

Apostolos L. Pierris

ON OECHALIA

Three chiefly districts claimed as their own the renowned city (cf. e.g. Pausanias IV 2, 2-3): the Messenians identified it with Καρνάσιον, the grotto where the Andanian Mysteries were celebrated, second in awesomeness only to the Eleusinian sanctuary, according also to the highly competent Pausanias (IV, 33, 4-5). The ἄλσος was just opposite and above the Stenyclarian plain, near the town Andania. The bones of Eurytus, whose name is always connected with Oechalia in poets and logographers, were kept in Καρνάσιον. Pausanias (*loc. cit.*) presents the Messenian identification of Oechalia as a matter of fact; and he explicitly expresses his approval of the Messenian tradition in IV, 2, 3. Demetrius from Scepsis, with regard to the Homeric passage in the Messenian catalogue about the passion of Thamyris at the pitiless hands of Μοῦσαι, correctly identified the there referred Οἰχάλια with the Ἀρκαδικήν, ἣν νῦν Ἀνδανίαν καλοῦσιν (apud Strabo, VIII, 339). (The Stenyclarian plain was very near the Arcadian boundary, SW and proximately the Megalopolitan area). Strabo himself in VIII, 350, recognizes three homonym Oechaliae and

accepts Andania as the city of Eurytus from whom Thamyras went away when fate overtook his music in Δώριον: αὐτοῦ δέ που (sc. near Δώριον which was said to be ἐν Αὐλῶνι – that is, in the passageway from the Ionian sea to the great Messenian plain - τῆς Μεσσηνίας) καὶ ἡ Οἰχαλία ἐστὶν ἢ τοῦ Εὐρύτου, ἢ νῦν Ἀνδανία, πολίχνιον (notice the double diminutive) Ἀρκαδικὸν ὁμώνυμον τῷ Θετταλικῷ καὶ τῷ Εὐβοϊκῷ (thus agreeing with the *three* main candidatures, as in Pausanias): ὅθεν φησὶν ὁ ποιητὴς ἐς τὸ Δώριον ἀφικόμενον Θάμυριν τὸν Θρᾶκα ὑπὸ Μουσῶν ἀφαιρεθῆναι τὴν μουσικὴν. And so VIII, 360: τὴν δὲ Ἴρην (sc. πόλιν) κατὰ τὸ ὄρος δεικνύουσι τὸ κατὰ τὴν Μεγαλόπολιν τῆς Ἀρκαδίας ὡς ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀνδανίαν ἰόντων, ἦν ἔφαμεν Οἰχαλίαν ὑπὸ τοῦ ποιητοῦ κεκληθῆσθαι. Plinius IV, (7) 15 recenses Oechalia among Messenian cities.

The Thessalians held that Oechalia was in a place called Εὐρύτιον, χωρίον δὲ ἔρημον ἐφ' ἡμῶν ἐστὶ τὸ Εὐρύτιον, πόλις τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἦν καὶ ἐκαλεῖτο Οἰχαλία. This must be the one near Τρίκκη (which Strabo X, 448 gives as one of the candidates); thus the requirement of the passage in the Catalogue respecting the dominion of the Asclepiads in the area was fulfilled, but in an altogether hazardous fashion: to elevate to the glory of the Oechalia, whose fame reaches the Heaven, an insignificant uninhabited location whose unfortune was to be called Εὐρύτιον, is cardinally arbitrary and self-cancelling. I dismiss the candidature therefore unperturbed; in fact it does tell in verity against the Homeric passage in question, the fact

that no better advocacy could be advanced for Oechalia as being located thereabout. Strabo speaking of the Asclepiadic district in the Catalogue notices very indefinitely (IX, 438) τὴν δ' Οἰχαλίαν πόλιν Εὐρύτου λεγομένην ἔν τε τοῖς τόποις τοῦτοις ἱστοροῦσι καὶ ἐν Εὐβοίᾳ καὶ ἐν Ἀρκαδίᾳ (he means the Andamian location, as supra), καὶ μετονομάζουσι ἄλλως (hence no actual place in post-heroic times bore that name), ὃ καὶ ἐν τοῖς Πελοποννησιακοῖς εἴρηται [1].

The Euboic candidature on the other hand possessed a splendid testimonial: Creophylus in *Οἰχαλίας Ἄλωσις* (or *Ἡράκλεια* as Pausanias refers to it) *πεποίηκεν ὁμολογοῦντα τῷ Εὐβοέων λόγῳ*; No doubt in order to connect closely and harmonize the heroic capture of Oechalia, Iole's love, Hercules deification through fire in Oeta, Trachinian traditions and the Heracleia under Oeta. However he did not specify any particular location [2], an omission which Hecataeos the Milesian (1 F 28 Fr.Gr.H) supplied by identifying the city-phantom with a Σκιῶν in the Eretrian district. In fact Stephanus Byzantius, s.v. Ἐρέτρια has: ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ Μελανηῖς ἀπὸ Μελανέως τοῦ Εὐρύτου πατρός. Melaneus (the Dark one), we see from the Messenian tradition Paus. IV, 2, 2, an Apollonian archer, (the Black bringer of death from the Light of the world), came to Camasion, which he called Οἰχαλία from the name of his wife. The parallelisms proceed deeply: as we can further appreciate from the fact that beside this Σκιὰ πολίχνιον Εὐβοίας οὗ τὸ ἐθνικὸν Σκιεὺς (Stephanus Byzantius, s.v. Σκιάς), there was also Σκιάς, χώρα Ἀρκαδίας, καὶ Σκιάτης τὸ ἐθνικόν (*ibid.*),

near and to the north of Megalopolis (Pausanias VIII, 35, 5, who calls it Σκιάδις. There was a Σκίαθις mountain in the Pheneatic district (VIII, 14, 1). [And cf. the island Σκίαθος to the north of Euboea].

Sophocles in his *Trachiniae*, 74; 237, agrees with an undetermined Euboean location by the coast – regularly, as had been noticed in antiquity, following the ancient epic poems, especially those of the Cycle. Apollonius Rhodius, *Arg.*, I, 86 sqq., as is evident from the context, also posits Oechalia in Euboea (with Eurytus localized there, who was given a divine τόξον as a gift by Apollo, but was insane enough then to provoke in contest the divine giver himself). Diodorus adopts the Euboean account, in the relation of the hero's deeds, IV, 37 *ad fin.* That he mentions the Κηναῖον promontory, where Hercules, carrying with him Iole, went after capturing the city, is in perfect agreement with Sophocles, *Trachiniae*, 234 sqq.; 740 sqq.; 979 sqq. They both reflect a cyclic poet, in all likelihood Creophylus. On the other hand, that an *Arcadian* contingent followed Hercules in this exploit and his final adventures outside Peloponnesus (IV, 34), and and that it was instrumental in Οἰχαλίας ἄλωσιν (IV, 37) may indirectly indicate the Peloponnesian position of the event.

Strabo accepts this Euboic one, too, as an Oechalia with its Eurytos. X, 448: ἔστι δὲ καὶ Οἰχαλία κώμη τῆς Ἐρετρικῆς (was there some habitation called Οἰχαλία in the place, after Hecataeus? or did he ignore this? or does Strabo speak in a broad sense?), λείψανον τῆς ἀναιρεθείσης πόλεως ὑπὸ Ἡρακλέους, ὁμώνυμος τῆς <ἐν> Τραχινίᾳ

(as Stephanus Byzantius s.v. Οἰχαλία, who gives the same exactly list but for the exacter Messenia in place of Arcadia, regarding Andania: ἐν Τραχῖνι) καὶ τῇ περὶ Τρίκκην καὶ τῇ Ἀρκαδικῇ, ἣν Ἀνδανίαν οἱ ὕστερον ἐκάλεσαν, καὶ τῇ ἐν Αἰτωλίᾳ περὶ τοὺς Εὐρυτᾶνας. Thus Strabo accepts judiciously all traditions, postulates as many *Oechaliae* (adding a fourth, Aetolian one), in three of whom there must have been corresponding royal Εὐρυτοὶ – those in Messenia and Thessaly by reason of the two Homeric passages, the one in Euboea because of the accounts of the Herculean exploit. This simultaneous affirmation of the various traditions he does deliberately and purposefully, and in opposition to Apollodorus on whom his criticism v. Strabo VIII, 339 and supra. Trusting Plinius, *Nat. Hist.* IV, 12 (21) §64, Oechalia was the old name of Chalcis – this city naturally contending with Eretria over this as well, as in all matters of importance.

Of the *Trachinian* candidature I have spoken disparingly above. A location in Aetolic *Eurytania*, as testifies by Strabo, is supported by the Aristotelian authority. V. Tzetzes, Sch. in Lycophron, *Alex.*, 799: Ἀριστοτέλης φησὶν ἐν Ἰθακησίων πολιτείᾳ (= Fr. 123 (460) Rose, *Aristoteles Pseudepigraphus*) Εὐρυτᾶνας ἔθνος εἶναι τῆς Αἰτωλίας ὀνομασθέν ἀπὸ Εὐρύτου, παρ' οἷς εἶναι μαντεῖον Ὀδυσσέως [3]. A local tradition must be here utilized, as the very extreme scarcity of information regarding the peripheral and rude Eurytanes indicates. But on what else did it rest beyond the synonymy (Εὐρυτος – Εὐρυτᾶνες), there is (and there may have then been not much more) practically no clue to determine. The Ithaca connection (via Acarnania no doubt and the non-island, mainland parts of the Cephallonian and Ithacesian territory) makes a *Messenian* reference easier to understand.

Homer, in *Ilias*, B, 594 sqq. (in the Nestorian catalogue) cannot but think of the Messenian Οἰχάλια:

----- καὶ Δώριον, ἔνθα τε Μοῦσαι
 ἀντόμεναι Θάμυριν τὸν Θρήϊκα παῦσαν ἀοιδῆς
 Οἰχαλίθην ἰόντα παρ' Εὐρύτου Οἰχαλιῆος·
 etc.

Thus it is interpreted by Pausanias (IV, 33, 7) and Strabo (VIII, 538). The former locates it doubtlessly and definitively on the road from Andania to Kyparissia, *ibid.* §§6-7: Ἰόντων δὲ ὡς ἐπὶ Κυπαρισσίας ἀπὸ Ἀνδανίας πολίχνη τε ἐστὶ καλουμένη καὶ ποταμοὶ Ἥλέκτρα καὶ Κοῖος ρέουσι. Τάχα δ' ἄν τινα καὶ λόγον ἐς Ἥλέκτραν τὴν Ἄτλαντος λέγοιεν καὶ ἐς Κοῖον τὸν Λητοῦς πατέρα, ἧ καὶ τῶν ἐπιχωρίων ἡρώων εἶεν Ἥλέκτρα τε καὶ Κοῖος. Διαβάντων δὲ Ἥλέκτραν Ἀχαΐα τε ὀνομαζομένη πηγὴ καὶ πόλεως ἐστὶν ἐρείπια Δωρίου. Πεποίηκε δὲ Ὅμηρος μὲν Θαμύριδι ἐνταῦθα ἐν τῷ Δωρίῳ γενέσθαι τὴν συμφορὰν, ὅτι καὶ αὐτὰς Μούσας νικήσειν ἔφασκεν ἀδούσας· Πρόδικος δὲ Φωκαεύς, εἰ δὴ τούτου τὰ ἐς τὴν Μινυάδα ἔπη, προσκειῖσθαι φησὶ Θαμύριδι ἐν Ἄιδου δίκην τοῦ εἰς τὰς Μούσας ἀυχήματος. Pausanias' description is as normally so vivid that I would easily translate into the actual geography, if I had visited the location; to rest on the usual modern superficialities, themselves resting on inexact maps or unperceptive eyes, is always naïve and shallow. –

Strabo's indefiniteness and misgivings stem from his view that the Nestorian Pylos was in fact the Triphylian and not the Messenian one (see the context). He comments: Δώριον δ' οἱ μὲν ὄρος, οἱ δὲ πεδῖον φασίν, <οἱ δὲ καὶ πόλιν> [4]. οὐδὲν δὲ νῦν δείκνυται (he looks obviously for an appropriate position preferably north, or slightly south at the very most, of

the Neda river; as is also evident by what follows): ὅμως δ' ἔνιοι τὴν νῦν Ὀλουριν ἢ Ὀλουραν ἐν τῷ καλουμένῳ ἀυλῶνι τῆς Μεσσηνίας κειμένην Δώριον λέγουσιν. (No doubt the Messenian *defile or strait* is, as I indicated above, the natural passage leading from the Stenyclarian plains to the Ionian Sea near Kyparissia, which exactly the rail way and road follow even today). αὐτοῦ δέ που καὶ ἡ Οἰχαλία ἐστίν ἢ τοῦ Εὐρύτου, ἢ νῦν Ἄνδανία, πολίχνη Ἀρκαδικόν etc., as above. He is not naturally happy about a single isolated spot by Andania in the interior of the country, which he has to accept as belonging to the territory of the Triphylian Pylos. Since on the other hand Messenia was for him one with Laconia even in the times before the Doric contest, but the Stenyclarian plain could not well be considered Lacedaemonian, he refers it to Arcadia. Presumably he would make (if pressed with Dorion) the area north of Ithome the meeting place of three territorial unities, the Laconic, the Arcadian and that of the Triphylian Pylos. It is strange, though explicable, how much actual truth there is in Strabo's discernements even when they are perverted [5]. For after all the Messenia of the Ionian Sea (the Pylos-kingdom) in Trojan-War times was distinct from the Messenia of Stenyclaros, Andania, Ithome, Pamisos, Pharai and the coastal areas round the Messenian Gulf. But who can doubt where the aboriginal Messenian character was formed and maintained, in close connection with the primeval Lycaeon centered, SW-Arcadia, despite first an Aeolian [6] and then the Doric admixture? And in any case the prime difference regarding testimonial authority in these matters between the wisest Geographer and the ablest and most erudite Perieget is that the latter was an eye-witness, with a most erudite and properly cultivated eye for that matter. —

Dicaearchus' singularly idiosyncratic notion that Homer in B, 594 refers to a fourth unnamed place as the actual spot of the Thamyrian-Musaic ill-starred encounter by ἔνθα τε (v. Stephanus Byz., s.v. Δώριον· πόλις μία τῶν τριῶν ὧν Ὅμηρος μνημονεύει «καὶ Πτελεὸν καὶ Ἐλος καὶ Δώριον». Δικαίαρχος δὲ (= Frg. 61 Wehrli) τέτταρας ταύτας εἶναί φησι, καὶ Πτελέας, οὐ Πτελεὸν τὴν μίαν καλεῖ, κατὰ τὸ πρῶτον τοῦ βίου τῆς Ἑλλάδος βιβλίον), does not contribute in solving our problem: certainly it must be located around Andania in any case. But the location of the atrocious incident in Dorion is highlighted by the account which would make it the place where Thamyris invented the Dorian musical trope; such a divine spark of wisdom was bound to provoke the superior sacred Envy of the Muses; v. the *Epitome* of Stephanus s.v.: Δοσίθεος ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ πόλει φησιν ὑπὸ Θαμύρα εὐρεθῆναι τὴν Δώριον ἀρμονίαν. And the shreds of the major recension may thus be reconstituted in some such way following Meineke: <ἐν Δωρίῳ τ>ῶ περιὶ Μεσσήνην, κα<θά φησι Δοσίθεος, ὑπὸ Θαμύρα εὐρεθῆναι τὴν> ἀρμονίαν καὶ τῆς <πόλεως ἐπώνυμον προση>γορευῆσθαι Δώριον. εἰ<ναι δὲ ταύτην τὸ σύστημα> οὗ πρῶτον ἐν Δελ<φοῖς ἐπίδειξιν ποιήσασθαι (?)...> –

It is very significant that with the Messenian location of Oechalia agrees Homer in a non-catalogue passage, *Odysseia* φ, 13 sqq. Odysseus met Iphitus the son of Eurytus in Orsilochus' house, in Messenia – specifically, as the *Sch.* have ad v. 16: ἐν Φεραῖς, rather Φαραῖς or, with Homer, Φηραῖς or Φηρηῆ. Correctly located, v.

Odysseia γ, 488-9; ο, 186-7, cf. Pausanias IV, 1,4: consult Pausanias' genealogy in IV, 30, 2, who appositely refers to *Ilias*, E, 541 sqq. (As to the form of the name, the tradition gave here Ὀρσίλοχος to both grandfather and the hero in the Troian War, but some grammarians thought Ὀρτίλοχος is the correct form for both – which is followed by Pausanias in so far as the modern recensions are accurate portrayals of the mss. readings; Strabo also reads Ὀρτιλόχοιο in the Iliadic passage, VIII, p. 367 – while an Alexandrian philologist with typical infelicity, called Ὀρτίλοχον the earlier and Ὀρσίλοχον the latter person. Cf. *Sch. T ad E*, 542: ὁ πρόγονος διὰ τοῦ τ, ὁ παῖς διὰ τοῦ σ· καὶ ἐν Ὀδυσσεΐᾳ οὖν διὰ τοῦ τ (as the reference is only to the son of Alpheius there). In *Odysseia's* three *loci cit.* Ὀρτίλοχος is transmitted, with reference to the older prince. No doubt Ὀρσίλοχος must be the name; with Ὀρτίλοχος a dialectal variant).

Odysseus, a mere boy (παιδνός), came a *long way* from Ithaca (v. 20, πολλήν ὁδόν) to demand back what some Messenians had plundered; arrangements should have existed officially between the two regions on chiefs' level enabling Odysseus to ask public retribution (v. 16: ἦλθε μετὰ χρεῖος, τό ῥά οἱ πᾶς δῆμος ὄφελλε) for privately and piratically wrought wrong.

Iphitus was on a comparable mission, searching for twelve lost mares with their mule progeny. The two heroes met in Orsilochus' home, at Φαραΐ, we have seen, in Messenia (v. 15), which was part of wider Lacedaemonia (v. 13); cf. *Sch. ad v.* 13; 15. This is why the area

of the so-called κοίλη Μεσσήνη (the plains by the innermost niche of the gulf opening up to the interior) and the area of the Stenyclarian fields are not recensed in the Catalogue, although the Diocleids are praised in the Iliadic passage mentioned above by the triple incense of enabling genealogy, youth flowering and military prowess. They followed the two Atreid brothers (v. 552). They must have formed a sort of territorial accretion to their dominions, gained by the joint endeavours of Mycenaean power and Lacedaemonian proximity, the *Pelopid-Achaean* conjunction. Thus when Agamemnon desperately seeks Achilles' appeasement, he offers to the gravely offended hero, among other precious gifts, seven towns in this very area, including *Pharae* (*Ilias*, I, 149 sqq.; 291 sqq.), as was meaningfully emphasized by Strabo (VIII, 359). –

Iphitus and Odysseus liked each other with heroic love and exchanged precious gifts in their common host's home, ἀρχὴν ξεινοσύνης προσκηδέος: great Eurytus' bow his son gave to the boyfriend, and he, in his turn, responded with presents of sharp sword and valiant lance. But their relationship was ill starred: Iphitus, searching for the lost or stolen horses reached the Argive plain where, in Tiryns (*sch.* ad v. 22, the Herculean residence), he was atrociously and impiously killed by his very host, the glorious doer of enormities, great Heracles himself, who did keep the splendid herd. *It is only from the Messenian Oechalia that Iphitus could have started his journey in order to visit first the neighbouring Pharae and then Tiryns.* Eustathius is

unexpectedly but gravely misled in adopting unquestionably the Thessalian origin of the Eurytiad, *Comm. in Odysseia* p. 1899.36 sqq.

A further issue on the Oechalian question needs some additional reflection. It concerns the clarification of the Pherecydian account – a crystal clear narration which has typically been entangled in the snares and nightmares of modern confusion. The relation easily proclaims itself through the combination of two passages (FrGrH, 3 F 82):

1) *Scholia* in Sophocles, *Trachiniae*, 354: Φερεκύδης φησιν οὕτως: «μετὰ δὲ τὸν ἀγῶνα (unknown which one; it was said that Eurytus cancelled a promise regarding an ἄθλον and Iole) Ἡρακλῆς ἀφικνεῖται πρὸς Εὐρυτον τὸν Μέλανος τοῦ Ἀρκεσιλάου εἰς τὴν Οἰχαλίαν - ὠκεῖτο δὲ αὕτη ἐν Ἰθώμῃ [accepting Clavier's correction for the impossible *Θούλη*; or, maybe, we may write *Θώμη* or *Θωμαίω*, cf. Strabo IX, 437 on the Thessalic *Ἰθώμη* where it should be read *Θώμαιον*, pro *Θαμαί* with variants, according to *Stephanus Byz.*, s.v. *Ἰθώμη*. The whole or part of the plains north of the mountain Ithome was probably *Arcadian* after the Messenian wars and was so registered by Pherecydes and, much later, Strabo – we have noticed this awkwardness in the latter above. The probable boundary would be the river Valyra (further down called Pamisos), thereby marking what is here required, the Stenyclarian plain, v. Pausanias IV, 33, 4] τῆς Ἀρκαδίας – καὶ ἦται τὴν θυγατέρα Ἰόλην [so I correct pro Ὑλλω; for the continuation in (2), as well as the consonant Herodorian account shortly to be quoted, imply as much, just as the odd uniqueness of the

Hyllian complication in itself] γυναιῖκα· τοῦ δὲ μὴ δόντος Ἡρακλῆς εἶλε τὴν Οἰχαλίαν, καὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς ἔκτεινε. Εὐρυτος [the very likely correction of Müller pro Ἴφιτος, cf. the supporting Herodorean testimony to be adduced in a moment] δὲ ἔφυγεν εἰς Εὐβοίαν». Clearly this Oechalia is the one by Andania; Hercules killed the three sons of Eurytus (Τοξέα, Μολίονα καὶ Πύτιον according to Diodorus, IV, 37 *sub fin.*; Τοξέα, Δηϊόνα and Κλύτιον according to Hesiod, Fr. 26 (*scholia* in Sophocles, *Trachiniae*, 272, vestiges found in papyri vv. 27-31) while Eurytus (with his fourth son Iphitus who according to the Apollodorian *Bibliotheca* II, 128 was the *oldest* son) emigrated to Euboea. That Pherecydes follows a distinct and different tradition from that of Creophylus is evidenced also from the divergent number of sons given by each to Eurytus, v. Schol. Sophocles, *Trach.* 272: Κρεώφυλος δέ, δύο (*sc. υἱούς*)· Ἀριστοκράτης δὲ τρεῖς, Τοξέα, Κλύτιον, Δηϊόνα. But Iphitus must presumably also be counted in the Aristocratean and Creophylian account; unless only the *killed sons* are listed by them. (The Iphitus son of Naubolus – *Ilias* B, 517 sq.; Apollodorus, *Bibl.*, I, 113; Apollonius, *Argon.* A, 207; Orphic *Argon.* 144 – is a distinct person of Phocian pedigree). – With the main features of this account, Herodorus from Heracleia also agreed (FrGrH, 31 F 37) (the treatment would occur in his ὁ καθ' Ἡρακλέα λόγος), as we learn from *Scholia* ad Euripides, *Hippolytus* 545: Ἡρόδωρος δὲ φησιν ὅτι τοῦ τῆς Ἰόλης γάμου προκειμένου τοξείας ἐπάθλου Ἡρακλέα νικήσαντα ἀπαξιῶσθαι τοῦ γάμου. διὸ καὶ κατὰ κράτος ἐλεῖν τὴν

Οἰχαλίαν καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτῆς ἀνελεῖν, Εὐρυτον δὲ φυγεῖν εἰς Εὐβοίαν.

2) The *Scholia* ad Homerus, *Odysseia* φ, 22 give the Pherecydian account of the incident there sung regarding the search for the prize horses and the enormity committed by Hercules. The relevant passage begins thus: Ἴφιτος Εὐρύτου μὲν παῖς, Οἰχαλιεὺς δὲ τὸ γένος, ἀπολομένων αὐτῷ τῶν ἵππων etc. Evidently Pherecydes harmonized in a manner the Messenian and Euboean residences of Eurytus, making the latter the sequel of the former. The connection of the incidents is made explicit: Hercules destroyed Iphitus διὰ τὸ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔχειν ἔγκλημα καὶ τὸν πατέρα, ὅτι τελέσαντι αὐτῷ τὸν ἄθλον τὴν Ἰόλην γαμεῖν οὐκ ἔδωκαν ἀλλ' ἀτιμάσαντες ἀπέπεμψαν. (In fact the sequence of events is stressed evermore by Diodorus IV, 31, where the very rejection of Hercules causes him to drive away the horses in revenge). Pherecydes' weak harmonization of the diverging traditions did not rest, I believe, on a prior conjugating testimony local or poetical, over and above the accounts themselves. (Significantly, the sequence of events in Sophocles, *Trachiniae*, 247 sqq. is, further, different, in that the sack of Oechalia is posited after the servitude under Omphale and not before the murder of Iphitus). In any case the harmonization cannot alter the naturalness of the supposition of a definitely Messenian starting point for Iphitus' fatal search in the Odyssean passage.

Converging streams push the *Iliadic* lines B, 729-33 out of the text. Not that we should not have found included in the Catalogue the region of the northern interior grand plain of Thessaly, the area called Istaetis. Although we should bear constantly in mind that the Homeric geography of (particularly interior and Magnesian) Thessaly (*beyond Othrys, the coast of the Gulf Pagasiticus and southern Pelasgiotis*) is perplexed and uncertain – an about half-way condition between the definiteness in the descriptions of the chief, important Hellenic regions and the obscure anonymity of western mainland Greece. Strabo, noticing the fact with particular reference to the difficulties in segregating the various Magnesian realms, ascribes it to the general continual movements, transformations, and agglomerations of the diverse bodies-politic in the area, IX, 442: εὐόκασιν οὖν διὰ τὰς συνεχεῖς μεταστάσεις καὶ ἐξαλλάξεις τῶν πολιτειῶν καὶ ἐπιμίξεις συγχεῖν καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα καὶ τὰ ἔθνη, ὥστε τοῖς νῦν ἔσθ' ὅτε ἀπορίαν παρέχειν. He proceeds to illustrate the point with two examples, one less, the other, very informatively, more happy.

However, what makes singular the Asclepiadic affair is that at the time of the fundamental formative recensions of the Homeric poems which begun (or were consolidated) with the Peisistratid relevant activity, the Messenians were a virtually lost and insignificant people, of no consequence, contemned and disregarded. It is quite possible that their peculiar traditions on such a mighty matter, to the extent that they might have been reflected more clearly in the Homeric

Epics, were neglected or rejected. Just as the Pythian God himself, when specifically asked by the phyletically interested *Arcadian* of Pausanias whether he begot Asclepius from the *Messenian* maiden, he explicitly discountenanced the claim, simultaneously dissociating the event from the complicated Thessalian incrustation: he in this occasion sanctioned the Epidaurian account (v. my essay *On Asclepius' Parentage, Birthplace and Cult-Localization*).

Finally, Hesiod seems to have upheld the Euboean – or maybe an Oetean location of Oechalia. In his papyrically preserved Fr. 26 (Merkelbach et West), the progeny of Porthaon's daughters (v. 9 Εὐρυθεμίστην τε Στρατονίκην τε Στερόπην τε) is hymned in noble florid strains of unmistakable Hesiodicity. They roved, often abandoning their father's halls and renowned mother, with Nymphs and the (Heliconian) Muses on the mountains of Phocis and Boeotia; *Parnassus, Παρνασσός* (v. 12), being recognized in the shreds. Once, when, glowing in the beauteous spring of their youth, played softly by an ἀργυροδίνης river (Spercheius thinks Lobel, but Achelous, Evenus, Cephissus are more probable candidates if we must concretise the lost piece of the imagery) and collected perfumed flowers for rich wreaths to decorate the head-ornaments of their frame, Apollo intervened and seized Stratonice, for once not for his own sake, but for his son's benefit and pleasure:

v. 22 ----- Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων·

βῆ δὲ φέ[ρ]ων ἀνάε[δ]ν[ον εὐζωνον] Στ[ρ]α[τ]ονίκην,

δῶκε δὲ π[αι]δὶ [φί]λω θαλ[εο]ῆν [κ]εκλήσθαι ἄκοιτιν
 ἀ]ντιθέω Μελ[αν]ῆι, [τὸν οὖρ]ε[σι] πότνια νύμφη

26 Ο]ἰτη[ί]ς Προ[ν]ό[η] (?) -----

It is clear from what is preserved that a mountain nymph *from Oeta* gave birth from Apollo to Melaneus, whom we cannot simply assume as just living there around. From this divinely effected conjugation, Eurytus was born, whose progeny is then recensed in the sequel of the passage. Last mentioned is Ἴολεια, after whom one will restore in the two succeeding verses (32-3) with the editors:

τ[ῆ]ς ἔ]νεκ' Οἰχ[αλ]ίη[ν]
 Ἀμφι]τροωνιάδης

It is clear from the context that the residence of Melaneus is the very Oechalia of the Herculean adventure.

Unless Hesiod explicitly specified the location in the missing portions of v. 26 or 32, Oechalia was left geographically unassigned by him. Something I consider very probable, for otherwise we would normally expect to hear from some source or other his determination in such a vexed, important question. I would further thus explain, the supposition of those who located the mythical city in the region of Trachenia, by Oeta: they inferred from the Hesiodic passage the identity of Oechalia with the Oetean nymphhood of Melaneus' mother. However the Euboean candidature appropriated at least the Melanean fatherhood of Eurytus; v. the above quoted passage from *Stephanus Byz.* s.v. Ἐρέτρια: ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ Μελανηΐς ἀπὸ

Μελανέως τοῦ Εὐρύτου πατρός. So far, the Messenians, too, agreed (Pausanias, IV, 2). They held that Melaneus (a man expert in archery and thus reputed to be a son of Apollo) came with Perieres to Messenia, received from him what was then called Karnasion, but renamed Oechalia in honour of Melaneus' wife. This last detail shows the divergence of the local Messenian from the Hesiodic narration. But an *Oetean* origin consists voicely with an *aeolic* combination. And the Apollonian parenthood is common.

NOTES

[1] It is significant that he faces serious difficulty with Ἰθώμη up there in Thessaly, as well (p. 437): τὴν δ' Ἰθώμην, ὁμωνύμως τῇ Μεσσηνιακῇ λεγομένην οὐ φασιν δεῖν οὕτως ἐκφέρειν, ἀλλὰ τὴν πρώτην συλλαβὴν ἀφαιρεῖν [should we then also read καὶ Θώμην κλωμακόεσαν in the Homeric Catalogue, B, 729 ?]: οὕτω γὰρ καλεῖσθαι πρότερον (sc. Θώμη), νῦν δὲ Θώμαιον (so the corrupt reading must be corrected from Stephanus Byzantius s.v. Ἰθώμη, who mentions the Thessalian form Θούμαιον according to the dialectic

change of ο and ω to ου) μετονομάσθαι, χωρίον ἐρμυνὸν καὶ τῶ ὄντι κλωμακόεν, ἰδρυμένον μεταξὺ τετάρων φρουρίων, ὥσπερ ἐν τετραπλεύρῳ κειμένων, Τρίκκης τε καὶ Μητροπόλεως καὶ Πελινναίου καὶ Γομφῶν. τῆς δὲ δὴ Μητροπολιτῶν ἐστι χώρας ἢ Ἰθώμη - or rather that Θούμαιον. –

Apollodorus upheld, it appears, exclusively the claims of Thessaly, as Strabo's criticism in VIII, 339 entails. He held that when Homer wishes and has the intention to differentiate homonymies he does it explicitly, as with Ὀρχομενὸς Μινύειος (the Boeotian) and Ὀρχομενὸς Πολύμηλος (the Arcadian), or with Σάμος Θρηϊκίη. Apollodorus must have deduced therefore that as Homer locates Oechalia explicitly in the Asclepiadean territory in Thessaly, and as the same expressions occur in the Thamyras-narration, the same location must be meant, and precisely the Thessalian one.

Strabo criticizes him, rather weakly, on the ground that this, and similar views, do not square with Demetrius Scepsius' accounts, from which Apollodorus borrowed most in his explanation of the Catalogue: ταῦτα δ' οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ τοῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ Σκηψίου Δημητρίου λεγομένοις, παρ' οὗ μεταφέρει τὰ πλεῖστα. But this was admittedly *ad hominem*. The real criticism stems from the difference of approach: Apollodorus tends to select, isolate, segregate and oppose information, Strabo to accept as real the diversity of traditions, and to attempt to externally harmonize the variant accounts.

We clearly perceive in this way juxtaposed the diverging traditions and methods of Alexandrianism with Pergamenism. The synthesis of the two is represented by the Syncretic Philology which ensued towards the end of the Hellenistic period and the beginning of the Roman; the task is to organically *unify informations* according to their spirit without doing violence to the essential variance of traditions but with integration of differences into an higher order coordination in each case. The Apollodorian solution lies, on the other hand, behind such Alexandrine-like sweeping generalization as in Stephanus Byzantius s.v. Οἰχαλία: πόλις ἐν τῷ Πελασγικῷ Ἄργει ἦν Ὅμηρος ἐν τῷ Πελασγικῷ Ἄργει τάσσει λέγων «οἱ τ' ἔχον Οἰχαλίην, πόλιν Εὐρύτου». [Not quite in Pelasgiotis of course, as it was in Istaetotis; but some considered the opening expressions of the Thessalian section in the Catalogue as referring to the entire Thessaly]. οἱ δὲ νεώτεροι τεθήκασιν αὐτὴν ἐν Εὐβοίᾳ. The same in *Schol. A, ad Ilias*, B, 596; 730; Sch. Apollonius, *Argon.*, I, 87. The misapplied opposition of Homer to the νεώτεροι is, evidently, of Alexandrine provenance and nature, as is the disregard of the various important other traditions, which are listed without reference and connection to the Homeric passage: ἔστι καὶ Μεσσηνὶς Οἰχαλία καὶ ἑτέρα ἐν Τραχῖνι καὶ ἐν Θετταλίᾳ [the one mentioned above in a different context and from another source!] καὶ ἐν Ἀρκαδίᾳ.

[2] Strabo's statement is even more indefinite, IX, 438: περὶ δὲ τούτων (sc. the various synonymous cities) ζητοῦσι, καὶ μάλιστα τίς

ἦν ἢ ὑπὸ Ἡρακλέους ἀλοῦσα καὶ περὶ τίνος συνέγραψεν ὁ ποιήσας τὴν Οἰχαλίας ἄλωσιν. (Strabo is not sure about the authorship of the epic poem, typically ascribed to Creophylus). Was it left undecided in the poem even whether the location was in Euboea? I can hardly believe it, if only because an essential part of poetic ornamentation would thus be missed by the poet, let alone the possibility of making persuasive descriptions of places, geographical configurations, movements and travels. Whatever reserved carefulness one may discern in Pausanias' formulation: πεποίηκεν ὁμολογοῦντα τῷ Εὐβοέων λόγῳ, this cannot likely mean that the Euboic location was a matter of sheer implication from the proximity of Euboea, as against other candidates to the Oetean consummation. However, it is not impossible that the Oechalia by *Trachinia* was a mere postulation to suit suchlike exigencies principally of that Epic poem. Pausanias would be then right not even to countenance such supposition and to offer for the unspecified Oechalia of the poet the *nearest site backed by concomitant traditions* [cf. this essay *ad fin.*].

[3] There follows: τὸ δ' αὐτὸ καὶ Νικάνδρος ἐν Αἰτωλικοῖς (Fr. 7 Fr.Gr.H.). This probably extends to both pieces of information, although it may refer only to the Odyssean oracle about which Lycophron spoke in the passage.

[4] Correctly supplied by Groske apud Kramer.

[5] Consult for instance how well he argues the question on the seven cities that Agamemnon in the magnificent Λιταί promised to

grant to Achilles should he resign from his adamant aloofness, abandon his unyielding, magnificent and destructive Wrath and help the hardpressed Greeks (*Ilias* I, 149 sqq.; 291 sqq.) in VIII, 359-361.

[6] Which Aeolian component was more impressed on the Ionian coast, on Pylian Messinicity. After all the representative of the Aeolian element in eastern Messenia, Perieres, was according to some not really son of Aeolus, but of Cynortas the son of *Amyclas* (Apollodorus, *Bibl.*, I, 87); thus the aboriginal phyletic Lacono-Messenian unity was maintained unimpaired. Apollodorus considers it as the more substantiated tradition (*ibid.*, III, 117); in III, 123 he mentions the view of some, according to which there were two Periereses, one the Aeolic father of Aphareus and Leucippus, the other, son of Cynortas and father of Oibalus.

[Spring, 1986]