The Classical Quarterly

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

Additional services for *The Classical Quarterly*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Hesioda III

Hugh G. Evelyn-White

The Classical Quarterly / Volume 10 / Issue 02 / April 1916, pp 65 - 69

DOI: 10.1017/S0009838800009332, Published online: 11 February 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009838800009332

How to cite this article:

Hugh G. Evelyn-White (1916). Hesioda III. The Classical Quarterly, 10, pp 65-69
doi:10.1017/S0009838800009332

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

APRIL, 1916.

HESIODEA III.

THE recently issued volume of the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* (Part XI.) contains new and important fragments from the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*; and the two substantial pieces grouped as No. 1358 are particularly welcome as shedding light upon two rather obscure sections of that work—the γῆς περίοδος, and the history of the Sons of Europa and Zeus. It goes without saying that the editors' treatment of these fragments is in every way admirable; and I trust it will not be regarded as an impertinence if I endeavour to restore a few lines which they have refrained from completing, and to offer an alternative reconstruction of a somewhat difficult passage.

I.

Frag. 1, Col. i, ll. 16 sqq.

The editors are certainly right in their view that these lines deal with Sarpedon. The surviving fragment does not suit either Minos or Rhadamanthys, and notices of their 'honours' must have followed later. We may observe, in passing, that the fragment on Minos quoted by 'Plato' (*Minos*, 320 D) from Hesiod¹ is too summary to have served this purpose, and may be supposed to have occurred in connection with a notice of a heroine wedded by Minos. Two considerations make it worth while to attempt to restore this passage further than the discoverers have done: (1) l. 20 can be completed with some degree of confidence; and (2) the portent described in ll. 25 sqq. does not seem to be that which preceded the death of Sarpedon.

(1) GH, in dealing with the conflation of the two Sarpedons (p. 45), refer to Apollodorus III. i. 2: καὶ αὐτῷ δίδωσι Ζεὺς ἐπὶ τρεῖς γενεὰς ζῆν—a sentence which recalls a line in the complaint of Teiresias in the *Melampodia*:²

ἐπτά τ' ἐπὶ ζῶειν γενεὰς μερόπων ἀνθρώπων.

It is possible that it is a coincidence merely, that l. 20 of the new papyrus ends exactly as does the verse from the *Melampodia*:]. μερόπων ἀνθρώπων; but if

¹ Rzach (1908), *frag.* 103.

² Rzach. *frag.* 161.

we take the express statement of Apollodorus about Sarpedon fully into account, we may pretty confidently restore

[τρεῖς γὰρ ἐπὶ ζῶειν γενεὰ]ς μερόπων ἀνθρώπων

and take this to be explanatory of *τιμή* in l. 18. For the first part of the following verse I suggest *μηδ' ἀπογηράσκειν*: such an amplification of the gift of longevity was obviously necessary whether Sarpedon ended his long life fighting before Troy, or was represented by our poet (see below) as living on after his fight with Patroclus. *ἀπογηράσκειν* occurs in Theognis (821), but not in Hesiod; *ἐντέλλειν* in l. 21 is not the verb one would have expected in this context, but need not create any difficulty.

(2) The passage (ll. 25-28) describing the portent is somewhat difficult. But the colon at the end of l. 23 indicates that Sarpedon is the personage *πολέμοιο δαίμων*, and that we cannot introduce Patroclus as slayer of Sarpedon in l. 24: nor can we fit the Homeric *ψιάδες αἵματοέσσαι* into the first part of l. 25, where they should occur, if at all, before the participial phrase *ἐπ' ἀριστ]ερά σήματα φαίνων*; nor, again, can these words, or an equivalent, find a place in l. 27—especially as the editors pronounce *αἶμ]ατος* out of the question. It seems almost impossible, then, to regard the portent under consideration as that which presaged the death of Sarpedon; indeed, the part played by the hero at Troy does not seem to be dealt with until ll. 29-30, and the narrative of his death may be thought to begin at l. 31. If this be so, the portent is most likely to have occurred as Sarpedon was setting out from Lycia for Troy, and ll. 25-26 may be restored in one of two ways. If the poet followed the Homeric account of the fate of Sarpedon we might read—

[τῷ δ' ὄρνυ προέηκ' ἐπ' ἀριστ]ερά, σήματα φαίνων
[κῆρά τε παιδὶ φίλῳ Ζεὺς] ἄφθιτα μῆδεα εἰδώς,

though in Homer Sarpedon has no such warning of his fate. I hope I shall not be thought perverse, however, in preferring a rather different type of reconstruction:

[οὐρανόθεν δὲ οἱ ἦκεν ὄγ' ἀστ]έρα, σήματα φαίνων
[νόστον θ' υἱὶ φίλῳ Ζεὺς] ἄφθιτα μῆδεα εἰδώς.

Sarpedon did indeed return to Lycia—in the arms of Sleep and Death; but if that were the 'return' referred to, *νόστος* must be used here in a cruelly ironical sense. Is it not possible that the Hesiodic poet took advantage of Zeus' indecision (II. 436-7) to represent—perhaps with ulterior motives—that Sarpedon was carried off *alive* from the battle? He may, for example, have tried to smoothe out the difficulties arising from the confusion of the two Sarpedons by transferring the Homeric account of Sarpedon I. (Z. 200-202) to the life of his composite Sarpedon *after he was carried back alive from Troy*. The process of reconciliation would be complete if we could suppose, further, that the hero was represented as being wounded only by Patroclus, and carried

back by Sleep and Death: perhaps Hera (as so often) was deceived. All this, however, would be building conjecture upon conjecture, were it not that the conflation of the two heroes necessitates the transference of the episode Z. 200-202 to the end of the life of the single figure, and that, without some such supposition, this episode must be thought to have been entirely ignored by the Hesiodic poet.

The whole passage, then, may be restored as follows:¹

- ἦ τοι ὁ μὲν Λυκίης τ' εὐρ]είης ἱφι ἀνασσε
 παμπολέας τ' ἴθυνε πό]λεις ἐὺ ναιεταώσας
 Ζηνὸς ἔχων σκήπτρον. πολ]λὴ δ' ἐοῖ ἔσπετο τιμῇ,
 τὴν οἱ δῶκε πατὴρ μεγάλη]τορι ποιμένι λαῶν.
 20 τρεῖς γὰρ ἐπὶ ζώειν γενεὰ]ς μερόπων ἀνθρώπων,
 μῆδ' ἀπογηράσκειν ἐνετείλ]ατο μητίετα Ζεὺς ·
 πέμπε δέ μιν Τροίηνδε. πολ]ὺν δ' ἐκρίνατο λαόν,
 λεκτοὺς ἐκ Λυκίης φῶτας Τρ]ώεσσ' ἐπίκουρους ·
 τοὺς ἄγε Σαρπηδὼν κρυεροῦ] πολέμοιο δαήμων.
 25 οὐρανόθεν δὲ οἱ ἦκεν ὅγ' ἀστ]έρα, σήματα φαίνων
 νόστον θ' υἱὶ φίλῳ Ζεὺς] ἄφθιτα μῆδεα εἰδώς.
]ατοὶ ἀμφιβαλούσαις
 εὖ γὰρ ἐνὶ φρεσὶ οἶδ' ὅτι δῆ] Διόθεν τέρας ἦεν.
 ἦ μέγ' ἀρίστευσέν τε μεθ' Ἑκτ]ορος ἀνδοφόνοιο
 30 καὶ τείχος ῥήξεν · Δαναοῖσι] δὲ κήδε' ἔθηκεν.
 ἀλλ' ὅτ' ἀρ' ἔμπνευσεν κρατερὸν μένο]ς Ἀργεῖ[ο]ισι
 Πάτροκλος

L. 16. GH (with τ' inserted).

L. 18. cp. Hesiod *frag.* 103. l. 3.

L. 20. cp. Hesiod *frag.* 166. l. 5.

L. 22. cp. Z. 168, 207: the subject of πέμπε is Zeus.

L. 23. cp. Z. 188.

L. 25. cp. Δ. 475.

L. 30. cp. M. 290-293.

II.

Frag. 2, Col. i, ll. 8 sqq.

Line 8 stands thus in the papyrus—

[.]' ἐπι ἐργα · και η[

The mark of elision immediately after the initial lacuna suggests that either a verb or τ' preceded by a genitive should be restored, and the καί² following makes the latter almost certain. Probably, then, the final lacuna also covers a

¹ The numeration is that of the papyrus.

comma: cp. ll. 9, 26.

² The high stop seems to have the value of a

race-name in the genitive. In the notices of the γῆς περιόδος (Hesiod, *frag.* 60-62) only one race-name begins in H- — the Ἡμίκυνες. I suggest, then, that the line may have ended καὶ Ἡ[μικύνων ἀγερῶχων (the epithet being mock-heroic, as in *Batrachomyomachia* 145). Stephanus of Byzantium¹ describes the Ἡμίκυνες as 'a race not far from the Hyperboreans and the Massagetae': the Hyperboreans are indeed mentioned in the papyrus-fragment (l. 20); but no reference to Ἡμίκυνες or Massagetae can be worked in there or near that place. It is therefore likely enough that the Hyperboreans were mentioned earlier, somewhere above l. 8; and that the first part of l. 8 was [Μασσαγετῶν τ'] ἐπὶ ἔργα. This restoration is, of course, mere conjecture; but it may be put forward as a reasonable possibility.

The discoverers give in their notes (pp. 49-50) a tentative reconstruction of ll. 10 sqq., following Professor Murray's suggestion that the φῶλον 'Ονειρών may have been introduced here. My reason for offering an alternative is the apparent parallelism between ll. 9-10 and 17-18. The former stands as follows in the editors' text—

[. . . . Κατουδ]άιων · και Πυγ[μαιων
[. . . . απε]ιρεσιων μελάνο [

the latter reads—

[. . . .] μελανες τε και Αι[θ]ιοπες μεγαθυμοι
[ηδε Κατου]δαιοι και Πυγμαί[οι] αμνητοι.

In one line of each pair the Pygmies and Κατουδάιοι are mentioned, and in the other we have μελάνο[corresponding to μέλανες. If we accept the editors' μελανό[πτερον ὄχλον, we must pronounce the apparent correspondence between the two pairs to be accidental and the result of coincidence; but this is not likely. Is it not better to regard l. 17 as substantially equivalent to l. 10, and, ignoring the accent of μελάνο[(which it would be hard to retain in any case), to restore the latter—

[φῶλα τ' ἀπε]ιρεσίων Μελανο[χρώτων Λιβύων τε]?

The correspondence between the two couplets is thus restored; and it is a matter of no moment that in l. 10 the Aethiopians are merely 'black-skins,' while in l. 17 they rejoice in their proper name and the Libyans² are called black: to the poet, doubtless, both peoples were equally black. μελανόχρως indeed seems to have no earlier authority than Euripides (*Hecuba*, 1106); but the Homeric forms μελανόχροος (τ. 146) and μελανόχρους (N. 589) may help to justify its use here. It is a form which a poet might conceivably invent for himself if indeed it were not already current. The use of a descriptive epithet in place of the noun to which it is ordinarily applied is, of course, a characteristic feature of Hesiod, as ἀνόστεος (*Works* 524); ἄτριχος (*Fr.* 96, l. 91).

¹ Hesiod, *frag.* 62. 3 (Rzach).

² The editors' restoration of l. 17 τοῖο Λιβύς]

μέλανες is surely confirmed by l. 15 (as against Professor Murray's Κόλχοι γὰρ] μέλανες).

What, then, of ll. 11-14? Probably the editors' restoration is as suited to the new context as to the old, except that *κωφούς* is no longer suitable at the opening of l. 13, and Mr. Lobel's Ἑπαφος might be inserted in l. 11. And if l. 12 does indeed ascribe seercraft to the Libyans, the reference—vague as it is—is doubtless to the famous Oracle of Amen at Siwah in the Libyan Desert.

I have ventured only to change the epithet in l. 11: ll. 13-14 are restored to convey the sense that those who seek to outwit the oracle will be misled by it and involve themselves in *ἄτη* (cp. *Hymn to Hermes*, 546-549).

For convenience the whole passage, in which the editors' restorations and those suggested above are combined, is here given :

[Μασσαγετῶν τ'] ἐπὶ ἔργα, καὶ Ἡ[μικύνων ἀγερώχων]
 [ἡδὲ Κατουδαίων, καὶ Πυγμαίων ἀμενῆνων,]
 10 [φύλα τ' ἀπειρεσίων Μελανόχρωτων Λιβύων τε ·]
 [τοὺς Ἑπάφω] τέκε Γαῖα πελώρη χρησμόλογους τε]
 [μαντοσύνης τε πανομφαίο[ν Διὸς εἰδότας αἴσῃ,
 [ψεύστας δ', ὅφρα θεοῖσιν ὑφε[ιμ]ένοι ἀτασ[θῶ]σιν
 [ἄνθρωποι], τῶν μὲν τε νόος [γλ]ωσσῆς καθ[ύπ]ερθεν.

HUGH G. EVELYN-WHITE.

RAMPTON, NEAR CAMBRIDGE.