

## AJAX'S ENTRY IN THE HESIODIC CATALOGUE OF WOMEN\*

The list of Helen's suitors in the *Catalogue of Women*, a late epic poem attributed to Hesiod, is directly related to the Catalogue of Ships in Iliad 2, in that it is in fact a list of future participants in the Trojan war.<sup>1</sup> That the two catalogues treat the same traditional material is demonstrated above all by their agreement on minor personages: not only the protagonists of the Trojan saga, but also such obscure figures as Podarces of Phylace, Elephenor of Euboea, Thoas of Aetolia, or Menestheus of Athens feature in both Homer and Hesiod, and are characterized by basically the same traditional expressions.<sup>2</sup> But, though the Hesiodic catalogue is sometimes used as evidence that a given Homeric personage belongs to the authentic tradition,<sup>3</sup> it seems that the exegetic potential of this poem has not yet been exploited in full. As I hope to show, the *Catalogue of Women* throws light on one of the most controversial issues in Homeric scholarship, that of the representation of Athens and Salamis in the Catalogue of Ships.

In the Catalogue of Ships, the Salaminian entry contains only two lines: *Αἴας δ' ἐκ Σαλαμῖνος ἄγεν δυοκαίδεκα νῆας, / στήσε δ' ἄγων ἴν' Ἀθηναίων ἴσαντο φάλαγγες* (Il. 2.557–8). As is well known, the second line of this passage was suspected in antiquity of being a sixth-century Athenian interpolation, intended to legitimate the annexation of Salamis by Athens, and we shall return to this later. The entry as a whole is one of the most problematic in the Catalogue of Ships: its detailed indication of the contingent's location is unique in the Catalogue,<sup>4</sup> its reference to the Athenian *φάλαγγες* instead of the usual *νῆες* is obviously out of line, and, above all, the very brevity of this entry is unprecedented in the Catalogue and hardly compatible with

\* An earlier version of this paper was read at the faculty seminar of the Hebrew University's Classics Department; my thanks are due to the participants in that seminar for their helpful comments and discussion. I would also like to thank the anonymous reader of this journal and the Editor for some valuable suggestions.

<sup>1</sup> Hes. fr. 196–204 M–W. On the relation to the Catalogue of Ships see M. L. West, 'Hesiodica', *CQ* N.S. 11 (1961), 132–3, R. Hope Simpson and J. F. Lazenby, *The Catalogue of the Ships in Homer's Iliad* (Oxford, 1970), p. 166. On the *Catalogue of Women* as a traditional poem see M. Parry, 'Homeric Formulae and Homeric Metre', in A. Parry (ed.), *The Making of Homeric Verse* (Oxford, 1971), p. 238, R. Janko, *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns* (Cambridge, 1982), pp. 27–8, 221–5, M. L. West, *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women* (Oxford, 1985), pp. 125–6, 135–6.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Il. 2.705 Ἰφίκλων υἱὸς πολυμήλου Φυλακίδαο and *Cat.* fr. 199.5 υἱὸς τ' Ἰφίκλοιο Ποδάρκης Φυλακίδαο, Il. 2.541 and *Cat.* fr. 204.53 Χαλκωδοντιάδης, μεγαθύμων ἀρχὸς Ἀβάντων (of Elephenor), Il. 2.638 Αἰτωλῶν δ' ἡγήτο Θόας Ἀνδραίμονος υἱὸς and *Cat.* fr. 198.9 Αἰτωλῶν δ' ἐμνάτο Θόας Ἀνδραίμονος υἱὸς, Il. 2.552 and *Cat.* fr. 200.3 υἱὸς Πετεῶο Μενεσθεύς. The only case where the same state is represented by different persons is that of Argos: in Hesiod Helen's Argive suitors are the sons of Amphiarāus, and not Diomedes, Sthenelus and Euryalus, who command the Argive contingent in Homer (*Cat.* fr. 197.6, Il. 2.563–6). According to West's suggestion (op. cit., p. 117), Diomedes and Sthenelus were mentioned as additional suitors from Argos in the lost lines 11–29 of fr. 196.

<sup>3</sup> This refers especially to the Athenian commander Menestheus, see D. L. Page, *History and the Homeric Iliad* (Berkeley, 1959), p. 173 n. 79, G. S. Kirk, *The Iliad: a Commentary*, i (Cambridge, 1985), p. 206.

<sup>4</sup> And is not supported elsewhere in the *Iliad*: this was the reason why the line was athetized by Aristarchus, see Schol. A to Il. 3.230 and 4.273, cf. Kirk, op. cit., pp. 207–8.

Ajax's prominence in the rest of the poem.<sup>5</sup> Now, whatever the reasons for Ajax's underrepresentation in the Catalogue of Ships, comparison with the *Catalogue of Women* shows that these reasons did not apply to the latter poem. In the list of Helen's suitors Ajax is described as exercising control over quite substantial territory: *Αἴας δ' ἐκ Σαλαμίνος ἀμώμητος πολεμιστῆς / μνάτο· δίδου δ' ἄρα ἔδνα ἐοικότα, θαυματοῦ ἔργα· / οἱ γὰρ ἔχον Τροιζήνα καὶ ἀγχίαλον Ἐπίδauρον, / νῆσόν τ' Αἴγινα Μάσητά τε κούροι Ἀχαιῶν, / καὶ Μέγαρα σκιοέοντα καὶ ὄφρυόεντα Κόρινθον, / Ἑρμιόνην Ἀσίνην τε παρέξ ἄλα ναιεταώσας, / τῶν ἔφατ' εἰλίποδάς τε βόας καὶ ἴφια μῆλα / συνελάσας δώσειν· ἐκέκαστο γὰρ ἔγχει μάκρῳ* (Hes. fr. 204.44–51 M–W). In Homer, Troezen and Epidaurus, Aegina and Mases, Hermione and Asine belong to Diomedes' kingdom, Corinth is among the towns of Agamemnon, and Megara is altogether missing.<sup>6</sup>

If Ajax's entry in the Catalogue of Ships had been the same as in 'Hesiod's' list of Helen's suitors, no question of his underrepresentation in Homer's Catalogue would have arisen. This is not to say, of course, that we can simply point to the Hesiodic fragment and declare that this is what Ajax's entry in Homer should have looked like. We cannot form an opinion as to whether or not 'Hesiod's' version bears on that of Homer before we have answered the following questions: (i) how 'Hesiod's' version stands in respect of the epic tradition; (ii) whether this version is compatible with the general context of the *Iliad*; and (iii) what might be the reason for the discrepancy between the two versions.

#### Hes. fr. 204.44–51 and the epic tradition

Although Homer and 'Hesiod' give two different versions of the allegiances of one and the same geographical area, their descriptions of this area are strikingly similar. Compare the following:

##### *Il.* 2.557–70

*Αἴας δ' ἐκ Σαλαμίνος ἄγεν δυοκαίδεκα νῆας,  
στήσῃ δ' ἄγων ἴν' Ἀθηναίων ἴσαντο φάλαγγες.  
Οἱ δ' Ἄργος τ' εἶχον Τίρυνθά τε τειχιόεσσαν,  
Ἑρμιόνην Ἀσίνην τε, βαθὺν κατὰ κόλπον ἐχούσας,  
Τροιζήν' Ἡϊόνας τε καὶ ἀμπελόεντ' Ἐπίδauρον,  
οἱ τ' ἔχον Αἴγινα Μάσητά τε κούροι Ἀχαιῶν,  
τῶν αὐτ' ἡγεμόνευε βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης...  
...Οἱ δὲ Μυκῆνας εἶχον, ἐϋκτίμενον πτολίεθρον,  
ἀφνειὸν τε Κόρινθον εὐκτιμέναν τε Κλεωνάς...*

##### Hes. fr. 204.44–51

*Αἴας δ' ἐκ Σαλαμίνος ἀμώμητος πολεμιστῆς  
μνάτο· δίδου δ' ἄρα ἔδνα ἐοικότα, θαυματοῦ ἔργα·  
οἱ γὰρ ἔχον Τροιζήνα καὶ ἀγχίαλον Ἐπίδauρον,*

<sup>5</sup> Ajax's entry is the shortest in the Catalogue of Ships. Next in brevity are the entry of the Magnes under the command of Prothoos (three verses) and that of another Thessalian contingent under the command of Eurypylus (four verses).

<sup>6</sup> *Il.* 2.560–2, 570. W. Leaf was probably right when he claimed that 'Hesiod's' way of describing Ajax's control over the territories in question suggests raiding rather than regular possession, see his 'Hesiod and the Dominions of Ajax', *CR* 24 (1910), 179–80. Yet this does not alter the fact that Ajax is presented in Hesiod as exercising authority over the lands that in Homer are ascribed to such a prominent leader as Diomedes and even to Agamemnon himself. Hence, unless we are prepared to entertain the possibility that Ajax could raid the territories of Diomedes and Agamemnon and also (as the *Iliad* clearly suggests) be on good terms with them, it should be concluded that the Homeric and the Hesiodic versions are mutually incompatible.

νήσόν τ' Αἴγιαν Μάσητά τε κούροι Ἀχαιῶν,  
καὶ Μέγαρα σκιδόντα καὶ ὄφρυνόντα Κόρινθον,  
Ἑρμιόνην Ἀσίην τε παρέξ ἄλα ναιεταώσας,  
τῶν ἔφατ' ἐλιποδάς τε βόας καὶ ἴφια μῆλα  
συνελάσας δώσειν· ἐκέαστο γὰρ ἔγχει μακρῷ.

Since the publication in 1907 by Schubart and Wilamowitz of the Pap. Berol. 10560, to which our fragment belongs, neither its similarity to *Il.* 2.560–2 nor its divergence from *Il.* 2.557–8 as regards Ajax's dominions has drawn much scholarly attention.<sup>7</sup> The only reason I can see for this is that from the standpoint of traditional Homeric scholarship the supposed interval of time between these two texts was regarded as crucial for the evaluation of the Hesiodic fragment:<sup>8</sup> in so far as the poet of the *Catalogue of Women* was close to Homer he could be seen as imitating him, and in so far as he diverged from his alleged model he could be seen as deliberately improving on Homer's version.<sup>9</sup> However, as soon as we admit that the interval of time does not separate two thoroughly individual compositions but rather the dates at which two traditional poems were fixed, our assessment of the way in which they relate to each other must adopt a different line. Indeed, the impact of Milman Parry's work on Homeric scholarship was felt, among other things, in the recognition of the fact that parallels between two traditional texts, striking as they may be, can well indicate that these are two independent variants of a common tradition.<sup>10</sup> Consequently, the fundamental question in assessing the character of the relation between the two is whether or not they should be viewed as such mutually independent variants. This is exactly the question whose relevance to the Homeric and the Hesiodic versions I intend to examine.

The points of coincidence between the two versions are so obvious that we may say with certainty that they are mutually related. In both of them Hermione and Asine, Troezen and Epidaurus, Aegina and Mases go together, coupled within a single verse.<sup>11</sup> Note also the formulaic affinity between the two versions: Ἑρμιόνην Ἀσίην τε at the beginning of the verse, καὶ – – – Ἐπίδauρον at the end, and Αἴγιαν Μάσητά τε κούροι Ἀχαιῶν after the first foot. Even when the same places are characterized by different epithets, these epithets are metrically equivalent (βαθὺν κατὰ κόλπον ἔχουσας in Homer and παρέξ ἄλα ναιεταώσας in 'Hesiod', ἀμπελόεντ'

<sup>7</sup> To my knowledge, the extant bibliography consists of the following items: U. von Wilamowitz in *Berliner Klassikertexte* v. 1 (Berlin, 1907), pp. 31ff., T. W. Allen, 'Argos in Homer', *CQ* 3 (1909), 83–4, W. Leaf, *CR* 24 (1910), 179–80, W. D. Meier, *Die epische Formel im pseudohesiodischen Frauenkatalog* (Zürich, 1976), pp. 184–6.

<sup>8</sup> According to West, op. cit., pp. 130–7, esp. p. 136, the *Catalogue of Women* was composed in the period between 580 and 520 B.C. Even if we raise the date of the poem to the beginning of the sixth or the end of the seventh century (see Janko, op. cit., pp. 85–7 and 247–8 nn. 37, 38), it would still be much later than the accepted date for the *Iliad*.

<sup>9</sup> This view is still held in the recent dissertation by W. D. Meier; cf., however, Janko's comment on Meier, loc. cit., that the variations between parallel lines in Homer and 'Hesiod' 'suggest oral knowledge and recomposition' (op. cit., p. 248 n. 39; Janko's italics).

<sup>10</sup> As G. P. Edwards put it in his discussion of the phrases common to Hesiod and the *Odyssey*: 'We can never rule out the existence of an older place X, which provided a common source for both A and B at the lines in question, so making their chronological relationship impossible to determine', see his *The Language of Hesiod in its Traditional Context* (Oxford, 1971), p. 189. The conditions in which *imitatio* can be admitted in oral poetry have been tentatively formulated by Janko, see op. cit., pp. 225–8.

<sup>11</sup> Neither the Homeric Eiones (an unknown town) nor the Hesiodic Megara are mentioned in the other version; note, however, that the formula μέγαρα σκιδόντα (seven times in the *Odyssey*) is identical with 'Hesiod's' expression for the city of Megara, cf. Meier, op. cit., pp. 178–9.

in Homer and ἀγχίαλον in 'Hesiod'), showing that they are in fact alternative fillings of the same underlying pattern.

Against this background, the points on which the two versions differ are especially instructive. These points of divergence are as follows.

*Il. 2.561* καὶ ἀμπελόεντ' Ἐπίδauρον and Hes. fr. **204.46** καὶ ἀγχίαλον Ἐπίδauρον. The epithet used by 'Hesiod' is undoubtedly a traditional one: it is encountered twice in Homer (notably, both occurrences fall in the Catalogue of Ships), though not in the same metrical position:<sup>12</sup> the direct parallel to the Hesiodic usage can be observed outside Homer, see *H. Del. Ap.* 32 καὶ ἀγχιάλη Πεπάρηθος.<sup>13</sup> As distinct from this, Homer's epithet ἀμπελόεντ' is in itself unique: elsewhere, this epithet takes the form ἀμπελόεσσαν and regularly occurs at the end of the verse.<sup>14</sup> As there seems to be no other evidence that Epidaurus was especially famous for its vines, it is possible that the Hesiodic epithet 'near the sea' gives a more appropriate characterization of the town.

*Il. 2.560* Ἑρμιόνην Ἀσίνην τε, βαθὺν κατὰ κόλπον ἔχουσας and Hes. fr. **204.49** Ἑρμιόνην Ἀσίνην τε παρέξ ἄλα ναιεταώσας. 'Hesiod's' expression obviously derives from the widespread pattern πόλεις εὐ ναιεταώσας.<sup>15</sup> As for the Homeric one, its only parallels seem to be *H. Dem.* 187 παῖδ' ὑπὸ κόλπῳ ἔχουσα and 238 καὶ ἐν κόλποισιν ἔχουσα.<sup>16</sup> Note that 'Hesiod's' description is free from the factual error contained in Homer's version: contrary to what Homer says, Hermione and Asine were not located on the same gulf.<sup>17</sup>

*Il. 2.570* ἀφνειὸν τε Κόρινθον and Hes. fr. **204.48** καὶ ὄφρυόνετα Κόρινθον. As distinct from the Epidaurus epithets, those for Corinth are not supposed to fill the same portion of the line: in Homer the noun-epithet combination for Corinth occupies the beginning and in 'Hesiod' the end of the verse. Though the Hesiodic epithet is paralleled in Ἰλῖος ὄφρυόεσσα at *Il.* 22.411, the full equivalent to his usage is again found outside Homer, see the line Πειρήνην οἰκεῖτε καὶ ὄφρυόνετα Κόρινθον in a response of the Delphic oracle quoted by Herodotus.<sup>18</sup> Homer's ἀφνειός, widespread in the epics, is usually employed as an epithet of persons:<sup>19</sup> if it is correct that this epithet could not have been applied to Corinth before the eighth century B.C.,<sup>20</sup> then the alternative epithet ὄφρυόεις, relating as it does to the natural fortress of Acrocorinth and thus appropriate in describing the city at any period of its existence, may well be a more ancient one.

*Il. 2.562* οἷ τ' ἔχον Αἴγιναν Μάσητά τε κούροι Ἀχαιῶν and Hes. fr. **204.47** νῆσόν τ' Αἴγιναν Μάσητά τε κούροι Ἀχαιῶν. That νῆσόν τ' Αἴγιναν is an authentic epic

<sup>12</sup> *Il.* 2.640 / Χαλκίδα τ' ἀγχίαλον, 697 / ἀγχιάλόν τ' Ἀνθρώνα (ἀγχιάλην Zenodotus, see Schol. A ad locum).

<sup>13</sup> Note that 'Hesiod's' use of the epithet involves an unnecessary metrical fault which could have been avoided if the poet had used the form ἀγχιάλην, cf. Zenodotus' reading of *Il.* 2.697 (n. 12 above).

<sup>14</sup> *Il.* 3.184 Φρυγίην... ἀμπελόεσσαν, 9.152, 294 Πήδασον ἀμπελόεσσαν, *H. Pyth. Ap.* 438 Κρίσην... ἀμπελόεσσαν, cf. *H.* 9.5.

<sup>15</sup> Or ναιετούσας or ναιεταούσας, see *Il.* 2.648, *Od.* 8.574, Hes. fr. 141.17 M-W, *H. Del. Ap.* 175, cf. Meier, op. cit., p. 186 n. 4.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. also the epithet βαθύκολποι (three times in the *Iliad*).

<sup>17</sup> See Kirk, op. cit., p. 209.

<sup>18</sup> Herod. 5.92 (= H. W. Parke and D. E. W. Wormell, *The Delphic Oracle*, ii [Oxford, 1956], N 7, p. 5).

<sup>19</sup> Or of personal estate, see *Il.* 14.122, *Od.* 1.393 (δῶμα, δῶ), *Od.* 1.232, 17.420, 19.76 (οἶκος): the only parallel to Homer's application of this epithet to a place is Hes. fr. 240.1-2 M-W Ἐλλοπή... / ἀφνειή μῆλ' οἱ καὶ εἰλιπόδεσσι βόεσσιν.

<sup>20</sup> See T. J. Dunbabin, 'The Early History of Corinth', *JHS* 68 (1948), 59-69 (esp. pp. 60 and 66). Cf. also J. B. Salmon, *Wealthy Corinth* (Oxford, 1984), p. 18.

formula follows from its additional emergence as νήσός τ' Αἰγίνῃ at *H. Del. Ap.* 31. Accordingly, Homer's οἳ τ' ἔχον Αἶγιναν should be taken as a modification of the fixed formulaic line which survived in full in the Hesiodic poem.<sup>21</sup>

We cannot say, therefore, that 'Hesiod's' divergences from Homer can be explained away simply as corrections introduced into the Homeric version by a more geographically competent poet.<sup>22</sup> This might well have been the case if the expressions used in his version were unique. We saw, however, that where 'Hesiod' diverges from Homer he uses traditional expressions attested elsewhere in the epic corpus.<sup>23</sup> His ἀγχίαλον Ἐπίδauρον should be read not against the Homeric ἀμπελόντ' Ἐπίδauρον, a unique modification on a traditional expression, but against ἀγχιᾶλη Πεπάρηθος at *H. Del. Ap.* 32, and his παρὲς ἄλα ναιεταώσας not against the Homeric βαθὺν κατὰ κόλπον ἐχούσας, again a unique expression, but against the formula πόλεις εὖ ναιεταώσας. Apart from this, if we assume 'Hesiod's' dependence on the Homeric version we shall never be able to explain the source of the formula νήσόν τ' Αἶγιναν. All these leave no doubt that Hes. fr. 204.44–51 is a genuine traditional version independent of *Il.* 2.557–70.

### Hes. fr. 204.44–51 and our 'Iliad'

It follows from the aforesaid that Ajax's characterization in the Catalogue of Ships was not the only characterization of this hero known to the Greek epic tradition. Naturally, this fact in itself does not mean that 'Hesiod's' version, traditional though it is, should be adopted for our *Iliad*, the more so as we cannot be sure that this version is sound from the inner standpoint of the Homeric poem. It is indeed reasonable to expect that if Ajax's representation in the Catalogue of Ships had been like that in the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* the *Iliad* as we have it would have been affected at more than one point.

First of all, the representation of Diomedes and, to a lesser degree, of Agamemnon, the two Achaean leaders to whom the Catalogue of Ships ascribes the lands attached to Ajax in the Hesiodic version, would be modified. Contrary to what one might expect, this would not raise serious difficulties as far as the rest of the *Iliad* is concerned. As G. S. Kirk has pointed out only recently, 'in the rest of the poem the question of his [Diomedes'] contingent, exactly whom he commands, is kept strangely silent (especially so in the fifth book which he dominates)...'.<sup>24</sup> Moreover, the alternative distribution of Diomedes' lands as suggested by 'Hesiod's' version would perhaps make the determination of his kingdom less difficult, in that it would reduce his status in respect of Agamemnon to more natural proportions, leaving him with Argos and Tiryns only.<sup>25</sup> As for Agamemnon, I cannot see how taking Corinth (the

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Allen, *CQ* 3 (1909), 84. Note that, according to Strabo 8.6.16, p. 375, some preferred to read νήσόν τ' Αἶγιναν into *Il.* 2.562; this variant also appears in what is supposed to be a quotation of *Il.* 2.559–68 in the *Contest of Homer and Hesiod*, see T. W. Allen (ed.), *Homeri opera* v.236–7.

<sup>22</sup> As seems to be implied in Meier, op. cit., pp. 185–6.

<sup>23</sup> This is also true of the general context of the passage. Thus, the unhomeric θαυματὰ ἔργα (*Cat.* fr. 204.45) is paralleled in *Aspis* 165, *H. Herm.* 80, 440, *H.* 7.34 (on this expression, see Janko, op. cit., pp. 137, 184); ἀμώμητος πολεμιστής (in Homer only Πουλυδάμαντος ἀμώμητοιο at *Il.* 12.109) can be compared with *Aspis* 102 ἀμώμητος Ἰόλαος and *H.* 33.3 ἀμώμητον Πολυδεύκεα.

<sup>24</sup> Op. cit., p. 180.

<sup>25</sup> On the problem of Agamemnon's and Diomedes' representation in the Catalogue of Ships see Page, op. cit., pp. 127–8, 129–32, Hope Simpson and Lazenby, op. cit., pp. 70–2, A. Giovannini, *Étude historique sur les origines du Catalogue des vaisseaux* (Bern, 1969), pp. 26–7, Kirk, op. cit., pp. 180–1.

only town of Ajax in his possession) from him could make his kingdom more problematic than it is now.

Secondly, adoption of the Hesiodic version would entail that Megara would at last occupy its place of honour among the participants in the Trojan war.<sup>26</sup> True, the absence of Megara, a Dorian city in historic times, from the Catalogue of Ships is often viewed as consistent with the Catalogue's presumed Mycenaean origins.<sup>27</sup> There is however reason to doubt whether denying 'Mycenaean legitimation' to every place that does not appear in the Catalogue of Ships is a methodologically valid approach: on this presumption, such important places as Dendra and Gla could not be seen as Mycenaean only because the Catalogue of Ships does not mention them.<sup>28</sup> Another important caveat is that the argument proceeding from the 'Dorian background' can with equal reason be applied also to the rest of the towns on our list: all of them were Dorian in historic times, all of them (except for Asine) are poor in Mycenaean remains,<sup>29</sup> and all of them (except for Troezen) are only too rarely mentioned in Greek legend. When viewed in this perspective, the presence of Megara on the map of the Catalogue would certainly be more justified than, say, the presence of Epidauros, a town which has so far yielded no Mycenaean remains and which does not appear in the mythological tradition.

Thirdly, 'Hesiod's' picture of Ajax's dominions is distinctly at variance with the inferior status of Salamis in respect of Athens as suggested by the Catalogue of Ships.<sup>30</sup> There can indeed be no doubt that the strategic position of Salamis as regards Athens is such that at any historical period whatever a Salaminian empire like that outlined in 'Hesiod' must have constituted a direct threat to the might if not the very independence of the Athenian state. Accordingly, a situation where Salamis was strong enough to control the Epidaurian peninsula, Aegina, and the Isthmus, could only have occurred if Athens had been politically weak. It seems to be more than a coincidence that just such Athenian weakness is attested in Greek tradition concerning the Trojan war. As is well known, the role played in the war by Athens is altogether insignificant. The commander of the Athenian contingent at Troy is the very embodiment of this insignificance – the man who leads the Athenians is neither Theseus nor one of his sons but the otherwise unknown Menestheus.<sup>31</sup> Consider now the position of Athens at the time of the Trojan war as attested in Greek tradition. Theseus, having abducted the maiden Helen, retires from Athens, and is found either in the Underworld or in exile; Attica, including Athens, has been ravaged by the Dioscuri, who took away with them not only Helen but also Theseus' mother Aethra

<sup>26</sup> This fact has been given due prominence in Allen, *CQ* 3 (1909), 83–4.

<sup>27</sup> See e.g. Page, *op. cit.*, p. 120, Kirk, *op. cit.*, p. 239.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Hope Simpson and Lazenby, *op. cit.*, pp. 154–5.

<sup>29</sup> See the data adduced in Hope Simpson and Lazenby, *op. cit.*, pp. 62–3.

<sup>30</sup> Both Wilamowitz, *op. cit.*, pp. 37–8, and W. Leaf, *CR* 24 (1910), 179–80, saw in 'Hesiod's' description of Ajax's dominions confirmation of the political situation suggested by the Catalogue of Ships: if Ajax is described as able to raid the lands of all his neighbours except for Attica, this means that he was an Athenian vassal. But it is hard not to agree with West who, proceeding from the inner standpoint of the *Catalogue of Women*, finds this reading tendentious: after all, there is no indication in the Hesiodic poem that the lands in question were controlled by someone other than Ajax, see West, *op. cit.*, p. 132 n. 21. Note also that though the suitors from Argos do appear in the Hesiodic list (see n. 2), the only characterization of this state given here is that it was *μάλ' ἐγγύθεν* from Sparta (*Cat. fr.* 197.7).

<sup>31</sup> The relation of this Athenian leader to Ajax shows the opposite of the alleged subordination of Salamis to Athens: on the few occasions that Menestheus' fighting is described in the *Iliad*, he is found associated with Ajax and his brother Teucer, but very much in Ajax's shadow, see *Il.* 12.331–77, 13.190–7, 690–710, cf. Kirk, *op. cit.*, p. 206.

herself; for the time being, Theseus' dynasty has been interrupted, and a stranger (an Athenian on his mother's side only), Menestheus, is king in Athens.<sup>32</sup> This is the context in which the Salaminian empire makes its appearance at Athens' very door. It is this domain and not the alleged greatness of Athens that fits in with the configuration of forces fixed in the Trojan saga.

Finally, the issue of Ajax's underrepresentation. It is significant that Ajax's entry in the Catalogue of Ships is not the only Iliadic passage where such underrepresentation can be observed. There is also the famous case of the Teichoscopia, where Helen, asked by Priam about the identity of Agamemnon, Odysseus, and Ajax, gives detailed explanations only as regards the two former; as for Ajax, she disposes of him in the shortest possible answer, οὗτος δ' Αἴας ἐστὶ πελώριος, ἔρκος Ἀχαιῶν, and proceeds to a description of Idomeneus about whom she has not even been asked.<sup>33</sup> It is possible that something similar also happens to Ajax in the appendix to the Catalogue of Ships, purporting to answer the questions as to who is the best warrior and whose are the best horses among those present: while Eumelus and his horses are given five verses, 'the best among men', Ajax, has only one, ἀνδρῶν αὖ μέγ' ἄριστος ἔην Τελαμώνιος Αἴας.<sup>34</sup> According to the hypothesis put forward by D. L. Page, Ajax is underrepresented in the *Iliad* because he did not originally belong to the Trojan saga but was imported into it from a much more ancient tradition, the main evidence for this being his tower-like body-shield.<sup>35</sup> However, this interpretation is difficult not only because Ajax is deeply rooted in the Trojan saga as we have it,<sup>36</sup> but also because it ignores the fact that Ajax is not an isolated figure in Greek heroic tradition. If we raise his date, we must also raise the date for his father Telamon; the latter, however, is firmly associated with the generation preceding that of the Trojan war in virtue of being the brother of Peleus and the comrade of Heracles.<sup>37</sup> As distinct from this, adoption of the version of Ajax's dominions given by 'Hesiod' allows us to reinstate him in a manner fitting his prominent position in the Trojan saga<sup>38</sup> without at the same time forcing us to abandon his well-attested genealogy.

<sup>32</sup> For a representative collection of the *testimonia* see Page, *op. cit.*, pp. 172–5 nn. 78–9. Page dismisses the Dioscuri invasion of Attica as late fiction (*ibid.*, p. 174); however, the tradition of this inroad goes well with the fact that in Homer Theseus' mother Aethra is in Troy; as Helen's servant, see *Il.* 3.144: Aethra's sojourn in Troy was also attested in the cyclic *Iliu persis* (Allen, *Homeri opera* v.108, 139) and, according to Paus. 5.19.3, on the Corinthian Chest of Cypselus. As was pertinently observed by M. P. Nilsson, a line mentioning the mother of Theseus as Helen's servant 'is not of such a nature as the Athenians would have introduced in order to enhance the mythical fame of Athens', see *The Mycenaean Origin of Greek Mythology* (Berkeley, 1931), p. 168.

<sup>33</sup> *Il.* 3.229. Cf. G. P. Shipp, *Studies in the Language of Homer*<sup>2</sup> (Cambridge, 1972), p. 239: 'The description of Idomeneus...which is commonly considered to have been inserted, truncating the description of Ajax'. Kirk, *op. cit.*, pp. 208, 297–9, seems to hesitate between adopting the above explanation and the psychological interpretation proposed in A. Parry, 'Have we Homer's *Iliad*?', *YCS* 20 (1966), 197–200. However, Parry's interpretation is uneconomic in that it cannot account for other cases of Ajax's underrepresentation in the *Iliad*.

<sup>34</sup> *Il.* 2.768 (the absent Achilles is, of course, beyond compare in both categories, see vv. 769–70).

<sup>35</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 147, 232–5.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. Kirk, *op. cit.*, p. 208.

<sup>37</sup> Hes. fr. 250 M–W, Pind. *Nem.* 3.37ff., 4.25ff., *Isthm.* 6.27ff. Sn., Apollod. 2.133. Another guarantee that Telamon is a contemporary of Heracles is that Ajax's half-brother Teucer, who participates in the Trojan war, was born to the Trojan princess Hesione, a sister of Priam taken by Telamon as part of his booty after Heracles' sack of Troy, cf. Soph. *Ai.* 1299ff., Apollod. 3.162.

<sup>38</sup> Ajax's rivalry with Odysseus and his subsequent death is the major theme of the cyclic poems *Aethiopis* and *Ilias parva*, see Allen (ed.), *Homeri opera* v.106–7, 126, 129–30; this subject is also mentioned in the *Odyssey*, see 11.543–7.

Thus, 'Hesiod's' version is not only not incompatible with the rest of the *Iliad* but it even throws light on such difficult points as the underrepresentation of Ajax and the insignificance of Athens in the Trojan war. In view of this, 'Hesiod's' description of Ajax's dominions seems preferable to that in Homer.

### Hes. fr. 204.44–51 and the Athenian 'recension' of Homer

Adoption of the Hesiodic version implies that details of Ajax's political background have been deleted from the Catalogue of Ships and probably also from the rest of the *Iliad*. The question of course is by whom, when, and for what purpose this was done. It is significant in this connection that the Athenian–Salaminian entry in the Catalogue of Ships is the very passage to which the greatest part of our evidence concerning the sixth-century Athenian 'recension' of Homer relates.<sup>39</sup> In the light of an additional piece of evidence which, I believe, the Hesiodic fragment provides, it may be useful to test against this fragment the main arguments denying Athenian editorial activity concerning the Catalogue of Ships. As far as I can see, there are two such arguments: that proceeding from the text of the Catalogue and that proceeding from the state of our evidence.

It has been claimed that the text of the Athenian and Salaminian entries in its present form does not justify the inference of a large-scale revision: even if we admit that both the praise of the Athenian commander Menestheus at *Il.* 2.553–5 and the location of the Salaminian fleet next to the fleet of Athens at *Il.* 2.558 have been interpolated, such interpolations can only be qualified as cosmetic and cannot substantiate the claim of a 'recension' on a greater scale.<sup>40</sup> This argument is undoubtedly sound as long as the version of Homer is our only option. However, the alternative version in 'Hesiod' shows that there is reason to expect real changes not so much in the location of the Salaminian fleet but in the fact that Salamis was dissociated from Megara while the latter was totally deleted from the map. If we add to this that Homer's picture of Attica, with Athens as its only city, is both unprecedented in the Catalogue and anachronistic in that it suggests that the synoecism of Attica has already taken place,<sup>41</sup> we shall have an excellent case for editorial activity the main intentions of which were not so much harmless interpolations flattering Athenian national pride but rather large-scale updating of the inherited map of heroic Greece in view of contemporary Athenian interest. In that case, the praise of Menestheus and the location of the Salaminian fleet can be no more than by-products of this activity.

Another argument against the Athenian 'recension' is that in the last analysis our

<sup>39</sup> Diog. Laert. 1.57 (quoting the fourth-century Megarian historian Dieuchidas), Str. 9.1.10, p. 394, Plut. *Sol.* 10.1, Diog. Laert. 1.48, Schol. B to *Il.* 2.557. The reliability of this evidence has been fully debated in R. Merkelbach, 'Die pisistratische Redaktion der homerischen Gedichte', *RhM* 95 (1952), 23–47, republished in *Untersuchungen zur Odyssee*<sup>2</sup> (München, 1969), pp. 239–62 (accepting it as reliable) and J. A. Davison, 'Peisistratus and Homer', *TAPA* 86 (1955), 1–21 (rejecting its reliability). See also M. Skafte Jensen, *The Homeric Question and the Oral Formulaic Theory* (Copenhagen, 1980), pp. 128–58.

<sup>40</sup> Allen, *CQ* 3 (1909), 84, Davison, *TAPA* 86 (1955), 18, id. in A. J. B. Wace and F. H. Stubbings (edd.), *A Companion to Homer* (London, 1962), pp. 220, 239, Kirk, op. cit., p. 180.

<sup>41</sup> Which agrees with the Athenian tradition that the synoecism of Attica took place under Theseus but disagrees with the historical evidence, see the discussion by A. Andrewes in *CAH*<sup>2</sup> iii.1, pp. 360–3. Cf. Hope Simpson and Lazenby, op. cit., p. 56, suggesting that such important towns in Attica as Marathon and Eleusis 'were deliberately omitted in order to project the synoecism back into the heroic past', and Giovannini, op. cit., p. 26, taking Homer's description of Attica as conclusive proof of the Catalogue's late origin.



evidence on this is in one way or another connected with Megara.<sup>42</sup> It is reasonable to suggest that if there was indeed some Athenian interference with the Catalogue, other Greek states would not have passed this over in silence. However, when arguing this, we virtually presume that Athens was the only Greek state to profit from the 'recension', and this is not what comparison with the Hesiodic version shows us. Note that in Homer the state that possesses the greatest part of the Hesiodic Ajax's dominions is Argos. Now, if we take the Hesiodic picture as a starting-point, we shall see that Argos' possessions have not simply been enlarged: in fact, they have been brought into correspondence with this state's reported sphere of influence under king Pheidon in the seventh century B.C.<sup>43</sup> Since Strabo describes Argos' expansions under Pheidon as restoration of the 'lot of Temenus', it can be inferred that these also were (or were claimed to have been) Argos' domains under this first Dorian king.<sup>44</sup> As we proceed, it will become clear that from the Corinthian point of view as well the political situation fixed in the Homeric Catalogue is much more satisfactory than it would have been if Corinth had been coupled with the rival state of Megara as in 'Hesiod',<sup>45</sup> or dominated by an actually existing power as would have happened if it had been transferred to Argos together with the other dominions of the Hesiodic Ajax. Corinth's position in the Catalogue of Ships, where it is presented as a vassal of the antiquarian empire of Agamemnon that had long ago ceased to exist, is free from such unpleasant political implications. Moreover, this position is also historically consistent: according to the Corinthian claim, the Dorian Corinth was founded not by a Temenid but by a Heraclid Aletes who was not related to the Argive house of Temenus.<sup>46</sup> Accordingly, of all the towns on the list, Corinth is the only one not associated with the 'lot of Temenus', a situation reflected in the Homeric map.

Now if Argos is satisfied in that it finds the 'lot of Temenus' restored in the Catalogue of Ships, and if Corinth sees its claim for independent origin supported by Homer, there is no reason whatever why these two states at least should raise their voices against a catalogue in which Salamis is dominated by Athens, Megara is altogether missing, and the synoecism of Attica under Athens has been completed even before the Trojan war. This may well be indicative of the means by which the Athenians were able to achieve wide recognition of their version, the more so as we cannot be sure that Athens, Argos, and Corinth were the only Greek states that would welcome the Catalogue of Ships in its present form. Indeed, presuming that meeting the interests of a large number of Greek states would constitute the safest guarantee of the adoption of the 'revised' version, it seems reasonable to suggest that the revisions in question were not confined to the immediate proximity of Athens. Accordingly, additional anachronisms and inexplicable gaps in the map of the Catalogue may well be due to other instances of this kind of editorial activity.<sup>47</sup>

<sup>42</sup> Davison, *TAPA* (1955), 16–17, and op. cit., p. 239. Cf. also Allen, 'Lang's *Homer and his Age*', *CR* 21 (1907), 18, and *CQ* 3 (1909), 84–5.

<sup>43</sup> See N. G. L. Hammond in *CAH*<sup>2</sup> iii.3, pp. 338–9, cf. Giovannini, op. cit., p. 26.

<sup>44</sup> Str. 8.3.33, p. 358, cf. Hammond in *CAH*<sup>3</sup> ii.2, pp. 694–6, and *CAH*<sup>2</sup> iii.1, p. 715.

<sup>45</sup> Corinth annexed part of the Megarian territory as a result of a series of wars concluded c. 700 B.C., see Hammond in *CAH*<sup>2</sup> iii.3, p. 334.

<sup>46</sup> See Dunbabin, *JHS* 68 (1948), 63–5, cf. Hammond in *CAH*<sup>2</sup> iii.1, p. 722.

<sup>47</sup> To judge from the absence of Messenia, Sparta is the next most probable candidate. The argument that Messenia is not mentioned in Homer because it was a Dorian state is as invalid as in the case of Megara (see above); moreover, it is worth keeping in mind in this context that the Dorian Messenia actually occupied the territory between the Dorian Sparta and Pylos, which was still inhabited by its former population (see G. L. Huxley, *Early Sparta* [London,

As distinct from this, there are no serious grounds for suspecting 'Hesiod's' version to have been fabricated in someone's political interest. Though this version obviously supports the claim of the Megarians that Ajax was originally described as possessing the territory of the Megarid, Megarian responsibility for the Hesiodic version is out of the question for the simple reason that the Megarians had a version of their own for Ajax's entry in the Catalogue of Ships, but, except for the formula *Αἴας δ' ἐκ Σαλαμῖνος*, this version has nothing in common with that adduced in 'Hesiod'.<sup>48</sup> On the other hand, though Greek literary tradition ascribes to Peisistratus the deletion of a line unfavourable to Theseus in the Hesiodic corpus, Ajax's entry in the *Catalogue of Women* is too much at variance with the Athenian interest to be considered to have undergone an Athenian influence.<sup>49</sup> Generally speaking, it is very unlikely that anybody would take a historically sound picture of the north-eastern Peloponnese such as that presented in Homer and transform it into a bizarre Salaminian empire which could hardly have any support in the experience of sixth-century Greeks.<sup>50</sup> This is not to say, however, that 'Hesiod's' picture of Ajax's dominions is in itself geographically or mythologically unreasonable: after all, Salamis, Aegina, the Epidaurian peninsula and the Isthmus do constitute a territorial continuity, and there is also evidence allowing one to link Ajax and his family with the territories in

1962], pp. 31–2 and Hammond in *CAH*<sup>2</sup> iii.1, p. 731 and iii.3, pp. 327–8). This territory, which corresponds fairly well to the blank space on the Homeric map between Nestor's Pylos and Menelaus' Sparta (see Hope Simpson and Lazenby, op. cit., p. 75, Map 4, cf. Str. 8.5.8, p. 368), was densely populated in Mycenaean times (see the map adduced by C. W. Blegen in *CAH*<sup>2</sup> ii.2 between pp. 171 and 172). Hence, we have good reason to ask where the towns and leaders representing this territory are to be found in the Catalogue of Ships. Answering this question exceeds the limits of the present discussion (though the seven Messenian towns of Agamemnon, mentioned in *Il.* 9.149–53 and 291–5, the leaders of one of them falling in battle in *Il.* 5.541–60, and also such passages as *Od.* 21.13–16 and 3.488–9 may be seen as providing at least some of the clues, cf. Hope Simpson and Lazenby, op. cit., p. 89 n. 37), but the very fact of the absence of Messenia from the map of the Catalogue can reasonably be connected with the arbitration on the Salaminian issue between Athens and Megara (probably, in 560s, see Andrewes in *CAH*<sup>2</sup> iii.3, p. 373), for Sparta was the arbitrator who decided in Athens' favour. According to the literary tradition, the Athenians quoted to the five Spartan arbitrators the Salamis entry in the Catalogue of Ships, in which the ships of Ajax had already been placed alongside the Athenian contingent (Arist. *Rhet.* 1. 1375b30, Str. 9.1.10, p. 394, Plut. *Sol.* 10.1); that the deletion of Messenia affected the outcome of the arbitration is indeed a very tempting conjecture. Anyway, the tradition of the Athenian–Megarian arbitration strongly suggests this event as a *terminus ante quem* for the Athenian 'recension' of the Catalogue of Ships (though not necessarily of the rest of the *Iliad*: note that in many respects the Catalogue can be seen as an intrusion on the poem, see e.g. P. Mazon, *Introduction à l'Iliade* [Paris, 1943], pp. 151–6), while the subsequent introduction of the Panathenaic rule was exactly the institution that would give the revised version the unique status of the normative text (on the Panathenaic rule see esp. Davison, *TAPA* 86 [1955], 7–15).

<sup>48</sup> Str. 9.1.10, p. 394 *Αἴας δ' ἐκ Σαλαμῖνος ἄγεν νέας ἐκ τε Πολίχνης / ἐκ τ' Αἰγαιούσσης Νισαίης τε Τριπόδων τε*.

<sup>49</sup> The line in question, *δεινὸς γάρ μιν ἔτειρεν ἔρωι Πανοπηίδος Αἴγλης* (giving the reason for Theseus' abandoning Ariadne) seems to be a quotation from the *Aegimius*, see Hes. fr. 298 M–W. Since Plut. *Thes.* 20 is our only evidence on the Athenian 'recension' of Hesiod, Merkelbach is very cautious in admitting the possibility that not only the Homeric but also the Hesiodic poems have undergone this 'recension', see *RhM* 95 (1952), pp. 41–2 n. 55.

<sup>50</sup> The Calaurian League, united around the cult of Poseidon on the island Calauria in the Saronic Gulf (in historic times belonging to Troezen), is an example of a similar conglomeration. The members of this ancient Amphictiony, originating either in the Bronze or, more probably, the early Iron Age (see A. M. Snodgrass in *CAH*<sup>2</sup> iii.1, p. 670), were Orchomenus, Athens, Aegina, Epidaurus, Nauplia, Hermione, and Prasiae, see Str. 8.6.14, p. 374. Argos became a member of the Calaurian League only in the early sixth century, occupying the place of Nauplia.

question.<sup>51</sup> But if a Salaminian empire similar to that described in ‘Hesiod’ did in fact exist, it is unfamiliar to us. Surely, ‘being unfamiliar’ can hardly be seen as a serious disadvantage in what is supposed to be a reproduction of the political map of Greece at the time of the Trojan war.

*The Hebrew University of Jerusalem*

MARGALIT FINKELBERG

<sup>51</sup> Aegina is the homeland of Ajax’s father Telamon; Ajax’s mother Periboea (or Eriboea) was the daughter of the Megarian king Alcathoos, see Xen. *Cyn.* 1.9, Paus. 1.42.4. The cult of Ajax is attested for Megara, the cult of Telamon for Aegina.