as well as the numerical commentary to the *Days* by John Protospatharios,³⁰ and the scholia of John Pediasimos Pothos (ca. 1250–1310/14) to the *Aspis*.³¹ Still, the interest for Hesiodic lost works is now episodic, and such will it remain until well into the humanistic age. The last chapter (§ 4) of this essay will investigate an interesting case of ideological re-use and re-creation of a single fragment from the *Catalogue* (5 M.-W. = 2 H = 2 Most) in late 15th century Italy.

²⁶ AG III 385.7–11 Boissonade: τὸν μετὰ τὸν Ὅμηρον, τὸ τῶν Μουσῶν δαφνοφάγον θρέμμα, καὶ οὐ γ’ ἡ ποιησις οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρώπου τινὸς διδάξαντος, ἀλλ’ αὐταῖς ἦν ταῖς Μούσαις αὐτοδιδάκτως ἐξεργασμένη. See West (1966) 165; cf. Tz. *proll. in Hes.* pp. 14.14–16.10 Gaisf. (Hesiod’s δαφνοφάγον) and on the Muses’ allegory in *Hes.* 1, pp. 29.5–30.11, 32.14–34.2, 6–16 Gaisf., with Pontani (2015) 380–381.

²⁷ Pontani (2005) 266.

²⁸ *Laur.* 32.16, a famous collection of non-Homeric poetry born in Planudes’ circle (Maximos’ own hand is not to be discerned in the Hesiodic section) is the earliest known manuscript to contain the three poems together, and the earliest preserved complete witness of the *Theogony*: see Turyn (1972) 28–39; Speranzi (2014) 108–109 no. 25. Ms. *Marc. gr.* Z 464 (coll. 762) is a copy of Hesiod’s poems with all the extant exegesis, compiled by Demetrios Triklinios, and equipped with his personal notes and additions: see esp. West (1978) 71; Turyn (1972) 123–127; Derenzini (1979); Mioni (1985) 248–251; Bianconi (2005) 96–100, 104, 248.

²⁹ Ed. Pertusi (1951); Grandolini (1991). See West (1978) 70; Wilson (1996³) 245–247; Pontani (2005) 267–269, and (2015) 413 and 417. Moschopoulos quotes the *Theogony* in his scholia to the *Works and Days*: see Hes. *Th.* 124, 927–928 in the *scholl.* 3 and 60, pp. 3–4 and 19 Grandolini.

³⁰ Ed. Gaisford (1823²) 448–459; see Krumbacher (1897) 558; West (1978) 70.

³¹ Ed. Gaisford (1823²) 609–654; see Russo (1965²) 56; Bianconi (2005) 61–62; Pontani (2015) 406–407. Other anonymous commentaries or paraphrases to the three poems are attested from this turn of years: see Russo (1965²) 57 n. 45; West (1966) 71–72; West (1978) 71.

2 Hesiod's Fragments in Ioannes Tzetzes

2.1 Ioannes Tzetzes and Hesiod

Ioannes Tzetzes can well be regarded as the most Hesiodic among the 'professional Hellenists' of the Comnenian age.³² He parades himself as the first commentator of the *Works and Days* after Hesiod, as the Neoplatonist (whom he of course deems inferior), and as the best connoisseur of the genealogies of heroes and gods as presented in the *Theogony*.³³ Like Homer (to whose *Iliad* Tzetzes produced a long preface and scholia to book 1), Hesiod becomes the object of a painstaking line-by-line analysis, as well as of an imitative and interpretative effort of a didactic kind: Tzetzes does not resort here to hexametrical re-creation, as in the isolated experiment of the *Carmina Iliaca*, nor to a pervasive exegesis in poetic fashion, as in the *Homeric Allegories*, but he attempts a fresh reading with exegetical thrust of the *πᾶσα θεογονία ἐν βραχεῖ* ('summary of the entire theogony').³⁴


These works are very different in terms of the intended audience – pupils in the case of the *exegesis* devoted to the *Works and Days*, aristocratic circles for the *Theogony* – but beyond the well-known, idiosyncratic character of the author, we can discern a genuine interpretative effort that manages to combine a detailed reading of the text, categories of literary criticism, and an erudite mytho-

³² See Kaldellis (2007) 301: Tzetzes and Eustathios 'were both what we call professional Hellenists, in that they made their living teaching the classics and commenting on ancient texts (though their careers were quite different)'; cf. p. 240: 'We should, then, think more in terms of a spectrum ranging from creative sophists obsessed with Greek things (Prodromos and Tzetzes); bishop-scholars who combined Hellenic nobility with Christian ethics (Eustathios and Michael Choniates)'. On Tzetzes and Hesiod, see also Roilos (2014) 232 n. 8.


³³ See Tz. *proll. in Hesiod.* pp. 10–12.11 Gaisf., with Wilson (1996²) 194; Budelmann (2002) 152; Pontani (2015) 380; and Tz. *Th.* 24–32 with Jeffreys (1974) 149.

³⁴ Tzetzes' *Theogony*, after a proem directed to the sponsor of the work (the sebastokratorissa Eirene, ll. 1–47), traces the genealogies of the gods down to the classical Olympian pantheon (ll. 48–377), and then crosses over to the genealogical catalogue of Greek and Trojan heroes (with their allies) and their deeds (ll. 378–723); in the epilogue, a text with an especially complicated editorial history (see Wendel 1940; Hunger 1953), Tzetzes shows off his knowledge of the various foreign languages spoken in Constantinople. The idea of writing a companion to the whole of Greek mythology (in the terms that were suitable for the skills of his audience) is the same presiding over the *Carmina Iliaca*, which retrace συνοπτικῶς τὴν πᾶσαν Ἰλιάδα (Σ *Carm. Il.* p. 101.2 Leone): see Braccini (2009–2010). On the exegesis to the *Erga* see Dahlén (1933); Ponzio (2003).

graphical inquiry.³⁵ In the scholium to *WD* 113–114, for example, Tzetzes proposes two readings of the passage οὐδέ τι δειλόν / γῆρας ἐπῆν (the golden race, immune from old age).³⁶ The discussion of the word-division of οὐδέτι into either οὐδέ τι (the prevailing reading in our mss.) or οὐδ' ἔτι (a reading attested in just a few codices) shows that the exegete pays attention to even the most detailed and minute textual variants.³⁷ But Tzetzes also tries his hand at broader literary interpretations, nourished by his own personal readings: When he comments on the famous Hesiodic apologue on the roads to virtue and vice (*WD* 288–292), he points to a parallel with a passage in Quintus Smyrnaeus (*Posthom.* 5.49–56) in which Arete is personified as a woman sitting atop a palm-tree on a steep, almost inaccessible mountain.³⁸ In his own *Theogony*, when following Hesiod's text in tracing the offspring of Ouranos and Ge (ll. 48–108), he does not resist the temptation to add references to various mythographical variants: between the Erinyes and the Giants, born from Ouranos' blood (Hes. *Th.* 183–186), there come the Telchines, for whom Tzetzes offers two more alternative genealogies, one according to Bacchylides (fr. 52 Snell-Maehler, of which he is the only source) and one according to unknown τινές.³⁹ The opportunity to insert mythographical stories into a didactic context, however unrelated, cannot be

35 On Tzetzes' works on commission see Rhoby (2010); on the sebastokratorissa Eirene, patron of Tzetzes' *Theogony*, see now Jeffreys (2014). The commentaries on  poets are meant for pupils as well as for erudites: Kaldellis (2009) 29–31.

36 P. 115.3–7 Gaisf. 'οὐδὲ κατὰ τι δειλὸν ὑπῆρχεν αὐτοῖς τὸ γῆρας', ὡς νῦν ἡμῖν, ἢ οὕτω 'οὐδὲ ἔτι, καὶ ἀκμὴν, ἐπῆν γῆρας δειλόν, καὶ ἄθλιον ἢ δειλίας ἀνάμειστον'.

37 To the best of our knowledge, οὐδ' ἔτι is only attested in three mss. of the φ family (all 13th–14th c.: see West 1974, 176–181) that also carry Tzetzes' exegesis: hence it is more likely that this note (with no equivalent in what we possess of the ancient scholia) has influenced the main text than viceversa; in Hesiod's line, τι is 'hardly more than a metrical stopgap' (West 1978, 179 *ad loc.*). Tzetzes' painstaking attention to orthographical details brings to mind his special attention to the decipherment of 9th-century manuscripts, as witnessed in the case of Thucydides, where he took pains to add and correct accents and diacritical signs in order to make reading easier: see Luzzatto (1999) 21–30. Another comparable case in *in Hes.*  438, p. 279.18–23 Gaisf.

38 Quintus numbers to Tzetzes' main sources for part III of the *Carmina Iliaca*: see Leone (1984). Homeric scholia and Eustathius refer to the poet by name, whereas Tzetzes dubs him Κόιντος ὁ Σμυρναῖος (*proll. in Il.* p. 67.19 Paph.; *Hist.* 2.492): See Vian (1963) vii–viii, 1.

39 Tz. *Th.* 82–85: καὶ σὺν αὐταῖς οἱ τέσσαρες ὀνομαστοὶ Τελχίνες, / Ἀκταῖος Μεγαλήσιος Ὀρμένος τε καὶ Λύκος, / οὗς Βακχυλίδης μὲν φησι Νεμέσεως Ταρτάρου, / ἄλλοι τινὲς δὲ λέγουσι τῆς Γῆς τε καὶ τοῦ Πόντου. Without any reference to their genealogy, the Telchines are presented by Tzetzes also in *Hist.* 7.119–28 and 12.829–34, where he adds two more names (cp. Zenob. 5.41; Suda τ 293 Adler) to the four listed here (all unattested elsewhere except for Lykos): See Harder (1886) 75 and H. Herter in *RE* VA.1 (1934), 199 and 211; Leone (2007) *ad locc.*

missed; in this case, we are faced with the conceptual leap from the Erinyes to other daemons, the Telchines (also in Tzetzes' *ep.* 94 and 102, pp. 136.10–11 and 148.7–8 Leone): for the latter, the erudite information is taken from one or more sources which – as in many other cases – remain unknown to us.

Tzetzes' approach to Hesiod (and to classical authors in general) goes well beyond self-celebration and a weary re-statement of ancient material.⁴⁰ For Tzetzes, Hesiod is a reference author; while he cannot equal Homer – even the bare thought that he may have defeated Homer in a contest is ridiculous –⁴¹ he is still an *auctoritas* as a source of *dicta* and of mythographical doctrine. In the scholia to Lycophron, the *Theogony* provides Tzetzes with much material that helps explain the Alexandrian poet's cryptic allusions: e.g. the reason why Styx is the warrant of divine oaths (Lyc. 707), namely the help she gave to Zeus during his battle against the Titans (Hes. *Th.* 397–400);⁴² or the etymology of Herakles' epithet βοαγίδης (Lyc. 652), which depends on the fact that the hero took Geryon's cattle away from the island of Erytheia (see Oppian, *Cyn.* 2.110–111 and Hesiod, *Th.* 289–294).⁴³ The ancient scholia to these passages contain no references to mythographical sources:⁴⁴ While it is certainly possible that Tzetzes may have embarked on a study of lost exegetical materials, it is more likely that, being such an attentive student of the Hesiodic text, so proud of his culture and his readings, Tzetzes should be credited with their adoption to exegetical ends.⁴⁵

⁴⁰ The studies of Maria Jagoda Luzzatto (1998, 1999, 2000) have shed light on Tzetzes' working method. His importance in the history of Classical scholarship, after recent reassessments (see Grünbart [2005] 143; Pontani [2015] 378–385), still needs a comprehensive, in-depth reappraisal (see Cesaretti 2010).

⁴¹ See *proll. in Hes.* pp. 16.15–18.10 Gaisf.; *scholl.* 238, 253, 262, 270, 276, 282–285, 654–659, pp. 172.5–173.8, 181.53–182.3, 185.3–17, 188.26–28, 191.4–13, 195.6–11, 368.12–25 Gaisf.; *Hist.* 12.157–60, 185–204 (with the scholia *ad locc.*), 13.641–44; and Koning (2010) 247. In these passages of the exegesis to the *Works and Days*, Hesiod's inferiority is demonstrated on the grounds of his alleged rhetorical or metrical inadequacy.

⁴² Tz. *in Lyc.* 707, p. 232.2–6 Scheer: ὁ δὲ Ἡσίοδος ἐθεογονία διὰ τοῦτό φησι τὸν Δία ὄρκον τῶν θεῶν ποιῆσαι τὴν Στύγα, ὅτι πρώτη κτλ.

⁴³ Tz. *in Lyc.* 651, p. 217.22–26 Scheer: βοαγίδα ὅτι τὰς βοῦς τοῦ Γηρῦνόνου ἤγεν ἐξ Ἐρυθείας τῆς περὶ τὸν Ἰκεανὸν νήσου ὡς φησι καὶ Ὀππιανὸς ἐν τοῖς Κυνηγετικαῖς 'αὐτῶι ἐπ' Ἰκεανῶι δηρίσατο Γηρῦνῆι' καὶ Ἡσίοδος, οἶμαι, ἐν Θεογονίαι 'Ὀρθον – Εὐρυτίωνα'. The partial quotations refer to Opp. *Cyn.* 211 and Hes. *Th.* 293.

⁴⁴ See *scholl. vett.* Lyc. 652d, 706a-7b, pp. 133, 141–142 Leone.

⁴⁵ See οἶμαι in the second passage (n. 43). Tzetzes often boasts his sensational memory: As for the books he needs to consult in order to find information (*Hist.* 12.2–6), he is able to repeat by heart their contents as if he could hold them once again in his hands (1.278–279); he is liable to

On the other hand, Tzetzes' *Letters* offer a different kind of rhetorical use of quotations from the *Works and Days*; in *ep.* 79, he deftly modifies a well-known hexameter (*WD* 101), and in the related *historia* he reveals the learned allusion: ὁ μὲν Ἡσίοδος φησι ἐν Ἔργοις καὶ Ἡμέραις, / πλείη μὲν γὰρ γαῖα κακῶν, πλείη δὲ θάλασσα. / τοῦτο δὲ κατὰ ῥήτορας καλεῖται παρωδία, / τὸ πλείη μὲν γὰρ γαῖα σοφῶν, πλείη δὲ θάλασσα. / παραγραμματισμὸν φασὶ δ' οἱ ποιηταὶ τὸ σχῆμα, / τὸ χρῆσθαι τοῖς τοιοῦτοις δε δεινότητος μεθόδωι.⁴⁶ Hesiod's line becomes – as is so often the case with Homer's hexameter – contemporary literature – a rhetorical device: This confirms that the author of the *Works and Days*, however inferior to Homer, still occupied a place of honour in Tzetzes' cultural horizon, and in the culture of his age.⁴⁷

2.2 Tzetzes and the Lost Hesiod: Heroogonia, Astronomia, and Other Fragments

In Tzetzes, predictably, the confrontation between Homer and Hesiod mostly ends in favour of the former; there are, however, some passages in which the Askran poet is defended from the attacks of ancient critics.⁴⁸ For instance,

error, but his mind, working as a library (*All. Il.* 15.87–88), allows him to display a huge amount of data (*Hist.* 8.173–180). More relevant passages in Wendel (1948) 2008.

46 'Hesiod says in the *Works and Days* that "the earth is full of evils, and the sea is full". To say "the earth is full of wise men, the sea is full" is what rhetors call parody. Poets term it figure of *paragrammatismos*, i. e. to use similar words for rhetorical effective. See Tz. *ep.* 79 (1150/54), p. 118.10 Leone: πλείη μὲν γὰρ γαῖα σοφῶν, πλείη δὲ θάλασσα. The modified quotation has an ironical sense: The world is full of wise men, so the *chartouliarios* attending Tzetzes' classes à *contrecoeur* will find a teacher who suits him better. More Hesiodic quotations in the *Letters*, then explained in the *Histories* (remarkably, all from the *Works and Days*): *ep.* 8, p. 17.8–9 Leone with *Hist.* 6.739–42 (Hes. *WD* 319); *ep.* 16, p. 30.16 Leone with *Hist.* 7.228–234 (*WD* 40); *ep.* 31, p. 46.15–16 Leone with *Hist.* 8.41–3 (*WD* 486); *ep.* 57, pp. 83.4–5, 84.6–9 Leone with *Hist.* 9.331–47 and 355–357 (*WD* 86–88 e 270–272); *ep.* 60, p. 89.18–21 Leone with *Hist.* 9.719–726 (*WD* 296–297); *ep.* 67, p. 96.17–18 Leone with *Hist.* 10.209–15 (*WD* 373). As Rzachs's apparatus (however incomplete) amply shows, many passages in Tzetzes' oeuvre quote or allude to Hesiodic passages, as in the case of Hes. *Th.* 123 (ἐκ Χάεος δ' Ἐρεβός τε), reworked by Tzetzes in *Carm.* 1 (ἐκ Χάεος Ἐρέβους τε).

47 Ll. 101–103 of the *Works and Days* feature in Stobaeus' *Anthologium* (4.34.32). On the rhetorical use of Homeric quotations, see Nünlist (2012); Cullhed (2014) 39–49 (with the reference to Tzetzes' Homeric quotation in *ep.* 14, p. 25.5–6 Leone and *Hist.* 7.103–9, see esp. 108–9: ἐγὼ παρεγραμμάτισα ῥητορικῶι δὲ τρόπωι / πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον νῦν ἐμοί κτλ.).

48 In several cases the criticism to which Tzetzes responds is levelled by the ancient scholia: Tz. in *Hes.* 58, p. 32.4–6 Gaisf. (*Procl. in Hes.* 58 Pertusi = fr. *52 Marzillo); Tz. in *Hes.*

against a certain Poseidonius of Apollonia, who accused Hesiod of altering Homeric words such as Ὀϊλεύς and νήδυμος into Ἴλεύς and ἥδυμος, Tzetzes attempts to justify the occurrences of both these terms, corresponding to fragments 235 M.-W. (= 112 H = 176 Most) and 330 M.-W. (= 280 Most).⁴⁹ In a scholium on his introduction to the *Iliad* (pp. 418.12–420.4 Papath.), Tzetzes scolds Poseidonius for plainly ignoring Hesiod's passage, where the name Ὀϊλεύς simply undergoes an Ionic aphaeresis, to be explained in the light of a dialectal choice or of the name's etymology, as documented by the Hesiodic lines that connect it to the benevolence of Oileus' river: The nymph whom Apollo ingravidated at the time when Poseidon built the walls of Troy (οὐνεκα νύμφην / εὐρόμενος ἴλεων μίχθη ἐρατῆι φιλότητι).⁵⁰ As for ἥδυμος, Tzetzes argues that it occurs in Orpheus, whom Homer imitates, and even in Homer himself.⁵¹

Beyond the specific content of these observations, which affect delicate (and hotly debated) philological problems in Homer's text, it is interesting to see that Tzetzes reacts to Poseidonius' criticism by gathering his knowledge of ancient epic poetry, and thus recovers an invaluable quotation of Hesiodic lines transmitted in the *Etymologica*.⁵² The last two lines of fr. 235, dealing with the fortifi-

⁴⁸ 152, p. 134.6–10 Gaisf. (Σ Hesiod. 2a); Tz. in Hesiod. 383, p. 249.6–9 Gaisf. (Σ Hesiod. 383 f. Pertusi). On the Homer/Hesiod comparison, see above n. 41.

⁴⁹ *Proll. in Il.* p. 4.14–17 Papath. Tzetzes is the only witness of fr. 330. As suggested by the editors, this Poseidonius might be identified with the pupil of Aristarchus mentioned by some scholia to the *Iliad* (see *RE* XXII.1 [1953], 826 [C. Wendel]; Schwartz [1960] 51–52; *LGGA* s.v. 'Posidonius [1]'). Another, analogous reference to one Poseidonius (who argued for Homer's priority and for Hesiod's tampering with Homeric lines) is to be found in Tzetzes' *Prolegomena (proll. in Il.* pp. 27.13–28.7 Papath.): This is today fr. 459 Theiler of the philosopher Poseidonius of Apamea (= Hes. T 5 Most), but the comparison with the passage just discussed may rather suggest its identification with Aristarchus' pupil (*contra* F. Jacoby in *FGrHist* 279, IIIa Kommentar, pp. 362–363), or it might at least rule out its being identified with the philosopher from Apamea.

⁵⁰ The issue of Hesiod's Ἴλεύς was ubiquitous in ancient philological discussions on Homeric Ὀϊλεύς and Ὀϊλίος. Aristarchus rejected the variant without initial omikron as belonging to the *neoterói* (see *Σ Hesiod.* 2, pp. 527–31, I 299 Erbse), but it was supported by Zenodotus (see *Σ Hesiod.* 336d, IV 83 Erbse, with Stesich. fr. 229 Davies); see also Pind. *Ol.* 9.112 with Σ *ad loc.* I 306.15–17 Dr. and other passages collected by M-W *ad loc.* (see also Eustathios *infra* § 3).

⁵¹ The reference is here to frs. 741 and 855 Bernabé. Homer's textual transmission attests almost exclusively νήδυμος (*Il.* 2.2; 10.91, 187; 14.242, 253, 354; 16.454; 23.63; *Od.* 4.793; 12.311, 366; 13.79 see also *Il.* 12.311), and Tzetzes himself employs the clause νήδυμον ὕπνον in *Carm. Il.* 3.229. The reading ἥδυμος (which in some cases could be explained by linking the ephelestyic *ny* with the foregoing word) was refused by Aristarchus (see *Σ Hesiod.* 330 B 2b-c² (I 175.19–176.36 Erbse); Leaf *ad Il.* 2.2) and adopted ἥδυμος in the text; Leumann (1950) 44–45.

⁵² *Etym. Gud.* s.v. Ἴλεύς (Reitzenstein (1897) 161 ll. 4–9 (ll. 1–5, from a commentary on Simonides: fr. 650 Page); *Etym.Gen.* A (vv. 1–4) and B (vv. 1–3), see M-W *ad loc.*; *Etym. Mag.* 10.10.10)

cations of Troy, are also quoted by Tzetzes in a scholium to Lycophron's *Alexandra*, where they serve as poetic evidence of the gods' support to Laomedon: they clearly belonged to a group of quotations that Tzetzes kept at hand so as to use them in different contexts, a common practice that emerges throughout his writings.⁵³

Tzetzes ascribes the hexameters on the birth of Ileos to Hesiod ἐν τῇ ἥρωικῇ γενεαλογίᾳ. This peculiar indication reappears in other Tzetesian quotations of Hesiodic fragments of genealogical content, mostly attributed today to the *Catalogue of Women*: fr. 9 and 205 M.-W. (= 4 and 95 H = 9 and 145 Most). As for the former – two lines on Hellen's sons Xouthos and Aiolos – it is taken over from an ancient scholium to Lycophron,⁵⁴ but Tzetzes contributes two things: The indication of the work (the source speaks generically of 'Hesiod') and the comparison with three lines of similar content drawn from a scholium to Pindar (fr. 10a.25–27 M.-W. = 5.25–27 H = 10.25–27 Most).⁵⁵ Two further quotations of the same fr. 9 M.-W. in the *Exegesis* to the *Iliad* present a curious textual interference with these lines on the Aiolids: The second hemistich of l. 1 rings θεμιστοπόλου βασιλῆος in one case and θεμιστοπόλοι βασιλῆες in the other,⁵⁶ rather than φιλοπολέμου βασιλῆος. Tzetzes' memory is clearly misled by the very analogy he is pointing out in his commentary to Lycophron.⁵⁷

Another Hesiodic passage attributed by Tzetzes to the '*Heroic genealogy*' comes from the scholia to Pindar, and it is re-used both in his exegesis of Lyco-

⁵³ Ἴλεως) p. 470.137–4 (Il. 1–3). Etymology is also the reason why the fragment is quoted by Eustathios (*in Il.* 650.46, see below § 3.2).

⁵³ Tz. *in Lyc.* 393, p. 147.16–21 Scheer (with no mention of Hesiod), to be compared with Σ vet. 393e, p. 76 Leone. The fragment is thus quoted once for a linguistic issue (see also *Carm. Il.* 3.644 Ἴλέος ἄλκιμος Αἴας with Leone's apparatus) and once for a mythographical issue: It is more economical to think that the hexameters were deployed toward different goals in different contexts, rather than that he drew on different sources.

⁵⁴ Tz. *in Lyc.* 286 (p. 121.30–35 Scheer) from Σ vet. *ad loc.* (p. 58.1–3 Leone). The lines read Ἑλληνος δ' ἐγένοντο φιλοπολέμου βασιλῆος / Δῶρός τε Εὐϋθός τε καὶ Αἴολος ἵππιοχάρμης.

⁵⁵ Σ Pind. *Pyth.* 4.253c, II 133.7–10 Dr. The three lines of fr. 10a, known today through papyrological finds (Αἰολίδαι δ' ἐγένοντο θεμιστοπόλοι βασιλῆες / Κρηθεὺς ἠδ' Ἀθάμας καὶ Σίσυφος αἰολομήτης / Σαλμωνεύς τ' ἄδικος καὶ ὑπέρθυμος Περιήρης), are copied by Tzetzes right after those of fr. 9 with no introduction or mediation.

⁵⁶ Respectively, Tz. *in Il.* pp. 94.13–95.5 Papat. and Tz. Σ *proll. in Il.* p. 430.10–13 Papat., with attribution to the '*Heroic genealogy*'.

⁵⁷ This contamination may in theory go back to Plutarch, who quotes the first line of fr. 9 (with no attribution to Hesiod: Hunter (2014) 283–284) with θεμιστοπόλοι βασιλῆες (*Qu. Conv.* 9.15.2 [747f]), but it may well be the fruit of Tzetzes' own confusion (θεμιστοπολ- βασιλ- is much more frequent, see *Hymn. hom. Cer.* 103, 215, 473; *Il.* 1. 238–239 with D.H. *Ant.* 5.74; φιλοπολέμω βασιλῆ only in Q.S. 9.526).

phron and in that of *Iliad* book 1.⁵⁸ The lines concern the birth of Aiakos and the myth of the autochthony of the Myrmidons/Aiginetes, the first sailors, born through a metamorphosis from the ants by virtue of Aiakos' prayer to Zeus. Tzetzes inserts the quotation in two long, partly overlapping mythographic digressions, where the very sequence (illustration of myth / quotation of Hesiodic fragment / allegorical interpretation by Theogenes, *FGrHist* 300 F 1) points to a close adherence to Pindar's scholium.⁵⁹

The attribution of all these Hesiodic lines to an ἥρωικὴ γενεαλογία should be paralleled with the title Ἡρωογονία mentioned by Tzetzes in his introduction to the *Works and Days* in a partial list of Hesiod's works: οὕτω δὲ [i.e. "Ἔργα καὶ Ἡμέραι τὸ βιβλίον] ἐπιγέγραπται πρὸς ἀντιδιαστολήν τῶν ἐτέρων αὐτοῦ πεντεκαίδεκα βιβλίων Ἀσπίδος, Θεογονίας, Ἡρωογονίας, Γυναικῶν καταλόγου, καὶ λοιπῶν ἀπασῶν.⁶⁰ The complex transmission of Tzetzes' *prolegomena* to the *Works and Days*, an abridged form of which was pasted with the *prolegomena vetera* under the heading Πρόκλου Διαδόχου in some humanistic manuscripts, has long obliterated Tzetzes' paternity of this label.⁶¹ A poem by Hesiod labelled *Heroogonia* is otherwise unknown, whereas there are various ancient references to the genealogies of heroes at the end of the *Theogony* and in the *Catalogue of Women*: In a scholium on the beginning of the *Works and Days* we read that Hesiod μετὰ τὴν ἥρωικὴν γενεαλογίαν καὶ τοὺς Καταλόγους ἐπεζήτησε καινουργῆ-

58 Tz. in *Lyc.* 176, pp. 85.20–86.11 Scheer; Tz. in *Il.* 1.180, pp. 233.15–235.13 Papath.: From Σ Pind. *Nem.* 3.21, III 45 Dr. = Hes. fr. 205.1–6 (a seventh line is quoted by Σ Pind. 8.26e, I 242.20–23 Drachmann).

59 In Tzetzes' exegesis of Homer the allegorical interpretation of the myth's 'true' meaning is followed by a different account the origin of the Myrmidons (τὸ δ' ἀληθέστερον πάντων οὕτως ἔχον ἐστὶ κτλ.: Myrmidons' birth from Zeus and Eurymedusa, see e.g. Clem. Al. *Protr.* 2.39 and Σ *ad loc.* p. 309.4–6 Stählin). The myth of Aiakos and the ants, together with its allegoresis, is taken up once again by Tzetzes in *Hist.* 7.303–17 (περὶ Αἰακοῦ, οὗ χάριν ὁ Ζεὺς τοὺς μύρμηκας ἀνθρώπους ἐποίησεν).

60 'And it is entitled in this way to set it apart from his fifteen other books, *Aspis*, *Theogony*, *Heroogony*, *Catalogue of Women*, and all the others' (transl. Most), pp. 19.21–20.2 Gaisf. = Hes. *Cat. test.* p. 1 M.-W. = T 43 Most. On the number of works attributed by Tzetzes to Hesiod see Pertusi (1951) 269 n. 2; Cingano (2009) 93–94.

61 The humanistic manuscript transmission (most notably mss. *Par. gr.* 2736 and 2833; but see also *Par. gr.* 2777) determined the *facies* of these materials in Gaisford's edition, and thus the prevailing attribution of the catalogue of Hesiod's works to Proclus rather than Tzetzes (only exception: Casanova [1979a] 218–219). On the complex issue see Cardin (2009).

σαι πάλιν ἑτέραν ὑπόθεσιν;⁶² in an epigram of the *Greek Anthology*, we read that he wrote about μακάρων γένος, ἔργα, and γένος ἀρχαίων ἡμιθέων.⁶³

These witnesses, together with the rather foggy memory of the exact content of the *Catalogue of Women*, suggest that Tzetzes might have himself coined this new title, applying it to some lines on heroic genealogies that he found in his sources.⁶⁴ It is not by chance that, among the Hesiodic material transmitted by Tzetzes, the only genealogical fragment that does not carry a specific attribution is also the only one for which he had no exact wording (fr. 194 M.-W. = 137b–c Most), and thus could not suggest a more exact provenance.⁶⁵

Another attribution unmatched in ancient texts is that of ll. 7 and 10 of fr. 211 M.-W. (= 100 H = 152 Most), now known through papyrological evidence. In the excursus on poetical genres contained in the *prolegomena* to Lycophron's *Alexandra*, Tzetzes names among the writers of epithalamia a certain Agamestor

62 'After the heroic genealogy and the *Catalogues*, he wanted to begin anew with a different subject matter' (transl. Most), *prol. B* in Hesiod, p. 39–10 Pertusi = Hes. *Cat. test.* p. 1 M.-W. = T 48 Most. Cf. Schwartz (1960) 50–51.

63 AP 9.64.7–8 (= Asclep. dub. 45 Gow-Page, Guichard) = Hes. T 44 Most. See also POxy 3537r (MP³ 1849.1 and 1857.32; LDAB 5556; III–IV c.) = Hes. T 95 Most, ll. 5–6: αὐτὴ μοι γένος εἶπε θεῶν πτολῆμος τε γιγάντων / πάντων θ' ἡρώων γενεήν, φύλλον τε γυναικῶν.

64 The only exact indication on the content of the *Catalogue of Women* (as opposed to *Theogony* and *Works and Days*) is in Max. Tyr. 26.4 = T 46 Most (ὁ Ἡσίοδος... τὰ γένη τῶν ἡρώων, ἀπὸ γυναικῶν ἀρχόμενος καταλέγει). Lucian (*Hes.* 1 = T 45 Most) speaks of γυναικῶν ἀρεταί, Pausanias (9.31.4–5 = T 42 Most) of ἐξ γυναικῶν αἰδόμενα; the list in *Suda* η 583 Adler reports the title Γυναικῶν ἡρωϊνῶν κατάλογος ἐν βιβλίῳ ε'. See Hes. TT 56–65 Most and Eustathios, *infra* § 3. None of Tzetzes' sources for *Cat.* fr. 9, 10a, 205 and 235 M.-W. quotes the title of the original Hesiodic work. Marckscheffel (1840) 104–5 already observed that both 'Heroogonia' and 'Heroic genealogy' were false titles to indicate the *Catalogue*, whereas Schwartz (1960) 24–25, and Cohen (1983) 131–133 (= [1986] 140–141) attached it to the end of the *Theogony* (ll. 963–1020), and Casanova (1979a) 218–219 to the end of the *Theogony* and to the *Catalogue*. This title (considered as ancient by Hirschberger 2004, 29–30), rather than a *trouvaille* in some lost ancient source, should be regarded as a *prol. vet.* B.

65 This is fr. 137a Most, an alternative genealogy for Agamemnon, found in *Il.* 7, p. 21 van Thiel. Tzetzes deals with this issue (flanking Hesiod's witness with Aeschyl. *Ag.* 1601–2) three times: Tz. *in Il.* 1.7 and 1.122, pp. 103.10–104.8 e 210.8–12 Papat.; *Σ All. Il.*, *proem.* 510, III 378.9–11 Cramer = 605.6–8 Matranga. See Papatomopoulos (1980) 11–26, and *infra* § 3 on Eustathios' witness. Three more fragments are ascribed by Tzetzes generically to 'Hesiod': fr. 67b M.-W. (= 36 H = 68 Most), on Autolykos' ability as a thief (Tz. *in Lyc.* 344, p. 134.1–5 Scheer, from *Etym. Magn.* α 317, I 87.31–88.6 L.-L., where it is quoted for the occurrence of the adj. αἰδηλος); fr. 270 M.-W. (= 206 Most), quoted for its metrical peculiarity by Tz. *Σ De metr.* 25, III 318 Cramer (from *Σ Hephaest.* p. 109.4 Consbruch; see also *Σ* [644b]); fr. 304 M.-W. (= 254 Most), a famous riddle on the lifetime of nymphs, partly quoted by Tz. *in Il.* 1.225, p. 263.12–15 Papat. and *Σ prol. in Il.* p. 415.10–14 Papat. from Plut. *De def.* c [415c-d].

of Pharsalos, who is then mentioned as the author of an epithalamium for Thetis,⁶⁶ and Ἡσίοδος αὐτὸς γράψας ἐπιθαλάμιον εἰς Πηλέα καὶ Θέτιν ἄτρεις μάκαρ, Αἰακίδη, καὶ τετράκις ὄλβιε Πηλεῦ, / ὃς τοῖσδ' ἐν μεγάροις ἱερὸν λέχος εἰσαναβαίνεις'.⁶⁷ Tzetzes' source is unknown, and scholars have supposed that he might have got the reference to both Agamestor's and Hesiod's epithalamia from the notoriously unreliable *New History* of Ptolemy the Quail.⁶⁸ But the papyrus seems to lend support to the authenticity of these lines, and so do various data pointing to the existence of a long section on the myth of the Aiakids in the *Catalogue of Women*.⁶⁹ Tzetzes' attribution of an 'epithalamium' is generally interpreted as referring to an ancient title for this particular section of the *Catalogue*,⁷⁰ but it might as well have been suggested to Tzetzes – who was interested in the history of this poetic genre – by the very content of the lines (e.g. the *makarismos* of the bridegroom).⁷¹ What is certain is that John's words do not explicitly link these hexameters either with the *Catalogue of Women* or with the *Heroogonia*.

One more fragment is ascribed by Tzetzes to a lost poem by Hesiod, once again in the wake of an unknown source. Three and a half lines carrying the catalogue of the Iades are preserved by a scholium to Aratus' *Phaenomena* (fr. 291 M.-W. = 227a Most),⁷² and they are quoted by Tzetzes in a long mythographical digression on the Pleiades in his exegesis to the *Works and Days* (s. 383–84, pp. 246.23–247.2 Gaisf.) as well as, with some metrical adjustments, in a *historia* dealing with Meton and ancient astronomy (*Hist.* 12.161–65). In both passages,

66 Tz. in *Lyc.* 178, II 89.8–15 Scheer and in *Il.* 1.58, p. 162.1–8 Papath. = Agamest. Phar. *SH* 14, four lines reported as found ἐν τῷ τῆς Θέτιδος ἐπιθαλαμίῳ / ἐν τῷ ἐπιθαλαμίῳ τῶν Θέτιδος γάμων. The content of the lines matches what Phot. *Bibl.* 152b.29–32 gathers from Ptolemy the Quail.

67 'Hesiod who also wrote an epithalamium for Peleus and Thetis, "three times blessed, o Aiakides, and four times, o Peleus, you who in these halls go up into the holy marriage-bed"': Tz. *proll.* in *Lyc.* p. 4.9–15 Scheer.

68 See Schwartz (1960) 52. The reliability of this Agamestor of Pharsalos, recently questioned by Cameron (2004) 152–153, is argued by the editors of the *Supplementum Hellenisticum*.

69 See the fragments of Aigina's *ehoie* (205–14 M.-W. = 145–153, 292 Most ~ 95, 97, 99–100, *26 H) discussed in Cardin (2010).

70 See M.-W. *ad loc.* and Hirschberger (2004) 30.

71 See Cardin (2009) 245–247; Cingano (2009) 94 n. 7.

72 Arat. 172, p. 166.6–10 Martin. See Dahlén (1933) 58–63; Martin (1974) xxviii. Tzetzes' passage on the Pleiades myth was so complete and well-thought as to end up in some manuscripts of Aratus (see Martin 1956, 74–80 and 276–277; Martin 1974, xxiv and *exc. de Pleiadibus* pp. 547–8.16 Martin) and of Aeschylus (see Σ Aeschyl. *Prom.* 425b-d, p. 136 Herington; Allegrini 1971–1972, 232–233).

Hesiod's words are cited as belonging to a βιβλος ἀστρική.⁷³ Once again, our limited knowledge, as opposed to the multiplicity of the sources available to Tzetzes, does not allow us to take for granted that the attribution is Tzetzes' own invention; he certainly studied and quoted Aratus and the transmitted scholia to the *Phaenomena*;⁷⁴ he possibly also knew of the existence of an Hesiodic poem by the title Ἀστρονομία, quoted by Athenaeus in relation to some lines about the Pleiades;⁷⁵ and he could recognise in a passage of Plutarch a reference to the existence of a Hesiodic work on astronomy.⁷⁶

Albeit with great caution, we can outline Tzetzes' specific *modus operandi* in quoting the minor works of the Hesiodic *corpus*. First and foremost, he privileges the quotations of entire lines, which he memorised and reused in different contexts, with a bias for those of mythographical content. Even in the absence of clear clues in his direct source, he tends to indicate regularly the work to which the lines belonged, thus displaying on the one hand his deep knowledge of the ancient testimonia to Hesiod and his literary output, on the other hand his desire to show off his erudition by referring to poetical *auctoritates* in as clearly identifiable a way as possible.⁷⁷

The same holds true for other groups of hexameters from the Hesiodic *corpus* transmitted in Tzetzes' writings, albeit not written by Hesiod in Tzetzes' view. Two fragments of the *Melampodia* concerning Teiresias – the famous answer about the proportions of sexual pleasure in men and women (fr. 275 M.-W. = 211a–b Most) and a lament to Zeus for his long life, stretching over 7 generations (fr. 276 M.-W. = 212 Most) – are attributed by Tzetzes, following the scholia to Lycophron, to ὁ τῆς Μελαμποδίας ποιητής.⁷⁸ Finally, the eyes of Argo, the

73 *Hist.* 12.161–62: οὐ γράφει [*scil.* Ἡσίοδος] βιβλον ἀστρικήν; ἤς τὴν ἀρχὴν οὐκ οἶδα / ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ βιβλίου δὲ τὰ ἔπη κείνται ταῦτα. In *Hist.* 12.166 Tzetzes mentions the astrological content of the *WD*: καὶ ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ Ἡμερῶν ἀστρολογεῖ δε πόσα.

74 See p. 246.11–14 Gaisf., with (somewhat jumbled) quotations of ll. 257/261, 258, 262–263 of the *Phaenomena*.

75 Athen. 11.80 (491c-d) = Hes. *Cat. fr.* 288–290 M.-W. (= 223–225 Most) = T 75 Most, where the attribution to Hesiod is uncertain: ὁ τὴν εἰς Ἡσίοδον ἀναφερομένην ποιήσας Ἀστρονομίαν.

76 The list of authors of verse or prose astronomies in Plut. *De Pyth. orac.* 18 [402f] = Hes. *Astr. test.* p. 148 M.-W. = T 76 Most. Few other traces of this poem are extant: see Cingano (2009) 129–130.

77 The only non-mythographical fragments are fr. 235, 270 and 330. The only poetic quotation devoid of attribution is that of fr. 235.4–5 (see above n. 53), although one wonders if this depends on the poor editorial state of Tzetzes' commentary to the *Alexandra*. See also below (with n. 81) on fr. 61 and 170.

78 For the former fragment see Σ *vet.* Lyc. 683, p. 183.2–11 Leone and Tz. in Lyc. 683, p. 226b.19–22 Scheer. Both lines are evoked, without any attribution, in Apollod. 3.6.7 and in

guardian of Io, were four in number according to the author of the *Aigimios* (fr. 294 M.-W. = 254 Most).⁷⁹ Here too, Tzetzes patiently and subtly reconstructs from his sources the mythographical context and the attribution of the original work.⁸⁰

When the sources do not mention the work or the author of the lines, and the subject does not help, the poetic words lend themselves to all sorts of attributions. This is the case of fr. 61 M.-W. (= *24 H = 240 Most) νήπιος, ὃς τὰ ἐτοῖμα λιπὼν ἀνέτοιμα διώκει ('fool, who rejects the available and pursues the unavailable', transl. Most): Tzetzes, when quoting this gnomic line in a learned letter (ep. 60, p. 89.25 Leone), omits the name of the source, but then, in his *Histories*, he feels obliged to compensate for this inexactitude and for the temporary black-out of his prodigious memory (*Hist.* 9.744–50):

τίνος τυγχάνει τὸ ῥητὸν ἐκ λήθης παρεσύρην,
εἴτ' οὖν ἐξ Ὀδυσσεΐας γε καθέστηκεν Ὅμηρου,
εἴτ' οὖν ἐτέρου ποιητοῦ. βιβλους γὰρ ὡσεὶ δύο,
εἶτε καὶ τρεῖς ἢ τέσσαρας στέρνοις ἐμοῖς συγκρύπτω,
καὶ ἀργαλέον μοί ἐστιν θεὸν ὡς πάντα λέγειν'.
εἰκὸς δε καὶ λανθάνεσθαι τίνων εἰσὶ τὰ ἔπη·
Ἐρμῆς γὰρ ὁ χρυσόρραπς οὐ μάχεται τῆι λήθῃ.⁸¹

'Out of forgetfulness I passed over the author of the saying, whether it is from Homer's *Odyssey*, or by another poet. I keep hidden inside me, as it were, two books, or even

various scholia to the *Odyssey* (ad 10.494, pp. 475 and 782 Dindorf and 218–19 Ernst): Tzetzes reports the first line in the correct form attested in the latter witnesses (more particularly the Homeric scholia, as is customary for him), not in the wrong one carried by the scholium to Lycophron. For fr. 276, Tzetzes is our only witness, again in his exegesis to Lycophron (*in Lyc.* 682, p. 255.14–26 Scheer) and to Homer (*proll. in Il.* pp. 33.12–34.16 Papatth.): It is impossible to gauge whether the attribution derives from Tzetzes' lost source, or if it is simply the product of Tzetzes' extrapolation from the nearby Σ vet. 683.

79 See Σ Eur. *Ph.* 1116, pp. 365.21–366.8 Schwartz and Tz. *in Il.*  and Σ *proll. in Il.*, pp. 199.20–200.7 and 457.11–15 Papatth.

80 In one of the two quotations of the *Aigimios*, Tzetzes even mentions the poet as an otherwise unknown Kleinias; but this indication may be the result of a simple blunder, or a forgery (see Papatthomopoulos [1980] 27–28; Cingano [2009] 123–124). On Tzetzes' reliability as a witness of ancient fragments (Archilochus) see most lately Cannatà Fera (2012) (esp. pp. 705–706 with earlier bibliography).

81 The gnome is quoted by many authors (Σ Pind. *Pyth.* 3.38c, II 68.10–12 Dr.; Plut. *De garrul.* 7505d, with no indication of author; Σ Theoc. 11.75, p. 248.14–17 Wendel, with Hesiod's name). Another fragment of the Hesiodic *corpus* (fr. *170 M.-W. = 74 H = 119 Most) is quoted anonymously by Tzetzes (*in Lyc.* 219, p. 102.7–26 Scheer, esp. 24–25), who clearly derives it from Σ Pind. *Nem.* 2.17c, III 34.5–36.10 Scheer (the same source we also have), where equally no attribution is mentioned. On Tzetzes' memory see above n. 45.

three or four, and “it is hard for me to tell everything like a god”. It is easy that one should forget whose are the lines, for golden-wanded Hermes cannot compete with forgetfulness’.

3 Hesiod's Fragments in Eustathios*

3.1 Eustathios and Hesiod

Until 1840, the only existing collection of Hesiod's fragments was ordered by source, and it opened with a series of Hesiodic lines drawn ‘*ex Eustathio*’, i.e. those quoted by Eustathios of Thessalonike in his monumental commentaries to the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.⁸² This prominent position, however, did not help: To the best of our knowledge, no proper inquiry into the topic *de Eustathii studiis Hesiodicis* has ever been carried out,⁸³ which might partly be explained by the fact that, though of course interested in archaic epic poetry, the learned archbishop nowhere displays a special favour for the Askran poet.⁸⁴ In his *Parekbolai* we do come across dozens of quotations from the *Works and Days* and (to a lesser extent) from the *Theogony* and the *Aspis*, and we also find references to the literary tradition about the *certamen Homeri et Hesiodi*,⁸⁵ as well as snapshots from both the ancient and the Byzantine exegesis to the poet.⁸⁶ However, there are relatively few traces of Eustathios' interest in Hesiod's peculiar literary

* My thanks to Baukje van den Berg for her comments on an earlier draft of this chapter.

82 We are referring to the collection of Hesiod's ἀποσπασμάτια first put together by Daniel Heinsius in the 1603 edition (*Hesiodi Ascræi quæ extant*, ex off. Plantiniana Raphelengii), and later reproduced (e.g. in Graevius' 1667 Amsterdam Elzevier edition), augmented (most notably by Thomas Robinson, *Hesiodi Ascræi quæ supersunt*, Oxford 1737, and by J.Fr. Boissonade, *Hesiodi Opera*, Paris 1824), and finally superseded by Marckscheffel, who in 1840 (*Hesiodi, Eumeli etc. Fragmenta*, Leipzig) opted for ordering the fragments according to Hesiod's lost works rather than to the ancient sources. But Marckscheffel had a predecessor: Henri Estienne's 1566 Geneva edition of the *Poëtae Graeci principes heroici carminis* was in fact the first to collect Hesiodic fragments (on pp. 134–135), and while it did not gather more than four (all from Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistae*) it did arrange them according to Hesiod's works (one from the *Catalogue* and three from the *Melampodia*).


83 Such as Benedetti (1976–1977), or van der Valk (1983), though both these essays are more narrowly focused on issues of textual criticism.

84 van der Valk (1971) xc-xci.




85 See in *Il.* 4.38–39 with van der Valk's apparatus.


86 See e.g. in *Il.* 194.31, where the ancient scholiasts (τινες τῶν παλαιῶν σχολιαστῶν τοῦ Ἡσιόδου) are overtly evoked as such; Tzetzes is never mentioned, but his exegesis (in *Hesiodi* 32) probably stands behind the ἔνιοι who wrongly use ἀκτής in the masculine according to in *Il.* 868 and more hidden cases of possible interaction can be detected.



quality and/or in the genre(s) or the style of his works; indeed, even the specifically genealogical information scattered throughout the *Theogony* is but rarely put to use in the explanation of Homer's tales.

Most of Eustathios' quotations from Hesiod's extant works have to do with lexical, morphological or syntactical issues, or else – and perhaps even more frequently – with ethical maxims to be gained from a close reading of the *Works and Days*. This conspicuous moral thrust also explains the good number of Hesiodic reminiscences in Eustathios' non-exegetical works, from his *Letters* down to his speeches and minor treatises:  the passages of moral value could of course provide interesting material for the writer of Byzantine rhetoric, and proverbial or paradigmatic 'one-liners' could easily be evoked in speeches of various kinds.⁸⁷ The comparison with Homer does surface *hic illic* throughout the *Parekbolai*, often in the wake of suggestions in the ancient scholia,⁸⁸ but it often amounts to assigning the Askran poet a secondary role vis-à-vis his more illustrious contemporary, because of his pedantry (μικροπρέπεια),⁸⁹ the ambiguity of his vocabulary,⁹⁰ or his less effective style.⁹¹ Eustathios, in other words, seems to

87 Suffice it to consult the index of Eustathios' *opera minora* (ed. Wirth 2000) or that of his letters (ed. Kolovou 2006), where mostly proverbial *topoi* occur, in order to understand that Hesiod is the most frequently quoted ancient poet after Homer, on a par with the tragedians and Aristophanes. On the relationship between exegesis and rhetorical teaching in the case of Eustathios see Nünlist (2012).

88 E.g. Eust. *in Il.* 263.6–12 (from  494–877, quoting Plat. *Resp.* 393d–94d) on Hesiod's *idēa λόγος* as being neither dramatic nor mimetic but mixed; Eust. *in Il.* 238.13–17 (from  360b) on the political skill of the men in power. But some of Eustathios' notes are in fact original, e.g. *in Od.* 1645.60–1646.3 with a comparison between Pandora's *pithos* of Elpis (Hes. *WD* 94–104, also quoted in a Homeric context e.g. by Michael Psellos in *Philos. min.* 45.58 Duffy, probably in the wake of Σ  T Ω 527–8ab) and the *askos* of the winds in *Od.* 10.9.

89 See Eust. *in Il.* 613.5–10, where Hesiod's painstaking description of how to cut wood for carts (*WD* 423–426) is deemed less effective than Homer's rapid and subtle hint in passing (ἐπιτρέχων καὶ ἐν πο ) to such minutiae (the reference is to φήγινος ἄξων in *Il.* 5.838): Homer, Eustathios argues, pays more attention to the grander issues pertaining to heroes and heroic life. A similar stance appears in Eust. *in Il.* 501.37–38, where the swift comparison in *Il.* 4.482–87 is deemed more effective than the flat and boring prescriptions in Hes. *WD* 455–457.


90 Eust. *in Il.* 250.46–251.3 compares Homer's use of ἔργον as having a divine sanction (ὁ δὲ θεὸς ἐγγυαλίζει) in *Il.* 2.436 with Hesiod's potentially confusing use of the same word in the famous line ἔργον δ' οὐδὲν ὄνειδος, ἀεργίη δέ τ' ὄνειδος (Hes. *WD* 311): Socrates, who repeated this motto again and again (Xen. *Mem.* 1.2.56–57), earned the fame of a relativist  g activism regardless of its ethical purport, and this is  e to the meaning of ἔργον. The same story, whose moral purport evidently appealed to Eustathios, is repeated in *Exeg. can. iamb.* 185.8–14 Cesaretti-Ronchey and, in a slightly different tone, in *De emend. vita monach.* 63.29–39 Metzler.


lack the deeply antagonistic dimension of the Hesiod-Homer confrontation that is so typical for Tzetzes (see above § 2).

Fragments of Hesiod's lost works do not play a major role in this context: Since they belong to works none of which had been preserved down to Eustathios' times, they could only be quoted at second hand, i. e. through the quotation of extant intermediary sources, and this process was more likely to happen in Eustathios' exegetical writings, rather than in his own creative prose.⁹² However, there is at least one remarkable passage in which the archbishop not only shows an awareness of the existence and the nature of the *Catalogue of Women*, but also refers to it in order to back his idea of Homer's superiority: When commenting on Achilles singing in his tent (the famous scene of *Il.* 9.189) in *in Il.* 745.47–50, he writes that the hero is singing κλέα ἀνδρῶν,

οὐ μὴν γυναικῶν καταλόγου κλέα κατὰ τοὺς ἐν θηλυδρώδεσι κωμάζοντας μέλεσιν [ἢ καὶ κατὰ τὸν καλὸν Ἡσίοδον, ὃς Ὀμήρου, καθὰ τις παλαιὸς ἔφη, τὸν ἠρωϊκὸν ἀνδρῶνα σεμνύναντος, αὐτὸς ἐν τῷ τῶν ἠρωίδων Καταλόγῳ τῆς γυναικωνίτιδος γέγονε].

Not the epic deeds of a catalogue of women, like the poets who revel in effeminate songs [or like good old Hesiod: according to an ancient author, while Homer had extolled the armory of the heroes, in his *Catalogue of Heroines* he became the master of the gynaeceum].

This is not an original observation: The first part of the sentence is taken wholesale from  *Il.* T I 186, which tries to defend Achilles from the charge of effeminacy; the rest, being a later addition penned by the author himself in the margins of his manuscript (the autograph *Laur.* 59.2–3), faithfully reports the argument made by Alexander the Great to his father Philip in Dio Chrysostom's account (*or.* 2.14 = Hes. T 57 Most).⁹³ This view of the *Catalogue*, however, ties in well with another passage where Eustathios insists on this poem as a foil for revealing Homer's superiority: In *in Od.* 1680.29 (on *Od.* 11.225; it is Hes. T 65 Most) we read that the *Nekyia* contains a catalogue of both male and female figures, not only of heroines as is the case with Hesiod. While this remark betrays an inevitable ignorance of the wider context and content of the lost epic poem, it also partially implies the archbishop's misogynist stance.

⁹¹ Hesiod's *Aspis*, for instance, originated from the 'envy for Homer', the ζῆλος Ὀμηρικός, but proved ultimately inadequate in comparison with its model: Eust. *in Il.*  –12 and 35–39; *in Il.* 1160.47.

⁹² A very short and selective survey of the quotations of Hesiod's fragments in Eustathios is offered by Schwartz (1960) 48–50.

⁹³ On Alexander's judgment, see Scully (2015), chap. 4 n. 1; on Dio and Hesiod, see Hunter (2014) 1–20.

Most of the occurrences of Hesiodic fragments in Eustathios depend directly on the Homeric scholia. There are, however, a number of cases in which the Byzantine commentator decides to drop the reference to (or quotation from) Hesiod in the scholia, whether the latter concerns mythographical, genealogical or grammatical issues.⁹⁴ This phenomenon need not surprise us: It is clear that Eustathios adopts an utilitarian approach, lending Hesiod no peculiar *auctoritas*,

94 Eust. *in Il.* 340.20–27 follows [redacted] 764 (Herodian) on the accent of ποδώκης, but does not quote the hemistich [redacted] ἧς δὴ Ἀγαάντη (fr. 73.2 and 76.5, 20 M.-W. = *2.2 and *3.5, 20 H = 47.2 and 48.5, 20 Most). Eust. *in Il.* 661.47 is silent about the Hesiodic identification of Arne as a Boiotian city [redacted] 9d1, with Hes. fr. 218 M.-W. = 166 Most). Eust. *in Il.* [redacted] 4 refrains from evoking Hesiod (fr. 189 M.-W. = 132 Most) as the first to use the name “Argos” for the entire Peloponnese, as does the Σ (A) I 246. Eust. *in Il.* 816.37 disregards the hint in Σ (A) K 431a to Hesiod’s and Homer’s relative chronology on the basis of the name [redacted] ες instead of Λυδοί (fr. 334 M.-W.). Eust. *in Il.* [redacted] 5 does not invoke Hesiod’s authority (fr. 314 M.-W. = 265 Most) on the meaning of ἄξυλος and ἀξυλίη (as does [redacted] 155b). Eust. *in Il.* 905.45 ignores the Hesiodic genealogy of Europa (fr. 140 M.-W. = 89 Most) contained in [redacted] 292–93. Eust. *in Il.* [redacted] 7 tackles the issue of ἵππη-λάτα / ἵπποτα = φυγάς, but he does not follow Σ (A) Ξ 119a in quoting Hes. fr. 228 M.-W. (= *18 H = 173 Most) on the topic. Eust. *in Il.* [redacted] 1–22 on the name Polydore omits the reference to its occurrence in Hesiod (fr. 213 M.-W. = 153 Most, from [redacted] 175c1). Eust. *in Il.* [redacted] 7 does not report that Hesiod (fr. 191 M.-W. = 134 Most) identified the wife of Sthenelos as Nikippe, daughter of Pelops (Σ [AT] T 116a). Eust. *in Il.* [redacted] 7 does not specify the Cretan origin of Lykomedes, which is known as Hesiod’s version (fr. 202 M.-W. = 156 Most) from Σ (T) T 240. Eust. *in Il.* [redacted] 3 disregards Hes. fr. 328 M.-W. (= 278 Most) on the use of ἄφωρα as ‘lion’, quoted in Σ (AT) Φ 528b1. Eust. *in Il.* [redacted] 7–49 on the venue of Oedipus’ death follows Σ (A) Ψ 679a, but not Σ (T) Ψ 679b (the latter has a reference to Hes. fr. 192 M.-W. = 135 Most). Eust. *in Il.* [redacted] 7 drops a Hesiodic line (fr. 316 M.-W. = 267 Most) on ὀπτῶ and the action of cooking (quoted as a parallel in [redacted] Ω 624). Eust. *in Od.* [redacted] 1, while dealing with Ogygia, does not mention Hes. fr. 204.60 M.-W. (= 155.60 Most) which appears in Σ α 85a. Eust. *in Od.* [redacted] 2 disregards the occurrence of Hes. fr. 337 M.-W. (= 285 Most; a line on the production of wheat) in Σ (EX) η 104. Eust. *in Od.* [redacted] 1 does not pick up the genealogy of Demeter in Σ (H) κ 2 (Hes. fr. 4 and 9 M.-W. = 5 and 9 Most). Eust. *in Od.* [redacted] 0 does not dwell on the genealogy of Tyro (Jason from Aison and Polymela) in Σ (V) μ 69 (fr. 36 M.-W. = 37 Most). Eust. *in Od.* [redacted] 1 reports from Σ (HV) τ 34 that heroes did not make use of λύχνοι, but omits the reference to Hesiod fr. 341 M.-W. = 288 Most. Eustathios also disregards the Hesiodic lines on Demodoke (fr. 22.5–7 M.-W. = 14.5–7 H = 18.5–7 Most) transmitted by Porph. *Qu. Il.* [redacted] 3 Schrader. We shall not consider here Hesiodic fragments that are not identified as such in the scholiastic source (fr. 60 and 240 M.-W. = 71 and 115 H = 239 and 181 Most), nor more problematic cases on the textual niveau (fr. 270 and 304.1 M.-W. = 206 and 254.1 Most). Eust. *in Il.* 882.16 omits a reference to fr. 17 M.-W. = 13 Most (Σ [A] Λ 750) on the genealogy of the Molionids, but fr. 18 M.-W. = 15 Most on the same topic is quoted immediately afterwards (see below).

and obviously not sharing in our modern enthusiasm for collecting fragments of lost ancient poems.⁹⁵

This said, there are quite a few instances in which Eustathios does pick up from his sources explicit references to passages of the *Catalogue*. In a minority of cases, he is our only extant source. Setting aside the so-called 'spurious fragments', i. e. false attributions to Hesiod that originated in mistakes of Eustathios' memory,⁹⁶ the true cases of one-source fragments are all to be explained by his having access to an intermediate source (most likely a scholium), now lost. The most useful distinction one can make among these quotations is thus less one of sources than one of typology: In order to exemplify Eustathios' preferences, we shall distinguish between fragments of grammatical/lexicographical and fragments of genealogical/mythographical content; for neither of these categories shall we offer a detailed discussion of all the relevant instances.

3.2 Hesiodic Fragments: Grammar and Vocabulary

According to Hesiod's *Catalogue*, Ileus, the father of the Lokrian Ajax, one of the protagonists of the war against Troy, was the offspring of Apollo (fr. 235 M.-W. = 112 H = 176 Most): This rare piece of information, delivered in five hexameters preserved by the Byzantine etymologica,⁹⁷ aroused the interest of Ioannes Tzetzes (see above § 2.2), but not that of Eustathios, who in *in Il.* 650.46 limited himself to a brief quotation of one and half lines out of the five (ll. 2–3), in order to establish the correct spelling of Ileus' name (vs. 'Oileus') and to link it etymologically with the adj. ἰλεως 'benign'.

⁹⁵ On the development of this fashion, see e. g. Dionisotti (1997). For the case of Hesiod's fragments in particular, see below § 4.4.

⁹⁶ When he assigns to Hesiod a 'Doric' form τέττορες (*in Od.* [redacted] 3 = Hes. fr. spur. 411), he is probably thinking of *WD* 698 τέτορ' (see West [1966] 87; Eustathios [redacted] believed, mostly in the wake of the ancient scholiasts, that Hesiod used Dorisms, see e. g. *in Il.* 585.21; *in Od.* 1759.32). When he credits Hesiod with the hemistich ὑπερβασίαι δ' ἀλεγειναί (*in Il.* [redacted] = Hes. fr. spur. 386) he is probably confusing with the famous ending of the *Works and Days* (828) ὑπερβασίας ἀλεείνων. When he quotes (*in Il.* [redacted]; see 447.26) the hemistich παῦροι δέ τε πατρός ἀρείους as being by Hesiod (fr. spur. 384), he certainly has in mind *Od.* 2.277. When he evokes Hesiod's authority for the role of springs as 'beginnings' (*in Il.* [redacted] 6 = fr. spur. 385), he is probably alluding to the role of πηγαί in *Th.* 736–38, whether or not this *rapprochement* was once contained in a lost scholium to *Il.* [redacted] 3. When he attributes to Hesiod the story of Klymene's marriage with Helios (*in Od.* 1689.2 = fr. spur. 387), he is probably reflecting a wrong indication in Σ (V) λ 326.

⁹⁷ *Etym. Gen.* s.v. Ἰλεός (*Etym. Magn.* *470, 136–42); *Etym. Gud.* [redacted] 1 Sturz (with Reitzenstein 1897, 161.4): the fragment once pertained to a commentary on Simonides (ἐν δ' Σιμωνίδου).

Who would not like to have some information on the infidelity of Tyn-dareos' daughters, amongst whom figure such prominent women as Helen and Clytaemestra? A scholium on Euripides' *Orestes* (249 = fr. 176 M.-W. = *8 H = 247 Most) preserves seven lines on this topic from Hesiod's *Catalogue* (or from the *Megalai Ehoiai*, as Hirschberger suggests), but of all this Eustathios (*in Il.* 125.3; 126.11; 797.46) appreciates only the paronomastic word-play (Φυλιῆα φίλον) in line 4. Indeed, one might wonder whether the archbishop is drawing here on a repertoire of examples of the rhetorical figure of παρήχησις, rather than on the Euripides-scholium itself.

The fate of Proitos' daughters numbers among the cruellest punishments inflicted on characters of Greek myth: Eustathios (*in Od.* 1746.7) is our only witness for the three lines describing their leprosy and hair-loss (fr. 133.3–5 M.-W. = 49.3–5 H = 82.3–5 Most: ll. 1–2 are very fragmentarily preserved in POxy 2488 A), but following his declared (and lost) source, namely the grammarian Herodian,⁹⁸ he employs this quotation only to observe that the rare neuter noun κνύος 'itch' in l. 3 is a verbal noun deriving from κνύω / κνύζω 'to scratch'. The archbishop states here explicitly that he is quoting from Hesiod's *Catalogue* (παρὰ Ἡσιόδω ἐν Καταλόγῳ περὶ τῶν Προιτίδων), and this is one of the very few times when he does so.

By contrast, Eustathios' only hint to the *Melampodia*, briskly described as a ποιημάτιον by Hesiod, is the reference to the peculiar spelling σκύφορς for σκύφορς in fr. 271 M.-W. (= 207 Most; quoted by Athenaeus 11.498a-b), which provides a useful *comparandum* for Homer's famously irregular prosody of the word ὄφις in *Il.* 1.118 (see *in Il.* 900.16 and *in Od.* 1775.18).

These instances, as well as several other ones involving single words or expressions allegedly attested in Hesiod,⁹⁹ show that grammatical and lexical interests were often prominent over any other concern in Eustathios' consideration

⁹⁸ Hrd. *Cath. pros.* 1.445.15 Lentz: This passage, as Lentz's entire edition of the lost Καθολικὴ πηγή (α, is a mere modern reconstruction from fragments scattered in extant sources, in this case from Eustathios himself (Hirschberger's edition is misleading in this respect).

⁹⁹ See e.g. Eust. *in Il.* 1.118 on the orthography of the toponym Ἰγρή (from Hes. fr. 181 M.-W. = 87 H = 124 Most); *in Il.* 295.3 on the apocope in βρή (fr. 329 M.-W. = 279 Most, from Strabo 8.5.3, p. 364 C.); *in Il.* 1.118 and *in Od.* 1775.18 on the meaning of φυλοχόος μῆν (fr. 333 M.-W. = *31 H = 283 Most, Mom Pollux 1.231: but Eustathios omits Hesiod's name); *in Il.* 875.52 on the meaning of καλλιγύναϊς (fr. 277 M.-W. = 213 Most, from Athen. 13.609E; it is interesting to remark that Eustathios' comment starts from the variant reading καλλιγύναικα for πουλυβότειραν in *Il.* 11.770, see *in Il.* 11.770b); *in Il.* 1337.32–34 on the Hesiodic attestation of μαχλοσύνη (fr. 132 M.-W. = 47 H = 81 Most, from Hes. fr. 25–30); *in Od.* 1775.18 on Megara being called σκίοεντα (fr. 204.48 M.-W. = 110.48 H = 155.48 Most, from Porph. *in Od.* p. 22.9 Schrader, on *Od.* 1775.18).

of our poet's fragments. It should be highlighted, however, that on the very first page of his commentary to the *Iliad* (*in Il.* 6.14) we find three lines of Hesiod illustrating the etymology of ῥαψωιδός from the verb ῥάπτειν, 'to weave' (fr. dub. 357 M.-W. = 297 Most): This fragment, no matter if evoked for mere grammatical purposes, and no matter if deemed spurious by most modern scholars today, is in fact a conspicuous autobiographical witness of Hesiod's *agon* with Homer in Delos, and thus a remarkable document of literary history in its own right.¹⁰⁰

Finally, another linguistic observation – on the creation of patronymic forms such as Βουτάδης from the proper name Βούτης – leads Eustathios (*in Il.* 13.44) to a brief mention of Boutes as being the son of Poseidon (not of Pandion, as elsewhere in mythography, e.g. Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.14.8): This piece of information (Hes. fr. 223 M.-W. = 169 Most) is peculiar to the archbishop, and it is probably indebted to a lost grammatical source which is also the source of *Etym. Magnum* 210.7.¹⁰¹ Here, once again, Eustathios, despite his primarily grammatical interest, insists that the genealogy of Boutes was stated by Hesiod ἐν Καταλόγῳ: This leads us to consider now more closely the fragments quoted because of Eustathios' interest in genealogy.

3.3 Hesiodic Fragments: Genealogy and Mythography

That the *Catalogue of Women* should be invoked by later writers chiefly when the discussion of a genealogy is at stake is hardly surprising. The scholia present several such occurrences, and in many of them – including one where Tzetzes amplifies the exegesis in a display of all his erudition¹⁰² – Eustathios simply summarizes the data he finds in earlier exegesis.¹⁰³ There are, however, some peculiar instances of Eustathios' *Vorgehensweise* with Hesiodic fragments.

100 It has aroused multiple interpretations in modern scholarship: See the updated overview in Bassino (2013) 14–18.

101 In Eustathios' passage, the part on the Eteoboutadai appears to have some connection with Harpocr. 75.13 Dind.; see also Schwartz (1960) 49–50.

102 Eust. *in Il.* 21.14 on Agamemnon's genealogy from Pleisthenes rather than Atreus (Hes. fr. 194 M.-W. = 137 Most) is a simple transcription from Σ (D) A 7, whereas Tzetzes, *in Il.* pp. 130.10–104.8, 210.8–12 Papat. (see Hes. fr. 137b-c, and above § 2.2) gives a much more detailed and fantastic genealogy for the generations in-between.

103 See e.g. Eust. *in Il.* [redacted] 27 and 1321.20 on the Molionians (from [redacted] 710 and [redacted] Ψ 638–42; fr. 18 M.-W. = 15 Most, a fragment and a topic the archbishop will evoke again in *de emend. vita monach.* 25.5–6 Metzler); *in Il.* [redacted] 8 on Orsippus running naked at Olympia (from Σ [D] and [bT] Ψ 683b; fr. 74 M.-W. = 50 Most); *in Od.* [redacted] 2 on Apollo and Paeon as heal-

That Achilles and Patroklos were cousins is common knowledge; but that Hesiod already endorsed this kinship is known only from fr. 212a M.-W. (= 147 Most), a passage of Eustathios' commentary on the *Iliad* (*in Il.* 112.45–113.1; on Patroklos' first appearance in the poem, *Il.* 1. 337) drawn from what the author calls a *παλαιὰ ἱστορία*. This formula is used in the *Parekbolai* for various pieces of ancient evidence, particularly mythographical tales:¹⁰⁴ In this case the genealogy of Menoitios' family (for which see e.g. *Il.* Pind. *Ol.* 9.104a and 106a-b) must derive, as van der Valk argued, from a scholium *ad locum* which has since been lost.

Maron is one of the descendants of Dionysos, but the details of his genealogy are rather confused in the extant scholia to the *Odyssey*: *Od.* 197 Dind. presents him as the son of Dionysos' son Euanthes, whereas *Od.* 198 Dind. (before Sittl's conjecture) reports that in Hesiod (fr. 238 M.-W. = 180 Most) he was the son of Dionysos' son Oinopion. Eustathios (*in Od.* 1623.44), who repeatedly shows a special interest for Maron (see *in Il.* 359.13), seems to choose yet another option, namely Maron as the son of Euanthes, who in his turn is the son of Dionysos' son Oinopion. It may well be that this is what Eustathios actually read in the *Od.* 198, if Sittl's integration of Euanthes' name in the scholium (p. 422.3 Dind.) hits the mark.

That Eustathios had a genuine interest in genealogy and mythography, even beyond the mere transcription of Homeric scholia, is proved by the way in which he dealt with the myth of Nestor's childhood in Gerenon / Gerena (*in Il.* 231.29): Not only did the Byzantine scholar draw on the *Dionysia* 36,¹⁰⁵ but he also resorted to Stephanus of Byzantium's *Ethnika* (γ 60 Bill.) in order to give some more precise geographical information about this mysterious city (fr. 34 M.-W. = 26c H = 34 Most) and to append three lines about the sad fate of Neleus' offspring (fr. 35.6–8 M.-W. = 26a.6–8 H = 33.6–8 Most, now in the middle of the fragment attested by POxy 2481, fr. 3).

Again in book 2 of the *Iliad*, the *Catalogue of ships* clearly opens up endless opportunities for a wide array of geographical, genealogical and mythographical explanations. The occurrence of the Kephisos river in *Il.* 2. 522 elicits the mention

ers (from Σ [V] δ 232a: fr. 307 M.-W. = 257 Most); Eust. *in Od.* 4 on Arete being Alkinoos' sister (from Σ [V] η 54: fr. 222 M.-W. = 144 Most); Eust. *in Od.* 2 (from Σ [V] λ 286) with the allusion to Neleus' children in fr. 33a, 12–19 M.-W. (= 25.12–19 H = 31.12–19 Most; now in the middle of POxy 2481, and attested in Σ Ap. Rhod. 1.156–60a); *in Od.* 9 on the Sirens charming the winds (from Σ [V] υ 168: fr. 28 M.-W. = 25 Most).

¹⁰⁴ E.g. Ptolemy the Quail in *in Il.* 45; Σ (D) B 581 in *in Il.* 7; Hellenicus (Σ [A] O 651) in *in Il.* 1 (see van der Valk *ad locum* etc. See also Schwartz (1960) 49.

¹⁰⁵ See on the topic the 58d Pont. with the *apparatus testimoniorum*.

of its origin from Lilaia ('Hes.' fr. 70.18 M.-W. = 31.18 H = 41.18 Most) both in the D-scholium *ad loc.* and (hence) in Eustathios *in Il.* 275.16.¹⁰⁶ Stephanos of Byzantium (α 486 Bill.) is also Eustathios' sole source when he comments on the children of Orchomenos in *Il.* 2.511 (*in Il.* 272.18 = fr. 77* M.-W. = *17 H = 44 Most). In *Il.* 2.695 we find the mention of Phylake, one of the ancestors of Protesilaos, the first hero to die in the Trojan expedition: Eustathios (*in Il.* 323.44–324.1) quotes three lines from 'Hesiod's' *Catalogue* (fr. 62 M.-W. = 33a H = 62 Most) in order to illustrate the legendary speed in running of Phylakos' son Iphiklos. Here, too, it is likely that the archbishop is drawing on a lost source, a *scholium uberius* as Erbse puts it, because the extant scholia to the *Iliad* (and not even to that passage: [redacted] 227) only report l. 2 of the fragment, and in a different form.¹⁰⁷ Finally, *Il.* 2.608 contains a reference to Lykaon, whose παραίβασία against Zeus (fr. 164 M.-W. = 114 Most) is evoked by Eust. *in Il.* 302.19; however, one should not discard van der Valk's suggestion that we may be dealing here not with the myth of Lykaon, but with a simple quotation of the word παραίβασία, which also occurs in *Th.* 220.

The 'Geographer' *par excellence*, namely Strabo (1.2.34, p. 42.19 C.), provides crucial information on the antiquity of the name of Arabia and on the genealogy of Arabos and Thronia according to 'Hesiod' (fr. 137 M.-W. = 54 H = 88 Most; see Eust. *in Od.* 1464.83 on *Od.* 4. 84; see also Eust. *in Dion. per.* 927: the archbishop follows here his source in stressing that this information derives from the *Catalogue of Women*). And Strabo is implied in what is perhaps the most intriguing case of an Hesiodic fragment transmitted by Eustathios, namely that on the Danaids and the drought in Argos, quoted in his note on *Il.* [redacted] πολυδίψιον Ἄργος (*in Il.* 461.6). The line describing the miraculous intervention of the Danaids (fr. 128 M.-W. = 45a-b H = 76a-b Most) is preserved by Strabo (8.6.8, p. 371.15–17 C.) as Ἄργος ἄνυδρον ἐὸν Δανααὶ θέσ[redacted] Ἄργος ἔνυδρον, but in Eustathios the same line occurs with two diverging features: First and foremost, the attribution to Hesiod;¹⁰⁸ secondly, the wording Ἄργος ἄνυδρον ἐὸν Δαναὸς ποί-

106 Here too, Eustathios provides an interesting variant: Λυλαίηθε(ν) προχέει (adopted in the text by M.-W. and Most) for Λυλαίησι προίει of the D-scholium.

107 The problematic issue is dealt with by Hirschberger (2004) 267, who prefers to detect here two different lines; see on the other hand Casadio (1977). At any rate, Eustathios' respect for his poetical source is shown by the fact that in his autograph ms. he left a blank space before the final hemistich of l. 3 καὶ οὐ σινέσκετο καρπὸν, whether this reflected a lacuna in his antigraphon or his own deduction, on metrical grounds, that the first hemistich of l. 3 had gone lost at some stage of the textual transmission.

108 This attribution also appears in an interlinear note on the Vatican palimpsest of Strabo, but it certainly did not belong to Strabo's original text: see Radt (2007) 461–462.

ησεν εὐνδρον, which changes both the subject and the entire structure of the line. These differences prevent us from believing (*pace* Erbse) that Eustathios may have used Strabo as his only source, and force us to conclude that he actually resorted to a different *Mittelquelle*, most probably a fuller version of the Σ (D) Δ 171, which in its present form contains what looks like a paraphrase of the Hesiodic line in the version attested by Eustathios, i.e. with Danaos as the subject.

The longest fragment of Hesiod's *Catalogue* to be found in the *Parekbolai* is fr. 305 M.-W. (= *11 H = 255 Most) on the genealogy of the mythical poet Linos, the son of Ourania and the grandson of Poseidon. The four hexameters constituting this fragment occur in *in Il.* 1163.62, and they derive *recta via* from the scholion § 570c1; but, strikingly enough, the last of these lines (ἀρχόμενοι δὲ Λίνον καὶ λήγοντες καλέουσιν) receives a special intertextual exegesis in *in Il.* 1164.23, where Eustathios argues that the line

Ὅμηρικου μὲν ῥητοῦ ἤρτηται τοῦ 'έν σοὶ μὲν λήξω, σέο δ' ἄρξομαι' [I 97], σύμφωνον δὲ ἔχει καὶ τὸ 'τί κάλλιον ἀρχόμενοις ἢ καταπαυόμενοις ἢ τὸ ποθεινότατον

looks back to Homer's sentence 'I shall end with you, and with you I shall begin' [*Il.* 9.97], and has the same sense as the distich 'what is better than the most desired thing, for those who begin or for those who end?' [Dion. Chalc. fr. 6 West]

By any standard, a subtle stylistic remark.


3.4 Conclusions

Albeit anything but systematic, Eustathios' interest for catalogic poetry and its relationship with the Homeric masterworks does occasionally surface in his writings.¹¹⁰ One might wonder, however, if the archbishop felt somewhat uneasy when dealing with fragments of a poem such as the *Catalogue of women*, structured around stories of sexual intercourse between mortal women and pagan gods.


A hint in this direction comes from what is perhaps the most spectacular genealogical doxography in the whole of the *Parekbolai*, namely the one concerning Arkeisios, Laertes, Odysseus, and finally Telemachos' marriage with Pol-

¹⁰⁹ See on this kind of formulas e.g. the commentary of Griffin (1995) 86.

¹¹⁰ It might be argued that Hesiod is implied among οἱ μεθ' Ὅμηρον who proved inferior to Homer in the genre of catalogues according to *in Il.* § 9–43 (the concluding lines of the exegesis on the *Catalogue of ships*).

ykaste and the birth of their son Persepolis: This lineage of descent is secured for 'Hesiod' (fr. 221 M.-W. =  H = 168 Most) by Eustathios in *Od.* 1796.38 (on *Od.* 16. 117–20), who heaps this piece of information about the *Catalogue* on top of other, partially quite diverse genealogies of the same family in the epic cycle (*Nostoi* and *Telegony*), in Sophocles, Aristotle and Hellanicus:¹¹¹ Eustathios' (probably mythographical) source remains unknown down to the present day.

However, at the end of this long catalogue of *Stammbäume*, the archbishop abruptly puts an end to this display of erudition, and rounds off the passage by a distich of dodecasyllables which almost attempts to disavow and obliterate his persisting interest in this kind of lurid pagan stories:

 this is superfluous, and vain evil; / if it is laid out in short, little will be the drawback',¹¹²

περιττὰ ταῦτα καὶ κενὴ μοχθηρία. / εἰ δ' οὖν στενωῶς φράζονται, μικρὸν τὸ βλάβος.

4 Fr. 5 M.-W. and Greek Humanists in Italy

4.1 Generalities

As was mentioned above (§ 1), the popularity of Hesiod in the late Byzantine era was largely confined to his role in schools and to the editorial work performed on his poems: Planudes' scholia (and his important ms. *Laur.* 32.16, the first one to include the *Theogony* as well), Moschopoulos' commentary (and his curricular readings that also embraced the *Works and Days*), Triklinios' comprehensive edition, etc. In this context, there are virtually no traces of a specific attention paid to Hesiodic fragments, and this holds through to the mature age of Italian humanism.¹¹³

More work needs to be done in order to reconstruct the exact developments of this reception. For the time being, we shall point to a single instance in which

¹¹¹ See Hellan. fr. 156 Fowler (with Fowler's commentary).

¹¹² Maas (1952) 1, insisting on the unusual character of this *a parte*. For the *incipit* see e.g. Gal. *Diff. puls.* 8.497.6 K. περιττὰ γὰρ ταῦτα καὶ ἔξω τῆς ἡμετέρας τέχνης, but see also Basil. *Rebus mund. non adh.*, PG 31.548d, and often in John Chrysostom. For a similar idea see Eust. in *Dion. Per.* 205.7–8 Müller (about non-pertinent digressions in the exegesis to Dionysius) φιλοτιμία κενὴ καὶ φαύλη δοξασοφία.

¹¹³ Botley (2010) 100–102. See also the references in Wilson (1992) *ad indicem*.

the Byzantine and humanistic transmission of an important Hesiodic fragment has a bearing both on its editorial *facies* and on its ideological meaning.

4.2 Hes. Fr. 5 M.-W. in John Lydos

This is *Cat. fr. 5* in Merkelbach-West's edition (= 2 H = 2 Most), transmitted by John Lydos, *De mens.* 1.13, p. 7.22 Wünsch:

τοσούτων οὖν ἐπιξενωθέντων τῆς Ἰταλίας, ὥσπερ ἐδείχθη, Λατίνους μὲν τοὺς ἐπιχωριάζον-
τας, Γραικοὺς δὲ τοὺς ἐλληνίζοντας ἐκάλου, ἀπὸ Λατίνου τοῦ ἄρτι ἡμῖν ῥηθέντος καὶ Γραι-
κοῦ τῶν ἀδελφῶν, ὡς φησιν Ἡσίοδος ἐν Καταλόγοις

Ἄγριον ἠδὲ Λατῖνον (*Th.* 1013)

<καὶ πάλιν>

κούρη δ' ἐν μεγάροισιν ἀγαυοῦ Δευκαλίωνος
Πανδῶρη Διὶ πατρὶ θεῶν σημάντορι πάντων
μυχθεῖσ' ἐν φιλότῃ τεκέ Γραικὸν μενεχάρμην.

since so many people – as has just been shown – had wandered to Italy, they called the locals ‘Latins’, and the Greek-speaking people ‘Graikoi’, respectively from Latinus, whom we spoke of a little earlier, and Graikos, brothers, as Hesiod says in the *Catalogues*,

‘Agrios and Latinos’ (*Th.* 1013),

and again,

‘and a maiden in the halls of illustrious Deukalion,

Pandora, who with Zeus the father, the commander of all the gods,

having mingled in love, bore Graikos who delighted in remaining steadfast in battle’.

Due to their conspicuous place at the beginning of the genealogies, these lines have attracted a large body of scholarship. Modern critics disagree on a number of issues, above all their authenticity,¹¹⁴ the nature and relevance of the hemistich Ἄγριον ἠδὲ Λατῖνον (a quotation of *Th.* 1013, as Merkelbach and later editors suppose, in the wake of Wilamowitz? the occasional note of an anonymous reader, as G. Hermann believed? the first words of the *Catalogue* fragment?), the identity of Pandora (the well-known Pandora sent to Epimetheus, or, as West and Hirschberger assume, a namesake character?), her relationship to Deukalion mentioned in the foregoing line (her husband? her father? her son-in-law?),¹¹⁵

¹¹⁴ Challenged by Niese, and defended by Wilamowitz, whose discussion (1962: 80–82) remains very helpful.

¹¹⁵ It is worth remarking that Eust. in *Il.* [] τοὺς δὲ [scil. stones thrown by De []n's after the flood] τὴν γυναῖκα Πύρραν καὶ τὴν θυγατέρα Πανδῶραν, ἣν Ἡσίοδος πρώτην γυναῖκα φησι has often been invoked as a witness to the genealogy of Pandora as De []n's daughter, pos-

and finally the role of Graikos, a character otherwise unknown to Greek mythology but taken here to be no less than the forefather of the Greeks (a role otherwise pertaining to Deukalion's other son, Hellen).

While not dwelling on these delicate and probably insoluble questions,¹¹⁶ we shall try to draw attention to the transmission of the fragment's source, and then focus on its mysterious 'fourth line' as transmitted – per scholars and editions since Schultz¹¹⁷ – by a marginal note in ms. *Matr.* 4607: καὶ Γραικὸς τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἐξ Ἄγριον ἠδὲ Λατῖνον.

First of all, Lydos' text. The first book of the *de mensibus*, a treatise devoted to issues of comparative chronology and chronography, has come down to us not in its entirety, but only through numerous excerpts preserved in several manuscripts. As it happens, our fragment is known from a single independent witness, namely *Vat. Barb. gr.* 194 (Wünsch's A), a manuscript that watermarks and historical considerations help date safely within the 1480s:¹¹⁸ This is the text of the *Barberinianus*, the sole basis for every speculation on the transmission of our fragment:

τοσούτων οὖν ἐπιξενωθέντων τῆς Ἰταλίας, ὡσπερ ἐδείχθη αὐτοῖς, Λατίνους μὲν τοὺς ἐπιχωριάζοντας, Γραικοὺς δὲ τοὺς ἐλληνίζοντας ἐκάλουν, ἀπὸ Λατίνου τοῦ ἄρτι ἡμῖν ῥηθέντος καὶ Γραικὸς τῶν ἀδελφῶν, ὡς φησιν Ἡσίοδος ἐν Καταλόγῳ

ἄγριον εἶδε Λατῖνον
 κούρη δ' ἐν μεγάροισιν ἀγαθοῦ Δευκαλίωνος
 Πανδώρη Διὶ πατρὶ θεῶν σημάντορι πάντων
 μηθεῖσα ἐν φιλότῃ τεκέ Γραικὸν μενεχάρμη.¹¹⁹

John Lydos, the antiquarian and historian of Roman culture of the Justinianic age,¹²⁰ is clearly trying to show here that East and West belonged together:

sibly implied by this fragment, although this is far from certain: See Hirschberger (2004) 174–175 and the perplexity uttered by Casanova (1979b) 181–182.

116 A nice overview of the different solutions proposed by scholars is provided by Casanova (1975), and (more succinctly) by Hirschberger (2004) 171–172.

117 Schultz (1910) 11 and 132.

118 Amongst A's apographs the only interesting codex is *Par. gr.* 3094, a 17th-century book written by Emery Bigot, for which, *pace* Wünsch, there is no need to believe that it had access to a different witness: See Ferreri (2002) 205 and note 63, with many integrations to the textual history of the *De mensibus*.

119 Accents and spirits are misplaced in the first hemistich, which may in fact read something like ἄγριοῖδε. The reading Γραικός for Γραικοῦ in l. 3 of Lydos' prose introduction should be remarked.

120 See Maas (1992) esp. 53–66 for the 'antiquarian' dimension of the *De mensibus*.

His reference to Hesiod therefore carries an ideological bias, for the brother-relationship between Latinos and Graikos is paramount to the construction of a shared identity between the Greek and the Roman world in an age when the political unity of the empire had been severed by history, and Justinian was attempting to revive it in some form.¹²¹

We shall not discuss here whether this genealogical link between Greeks and Latins was in fact already present in the *Catalogue of Women*, at least in the version Lydos was reading;¹²² what is certain is that in the form reconstructed by Hesiod's editors, the link between Graikos and Latinos is conspicuously missing from the text. Precisely this *crux* – aggravated by the conflict with the *Theogony* tradition according to which Latinos is Kirke's son, and Graikos is Pandora's¹²³ – has pushed scholars of the last two centuries to attempt bold reconstructions of Lydos' wording, starting from the collocation of the first three words ἄγριον ἠδὲ λατῖνον. If we simply disregard and expunge this hemistich, we lose the mention of the forefather of the Latins; if we consider it a quotation from Hes. *Th.* 1013 (the offspring of Odysseus and Kirke: Agrios would thus become a proper name, to be written with capital alpha), we do get a glimpse of the Greek genealogy of Latinos, but we miss a clear connection with Graikos, or with the Deukalionids in general; if we consider the hemistich as belonging to the line immediately preceding κούρη δ' ἐν μεγάροισι, the textual proximity does not satisfactorily explain the syntactical and conceptual link between the two accusatives and Pandora's genealogy; alternatively, we might follow West, who proposed to transpose the hemistich (or parts of it) after l. 3.¹²⁴

In what follows I shall argue that the embarrassment caused by the lack of a clear connection between Latinos and Graikos was not new when felt by modern scholars. Indeed, it was this very embarrassment that gave rise to the 'fourth line'

¹²¹ See Hirschberger (2004) *ad loc.*, also concerning the choice of Graikos (whence the Latin term *Graecus* derives) instead of Hellen. The attempt of Dräger (1997) 27–41 (esp. 31–32) to read Lydos' passage in a different way (i.e. as not implying that Graikos and Latinos were brothers) rests on an utterly impossible syntactical interpretation, and on an inadequate knowledge of the ms. transmission.

¹²² As it happens, few scholars seem to have taken into account the interesting arguments in support of an early contact between East and West put forth by Jameson – Malkin (1998).

¹²³ Casanova (1975) 128, who then resorts to the hypothesis that the lines were inserted in the text by an anonymous annotator wishing to contradict (rather than to support) Lydos' argument: This is far-fetched, and has found little support among scholars.

¹²⁴ West believes that Lydos misunderstood ἄγριος in l. 4 as a proper name, and thus arbitrarily connected these lines with *Th.* 1013, where Latinos is also mentioned. A more straightforward alteration had been proposed by Müttzell, who re-wrote l. 4 as ἄγριον, ἠδὲ λατῖνον ἀμύμονα τε κρατερόν τε: See Casanova (1975) 126–127.

mentioned above, which has so far been dismissed by editors as “*sensu carens*”.¹²⁵

4.3 Ianos Laskaris

Thanks to the pioneering research of Luigi Ferreri,¹²⁶ we now know that ms. *Barb. gr.* [redacted] was first used in Florence in May 1491 by Angelo Poliziano as a source for the excerpts from I [redacted] Lydos penned in his ‘zibaldone’, now ms. *Par. gr.* [redacted].¹²⁷ unsurprisingly, Poliziano did not miss the opportunity to transcribe Hesiod’s fragment, exactly in the same form as in the *Barb.*¹²⁸ More important, from Poliziano’s notes we learn that in 1491 the owner of the *Barberinianus* was the celebrated Greek humanist Ianos Laskaris, who might have acquired it during his first book hunt in Greece (fall 1490-early 1491), or else in Italy, perhaps during his wanderings in Ferrara, Padua and Venice in the late 1480s.¹²⁹

Ianos Laskaris himself made use of Lydos’ *de mensibus* in his public oration in support of Greek studies held in Florence in October or November 1493.¹³⁰ As in other speeches of the same genre, in this remarkable Latin text Laskaris wished to highlight the antiquity of Greek culture, and – this is something that will not feature e.g. in Pietro Bembo’s or Scipione Forteguerra’s later orations – its superiority vis-à-vis Roman culture.¹³¹ When it comes to stressing the original kinship between Greeks and Latins, Laskaris exclaims (ll. 141–51):

‘Quid quod Italus et ipse Oenotrius, quid quod Latinus Graecus genere et Graeci frater ip-sius, si credis Hesiodo, ut a duobus fratribus fraterna sint denominata genera? Haec auctores vestri ab Hesiodo referunt:

κούρη δ’ ἐν μεγάροισιν ἀγαυοῦ Δευκαλίωνος
 Πανδώρα Διὶ πατρί, θεῶν σημαντορι πάντων,
 μυχθεῖσ’ ἐν φιλότῃ τέκε Γραικὸν μενεχάρμη
 καὶ Γραικὸς τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἐς ἄγριον εἶδε Λατῖνον.

125 ‘Quite meaningless... and should be ignored’ (West 1966, 434). Hirschberger and Most barely mention it.

126 Ferreri (2002) esp. 204–211.

127 On this manuscript see most recently Silvano (2010).

128 Save for εἶδε not εἶδε, and τέκεν not τέκε. Poliziano’s ‘zibaldone’ was neither accessible to nor consulted by scholars for a long time after his death.

129 Ferreri (2002) 207–212. Laskaris was later to lend the manuscript to the Calabrian humanist Aulo Giano Parrasio: See particularly Formentin (2010).

130 Meschini (1983). This reference has escaped so far all editors of Hesiod.

131 See Gastgeber (2014); Lamers (2015) 1 [redacted] 65.

Illustris virgo sub tectis Deucalionis
 Pandore divum patri commixta tonanti
 atque hominum domino Graecum produxerat acrem,
 et fratrem durum inspexisti, Graece, Latinum’.

Hesiod’s *auctoritas* is crucial for Ianos Laskaris in order to show that Greeks and Romans share a common origin since the earliest times: This is why he must overcome the aforementioned problem concerning the lack of a clear statement of kinship between Graikos and Latinos in Hesiod’s fragment as transmitted by Lydos. The fourth line of the fragment is thus fashioned by Laskaris *suo Marte* through a small intervention on the wording of Lydos’ sentence as it appears in the *Barberinianus*:¹³² καὶ Γραικὸς τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἄγριον εἶδε Λατῖνον becomes καὶ Γραικὸς τὸν ἀδελφὸν <ἐς> ἄγριον εἶδε Λατῖνον (indeed, in his first attempt he had chosen the preposition ἐπ’ rather than ἐς: in either case, we have a highly unusual tmesis of the verb ἐσεῖδ’ or ἐπεῖδε -, “*inspexisti*” as the Latin goes).¹³³

This is not the place to speculate on the reference to Graikos rather than Hellen as the forefather of the Greeks: It should be kept in mind that Γραικός was often (if not always) perceived by the Byzantines as a slightly pejorative ethnonym vis-à-vis Ἑλληνα (or, in political terms, Ῥωμαῖος); in humanistic times, attitudes toward this name were rather ambivalent and mainly still negative.¹³⁴ Be that as it may, Ianos Laskaris’ adoption of Hesiod’s genealogy bolstered his argument and prepared the ground for his overt exaltation of Greek culture as essential in all fields of knowledge.¹³⁵

¹³² This had already been seen by West (1966) 434 (followed by Hirschberger 2004, 172), although he only knew Wünsch’s text (not the *Barberinianus*) and only Konstantinos Laskaris’ version of the line (for which see below § 3.4). Dräger (1997) 27–40, who takes the line seriously, also believes it originated from some misunderstanding of Lydos’ words, but his interpretation of the textual evidence is misleading.

¹³³ See Meschini’s apparatus criticus *ad loc.*, registering the variants of Laskaris’ earlier (autograph) draft in ms. *Vat. gr.* 1323 (ff. 1r-40v: here, f. 9r), which also had a different wording for the Latin rendering of l. 4: ‘*Et Graecus [then corrected into durum] fratrem vidit mox deinde Latinum*’. Meschini’s text (with a faulty Γραικός for Γραικός) is based on the “clean” copy of *Vat. gr.* 1323 contained in ms. *Riccard.* 3022 (ff. 36r–63v: here, f. 42r).

¹³⁴ See on the topic Kaldellis (2007) *passim* (esp. 115 note 224), and for the humanistic period Lamers (2015) 154–155.

¹³⁵ See the penetrating analysis by Lamers (2015) 154–155 and n. 603 (some partly correct comments on our fragment).

4.4 Konstantinos Laskaris

Having shown that the creation of l. 4 of our fragment was far from a senseless initiative by some uneducated scribe, and rather proceeded from a clear ideological choice of one of the most prominent Greek scholars of Western humanism, I now turn to the other witness of Hesiod's fragment containing this line, which is also the only one hitherto known to scholars and editors. Ms. *Matritensis* 4607 is a book that belonged to the Greek humanist Konstantinos Laskaris (no family relationship with Ianos can be established, nor did the two entertain any contact during their long stays in Italy),¹³⁶ and it contains above all Hesiod (with Tzetzes' and Proclus' exegesis) and Theocritus.¹³⁷ Except for an older core belonging to the early 15th century (ff. 54–66), all the rest of the manuscript was written by Konstantinos Laskaris himself, partly (ff. 1–131) in Milan in the early 1460s, and partly (the bucolic section in ff. 133–53) during his later years in Messina.¹³⁸

Now, on f. 113r of the *Matritensis* we find the end of Hesiod's *Theogony*, in Konstantinos Laskaris' hand: the text once closed with l. 1020, then Laskaris himself added, in red ink, the two final lines 1021–1022, which notoriously introduce the *Catalogue of Women* (they correspond to fr. 1.1–2 M.-W., as attested also by POxy 2354),¹³⁹ and then the conclusive note τέλος τῆς Θεογονίας Ἡσιόδου. Below this note we find another addition, this time in K. Laskaris' later hand (i.e. the same handwriting we find in the Theocritus section of ms. 4607 in ff. 133–153).¹⁴⁰ The note is introduced by the indication Ἡσιόδου καὶ ταῦτα,

136 See Martínez Manzano (1994) 162–163 (= 1998, 170), against the idea that the two should be brothers.

137 See the descriptions by De Andrés (1974) 108–111 (to be integrated with Martínez Manzano [1994] 319, 181 and 134 [= (1998) 78 n. 5 and 132] esp. for the Nicander excerpts on ff. 85–88); Corrales Pérez (1994) 41 (and 209–19 on the philological value of the *Scutum* section); Schultz (1910) 11. The subscription on f. 153v reads Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ Λασκάρειος καὶ ὁ κόπος καὶ τὸ κτῆμα. On the scholia of the *Matritensis* see di Gregorio (1971).

138 That the final quires belong to the later years of Laskaris' stay in Messina (1465–1501) is confirmed by the watermarks (*fleur de lys* type 7312 Briquet, dated to 1479–82, but not identical), and by the handwriting: See De Andrés (1974) 110; Martínez Manzano (1994) 260 n. 21 and 319. Galán Vioque (2006) 42; Botley (2010) 219 n. 420.

139 On these two lines and their fate in manuscripts (they figure at the end of the *Theogony* in Vat. gr. 1021–22, the second-oldest of our mss., and are sometimes added *après coup* in other codices) see West (1966) 437, as well as the apparatus of Solmsen *ad loc.* A proper inquiry on their presence in manuscripts still has to be carried out.

140 Examples in Martínez Manzano (1994) plates xxxiii–xxxv (= 1998, plates 9–10). Gallavotti (1999) 70–72 tentatively assumes on philological grounds that this section should in fact go back to the 1460s. But the Messina years were a time when K. Laskaris displayed a strong interest in archaic epic: See also Montanari (1979) 46 and 65–71 on ms. *Matritensis* 4629.

and it transmits precisely fr. 5 M.-W. of Hesiod's *Catalogue*, equipped with the fourth line in the form καὶ Γραϊκὸς τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἐς ἄγριον ἠδὲ Λατῖνον.

It is impossible that this textual *facies*, which mirrors so closely the one adopted by Ianos Laskaris in his 1493 oration,¹⁴¹ should have been conceived independently by Konstantinos Laskaris in Messina (to cast away any doubt, there is no evidence that he was acquainted first-hand with the very rare text of John Lydos' *de mensibus*). Furthermore, we have seen that Ianos' source was the *Barberinianus* itself, so it is impossible to postulate a common source. We are thus left with the certainty that Ianos created the line and that Konstantinos simply received and propagated this innovation in his manuscript. Unfortunately, we are not in a position to reconstruct the channel by which Konstantinos came to know of this fragment. The idea of his trip to Florence in the 1490s, once envisaged by A. Diller on other grounds, is now mostly discarded by scholars.¹⁴² And neither of the two extant manuscripts of Ianos Laskaris' oration ever arrived so far south (the *Riccardianus* never left Florence, and *Vat. gr.* 1414 followed Laskaris in his adventurous life). We might surmise that a role was played by Konstantinos' pupil Pietro Bembo, who must have been interested in this kind of orations *de studiis Graecis* (he delivered one in Venice in 1494–95),¹⁴³ and might therefore have had Ianos Laskaris' text sent to him in Messina, where he spent no less than two years (1492–1494) at Konstantinos' school.¹⁴⁴

Be that as it may, as a humanist who had made such significant contributions to the learning of Greek in Europe (the Greek grammar known as *Erotemata* was the first Greek book to be published in the West in 1476), Konstantinos Laskaris must have been very sensitive to a fragment uniting Greeks and Latins at such a high mythographical level. His only preserved erudite works, two historical overviews on the writers of Sicily and Calabria, also attest to a sense of continuity between the Greek and the Roman traditions,¹⁴⁵ and so does his attention to the penetration of Latin vocabulary in Greek speech since the age of Constan-

141 The only difference, ἠδέ for εἶδε, may have been prompted by the confusion with *Th.* 1013 which is to be found a few lines above on the same page.

142 See Diller (1957) 179, contradicted by Martínez Manzano (1994) 16 note 51 (= 1998, 12 note 35). But see also *ibid.* 272 (= 1998, 194–195) on the issue of the manuscript of Gorgias' works allegedly seen by Laskaris in Florence. What K. Laskaris writes in his letter to Bembo of June 1494 (Martínez Manzano 1994, 29–30 = 1998, 24–25) basically rules out any journey of his in that period.

143 See Wilson (2003).

144 We know from Bembo's correspondence that Laskaris was on friendly terms with the Florentine Angelo Poliziano: Martínez Manzano (1994) 27–28 (= 1998, 26). Or one might suspect another one of his many pupils, listed by Martínez Manzano (1994) 25 (= 1998, 21).

145 See Cohen-Skalli (2014), with updated bibliography on Laskaris.

tine the Great;¹⁴⁶ in the preface to his grammar, he boasts having taught in various Italian cities πολλοὺς ὠφελήσας Γραικοὺς καὶ Λατίνους.¹⁴⁷

If Konstantinos Laskaris was thus deriving his knowledge from Ianos, he was not doing so in a passive way. And we might still credit him with a special, original merit: [redacted] was the first known scholar to unite on the same page what is now fr. 1 M.-W. = H = Most (of course limited to ll. 1–2; the rest is known to us today only through papyrological evidence) and what is now fr. 2 H = Most (= 5 M.-W.) of Hesiod's *Catalogue*. Whether this choice was made with some philological awareness or not, is impossible to tell. To the best of [redacted] knowledge, that the last two lines of the *Theogony* (1021–1022) should in fact introduce to the *Catalogue of Women* (the work to which Lydos openly ascribes the fragment he is quoting – a fragment whose position towards the beginning of the poem is ensured beyond doubt by the mention of Pandora), was first explicitly stated by Friedrich August Wolf (*Theogonia Hesiodica*, Halae Saxonum 1783), then more clearly by C. Götting (*Hesiodi Carmina*, Lipsiae 1831).¹⁴⁸

But perhaps the first to understand this continuity was the first Latin translator of the *Theogony*, namely the Italian scholar Bonino Mombrizio, who concluded his Ferrara 1474 Latin version of the poem (printed 21 years before the *princeps* of the Greek text) by adding 10 lines of his own invention where he complained about the loss of such an exciting text as the *Catalogue of Women*: 'O modo tam digno cur me fortuna fefellit / Codice, materia cur me privavit [redacted] - esta? / An quo iam merito vatem fraudaret honore / neve suum decus esse suo furiata labori / ferret, et Ascreaeas ea nollet vivere musas? / Nos ea Romanis an quod convertere verbis / noluit? ah si sic quanti puto conscia diva es, / aemula Mombrition nolis emergere nomen. / Quae te causa movet? sunt quae nos multa valemus / scribere, sunt studiis accomoda plurima nostris'.¹⁴⁹

Bibliography

- Allegrini, S. (1971–1972). 'Note di Giovanni Tzetzes ad Eschilo', in: *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università degli studi di Perugia* 9, 221–223.
- Basilikopoulou-Ioannidou, A. (1971). *Ἡ ἀναγέννησις τῶν γραμμάτων κατὰ τὸν ΙΒ' αἰῶνα εἰς τὸ Βυζάντιον καὶ ὁ Ὅμηρος*, Athens.
- Bassino, P. (2013). *Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi*, Ph.D. Diss., University of Durham.

¹⁴⁶ See Lamers (2015) [redacted] 35, and Martínez Manzano (1994) 171.7–11.

¹⁴⁷ 'Being useful to many Greeks and Latins': See Martínez Manzano (1994) 199.71–72.

¹⁴⁸ Götting attributed the two lines to an interpolator. See also Fabricius – Harles (1790) 589.

¹⁴⁹ On Mombrizio see most recently Raschieri (2011).

- Benedetti, F. (1976–1977). 'De Eustathii grammatici studiis Oppianeis', in: *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università degli studi di Perugia* 14, 431–441.
- Bianconi, D. (2005). *Tessalonica nell'età dei Paleologi. Le pratiche intellettuali nel riflesso della cultura scritta*, Paris.
- Botley, P. (2010). *Learning Greek in Western Europe*, Philadelphia.
- Braccini, T. (2009–2010). 'Erudita invenzione: riflessioni sulla *Piccola grande Iliade* di Giovanni Tzetzes', in: *Incontri triestini di filologia classica* 9: 153–173.
- Browning, R. (1975). 'Homer in Byzantium', in: *Viator* 6: 15–33 (= *Studies on Byzantine History, Literature and Education*, London 1977, no. XVII).
- Browning, R. (1992a). 'The Byzantines and Homer', in R. Lamberton and J. J. Keaney (eds.), *Homer's Ancient Readers. The Hermeneutics of Greek Epic's Earliest Exegetes*, Princeton, 134–148.
- Browning, R. (1992b). 'L'insegnante', in: G. Cavallo (ed.), *L'uomo bizantino*, Rome and Bari, 132–169.
- Budelmann, F. (2002). 'Classical Commentary in Byzantium: The Commentaries of Tzetzes on Ancient Greek Literature', in: R. G. Gibson and C. Shuttleworth Kraus (eds.), *The Classical Commentary: Histories, Practices, Theory*, Leiden, 141–169.
- Cameron, A. (2004). *Greek Mythography in the Roman World*, Oxford.
- Cannatà Fera, M. (2012). 'Giovanni Tzetzes e i "giambi" di Archiloco (fr. 215 W. = 20 T.)', in: D. Castaldo, F. G. Giannachi, and A. Manieri (eds.), *Poesia, musica e agoni nella grecia antica*, Atti del IV Convegno internazionale ΜΟΙΣΑ (Lecce, 28–30 October 2010), Galatina, 694–710.
- Cardin, M. (2009). '*Heroogonia*. Il *Catalogo delle donne* di Giovanni Tzetzes', in: *Philologus* 153: 237–249.
- Cardin, M. (2010). 'L'*ehoia* di Egina e le Asopidi nel *Catalogo delle donne* esiodeo', in: E. Cingano (ed.), *Tra panellenismo e tradizioni locali: generi poetici e storiografia*, Alessandria, 151–210.
- Casadio, V. (1977). 'Hes. fr. 62 M.-W.', *Museum Criticum* 10–12: 7–9.
- Casanova, A. (1975). 'Un'aporia in Giovanni Lido (de mens. I 13)', *Maia* 27: 125–131.
- Casanova, A. (1979a). '*Catalogo, Eèe e Grandi Eèe* nella tradizione ellenistica', *Prometheus* 5: 217–240.
- Casanova, A. (1979b). *La famiglia di Pandora*, Florence.
- Cesaretti, P. (2010). 'Tzetzes, John', in: A. Grafton, G. W. Most, and S. Settis (eds.), *The Classical Tradition*, Cambridge MA, and London, 957.
- Cingano, E. (2009). 'The Hesiodic Corpus', in: F. Montanari, A. Rengakos, and C. Tsagalis (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Hesiod*, Leiden and Boston, 91–130.
- Cingano, E. (2014). *Eustathios of Thessalonike. Parekbolai on Homer's Odyssey 1–2*, Ph.D. Diss., University of Uppsala.
- Cohen, I. M. (1983). *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women. Studies on the Fragments of an Early Greek Epic*, Ph.D. Diss., University of Toronto.
- Cohen, I. M. (1986). 'The Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* and the *Megalai Ehoiai*', *Phoenix* 40: 127–142.
- Cohen-Skalli, A. (2014). 'De Byzance à Messine: les *Vitae Siculorum* de Constantin Lascaris, leur genèse et leur tradition', *Revue d'Histoire des Textes*, 9: 79–116.

- Colonna, A. (1953). 'I *Prolegomeni* ad Esiodo e la *Vita esiodea* di Giovanni Tzetzes', *Bollettino del comitato per la preparazione della edizione nazionale dei classici greci e latini* 2: 27–39.
- Corrales, Y. (1997). 'La actividad en los centros de copia de los monasterios del Atos (siglos XI-XII): algunas conclusiones a la luz de los fragmentos del *Par. suppl. gr. 663*', in: P. Bádenas – A. Bravo – I. Pérez Martín (eds.), *Ἐπίγειος οὐρανός. El cielo en la tierra. Estudios sobre el monasterio bizantino*, Madrid: 171–181.
- Corrales Pérez, Y. (1994). *Die Überlieferungsgeschichte des pseudohesiodeischen Scutum Herculis*, Ph.D. Diss., University of Hamburg.
- De Andrés, G. (1974). *Catálogo de los códices griegos de la Biblioteca Nacional*, Madrid.
- Dahlén, C. (1933). *Zu Johannes Tzetzes' Exegesis des hesiodeischen Erga*, Uppsala.
- Degni, P. (2008). 'I manoscritti dello "scriptorium" di Gioannicio', *Segno e testo* 6: 179–248.
- Derenzini, G. (1979). 'Demetrio Triclinio e il Codice Marciano Greco 464', *Scrittura e civiltà* 3: 223–241.
- Di Gregorio, L. (1971). 'Sulla tradizione manoscritta degli *scholia vetera* alla *Teogonia* di Esiodo I. Le copie del Marc. gr. 464 (= 762), II. La famiglia del Vat. gr. 1332, III. I codici contaminati', *Aevum* 45: 1–24, 187–207, 383–408.
- Di Gregorio, L. (1972). 'Sulla tradizione manoscritta degli *scholia vetera* alla *Teogonia* di Esiodo IV. Conclusioni', *Aevum* 46: 1–15.
- Diller, A. (1957). 'The Manuscripts of Pausanias', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 88: 169–188.
- Dionisotti, A. C. (1997). 'On Fragments in Classical Scholarship', in: G. W. Most (ed.), *Collecting fragments / Fragmente sammeln*, Göttingen: 1–33.
- Dräger, P. (1997). *Untersuchungen zu den Frauenepigrammen Hesiods*, Wiesbaden.
- Fabricius, J. A. – G. Chr. Harles (1790⁴), *Bibliotheca Graeca*, I, Hamburg.
- Ferreri, L. (2002). 'I codici parrasiani della Biblioteca Vaticana, con particolare riguardo al *Barberiniano greco* 194, appartenuto a Giano Lascaris', in: G. Abbamonte, L. Gualdo Rosa, and L. Munzi (eds.), *Parrhasiana* II, Atti del II Seminario di studi su Manoscritti medievali e umanistici della Biblioteca Nazionale di Napoli (Naples, 20–21 October 2000), Naples, 189–223.
- Flach, H. (ed.) (1876). *Glossen und Scholien zur hesiodischen Theogonie mit Prolegomena*, Leipzig.
- Flusin, B. (2008). 'L'insegnamento e la cultura scritta', in: J.-C. Cheynet (ed.), *Il mondo bizantino*, II, Turin: 363–395.
- Formentin, M. R. (2010). 'Un nuovo codice di Giovanni Lido, autografo di Aulo Giano Parrasio', in: M. d'Agostino and P. Degni (eds.), *Alethes philologiae*, G. Prato, II, Spoleto: 401–408.
- Fryde, E. B. (2000). *The Early Palaeologan Renaissance (1261–c. 1360)*, Leiden and Boston.
- Galán Vioque, G. (2006). 'Un nuevo testimonio de Nicandro, *Theriaca*, vv. 933–958', *Emerita* 74: 41–46.
- Gastgeber, Chr. (2014). 'Griechischstudium im italienischen Humanismus. Eröffnungsvorträge des Demetrios Chalkondyles zum Griechischlehrgang in Padua 1463 und 1464', *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 64: 67–104.
- Gallavotti, C. (1999). *Theocritea*, Rome.
- Grandolini, S. (ed.) (1991). *Manuelis Moschopuli Commentarium in Hesiodi Opera et dies*, Rome.

- Griffin, J. (1995). *Homer. Iliad Book 9*, Oxford.
- Grünbart, M. (2005). 'Byzantinisches Gelehrtenelend – oder: Wie meistert man seinen Alltag?', in: L. M. Hoffmann (ed.), *Zwischen Polis, Provinz und Peripherie. Beiträge zur byzantinischen Geschichte und Kultur*, Wiesbaden, 413–426.
- Harder, Ch. (1886). *De Ioannis Tzetzae Historiarum fontibus quaestiones selectae*, Kiel.
- Hilgard, A. (ed.) (1894). *Theodosii Alexandrini Canones. Georgi Choerobosci scholia. Sophronii Patriarchae Alexandrini excerpta, Grammatici Graeci IV.1–2, Prolegomena*, Leipzig.
- Hirschberger, M. (2004). *Gynaikōn Katalogos und Megalai Ēhoiai. Ein Kommentar zu den Fragmenten zweier hesiodeischer Epen*, Munich and Leipzig.
- Hunger, H. (1953). 'Zum Epilog der Theogonie des Johannes Tzetzes', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 46: 302–7 (= *Byzantinische Grundlagenforschung*, London 1973, no. XVIII).
- Hunter, R. (2014). *Hesiodic Voices. Studies in the Ancient Reception of Hesiod's Works and Days*, Cambridge and New York.
- Jameson, M. H. – Malkin, I. (1998). 'Latinos and the Greeks', *Athenaeum* 86: 475–485.
- Jeffreys, E. (2014). 'The sebastokratorissa Irene as Patron', in: L. Theis, M. Mullett, and M. Grünbart (eds.), *Female Founders in Byzantium and Beyond*, Vienna, 177–194.
- Jeffreys, M. J. (1974). 'The Nature and Origins of the Political Verse', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 28: 143–195 (= E. M. Jeffreys and M. Jeffreys, *Popular Literature in Late Byzantium*, London 1983, no. IV).
- Kaldellis, A. (2007). *Hellenism in Byzantium. The Transformation of Greek Identity and the Reception of the Classical Tradition*, Cambridge and New York.
- 009). 'Classical Scholarship in Twelfth-Century Byzantium', in: Ch. Barber and D. Jenkins (eds.), *Medieval Greek Commentaries on the Nicomachean Ethics*, Leiden and Boston, 1–43.
- Kolovou, F. (ed.) (2006). *Die Briefe des Eustathios von Thessalonike*, Munich and Leipzig.
- Koning, H. H. (2010). *Hesiod: The Other Poet. Ancient Reception of a Cultural Icon*, Leiden and Boston.
- Krumbacher, K. (1897). *Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur*, Berlin.
- Lamers, H. (2015). *Greece Reinvented*, n.
- Lemerle, P. (1971). *Le premier humanisme byzantin. Notes et remarques sur enseignement et culture à Byzance des origines au X^e siècle*, Paris.
- Leumann, M. (1950). *Homerische Wörter*, Basel.
- Leone, P. L. M. (1984). 'I Carmina Iliaca di Giovanni Tzetzes', *Quaderni catanesi di studi classici e medievali* 6: 377–405.
- Leone, P. L. M. (ed.) (2007). *Ioannis Tzetzae Historiae*, Galatina (LE).
- Lucà, S. (1993). 'I Normanni e la rinascita del XII secolo', *Archivio storico per la Calabria e la Lucania* 60: 1–91.
- Luzzatto, M. J. (1998). 'Leggere i classici nella biblioteca imperiale: note tzetziene su antichi codici', *Quaderni di storia* 48: 69–86.
- Leo L. M. (1999). *Tzetzes lettore di Tucidide. Note autografe sul Codice Heidelberg Vaticano Greco 252*, Bari.
- Leo L. M. (2000). 'Note inedite di Giovanni Tzetzes e restauro di antichi codici alla fine del XIII secolo: il problema del Laur. 70, 3 di Erodoto', in: G. Prato (ed.), *I manoscritti greci*, Atti del V Colloquio Internazionale di Paleografia greca (Cremona, 4–10 October 1998), Florence, 633–654.

- Maas, M. (1992). *John Lydus and the Roman Past*, London and New York.
- Maas, P. (1952). 'Verschiedenes zu Eustathios', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 45: 1–3.
- Magnelli, E. (2003). 'Reminiscenze classiche e cristiane nei tetrastici di Teodoro Prodromo sulle Scritture', *Medioevo Greco* 3: 181–194.
- Martano, A. (2002). 'Scolii e glosse allo *Scudo di Eracle* del manoscritto Ambrosiano C 222 inf.', *Aevum* 76: 151–200.
- Martano, A. (2005). 'La tradizione manoscritta dell'esegesi antica allo *Scudo di Eracle* esiodeo: la famiglia del Vat. Gr. 1332 (sec. XIII-XIV)', *Aevum* 79: 461–490.
- Martano, A. (2006). 'L'esegesi antica allo *Scudo di Eracle* nell'*Etymologicum Genuinum* e *Gudianum*', *Memorie dell'Accademia Roveretana degli Agiati* 256: 85–119.
- Martano, A. (2008). 'La tradizione manoscritta dell'esegesi antica allo *Scudo di Eracle* esiodeo: due gruppi di codici (sec. XIV–XVI)', *Aevum* 82: 543–580.
- Martin, J. (1956). *Histoire du texte des Phénomènes d'Aratos*, Paris.
- Martin, J. (ed.) (1974). *Scholia in Virgatum vetera*, Stuttgart.
- Martinez Manzano, T. (1990). *Konstantinos Laskaris*, Hamburg.
- Navarro J. (1998). *Constantino Láscaris*, Madrid.
- Navarro J. (2000). 'Una curiosa legatura epsilon-iota nel codice Ambrosiano C 222 inf.', in: S. Lucà (ed.), *Omaggio a Enrica Follieri*, Grottaferrata, 203–207.
- Navarro J. (2003). 'Ambrosianus C 222 inf. (Graecus 886): il codice e il suo autore. Parte prima: il codice', *Aevum*: 263–275.
- Navarro J. (2004). 'Ambrosianus C 222 inf. (Graecus 886): il codice e il suo autore. Parte seconda: l'autore', *Aevum* 78: 411–440.
- Menchelli, M. (2001). 'Nota paleografica a un Platone medio-bizantino: un copista "indoctus" e due codici di Minoide Mynas (Par. suppl. gr. 663 e 668)', *Scrittura e civiltà* 25: 145–165.
- Mergiali, S. (1996). *L'enseignement et les lettrés pendant l'époque des Paléologues (1261–1453)*, Athens.
- Meschini, A. (1983). 'La prolusione fiorentina di Giano Laskaris', in: *Umanesimo e Rinascimento a Firenze e Venezia*, III, Florence, 69–113.
- Migliorini, T. (ed.) (2010). *Gli scritti satirici in greco letterario di Teodoro Prodromo: introduzione, edizione, traduzione e commento*, Ph.D. Diss., University of Pisa.
- Mioni, E. (1965). *Catalogo di Manoscritti Greci esistenti nelle biblioteche italiane I*, Rome.
- Mioni, E. (1985). *Codices Graeci in manuscriptis Bibliothecae Divi Marci Venetiarum. Thesaurus antiquus II. Codices 300–625*, Rome.
- Montanari, F. (1975). *Studi di filologia omerica antica I*, Pisa.
- Morgan, G. (1983). 'Homer in Byzantium: John Tzetzes', in: C. A. Rubino and C. W. Shelmerdine (eds.), *Approaches to Homer*, Austin, 165–188.
- Nünlist, R. (2012). 'Homer as a Blueprint for Speechwriters', *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 52: 493–509.
- Pertusi, A. (1950). 'Intorno alla tradizione manoscritta degli scolii di Proclo ad Esiodo I. Il Cod. Vat. gr. 38 ed il Cod. Marc. gr. IX 6, II. Il Cod. Paris. gr. 2771 (A)', *Aevum*: 10–26, 528–544.
- Pertusi, A. (1951). 'Intorno alla tradizione manoscritta degli scolii di Proclo ad Esiodo III. Il Cod. Vat. gr. 904 (Q), IV. Proclo e non Proclo, V. Scolii planudei e bizantini inediti alle Opere', in: *Aevum* 25: 20–8, 145–59, 267–78, 342–52.

- Pertusi, A. (1952). 'Intorno alla tradizione manoscritta degli scolii di Proclo ad Esiodo VI. Il Cod. Genav. 45 (Γ) e la classe b, VII. Il contributo degli scolii di Proclo al testo de "Le opere e i giorni"', *Aevum* 26: 131–146, 197–227.
- Pertusi, A. (1953). 'La tradizione manoscritta degli scolii alle Opere e i Giorni e le note inedite attribuite a Massimo Planude', in: *Atti dello VIII Congresso internazionale di Studi Bizantini* (Palermo, 3–10 aprile 1951), Rome, 177–182.
- Podestà, G. (1945). 'Le satire lucianesche di Teodoro Prodromo, I', *Aevum* 19: 239–252.
- Pontani, A. (ed.) (1999). *Niceta Coniata. Grandezza e catastrofe a Bisanzio*, II, Milan.
- Pontani, F. (2005). *Sguardi su Ulisse. La tradizione esegetica greca all'Odissea*, Rome.
- Pontani, F. (2006). 'The First Byzantine Commentary on the *Iliad*: Isaac Porphyrogenitus and his Scholia', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 99: 551–596.
- Pontani, F. (2015). 'Scholarship in the Byzantine Empire (529–1453)', in: F. Montanari, S. Matthaios, and A. Rengakos (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship I. History. Disciplinary Profiles*, Leiden and Boston, 297–455.
- Ponzio, A. (2003). 'Gli scolii di Tzetze agli *Erga* di Esiodo. Elementi per la costituzione del testo e rapporto con il commentario plutarco', in: P. Volpe Cacciatore (ed.), *L'erudizione scolastico-grammaticale a Bisanzio*, Atti della VII Giornata di studi bizantini (Salerno, aprile 2001), Naples, 129–147.
- Radt, S. (ed.) (2007). *Strabons Geographika*, VI, Göttingen.
- Raschieri, A. A. (2011). 'Bonino Mombrizio traduttore dell'*Epitome* grammaticale di Costantino Lascaris', in: A. Balbo, F. Bessone, and E. Malaspina (eds.), *Tanti affetti in tal momento*, Alessandria, 741–753.
- Reitzenstein, R. (1897). *Geschichte der griechischen Etymologika*, Leipzig.
- Rhoby, A. (2010). 'Ioannes Tzetzes als Auftragsdichter', *Graeco-Latina Brunensia* 15: 155–170.
- Roilos, P. (2014). "'Unshapely Bodies and Beautifying Embellishments": The Ancient Epics in Byzantium, Allegorical Hermeneutics, and the Case of Ioannes Diakonos Galenos', *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 64: 231–246.
- Romano, R. (ed.) (1999). *La satira bizantina dei secoli XI–XV*, Turin.
- Ronconi, F. (2007). *I manoscritti greci miscellanei. Ricerche su esemplari dei secoli IX–XII*, Spoleto.
- Russo, C. F. (ed.) (1965²). *Hesiodi Scutum*, Florence.
- Russo, G. (1992). *Contestazione e conservazione: Luciano nell'esegesi di Areta*, Berlin and Boston.
- Schultz, H. (1910). *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der Hesiod-scholien*, Berlin.
- Schultz, H. (1913). 'Zur Nebenüberlieferung der Hesiodscholien', *Nachrichten von der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen* 2: 252–263.
- Schwartz, J. (1960). *Pseudo-Hesiodica. Recherches sur la composition, la diffusion et la disparition ancienne d'oeuvres attribuées à Hésiode*, Leiden.
- Scully, S. (2015). *Hesiod's Theogony. From Near Eastern Creation Myths to Paradise Lost*, Oxford and New York.
- Silvano, L. (2010). *Angelo Poliziano. Appunti per un corso sull'Odissea*, Alessandria.
- Speranzi, D. (2014). 'Silloge di poeti greci esametrici', in: D. Lippi (ed.), *Animalia. Gli uomini e la cura degli animali nei manoscritti della Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana*, Florence, 108–109.
- Stefec, R. S. (2014). 'Aspekte griechischer Buchproduktion in der Schwarzmeerregion', *Scripta* 7, 205–234.

- Turyn, A. (1972). *Dated Greek Manuscripts of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries in the Libraries of Italy*, Urbana.
- Uhlig, G. (1883). *Dionysii Thracis Ars grammatica, Grammatici Graeci* I.1, Leipzig.
- van der Valk, M. (ed.) (1971). *Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes*, I, Leiden.
- van der Valk, M. (1983). 'Eustathius and Callimachus', *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 24: 367–373.
- Vian, F. (ed.) (1963). *Quintus de Smyrne. La suite d'Homère*, I, Paris.
- Wendel, C. (1940). 'Das unbekannte Schlusstück der *Theogonie* des Tzetzes', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 40: 23–26.
- Wendel, C. (1948). 'Tzetzes. Johannes', *RE* VII A.2: 1959–2010.
- West, M. L. (1964). 'The Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts of Hesiod's *Theogony*', *The Classical Quarterly* 14: 165–189.
- West, M. L. (ed.) (1966). *Hesiod. Theogony*, Oxford.
- West, M. L. (1974). 'The Medieval Manuscripts of the *Works and Days*', *The Classical Quarterly* 24: 161–185.
- West, M. L. (ed.) (1978). *Hesiod: Works and Days*, Oxford.
- West, M. L. (2001). *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the Iliad*, Munich and Leipzig.
- von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. (1962). *Kleine Schriften*, IV, Berlin.
- Wilson, N. G. (1983). 'A Mysterious Byzantine Scriptorium: Ioannikios and his Colleagues', *Scrittura e civiltà* 7: 161–176.
- Wilson, N. G. (1992). *From Byzantium to Italy*, London.
- Wilson, N. G. (1996²). *Scholars of Byzantium. Revised Edition*, London.
- Wilson, N. G. (ed.) (2003). *Pietro Bembo. Oratio pro litteris Graecis*, Messina.
- Wirth, P. (ed.) (2000). *Eustathii Thessalonicensis Opera minora*, Berlin and New York.

