

conjectured that there was a very large number of phratries, ranging in size from a few dozen to several hundred members, and that there were perhaps as many phratries as there were demes.¹⁵ This suggestion seems to me to be quite reasonable, and it provides an explanation for a phratry of twenty members. But Roussel accepts without argument the conclusion of von Premerstein, that *IG II².2344* is only the list of a single thiasos.¹⁶ The inscription, however, actually provides a confirmation of Roussel's own hypothesis. For as I have attempted to argue, there is no basis for von Premerstein's interpretation, other than the preconception that there could not have been more than about 20 phratries. Let us, however, suppose for the moment that there were as many phratries as there were demes, say 150 for the sake of argument. If in 400 B.C. there were approximately 20,000 Athenian citizens,¹⁷ that would give an average of 133 citizens per phratry. Now one might object that 20 is still far from an average of 133, and that such a small phratry is still an anomaly. It also might seem to strain credibility that the sole surviving intact list is from the low end of the spectrum.

One must not forget, however, that phratries were hereditary societies of pre-Solonian origin which had survived wars and plagues. It is not surprising, therefore, if such a phenomenon as large and small phratries should have arisen over time. Thus some phratries probably had many more than the hypothetical average of 133 members. Moreover, between 431 and 400 B.C. the citizen population of Athens was almost halved, and this loss would not have affected every phratry to the same degree. The combination of those two factors, when taken with the fact that the number of phratries may have been a hundred or more, diminishes the seeming improbability that one phratry had only 20 members. It is by chance that the record of a small phratry has survived. For all that we know, there may have been many such small phratries. But even if there were very few phratries as small as this, one cannot dismiss the evidence of this inscription simply because one believes that the odds are against the list of a small phratry, and of no other, having survived.

I conclude, therefore, that *IG II².2344* is the dedication of a full phratry. That is the natural meaning of the text, and no evidence contravenes it. Given the present state of the evidence it is impossible to determine how many phratries existed at any particular time, but one can now confidently state that phratries greatly varied in size, from 20 members (or less?) to probably a few hundred.

Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island

MICHAEL A. FLOWER

¹⁵ *Tribu et Cité* (Paris, 1976), 142–3.

¹⁶ *Op. cit.* 149 n. 33.

¹⁷ A. W. Gomme, *The Population of Athens in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C.* (Oxford, 1933); cf. the table on p. 26.

A HESIODIC REMINISCENCE IN VIRGIL, *E.* 9.11–13

At *W.D.* 202–12 Hesiod relates his *αἶνος* for the edification of the recalcitrant βασιλῆες, who must themselves admit the truth of the fable's moral (*φρονέουσι καὶ αὐτοῖς*).¹ A hawk has seized a nightingale, and crushes her cries of misery by saying that she is in the claws of one who is πολλὸν ἀρείων and who is therefore at liberty to dispense with her as he pleases: anyone who tries to resist κρείσσονες is mad, for he has no chance of winning and merely adds physical pain to the shame of defeat.

Just what were the βασιλῆες to have made of this? Hesiod's most recent editor (and

¹ So M. L. West, *Hesiod: Works and Days* (Oxford, 1978) on 202.

champion) claims that 'Hesiod does not manage to make it [the *aĩnos*] into a lesson for them [the kings]', and 'can only proceed by saying "Well, don't you behave like that"' (213, with Perses replacing the incorrigible kings).² This is unduly pessimistic. The context provides the clue. The *aĩnos* is immediately preceded by the description of the age of iron, one of the chief hallmarks of which, Hesiod says, will be the rule of might over right (*δίκη δ' ἐν χερσίν*: 192), together with the general perversion of justice (189–94). Immediately after the *aĩnos* follows the explicit statement of the kings' duty to uphold *δίκη* (213–73). Admittedly, the poet first turns his attention on Perses, who is warned to listen to *δίκη* and not to resort to *ὑβρις*, since *ὑβρις* is bad for a man low on the social scale (*δελιῷ βροτῷ*: 214).³ But the mention of social class leads Hesiod directly into the statement that not even the nobleman (*ἐσθλός*) can risk *ὑβρις*. That the kings in particular are meant is made clear by the reference to the *δωροφάγοι* of line 221 who dispense justice crookedly.⁴ Moreover, Hesiod states that it is from the kings' just exercise of their duty to dispense *δίκαι* that the commoners may hope for security over their livelihood (225–47, 258–62). Thus, given the thinking expressed in the passages which frame the *aĩnos*, it seems likely that in the *aĩnos* Hesiod is first reminding the kings that the weak common people are at their mercy, and secondly admonishing the kings not to behave like the hawk but to respect the obligation bestowed upon them by their power.

Poetry, too, is in Hesiod's mind. The hawk claims his power over the nightingale for all that she is an *ἀοιδός* (208). As West notes, the normal prey of the hawk in Homer is the dove, but 'Hesiod prefers a nightingale because it stands for himself, cf. 208'. Thus people like Perses and Hesiod, for all the latter's poetry, are in the grip of the kings. Moreover, Hesiod plainly sees his poetry as a vehicle of protest for the common folk.⁵

In *E.* 9 Virgil makes Lycidas say that he had heard that Menalcas had by his poetry (*carminibus*: 10) saved a piece of land in the neighbourhood from the land-commissioners. Moeris admits that that was indeed the story that had got around,

sed carmina tantum
nostra ualent, Lycida, tela inter Martia quantum
Chaonias dicunt aquila ueniente columbas.

E. 9.11–13

Dicunt, as T. E. Page and others have seen, suggests a proverb, and Latin poetry uses this one quite frequently. Its main elements are the gentleness or timorousness of the dove and the fierceness or physical superiority of the eagle or, in some versions, of the hawk. So in Horace *C.* 1.37.17 f. Caesar masters Cleopatra 'accipiter uelut | mollis columbas' and in *C.* 4.4.31 f. 'neque imbellem feroces | prognerant aquilae columbam'; Lucretius in a *reductio ad absurdum* had written 'tremetque per auras | aeris accipiter fugiens ueniente columba' (*R.N.* 3.751 f.) and Virgil himself was to refer in a simile to the ease with which a hawk preys on a dove (*A.* 11.721–4).⁶ But here Virgil has applied the proverb in a strikingly idiosyncratic manner and has in one significant aspect departed from the standard formulation. First, the proverb

² West, *op. cit.* 49 and on 202–12.

³ For the social reference see West *ad loc.*

⁴ Cf. 38 f.: βασιλῆας | δωροφάγους, οἳ τήνδε δίκην ἐθέλουσι δικάσσαι. On δωροφάγος see West on 39.

⁵ For the interpretation of the fable offered here see further especially M. Puelma, 'Sänger und König: Zum Verständnis von Hesiods Tierfabel', *M.H.* 29 (1972), 86–109 and P. Pucci, *Hesiod and the Language of Poetry* (Baltimore and London, 1977), 61–81.

⁶ See also e.g. Ovid *M.* 1.506 and 5.605 f.

is made to illustrate a poet's attempt by means of his *carmina* to protest at the brutal way in which his overlords are manipulating common folk like himself: the proverb is applied to a poet's protest. Secondly, by specifying that the doves are Chaonian and thereby referring to the dove-priestesses of Dione at Dodona, the *πέλειαι*, Virgil is turning the doves of the proverb into *uates*, prophet-poets, who have their own *carmina* to sing.⁷ This adaptation of the proverb is unparalleled in Latin literature and was suggested to Virgil, I submit, by Hesiod's use of poetry to modify the unjust behaviour of his *βασιλῆες* towards their common subjects and by Hesiod's *ἀηδών*, who is so emphatically called an *αἰοιδός*.⁸ Virgil is indebted to Hesiod in *E.* 4, where the myth of the five ages is a major influence,⁹ and at *E.* 6.64–73, where explicit reference is made to Hesiod's encounter with the Muses on Helicon (*Theog.* 22–35); so a creative reminiscence of the farmer-poet's sermon to the *βασιλῆες* in a poem, like *E.* 9, protesting on behalf of country folk is quite in line with Virgilian practice.

University of Canterbury, New Zealand

G. ZANKER

⁷ So e.g. M. C. J. Putnam, *Virgil's Pastoral Art: Studies in the Eclogues* (Princeton, 1970), 303–6, 312 and 318, and R. G. G. Coleman, *Virgil: Eclogues* (Cambridge, 1977) on 13.

⁸ Fables and proverbs were of course comparable in that they were both used as vehicles of folk-wisdom; Virgil may have preferred a proverb because the brevity of the genus was more appropriate in the dramatic dialogue of *E.* 9.

⁹ See Coleman on *E.* 4.6, 15 f., 18, 30, 32, 36, 53.

ROMULUS TROPAEOPHORUS (*AENEID* 6.779–80)

...viden, ut geminae stant vertice cristae
et pater ipse suo superum iam signat honore?

A general consensus has emerged among twentieth-century commentators on the *Aeneid* that *pater ipse...superum* must be taken together and understood as referring to the father of the gods and not to Mars, sire of Romulus. What remains a subject of debate is the meaning of *honor* here and its particular association with Jupiter. Does it betoken the abstraction itself or a concrete manifestation of it? Austin, following Donatus, opts for the former alternative ('probably no more than "majesty"'),¹ Norden and R. D. Williams for the latter. Of these the first finds a reference to the Zeus-given sceptre of kings,² the second to Jove's thunderbolt.³

The language of the passage argues in favour of metonymy for two reasons. First, we expect Anchises, when showing off Romulus, to adhere to the pattern he has already set in the two portions of his parade which have preceded. In the case of the initial hero, Silvius, we attend largely to genealogical background (760–6). The second segment, a group made up of Procas, Capys, Numitor and Aeneas Silvius, elicits from Aeneas' father a series of exclamations on the valour of their *res gestae* (767–77). Yet

¹ *P. Vergili Maronis: Aeneidos Liber Sextus*, ed. R. G. Austin (Oxford, 1977), on line 780. His comments are in the tradition of La Cerda and Heyne-Wagner, who see the line as proof of Romulus' apotheosis.

² E. Norden, *P. Vergilius Maro: Aeneis Buch VI* (Stuttgart, 1957), on lines 779 f., citing Homer *Il.* 9.98, Pindar *P.* 1.6 and the imitation at *Ciris* 269 (*quem* [Nisus] *pater ipse deum sceptri donavit honore...*). He offers Dion. *Ant. Rom.* 3.61 and Lydus *de Mag.* 1.7 as evidence for Romulus as sceptre-bearer, but Dionysius associates the Roman adoption of regalia (including the sceptre) from the Etruscans with Tarquinius Priscus and only connects Rome's use of the twelve axes explicitly with Romulus.

³ *The Aeneid of Virgil: Books 1–6*, ed. R. D. Williams (London, 1972), on 779–80.