Classical Quarterly 64.2 448–461 © The Classical Association (2014)
doi:10.1017/S0009838814000445

VERSES ATTRIBUTED TO THE *TELEGONY**

The huge differences characterizing the main editions of the Greek epic poets of the Archaic period are well known. The sparse amount of information available poses serious problems; so too does the lack of unanimous acceptance of the same methodological principles with respect to the attribution of a citation to a given author and poem. The case of the *Telegony* is typical: Bernabé lists five fragments,[1] Davies two (only one in common with Bernabé),[2] and West six (four in common with Bernabé, one in common with Davies, and one published by Livrea[3] ten years after the appearance of the editions of Bernabé and Davies). To alert the reader that the attribution of fragments 1 and 2 to the *Telegony* is conjectural and not based on ancient evidence, West attaches an asterisk to them.[4] My aim is to discuss both what certain scholars have taken as one (and, for exactly 110 years, the only)[5] of the two surviving lines from Eugammon's *Telegony*, that is fr. 1 (*PEG* 1, Bernabé = *1 West) = fr. 2 (Allen), and also what appears as fr. *2 in West's Loeb edition.

TELEGONY fr. 1 (*PEG* 1, BERNABÉ = *1 WEST) = fr. 2 (ALLEN)

The Athenaeus passage reads as follows:[6]

καὶ τὸν Ὀδυσσέα δὲ Ὅμηρος πολυφάγον καὶ λαίμαργον παραδίδωσιν ὅταν λέγῃ (η 215)·

* I wish to thank M. Davies, P. Finglass, W. Kullmann, A. Rengakos, M.L. West, and the anonymous referee for constructive comments and criticism; M. Davies also for letting me see his unpublished notes on the *Telegony*; M.L. West also for bringing to my attention his article on Baldr; and audiences at the Classics departments of Cornell and Columbia Universities, where an earlier version of my work was presented.

[1] A. Bernabé, *Poetae Epici Graeci: Testimonia et Fragmenta. Pars I* (Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1987).

[2] M. Davies, *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Göttingen, 1988).

[3] E. Livrea, 'Nuovi frammenti della *Telegonia*', *ZPE* 122 (1998), 1–5, at 2.

[4] M.L. West, *Greek Epic Fragments: From the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries* BC (Cambridge, MA, and London, 2003), x.

[5] See H. Diels, 'Atacta II', *Hermes* 23 (1888), 279–88, at 279, who argued that ἤσθιεν ἀρπαλέως κρέα τ᾽ ἄσπετα καὶ μέθυ ἡδύ (cited by Athen. 10.412d) came from Eugammon's *Telegony*, and in particular from the episode of Odysseus' visit to his cattle in Elis and his stay at the house of Polyxenus. See also T.W. Allen, 'Homerica II: additions to the epic cycle', *CR* 27 (1913), 189–91, at 191, who endorsed this view and printed this hexameter as fr. 2 in his edition of the Cyclic epics. A. Rzach, 'Kyklos', *RE* (1922), 11.2, cols. 2347–2435, at 2432, thought it more appropriate that, since Odysseus' designation as an old man was more at home after his return from Thesprotia in the *Telegony*, it might have come from that particular part of Eugammon's epic.

[6] The text is that of G. Kaibel, *Dipnosophistarum libri xv* (Leipzig, 1887–90 [repr. Stuttgart 1965–6]), 10.412b26–d16, with a few changes according to the edition of S. Douglas Olson, *Athenaeus: The Learned Banqueters, Vol. IV: Books 8–10.420e* (Cambridge, MA, and London, 2008).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000445 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ἀλλ᾽ ἐμὲ μὲν δορπῆσαι ἐάσατε κηδόμενόν περ·
οὐ γάρ τι στυγερῇ ἐπὶ γαστέρι κύντερον ἄλλο
ἔπλετο, ἥ τ᾽ ἐκέλευσεν ἔο μνήσασθαι ἀνάγκῃ
καὶ μάλα τειρόμενον καὶ ἐνιπλησθῆναι ἀνώγει.[7]

ὑπερβάλλουσα γὰρ ἐν τούτοις φαίνεται αὐτοῦ λαιμαργία μετὰ τοῦ μηδὲ ἐν δέοντι τὰ περὶ τῆς γαστρὸς γνωμολογεῖν. ἐχρῆν γάρ, εἰ καὶ ἐλίμωττεν, διακαρτερεῖν ἢ μετριάζειν τὰ περὶ τὴν τροφήν. τὸ δὲ τελευταῖον καὶ τὴν τελειοτάτην αὐτοῦ παρίστησι λαιμαργίαν καὶ γαστριμαργίαν (η 219)·

ὡς καὶ ἐγὼ πένθος μὲν ἔχω φρεσίν, ἡ δὲ μάλ᾽ αἰεὶ
ἐσθέμεναι κέλεται καὶ πινέμεν, ἐκ δέ με πάντων
ληθάνει ὅσσ᾽ ἔπαθον, καὶ ἐνιπλησθῆναι ἀνώγει.

ταῦτα γὰρ οὐδ᾽ ἂν ἐκεῖνος ὁ Σαρδανάπαλλος εἰπεῖν ποτε ἂν ἐτόλμησεν. γέρων τε ὢν
ἤσθιεν ἁρπαλέως κρέα τ᾽ ἄσπετα καὶ μέθυ ἡδύ.

Homer presents Odysseus as well as a greedy gourmand, when he says (*Od*. 7.215–18):

But let me eat my dinner, unhappy as I am.
For nothing is more shameless than the miserable
belly, which orders us to pay attention to it and gives us no choice,
even when we are worn out, and demands to be filled.

For in this passage Odysseus' greed is shown to be excessive, and he offers an unnecessary sententious discussion of his belly; because even if he was famished, he should put up with the situation, or have eaten a modest amount. But his conclusion establishes his extreme greed and gluttony (*Od*. 7.219–21):

Since I feel pain in my heart; but my belly relentlessly
insists that I eat and drink, and makes me forget
all my sufferings, and demands to be filled.

Not even the famous Sardanapallus would have dared to say this. And although he was an old man,

he ravenously consumed boundless meat and delicious wine.[8]

The attribution of the verse ἤσθιεν ἁρπαλέως κρέα τ᾽ ἄσπετα καὶ μέθυ ἡδύ to the *Telegony* is based on the following arguments:

(a) Metrical, dictional, and stylistic considerations strongly suggest that the verse is archaic.[9]
(b) The phrase γέρων τε ὤν that precedes the citation of the verse in question in Athenaeus' text shows that the narrator portrays Odysseus avidly eating enormous

[7] The text of *Odyssey* 7.218 has ἐνὶ φρεσὶ πένθος ἔχοντα instead of ἐνιπλησθῆναι ἀνώγει; cf. *Od*. 7.219 (πένθος μὲν ἔχω φρεσίν) and *Od.* 7.221 (ἐνιπλησθῆναι ἀνώγει), both cited by Athenaeus below. See also n. 13 below.

[8] Translation by Olson (n. 6).

[9] ἁρπαλέως and ἄσπετα are not used in a similar context in Hellenistic and Imperial epic. The possibility that Athenaeus is drawing this line from some parodic epic poem on matters gastronomical must be excluded for the following reasons: (i) Athenaeus regularly names his source and often the work from which he is drawing his citation; (ii) the line cited in Athen. 10.412d cannot come from epic parodists such as Archestratus of Gela (*Hedypatheia*) and Matro of Pitane (*Attic Dinner Party*), because neither the former's didactic (pseudo-Hesiodic) style nor the latter's technique of reshaping his Homeric or Hesiodic model by introducing alterations that 'almost always have some recognizable motivation in humor or grammar' apply to the context of Athenaeus' 'citation'; see A. Sens, '"Τίπτε γένος τοὐμὸν ζητεῖς;": the *Batrachomyomachia*, Hellenistic epic parody, and early epic', in F. Montanari and A. Rengakos (edd.), *La Poésie épique grecque: métamorphoses d'un genre littéraire, Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique* (Geneva, 2006), 215–44, at 228. Metrical considerations are also heavily against such an attribution; e.g. Archestratus 'never allows hiatus after a word ending in a short vowel' (S. Douglas Olson and A. Sens, *Archestratus of Gela: Greek Culture and Cuisine in the Fourth Century* BCE [Oxford, 2000], lxvi). On Matro, see S. Douglas Olson and A. Sens, *Matro of Pitane and the Tradition of Epic Parody in the Fourth Century* BCE*: Text, Translation, and Commentary* (Atlanta, GA, 1999).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000445 Published online by Cambridge University Press

quantities of meat and sweet wine. Given that the only archaic poem in dactylic hexameter where Odysseus featured as an old man was Eugammon's *Telegony*, it is plausible that this verse does come from this epic poem.

However, there are arguments that can be raised against the attribution as follows. First, Athenaeus consistently cites (and sometimes even names) the authors of cyclic epics and other archaic poets as well.[10] A look at 'Athenaeus' in Bernabé's *Index Fontium* shows that he quotes his cyclic or archaic epic source more than thirty times. For example, he names Eumelus or Arctinus as the poet of the *Titanomachy* (1.22c, 11.470b), and he refers to the poet of the *Thebais* (7.317a, 11.465e), the *Cypria* (2.35c, 4.137e, 8.334b, 15.682d, 15.682f), the *Ilias Parva* (3.73e), the *Iliou Persis* (13.610c), the *Nostoi*, and/or the *Atreidôn kathodos* (7.281b, 9.399a). Why would he then abstain from mentioning Eugammon and the *Telegony*, when he regularly does the exact opposite with respect to other cyclic poets?

Secondly, Athenaeus has clearly indicated to his readers that his quotations in 10.412b26–d16 are from Homer at the very beginning of this section (καὶ τὸν Ὀδυσσέα δὲ Ὅμηρος πολυφάγον καὶ λαίμαργον παραδίδωσιν ὅταν λέγῃ). In particular, he has included the verse under discussion within an Odyssean context, after giving two other citations from Book 7 of the *Odyssey* (215–8 and 219–21). When he changes context and author, he makes it perfectly plain by giving the author's name (10.412d17: Θεαγένης δ' ὁ Θάσιος …). The fact that he does not follow this practice with respect to the line ἤσθιεν ἀρπαλέως κρέα τ' ἄσπετα καὶ μέθυ ἡδύ strongly suggests that he regards it as Homeric and, in particular, as Odyssean.

Thirdly, the key point is that γέρων does not designate Odysseus' old age but the disguised Odysseus, who quite often is called a γέρων ('old fellow') in the second half of the *Odyssey* (for example in 14.37, 14.122, 14.166, 14.386, 14.508, 18.21, 18.74).[11] Some of these uses of γέρων are attested within a context pertaining to

[10] This is in accordance with Athenaeus' standard treatment of his sources. On his general reliability, see K. Zepernick, 'Die Exzerpte des Athenaeus in den Deipnosophisten und ihre Glaubwürdigkeit', *Philologus* 77 (1921), 311–63; P.A. Brunt, 'On historical fragments and epitomes', *CQ* 30 (1980), 477–94, at 481; D. Ambaglio, 'I *Deipnosofisti* di Ateneo e la tradizione storica frammentaria', *Athenaeum* 78 (1990), 51–64; G. Arnott, 'Athenaeus and the epitome: texts, manuscripts, and early editions', in D. Braund and J. Wilkins (edd.), *Athenaeus and His World: Reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire* (Exeter, 2000), 41–52, at 41. At times Athenaeus makes mistakes that take the form of omissions, paraphrases, and replacements of part of the original text, though we should be careful to distinguish his own carelessness from that of the epitomist; see R.W. Sharples and D.W. Minter, 'Theophrastus on fungi: innacurate citations in Athenaeus', *JHS* 103 (1983), 154–6; A. Tronson, 'Satyrus the Peripatetic and the marriages of Philip II', *JHS* 104 (1984), 116–26; C. Bréchet, 'Du "grand livre" homérique aux *Deipnosophistes*: exploration d'un *continuum*', in D. Lenfant (ed.), *Athénée et les fragments d'historiens* (Paris, 2007), 321–40.

[11] The way in which the actual text of Athenaeus is phrased in this case is rather misleading. One may think that the γέρων to whom he is referring is none other than Sardanapallus himself, the notorious Assyrian King Assurbanipal, whose name had become closely associated in Greek literature with extravagant luxury and effeminacy. Athenaeus offers an entire passage on the proverbial gluttony of Sardanapallus in 12.528f–530c, in which various accounts of the end of his life and their proper sources are listed. I take γέρων as referring to Odysseus for the following reasons: (i) there is no satisfactory explanation concerning Athenaeus' use of a line with strong Homeric echoes for Sardanapallus; (ii) his old age is related to his effeminacy, the association of food and drink with that old age being only secondary (see *Suda* Σ 121 s.v. Σαρδανάπαλος, Σ 122 s.v. Σαρδαναπάλους, and Σ 497 s.v. καταγηρᾶσαι [Adler]). This becomes obvious in the section which Athenaeus devotes in Book 12 to 'Female-Kings' (12.528e–531a), on which see M. Gambiato, 'The female-kings: some aspects of the representation of eastern kings in the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000445 Published online by Cambridge University Press

excessive eating and drinking (in the hut of Eumaeus and in the episode with the glutton Irus).[12]

Finally, given this, I would like to argue that, under the influence of the formulaic line ἥμεθα δαινύμενοι κρέα τ᾽ ἄσπετα καὶ μέθυ ἡδύ employed for Odysseus and the comrades five times in the Apologoi (*Od*. 9.162 = 9.557 = 10.184 = 10.477 = 12.30), Athenaeus deliberately[13] made one of his banqueters create a line reading ἤσθιεν ἀρπαλέως κρέα τ᾽ ἄσπετα καὶ μέθυ ἡδύ that sounds perfectly Odyssean.[14] Similar context had triggered and facilitated this display of knowledge and poetical virtuosity, since it emphasized the theme of gluttony, which was after all needed in this particular section of the *Deipnosophistae*, given that Athenaeus aimed at highlighting Odysseus' excessive greed.[15] For Odysseus had been presented as a glutton in the very same Odyssean context that he was called a γέρων, namely in Eumaeus' hut. In fact, it is possible that Athenaeus made one of the banqueters use the syntagma ἤσθιεν ἀρπαλέως[16] that is employed in alternate lines in *Od*. 14.109–10 (ὣς φύθ᾽, ὁ δ᾽ ἐνδυκέως κρέα τ᾽ ἤσθιε πῖνέ τε οἶνον | ἀρπαλέως ἀκέων, κακὰ δὲ μνηστῆρσι φύτευεν),[17] where this diction had been employed by the narrator for *Odysseus alone*.

This line of thought even explains Athenaeus' expression γέρων τε ὤν, which has misled a number of scholars who have treated it as an allusion to Odysseus' old age,[18] a theme that could easily have been included in the time frame of

Deipnosophistae', in Braund and Wilkins (n. 10), 227–30, esp. at 230; (iii) Athenaeus gives on a regular basis the source he is employing by author's name and/or work. When he does not know or has no direct knowledge of his source, he explicitly tells his readers (see e.g. 8.336d–e, where he cites twelve lines from Alexis' *The Instructor of Profligacy* on the basis of *On Timo's Silloi* by Sotion of Alexandria) and may at times even indicate the range of his knowledge. Here there is no φησί τις or any other expression indicating a different source than the one he has been employing since the beginning of this passage, i.e. Homer (see also 8.336b).

[12] It should be noted that Eustathius of Thessalonica (*Commentarii ad Odysseam pertinentes*, 2.166.45–2.167.20) cites this entire passage of Athenaeus on Odysseus' gluttony (10.412b–d) in his discussion of the episode between Odysseus and Irus, i.e. when Odysseus is disguised and is called a γέρων, which shows that he considers the entire Athenaeus passage as relevant to that part of the *Odyssey*.

[13] A mistake based on a slip of memory is much less likely because, although ἦσθεν/ἤσθιεν and ἀρπαλέως are attested in subsequent lines in *Od*. 6.249–50 and 14.109–10 respectively, they are separated by entire books from all five attestations of the formula κρέα τ᾽ ἄσπετα καὶ μέθυ ἡδύ; see Bréchet (n. 10), 330–1, though both his other examples in 10.444e and 12.511b are, strictly speaking, of a different sort, since in the former the new hexameter is not forged by Athenaeus but by Hegesander of Delphi (fr. 20, *FHG* iv.417) or his source, and in the latter Athenaeus is substituting one Homeric word with another *within a given expression*.

[14] This explanation is consonant with Athenaeus' practice in quoting Homer. He often cites a word or expression from a given line, then omits the rest of the line and continues with part of the next verse (there are multiple examples: see e.g. 1.9b, 1.10b, 1.14a, 1.24f). He also changes certain expressions when quoting a line or group of lines. A typical example of the latter tendency can be seen in the passage under discussion (10.412c), in which *Od*. 7.218 καὶ μάλα τειρόμενον καὶ ἐνὶ φρεσὶ πένθος ἔχοντα is cited as καὶ μάλα τειρόμενον καὶ ἐνιπλησθῆναι ἀνώγει. On Athenaeus' practice in citing Homer, see Bréchet (n. 10), 321–40.

[15] There is a vivid discussion in the scholia of both the *Iliad* (e.g. A on 8.231, bT on 9.206b, AbT on 20.84a [Erbse]) and the *Odyssey* (T on 7.216 [Dindorf]) with respect to whether certain eating and/or drinking habits are appropriate or inappropriate to the notion of the hero. Athenaeus' line cannot have come from the scholia, since he systematically mentions his scholiastic sources, Aristophanes of Byzantium and Aristarchus being well-known examples; see Bréchet (n. 10), 331–5.

[16] Interestingly enough, κρέα also features in the same Odyssean context.

[17] See also *Od*. 6.249–50 (ἦ τοι ὁ πῖνε καὶ ἤσθε πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεὺς | ἀρπαλέως· δηρὸν γὰρ ἐδητύος ἦεν ἄπαστος).

[18] Most recently A. Debiasi, *L'epica perduta* (Rome 2004), 255 n. 52.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000445 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Eugammon's *Telegony*.[19] Before facing the glutton Irus (*Od*. 18.21–2), Odysseus refers to himself in the following manner: μή σε γέρων περ ἐὼν στῆθος καὶ χείλεα φύρσω | αἵματος. We do not need to assume that Athenaeus changed the Homeric γέρων περ ἐών into γέρων τε ὤν. The standard use of γέρων for the disguised Odysseus in Book 14 (especially when Odysseus is described eating avidly) suffices for the argument presented above. The attestation of the phrase γέρων περ ἐών in an Odyssean context pertaining to the theme of gluttony (this time Irus' gluttony) may have further facilitated the process that I described above.[20]

Kaibel's laconic note 'versus non Homericus' in the critical apparatus of his edition of Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistae* turns out to be quite ironic: the verse is not Homer's but is clearly Homeric, in the sense that I suggest above, and certainly not by Eugammon of Cyrene.

TELEGONY fr. *2 (WEST)

It is now more than ten years since Enrico Livrea suggested that Synesius' letter 148 to Olympius[21] contains a fragment from Eugammon's *Telegony*. Subsequently, M.L. West included it in his Loeb edition of Greek Epic Fragments.[22] In what follows, I intend to examine whether this attribution is correct.[23]

In his letter to Olympius, Synesius presents the peaceful way of life and customs of the farmers and shepherds of the Cyrenaean hinterland.[24] The text to be discussed runs as follows (148.1–66):[25]

Ἀπέλιπον τὴν τάξιν τῶν φόρων. τί γὰρ ἦν ποιεῖν, οὐδενὸς Ἑλλήνων τῶν τὴν Λιβύην ἐπῳκηκότων θέλοντος εἰς τὴν παρ᾽ ἡμῖν θάλατταν ἐκπέμπειν ὁλκάδας; καὶ σὲ δὲ ἀφίημι τῆς συντάξεως· οὐδὲ γὰρ Σύροις ἐπιμελὲς καταίρειν εἰς τὰ Κυρηναίων ἐπίνεια. Λάθοι δ᾽ ἄν με τοῦτό ποτε καὶ γενόμενον· οὐ γάρ εἰμι γείτων θαλάττης οὐδ᾽ ἐλλιμενίζω συχνά, ἀλλ᾽ ἀνῴκισμαι πρὸς νότον ἄνεμον Κυρηναίων ἔσχατος, καὶ γείτονες ἡμῖν εἰσιν οἵους

[19] Since Odysseus had stayed among the Thesprotians for quite a few years, so that Polypoites, his son from Callidice, had reached the required age to take the throne after his mother's death, it is assumed that he returned to Ithaca in his old age. This, of course, does not necessarily mean that this topic was exploited in the *Telegony*, though it may well have featured in an oral **Thesprotis*, in which Odysseus died in his old age in the land of the Thesprotians (perhaps in the manner described in *Od*. 11.134–7 = 23.281–4); on this episode, see the Appendix.

[20] Notice that the reference to Sardanapallus also scans as a hexameter (ταῦτα γὰρ οὐδ᾽ ἂν ἐκεῖνος ὁ Σαρδανάπαλλος εἰπεῖν). With respect to Sardanapallus, the 'naked' reference to the notorious Assyrian king in 10.412d is explained on the basis that his famous self-composed epitaph (see εἰπεῖν ποτε ἂν ἐτόλμησεν) has already been discussed by the wise banqueters in 8.335f–337a. On a comparison between Sardanapallus' epitaph and what is said in the *Odyssey*, see 8.336a–b; on the Assyrian king's gluttony, luxuriousness, and effeminacy, see 12.528f–530c.

[21] See A. Garzya, *Synesii Cyrenensis Epistolae* (Rome, 1979).

[22] West (n. 4), 168, fr. *2. Being (rightly) sceptical about this attribution, West has attached an asterisk to this fragment number (see p. 448).

[23] Livrea also suggested in the same article that Callimachus' *Hecale* fr. 294 Pfeiffer = 49.9–10 Hollis *potrebbe non esser immune da reminiscenze di Eugammone, e perfino preservarne in qualche misura il Wortlaut, omaggio di Callimaco al suo lontano conterraneo*. I will not explore this attribution, since West has (rightly) excluded it from his edition. As A. Hartmann, *Untersuchungen über die Sagen vom Tod des Odysseus* [Munich, 1917], 66, has convincingly shown, Cercyon is a later addition to the Agamedes and Trophonius episode. See also M. Davies, *The Greek Epic Cycle* (London, 1989), 86.

[24] See D. Roques, *Études sur la correspondence de Synésios de Cyrène* (Brussels, 1989), 110–12.

[25] Livrea (n. 3), 2 = *fr. 2 West.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000445 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Ὀδυσσεὺς μετὰ τὴν Ἰθάκην τὸ πηδάλιον ἔχων ἐζήτει, μῆνιν Ποσειδῶνος ἐκ τοῦ χρησμοῦ παραιτούμενος,

οἳ οὐκ ἴσασι θάλασσαν
ἀνέρες, οὐδέ θ᾽ ἅλεσσι μεμιγμένον εἶδαρ ἔδουσιν.

ἀλλὰ μὴ λόγον ἄλλως οἰηθῇς τὸ μηδὲ μέχρις ἁλῶν τοὺς δεῦρο κεχρῆσθαι θαλάττῃ, μηδὲ μὴν ἅναλα διὰ τοῦτο κατεσθίειν ἡγοῦ τὰ κρέα τε καὶ τὰ πέμματα. εἰσὶ γὰρ τὴν᾽ ἱερὰν Ἑστίαν᾽, εἰσὶν ἠπειρῶται παρ᾽ ἡμῖν ἅλες, ἀπέχοντες πρὸς νότον ἔλαττον ἢ πρὸς ἀπαρκτίαν ἡ θάλαττα. τούτους Ἄμμωνος καλοῦμεν τοὺς ἅλας. πέτρα δὲ αὐτοὺς ψαφαρὰ καὶ τρέφει καὶ κρύπτει, ἣν ὅταν ἀφέλῃς ἐπιβεβλημένην ὥσπερ ἐφελκίδα, ῥᾳστώνη πολλὴ καὶ χερσὶ καὶ σκαλίσιν ἀροῦν τὸ βάθος. τὸ δὲ ἀναχωννύμενον ἅλες εἰσίν, ἰδεῖν τε ἡδεῖς καὶ γεύσασθαι. ἀλλ᾽ ὅπως μὴ σοφιστικὴν ἀπειροκαλίαν οἰηθῇς τὸ ἐπεξελθεῖν τῶν ἐπιχωρίων ἁλῶν τῷ διηγήματι· ἥκιστα γὰρ τοῖς ἀγροδιαίτοις ἡμῖν προσιζάνει τὸ φιλότιμον πάθος. ἀλλὰ σὺ γὰρ ἀπαιτεῖς ἕκαστα παρ᾽ ἡμῶν τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν εἰδέναι.

Ἀνέχου τοίνυν ἀδολεσχούσης ἐπιστολῆς, ἵνα καὶ τῆς ἀκαίρου πολυπραγμοσύνης δῷς δίκην. ἅμα δὲ καὶ χαλεπὸν εἰς πίστιν τὸ ἑκάστοις ἀπότροφον. οὐ φαῦλον οὖν ἔργον Σύρον ἀναπεῖσαι περὶ χερσαίων ἁλῶν, ἐπεὶ καὶ δεῦρο πράγματα ἔχω περὶ νεῶν καὶ ἱστίων καὶ θαλάττης ἀνακρινόμενος. οἶσθα γὰρ ὡς ἐγὼ καὶ φιλοσοφῶν ποτε ἅμα ὑμῖν ἐθεασάμην τὸ χρῆμα τοῦτο τὴν θάλασσαν, καὶ πρὸς Φάρῳ καὶ πρὸς Κανώβῳ τὴν μεγάλην λίμνην τὴν λαμυράν. καὶ εἵλκετο ναῦς, καὶ ἀνήγετο πρὸς οὖρον αὕτη, κώπαις ἐκείνη. ἐγελᾶτε οὖν εἰκάσαντος αὐτὴν ἐμοῦ ζῴῳ πολύποδι. οἱ δὲ διάκεινται τὰς γνώμας ὥσπερ ἡμεῖς, ὅταν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐπέκεινα Θούλης ἀκούωμεν, ἥτις ποτέ ἐστιν ἡ Θούλη, διδοῦσα τοῖς διαβᾶσιν αὐτὴν ἀνεύθυνα καὶ ἀνεξέλεγκτα ψεύδεσθαι. ἀλλ᾽ οὗτοί γε, κἂν προσίωνταί ποτε τὰ περὶ τῶν νεῶν ἢ δόξωσιν ἐκεῖνο γελᾶν, ἀνὰ κράτος ἀπιστοῦσιν ὅτι δύναται τρέφειν ἀνθρώπους καὶ θάλαττα· τοῦτο γὰρ μόνην ἔχειν ἀξιοῦσι τὴν μητέρα γῆν τὸ πρεσβεῖον.

Ἐγὼ δέ ποτε αὐτοῖς ἀνανεύουσι πρὸς τὰ περὶ τῶν ἰχθύων, ἀναλαβών τινα κέραμον καὶ προσαράξας πέτρᾳ, ἔδειξα τῶν ἀπ᾽ Αἰγύπτου ταρίχη συχνά· οἱ δὲ ὄφεων πονηρῶν ἔφασαν εἶναι σώματα, καὶ ἀναθορόντες ἔφευγον, τὰς ἀκάνθας ὑποπτεύοντες ὡς οὐδὲν ἠπιωτέρας τοῦ διὰ τῶν ὀδόντων φαρμάκου. καὶ ἔφη τις ὁ γεραίτατος καὶ ἐν τῇ δόξῃ φρενῶν ἐπηβολώτατος, σχολῇ γοῦν περὶ ὕδατος ἁλυκοῦ πιστεῦσαι καλόν τι αὐτόθι τρέφεσθαι καὶ ἐδώδιμον, τῶν πηγαίων τῶν ἀγαθῶν καὶ ποτίμων ναμάτων βατράχους καὶ βδέλλας γεννώντων, ὧν οὐδ᾽ ἂν ὁ μαινόμενος γεύσαιτο. καὶ εἰκότα γε ἀγνοοῦσιν.

οὐ γὰρ σφᾶς ἐκ νυκτὸς ἐγείρει κῦμ᾽ ἐπιθρῴσκον

πελάγους, ἀλλ᾽ ἵππων χρεμετισμοὶ καὶ μηκάζον αἰπόλιον, καὶ προβατίων βληχὴ καὶ ταύρου μύκημα, πρώτης δὲ ἀκτῖνος ἐπιβαλλούσης τῶν μελιττῶν ὁ βόμβος, εἰς ἡδονῆς λόγον οὐδεμιᾷ παραχωρῶν μουσικῇ.

I have neglected the duty to pay tribute, but what could I do? Not one of the Greeks settled in Libya is willing to dispatch merchantmen to your sea. At the same time I release you from your contribution, for Syrians never take the trouble to call at the ports of the Cyrenaica, and if one did by chance come, I should never know of it. As a matter of fact, I do not live near the sea, and I rarely come to the harbour. I have moved up country to the southern extremity of the Cyrenaica, and my neighbours are such men as Odysseus was in quest of, when he steered from Ithaca, to appease the wrath of Poseidon, in obedience of the oracle:

'Men, who know not of the sea, nor eat food mixed with salt'.

But do not think that I am exaggerating when I say that people here do not take to the sea, even for the purpose of getting their salt, nor yet suppose that thus they eat their meat and cakes unsalted. We have, I swear by holy Hestia, at a distance to the south less than that which separates us from the sea to the north, a native salt which comes from the earth and which we call Ammon's salt. It collects under a scab, as it were, of crumbling stone, and when this scab, which conceals it, has been removed, it is easy enough to scoop out the depths with one's hand or with a shovel, and the lumps that you may take up in this manner are salt, pleasant both to look at and to taste. Do not think it sophistical vanity on my part, this account of the salts found in this country. Rustic people such as we are the last to harbour vain glory. But

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000445 Published online by Cambridge University Press

you express a wish to learn from me about everything in my part of the world.

Therefore be prepared for a loquacious letter, that you may pay the penalty for your untimely curiosity. At the same time, what is foreign to anyone is difficult of credence. A Syrian will not easily acknowledge the existence of salt from the earth, very much as people here are hard to convince when I answer questions about ships, sails, and the sea. You may remember that once when I was studying philosophy with you, I looked out upon this very thing, the sea, and the great deep lake which stretches from Pharos to Canopus. One ship was being towed in; another was moving with all sails set; another was propelled by oars. You laughed at me when I compared this last one to a centipede. Now the people here are in the same state of mind as we ourselves, whenever we listen to tales in the world beyond Thule, whatever Thule may be, which gives to those who have crossed it freedom to lie about it without criticism or censure. Even if they admit what is told them about vessels, or only seem to laugh at it, at all events they stoutly refuse to believe that the sea too is able to nourish mankind. According to their idea, this privilege belongs to mother earth alone.

On one occasion, when they refused to believe in the existence of fish, I took a certain jar, and dashing it against a stone, showed them plenty of salted fish from Egypt, on which they said they were the bodies of evil snakes, sprang up and took to flight, for they suspected that the spines were as dangerous as the poison of a serpent's fang. Then the oldest and most intelligent of them all said that he found it difficult to believe that salt water could produce anything good and fit to eat, since spring water, excellent though it be to drink, produces nothing except frogs and leeches, which not even a madman would taste. And yet their ignorance is natural.

'For the onrushing wave' of the sea 'awakens them not in the night' – only the neighings of horses, the bleating of a herd of goats, the cry of sheep, or the bellowing of a bull; then at the first ray of sunshine the humming of bees, yielding the palm to no other music in the pleasure it gives.[26]

I shall argue that the dactylic hexameter οὐ γὰρ σφᾶς ἐκ νυκτὸς ἐγείρει κῦμ᾽ ἐπιθρῴσκον does not come from Eugammon's *Telegony* for the following reasons. First, when Synesius refers to what he considers a post-Odyssean adventure of Odysseus he uses one and a half lines from *Od*. 11.122–3 (= 23.269–70): οἳ οὐκ ἴσασι θάλασσαν | ἀνέρες, οὐδέ θ᾽ ἅλεσσι μεμιγμένον εἶδαρ ἔδουσιν. If Synesius knew the actual text of the *Telegony*, as is taken for granted by those who are eager to accept that the verse οὐ γὰρ σφᾶς ἐκ νυκτὸς ἐγείρει κῦμ᾽ ἐπιθρῴσκον comes from this lost epic, he would not have referred to its content by an Odyssean verse[27] but with a verse of the *Telegony*.[28]

Secondly, the use of the word πηδάλιον ('steering paddle', 'rudder') instead of ἐρετμόν ('oar') (εὐῆρες ἐρετμόν, *Od*. 11.121 = 23.268) covertly indicates that Synesius is hereby employing his general knowledge of the Homeric text with respect to this episode.[29] He is clearly operating on an Odyssean note, since it is very likely that he is mixing expressions such as πηδάλιον μετὰ χερσὶ θεούσης νηὸς ἔχοντα (*Od*. 3.281) with ἐν χείρεσσιν ἔχοντ᾽ εὐῆρες ἐρετμόν (*Od*. 23.268).[30] Conversely, if he wanted to substitute the Homeric word ἐρετμόν with a synonym that was widely employed in later Greek, he would have used κώπη, which he regularly employs in his *Epistles*.[31]

Thirdly, before citing the dactylic hexameter in question, Synesius uses the phrase καὶ εἰκότα ἀγνοοῦσιν, which recalls the Odyssean expression οἳ οὐκ ἴσασι

[26] Translation by A. Fitzgerald, *Letters of Synesius of Cyrene* (London, 1926).

[27] The alternative possibility, i.e. that *Od*. 1.122–3 (= 23.269–70) is a verbatim quotation from an oral, pre-Homeric *Telegony*, is simply untenable.

[28] It is highly likely that Synesius considered the oar story to have been part of the *Telegony*, on which see the Appendix.

[29] The word πηδάλιον is also regularly used by Synesius in the *Epistles*; see e.g. *Ep*. 5.15, p. 15; 5.11, p. 16; 5.15, p. 21 (Garzya).

[30] See *Od*. 11.121: λαβὼν εὐῆρες ἐρετμόν.

[31] See *Ep*. 4.26, 148.38, in R. Hercher (ed.), *Epistolographi Graeci* (Paris, 1873, repr. 1965).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000445 Published online by Cambridge University Press

θάλασσαν (11.122 = 23.269) quoted at the beginning of his letter to Olympius (148.12). This may indicate that he is still within the Odyssean framework set by his initial reference to Homer and that he is, therefore, operating on an Odyssean note.[32]

Fourthly, Livrea makes much of the violation of Naeke's rule,[33] which is regularly followed in the dactylic hexameter of the Hellenistic period, and argues that the verse is archaic. The diction of this line suggests otherwise. In particular, σφᾰ́ς is only attested once in Homer (*Il*. 5.567: μή τι πάθοι, μέγα δέ σφας ἀποσφήλειε πόνοιο) as an enclitic that has probably replaced σφε to avoid hiatus,[34] and is short in quantity. In the extant corpus of archaic Greek poetry it occurs one more time, in the beginning of the verse (*Th*. 34: σφᾶς δ' αὐτάς), and though it is long there, as in Synesius, it does not tell against our suggestion, since it is placed in proclitic position,[35] whereas in Synesius it is not. Conversely, since Synesius' σφᾶς is long, it is rather unlikely to have existed in an archaic verse. Of course, one cannot exclude the possibility that it is Synesius who has substituted an original σφέας with synizesis by σφᾶς, but other dictional issues strongly indicate that the verse is not archaic. In particular, neither ἐγείρω nor ἐπιθρώσκω ever occur with κῦμα as subject in the extant corpus of archaic Greek epic.

Fifthly, since Synesius' ἐκ νυκτός recalls ἐκ νυκτῶν from *Od*. 12.286, it is worth examining the wider context of this Homeric *hapax*. Odysseus, who is with his comrades on the island of Thrinacia, suggests that they should depart immediately because Teiresias had specifically warned him not to eat the cattle of the Sun (*Od*. 11.107–15). Eurylochus argues that it is dangerous to sail away at night, when there are terrible winds that may destroy their ship. He suggests that they should stay ashore, eat what food is left in their ship, and depart at daybreak. Unfortunately, the next day Zeus sends menacing winds that do not allow them to leave the island. Problems arise when they run out of food. Finally Odysseus' advice is rejected and, when he falls asleep, his comrades slaughter and eat the cattle of the Sun (*Od*. 12.279–396). Throughout this entire passage (and even before) emphasis is given to the sound made by the sheep and cattle on the Sun's island, both when Odysseus and his men first arrive (*Od*. 12.265–6: μυκηθμοῦ τ' ἤκουσα βοῶν αὐλιζομενάων | οἰῶν τε βληχήν) and most tellingly when the comrades roast and eat them (*Od*. 12.395–6: κρέα δ' ἀμφ' ὀβελοῖσι μεμύκει, | ὀπταλέα τε καὶ ὠμά, βοῶν δ' ὣς γίγνετο φωνή). Likewise, Synesius' dactylic hexameter is followed by his statement that the people who are ignorant of the sea are only awakened at night by 'the neighing of horses, and the bleating of goats and sheep and the bellowing of bulls' (ἀλλ' ἵππων χρεμετισμοὶ καὶ μηκάζον αἰπόλιον, καὶ προβατίων βληχὴ καὶ ταύρου μύκημα). Seen from this vantage point, Synesius' reference seems to be building on his general knowledge of Homer[36] and in particular of the Thrinacia episode, where equivalent

[32] See below (point 5).

[33] According to this rule, diaeresis after a spondaic fourth-foot is generally avoided.

[34] P. Chantraine, *Grammaire homérique: phonétique et morphologie* (Paris, 1958–63), 1.267.

[35] See J. Wackernagel, *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer* (Göttingen, 1916), 4–6; M.L. West, *Hesiod: Theogony* (Oxford, 1966), 166 on v. 34. The crucial point is that in Synesius' text σφᾶς is not followed by αὐτούς and is, therefore, anaphoric-deictic and not reflexive.

[36] Some of these features are also attested in the story of the Cyclops: (i) the 'they do not know of the sea' motif (9.125–7: οὐ γὰρ Κυκλώπεσσι νέες πάρα μιλτοπάρῃοι, | οὐδ' ἄνδρες νηῶν ἔνι τέκτονες, οἵ κε κάμοιεν | νῆας ἐυσσέλμους, …); (ii) the noise made by various animals (9.166–7: Κυκλώπων δ' ἐς γαῖαν ἐλεύσσομεν ἐγγὺς ἐόντων, | καπνόν τ' αὐτῶν τε φθογγὴν οἰῶν τε καὶ αἰγῶν; cf. 9.439: θήλειαι δὲ μέμηκον ἀνήμελκτοι περὶ σηκούς); (iii) (uninterrupted) sleep (9.150–1: ἐκ δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ βῆμεν ἐπὶ ῥηγμῖνι θαλάσσης· | ἔνθα δ' ἀποβρίξαντες ἐμείναμεν ἠῶ δῖαν); and (iv) movement of a wave (9.147–8: οὔτ' οὖν κύματα μακρὰ κυλινδόμενα προτὶ

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000445 Published online by Cambridge University Press

themes were used. These observations indicate that he has probably made up this verse and that he is still operating with an Odyssean context in mind.[37] Since he is not citing anyone, he gives us this verse without indicating authorship.[38]

Sixth, Synesius never mentions a Cyclic poet by name, nor does he ever cite another line from the Cyclic epics. This observation should not be confused with his knowledge of episodes featuring in the Cyclic epics, as *Ep.* 123.9–10 (*Nostoi* fr. 7 *PEG* 1, Bernabé = fr. 6 *EGF*, Davies = fr. 6 West) shows.

Seventh and finally, Livrea's suggestion is based on his belief that the episode of Odysseus wandering with an oar on his shoulder and his appeasement of Poseidon by means of sacrifices after arriving at a land where people are ignorant of the sea[39] would have been included in Eugammon's *Telegony*.[40] In my view, this is hardly the case, since (a) the episode is absent from Proclus' summary of the *Telegony*, (b) Odysseus performs the sacrifices ordered by Teiresias *after* his return to Ithaca from *his first journey to Elis* and *before* his departure to Thesprotia, and (c) Odysseus' journey to Thesprotia resulted from his *Wanderlust*.[41]

Thus, when measured cumulatively, the evidence marshalled above strongly suggests that the dactylic hexameter of unknown authorship quoted by Synesius does not come from Eugammon's *Telegony*. Discomforting as it is, it may well be the case that not a single verse from this lost epic about Odysseus' post-Odyssean adventures has survived the test of time.

Aristotle University of Thessaloniki CHRISTOS TSAGALIS
christos.tsagalis@gmail.com

APPENDIX

There are strong reasons for suggesting that the episode of Odysseus travelling to the land of the Thesprotians with an oar on his shoulder belonged to an older

χέρσον | εἰσίδομεν). That Synesius also has the episode of the Cyclops in his mind, see the very beginning of his letter (p. 267, 1–6 [Garzya]): ἀμέλει γελῶσιν, ὅταν περὶ αὐτοῦ λέγωσιν, ἡγούμενοι πέρυσιν ἐκτετυφλῶσθαι τὸν Κύκλωπα, καὶ ὡς εἵλκετο μὲν ὑπὸ τῷ κριῷ τὸ γερόντιον, τὸ δὲ κάθαρμα τὴν θύραν ἐτήρει καὶ οὐραγεῖν ᾤετο τὸν ἡγεμόνα τῆς ποίμνης, οὐκ ἀχθόμενον τῷ φορτίῳ, τῇ δὲ αὐτοῦ συμφορᾷ συναχθόμενον.

[37] For comparable phenomena, see M. Davies, 'Poetry in Plato: a new epic fragment?', *MH* 37 (1980), 129–32; M. Davies, 'Tzetzes and Stesichorus', *ZPE* 45 (1982), 267–9. In these two studies, it is convincingly shown that metrical sequences (such as Ἄδρηστον μελίγηρυν in Plato's *Phaedrus* 269a5) or even 'entire hexameters' (Τρώεσσ' οἳ τότ' ἴσαν Γελένας εἴδωλον ἔχοντες), which have been mistakenly attributed to Stesichorus, may have been either created by the author of the ancient source (Plato in the first case) or caused by a combination of various factors such as forgetfulness and misunderstanding of an earlier reference (Tzetzes in the second case).

[38] See the Appendix.

[39] Strictly speaking, the verse in question designates people who live far away from the sea (and are never awakened by the sound of waves) and not people who do not know the sea.

[40] This is a different argument from the first one presented above, for there I tried to show that, even if Synesius thought that the episode with the oar occurred in the *Telegony*, he only had a vague idea of the epic's content, not the actual text. Conversely, here the argument relates to Livrea's belief that the episode with the oar belongs to the *Telegony*, and as a result the line in question may have come from the same context as 'people who are ignorant of the sea'.

[41] For a detailed presentation of this final argument, see the Appendix.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000445 Published online by Cambridge University Press

pre-Homeric Thesprotian tradition, but not Eugammon's *Telegony*.[42] Therefore, I shall try to explain my thesis in considerable detail.

The first argument is that the episode with the oar is not mentioned by Proclus.[43] Critics may argue that other details of the *Telegony*, such as Odysseus' second son by Penelope (Ptoliporthes-Arcesilaus), are also left out by Proclus, whose version is after all a summary. There is, however, an important difference here: there are other features associated with this episode that, cumulatively valued, make it unlikely that the story of the 'Sailor and the Oar' would have featured in Eugammon's epic. In other words, the lack of any reference by Proclus to the episode with the oar must be seen within a reshaping of the content of an older Thesprotian oral tradition, which Eugammon and the *Odyssey* undoubtedly knew.[44] Clement's statement that 'the Cyrenaean [poet] stole from Musaeus the entire Book on the Thesprotians'[45] may be a way of saying that a poetic tradition so old as to be attributed to a legendary figure such as Musaeus lies behind the Thesprotian section of Eugammon's poem. We shall return to this point later: for the time being, suffice it to say that there are reasons for emphasizing Proclus' silence about such an important episode that – according to the *Odyssey* – functioned as the aetiology for Odysseus' journey inland.

The second argument is that, in the *Odyssey*, Teiresias advises Odysseus to perform two sets of sacrifices: one for Poseidon (*Od*. 11.130–1) and one for the rest of the immortal gods (*Od*. 11.132–4). The former must include a lamb, a bull, and a boar (ῥέξας ἱερὰ καλὰ Ποσειδάωνι ἄνακτι, | ἀρνειὸν ταῦρόν τε συῶν τ' ἐπιβήτορα κάπρον), and should take place in the land of the people who are ignorant of the sea, while the latter must be offered *after* Odysseus' return to Ithaca (οἴκαδ' ἀποστείχειν ἔρδειν θ' ἱερᾶς ἑκατόμβας | ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι, τοὶ οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἔχουσι, | πᾶσι μάλ' ἐξείης). According to Proclus' summary, Odysseus performs the sacrifices ordered by Teiresias *after* his return to Ithaca from *his first journey to Elis* and *before* his departure to Thesprotia (313–4 Severyns = § 118 Kullmann: ἔπειτα εἰς Ἰθάκην καταπλεύσας τὰς ὑπὸ Τειρεσίου ῥηθείσας τελεῖ θυσίας).

In order to avoid this obvious contradiction, scholars have come up with two suggestions. First, Merkelbach has argued that an original εἰς Ἤπειρον καταπλεύσας must at some stage have been changed into εἰς Ἰθάκην καταπλεύσας, since (according to his theory of Odysseus' exile) Odysseus could not return to Ithaca after Elis.[46] This

[42] Though essential, this argument is completely independent of all the others that I present above. As such, its rejection would not affect my central thesis, i.e. that fr. *2 (West) does not come from Eugammon's *Telegony*.

[43] Davies (n. 23), 7, rightly reminds us that, since Proclus' summaries have been transferred to the MSS of the *Iliad* to facilitate understanding of Homer's epic, discrepancies with and repetitions of events attested in the Homeric epics had to be removed from them. In this light, the case of the sacrifices ordered by Teiresias is really problematic, for they should have been omitted. In other words, we would have expected an absence of any reference to these sacrifices, which are mentioned in the *Odyssey*. Referring to the sacrifices but omitting their prerequisite (the 'Sailor and the Oar' tale) is extremely awkward.

[44] See A. Ballabriga, 'La prophétie de Tirésias', *Métis* 4 (1989), 291–304, at 298, who points to an interesting association between the funeral rites offered to Elpenor and the 'planting of the oar' motif. See *Od*. 11.77 (πῆξαι τ' ἐπὶ τύμβῳ ἐρετμόν) and 11.129 (πήξας εὐῆρες ἐρετμόν).

[45] Clem. Alex. *Strom*. 6.25.1 (2.442 Stählin) = Eus. *Praep. Ev*. 10.2.7 (1.559 Mras): ἤδη δὲ οὐ τὰς διανοίας μόνον καὶ λέξεις ὑφελόμενοι καὶ παραφράσαντες ἐφωράθησαν, ὡς ἐδείχθη, ἀλλὰ γὰρ καὶ τὰ φώρια ἄντικρυς ὁλόκληρα ἔχοντες διελεγχθήσονται· αὐτοτελῶς γὰρ τὰ ἑτέρων ὑφελόμενοι ὡς ἴδια ἐξήνεγκαν, καθάπερ Εὐγάμμων (Dindorf; Εὐγάμων Clem.; Εὐγράμμων Euseb.) ὁ Κυρηναῖος ἐκ Μουσαίου (B 6 D.–K.) τὸ περὶ Θεσπρωτῶν βιβλίον ὁλόκληρον.

[46] R. Merkelbach, *Untersuchungen zur Odyssee* (Munich, 1969), 147.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000445 Published online by Cambridge University Press

proposal has at least four serious flaws. First, why would this change occur in the first place? Was it a scribal error or a deliberate change? Both alternatives are clearly wrong: the former could not have been the case, since a change of Ἤπειρον > Ἰθάκην is palaeographically implausible. With respect to the latter, even if we assume that this was an emendation introduced by someone who wanted to bring the summary into agreement with Homer, it remains obscure why he would have introduced a change that would be in line with Homer with respect to the first set of sacrifices but *against* Homer as far as the second set is concerned. After all, there were two sets of sacrifices, both specified by Teiresias – one that would take place in the mainland and one in Ithaca after Odysseus' return.[47] Secondly, the word Ἤπειρος is never employed by Proclus, nor is it ever attested in archaic epic, nor is it used before the classical period to designate a wide geographical area in the north-west of the Greek mainland,[48] of which Thesprotia is only one part.[49] Given that Proclus systematically uses the Homeric or archaic versions of place names, it is unlikely that he could have used the word Ἤπειρον instead of Ἰθάκην. Thirdly, it misinterprets the *usus scriptoris*, for Proclus employs the verb καταπλέω ('sail from the high sea to the land', 'put into port', 'put in', or 'sail back') only for arrival by sea *at an island*, so it is much more likely that *here* it designates a journey of return and arrival, namely Odysseus' return to Ithaca.[50] Consequently, it is likely that Proclus would have used the participle ἀποπλεύσας and not καταπλεύσας, if he wanted to designate a sailing-away from Elis to Thesprotia.[51] Fourthly, Merkelbach's suggestion tries to solve one problem, but ends up creating another: since Teiresias spoke of two sets of sacrifices, if Odysseus is presented as going from Elis directly to Thesprotia (according to

[47] *Od*. 11.130–4 = 23.277–81.

[48] The place name Ἤπειρος is attested in Pseudo-Apollodorus' relevant passage (*Epit*. 7.34: πεζῇ διὰ τῆς Ἠπείρου βαδίζων εἰς Θεσπρωτοὺς παραγίνεται καὶ κατὰ τὰς τοῦ Τειρεσίου μαντείας θυσιάσας ἐξιλάσκεται Ποσειδῶνα), but *after* the completion of another set of sacrifices to Hades and Persephone (see *Od*. 10.521–40) that probably take place in Ithaca, and certainly *after* Odysseus arrives among the Thesprotians. In Proclus' version, Teiresias' sacrifices are performed in Ithaca *before* his departure to Thesprotia.

[49] The alternative reading of Ἤπειρον as ἤπειρον, which is, of course, attested in archaic epic with the meaning 'mainland', does not fit so well, for Odysseus is already on the mainland (Elis), so it seems awkward to sail *again* to the mainland. Moreover, designation of a specific place is needed.

[50] Proclus' use of compound forms of πλέω in his summary confirms the abovementioned argument: συμπλεῖν (92–3 Severyns = § 6 Kullmann) refers to Aeneas' journey together with Paris to Sparta, ἐκπλεῖ (98 Severyns = § 10 Kullmann) designates Menelaus' journey from Sparta to Crete, ἀποπλεύσας (104–5 Severyns = § 13 Kullmann) denotes Paris' journey from Sparta to Ilium, ἀποπλέουσιν (129 Severyns = § 26 Kullmann) is used for the departure of the Achaeans from Mysia, προσπλεύσαντες (254 Severyns = § 90 Kullmann) points to the sailing in of the fleet from Tenedos to Troy, ἀποπλέουσιν (266 Severyns = § 95 Kullmann) refers to the departure of the Greek fleet from Troy, ἐκπλεύσας (285 Severyns = § 104 Kullmann) designates Menelaus' departure from Troy, ἀποπλεόντων (291 Severyns = § 106 Kullmann) indicates the sailing-away of Agamemnon's fleet from Troy, and ἀποπλεῖ (309–10 Severyns = § 115 Kullmann) points to a sailing-away journey from Ithaca to Elis. Apart from συμπλεῖν, which is not really relevant to this argument, in all the other cases the meaning is 'sailing away' or 'sailing away towards a place'. The only time that Proclus employs the verb καταπλέω (144 Severyns = § 32: καταπλέουσιν εἰς Τένεδον) he is clearly emphasizing not the place of departure but that of arrival. In particular, καταπλέω designates arrival by sea at an island, i.e. just as is the case with εἰς Ἰθάκην καταπλεύσας (313 Severyns = § 118 Kullmann). With respect to the arrival of the Achaeans at Tenedos, Pseudo-Apollodorus has προσέσχον (*Epit*. 3.23) and προσπλέοντας (*Epit*. 3.26).

[51] See C. Tsagalis, *The Oral Palimpsest: Exploring Intertextuality in the Homeric Epics* (Cambridge, MA, and London, 2008), 87–8.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000445 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Merkelbach's argument) and performs Teiresias' sacrifices there, then the second set of sacrifices will never be offered in Ithaca.[52]

The second suggestion comes from West, in his edition of the Greek Epic Fragments, where he combines some information given by Pseudo-Apollodorus' *Epitome* with Proclus' summary of the *Telegony*.[53] He thus prints the following plot summary with respect to the passage in question: ἔπειτα εἰς Ἰθάκην καταπλεύσας τὰς ὑπὸ Τειρεσίου ῥηθείσας τελεῖ θυσίας. Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα εἰς Θεσπρωτοὺς ἀφικνεῖται <καὶ κατὰ τὰς Τειρεσίου μαντείας θυσιάσας ἐξιλάσκεται Ποσειδῶνα, Ap.>. Thus, we have a summary where two conflicting versions are combined. Since it is, I think, obvious that the same sacrifices (specified by Teiresias) cannot be mentioned twice, we are faced with an insoluble problem. Pseudo-Apollodorus must be used with great caution, for although he may at times offer information that must have belonged to the *Telegony*, this should not make us forget that he is writing a mythological compendium and not the summary of a given epic poem.[54] Each piece of information that he gives us should, therefore, be judged on its own merit. A typical case is, for example, his complete silence about Odysseus' journey to Elis, which was (beyond any reasonable doubt) part of the *Telegony*.[55]

My third argument is that, since, according to Proclus' summary, Odysseus performed the sacrifices specified by Teiresias *in Ithaca*, *before* his departure to Thesprotia, it becomes plausible that the purpose of Odysseus' journey to Thesprotia was altogether different. The fact that Proclus does not mention the reason for this journey has caused a lot of head-scratching, but Ballabriga's claim that Odysseus'

[52] There is one more point to be stressed, though not very much: if the sacrifices specified by Teiresias were carried out in Epirus and the story of the 'Sailor and the Oar' formed part of the *Telegony*, then the journey to Epirus would have included two major episodes, the 'Oar' and the tale of Callidice. This would run *against* the tendency of this epic to have a single focus in each episode: Elis – hospitality of Polyxenus, Thesprotia – Callidice, Ithaca – Telegonus.

[53] See West (n. 4), 166.

[54] See Davies (n. 23), 7.

[55] On the grounds of similarity of content and sometimes diction, M. Davies, *Prolegomena and Paralegomena to a New Edition (with Commentary) of the Fragments of Early Greek Epic* (Göttingen, 1986), 105–6, has argued that Pseudo-Apollodorus and Proclus 'derive ultimately from a common source, and that common source, filtered through an unknown and unknowable number of intermediate abridgements about which it would be futile to speculate further, consists of the Epic Cycle from *Cypria* to *Telegony*'. West (n. 4), 12, asks for caution, 'as Apollodorus has sometimes incorporated material from other sources such as tragedy', but uses Pseudo-Apollodorus to complete Proclus' summaries. Conversely, W. Kullmann, *Die Quellen der Ilias: Troischer Sagenkreis* (Wiesbaden, 1960), 139, 156, and 'Ilias und Aithiopis', *Hermes* 133 (2005) 9–28, at 12 n. 12, does not put Pseudo-Apollodorus on a par with Proclus with respect to the level of accuracy of information included in the actual poems of the Cycle. G. Scafoglio, 'Proclo e il ciclo epico', *Göttinger Forum für Altertumswissenschaft* 7 (2004) 39–57, at 42–4, argues that Proclus had read the actual poems of the Cycle that survived to his day and that Pseudo-Apollodorus also used them from time to time, hence his similarities with Proclus with respect to content and diction (43). It is generally agreed that the sources of Pseudo-Apollodorus' *Bibliotheca* are multiple: see C. Robert, *de Apollodori Bibliotheca* (Berlin, 1873); A. Söder, *Quellenuntersuchung zum 1. Buch der Apollodorschen Bibliothek* (Diss. Würzburg University, 1939); M. Van der Valk, 'On Apollodori *Bibliotheca*', *REG* 71 (1958), 100–68. In my view, there are two important facts that should not be underestimated: (i) Pseudo-Apollodorus never states that he offers the plot of any given epic; (ii) abridgements, bizarre selections (such as the absence of the Elis journey in the relevant section of Pseudo-Apollodorus' *Epitome*), and the addition of minor points (such as Telegonus' lamentation upon his realization that he had killed his own father) should in no way be treated as indications that the episodes or scenes were absent (Elis) or featured (lamentation) in the actual work that is summarized (*Bibliotheca*) and by extension in the *Telegony*, whose content we know from a different, reliable source (Proclus); see Brunt (n. 10), 477–94, at 478.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000445 Published online by Cambridge University Press

wandering is a voluntary one and that it stems from his *Wanderlust* that is reflected even in the hero's false tales in the *Odyssey* (e.g. 14.244–6) seems to me plausible.[56] This scenario solves various problems, including Proclus' clear designation of the reason for Odysseus' journey to Elis (ἐπισκεψόμενος τὰ βουκόλια).[57] We may even argue that Proclus' phrase 'in order to visit his cattle' explains why Odysseus went to Elis, not why he left Ithaca. In the case of Thesprotia, there was no need to do that, since Odysseus' Thesprotian adventure had become so closely associated with Odysseus' post-Odyssean fate that it hardly needed an explanation. In an older Thesprotian tradition, Odysseus may have died peacefully in Thesprotia ἐξ ἁλός ('away from the sea'),[58] as Teiresias had prophesied in *Od*. 11.134. When the myth of Telegonus, which belonged to the typical story pattern 'son kills his father by accident', was added to the older Thesprotian lay and the expression ἐξ ἁλός was reinterpreted so as to mean 'from the sea',[59] Eugammon had to invent a reason for Odysseus' departure from Thesprotia and return to Ithaca. This reason was Callidice's death, which allowed Odysseus to leave the throne to Polypoites, the son he had by her. It therefore becomes plausible that the Thesprotian episode acquired a novel function in Eugammon's *Telegony*, since it was used to create the necessary time lapse for two important developments or innovations introduced by Eugammon:[60] the coming of age of Polypoites and Ptoliporthes-Arcesilaus, the two sons Odysseus had acquired by Callidice and Penelope respectively. Both of them were of the utmost importance to the poet of the *Telegony*: the former would succeed to the throne in Thesprotia, the latter in Ithaca

[56] See Ballabriga (n. 44), 291–304. Merkelbach's suggestion that Odysseus went to Elis and then to Thesprotia, because he was exiled after the killing of the suitors (as covertly indicated by the initial phrase of Proclus' summary) is based on his emendation of Proclus' εἰς Ἰθάκην to εἰς τὴν Ἤπειρον. For reasons given above, I believe this exile scenario must be dismissed altogether. It is significant that Pseudo-Apollodorus (*Epit*. 7.40) refers to Odysseus' exile *only* in a version (7.40: εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ λέγοντες) that is clearly distinct from the one pertaining to the *Telegony* (7.34–7); see also Plutarch, *Moralia*, 294 CD (*Aetia Romana et Graeca* 14 = Aristotle fr. 507 R.).

[57] 310 Severyns = § 115 Kullmann.

[58] M.L. West, 'The Death of Baldr', *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 32 (2004), 1–9, at 5–6, puts forward a different possibility, suggesting that the ambiguity of the expression ἐξ ἁλός has resulted from the loss of the key of the story. If this Indo-European narrative pattern of 'exclusive polarities' is employed, it can be argued that 'Odysseus … had been declared invulnerable to anything grown or made on the earth. (Perhaps also to any man born of woman, since Telegonos' mother was a goddess)'.

[59] See (i) schol. *Od*. 11.134 (487.12 Dindorf): Ἔνιοι δὲ κατὰ παράθεσιν, ἐξ ἁλός, οἷον ἀπὸ θαλάσσης … καί φασιν ὡς ἐντεύξει τῆς Κίρκης Ἥφαιστος κατεσκεύασε Τηλεγόνῳ δόρυ ἐκ τρυγόνος θαλασσίας, ἣν Φόρκυς ἀνεῖλεν ἐσθίουσαν τοὺς ἐν τῇ Φορκίδι λίμνῃ ἰχθῦς· οὗ τὴν μὲν ἐπιδορατίδα ἀδαμαντίνην, τὸν δὲ στύρακα χρυσοῦν εἶναι, τὸν Ὀδυσσέα ἀνεῖλεν; (ii) Schol. *Od*. 11.134 (487.23 Dindorf): οἱ νεώτεροι τὰ περὶ Τηλέγονον ἀνέπλασαν τὸν Κίρκης καὶ Ὀδυσσέως, ὃς δοκεῖ κατὰ ζήτησιν τοῦ πατρὸς εἰς Ἰθάκην ἐλθὼν ὑπ᾽ ἀγνοίας τὸν πατέρα διαχρήσασθαι τρυγόνος κέντρῳ; (iii) Eust. *Od*. 1676.43: θάνατος δὲ ἕξαλος ὁ ἠπειρωτικὸς καὶ ἔξω θαλάσσης, ἵνα λέγῃ ὅτι εἰ καὶ δυστυχεῖς ὦ Ὀδυσσεῦ κατὰ θάλασσαν, ἀλλ᾽ ὁ θάνατός σοι οὐκ ἐν αὐτῇ ἔσται ἀλλ᾽ ἔξω αὐτῆς. τινὲς δὲ ἐξ ἁλὸς γράφουσι κατὰ παράθεσιν ἐν δυσὶ μέρεσι λόγου, λέγοντες ὡς Τηλέγονος ὁ Κίρκης καὶ Ὀδυσσέως ἡφαιστότευκτον δόρυ ἔχων, οὗ ἀδαμαντίνη μὲν ἡ ἐπιδορατίς, αἰχμὴ δὲ κέντρον θαλασσίας τρυγόνος, χρυσοῦς δὲ ὁ στύραξ, καὶ ἐλθὼν ἐκ Τυρσηνίας εἰς ἀναψηλάφησιν τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ λεηλατῶν ἀγνοίᾳ τὰ ἠπειρωτικὰ τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως κτήματα καὶ εὑρὼν ἀντίπαλον τὸν πατέρα, ἀνεῖλεν οὐκ εἰδώς. καὶ οὕτω τῷ κατὰ θάλασσαν ἀεὶ κακῶς πράττοντι ἐκ θαλάττης αὖθις ὁ θάνατος, ὃς ἔπεφνεν αὐτόν, καθὰ καὶ Ὀππιανός (*Halieut*. 2.497) ἱστορεῖ, τῷ τῆς τρυγόνος κέντρῳ, ἣν Φόρκυς φασιν ἀνεῖλεν φθείρουσαν τοὺς ἐν τῇ Φορκίδι λίμνῃ ἰχθῦς; (iv) Ps.-Apollod. *Epit*., 7.36: καὶ Ὀδυσσέα βοηθοῦντα τῷ μετὰ χεῖρας δόρατι Τηλέγονος <τρυγόνος> κέντρον τὴν αἰχμὴν ἔχοντι τιτρώσκει, καὶ Ὀδυσσεὺς θνῄσκει.

[60] See Hartmann (n. 23), 71–5.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000445 Published online by Cambridge University Press

after Odysseus' death, the double marriages of Telemachus with Circe and Telegonus with Penelope, and their transfer and subsequent immortalization in Aeaea.

Given this, Proclus' reference to sacrifices specified by Teiresias to be offered in Ithaca *before* going to Thesprotia may be a relic of the older Thesprotian lay. Teiresias' sacrifices had, in the course of time, become so intricately entwined with the Thesprotian episode that reference to them remained even when their prerequisite, the story of the 'Sailor and the Oar', was omitted. As Hansen has shown, the basic point of this story is its aetiological coda.[61] In the *Telegony*, there is no purpose or aim in Odysseus' visit to Thesprotia. In Proclus' summary, the sacrifices specified by Teiresias may have designated only the sacrifices to all the gods, namely only the second set of sacrifices ordered by Teiresias in the *Odyssey*. These sacrifices did not change place (since they were still carried out in Ithaca) but rather changed time. Odysseus' second return to Ithaca (not after Elis but after Thesprotia) was caused in the *Telegony* by Callidice's death and had, therefore, been completely separated from the story of the 'Sailor and the Oar'.[62] Another possible explanation is that, under the influence of the Thesprotian episode, Proclus mistakenly used the expression τὰς ὑπὸ Τειρεσίου … θυσίας, although he wanted to designate the sacrifices that Circe (10.521–5) had told Odysseus to perform in Ithaca (which are also mentioned in Ps.-Apollod. *Epit*. 7.34).[63] This scenario is further strengthened by the fact that both Circe's sacrifices and Teiresias' were connected by their Underworld element, the former due to Hades and Persephone, the latter because Teiresias was in the Underworld. As suggested above, it was the influence of the Thesprotian adventure that facilitated Proclus' mistake.

[61] W.F. Hansen, 'Odysseus' last journey', *QUCC* 24 (1977), 27–48.

[62] G.L. Huxley, 'Homerica II: Eugamon', *GRBS* 3 (1960), 23–8, suggested that Odysseus had performed the sacrifices to Poseidon in Elis and that it was in Arcadia that the tale of the 'Sailor and the Oar' took place. For a refutation of this theory, see Tsagalis (n. 51), 86–7.

[63] See Debiasi (n. 18), 257 n. 74, who postulates ὑπὸ Κίρκης instead of ὑπὸ Τειρεσίου. This argument is different from Merkelbach's change of Ἰθάκην to Ἤπειρον: since a sacrifice *to* Teiresias formed part of the sacrifices which Circe told Odysseus to perform in Ithaca (*Od*. 10.522–5), confusion was facilitated. Debiasi (253–4) also entertains the idea, on the basis of Clement's assertion that Eugammon had stolen the entire Thesprotian Book from Musaeus (*Strom*. 6.2.25.1 = Euseb. *Praep. Ev*. 10.2.7), that the *Telegony* may have contained a Nekyia that would have shared a number of similarities with its Odyssean counterpart. I am very sceptical about this suggestion, whose core was first suggested by E. Schwartz, *Die Odyssee* (Munich, 1924), 140.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000445 Published online by Cambridge University Press