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](#)

Hesiodea

Hugh G. Evelyn-White

The Classical Quarterly / Volume 7 / Issue 04 / October 1913, pp 217 - 220

DOI: 10.1017/S0009838800015330, Published online: 11 February 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009838800015330

How to cite this article:

Hugh G. Evelyn-White (1913). Hesiodea. The Classical Quarterly, 7, pp 217-220 doi:10.1017/S0009838800015330

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

OCTOBER, 1913.

HESIODEA.

I

(*Catalogue*,¹ Fragments 7b and 245).

Two papyrus fragments (*Berlin Pap.* 7497 and *Oxyrh. Pap.* 421) treat of the ancestry and story of Bellerophon. The first has the beginnings of fifteen lines, and the other the endings of nineteen: both are assigned to the second century A.D.

The Berlin piece has been generally accepted as a scrap from the Hesiodic 'Catalogue of Women,' and this verdict seems just enough. But the other fragment has been treated with less consideration: Rzach, for example, relegates it to his class of 'dubia.' Yet I think there can be no manner of doubt but that Grenfell and Hunt were right in claiming Hesiodic origin for their papyrus. It is hard to see anything in it which is alien from the Hesiodic manner and style. Schubart and Wilamowitz have also pointed out that in both pieces Bellerophon's mother is the real subject of the poem, and that Athena plays some part in both.² Unless, then, the two fragments are incompatible with one another, probability is that both come from the same passage. I have tried to show that this is really the case by giving below the text of the papyri, with some restoration to show their presumed connection: the supplements, save in ll. 3-4, 12 (*imit.*), 20-22, are mine; the exceptions will be found in Rzach's apparatus.

]Ποσε[ιδάων

] . . λ' ὅν γ . .

Εὐρυνόμη Νίσου θυγάτηρ Παν]διονίδαο

τὴν πᾶσαν τέχνην ἐδιδ[άξατο Παλλὰς Ἀθή[νη,

μήδεά τ' ἰδμοσύνην τ' ἐπί· οἷ]δε γὰρ ἴσα θεοῖσι.

θεσπεσίη δ' ὁδμὴ παρὰ εἷ]ματος ἀργυφέοιο

ὄρνυτο κινυμένης· βλεφάρων] δ' ἀπὸ εἶδος ἄητο.

5

¹ Rzach, *ed. min.* (Teubner), 1908.

² *Berl. Klassikertexte*, v. 1, pp. 45-6.

τῆς δ' ἄρ Γλαύκος Ἀθηναί]ης πειρήσατο βουλαῖς,
 βοῦς ἐλάσα[ς· ἀλλ' οὐ τι Διὸς νόον αἰγιόχοιο
 ἔγνω· ὁ μ[έν δώροις διζ]ήμενος ἦλθε γυναι[κα,
 10 βουλῇ Ἀθ[ηναίης· ὁ δ' ἄναξ] νεφεληγερέτα Ζεὺ[ς
 ἀθανάτων [ἀνένευε κ]αρήατι μήποτ' ὅπατ[ρους
 ἔσσεσθαι π[αῖδας . . .]ντου Σισυφίδαο.
 ἦ δὲ Ποσε[ιδαῶνος ἐν] ἀγκοίνησι μυγελ[σα,
 15 Γλαύκῳ ἐν [οἴκῳ ἔτικτεν] ἀμύμονα Βελλ[εροφόντην
 ἔξοχον ἀνθ[ρώπων . . .]κτιμὴ ἐπ' ἀπείρονα π[όντον.
 τῷ δὲ καὶ ἡ[λάσκοντι πα]τήρ πόρε Πήγασο[ν, δς δὴ
 ὠκύτατον [πτερύγεσσι φέρων γέ] μιν ἔπτε[τ' ἀτειρῆς
 πάντη ἀν[ὰ χθονὰ . . . ἐπεὶ ἦντ'] ἀήται ἱαλ[λεν
 σὺν τῷ πῦρ πνείουσαν ἐλὼν κατέπεφνε Χίμαιραν.
 γῆμε δὲ π[αῖδα φίλην μεγαλήτορος Ἰοβάταο,
 αἰδοίου βασ[ιλῆος . . .
 κοίρανος ἀ[. . .
 ἦ τέ[κε . . .

5 οἶ]δε,]τε G(renfell) and H(unt).

12 ὅπατ[ρους, ὁπάσ[σαι G.H.

15 ἐν [οἴκῳ, ἔτ[ικτε, Schubart-Wilamowitz.

19 ἀήται ἱαλ[λεν,]ξηταιαλ[G.H.

It will be seen that the endings of the *Oxyrhynchus* lines run on naturally with the beginnings of the Berlin lines. Certain difficulties occur, but they are not difficulties of sequence. Thus in l. 9 βοῦς ἐλάσας would ordinarily be used of a raid, not of driving oxen as a bridal gift; in 11-12 the order ἄναξ . . . ἀθανάτων is paralleled by Theognis 285-6; for the curse in 12-13 cf. the curse of Aphrodite on the daughters of Tyndareus, or that of Zeus on Thetis; in l. 16, I cannot think of a restoration of . . .]κτιμὴ. I may add that in l. 15 ἐν is certain: a photograph which I obtained through the kindness of Dr. Schubart shows that the broken letter after ε was ν, not τ. In the same line Γλαύκῳ is clear, but may be a blunder for Γλαύκου.

II

(Rzach, Fragment 135.)

The Berlin Papyrus 9777 which once contained the story of Meleager is a mere fragment, but satisfactory supplements have been suggested for much of the *recto*. I venture to offer here restorations of some lines which I have not seen attempted elsewhere:

Ll. 4-5. αὐτεριατ ἀρηίφ[ιλος κρατερὸς Μελέαγρος,
 ξανθοκόμης [Οἰνῆος ἰδ' Ἀλθαίης φίλος υἱός·

- Ll. 7-8. γοργῶν¹. ὑψηλ[ῶ δέ ποτ' ἐν Καλυδῶνι δάμασσε
θῆρ' ὁ[λοὸν χλούνην σὺν ἄγριον ἀργιόδοντα.
Ll. 20-22. τοὺς τέκε, καὶ δειν[ὸν ἐν αἰδείησιν ἔρεξε²
ὁππότε φαρμακό[εν . . .
λῶπ[ος] κῆ[ρα μέλαιναν ἔχον³ . . .

III

(*Works and Days*, 169 and 169 *a-d*.)

The line 169 preserved by 'Proclus' and known also to two other witnesses is absent from all MSS. of Rzach's classes ΩΨΦ: according to Rzach it occurs only in some inferior MSS. which took it over, apparently, from the scholiast. To this the Geneva Papyrus (No. 94) adds fragments of four lines, otherwise unknown, of which the following is a transcript: only certain restorations are added.

τοῦ γὰρ δεσμὸν ἔλυσε πα[τὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε.
ν]εάτοις τιμῇ[
ἄ]λλο γένος θῆκ' [εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς
ἀνδρῶν, οἷ] γεγάασιν ἐπὶ [χθονὶ πουλυβοτείρῃ.

The true position of these five lines is clearly after l. 171, where Peppmuller puts them, since τηλοῦ ἀπ' ἀθανάτων would naturally follow παρ' Ὀκεανὸν βαθυδίνην. Rzach, then, is certainly right in postulating a double recension; (a) 172-3; (b) 169 and 169 *a-d*: the similar position of τοῖσιν in 172 and 169 may indicate that they are alternatives.

'Proclus' makes the following note on 169: τοῦτον καὶ τοὺς (Schömann; τόν codd.) ἐξῆς ὡς φληναφώδεις ἐξοικίζουσι τῶν Ἡσιόδου τὰ τε ἄλλα φανλίζοντας (-τες codd.), καὶ τὸ ἐνθουσιαστικὸν τῆς εἰσβολῆς τῶν μετ' αὐτοὺς στίχων ἀφαιροῦντας (Rzach: ἀφαιρεῖν ἀπόντος codd.). Clearly the scholiast knew of more than one verse following 169, and we may safely assume he knew all five, 169, 169 *a-d*. The criticism he reproduces seems to be double: first, there are some verses which weaken the rest; and secondly, others weaken the bitter intensity of the opening of the Fifth Age. The first verses I take to be 169, 169 *a-b* which closed the account of the Heroic Age. How is the last of these to be restored? Doubtless, like l. 142, it stated the posthumous reward of the departed race: read therefore,

τοῖσι δ' ὁμῶς ν]εάτοις τιμῇ [καὶ κῦδος ὀπήδει.

Secondly, we must look for verses which might be held to weaken the force of the introduction to the Iron Age. Both Peppmuller and Weil in their restorations of 169 *c* make the poet say: 'Zeus made no other so glorious race'—which may be weak, but certainly has no effect for good or ill on the

¹ Robert's restoration; γοργῶν ὑψηλ, Papyrus.

² Cf. λ. 272.

³ Cf. *Shield*, 132.

following lines. Weil, however, recognized the possibility that this verse introduced the new race, though he does not seem to have been much drawn to this view. Yet surely it is the right one. When the scholiast talks of verses weakening the *élan* of the introduction to the Iron Age, he must be referring to some kind of introduction now lost. What can it have been? If l. 169 *b* dismisses the hero-race as Hesiod dismisses his other races above, is it not likely that l. 169 *c* follows the formula usual in introducing a new race (cf. ll. 127, 143, 157)? Perhaps we may read:

πεμπτόν δ' αὖτις ἔτ' ᾗ]λλο etc.

If we read 169 *c-d* so, before 174-5, we get some such result as this: 'Zeus then made a fifth race, and I would I had never been of it.' The scholiast then might well say of 169 *c-d* that they took away τὸ ἐνθουσιαστικόν of the following lines. We might surmise that 169 *c-d* are only alternatives for 174-5.

If all this is right, we must next ask which is the more original of the two recensions. First let us weigh 172-3 against 169, *a-b*. Lines 172-3 themselves might well be spurious work as a mere patch-work of tags (cf. Σ 568, δ 229, *W.* and *D.* 237), were it not that (1) the interpolation would be extraordinarily clumsy in any text which already contained the Geneva lines, and (2) they heighten the picture of the happiness of the heroes, while the new lines have a purely negative effect in this regard. On the other hand, 169 sqq. may well be imitative: τηλοῦ ἀπ' ἀθανάτων is an obvious tag, and the second half verse may be after *Theog.* 71; 169 *a* might be inspired by *Theog.* 501-2. As for 169 *b*, it would be possible to argue that it is original because it falls into line with Hesiod's usual treatment of a departing race; or, conversely, that it was probably inserted (with the other verses in question) because an editor remembered Hesiod's usual practice and missed it here. Secondly, there are the rival lines 169 *c-d* and 174-5. Here the issue can hardly be doubtful: to exchange the latter with their abrupt and bitter force for the former would be to take brazen arms for golden. Surely here an editor with more academic than literary feeling has tried to force the Iron Age into the mould of the more malleable ages. If this is true for ll. 169 *c-d*—the latter does not call for discussion—it is almost certainly true for the preceding lines, and the Geneva papyrus gives us the less original, though certainly an ancient, version. At the same time ll 172-3 are not above suspicion: may not the Heroic Age have ended at l. 171?

HUGH G. EVELYN-WHITE.