

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

A NEW HESIODIC FRAGMENT

Maximus of Tyre 35. 2 (p. 403. 6 Hobein) preserves a hitherto unidentified dactylic hexameter in the following context:

πατέρα γάρ που θεῶν καὶ ἀνθρώπων εἶναι λέγει [sc. "Ὅμηρος] τὸν Δία, οὔτι που
διότι ὑπεκδὺς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, νῦν μὲν ὄρνιθι εἰκασθεὶς, νῦν δὲ χρυσῷ, καὶ ἄλλοτε
ἄλλω, γυναιξὶ θνηταῖς ἐπλησίαζεν

"σπερμαίνων τὰ πρῶτα γένος κυδρῶν βασιλῆων."

οὕτω γὰρ ἂν εἴη ὁ Ζεὺς ὀλιγοτεκνότατος κτλ.

Hobein (ad loc.) poses the question "versus vel ipsius Maximi vel alii poetae sequioris aetatis?" This is not helpful. On the other hand, first appearances notwithstanding, one should beware of assuming that Maximus thought that he was adducing a Homeric verse; the larger context makes it quite clear that Homer is introduced specifically because he had described Zeus as father of gods and men, πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε, and not because of this verse. In and of itself the hexameter, especially preceded as it is by mention of Zeus' sexual unions with mortal women, is reminiscent rather of catalogue poetry. So much would speculation seem to suggest; as it happens, we need not confine ourselves to such.

In 1956 E. Lobel published *POxy.* 2354 (second century A.D.), which contains fragmentary remains of the first twenty-two verses of the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* (= frag. 1 M.-W.). The identification is guaranteed by the fact that the papyrus traces of the first two verses are clearly identical with the last two verses (1021–22) of the *Theogony*, a couplet which has long been recognized as the transitional beginning of the *Catalogue of Women*.¹ (A papyrus fragment of the *Theog.* and many MSS in fact omit vv. 1021–22, obviously because they were not regarded as belonging to the *Theog.* proper.) Here are verses 14–16 of the *Catalogue of Women*, as preserved in *POxy.* 2354 and restored by the editors:

τάων ἔσπετε Μ[οῦσαι
ῥοσσ[αι]ς δὴ παρελ[έξατ' Ὀλύμπιος εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς
σ]περμ[αί]νων τα[

Of the very rare verb σπερμαίνω Lobel remarked "σπερμαίνειν γενεῆν Ἔργ. 736. The verb is Hesiodic (*Et. Mag.* in σπέρμα) and does not reappear till Callimachus (fr. 652)." See also R. Pfeiffer on Callimachus (loc. cit.). Observe that the context in the papyrus and in Maximus is the same, namely, the union

1. νῦν δὲ γυναικῶν [φῦλον ἀείσατε, ἡδυέπειαι
Μοῦσαι Ὀλυμπιάδε[ς, κοῦραι Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο

of Zeus with mortal women.² Uncommon (and Hesiodic) verb, identical context, and perfect agreement with the remains of the letters on the papyrus: all this is beyond coincidence. Obviously *POxy.* 2354. 16, when intact, was none other than the very verse which Maximus has preserved.

Mention of the race of kings, γένος κυδρῶν βασιλῆων, many of whom are recorded in the *Catalogue*, is of course hardly surprising in a Hesiodic context. It was Ascræan Hesiod himself who asserted ἐκ Διὸς βασιλῆες (*Theog.* 96). Nor is there the slightest reason to doubt Maximus' familiarity with the *Catalogue of Women*. That this work was still in circulation in his time we learn from the actual papyri, such are the dates of some of them. There exists even more telling, since more specific, evidence. For Maximus himself at 26. 4 (p. 312. 13–15 H.) explicitly reveals that he was familiar with this very poem: καθάπερ ὁ Ἡσίοδος, χωρὶς μὲν τὰ γένη τῶν ἡρώων ἀπὸ γυναικῶν ἀρχόμενος, καταλέγων τὰ γένη, ὅστις ἐξ ἧς ἔφυ κτλ., clearly a reference to the *Catalogue of Women*. In yet another passage, 18. 9 (p. 230. 8–10 H.), he mentions, in a comparable context, kings: Ἡσιόδῳ δὲ αἰεῖδουσιν αἱ Μοῦσαι τί ἄλλο ἢ γυναικῶν ἔρωτας καὶ ἄνδρῶν καὶ ποταμῶν ἔρωτας καὶ βασιλέων καὶ φυτῶν;†³

In a word, here is the sixteenth verse, complete and intact, of the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*—σπερμαίνων τὰ πρῶτα γένος κυδρῶν βασιλῆων.

R. RENEHAN

*University of California,
Santa Barbara*

2. Ζεὺς in v. 15 is a restoration, but the sense is not in doubt, even if the *ipsissima verba* may be. Verse 5 begins μισγόμεναι θεοῖσιν, and Poseidon, Ares, and Hermes are mentioned in vv. 17, 18, and 21 respectively. Zeus was certainly named before them. See Lobel on v. 15: "The subject is Zeus, who must have been mentioned in this or the next verse." He was not mentioned in the next verse, as will appear, if it has not already.

3. Both these passages of Maximus contain textual difficulties (which do not affect my argument), but the *editio maior* of Maximus, which has long been in preparation by G. L. Koniaris, is now so near completion that I can with confidence refer the reader to that work for the details.

ΚΛΗΡΩΣΙΣ ΕΚ ΠΡΟΚΡΙΤΩΝ IN FOURTH-CENTURY ATHENS

Most students of Athenian history believe that κλήρωσις ἐκ προκρίτων was used in fifth-century Athens for the election of archons and perhaps of other magistrates but was abolished some time after 458/57 and was no longer used in the fourth century.¹ On the introduction of the procedure, scholars are divided. Some accept the information given at *Athenaion Politeia* 8. 1 that κλήρωσις ἐκ προκρίτων was instituted by Solon and used for all magistrates selected by lot. Others are skeptical and hold that κλήρωσις ἐκ προκρίτων was never used before 487/86.² On this view the ascription to Solon is a reflection of the controversy about the ancestral constitution.

1. Cf., e.g., C. Hignett, *A History of the Athenian Constitution* (Oxford, 1952), p. 227.

2. Cf., e.g., P. J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian "Athenaion Politeia"* (Oxford, 1981), p. 148 (introduced by Solon); Hignett, *History*, p. 227 (introduced in 487/86).