

## A NOTE ON THREE LINES IN THE CATALOGUE OF SHIPS

The Catalogue of Ships, or Achaian Catalogue, of *Iliad* 2 has been argued, on a number of grounds, to represent a picture of the political geography of late Mycenaean Greece. It is claimed further that the Catalogue was composed in the Mycenaean, or more likely, the Submycenaean, period, or else that it evolved directly and with minimal change from a dactylic hexameter poem of that period. While none will deny—all, indeed, will insist—that the Catalogue contains “additions” of Ionic creation, the confidence it will be possible to feel in the existence of a Mycenaean or Submycenaean Catalogue is directly proportional to the possibility of believing that an essential core of the existing Catalogue is Mycenaean in language. That is to say, insofar as a single essential line of the Catalogue—a line that cannot be viewed as required to fit an entry to the contingencies of the *Iliad*, for example—exhibits definitely post-migration linguistic features, to that degree the case for a Mycenaean or Submycenaean Catalogue (or minimally the case for an accuracy of correspondence between such a Catalogue and our own) is impaired.

As it happens there are extremely few reliable indexes of distinctively post-migration Ionic language. Perhaps only two are genuinely reliable: the presence of uneliminable contractions, above all the second declension genitive singular in *-ου* (where it cannot be emended to *-οι* or *-οο*); and the ignoring of digamma. It appears to be wholly certain that a Mycenaean or Submycenaean hexameter poem of the Catalogue of Ships cannot have contained either of these features.

The Catalogue as we have it (and even ignoring acceptably extraneous passages in it) does contain a few—not many, but a few—instances of essential contraction or ignored digamma. Some of these can be satisfactorily accounted for. Indeed, in some cases we *must* make something like the proposed emendation to produce metric sense. Thus for *υῖες Ἰφίτου μεγαθύμου Ναυβολίδαο* (2. 518), which does not, as it stands, scan properly,

we can and should read *\*υῖες Φιφίτοο μεγαθύμοο Ναυβολίδαο*. What I shall offer, in this note, are suggestions for the emendation of three further problematic lines in the Catalogue.

The first of these poses, I should like to claim, a parallel case to 2. 518 above. It is *τῶν αὐθ' ἡγείσθην Ἀσκληπιοῦ δύο παῖδε* (2. 731). As will be noted, the line does not really scan. It describes the two sons of Asklepios, Podaleirios and Machaon. Chantaine (*Grammaire Homérique*, I, 45) proposes that the offending component be read *Ἀσκληπίοο δύο παῖδε*. He does not however indicate how the resulting artificially lengthened *-ο* is to be explained or understood.

It is well known that the sole style of patronymic attested from the Linear B tablets is of the type represented in Homer by *Αἴας Τελαμώνιος*, the adjectival of the father's name. Some have wanted to deny to Mycenaean Greek therefore the most frequent Homeric form, with the ending in *-δης*. This seems premature and probably unwarranted. At any rate, what the Linear B tablets and the evidence from elsewhere in Homer suggest is that we read 2. 731 as *\*τῶν αὐθ' ἡγείσθην Ἀσκληπιῶ δύο παῖδε*, i.e., as describing the two Asklepiian sons, with the form an adjectival in the dual. For the Mycenaean for “son of Asklepios” will, evidently, have been *Asklepiios*. And quite easily, either in the oral tradition, or later, in the manuscript tradition, *Ἀσκληπιῶ* would give place to *Ἀσκληπιοῦ*. 2. 731 then is both perfectly metrical and lacking an Ionic contraction. (Cf. also 4. 367 *Σθένελος, Καπανήιος υἱός*, “Sthenelos, the Kapaneian son”; *Od.* 3. 190 *Φιλοκτήτην, Ποιάντιον ἀγλαὸν υἱόν*, “Philoctetes, the splendid Poiantian son,” etc.)

The second and third cases I shall discuss are less certain, in my view. Both however seem wholly satisfactory. The first is *Νιρεὺς Ἀγλαΐης υἱὸς Χαρόποιό τ' ἀνακτος* (2. 672). The line is genealogical “comment” and hence arguably no part of the original

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 EROTIVM 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.