

Catalogue. However, the fact remains that its ignored digamma compromises the case for a Submycenaean Catalogue. May not the original have been \**Nireūs Aglaīēs uīōs Xáropos te Fánaktos*? The father's name, at least in A. E. Murray's Loeb translation (and also, in the nineteenth-century translation of the Earl of Derby), is given as Charops. Neither Nireus nor his father reappears anywhere else in the early epic. However, there is a Charops in the *Iliad* (11. 426), though there is no one else by either name. Further, Nireus of Syme appears to have close links with the two other Dodecanese contingents in the Catalogue, whose leaders are, respectively, the son, and the two grandsons, of Herakles. One of the deified Herakles' classical titles was *Xároψ* (Paus. 9. 34. 5), which appears to point in this same direction. Moreover, in one tradition (Ptolemy Hephaestionos: Pho-

tius 147b. 12) Nireus is identified as son (or alternatively as lover) of Herakles.<sup>1</sup>

The third problematic line on which I wish to make a suggestion is καὶ Σθένης, Καπανῆος ἀγακλειτοῦ φίλος υἱός (2. 564), containing as it does an essential second declension contraction. In its place we may easily imagine an original, \*καὶ Σθένης, Καπανῆος ἀγακλέφους φίλος υἱός. One might even see how the latter, if it were the original for 2. 564, came to be replaced with the line as it now stands. The suggested original consists of five words in succession ending in -ος. We may imagine an Ionian poet, reciting the antique Catalogue for the hundredth time or so, deliberately altering the monotony of the succession of -ος endings by varying ἀγακλέ(φ)ους with ἀγακλειτοῦ, and the change persisting.

P. J. LOPTSON

UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN

1. The reading proposed for 2. 672 was proposed earlier, by Brandreth (1841), and printed in the Van Leeuwen-Mendes da Costa edition of the *Iliad* (1906). The considerations itemized above linking Nireus with Herakles, as well as the climate

of Homeric opinion in which, following Parry, Ventris, and Page, the Catalogue of Ships is now viewed, may offer further support for Brandreth's reading and justify its being brought back to the notice of scholars.

## THE COMPLAINT OF EROTIIUM IN *ANTHOLOGIA PALATINA* 11. 88

After many years of relative obscurity, the epigrams of Lucillius, which are found almost exclusively in Book 11 of the *Greek Anthology*, have recently attracted some scholarly attention in their own right. Particularly impressive has been the work of Louis Robert on the irrisory poems that parody agonistic epigrams.<sup>1</sup> Quite recent also has been the publication at long last of the Budé edition of Book 11 edited by Robert Aubreton,<sup>2</sup> which stands as the most scholarly critical text available. Superior to Beckby's second edition, which is the only one completed since Jacobs' second,<sup>3</sup> this

work shows careful attention paid to the MSS and their tradition. In one short epigram of Lucillius, however, Aubreton needlessly accepts an emendation under the influence of earlier editors, relegating the better reading of the MSS to the apparatus.

*Anth. Pal.* 11. 88 is the first of a rather long series on exceptionally lean or tiny people.<sup>4</sup> It is the story of a little girl, Erotium, who was snatched up by a gnat one day while she was playing. Reminded of the rape of Ganymede, Erotium exclaimed in surprise that Zeus could want her. The single distich runs as follows:<sup>5</sup> τὴν μικρὴν παῖζουσαν

1. "Les épigrammes satiriques de Lucillius sur les athlètes: Parodie et réalités," in A. E. Raubitschek et al., *L'épigramme grecque*, Fondation Hardt, Entretiens XIV (Geneva, 1968), 181–295. Robert particularly demonstrates the use of agonistic terms in unexpected and paradoxical contexts.

2. *Anthologie grecque*, première partie: *Anthologie palatine*, Tome X (Livre XI) (Paris, 1972).

3. H. Beckby, *Anthologia Graeca*<sup>2</sup>, 4 vols. (Munich, 1965–68); *Anth. Pal.* 11 is in Vol. III. F. Jacobs, *Anthologia Graeca ad fidem codicis . . . Palatini*, 3 vols. (Leipzig, 1813–17).

4. Poems 11. 88–95, 99–101, and 103–107 are by Lucillius. The lemma to 88 introduces the section: εἰς μικροῦς <καὶ> λεπτοῖς.

5. Both MSS that preserve it agree on this reading. The ἦπασεν of P is an obvious and not uncommon error. P is Palatinus Heidelbergensis gr. 23 (saec. xi), published in photographic form by K. Preisendanz, *Anthologia Palatina*, Codices Graeci . . . phototypice depicti duce Scatone DeVries, XV, 2 vols. (Leyden, 1911). Pl is the Planudean autograph of 1299–1301, the Marcianus gr. 481 (863), of which I have consulted a microfilmed reproduction.

Ἐρώτιον ἥρπασε κώνωψ· / ἥ δὲ “τί,” φησίν,  
 “δῶ, Ζεῦ πάτερ, εἴ μ’ ἐθέλεις;” The first half  
 of the pentameter has elicited emendation  
 by various editors over the years, particularly  
 those who are troubled by the use of a  
 movable *ν* to lengthen the preceding syllable  
 and are hesitant about the precise meaning  
 of δῶ in this context. The transposition  
 suggested by Opsopaeus is little improvement  
 on the meter, however: ἥ δὲ φησὶ τί ὦ . . .<sup>6</sup>  
 The commonest emendation by the early  
 editors is some substitution for δῶ, such as ἰδ’  
 ὦ (Scaliger), ἰδοῦ (Brunck), or πάθω (Jacobs).<sup>7</sup>  
 Although Hecker suggested δρῶ,<sup>8</sup> which is  
 paleographically better than πάθω, the subse-  
 quent editions of Dübner and Beckby retain  
 the reading of Jacobs, accepting also the  
 emendation ἦ for εἴ from Boissonade.<sup>9</sup>  
 This interrogative particle is often “epexegetic  
 of a preceding question, suggesting the  
 answer to it” (LSJ, *s.v.*, II. 1. a), and so  
 would follow well after the rhetorical  
 question of appeal, τί πάθω; Thus we have  
 the double question of Dübner and Beckby:  
 ἥ δὲ “τί,” φησί, “πάθω; Ζεῦ πάτερ, ἦ μ’  
 ἐθέλεις;” The only recent original suggestion  
 has been the <ῖ>δω of Keydell,<sup>10</sup> which is  
 explained as acceptable for ἐπίδω (“was  
 werde ich erleben?”) and likewise suggests  
 a second question introduced by ἦ rather than  
 a conditional clause.

With this brief survey in mind, consider  
 the text given by Aubreton, which is sub-  
 stantially that of Hecker: ἥ δὲ “τί” φησίν,  
 “δρῶ, Ζεῦ πάτερ, εἴ μ’ ἐθέλεις;” Two pitfalls  
 have been avoided. First, the movable *ν*  
 is retained, in keeping with accepted practice  
 in Lucillius’ epigrams (cf. βρῖσιν βαρύς in  
 11. 91. 3). Although he sometimes omits

the *ν metri gratia* where one might expect it  
 (cf. 11. 408. 5), both punctuation and meter  
 suggest keeping it here. Secondly, Aubreton  
 has not been led by the one emendation to  
 accept another and so he retains the εἴ  
 of the MSS. The meaning seems clear:  
 “What am I to do, Father Zeus, if you want  
 me?” This is to be interpreted apparently  
 to mean: “If you want me as you wanted  
 Ganymede, I do not know what to do”  
 (i.e., “Woe is me!”).

None of the editors, then, has seriously  
 suggested taking the reading of line 2 as it  
 stands in the MSS. Only Wechel retained the  
 δῶ, but without discussion of its meaning.<sup>11</sup>  
 There are, however, several possible inter-  
 pretations of the reading as preserved. “What  
 am I to give you, Father Zeus, if you want  
 me?” Perhaps this means, “Since I am so  
 very small, how could I be your partner in  
 love, as Ganymede was?” But such a render-  
 ing is difficult to interpret and rather forced.  
 Since Robert has shown how cleverly Lucillius  
 uses the actual terminology of agonistic  
 dedications to parody them, we are reminded  
 that this epigram too is a parody; and in that  
 light we ought to consider the uses of  
 διδόναι with reference to the duties rendered  
 by way of service or sacrifice to the gods  
 (cf. ἰρὰ ἔδωκε of *Od.* 1. 67–68). Ganymede  
 was snatched up by the eagle of Zeus to  
 perform the function of cupbearer. Erotium  
 may be inquiring, “What service am I to  
 render, Father Zeus, if you want me (i.e., for  
 some specific duty, as you wanted Gany-  
 mede)?” This interpretation changes the  
 tenor of the epigram from reluctance or  
 despair in Erotium’s reply to a willing  
 acquiescence in Zeus’s will. The eagerness

6. V. Opsopaeus, *In Graecorum epigrammatum libros IV annotationes* (Basel, 1540; quoted by F. Jacobs, *Anthologia Graeca* [Leipzig, 1794–1814]).

7. The marginal notes of Joseph Scaliger in the second Aldine edition (Venice, 1521) are quoted by Jacobs (n. 6); P. Brunck, *Analecta veterum poetarum Graecorum* (Strasbourg, 1772–76; 2nd ed., 1785); Jacobs, *op. cit.* (n. 6); *idem, op. cit.* (n. 3).

8. A. Hecker, *Commentatio critica de Anthologia graeca* (Leyden, 1843), quoted by F. Dübner, *Epigrammatum Anthologia Palatina* (Paris, 1871–90).

9. The previously unpublished notes of Boissonade were included in the edition of F. Dübner (n. 8).

10. R. Keydell, “Zur Sprache des Epigrammatikers Lukillios,” *Philologus*, CXII (1968), 141–45. Cf. p. 142, n. 1. Keydell curiously gives the MS reading of verse 2 showing three puncts: ἥ δὲ . . . τί φησίν, etc. P shows no break there whatever and P1 shows only a single punct to designate the beginning of a direct quote.

11. Wechel was primarily concerned with the meter, accepting the transposition suggested by Opsopaeus. The scholia of Andreas Wechel were published by his heirs together with the text of H. Stephanus (*Epigrammatum Graecorum libri VII* [Frankfurt, 1600]). They are reported by both Jacobs and Dübner.

of others to emend the line seems to have stemmed from the presupposition that one who is snatched up by Zeus for divine service would react negatively. But remember that, in Erotium's mind, the gnat was the eagle of Zeus come to effect her apotheosis. Such ironic naiveté is entirely consistent with the more than one hundred Lucillian epigrams in *Anth. Pal.* 11.

The idea of godly service implied in this use of *διδόναι* suggests a similar construction worth consideration, and that is the use of *διδόναι* with a reflexive or equivalent to designate surrender or self-sacrifice.<sup>12</sup> Several examples occur in Euripides with such equivalent reflexives as *σῶμα* or *τάρμά*, the indirect objects in every case being divinities.<sup>13</sup> In the epigram before us, the interrogative *τί* functions in place of the reflexive. "What am I to give up to you (since in fact I am so very small that there is no 'self' to surrender)?"

12. For the reflexive construction see particularly LSJ, *s.v.*, II. 4 ("give oneself up") and Arndt-Gingrich, *s.v.*, 6 ("self-sacrifice"). Very similar is LSJ, *s.v.*, II. 1, without a reflexive, "hand over" or "deliver up" someone.

This interpretation is indeed an outrageous hyperbole, but scarcely more outrageous than the couplet following it (11. 89), which describes a man so short that the ground was "up." In such a rendering, moreover, one may read either a note of frustration, because she feels inadequate in the face of such an opportunity, or perhaps an incredulous plea that Zeus would surely do better to seek another, larger person. The virtue of this interpretation is that the "point" of Erotium's exclamation turns on the "point" of the parody, her unbelievably diminutive physique.

Both of these interpretations seem plausible and would at least justify retaining in a critical edition the text as given by P and Pl.

BURTON J. ROZEMA

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

13. *IA* 1555: *σῶμα . . . θῆσαι δίδωμι*; *Ion* 1285: *τὸ σῶμα τῷ θεῷ δίδωμι ἔχειν*; and *IT* 714–15: *ὦ [sc. Apollo] ἐγὼ δούς τάρμά . . .*

### A NOTE ON DURIS IN ATHENS

Inscriptional studies have revealed a close association between the Antigonids and Samos in the period following the islanders' return from exile in 321.<sup>1</sup> Aside from several decrees honoring agents of Antigonos and Demetrius, the Samians instituted a festival to the kings and named one of their tribes Demetrias; literary evidence confirms Samian representation on the Antigonid military staff.<sup>2</sup>

Such revelations are useful in determining facts about the tyrant and historian, Duris of Samos. While his activities continue to baffle scholars, the Samian–Antigonid liaison helps clarify at least one aspect of his life.

Athenaeus reports both Duris and his brother Lynceus, the comic poet, had studied under Theophrastus in Athens.<sup>3</sup> The circumstances under which they came and the date of their arrival have remained obscure. Demetrius did not "free" Athens until 307, and Duris and Lynceus, sons of an Antigonid-supported tyrant,<sup>4</sup> would not likely have been welcomed by Cassander's government before that year.<sup>5</sup> Moreover, the Athenians had a recent history of unfriendly relations with Samos. They had held the island as a cleruchy since 366/65 and relinquished it grudgingly<sup>6</sup> when Perdiccas enforced Alexander's original decree to restore all exiles to their homes.

1. C. Habicht, "Samische Volksbeschlüsse der hellenistischen Zeit," *Ath. Mitt.*, LXXII (1957), 154–209; and M. Schede, "Aus dem Heraion von Samos," *Ath. Mitt.*, XLIV (1919), 4–20. Cf. J. Barron, *The Silver Coins of Samos* (London, 1966), pp. 135–36.

2. Themison of Samos: Diod. 19. 62. 7, 20. 50. 4.

3. *Ath.* 4. 128A, 8. 337D (*FGH* 76 T 1–2); *Suda*, *s.v.* "Lynceus."

4. For Duris' father Kaios, son of Duris, see especially J. Barron, "The Tyranny of Duris of Samos," *CR*, N.S. XII (1962), 189–92.

5. Reflected, perhaps, in Duris' uncomplimentary description of Cassander's governor, Demetrius of Phalerum (*Ath.* 12. 542B–E: *FGH* 76 F 10).

6. Diod. 18. 8. 7; Habicht (n. 1), pp. 156–64 (No. 1).