

Maria N. Kazanskaya

## ΙΦΙΑΝΑΣΣΑ: A LOST HOMERIC READING IN LUCIAN?

Nereids play an important part in Lucian's *Dialogi marini*, participating in five of the fifteen dialogues. According to the tradition Nereids were fifty, and their names are preserved in two catalogues of different length and intent: a list of thirty-three names is given by Homer, as Thetis, accompanied by her sisters, performs a γόος anticipating Achilles' premature death, and the lengthy list of names is meant to enhance the significance and the solemnity of her lament (*Il.* 18. 37–49);<sup>1</sup> the second catalogue of fifty names is given by Hesiod, when he speaks of Nereus' progeniture (*Th.* 240–264). It has been suggested that a similar catalogue may have appeared in the epic poem *Aethiopis* in the episode of lament for Achilles, as Proclus in his summary of the poem in the *Chrestomathy* says that the Muses and the Nereids were by Thetis' side as she mourned her son.<sup>2</sup> However, a close look at the *Dialogi marini* shows beyond doubt that in choosing the Nereids for his dialogues Lucian was using the catalogues in the *Iliad* and in *Theogony* and even taking into consideration the placement of the Nereids' names in the two lists. Thus, in the first dialogue, while Galatea's participation (as the object of Polyphemus' love) was indispensable, her pairing with Doris was due to the fact that their names appear in the verse used with minimal change in both catalogues:

Δωρίς καὶ Πανόπη καὶ ἀγκαλειτὴ Γαλάτεια... (*Il.* 18. 45).

Δωρίς καὶ Πανόπη καὶ εὐειδὴς Γαλάτεια... (*Th.* 250).

---

<sup>1</sup> For the discussion of the effect produced by the catalogue of Nereids in *Il.* 18. 37–49, see Edwards 1991, 147–148 (n. on *Il.* 18. 39–49); Tsagalis 2018, 60.

<sup>2</sup> Καὶ Θέτις ἀφικομένη σὺν Μούσαις καὶ ταῖς ἀδελφαῖς (*scil.* Νηρεΐσιν) θρηνεῖ τὸν παῖδα (Procl. *Chr.* 172 Severyns). This suggests that the Nereids accompanying Thetis would have been listed, at least in part, and Neoanalysts consider the catalogue of Nereids in the *Iliad* as derived from the *Aethiopis* (or rather, from the oral version of the *Aethiopis*): see West 2003, 2–5; cf. Kakridis 1949, 66–73; Krafft 1963, 144; Rengakos 2015, 315–317; West 2011, 344; Davies 2016, 20; Currie 2016, 121–126.

In *DMar.* 7 Galene and Panope are chosen for the sake of their names,<sup>3</sup> and both originate from Hesiod's catalogue (*Th.* 244 and 250 = *Il.* 18. 45, respectively). In *DMar.* 12, Thetis (who appears in the Hesiod's catalogue at *Th.* 244) is chosen to narrate the misfortunes of Danae and the infant Theseus, because her personal story, i.e. the loss of her only son under Troy, renders her uniquely suited for a compassionate account of the young mother's plight; Lucian pairs her up in this dialogue with Doris (from *Th.* 250 = *Il.* 18. 45), it seems, in order to counterbalance the pair from *DMar.* 7, Galene and Panope, who appear in the same verses 244 and 250 of *Theogony*. In *DMar.* 6 Amphitrite's appearance is due to her being Poseidon's consort and thus the only Nereid capable of confronting him over Helle's death.<sup>4</sup>

The only name that is found neither in Homer's nor in Hesiod's catalogue of the Nereids is Iphianassa who appears in the fourteenth dialogue: given that her voice in this dialogue is an authoritative one (in particular, she determines that the Nereids will not pursue Andromeda and Perseus), it is obvious that Lucian chose this particular Nereid for her name; still, due to her absence from the two standard catalogues, she stands out among the other Nereids of *Dialogi marini*. What is even more troubling, Lucian is the only ancient author to mention Iphianassa the Nereid. Pseudo-Apollodorus mentions Iphianassa as the wife of Endymion of Elis and the mother of Aetolus.<sup>5</sup> The same Pseudo-Apollodorus names Iphianassa among the three daughters of Proetus and Stheneboeia (*Bibl.* 1. 7. 6).<sup>6</sup> Another Iphianassa appears in Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Post-homerica* as the mother of Menalces by Medon (8. 295–297). Finally, in Homer Iphianassa is the name of Agamemnon's and Clytemnestra's daughter (*Il.* 9. 145 and 287): ancient readers alternatively identified her

<sup>3</sup> Γαλήνη, as her name implies, is associated with a calm sea, and Lucian engages in wordplay with her name when he has Galene explain her absence from Thetis' and Peleus' wedding: ὁ γὰρ Ποσειδῶν ἐκέλευσέ μέ, ὃ Πανόπη, ἀκύμαντον ἐν τοσοῦτῳ φυλάττειν τὸ πέλαγος (*DMar.* 7. 1). Panope, on the other hand, was present and is able to recount in detail the events she witnessed; cf. Bartley 2009, 102: "Lucian opens with a pun by having Panope, whose name implies that she is all-seeing, say straightforwardly to Galene 'Did you see...?' A similar pun on Galene's name follows at 1. 5".

<sup>4</sup> Amphitrite appears twice in Hesiod's catalogue of the Nereids (*Hes. Th.* 243 and 254) and is later mentioned as Poseidon's consort at *Th.* 930. She is known to Homer as Poseidon's wife, but does not appear in the catalogue of lamenting Nereids at *Il.* 18. 37–49 because of her high status.

<sup>5</sup> Ps.-Apollod. *Bibl.* 1. 7. 6; but cf. Paus. 5. 1. 4.

<sup>6</sup> Ps.-Apollod. *Bibl.* 2. 2. 2; Iphianassa the daughter of Proetus appears in Hes. fr. 129. 24 Merkelbach–West and as such is also mentioned by Servius (*Comm. in Buc.* 6. 48).

with Iphigenia (cf. in particular, Lucr. 1. 85) – the third variant of her name would be Iphimede known to Hesiod (fr. 23. 13–26 Merkelbach–West) – or distinguished them as different figures.<sup>7</sup>

Given Lucian's attention to the choice of characters and his skillful use of names to refer to literary models or to suggest new perspectives on a well-known myth, the isolated position of Iphianassa in the *Dialogi marini*, where intertextuality plays an important part, is problematic indeed. There seem to be several possibilities to explain Lucian's use of this particular name.

In their respective editions of Lucian, Macleod and Bartley have suggested that Iphianassa's name was due a mistake of some kind: Macleod thought that Lucian might have remembered it wrongly, or might have been using a faulty text, while Bartley was willing to consider the possibility of Lucian himself mistaking the name or deliberately inventing a different one.<sup>8</sup> However, the idea that the name Iphianassa is due to a *lapsus memoriae* is inconsistent with the attention that Lucian shows to the choice of Nereids throughout the *Dialogi marini*, and there seems to be no reason for his inventing a name for this particular Nereid, while all other names are taken either from Homer's or from Hesiod's catalogue of Nereids. Another solution would be to suggest that the name Iphianassa originated from a different source, e.g. from the catalogue of Nereids that can be reconstructed for the poem *Aethiopsis*. This possibility cannot, of course, be excluded, but this is unlikely: could Lucian expect his readers to recognize a name from a Cyclic poem that was no longer widely read

---

<sup>7</sup> See *Schol. Soph. El.* 157 with reference to the *Cypria*. While the identification of Iphimede with Iphigenia is self-evident from the description of her sacrifice (cf. Solmsen 1981), the equivalence between Iphianassa and Iphigenia is less straightforward, as in *Il.* 9. 145 she is listed among daughters that Agamemnon would be willing to give to Achilles; obviously, this would imply that she was alive at the moment of the offer and that the sacrifice had not taken place. Modern scholars are divided in their approach to the multiplicity of names: Iphigeneia, Iphianassa and Iphimede are identified as one and the same person by Wright 2005, 70 n. 35, Robbins 2013, 227; Iphigenia and Iphianassa are considered equivalent by Nagy 2017, while Hainsworth 1993, 77 notes: "It is likely enough that Iphianassa and Iphigeneia are variants of the same name, but the discrepancies from the later canonical version of Agamemnon's family soon began to trouble genealogists [...] The Homeric names probably reflect an eastern or Ionian, as opposed to a western or mainland, tradition". Kanavou 2015, 145 views the names of Agamemnon's daughters as speaking names that reflect his royal status, and also (for Laodike and Chrysothemis) his willingness to make amends to Achilles.

<sup>8</sup> See Macleod 1987, 255 in his *apparatus criticus*: "noster perperam meminisse vel texto corrupto uti potuit"; Bartley 2009, 156: "it is equally possible that Lucian has misheard the name, invented it or adapted another one".

in Roman times?<sup>9</sup> Alternatively, it would be possible to imagine that Iphianassa might have been mentioned in one of the two *Andromeda* plays (by Sophocles and by Euripides), to which *DMar.* 14 is largely indebted.<sup>10</sup> However, it is fairly certain that neither of them showed the Nereids on stage, and even more importantly, the presentation of the situation from the perspective of the Nereids seems to be Lucian's major innovation in this dialogue, and so the name Iphianassa probably cannot be traced back to Classical tragedy.

I would like to suggest a solution that dovetails with the second part of Macleod's suggestion ("texto corrupto uti potuit"): Lucian was probably using the Homeric catalogue of the Nereids, and his Ἰφιάνασσα is a lost variant reading for Ἰάνασσα at *Il.* 18. 47. The part of the catalogue in the *Iliad* where Ἰάνασσα is mentioned runs thus (*Il.* 18. 42–49):

καὶ Μελίτη καὶ Ἰαιρα καὶ Ἀμφιθόη καὶ Ἀγαυὴ  
Δωτὼ τε Πρωτὼ τε Φέρουσά τε Δυναμένη τε  
Δεξαμένη τε καὶ Ἀμφινόμη καὶ Καλλιάνειρα  
Δωρίς καὶ Πανόπη καὶ ἀγακλειτὴ Γαλάτεια  
Νημερτὴς τε καὶ Ἀψευδὴς καὶ Καλλιάνασσα·  
ἔνθα δ' ἔην Κλυμένη Ἰάνειρά τε καὶ Ἰάνασσα  
Μαῖρα καὶ Ὠρεῖθυια ἐϋπλόκαμός τ' Ἀμάθεια  
ἄλλαι θ' αἱ κατὰ βένθος ἀλὸς Νηρηίδες ἦσαν.

At first glance the verse in which the name Ἰάνασσα appears would seem to be unremarkable but for the pairing of names with a common first root (Ἰάνειρά τε καὶ Ἰάνασσα), a feature not uncommon for epic catalogues.<sup>11</sup> However, there is a certain peculiarity about the formation of the names in that the scansion shows that the digamma was respected both in Ἰάνειρα and Ἰάνασσα, but at the same time, the first root in the two names appears with *ῑ* instead of the expected *ῑ̄*. Obviously, the shortness of the first syllable *ῑ* can be explained by hiatus, and the epic poets seem to have had a certain degree of liberty in their treatment of the compound names with *ῑς* as the first root.<sup>12</sup> However, there is evidence

<sup>9</sup> On the reception of the *Aethiopis*, see Rengakos 2015, 306.

<sup>10</sup> See Bartley 2009, 152–155; cf. Hopkinson 2008, 219.

<sup>11</sup> E.g. the pairing of Ἰπποθόη and Ἰππονόη in Hesiod's catalogue of Nereids (*Th.* 251, a pair that West 1966, 240 *ad loc.* compares with the pair Ναυσίθοος and Ναυσίνοος at *Th.* 1017–1018), as well as Κυμοδόκη and Κυματολήγη at *Th.* 255–256.

<sup>12</sup> Thus, the short *ῑ*- is found in Ἰάνθη (*Hes. Th.* 349; *h. Hom. Dem.* 419); however, the names beginning with the instrumental form of *ῑς* always have the long *ῑ̄*:- cf. Ἰφιάνειρα (*Hes. fr.* 25. 39 Merkelbach–West), Ἰφιδάμας (*Il.* 11. 221 and 234); Ἰφικλῆς (*Il.* 2. 705; *Hes. fr.* 199. 5; etc.), Ἰφίνοος (*Il.* 7. 14) and Ἰφινόη (*Hes. fr.* 129. 24).

that the forms Ἰάνειρα and Ἰάνασσα (and in particular, the short initial vowel ἰ) caused uneasiness among the grammarians, so much so that Eustathius (*ad Il.* 18. 39 et 41 = vol. IV, 134 van der Valk) preserves an interpretation that preferred to derive the names from the verb ἰαίνω rather than from ἰς.<sup>13</sup>

Ἰστέον γὰρ ὅτι εἰσὶ τινὰ τῶν τοῦ ὕδατος, ἐξ ὧν ἐκάστου διάφορα τῶν τινες Νηρηίδων κοινοῦνται ὀνόματα, οἷον τὸ Ἰαιρα καὶ Ἰάνειρα καὶ Ἰάνασσα, ἴσως δὲ ἀκολουθῶς τοῖς δυσὶ τούτοις καὶ τὸ Καλλιάνειρα καὶ Καλλιάνασσα, παρὰ τὸ ἰαίνειν, ἐπεὶ τοιοῦτον τὸ στοιχεῖον εὐφρόσυνον δηλαδὴ πολυτρόπως.

According to Eustathius, Ἰαιρα, Ἰάνειρα and Ἰάνασσα, as well as Καλλιάνειρα and Καλλιάνασσα (that he manifestly segments Καλλ-ιάνειρα, Καλλ-ιάνασσα) derive from ἰαίνω: needless to say, this explanation violates the basic principles of compound name formation (this is glaring in the case of Καλλιάνειρα and Καλλιάνασσα). The reasoning behind etymology preserved by Eustathius may be reconstructed as follows. There could be two reasons behind the reluctance to acknowledge that the names Ἰάνειρα and Ἰάνασσα were compounds: a) the initial ἰ- in the names Ἰάνειρα and Ἰάνασσα is short, whereas if it were a separate root (ἰς), it would be expected to be long to show its distinctness; (b) Homer clearly wished Ἰάνειρα and Ἰάνασσα to counterbalance Καλλιάνειρα and Καλλιάνασσα, hence their formation must be identical; however, as compound names are expected to consist of two roots only, the second part of the names -ιάνειρα and -ιάνασσα would have to consist of a single root. If the names are considered as deriving from a single root ἰαν-, phonetically, the closest guess would be ἰαίνω ‘soothe’, a verb that happened to be suitable both semantically and morphologically. Admittedly, the case was stronger for Ἰάνειρα, than for Ἰάνασσα, but within an analogical framework Ἰάνασσα could be compared, e.g., to βασιλίσσα (βασιλεύω : βασιλίσσα :: ἰαίνω : Ἰάνασσα). Obviously, their resemblance to other feminine compound names, such as Κυδι-άνειρα, Λυσι-άνειρα, Λυσι-άνασσα, etc., had to be brushed aside.

It is clear, from the preservation and the presentation of this etymology in Eustathius, that it must have had, despite its evident deficiencies, an

<sup>13</sup> For modern scholars it is self-evident that the first root of the two names is  $\pi\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ : thus, Edwards 1991, 150 (on *Il.* 18. 47): “Ianeira (also at *HyDem* 421) and Ianassa are both from  $\pi\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ , ‘strength,’ + fem. forms of -άνηρ, -ἄναξ”; von Kamptz 1982, 102 § 34 a 4; Schwyzler 1950, I, 452.

authoritative proponent among Alexandrian scholars;<sup>14</sup> however, a part of the scholarly tradition might have questioned it, rightly interpreting the names as compounds (of the type Λυσι-άνειρα / Λυσι-άνασσα) with ἴς for the first root. Indeed, the derivation of Ἰάνειρα from ἰαίνω and the interpretation of the name as a feminine *nomen agentis* (as suggested by Eustathius) would have run counter to basic linguistic instincts of Greek speakers, even if it did have the advantage of eschewing the problem of the short ρ̄-, as well the issue of the inner form and semantics of the name.<sup>15</sup> With regard to Ἰάνασσα, the dissociation of the name from the noun ἄνασσα would most certainly have appeared improbable to some ancient philologists. Eustathius, as well as his (probably Hellenistic)<sup>16</sup> source, was primarily stressing the parallelism between the composite names Καλλιάνειρα – Καλλιάνασσα (both appearing at the end of the hexameter in v. 44 and v. 46) and Ἰάνειρά τε καὶ Ἰάνασσα of v. 47: they do in fact share a parallel formation, and the choice of the second root points to the social domain rather than to the marine.<sup>17</sup> Now, the name Ἰάνειρα appears elsewhere in archaic poetry,<sup>18</sup> and had to be retained without change, but Ἰάνασσα, which was not attested in the epics and was more difficult to reconcile with the derivation from ἰαίνω, could be modified. I would

<sup>14</sup> Eustathius repeats this etymology at another point of his commentary, as he cites Ianeira as a parallel for the Sicilians' calling the sea "sweet": ὁ καὶ σημείωσαι εἰς τὸ Ἰάνειρα. ὅπερ ὀνομά ἐστι Νηρηίδος ἐν Ἰλιάδι, ταυτοδύναμον τῷ Ἰάνασσα, ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἰαίνω τὸ εὐφραίνω εἴτουν γλυκαίνω (Eust. *ad Od.* 4. 511 = vol. I, 178).

<sup>15</sup> Cf. B. Mader in *LfggrE* 1955–2010, II, 1106, s.v. Ἰάνειρα: "der intendierte Sinn des Namens bleibt dann allerdings unklar (einfach formal analogisch zu Ἰάνασσα gebildet und Bedeutung etwa die starke Männer hervorbringt)".

<sup>16</sup> M. van der Valk 1971–1987, IV, 134 in his *apparatus criticus* notes, with regard to Eustathius' commentary on Μελίτη, "e fonte [...] vox γλυκασμός iam aetate Hellenistica reperitur, fortasse hausta est e fonte". As Eustathius in his overview of the Nereid names groups them semantically, and as the explanation given for the name Μελίτη is contingent with the etymology ἰαίνω 'soothe, rejoice' proposed for Ἰαιρα, Ἰάνειρα and Ἰάνασσα, it is probable that both stem from Alexandrian scholarship. It is worth mentioning that Μελίτη and Ἰαιρα appear side by side in v. 42, and their juxtaposition in Homer's text would have suggested the idea that their names belong to the same semantic field.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Edwards 1991, 148: "seven [names] are suitable for high-ranking women (Iaira, Amphinome, Kallianeira, Kallianassa, Klumene, Ianeira, Ianassa)".

<sup>18</sup> In the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* Ianeira appears in the list of Oceanids who were by Persephone's side when she was abducted: Χρυσήϊς τ' Ἰάνειρά τ' Ἀκάστη τ' Ἀδμήτη τε... (421). Occurrence of the same name in lists of Nereids and of Oceanids is fairly common, as M. L. West has noted (see West 1966, 237 on Hes. *Th.* 241): for example, in the same list of Persephone's companions Μελίτη who appeared in Homer and Hesiod as a Nereid (*Il.* 18. 42 and *Th.* 247) appears as an Oceanid in *h. Hom. Dem.* 419.

like to suggest that some scholars might have considered breaking up the symmetry and reconstructing, instead of Ἰάνασσα, a variant that was more viable from the point of view of name formation and metrics, Ἰφιάνασσα, with the first root taken in its instrumental form (cf. the syntagm ἱφι ἀνάσσειν).<sup>19</sup> In *Il.* 18. 47 this change would only involve omitting one of the conjunctions between the two names (preferably τε, so that the verse would probably have read \*Κλυμένη, Ἰάνειρα καὶ Ἰφιάνασσα or even \*κλυμένη Ἰάνειρα καὶ Ἰφιάνασσα).<sup>20</sup> Alternatively, Ἰφιάνασσα might have appeared in *Il.* 18. 47 not as a scholarly correction, but as a scribal *lapsus calami* under the influence of *Il.* 9. 145 and 287 where the name of Agamemnon's daughter appeared in the same position at the end of the verse.<sup>21</sup>

It is important to stress that there is nothing impossible in the idea that Lucian could preserve a Homeric reading that left no other trace in Homeric manuscripts and the papyri. We have at least two other examples when Homer is quoted by Lucian with a variant reading that is not attested elsewhere.<sup>22</sup> Thus, in *Charon*, the ferryman tells the story of how Homer, as he was sailing on his boat, started singing from *Odyssey* 5, conjuring an actual storm around them (Luc. *Char.* 7):

ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἤρξατο ἄδειν οὐ πᾶν αἰσιὸν τινα ᾠδὴν τοῖς πλέουσιν, ὡς ὁ Ποσειδῶν συνήγαγε τὰς νεφέλας καὶ ἐτάραξε τὸν πόντον ὥσπερ τορύνῃν τινὰ ἐμβάλων τὴν τρίαῖναν καὶ πάσας τὰς θυέλλας ὠρόθυνε καὶ ἄλλα πολλά, κυκῶν τὴν θάλατταν ὑπὸ τῶν ἐπῶν, χειμῶν ἄφνω καὶ γνόφος ἐμπεσὼν ὀλίγου δεῖν περιέτρεψεν ἡμῖν τὴν ναῦν· ὅτε περ καὶ ναυτιάσας ἐκεῖνος ἀπήμεσε τῶν ραψωδιῶν τὰς πολλὰς αὐτῇ Σκύλλῃ καὶ Χαρύβδει καὶ Κύκλωπι...

<sup>19</sup> Thus, Chantraine 1968–1977, 469, s.v. 1 ἱς : “[ἱς] s’emploie à l’instrumental ἱφι avec les verbes ἀνάσσειν, μαχέσθαι, δαμῆναι, et le participe κτάμενος”, and von Kamptz 1982, 85, § 29 b 1. The expression ἱφι ἀνάσσειν occurs at *Il.* 1. 38 and 452; 6. 478; *Od.* 11. 284; 17. 443; for a similar name formation, cf. the masculine name Ἰφιδάμας based on ἱφι δαμάζειν (cf. *Il.* 19. 417; 21. 208; *Od.* 18. 57 and 156).

<sup>20</sup> As for the non-observance of the digamma before Iphianassa's name in this reconstruction of the verse, cf. the list of Agamemnon daughters, Χρυσόθεμις καὶ Λαοδίκη καὶ Ἰφιάνασσα (*Il.* 9. 145 = 9. 287).

<sup>21</sup> Naturally, scholarly corrections and genuine variants are not always easy to distinguish (see recently Montanari 2015, with discussion of earlier scholarship on the subject).

<sup>22</sup> These examples were discovered through a thorough search of the *apparatus criticus* of M. L. West's editions of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* (West 1998–2000 and West 2017); a thorough search of Lucian's *œuvre* for the accuracy of Homeric quotations might yield other examples.



The passage is a close rendering in prose, though peppered with expressions from Homer, of the description of the sea-storm in which Odysseus almost perished (*Od.* 5. 291–293):

ὥς εἰπὼν σύναγεν νεφέλας, ἐτάραξε δὲ πόντον  
χερσὶ τρίαιναν ἐλών· πάσας δ' ὀρόθυνεν ἀέλλας  
παντοίων ἀνέμων ...

After the exactness with which verses 291–292 are rendered,<sup>23</sup> it is startling to see Lucian deviate from Homer's text, as we know it, in *πάσας τὰς θυέλλας ὠρόθυνε* (cf. *ὀρόθυνεν ἀέλλας* in *Od.* 5. 292). However, in Homer *θύελλα* and *ἄελλα* function as semantically equivalent metrical variants,<sup>24</sup> and as the modification of expression in Lucian entailed no change of content, M. L. West suggested in his *apparatus criticus* that Lucian's copy of Homer might have read *ὀρόθυνε θυέλλας*.<sup>25</sup> This is indeed quite likely: Charon in this episode is depicted as eagerly picking up and storing away in his memory verses that Homer “vomited” (*ἀπήμεσε*), and while the addition of *ὥσπερ τορύνην τινὰ ἐμβαλὼν* would characterize him as an enthusiastic, but unrefined audience, the change of Homer's *πάσας δ' ὀρόθυνεν ἀέλλας* to *πάσας τὰς θυέλλας ὠρόθυνε* does not seem to be deliberate.<sup>26</sup>

An even more straightforward example occurs in *De saltatione* 23,<sup>27</sup> as Lucian quotes Polydamas' speech from *Iliad* 13 to show that even Homer considered the dance *ἀμύμων*:

ὁ μὲν γὰρ Ὅμηρος τὰ ἥδιστα καὶ κάλλιστα καταλέγων, ὕπνον καὶ φιλότητα καὶ μολπὴν καὶ ὄρχησιν, μόνην ταύτην ἀμύμονα ὠνόμασεν, προσμαρτυρήσας νῆ Δία καὶ τὸ ἡδὺ τῇ μολπῇ, ἅπερ ἀμφοτέρω τῇ ὀρχηστικῇ πρόσσεστιν, καὶ ᾧδῃ γλυκερὰ καὶ ὀρχησμοῦ ἀμύμων, ὃν σὺ νῦν μωμᾶσθαι ἐπινοεῖς. καὶ πάλιν ἐν ἐτέρῳ μέρει τῆς ποιήσεως·

<sup>23</sup> Cf. *συνήγαγε τὰς νεφέλας*, cf. *σύναγεν νεφέλας* in Homer; *ἐτάραξε τὸν πόντον*, cf. *ἐτάραξε δὲ πόντον*; Homer's *χερσὶ τρίαιναν ἐλών* is amplified by a humorous simile *ὥσπερ τορύνην τινὰ ἐμβαλὼν τὴν τρίαιναν*.

<sup>24</sup> The noun *θύελλα* was used after words ending with a short vowel, and *ἄελλα* used after words ending in a consonant or sonant: cf. *ἴσος ἀέλλη* (*Il.* 11. 297; 12. 40), but *ἀνέμοιο θυέλλα* (*Il.* 6. 346; 12. 263, etc.), *φέρειν πόντονδε θυέλλα* (*Od.* 10. 48). The noun *ἄελλα* could also appear when there was need of shortening the long ending of the preceding word: cf. *ἀναρπάξασαι ἄελλαι* (*Od.* 8. 409), but *ἀναρπάξασα θυέλλα* (*Od.* 4. 515; 5. 419).

<sup>25</sup> West 2017, 111: “*ὀρόθυνε θυέλλας* fort. legit Luc.”

<sup>26</sup> On this passage, see Kim 2010, 16.

<sup>27</sup> Lucian's authorship of the dialogue *De saltatione* has sometimes been doubted, but see Anderson 1977.



ἄλλω μὲν γὰρ ἔδωκε θεὸς πολέμηϊα ἔργα,  
 ἄλλω δ' ὀρχηστὺν τε καὶ ἱμερόεσσαν ἀοιδὴν.  
 ἱμερόεσσα γὰρ ὥς ἀληθῶς ἢ μετ' ὀρχήσεως ᾤδῃ καὶ δῶρον θεῶν τοῦτο  
 κάλλιστον.

In the phrase that follows the Homeric quotation, Lucian especially insists that it is not simply the dance, but the unison of song and dance that is a divine gift. However, in Homer (*Il.* 13. 730–731) the second hemistich of v. 731 has a different reading:

ἄλλω μὲν γὰρ ἔδωκε θεὸς πολέμηϊα ἔργα,  
 ἄλλω δ' ὀρχηστὺν, ἑτέρῳ κίθαριν καὶ ἀοιδίην.

V. 731 was suspected by ancient scholars of being an interpolation, but the passage, due to its aphoristic nature, seems to have been fairly well known; however, Lucian is the only author to quote v. 731 as he does.<sup>28</sup> In Homer's text the song was separated from the dance (ἄλλω... ἑτέρῳ...); but the remark ἱμερόεσσα γὰρ ὥς ἀληθῶς ἢ μετ' ὀρχήσεως ᾤδῃ shows that Lucian was sufficiently certain of the text he was quoting, so that the idea of a misquotation may be dismissed. In his quotation the second part of v. 731 is replaced with a formulaic expression that is used twice in the *Odyssey* in this exact form and in combination with ὀρχηστὺν: οἱ δ' εἰς ὀρχηστὺν τε καὶ ἱμερόεσσαν ἀοιδίην / τρεψάμενοι τέρποντο... (*Od.* 1. 421–422 and 18. 304–305). The replacement of one formula by a related formula is a phenomenon that occurs regularly in Homeric manuscripts, and it is highly probable that Lucian's copy had a reading of v. 731 that is not attested elsewhere.

These two examples show that the text of Homer used by Lucian did carry variant readings that were not necessarily reflected in the Homeric manuscript tradition, and a variant reading of a similar kind could very well be behind the name of the Nereid Ἰφιάνασσα in *DMar.* 14. The suggestion that Ἰφιάνασσα was an ancient variant reading for Ἰάνασσα in *Il.* 18. 47 does not, of course, mean that it should be preferred over the reading preserved by the manuscripts. Indeed, Ἰφιάνασσα would produce two problems: (a) it would destroy the symmetry between the name pairs Καλλιάνειρα and Καλλιάνασσα (vv. 44 and 46) and Ἰάνειρά τε καὶ

<sup>28</sup> These lines are also quoted by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 4. 133. 2; the text of the quotation corresponds to the Homeric vulgate). V. 731, bracketed by West, was rejected by Aristarchus, but defended by Zenodotus of Mallos (the exegetical scholia even say that he invented the verse); see also Janko 1992, 138. Rengakos 1993, 125–126, referring to Call. *Hymn.* 1. 70–73, shows that v. 731 seems to have been known to Callimachus.

Ἰάνασσα (v. 47) in the Homeric catalogue; (b) it would create a misleading association with Agamemnon's daughter Iphianassa (Iphigeneia). Both points placed the reading Ἰφιάνασσα at a disadvantage with regard to Ἰάνασσα, and, since scholars who defended Ἰάνασσα could also refer to the etymology from ἰαίνω proposed for the name (along with Ἰαίρα and Ἰάνασσα), it is not surprising that the correction left no trace in the manuscript tradition.

If we recognize that Lucian was relying on the Homeric catalogue of the Nereids for the name Ἰφιάνασσα, the divergence from the form Ἰάνασσα being due to a variant reading in his copy, the choice of the name might have had a polemic side to it. While Lucian was certainly looking for a name that would indicate her authority among her sisters, Iphianassa is the only Nereid in the *Dialogi marini* that can be traced back exclusively to the Homeric catalogue of the Nereids (Doris appearing in both catalogues). Lucian might have indicated, by his choice of the name Ἰφιάνασσα, his trust in the authenticity of Homer's catalogue against Zenodotus and Aristarchus who had proposed to athetize the list of Nereids altogether on the grounds that it was 'Hesiodic in character':<sup>29</sup> after all, in his imagined conversation with Homer in the *True Histories*, Lucian asks Homer whether the verses athetized by Alexandrian scholars had been written by him, and the poet replies that all lines were his.<sup>30</sup>

Maria N. Kazanskaya

*Institute for Linguistic Studies, RAS*

subura@mail.ru

### Bibliography

- G. Anderson, "Lucian and the Authorship of *De saltatione*", *GRBS* 18 (1977) 275–286.  
 A. N. Bartley (ed., comm.), *Lucian's Dialogi Marini* (Newcastle upon Tyne 2009).  
 P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque : histoire des mots* (Paris 1968–1977).

<sup>29</sup> *Schol. A ad Il.* 18. 39–49: Ὁ τῶν Νηρείδων χορὸς προηθήτηται καὶ παρὰ Ζηνοδότῳ ὥς Ἡσιόδ<ε>ιον ἔχων χαρακτήρα· Ὅμηρος γὰρ κατὰ τὸ κοινὸν Μούσας λέγει καὶ Εὐλειθυίας, ἀλλ' οὐκ ὀνόματα· γελοῖόν τε ἐξ ὀνόματος προθέμενον εἰπεῖν πάσας, ὥσπερ ἀποκαμόντα εἰπεῖν "ἄλλαι θ' αἱ κατὰ βένθος ἄλδς Νηρηίδες ἦσαν". The phrase καὶ παρὰ Ζηνοδότῳ shows that Aristarchus and his school agreed with this athetesis.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. Luc. *VH* 2. 20: ἔτι δὲ καὶ περὶ τῶν ἀθετουμένων στίχων ἐπρώτων, εἰ ὑπ' ἐκείνου εἰσὶ γεγραμμένοι. καὶ ὃς ἔφασκε πάντας αὐτοῦ εἶναι. κατεγίνωσκον οὖν τῶν ἀμφὶ τὸν Ζηνόδοτον καὶ Ἀρίσταρχον γραμματικῶν πολλὴν τὴν ψυχρολογίαν. For a detailed analysis of this episode, see Kim 2010, 162–168.

- B. Currie, *Homer's Allusive Art* (Oxford 2016).
- M. Davies, *The Aethiopis: Neo-Neoanalysis Reanalyzed* (Washington, DC – Cambridge, MA – London 2016).
- M. W. Edwards, *The Iliad: A Commentary V: Books 17–20* (Cambridge – New York 1991).
- B. Hainsworth, *The Iliad: A Commentary III: Books 9–12* (Cambridge – New York 1993).
- N. Hopkinson (ed., comm.), *Lucianus: A Selection* (Cambridge – New York 1991).
- R. Janko (comm.), *The Iliad: A Commentary IV: Books 13–16* (Cambridge – New York 1992).
- J. Th. Kakridis, *Homeric Researches* (Lund 1949).
- H. von Kamptz, *Homerische Personennamen: Sprachwissenschaftliche und historische Klassifikation* (Göttingen 1982).
- N. Kanavou, *The Names of Homeric Heroes: Problems and Interpretations* (Berlin–Boston 2015).
- L. Kim, *Homer Between History and Fiction in Imperial Greek Literature* (Cambridge – New York 2010).
- Fr. Krafft, *Vergleichende Untersuchungen zu Homer und Hesiod* (Göttingen 1963).
- Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos I–IV [= LfgrE]* (Göttingen 1955–2010).
- M. D. Macleod (ed.), *Luciani Opera IV* (Oxford 1987).
- Fr. Montanari, “Aristarchus’ Conjectures (Once) Again”, in: M. Tziatzi, M. Billerbeck, F. Montanari, K. Tsantsanoglou (eds.), *Lemmata: Beiträge zum Gedenken an Christos Theodoridis* (Berlin–Boston 2015) 119–129.
- G. Nagy, “Iphigeneia and Iphianassa”, *Classical Inquiries* 2017.01.12 (URL: <https://classical-inquiries.chs.harvard.edu/iphigeneia-and-iphianassa>).
- Th. G. Palaima, “Wanaks and Related Power Terms in Mycenaean and Later Greek”, in: S. Deger-Jalkotzy, I. S. Lemos (eds.), *Ancient Greece from the Mycenaean Palaces to the Age of Homer* (Edinburgh 2006) 53–72.
- A. Rengakos, *Der Homertext und die hellenistischen Dichter* (Stuttgart 1993).
- A. Rengakos, “Aethiopis”, in: M. Fantuzzi, Chr. Tsagalis (eds.), *The Greek Epic Cycle and Its Ancient Reception: A Companion* (Cambridge 2015) 306–317.
- E. I. Robbins, *Thalia Delighting in Song: Essays on Ancient Greek Poetry* (Toronto–Buffalo–London 2013).
- E. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik auf der Grundlage von Karl Brugmanns Griechischer Grammatik I* (Munich 1953).
- M. van der Valk, *Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem Pertinentes I–IV* (Leiden – New York – Copenhagen – Köln 1971–1987).
- M. L. West (ed.), *Homeri Ilias I–II* (Munich–Leipzig 1998–2000).
- M. L. West, “Iliad and Aethiopis”, *CQ* 53 (2003) 1–14.
- M. L. West, *The Making of the Iliad: Disquisition and Analytical Commentary* (Oxford – New York 2011).
- M. L. West (ed.), *Homerus, Odyssea* (Berlin–Boston 2017).
- M. Wright, *Euripides' Escape-Tragedies. A Study of Helen, Andromeda, and Iphigenia among the Taurians* (Oxford – New York 2005).

The article examines Lucian's source for the name of the Nereid in *DMar.* 14, Iphianassa (Ἰφιάνασσα). This name does not appear in the two classical lists of Nereids in Homer (*Il.* 18. 37–49) and in Hesiod (*Th.* 240–264), from which Lucian drew the names of all other Nereids of his *Dialogi marini*, and Lucian is the sole ancient source to mention a Nereid by that name. This led scholars to suspect that the name may be due to a *lapsus memoriae* or to Lucian's use of a corrupt text, or that it might have even been invented by him. The article shows that, as with other Nereids, the name must go back to the Homeric or Hesiodic catalogue of the Nereids, and that Ἰφιάνασσα could be due to a variant reading in Lucian's copy of the *Iliad* that had \*Ἰάνειρα καὶ Ἰφιάνασσα instead of Homer's Ἰάνειρά τε καὶ Ἰάνασσα (*Il.* 18. 47). This would not be the only example that Lucian preserves a reading otherwise unattested in the Homeric manuscripts (cf. his quotation of *Il.* 13. 731 in *De salt.* 23 and his rendering of *Od.* 5. 292 in *Char.* 7).

В статье разбирается вопрос о том, на какой источник опирался Лукиан при выборе имени Ифианасса (Ἰφιάνασσα) для nereиды из *DMar.* 14. Это имя не встречается в двух классических каталогах nereид у Гомера (*Il.* 18. 37–49) и у Гесиода (*Th.* 240–264), к которым восходят имена всех остальных nereид в его *Морских диалогах*. Более того, Лукиан является единственным античным автором, который упоминает о существовании nereиды с таким именем: это вызвало подозрения у издателей Лукиана, что он мог опираться на испорченный текст, мог неправильно вспомнить или даже просто изобрести это имя. В статье показывается, что имя Ифианассы должно было восходить либо к гомеровскому, либо к гесиодовскому каталогу nereид и что Ἰφιάνασσα, вероятно, объясняется разночтением в лукиановском экземпляре *Илиады*: \*Ἰάνειρα καὶ Ἰφιάνασσα вместо Ἰάνειρά τε καὶ Ἰάνασσα (*Il.* 18. 47). Это был бы не единственный случай, когда Лукиан приводит гомеровский текст с разночтением, которое не засвидетельствовано в гомеровских рукописях (ср. цитату *Il.* 13. 731 в *De salt.* 23 и прозаическую передачу *Od.* 5. 292 в *Char.* 7).

## CONSPECTUS

GAUTHIER LIBERMAN	
Petits riens sophocléens : <i>Edipe à Colone</i> II	173
WALTER LAPINI	
La chiamarono <i>amplesso rubato</i> (Euripide, <i>Elena</i> 22)	199
VALERIA PETROVA	
The Bronze Horse and the Lifetime of Simon the Athenian	210
CARLO M. LUCARINI	
Textkritisches zu Agatharchides von Knidos und zu Markianos von Heraklea	221
SOFIA LARIONOVA	
Quadrivium in Varro's <i>Disciplines</i>	228
NATALIA KUZNETSOVA	
Ciceros Kritik an dem antonischen Provokationsgesetz	254
BORIS HOGENMÜLLER	
<i>Ameana (?) puella defututa</i> . Textkritische Überlegung zu Cat. c. 41	273
VSEVOLOD ZELTCHENKO	
Le mouchoir de Vatinius (Quint. <i>Inst.</i> VI, 3, 60)	282
MARIA N. KAZANSKAYA	
Ἰφιάνασσα: A Lost Homeric Reading in Lucian?	296
SVETLANA DUBOVA	
Apuleius' Venus and Speech Characterization	308
HANAN M. I. ISMAIL	
Some Insights into Egypt's History under the Reign of Maximinus Thrax (Mid-March / 25 March AD 235 – 10 May AD 238)	320
Keywords	341

---

Статьи сопровождаются резюме на русском и английском языке  
Summary in Russian and English