

Sicily and Italy in the *Odyssey**

Abstract

The article reviews the arguments for seeing ‘Temese’ (*Od.* 1.184) and ‘Alybas’ (24.304) as Italian place names, and considers the significance of the *Odyssey*’s being bookended by putative references to fictitious voyages to and from Italy by ‘Mentes’ and ‘Eperitos’ respectively. Sicilians, moreover, cut intriguingly different figures in the poem. On the one hand, the Suitors think of Sicilians as ruthless slave-dealers (20.383). On the other, Laertes relies on a devoted Sicilian woman (24.211-12), and Odysseus pretends to a fervent guest-friendship with a man from Sicania (24.303-14). The positive attitude of Odysseus and Laertes (and, by implication, of the poem’s narrator and narratee) towards Sicilians contrasts very suggestively with the negative attitude of the Suitors. It is, finally, suggested that Odysseus’ encounters with monsters and man-eaters (the Cyclopes, the Laestrygonians, Skylla and Charbdis, Kirke) may already have been situated in Sicily and Italy prior to the *Odyssey*, and that the poet of the *Odyssey* purposely refrained from situating his monsters there. Thus the *Odyssey*-poet himself may have pointedly adopted a positive attitude to the heroic-age inhabitants of Sicily that contrasted with the negative attitude prevailing in his tradition. This putative decision not to demonize the inhabitants of Sicily may be the natural concomitant of a desire to show the home-grown Suitors of Ithaca as the real “monsters” of the *Odyssey*.

Keywords

Odysseus’ wanderings, *exokeanismos*, Greeks and the ‘Other’.

* I am very grateful to Alessandra Coppola for the invitation to participate in the conference ‘I Greci nel Occidente,’ and to Flavia Frisone for useful bibliographical assistance. The article has also benefitted from the comments of its referees.

0 Introduction

The *Odyssey* features a handful of references to Sicily and Italy. These include mentions of ‘Sicilians,’ male (Σικελοί, 20.383) and female (Σικελή, 24.211); of a land ‘Sikanie’ (24.307), usually Sicily, here perhaps including Italy; and of two places that ancient and modern scholars have situated in Italy, ‘Temese’ (1.184) and ‘Alybas’ (24.304). There is, besides, a notable way in which Sicily and Italy do not (at least, not explicitly) feature in the *Odyssey*: as a location for Odysseus’ wanderings. Our concern will be to interpret all this. There is no reason why it should all be subsumable under a single, encompassing explanation. However, something approaching this will be tentatively proposed at the end of the discussion.

1 *Od.* 1.184: Temesa or Tama(s)sos?

The first possible mention of an Italian city in the *Odyssey* comes in the speech to Telemachos of Athene, disguised as the Taphian leader Mentès, 1.182-4:

νῦν δ’ ὄδε ξὺν νηϊ κατήλυθον ἡδ’ ἐτάροισι,
πλέων ἐπὶ οἴνοπα πόντον ἐπ’ ἀλλοθρόους ἀνθρώπους,
ἔς Τεμέσην μετὰ χαλκόν, ἄγω δ’ αἶθωνα σίδηρον.

184 Τάμασιν (-σον Meineke, cf. Strab. p. 255) quidam apud Steph. Byz. 599.¹

Now I have come, as you see, with a ship and comrades,
sailing over the wine-dark sea to visit foreign men,
bound for Temese, in quest of copper; I am bringing dark iron with me.

¹ The textual note is from the apparatus of von der Mühl 1962: 8, which is representative of modern editions. In reality, the status of the supposed variant is unclear, as we will see.

At line 184, the manuscripts have Τεμέσην, which is the universal reading of editors.² But Stephanus of Byzantium, the *Odyssey* scholia, and Strabo have been taken to attest an ancient variant Ταμάσην or Τάμασον. Following their lead, modern scholars have been divided whether to understand a reference to Tamassos, the city in Cyprus, or Temesa, the city in Bruttium, Italy.³ We have two, not quite identical, choices before us: first, whether to understand a reference at *Od.* 1.184 to the Cyprian city or to the Italian one; second, whether to read Τεμέσην or Τάμασον (or Τάμασιν) in the Odyssean text. This means trying to establish whether the form Τεμέση could also – in Homer, at least – refer to the Cyprian city known later as Tamassos or whether we are obliged to read Τάμασον (or Τάμασιν) if we wish to see a reference to the Cyprian city.

Here is Stephanus of Byzantium, τ 10:⁴

Τάμασος· πόλις Κύπρου, ἐν μεσογείᾳ, διάφορον ἔχουσα χαλκόν. τὸ ἐθνικὸν Ταμασίτης, καὶ Ταμάσιος ὡς Ἐφέσιος Θάσιος. ἐντεῦθεν τινες γράφουσιν „ἐς Ταμάσην⁵ μετὰ χαλκόν“, ἀπιθάνως· ἔστι γὰρ καὶ Ταμέση πόλις τῆς Ἰταλίας καὶ ποταμὸς. Πολύβιος δ' ἐν τῷ <τῆ> Τεμέσειαν τὴν πόλιν καλεῖ. τὸ ταύτης ἐθνικὸν Τεμεσαῖος.

Tamasos: a city in Cyprus, inland, with excellent copper; the ethnic adjective is Ταμασίτης and Ταμάσιος (like Ἐφέσιος, Θάσιος). Hence some read [*sc.* at *Od.* 1.184]: ἐς Ταμάσην μετὰ χαλκόν, implausibly; for there is also Tamese, a city in Italy and a river. Polybius in book 13 calls the city Temeseia. The ethnic adjective of this city is Τεμεσαῖος.

² Allen 1917: 7; von der Mühl 1962: 8; S. R. West 1981: 20; van Thiel 1991: 6; M. L. West 2017: 10; Pulleyn 2019: 72.

³ Of modern scholars, see e.g., favouring of a reference to Cyprian Tamassos: S. R. West 1988: 100; Pulleyn 2019: 157-8; cf. Nordheider 2008: 394: 32 ‘wahrscheinlicher’; cf. Stanford 1958: 224 ‘the likeliest view’; Richardson 1991: 126 ‘quite likely’. Favouring a reference to Italian Temesa, e.g. Allen 1910: 303; Camassa 1984: 13, 36; Papadopoulos 2011; cf. Crielaard 1995: 233 ‘seems preferable’; Lorimer 1950: 121 ‘the balance is decidedly in favour of Temesa.’

⁴ Stephanus of Byzantium’s *Ethnica* is cited throughout according to the editions of Billerbeck 2006 and Billerbeck and Neumann-Hartmann 2016 (here, p. 250).

⁵ The manuscripts attest: Ταμάσην, Τάμασιν, and Ταμέσην.

This entry presents difficulties. Ταμάσῃν is a puzzling form for the Cyprian city, for which a first-declension form is otherwise unattested (and the variants Τάμασιν and Ταμέσῃν are at least as puzzling); the form Τάμασον would be normal.⁶ Likewise, the form Ταμέση is unparalleled for the Italian city (Τεμέση, Τέμψα). It is quite likely an error for Τεμέση (see below).⁷

The most important scholia on the Odyssean passage (schol. *Od.* 1.184) read:⁸

Τεμέσην· Τεμέση πόλις Κύπρου, κατὰ δέ τινας Ἰταλίας, ἦν νῦν Βρεντέσιον
καλοῦσιν. HM¹TVY.

‘Temese’: Temese is a city in Cyprus, but according to some, in Italy, one which they now call
Brentesion. HM¹TVY.

ἐς Τεμέσην· πόλις ἐν Οἰνωτροῖς ἢ νῦν Τέμψα καλουμένη, ἣ Βρεντέσιον. Η κάλλιον
δὲ πόλιν λέγειν Ἰταλίας τὸ νῦν καλούμενον Βρεντέσιον, ὅπου καὶ ὁ χαλκὸς γίνεται ὁ
καλὸς καὶ ἐπαινετός. Η.

‘To Temese’: a city among the Oenotri, which is now called Tempsa, or Brentesion. Η It is better to
understand a city in Italy, present-day Brentesion, where indeed the fine and reputed copper comes from.
Η

The identification of Temese with Brentesion, i.e. Brundisium, in these scholia (and likewise Eustathius, *Commentary on the Odyssey*, Stallbaum i.46.21, 25-6) is hard to understand,⁹ unless perhaps we assume a crude confusion between Bruttium (Βρεττία), the region in which Temese-Tempsa was situated, and Brundisium (Βρεντέσιον, perhaps via the erroneous form

⁶ Cf. Meineke 1849: 599 ‘*malim* Τάμασον.’

⁷ Cf. Meineke 1849: 599 ‘*nonne* Τεμέση?’ All forms of the place-names are corrupt in this entry (see the apparatus in Billerbeck and Neumann-Hartmann 2016: 250).

⁸ See Pontani 2007: 101-2. The scholia I reproduce are Pontani’s scholia ‘a1’ and ‘b’. I omit his scholia ‘a2’ and ‘a3’ (which add nothing of significance); and also his ‘c’ (which declares Temese to be a ‘city of Hispania’).

⁹ See Mele 2009: 85-6.

Βρεντησία).¹⁰ At face value, the first scholion (Pontani's 'a1') implies that the form Τεμέση could denote either the Cyprian or the Italian city. Yet we cannot rule out that we are dealing with a clumsy compression of a fuller version, which ran along the following lines: 'the reference is either to a city in Cyprus [*sc.* Ταμασσός]; or, according to some, a city in Italy [*sc.* Τεμέση]'; we shall see (in section 2) a similar compression in the scholia to *Od.* 24.304.

Strabo writes the following, in the course of his treatment of Italy (6.1.5 C255-6):

ταύτης δὲ τῆς Τεμέσης φασὶ μεμνησθαι τὸν ποιητὴν, οὐ τῆς ἐν Κύπρῳ Ταμασοῦ· λέγεται γὰρ ἀμφοτέρως [τὸ ἐς Τεμέσην μετὰ χαλκόν].

They say that it is this Temesa that Homer mentions, not Tamassos in Cyprus; for¹¹ it is called / claimed both ways [the verse ἐς Τεμέσην μετὰ χαλκόν].

Editors are divided whether to regard the last phrase, the quotation of *Od.* 1.184a, as an intrusive gloss.¹² I incline to view it as such, in the light of Strabo's habitual use of the phrase λέγεται γὰρ ἀμφοτέρως,¹³ although nothing in my argument will ultimately depend on it. Strabo's phrase λέγεται γὰρ ἀμφοτέρως is itself ambiguous.¹⁴ It can mean either (a) 'for it [*sc.* the Cyprian Tamassos] is called both ways', i.e. we find both the forms Ταμασσός and Τεμέση for the Cyprian city; or (b) 'for it is claimed both ways', i.e. there are advocates both of seeing a reference to Italian Temesa and of seeing a reference to Cyprian Tamassos (whether or not that involves reading Τάμασον in the Homeric text).¹⁵ But Strabo's sentence could also be taken to imply that the two cities are not homonymous, if he distinguishes advisedly between

¹⁰ On the form Βρεντησία for Βρεντέσιον, see Dindorf 1855: 35, note on lines 1-2.

¹¹ The γὰρ-clause presupposes a mild ellipse of thought (see, in general, Denniston 1950: 61-2): '(there is controversy,) for...'

¹² Deleted by Meineke 1877: i.351, followed by Sbordone 1970: 287. Retained by Biffi 1988: 134; Radt 2003: 136.

¹³ See Meineke 1852: 58.

¹⁴ If we read λέγεται γὰρ ἀμφοτέρως τὸ ἐς Τεμέσην μετὰ χαλκόν, then we may understand: 'the phrase ἐς Τεμέσην μετὰ χαλκόν is ambiguous' (cf. Biffi 1988: 134-7).

¹⁵ For (a), see Jones 1967: 17, and cf. Str. 7.7.11 C328, 8.3.12 C343, 8.3.29 C353, 9.3.16 C424, 9.5.8 C433, 9.5.22 C443, 13.4.11 C628, cf. 13.1.19 C589; compare Meineke 1852: 58. For (b), see Radt 2003: 137, and cf. Str. 6.3.6 C282, 10.3.11 C468, 17.1.10 C795, cf. 1.2.11 C21.

a first-declension form in Τεμεσ- for the Italian city (*sc.* Τεμέση) and a second-declension form in Ταμασσ- for the Cyprian one (*sc.* Ταμασσός). Stephanus of Byzantium may have meant to uphold a similar differentiation, intending Τάμασος, Ταμασίτης, and Ταμάσιος of the Cyprian city, and Τεμέση (if we emend the transmitted Ταμέση), Τεμέσεια, and Τεμεσαῖος of the Italian one. We need to see whether clarity can be gained over what form(s) were possible for the Cyprian and the Italian place names, and what form(s) were in the ancient manuscript tradition of the *Odyssey*.

An Assyrian inscription of 673/2 BCE lists a ‘king of Tamosos (*sic*)’ (*šar Tamesi*) among kings of other Cyprian cities, which seems to confirm, if not the string ‘Tamas(s)-’, then at least ‘Tam-’, rather than ‘Tem-’, as the first syllable of the name of the Cyprian city.¹⁶ The oldest attested Greek form for the Cyprian city is apparently Ταμασσός (with double sigma, accented oxytone), later also Τάμασος (with single sigma, accented proparoxytone).¹⁷ Of these, metre requires that the latter form would have to have been used at *Od.* 1.184. There does not seem to be any independent evidence (independent, that is, of the exegetical tradition of *Od.* 1.184) for any first-declension form of the Cyprian city name or for any form of that name beginning with Τεμ- or Τεμεσ-.¹⁸ The attested forms for the Italian city are Τεμέση and (later) Τέμψα; the form Ταμέση is only doubtfully attested by Stephanus of Byzantium (τ 10). Of course, it is hard to be fully confident about what form either place name might have been capable of taking in Homer.¹⁹

¹⁶ Leichty 2011: 23 (= no. 1 column v line 68): LUGAL URU.ta-me-si. See also Bagg 2007: 247-8, with similar forms in other Assyrian inscriptions. I am grateful to Frances Reynolds for this reference and for discussion of the form.

¹⁷ For the forms Ταμασσός and Τάμασος, see Oberhammer 1932: 2095.8-10. For forms alternating between single and double sigma in Homer, see Chantraine 1988: i.179.

¹⁸ Compare Eustath. on *Od.* 1.185, Stallbaum i.46.33-4 τὴν μέντοι ἐν Κύπρῳ Τεμέσην, Τάμασον ἀξιούσι διὰ τοῦ α οἱ παλαιοὶ λέγεσθαι.

¹⁹ Str. 12.3.20 C549-50 discusses the lability of place names.

A degree of clarity can be attained as to what the transmitted reading(s) is (are) at *Od.* 1.184. Stephanus' sentence ἐντεῦθεν τινες γράφουσιν „ἐς Ταμάσην (better: Τάμασον)²⁰ μετὰ χαλκόν“, ἀπιθάνως· ἔστι γὰρ καὶ Ταμέση πόλις τῆς Ἰταλίας καὶ ποταμός may be recognized as an example of what W. J. Slater has called the 'learned proposal.'²¹ On this scenario, an ancient scholar takes exception to an unfamiliar word in the text and proposes to replace it with a familiar one; other scholars react by rejecting the proposal and justifying the unfamiliar word.²² Conservatism in matters of textual criticism would then be the motif for scholars' holding out for the transmitted reading, Τεμέσην.²³ It is hard even to be sure that any ancient scholar ever put Ταμάσην (or Τάμασον) in the text of the *Odyssey*, given that the phrase τινὲς γράφουσιν is capable of referring just to the commentary tradition; the word γράφουσι can also be used for 'understand a reference to x', without any alternative reading being implied.²⁴ Accordingly, the following reconstruction is plausible: ancient readers found Τεμέσην in the text; it caused perplexity to some scholars, which they proposed to solve by supposing that a reference to Cyprian Tamas(s)os was intended; and they raised further the thought that Homer may in fact have written Τάμασον;²⁵ to this, other scholars retorted that the transmitted written should stand, a reference to Italian Temesa being unproblematic. The whole ζήτημα presupposes that Cyprian Tamassos was much more familiar as source of copper ore than Italian Temesa. It is hard to see how the scholarly controversy could ever have arisen either if there had been a transmitted reading Τάμασον (which would then have been bound to prevail over the more obscure alternative Τεμέσην) or if there was a form of the place name (whether Τεμέση,

²⁰ See above.

²¹ See Slater 1989: 44-6, 51 (on the phrase τινὲς γράφουσιν). I am grateful to Enrico Prodi for supplying this reference.

²² Note also Slater 1989: 49-50 'The readiness with which some readings are dismissed by the ancients seems to me no small indication of their status [*sc.* as proposed conjectures]... It is not reasonable to believe that they took such answers [*sc.* to interpretative problems] for the most part in other than the spirit in which they were offered.'

²³ For textual critical conservatism in ancient scholarship, compare Str. 12.3.22 C550; see Pfeiffer 1968: 173-4; Slater 1989: 51-2.

²⁴ Slater 1989: 51.

²⁵ Taking the Ταμάσην / Τάμασιν / Ταμέσην in the mss of Steph. Byz. τ 10 to be in error for Τάμασον.

Ταμέση, Ταμάση, or something else) that was truly ambiguous between the Italian and the Cyprian cities (in which case again the Cyprian alternative was surely bound to win out). We should therefore hesitate to call Τάμασον (or Ταμάσην, etc.) an ‘ancient variant’ for Τεμέσην.²⁶ It should be regarded as having (at best) the status of a conjecture, one both supported and rejected in ancient scholarship, but never, as far as we know, introduced into the text.

There is an illuminating parallel for the argument in Strabo 12.3.20-4 C549-52, discussing *Il.* 2.856-7:

αὐτὰρ Ἀλιζώνων Ὀδῖος καὶ Ἐπίστροφος ἦρχον
τηλόθεν ἐξ Ἀλύβης, ὅθεν ἀργύρου ἐστὶ γενέθλη

And the leaders of the *Halizōnes* / *Halizōnoi* were Hodios and Epistophos from afar, from Alybe, where silver has its origin.

Strabo, convinced that this contingent of Trojan allies, the Ἀλιζῶνοι from Ἀλύβη, were to be identified with the Χάλυβες who lived south of the Black Sea, proposed two solutions: either to emend the transmitted ἐξ Ἀλύβης to ἐκ Χαλύβης or, without emending, to regard Ἀλύβη as an early form of Χαλύβη (12.3.20 C549). (Comparably, with *Od.* 1.184, there are the alternative options of emending the transmitted Τεμέσην to Τάμασον or, without emending, of seeing Τεμέση as an early form for Ταμασσός.) Strabo deploys two further arguments relevant to ancient arguments for the identification of Τεμέση (12.3.22 C551).²⁷ First, the respect afforded to the transmitted text: Strabo objects to other scholars’ interpretations that it involves their ‘tampering with the transmitted text’ (τὴν ἀρχαίαν γραφήν... κινεῖν). (Comparably, with *Od.* 1.184, to take Τεμέσην as referring to Cyprian Tamassos would involve tampering with the text, either in the sense either of emending it or of supposing that Homer meant Ταμασσόν

²⁶ Pace S. R. West 1988: 100; Mele 2009: 85.

²⁷ If Strabo supported a Black Sea location for the *Halizōnes* / *Halizōnoi* out of local patriotism (Camassa 1984: 14; Radt 2008: 371-2; Trachsel 2017: 266), that motivation remains entirely implicit here.

when he said Τεμέσην.) Second, the use of corroborative “archaeological” evidence: Strabo criticizes other scholars for not ‘indicating the silver mines’ (οὔτε τὰ ἀργυρεῖα δεικνύουσιν) that the Homeric text presupposes (*Il.* 2.857 ὄθεν ἀργύρου ἐστὶ γενέθλη) at the places that they would identify with Alybe.²⁸ (Comparably, with *Od.* 1.184, Strabo attaches positive weight to the fact that ‘mines are indicated in the vicinity’ of Italian Temesa: δείκνυται χαλκουργεῖα πλησίον).

Whichever city is referred to in *Od.* 1.184, it must have been familiar in Homer’s day as a source of copper ore, or it must at least have been credible as a source of copper ore for the heroic period. The island of Cyprus was synonymous with copper (*aes cuprium*), and Tamassos in particular was important in the early copper trade.²⁹ By contrast, it is unclear that Temesa in Italy was a source of copper ore.³⁰ In general, Greek overseas interests in Italy in the 8th century BCE were motivated by the trade in metal ores.³¹ However, the archaeological evidence of mining and the geological evidence of copper ore at Italian Temesa are contested.³² The textual evidence, on the other hand, is abundant; but it must be sifted critically.³³ Let us start with Strabo 6.1.5 C255-6 (already cited above):

ταύτης δὲ τῆς Τεμέσης φασὶ μεμνησθαι τὸν ποιητὴν... καὶ δείκνυται χαλκουργεῖα
πλησίον, ἃ νῦν ἐκλέλειπται

²⁸ The mining could be historical rather than ongoing: the mines at Pharnakia that Strabo would identify with the silver mines of Alybe implied by *Il.* 2.857 are only iron mines in Strabo’s day (12.3.19 C549). Likewise, the bronze/copper mines Strabo recognizes in the vicinity of Temesa are historical, ‘exhausted’ in his own day.

²⁹ Str. 14.6.5 C684 μέταλλά τε χαλκοῦ ἐστὶν ἄφθονα τὰ ἐν Ταμασσῶ. For the archaeological evidence, see Kassianidou 2004.

³⁰ Temesa was colonized by (Aetolian) Greeks from the sixth century BCE: before that it was allegedly an Ausonian settlement (Str. 6.1.5 C255; see La Torre 2006); a non-Greek settlement at Temesa at the time of Odysseus’ *nostos* is assumed in the legend of the ‘Hero of Temesa’ (Paus. 6.6.7-11, etc.). It follows that the name ‘Temese’ used at *Od.* 1.184 will have been that of the pre-Greek city (or rather ‘Tempsa’: Mele 2009: 85), then taken over by the Greek colonists (as with Gela, Zankle, Taras, Metapontium: Dunbabin 1948: 189; Risch 1965: 195).

³¹ e.g. Boardman 1964: 210; Burkert 1992: 12, with 159 n. 14.

³² See Guarascio 1982. In favour: e.g. Orsi 1916: 359. Against: e.g. Philipp 1934: 459.56-66. It has been proposed that Temesa was a *entrepôt* (Lorimer 1950: 121); that is not the position, however, taken by ancient authors (Strabo, etc.), who insist on historical mines in Temesa.

³³ Insufficiently critical is Papadopoulos 2011.

They say that Homer mentions this Temesa... and mines are indicated nearby, which have now been abandoned.

Strabo evidently believes in the existence of these ‘mines at Temesa’, to which he returns at 12.3.23 C551. Who is the implied agent of the passive form δείκνυται? Probably, Homeric scholars, whom we may infer also to be the implied subject of the preceding φασί.³⁴ The identification of Temesa was therefore disputed in Homeric scholarship before Strabo.³⁵ There is an excellent parallel for our use of δείκνυται at Strabo 12.3.22 C551 (on the question of the location of Alybe at *Il.* 2.857): οὔτε τὰ ἀργυρεῖα δεικνύουσιν, ‘these scholars do not show the silver mines’ (Strabo has specific, named scholars – Menekrates and Palaiphatos – in mind). It thus appears that our δείκνυται implies, not that Strabo was shown the depleted mines near Temesa by some local *cicerone*, but rather that scholars in Homeric commentaries adverted to the existence of historic mines near Temesa.³⁶ Strabo, in other words, may not have seen these mines for himself.³⁷

More or less contemporaneously with Strabo, we have three references in Ovid to either ‘the mines of Temesa’ or to ‘bronze / copper from Temesa.’ At *Metamorphoses* 15.707 *Temesesque metalla*, the context leaves it in no doubt that the Italian city is meant. It is natural to suppose that the same Italian city is understood at *Metamorphoses* 7.207-8 *Temesaea... aera* and *Fasti* 5.441 *Temesaeaque... aera*. However, if Temesa was not actively producing copper in Strabo’s time (6.1.5 C256 ἄ νῦν ἐκλέλειπται), then it was not in Ovid’s either. These Ovidian references appear to exploit the reader’s knowledge either of the existence of defunct mines near Temesa or of a poetic or a critical tradition which spoke of mines at Temesa. What these

³⁴ See, in general on Strabo and Homeric scholarship, Trachsel 2017.

³⁵ Biraschi 1982: 30 ‘La questione della identificazione di Temesa dunque si era posta già nell’ambito della esegesi omerica.’ The dispute may predate Callimachus (*Aetia* 85.10 Harder); see below.

³⁶ Thus the discussion of *Od.* 1.184 in Str. 6.1.5 C256 will not be an example of ‘local communities interpreting the [Homeric] text in their own way’ (Lightfoot 2017: 252).

³⁷ On Strabo’s use of δείκνυται, see especially Dueck 2000: 23.

references do not do in any straightforward way is attest a reality of mining or metal-working at Temesa.

We also find several references in Statius. At *Silvae* 1.1.41-2, in the description of Domitian's bronze statue, we read:

pectora, quae mundi ualeant euoluere curas

et quīs se totis Temese dedit hausta metallis.

... a chest capable of turning over the cares of the world,
and for which Temese gave herself exhausted with all her mines.

These lines allude to the notion that there are exhausted mines at Temesa (as Strabo 6.1.5 C256); clearly Italian Temesa is intended. Domitian's statue is wittily made into an *aition* for the exhausted mines of Temesa. Once again, however, the conceit no more pertains to a metal-working reality than does the obviously fictionalized-mythologized hyperbole of lines 3-4 of the same poem: *Siculis an conformata caminis / effigies lassum Steropen Brontenque reliquit?*, 'or did the effigy, moulded in Sicilian furnaces, leave Steropes and Brontes weary?' (translation by D. R. Shackleton Bailey). Further references by Statius to 'bronze / copper of Temesa' are *Silvae* 1.5.47-8 *nusquam Temesaea notabis / aera* ('nowhere [*sc.* in the baths of Claudius Etruscus] will you notice Temesan copper') and *Achilleid* 1.413 *aera domat Temese* ('Temese tames [i.e. smithies] bronze', *sc.* for the Trojan War).

Evidently we are by this time (Ovid, Statius) dealing with a topos in Latin poetry. Temesa has become quasi-formulaically associated with 'bronze / copper', the association having become a self-perpetuating idea, detached from any necessary reference to any known on-the-ground reality. In the hands of these Latin poets, moreover, what was perhaps a longstanding ζήτημα (geographical and textual) of Hellenistic Homeric scholarship presumably becomes infused with the additional zest of Italian patriotic sentiment.

An important precedent for the phrase *Temesaea... aera* in the Latin poets is Callimachus' possible use of the phrase *Τεμεσαῖον... [χαλκό]ν* (*Aetia* 85.10 Harder), though the supplement is far from certain. This Temesa is again very likely the Italian city: the verse belongs to the *aition* of Euthykses' statue in Locri, so the narrative setting is a South Italian one.³⁸ We might assume that Callimachus, savvy to the scholarly controversy over *Od.* 1.184, wished to lend his support implicitly to the identification of Homer's *Τεμέση* with Italian Temesa.

Things may be otherwise with Lycophron's mention of a *Ταμάσσιον κρατῆρα* (*Alexandra* 854), dedicated by Menelaos at the shrine of Athena Skyletria in South Italy: probably, 'a bronze mixing-bowl', with *Ταμάσσιος* being used metonymically for 'bronze, brazen.'³⁹ Even though the form *Τεμεσαῖος* with its two consecutive light syllables would have been less suited to Lycophron's trimeter, it is not plausible that Lycophron's use of the form *Ταμάσσιον* is just prosodically determined.⁴⁰ If it is correct that the name of the Italian city was always *Τεμέση*, with derivations in *Τεμεσ-*, and that the name of the Cyprian city was always *Ταμασ(σ)ος*, with derivations in *Ταμασ-*, then Lycophron's phrase should imply that he (seemingly in opposition then to Callimachus) wished to lend his support to the reading *ἐς Τάμασον μετὰ χαλκόν* at *Od.* 1.184 or, at least, that he wished to see a reference to Cyprian Tamassos as being intended there.⁴¹ The dedication of this 'mixing-bowl of Tamassian bronze' in a temple in Southern Italy might be seen as a deliberate intertextual irony in a long tradition of scholarly and poetic exchanges on this question.

³⁸ See D'Alessio 1996: 499 n. 102; Harder 2012: 75; cf. Sistakou 2002: 167.

³⁹ Differently, Lycophron's *Ταμάσσιον* is usually understood more literally and geographically: M. L. West 2013: 272 'from Cyprus'; Hornblower 2015: 329 'from Tamassos.' Compare Euphorion fr. 10 Lightfoot *κελέβην Ἀλυβηίδα*, 'silver cup' (literally, 'cup from Alybe'), making a learned allusion to *Il.* 2.857, where Alybe is 'the origin of silver.'

⁴⁰ On Lycophron and metrical resolution, see Hornblower 2015: 2 n. 7.

⁴¹ Compare Eustath. on *Od.* 1.185, Stallbaum i.46.33-4. Differently, Sistakou 2002: 167.

It is time to summarize a convoluted argument. There is no evidence that the Homeric text ever had any other form than Τεμέσῃν at *Od.* 1.184, and no evidence that Τεμέση was ever a possible form of the Cyprian city Tamassos. That already constitutes a powerful argument in favour of seeing a reference to the Italian city. All things being equal (which, it seems, they are not) it would be natural to prefer a reference to a city that was famous for copper mines over one that was not. Cyprian Tamassos was surely known for copper mining; both archaeology and literary texts testify to its importance as a source of copper ore. The fame of Italian Temesa for copper mining is more problematic. It rests, above all, on literary texts that allude to defunct historical (heroic-age) copper mines near Temesa (Strabo 6.1.5 C256; Ovid *Metamorphoses* 15.707; Statius 1.1.42). Many of these texts are compromised by their evident desire to support and perpetuate a particular exegetical tradition of *Od.* 1.184, probably reinforced, in the case of the Latin poets, by patriotic sentiment.⁴² From Strabo 6.1.5 C256 we can at least infer that someone before the first century BCE observed what they felt able to claim as evidence of historical mining of metal ore near Temesa. But that second-hand claim, along with its refractions in Ovid and Statius, is the closest we get to evidence for the reality of mining in Temesa. The upshot appears to be that, while we can say categorically that Cyprian Tamassos was a source for copper ore trade in the relevant period, we cannot so easily say of Italian Temesa either that it was or that it was not.⁴³

There are, however, methodological problems with simply preferring to see a reference to the locality (most) famous for its copper mines. This approach assumes that *Od.* 1.184 simply reflects the historical reality of the metal ore trade and proceeds to map the Homeric verse onto the best-attested historical reality. It does not take account of the fact that Mentēs'

⁴² A desire to exalt Rome may not be absent from Strabo either: e.g. Dueck 2000: 85-96, 107-15, 159-60.

⁴³ Strabo's report of copper mines at Temesa is taken seriously by Forbes 1950: 304: 'Italy had several copper mines' – which tended to be exhausted at different rates.

Taphian homeland lies (probably)⁴⁴ to the west of the Greek mainland, very near Ithaca, whither ‘Mentes’ detours – making a western trading route (to Italy) more natural than an eastern one (to Cyprus).⁴⁵ Nor does it take account of the possibility that the poet may have had poetic reasons for making reference to Italian Temesa as ‘Mentes’ destination (we shall consider such in section 6).

Two more minor considerations have been urged in favour of seeing a reference to Italian Temesa.⁴⁶ First, the phrase ἐπ’ ἄλλοθρούους ἀνθρώπους (183): the inhabitants of Italy seem more likely to be described as ‘speaking differently’ (that is, from Greeks)⁴⁷ than those of Cyprus.⁴⁸ Second, the expression 183-4 πλέων... / ἐς Τεμέσην is argued to suit better a coastal city, such as Italian Temesa, than a landlocked one, such as Cyprian Tamassos.⁴⁹ It is hard to know what weight to attach to these considerations. Probably neither deserves as much respect as the likelihood, first, that the only transmitted reading is Τεμέσην and, second, that this form is convincingly attested only for the Italian city.

The balance of probability tips to seeing a reference to the Italian city precisely because the transmitted reading is Τεμέσην and because this form is convincingly attested only for the

⁴⁴ The argument is complicated by the fact that the provenance of the Taphians is not securely known (S. R. West 1988: 88 supposes that it was ‘some distance away’, *sc.* from Ithaca; Bowie 2013: 222 that it was ‘not far away’, compare Thomas and Stubbings 1962: 308). The most plausible ancient identification is with the island of ‘Taphios’ (i.e. Meganisi): Str. 10.2.12 C20; compare *Barrington Atlas*, p. 54 C4. For the present argument, it would make no difference if it was identified with Cephallenia or with the Echinades.

⁴⁵ Malkin 1998: 72-3; compare Eustath. on *Od.* 1.185, Stallbaum i.46.21-2.

⁴⁶ Manfredi-Gigliotti 1994: 13-16 argues in favour of a reference to Italian Temesa on the basis that the exchange envisaged by ‘Mentes’ at *Od.* 1.184 cannot be of one metal ore (iron) for another (copper), as would be the case at Cyprian Tamassos, but rather of iron ore for *worked* copper at Italian Temesa – which he argues was renowned for its *working*, rather than its *mining*, of copper. The texts, however, speak of (exhausted) ‘mines’ at Temesa: Str. 6.1.5 C256 χαλκουργεῖα... ἃ νῦν ἐκλείπειται; Stat. *Silv.* 1.1.42 *Temese... hausta metallis*.

⁴⁷ It is debated whether the Taphian Mentes is himself Greek or non-Greek (for the former, see e.g. M. L. West 2014: 244; for the latter, e.g. S. R. West 1988: 88). If he is non-Greek, then ἄλλοθρούους will be understood from perspective of the (Greek) narratee, not that of the (non-Greek) speaking character (cf. Virg. *Aen.* 2.504 *barbarico*, with Austin 1964: 195).

⁴⁸ It is true that languages other than Greek were spoken on Cyprus (Pulleyn 2019: 157; cf. also Nordheider 2008: 394.40-43). However, ‘Mentes’ stress on this point presents Temesa as a more “foreign” location than Cyprus is likely to have been perceived as being: see Crielaard 1995: 233; La Torre 2009: 15 n. 11.

⁴⁹ Cf. Steph. Byz. τ 10 (*sc.* Τάμασος) πόλις Κύπρου, ἐν μεσογείᾳ. Malkin 1998: 73 ‘Cypriot Tamassos... is not a port’; Mele 2009: 85. Differently, S. R. West 1988: 100. Note that those maritime traders *par excellence* the Phoenicians may have penetrated to copper mines in Cyprian Tamassos by the ninth century BCE (Karageorghis 1982: 127, 149).

Italian city. The following tables summarize the different forms found in the texts discussed in this section (note: no attempt is made here to catalogue all mentions in Greek of Cyprian Tamas(s)os or of Italian Temesa / Tempsa).

Table 1: Forms of the name of the Cyprian city

Source	Form
Assyrian inscriptions	<i>Tamesos</i>
?Lyc. <i>Alex.</i> 854	Ταμάσσ- (reference to the Cyprian city is uncertain)
Str. 6.1.5 C255-6	Ταμασσός
Steph. Byz. τ 10	Ταμασ-: variants Ταμάσην, Τάμασιν, and Ταμέσην (an erroneous form?)
Eustath. i.46.33-4 Stallbaum	Τάμασος
Schol. <i>Od.</i> 1.184 (a1 Pontani)	Τεμέση (the result of confused reporting in the scholion?)

Table 2: Forms of the name of the Italian city

Source	Form
?Callim. <i>Aet.</i> 85.10	Τεμεσ- (reference to the Italian city is uncertain)
Str. 6.1.5 C255-6	Τεμέση
Steph. Byz. τ 10	Τεμεσ-; Ταμέση (an erroneous form?)
Scholl. <i>Od.</i> 1.184 (a1, b Pontani)	Τεμέση

2 *Od.* 24.304: Alybas

Contrary to what is sometimes stated, Temese at 1.184 is not the only possible mention of an Italian place name in the *Odyssey*.⁵⁰ There is another candidate in Alybas, mentioned in the speech of Odysseus, posing as ‘Eperitos’, to Laertes (*Od.* 24.304). Here is 24.304-7:

εἰμι μὲν ἐξ Ἀλύβαντος, ὅθι κλυτὰ δῶματα ναίω,
υἱὸς Ἀφείδαντος Πολυπημονίδαο ἄνακτος· 305
αὐτὰρ ἐμοί γ’ ὄνομ’ ἐστὶν Ἐπήριτος· ἀλλὰ με δαίμων
πλάγξ’ ἀπὸ Σικανίης δεῦρ’ ἐλθέμεν οὐκ ἐθέλοντα

I am from Alybas, where I inhabit a glorious home,
the son of Apheidas, son of lord Polypemon;
my name is Eperitos. Some higher power
drove me off course from Sikanie so as to come here unintentionally...

Here, (Odysseus-as-)‘Eperitos’ claims to hail ‘from Alybas’ (304). We will want to know where this place is, and whether it is real or fictional. But precedence must be given first to two other questions.

First, does πλάγξ’ ἀπὸ Σικανίης (307) give ‘Eperitos’ purported destination or his purported point of departure?⁵¹ There would be parallels for each. With the first, we may compare 1.75 πλάζει δ’ ἀπὸ πατρίδος αἴης, ‘he [*sc.* Poseidon] drives Odysseus off course from his fatherland,’ his fatherland being, of course, Odysseus’ destination.⁵² With the second, compare 9.259 ἡμεῖς τοι Τροίηθεν ἀποπλάγχθεντες Ἀχαιοί, ‘know that we are Achaeans who have been driven off course from Troy,’ Troy being (in the context of the *nostoi*) the Achaeans’ point of departure.⁵³ Evidently, we could understand πλάγξ’ ἀπὸ Σικανίης either way.

⁵⁰ Nordheider 2008: 394.25-7; M. L. West 2014: 84.

⁵¹ The ambiguity is noted by Phillips 1953: 54: ‘[‘Eperitos’] says that he was driven to Ithaca from Sicania, or out of his way from Alybas to Sicania.’

⁵² Crielaard 1995: 232; Mele 1998: 68.

⁵³ So Eustathius, on *Od.* 24.304 Stallbaum ii.324.21 ἐκεῖθεν δηλαδὴ ἐρχόμενον. Cf. also 15.382 (Odysseus to Eumaios) πολλὸν ἀπεπλάγχθης σῆς πατρίδος ἠδὲ τοκῆων, ‘you have strayed far from your fatherland and parents’ (Eumaios’ point of departure).

However, it seems necessary to take ἀπὸ Σικανίης as an amplification of the preceding ἐξ Ἀλύβαντος; thus, either ‘Eperitos’ was driven off course either after sailing from Sikanie, where Alybas is situated (ἀπὸ Σικανίης as point of departure), or he was driven off course while trying to return to Sikanie, where Alybas is situated (ἀπὸ Σικανίης as destination on the return voyage). Either way we must understand that Alybas is in Sikanie. It is hard to imagine that if Sikanie were meant to indicate a separate destination, ‘Eperitos’ would not also have indicated the purpose of his voyage (as ‘Mentes’ did at 1.184: ἐς Τεμέσην μετὰ χαλκόν). ‘Eperitos’ evidently withholds his itinerary and the purpose of his voyaging as being superfluous in this communication with Laertes.

Second, what does ‘Sikanie’ mean here? Later, of course, Sikania is equated with Sicily.⁵⁴ Can it here refer to Italy?⁵⁵ That assumption is made, tacitly, in the scholia, who identify ‘Alybas’ as a ‘city in Italy’, specifically, Metapontum. By the fifth century BCE, at the latest, the ancients were aware that Sicily and Italy had previously been one land mass.⁵⁶ did Homer share this awareness, and think of them both as ‘Sikanie’? Or did the poet of the *Odyssey* conceive of Italy/Sicily as a group of islands, perhaps like the poet of the end of the *Theogony*, collectively identifiable as ‘Sikanie’?⁵⁷ We may note that, in general, there is little clear differentiation between the ethnic terms Σικανοί and Σικελοί, and that the Σικελοί inhabited South Italy as well as Sicily.⁵⁸ If Σικανίη were understood as a designation for the region where Σικανοί / Σικελοί lived, it could logically have served as a designation for South

⁵⁴ The earliest references: Hdt. 7.170.1; Thuc. 6.2.2, 6.2.5.

⁵⁵ Poccetti 2012: 51 ‘The Homeric poems call the island [*sc.* Sicily] Σικανίη.’ This seems doubly imprecise, first, because Σικανίη is mentioned only in the *Odyssey*, and only here; second, because Italy rather than Sicily may be meant.

⁵⁶ See e.g. Aeschylus fr. 402 *TGrF*; Virgil, *Aeneid* 3.414-419; *alias*.

⁵⁷ ‘Hes.’ 1015 νήσων ἱεράων. See M. L. West 1966: 435; 2014: 84 and n. 41; Dräger 1997: 14.

⁵⁸ Poccetti 2012: 55 ‘Neither literary texts nor inscriptions suggest any concrete linguistic, cultural or social distinction between the ethnic names Σικανοί and Σικελοί’; see also *ibid.* 71. Sikeloi in South Italy: Poccetti 2012: 64.

Italy as well as Sicily, the restriction of its reference to Sicily then being a post-Homeric development.⁵⁹ But these considerations are purely speculative.

We may now return to the question whether Alybas is a real or a fictional place. Eustathius espouses the view that Ἀλύβας is a real place deliberately chosen by Odysseus to hint at his ‘wandering’ (ἀλάομαι, ἀλύω).⁶⁰ Many modern scholars assume rather that he invented a place name with this connotation.⁶¹ Yet Ἀλύβας, with β in its root, does not seem very suggestive of ἀλύω or ἀλάομαι. Nor if Odysseus invents the accompanying personal names Eperitos and Apeidas Polypemonides to hint riddlingly at his own and Laertes’ identities,⁶² does it therefore follow that he invented the place name Alybas. It is a different order of deception to allege the existence of fictitious persons and to allege that of a fictitious place.

There are reasons to take Alybas as a real place. First, Odysseus’ ‘lying tales’ in the *Odyssey*, differ from the *Apologoi* in their tendency to employ real, and contemporary, geography.⁶³ Second, formation of the name Ἀλύβας resembles other pre-Greek place names in Western Greece ending in –ας with a root containing -αντ- (and ethnic adjective in -αντῖνος):⁶⁴ Τάρας, genitive Τάραντος (ethnic Ταραντῖνος); Ἀκράγας, genitive Ἀκράγαντος (ethnic Ἀκραγαντῖνος).⁶⁵ Third, Temesa at *Od.* 1.184 is evidently a real place, whether we situate it in Italy or in Cyprus; and the lying speech of Athene-as-‘Mentes’ in book 1 is in a

⁵⁹ On Homer’s vagueness, compare Lane Fox 2008: 122.

⁶⁰ Eustathius, on *Od.* 24.304 Stallbaum ii.324.23. Erbse 1972: 101 suggested as the German place name ‘Irrhausen’ (also a real place) as an equivalent.

⁶¹ Wackernagel 1916: 250; Rüsing 1965: 583.15-17; cf. Kroll 1931: 1317.18; Heubeck 1992: 395; Lane Fox 2008: 122.

⁶² See, variously, Eustathius, on *Od.* 24.305 and 306 Stallbaum ii.324.24-30; Wackernagel 1916: 250; Erbse 1972: 101.

⁶³ Hölscher 1989: 213; Tsagalis 2012: 344 n. 105; Rutherford 1992: 71; Malkin 1998: 9; Danek 2015: 360; Węcowski 2019: 23, 25.

⁶⁴ For the ethnic Ἀλυβαντῖνος, see Eustathius Stallbaum ii.319.39 (Steph. Byz. α 232 gives Ἀλυβάντιος, if the text is sound). For ethnics in -ῖνος as typical for Sicily and Italy, see Steph. Byz. α 2; Billerbeck and Neumann-Hartmann 2016: 251 n. 16.

⁶⁵ See Wackernagel 1916: 250-51; Rüsing 1965: 583.4-6; Crielaard 1995: 232.

striking ring-composition with the lying speech of Odysseus-as-‘Eperitos’ in book 24 (as we shall see in the next section).

The scholia not only take Alybas is a real place, but situate it in Italy, identifying it with Metapontum.⁶⁶ Here are the scholia on *Od.* 24.304:⁶⁷

εἰμὶ γὰρ ἐξ Ἀλύβαντος· Ἀλύβας πόλις Θετταλίας ἢ νῦν Μεταπόντιον καλουμένη.
Ἀλύβην δὲ αὐτὴν ἐν τῷ καταλόγῳ φησί. H.Q. Ἀλύβας πόλις Ἰταλίας τὸ Μεταπόντιον,
ἢ μᾶλλον †Μεταπόντιον,⁶⁸ ἦντινα ἐν τῷ καταλόγῳ Ἀλύβην ἔφη· “αὐτὰρ Ἀλιζώνων
Ὀδῖος καὶ Ἐπίστροφος ἦρχον τηλόθεν ἐξ Ἀλύβης, ὅθεν ἀργύρου ἐστὶ γενέθλη” (*Il.*
2.857.). V.

I am from Alybas: Alybas is a city in Thessaly which is now called Metapontum. He [*sc.* Homer] calls it ‘Alybe’ in the [*sc.* Trojan] Catalogue. H.Q. Alybas is a city in Italy, Metapontum; or rather, Metapontum, which he calls ‘Alybe’ in the Catalogue: ‘And Hodios and Epistrophos were the leaders of the Halizōnes, from far away in Alybe, where silver has its origin’ (*Il.* 2.587). V.

These scholia raise as many questions as they answer. There are significant textual issues. In H.Q., we could consider emending Θετταλίας to Ἰταλίας (the same emendation is necessary in the scholia to *Od.* 1.184 in manuscript H).⁶⁹ But the resulting sentence Ἀλύβας πόλις Ἰταλίας ἢ νῦν Μεταπόντιον καλουμένη, Ἀλύβην δὲ αὐτὴν ἐν τῷ καταλόγῳ φησί would remain seriously flawed: Italian Metapontum can hardly be identified with the Alybe mentioned in the Trojan Catalogue (*Il.* 2.857). Additionally, therefore, we might contemplate a compression of an original notice that read something like the following: Ἀλύβας πόλις Ἰταλίας ἢ νῦν Μεταπόντιον καλουμένη· <κατὰ δὲ τινὰς, πόλις Θετταλίας> Ἀλύβην δὲ αὐτὴν ἐν τῷ

⁶⁶ Cf. Allen 1910: 303.

⁶⁷ Text after Dindorf 1855: ii.730 (Pontani’s edition of these scholia not being available at the time of writing).

⁶⁸ The repetition of Μεταπόντιον must be erroneous (dittography). I would propose emending to Θράκης, on the basis of comparison with Steph. Byz. α 232 and Eustath., in *Od.* 24.304 Stallbaum ii.324.21-2 (see below). Other emendations are κατὰ Πόντον (Buttmann) and τοῦ Πόντου (Barnes): see Dindorf 1855: ii.730, *in apparatus*. (A location in the Black Sea is intended to support the identification of ‘Alybas’ with the ‘Alybe’ of *Il.* 2.857.)

⁶⁹ For the emendation in schol. *Od.* 1.184 (H), see Pontani 2007: 102 (*in apparatus*, note to line 17). The equivalent emendation in schol. *Od.* 24.304 (H.Q.) has not to my knowledge been proposed so far.

καταλόγῳ φησί.⁷⁰ ‘Thessaly’ in this scholion may be due to confusion with ‘Thrace’, where some ancient scholars situated the Alybe of *Il.* 2.857 (Thracians having featured a little earlier in the Trojan Catalogue, *Il.* 2.844).

There is also Stephanus of Byzantium, α 232:⁷¹

Ἀλύβας. τοῦτον οἱ μὲν Μεταπόντιον ἤκουσαν τῆς Ἰταλίας, τινὲς δὲ Θράκης πόλιν, ὡς Ὅμηρος. τὸ ἔθνικόν Ἀλυβάντιος.

Alybas: some understand this of Metapontum in Italy, others of a city in Thrace, as does Homer [*sc.* *Il.* 2.857]. The ethnic adjective is Ἀλυβάντιος.

The statement ‘others [understand this of] a city in Thrace’ (τινὲς δὲ Θράκης πόλιν) presupposes both the equation of our ‘Alybas’ with the ‘Alybe’ of *Il.* 2.857 and the localization of that Alybe in Thrace.⁷² As we have already seen from Strabo 12.3.20-4 C549-52 (discussed in section 1), the localization of Piiadic Alybe was hotly contested.⁷³ Happily, we need not concern ourselves with the question of where precisely this Alybe is to be situated (whether in Thrace, the Troad, or in the environs of the Black Sea), since the equation of this Alybe with an Alybas in ‘Sikanie’ (*Od.* 24.304, 307) is a sheer impossibility.⁷⁴ Or rather, it becomes possible only if we detach 24.304 ἐξ Ἀλύβαντος from 24.307 ἀπὸ Σικανίης and take the latter to give ‘Eperitos’ overseas destination, rather than his point of departure or his point of return (objections to this were detailed above). There is no positive reason to locate the Alybas of *Od.* 24.304 in Thessaly / Thrace / the Troad, other than its near homonymity with the Alybe of *Il.* 2.857. The lexicographer Apollonius does better than many ancient scholars in keeping the

⁷⁰ Compare Steph. Byz. α 232 (see below), who writes οἱ μὲν Μεταπόντιον ἤκουσαν τῆς Ἰταλίας, τινὲς δὲ Θράκης πόλιν. Similarly, Eustathius on *Odyssey* 24.304 Stallbaum ii.324.21-2 ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι Ἀλύβη μὲν ἢ Ἀλύβας πόλις Ἰταλίας ἢ κληθεῖσα ὕστερόν, φασί, Μεταπόντιον, ἕτεροι δὲ πόλιν Θρακίαν ταύτην εἶπον.

⁷¹ See Billerbeck 2006: 164-5.

⁷² Cf. also *EM* 64.4 s.v. Ἀλιζῶνες.

⁷³ Strabo (12.3.20-27 C549-55) discusses at length various identifications. Cf. *EM* 64.1-5 s.v. Ἀλιζῶνες.

⁷⁴ Differently, Camassa 1984: 35-6.

Odyssean Alybas and the Iliadic Alybe distinct, situating the former in Italy and the latter in the Troad.⁷⁵

We do not know why some ancient scholars identified Alybas with Metapontum.⁷⁶ A. Heubeck, who rejects the identification, speculates that they did so ‘probably because the island of *Sikanie* is named in 307, and because of other place-names in Magna Graecia formed with *-ant-* such as *Taras*, *Akragas* (?).’⁷⁷ But both reasons are paradoxical. The first, because ἀπὸ Σικανίης (24.307) ought to have led ancient scholars to identify Alybas with a city in Sicily rather than with one in Italy.⁷⁸ The second, because it provides reasonable grounds for us (not just ancient scholars) to identify Alybas as a city in Italy or Sicily.⁷⁹ Unless the ancient scholars had some undisclosed further information to go on, it is not clear what basis they can have had for specifying one city of Magna Graecia over than another. We might have expected them to stay vague, as did Apollonius (*Lexicon Homericum* 24.18-19 s.v. Ἀλύβας: ‘the name of a city; it is in Italy’).

The natural assumption is that ancient scholars were in possession of knowledge about Alybas in Italy that we lack. Indeed, we do get two tantalizing glimpses of a possible bigger mythological picture.⁸⁰ Firstly, ‘Alybas’ is otherwise attested as a South Italian personal name for a mythological figure contemporary with Herakles. According to this tradition, Alybas was the father of Metabos, eponymous hero of the city of Metapontum. This tradition is attested (only) in the *Etymologicum Magnum* (579.28-32):

⁷⁵ Apollon. Soph. *Lex. Hom.* 24.18-19 Ἀλύβαντος πόλεως ὄνομα· ἔστι δὲ Ἰταλίας (citing *Od.* 24.304); 24.20 Ἀλυβή πόλις Τρωάδος (citing *Il.* 2.857). Compare Hesych. α 3281 Ἀλύβας· ... πόλις... ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ καὶ ἐν Τροίᾳ, with α 3282 Ἀλύβη· πόλις Τρωϊκή.

⁷⁶ Maaß 1907: 41 ‘Wir kennen ihre Gründe nicht’; Camassa 1984: 14 ‘Ma su che cosa poi si basava l’identificazione con Metaponto dell’Alybas...? Non lo sappiamo, in effetti...’.

⁷⁷ Heubeck 1992: 395.

⁷⁸ Cf. schol. *Od.* 24.307 Σικανίης· Σικελίας.

⁷⁹ Cf. Dunbabin 1948: 189 n. 1.

⁸⁰ See Maaß 1907: 41; Giannelli 1963: 83; Mele 1998: 68.

Μέταβος· Υἱὸς Ἀλίβαντος· Ἡρακλέα λέγεται ἐπὶ τὰς Γηρυόνου βοῦς ἀπιόντα ξενισθῆναι παρὰ Ἀλύβαντι, καὶ τότε γεννηθῆναι τὸ παιδίον· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο Μέταβον προσαγορευθῆναι, ἐπεὶ μετὰ τοὺς βοῦς τοῦ Γηρυόνου ἴει.

Metabos: the son of Alibas.⁸¹ It is said that when Herakles went off in quest of the cattle of Geryon he was hospitably received in Alybas' house, and that at that time a child was born, and was named 'Metabos' for this reason, because he was aiming 'at the cows' (*meta tous bous*) of Geryon.

Since Metabos is the eponymous hero of Metapontum, it is plausible that Alybas, too, is the eponym of a South Italian city.

Secondly, we encounter another 'Alybas' as the name given to the 'Hero of Temesa' in the *Suda*'s entry on the fifth-century BCE Locrian boxer Euthymos (3510 Adler):

Εὐθυμος· οὗτος ὁ Εὐθυμος ἠγωνίσσατο καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἐν Τεμέσῃ ἥρωα Ἀλύβαντα.

Euthymos: this Euthymos contended even against the Hero in Temesa, Alybas.

This *Suda* entry derives from Pausanias 6.6.11, where the manuscripts read:

τόδε μὲν ἤκουσα, γραφῆ δὲ τοιάδε ἐπιτυχῶν οἶδα· ἦν δὲ αὕτη γραφῆς μίμημα ἀρχαίας· νεανίσκος Σύβαρις καὶ Κάλαβρός τε ποταμὸς καὶ Λύκα πηγή, πρὸς δὲ Ἥρα⁸² τε καὶ Τεμέσα ἦν ἡ πόλις, ἐν δὲ σφισι καὶ δαίμων ὄντινα ἐξέβαλεν ὁ Εὐθυμος, χροῶν τε δεινῶς μέλας καὶ τὸ εἶδος ἅπαν ἐς τὰ μάλιστα φοβερὸς, λύκου δὲ ἀμπίσχετο δέρμα ἐσθῆτα· ἐτίθετο δὲ καὶ ὄνομα Λύβαντα ἐπὶ τῇ γραφῇ γράμματα.

The preceding I was told about; but from chancing upon a painting I know the gist of the following (it was a copy of an ancient painting): there was a young man Sybaris and Kalabros, a river, and Lyka, a spring, and in addition there was Hera and Temesa, the city; and in their midst there was also the spirit whom Euthymos expelled, awfully black as to his skin and exceedingly fearsome as to his whole

⁸¹ On the inconsistent spelling (Ἀλίβαντος / Ἀλύβαντι), see Visintin 1992: 64.

⁸² Often emended to ἠρῶόν.

appearance, and wearing the skin of a wolf for clothing; and writing on the painting gave him the name ‘Lybas’ (?).

The last sentence has been variously corrected by editors.⁸³ One correction, motivated by the *Suda*’s text, is ἐτίθετο δὲ καὶ ὄνομα <Α>λύβαντα ἐπὶ τῆ γραφῆ γράμματα, a corruption easily accountable as due to a haplography of alpha.⁸⁴ Another possible emendation is ἐτίθετο δὲ καὶ ὄνομα Λύκαν τὰ ἐπὶ τῆ γραφῆ γράμματα.⁸⁵ Here, the Hero’s name is Lykas, not Alybas; this form of the Hero’s name would be anticipated by the references earlier in the sentence to ‘a spring Lyka’ (Λύκα πηγῆ)⁸⁶ and the ‘wolfskin’ (λύκου... δέρμα) sported by the Hero.⁸⁷ This corruption would be due to the misreading of κ in Greek miniscule script as β.⁸⁸ (It must therefore be assumed to have taken place in the 9th or 10th centuries, following the introduction of miniscule script, but preceding the compilation of the *Suda*.) The choice between the alternatives is finely balanced. However, the preceding mentions of Λύκα and λύκου make it hard to see why a transmitted reading -λυκαν- should have been corrupted to -λυβαν-. It is not an advantage of the reading Λύκαν τὰ over <Α>λύβαντα that it supplies a definite article with the phrase ἐπὶ τῆ γραφῆ γράμματα: Pausanias’ usage shows that the article is dispensable.⁸⁹ It seems most reasonable to accept that the *Suda* preserves the correct form, and that ‘Alybas’ is the name given to the Hero in the picture seen by Pausanias. This Alybas may conceivably be

⁸³ On the choice of readings, see Visintin 1992: 59-73; and (on the textual problems of the whole passage) Mele 2009: 92-4.

⁸⁴ The emendation is to be found in the edition of Kuhn 1696, followed by Siebelis 1822-1828; Maddoli, Nafissi and Saladino 2003 (1999); cf. Pugliesi Carratelli 1982: 13. Ἀλύβαντα τὰ was in the apparatus of Clavier 1814-1823.

⁸⁵ The emendation is due to Bekker, in his edition of 1826-1827, and followed in the editions of Rocha-Pereira 1989-1990; Casevitz 2002.

⁸⁶ Less likely, ‘spring of Lykas’, with Λύκα as genitive (Visintin 1992: 61). In the context of this sentence, Λύκα is more likely to be a nominative in apposition to πηγῆ (compare, in the same sentence, the numerous other appositional phrases: νεανίσκος Σύβαρις, Κάλαβρος ποταμός, Τεμέσα ἢ πόλις), rather than a genitive of a noun identical to that proposed as the name of the Hero (nominative Λύκας).

⁸⁷ Visintin 1992: 60-1.

⁸⁸ Casevitz 1992: p. xxxiii; Jacquemin 2002: 138, following Diller 1956: 90. Cf. Visintin 1992: 60. See, in general, Reynolds and Wilson 2013: 225.

⁸⁹ Cf. Paus. 8.25.1 ἐν στήλῃ γράμματα, ‘letters on a stone’; 8.10.10 γράμματα ἐπὶ τῷ ψαλίῳ, ‘letters on the bridle.’

the eponym of a putative city Alybas, as the ‘young man Sybaris’ in the picture is an eponym of the city Sybaris.⁹⁰

We have thus up to three possible references to Alybas as either a place name or a personal name (and, perhaps, the eponym of a city) in a South Italian context: in the twenty-fourth book of the *Odyssey*, in the *Etymologicum Magnum*, and in Pausanias / *Suda*. Even with all the uncertainties, this is cumulatively suggestive. But even without going outside the Homeric text, we might have inferred that Alybas at *Od.* 24.304 is the name of real Sicilian or Italian locality.

It is a further question why in this lying speech to Laertes Odysseus claims to hail from this, or indeed any, South Italian locality; we shall return to this question in the final section.

3 Temesa and Alybas

Temesa and Alybas both feature in the painting described by Pausanias (6.6.11, if we accept the reading <A>λύβαντα). Moreover, Temesa and Alybas also both feature in lying speeches bookending the *Odyssey*, in books 1 and 24.⁹¹ These are clearly mirrored speeches. Athene’s speech in book one may even be considered to feature a proleptic anticipation of the wider narrative context of Odysseus’ speech in book 24 speech, when ‘Mentes’ mentions Laertes’ retreat into the country and his being tended there by an old serving-woman (1.189-93). The two speeches are linked further by a web of intertextuality. Thus, Telemachos in book 1 and Laertes in book 24 very similar questions to the disguised Athene and the disguised Odysseus respectively: ‘who are you, where is your home, what ship brought you here / where

⁹⁰ For this Alybas as an eponymous hero, see De Sanctis 1966: 23; Mele 2009: 92. It has further been suggested that a reflection of ‘Alybas’ as a toponym is to be found in the modern name, ‘Oliva,’ of the river in the territory of Temesa (La Torre 1997: 368). For Alybas as a lake or a river in Italy, compare Hesych. α 3281 (cf. α 2985), with Pearson 1917: 132.

⁹¹ On ring-composition in the *Odyssey*, see de Jong 2001: 565; Cook 2014: esp. 94-6.

did you leave your ship?’ (1.169-72 ~ 24.297-301). The speeches made in response by ‘Mentes’ (1.179-85) and ‘Eperitos’ (24.303-8) also strongly resemble each other. Two verses are shared exactly: *τοιγὰρ ἐγὼ τοι ταῦτα μάλ’ ἀτρεκέως ἀγορεύσω* (1.179 = 24.303) and *νηῦς δέ μοι ἦδ’ ἔστηκεν ἐπ’ ἀγροῦ νόσφι πόληος* (1.185 = 24.308): hardly a case of routinely recurring formulaic language, but a specific reprise.⁹² ‘Mentes’ claims to be an ancestral *xeinos* of the family (1.187-9), ‘Eperitos’ to be a devoted *xeinos* of Odysseus, of recent standing (24.263-79). Both claim mendaciously to have expected to find Odysseus at home (1.194-5; 24.262-4). The two speeches are also functionally similar: Athene under the *alias* of Mentes and Odysseus under the *alias* of Eperitos both seek by means of a psychological subterfuge to bring Telemachos and Laertes out of an emotional morass and to kick-start them into taking an active part in the action.⁹³

The claims of ‘Mentes’ to be bound ‘for Temese’ (1.184) and of ‘Eperitos’ to hail ‘from Alybas’ (24.304) should be seen in the context of this intratextuality. This intratextuality plainly does not require that they must both be Italian cities (or an Italian and a Sicilian city respectively), but it would be the stronger and more specific for it. It should also be noted that the arguments of this section view the twenty-fourth book of the *Odyssey* as well integrated into the poem as a whole. If this book is not authentic, then it must be considered an extremely deft interpolation.⁹⁴

⁹² Pace Heubeck 1992: 395 ‘Odysseus replies with a formulaic introduction (303 ~ i 179 etc.)’ On ‘specific reprises’, see Currie 2016: 259-62.

⁹³ With respect to Laertes, see Currie (forthcoming, 2).

⁹⁴ On the question of the status of book 24, see Heubeck 1992: 353-4; de Jong 2001: 561-2, 565-6; Saïd 2011: 217-18; Rutherford 2013: 97-102.

4 *Od.* 20.383: Sikeloi (the Suitors' perspective)

Apart from these vexed mentions of 'Temesa' and 'Alybas', we have a handful of unambiguous references to 'Sicilians' in the *Odyssey*. The first is 20.382-3 (spoken by one of the Suitors):

τοὺς ξείνους ἐν νηϊ πολυκλήϊδι βαλόντες
ἐς Σικελοὺς πέμψωμεν, ὅθεν κέ τοι ἄξιον ἄλφοι.

Let us throw the foreigners in a ship and take them to the Sikels; that would fetch you a handsome price.

The anonymous Suitor who makes this speech offers to convey Theoklymenos and the 'beggar' (i.e. Odysseus) by ship 'to the Sikeloi', whence Telemachos is likely to obtain a worthy price for them. Functionally, these 'Sikeloi' resemble the sadistic King Echetos, to whom Antinoos had previously threatened to deport Iros, predicting that he would 'cut off his nose and ears and tear out his testicles and give them to the dogs to eat raw' (18.85-8) – and whom the scholia speculate was a king of either Epirus or Sicily.⁹⁵ Here, the 'Sikeloi' here are viewed indiscriminately as a brutal people with a gruesome interest in the slave trade.⁹⁶ We should remember, though, that this is character-text, and who speaks it: this way of seeing is the Suitors', not the poet's. Narrator-text in the poem provides a contrasting picture, as we shall see presently.

5 *Od.* 24.211, 366, 389: Laertes' Sikel carer (the primary narrator's perspective)

In book 24, the narrator makes reference three times to an old woman characterized as a 'Sikel', who cares for Laertes. The passages in question are the following. First, 24.211-12:

⁹⁵ Scholl. *Od.* 18.85b = Mnaseas fr. 23 Cappelletto (for discussion, see Cappelletto 2003: 223-5). Steiner 2010: 169 calls Echetos a 'sinister bogey-man;' on this behaviour, see further Hall 1989: 26.

⁹⁶ Rutherford 1992: 235 'perhaps "Sicels" is only a vague name for barbarian bogey-men over the seas.' Lane Fox 2008: 122 'The land of the "Sicels" is the right sort of place to be rid of a pair of nuisances.'

ἐν δὲ γυνὴ Σικελὴ γρηῦς πέλεν, ἥ ῥα γέροντα

ἐνδυκέως κομέεσκεν ἐπ' ἀγροῦ νόσφι πόλῃος

Among them [*sc.* Laertes' domestic servants in the country] was a Sikel woman, an old woman [or: a woman, old woman Sikele], who tended the old man assiduously in the country, away from the city.

Second, 24.365-6:

τόφρα δὲ Λαέρτην μεγαλήτορα ᾧ ἐνὶ οἴκῳ

ἀμφίπολος Σικελὴ λοῦσεν καὶ χρίσεν ἐλαίῳ

Then the Sikel serving-woman [or: the serving-woman Sikele] washed great-hearted Laertes in his home and rubbed him with oil.

Third, 24.388-90:

... ἐπεὶ προμολοῦσα κάλεσσε

μήτηρ, γρηῦς Σικελή, ἥ σφεας τρέφε καὶ ῥα γέροντα

ἐνδυκέως κομέεσκεν, ἐπεὶ κατὰ γῆρας ἔμαρψεν.

... since their mother, the Sikel old woman [or: old woman Sikele] had gone ahead and summoned them [*sc.* the sons of Dolios], who raised them and tended the old man [= Dolios, the 'old man' of 387; = Laertes, in 211-12], now that old age had caught up with him.

This woman was first mentioned, but not as a Sikel, in 1.187-93 (Athene-as-'Mentes', speaking to Telemachos):

ξεῖνοι δ' ἀλλήλων πατρώϊοι εὐχόμεθ' εἶναι

ἐξ ἀρχῆς, εἴ πέρ τε γέροντ' εἴρηαι ἐπελθῶν

Λαέρτην ἦρωα, τὸν οὐκέτι φασὶ πόλινδε

ἔρχεσθ', ἀλλ' ἀπάνευθεν ἐπ' ἀγροῦ πῆματα πάσχειν

190

γρηῖ σὺν ἀμφιπόλῳ, ἥ οἱ βρῶσιν τε πόσιν τε

παρτιθεῖ, εὗτ' ἄν μιν κάματος κατὰ γυῖα λάβησιν

ἐρπύζοντ' ἀνά γουνὸν ἀλωῆς οἰνοπέδοιο.

We claim to be guest-friends of each other from our fathers' time, from way back, if you care to go and ask the old man, warrior Laertes, whom they say no longer goes to town, but endures his woes apart in the country, with an old serving-woman, who places the food and drink beside him, when fatigue takes hold of his limbs as he ambles up the slope of his vineyard.

Several things are puzzling here. Why does this old woman remain nameless? Why do we get this emphasis (three times) on her ethnic identity, when she is otherwise so little characterized? Why does her Sikel identity come to the fore only in book 24, not in book 1, when she is first mentioned?⁹⁷ Why does the poet make this character a Sikel at all (given that it is hard to believe that she is an inherited traditional figure)?

The narrator's refraining from naming the 'Sikel old woman' seems a strangely distancing treatment of a character who ought to have a claim on the narratee's sympathy. We should compare another nameless female in the *Odyssey*: the 'Phoenician woman' who colludes in the kidnapping of the young Eumaios (15.417 γυνή Φοίνισσ', and subsequently just γυνή, 'the woman': 434, 439, 458, 478). She appears only in Eumaios' character-text and clearly merits this cold, contemptuous manner of reference from Eumaios. By contrast, our 'Sikel old woman' is spoken of only in narrator-text and clearly does not deserve any such stand-offish treatment on the part of the primary narrator, who is evidently capable of evincing sympathy to some of his characters (Eumaios).⁹⁸

Yet does she remain nameless?⁹⁹ We should remember that Σικελή can be a personal name as well as an ethnic.¹⁰⁰ In sixth- and fifth-century Athens BCE, the female personal names Σικελά (in the Doric dialect) and Σικελία are attested, alongside the male personal names

⁹⁷ Heubeck 1992: 383.

⁹⁸ On the implications of the apostrophe Εὔμαιε, see de Jong 2001: 345; 2009: 94; Schmitz 2019: 3; compare Janko 1992: 317-18.

⁹⁹ Cf. Lane Fox 2008: 122 'Laertes' nameless Sicilian is the first old-age carer known in history or literature.'

¹⁰⁰ For Σικελή as a personal name in the *Odyssey*, see Poccetti 2012: 51. Pace Cerri 2007: 24 n. 32.

Σικανός and Σικελός.¹⁰¹ Moreover, the frequent use of γέρων with male personal names in the *Iliad* (Peleus, Priam, Phoinix, Nestor, and others) and the *Odyssey* (Laertes, Nestor, and others) invites us to see Σικελή as a female personal name qualified by the common noun γρηῦς. This understanding of 389 γρηῦς Σικελή, as ‘old woman Sikele’ is strongly recommended by the use of 387 γέρων Δολίος, ‘old man Dolios’ (her husband) just two lines previously, a line which it clearly intends to echo.¹⁰² So our ‘Sikel old woman’ perhaps does not remain anonymous: the ethnic is capable of doubling up as her personal name.¹⁰³ Note that it is not necessary to take a univocal view of all these instances of Σικελή: it would be possible to view Σικελή at 211 as an ethnic adjective, but to understand it by 366 or 389 as giving her personal name. But regardless of whether Σικελή is (always) used as an ethnic adjective or is (sometimes) used as a proper name, it is surely impossible to understand the word as distancing or derogatory. It is hardly to be approximated to Eumaios’ γυνή Φοίνισσ’ (15.417): in the twenty-fourth book, Σικελή, as ethnic-cum-personal name, is used of a highly sympathetic character, the devoted carer of Laertes and of her own husband Dolios. The ethnic-cum-personal name Σικελή in the narrator’s mouth in book 24 must therefore be allowed to have a quite different valence to the ethnic Σικελοί in the Suitors’ in book 20.

But why this emphasis on her ethnic identity? One possible answer is that this is simply a reflex of historical reality, the presence of Sikel slaves among Greeks (and vice-versa: compare 20.382-3).¹⁰⁴ But other answers are possible. One is that Laertes’ withdrawal from Ithacan society and his marginal existence in the countryside are here underlined by his preference for this Sikel carer. ‘Sikele’ (if we may call her thus) is herself marginal in every

¹⁰¹ *LGPN* II.397 (Athens, 450-425 BCE), IIIb.376 (Atrax, Thessaly, 4th cent. BCE). Poccetti 2012: 53; cf. 93-4 ‘The immigration of women into Greek cities since the earliest times is evidenced by ethnic names, used as feminine personal names.’

¹⁰² 387 ἦλθ’ ὁ γέρων Δολίος, σὺν δ’ υἱεῖς τοῖο γέροντος ~ 389 μήτηρ, γρηῦς Σικελή, ἥ σφραεας τρέφε καὶ ῥα γέροντα (with γέρων Δολίος and γρηῦς Σικελή both placed before the caesura in the third foot).

¹⁰³ On the manner of introduction of minor characters, see Scodel 2002: 97.

¹⁰⁴ Compare Crielaard 1995: 232-3.

way: female, old, foreign, poor, servile, living in the ἀγρός (1.190, 11.188, 24.205). She is diametrically opposed the Suitors, who are numerous (16.245-53), male, young, rich, free, inhabitants of the ἄστυ (23.137), and now squatters in Odysseus' own palace. In fact, no-one could be further removed than this old servant-woman from the several young Ithacan noblemen who are making Laertes' (and Penelope's and Telemachos') lives a misery.

Why is the old woman who looks after Laertes, who is first mentioned in 1.191, only specified in the narrative as being a Sikel as late as book 24? And why do we get this sudden clustering of references to Sicilian-Italian origins (real or pretended) within a short span of narrative in the twenty-fourth book of the poem (lines 211, 304, 307, 363, 389)? Why does Odysseus-as-'Eperitos' pretend to hail from 'Sikanie'? Curiously, these questions admit of an essentially unitary answer.

Undeniably one (troubling) effect of Odysseus' adoption of a Sikanian *alias* is to plunge Laertes into a deeper pitch of despair (before rescuing him from it): Odysseus' homecoming must appear very distant and uncertain if he was as far off course as 'Sikanie' at the time of his last sighting, five years ago (309). But it is possible again to excogitate other, more humane, reasons for Odysseus' adoption of a Sikanian *alias*. One is that Odysseus comprehends Laertes' aversion to contemporary Ithacan society and his preference for the old Sikel woman, and that his adoption of the persona of someone hailing from Alybas in Sikanie is designed to make himself, under this *alias*, instinctively sympathetic to Laertes. 'Eperitos' as a Sikanian is dissociated from the unsympathetic native Ithacans and associated with Laertes' own sympathetic γρηῶς Σικελή. There is a paradox here. Through the lying tale, Odysseus and Laertes initially bond via something very remote: Sicily-Italy. Laertes' unique relationship of trust with a Sikel woman finds a surprising reciprocation in Odysseus-as-'Eperitos'' unique guest-friendship with a man from Ithaca, who also happens to be Laertes' own son. Only once this indirect and fallacious bond between Laertes and Odysseus has been established, and

Laertes thus “prepared”, is it swept away in favour of the revelation of the most immediate bond possible: that between father and son.

This also suggests a reason why the ‘old woman servant’ of *Od.* 1.191 is not yet identified as a Sikel woman. The significance and relevance of her ethnic identity will emerge only in the context of the narrative of book 24. It is only here that she comes to the fore as a loyal devoted servant of remote Sicilian origins, and therefore as an antitype to the treacherous Suitors (and to other native Ithacans and their neighbours, the Cephallenians, who were formerly Odysseus’ allies, *Il.* 2.631, but are now sympathizers of the Suitors, *Od.* 24.353-5).

It is clear that Sicily / Sicilians (Sikeloi) are differently valorized for the Suitors and for Odysseus and his family. For the Suitors, Sicilians are slave-traffickers (20.383). But Laertes’ trusted carer is a Sicilian woman, and a ‘Sikanian’ is also (according to Odysseus’ lying tale) a devoted guest-friend to his absent son. The *Odyssey*’s attitude to Sicilians is therefore more nuanced than may be at first apparent.¹⁰⁵ Not only must we distinguish character-text from narrator-text, but we must also distinguish between different characters’ character-text. The Suitors’ character-text contrasts with that of Odysseus-as-‘Eperitos’ and with that of Athene-as-‘Mentes’, for whom the Italians (if Temese lies in Italy) were partners in the trade for metal ores. The Suitors’ view of Sicilians is undifferentiated: they speak of ‘Sikeloi.’ Laertes’ and Odysseus’ experience of Sicilians, on the other hand, is both differentiated and personalized: Laertes has an individual female Sikel carer; Odysseus, according to his own fiction, would have an individual male Sikanian guest-friend. As for the valence of Σικελοί in the poem, we should recognize that there is a contrast between what Sicilians mean to good characters and what they mean to bad ones. Bad characters construct Sicilians as bad; good characters (and,

¹⁰⁵ We should not make the Suitors speak for the poet or his public (as e.g. Mackie 1996: 110 n. 32: Sicily is ‘a place which was synonymous with death and slavery in Homer’s *Odyssey*’).

seemingly, the narrator himself) construct Sicilians as good. This thought will be taken further in the following section.

6 Odysseus' wanderings: not in Sicily-Italy

We have so far reviewed mentions, certain and uncertain, of Sicily-Italy in the *Odyssey*. We must now consider an important way in which Sicily-Italy is *not* mentioned in the *Odyssey*: as a location for Odysseus' wanderings. We have seen that Homer had knowledge of Sicily-Italy: certainly, through the generic references to Σικελοί and a Σικελή; possibly, through specific references to the Italian (?) cities Temese and Alybas.¹⁰⁶ However, Homer does not situate the Wanderings of Odysseus in Sicily-Italy; at least, he does not do so explicitly, and it is doubtful whether he does so implicitly.¹⁰⁷ The *Odyssey* situates the Wanderings in a non-real-world that is not to be looked for on a real map – what the ancients (following Eratosthenes) referred to as Homer's ἐξωκεανισμός, his 'transposition [*sc.* of the Wanderings] out into the Ocean' (probably, after Herodotus 2.23, being synonymous with 'mythologizing').¹⁰⁸ Even when Odysseus' wanderings take him back from the far West (Aiolië, 10.25, 28-9; Ogygia, 5.268-81)¹⁰⁹ towards Ithaca there is, strikingly, no mention of Sicily or Italy.¹¹⁰ We might be tempted to say that the *Odyssey* is pointedly at pains not to

¹⁰⁶ Cf. Dräger 1997: 16. M. L. West 2011 argues, further, that reference to Sicilian Mt Eryx is intended at *Od.* 5.283. The *Odyssey*-poet's knowledge of Sicily-Italy, extending to Temesa on the Tyrrhenian Sea as well as to Alybas (? = Metapontum, on the Ionian Sea), will then be more extensive than allowed by Cerri 2007: 24-5.

¹⁰⁷ Scholl. on *Od.* 20.383 ἐς Σικελούς· ἐγνώσκετο ἄρα τὰ κατὰ τοὺς Σικελούς· οὐκ εἰκὸς οὖν ἐκεῖ τὴν πλάνην γεγόνεσθαι, "To the Sikels": matters pertaining to the Sikels were therefore known [to the poet]; it is not for that reason probable that the Wandering [*sc.* of Odysseus] took place there.' Compare and contrast Eratosthenes fr. 6 Roller, in Str. 1.2.14 C23. Differently (Homer as locating the Wanderings in Sicily-Italy), see Polyb. 34.2.10, in Str. 1.2.15 C24; Str. 1.2.11 C21-2; and, recently, Roller 2015: 17-19; Pulleyn 2019: 31-2.

¹⁰⁸ Eratosthenes fr. 8 Roller, in Str. 7.3.6 C299; cf. Aristarchus in schol. *Od.* 5.55a; Apollodorus of Athens *BNJ* 244 F 157d, in Str. 1.2.37 C44. See esp. Romm 1992: 172-96, 2011: 586-7; Stockhammer 2013; also: Lesky 1948: esp. 51-68; Hölscher 1989: 135-58; Heubeck 1989: 4-5; M. L. West 2011: 11-12, cf. 2014: 113-22; Saïd 2011: 158-62. Note differently, however, Cerri 2007: 30-46, insisting on a real-world (but unexplored and unknown) location of Homer's Ocean.

¹⁰⁹ See Lesky 1948: 56, 62. Thrinakie must be in the North West (*Od.* 12.325-6; Lesky 1948: 61).

¹¹⁰ M. L. West 2014: 85 'It is noteworthy that in Odysseus' western wanderings he sees nothing of Sicily or Italy.'

associate the Wanderings with Sicily-Italy.¹¹¹ However, that would be to get ahead of ourselves – but we will in what follows see some substantiation of this idea.

The prevailing tradition in antiquity did indeed localize Odysseus' wanderings in Sicily-Italy. The tradition is familiar from Virgil's *Aeneid*.¹¹² However, it was already well established by the Archaic and Classical periods.¹¹³ Kirke is situated in Sicily-Italy by 'Hesiod' (*Theogony* 1011-16). Thucydides states that Cyclopes and Laestrygonians are said by 'poets' to have most anciently to have inhabited a part of Sicily (6.2.1).¹¹⁴ It is not clear who Thucydides intends by 'poets':¹¹⁵ hardly Homer, who neither explicitly nor implicitly locates Cyclopes or Laestrygonians in Sicily. An allusive reference in the 'Hesiodic' *Catalogue* to 'Ortygia' as home to the 'Laestrygonian race' (fr. 150.25-6 M-W) takes for granted an association between Sicily and the Laestrygonians that must have been developed in earlier hexameter poetry.¹¹⁶ Thucydides also situates Aiolie / Aeolia (the island of Aiolos) in the West (3.88.1). He identifies Scherie, land of the Phaeacians, with Corcyra (1.25.4, 3.70.4). He also, perhaps, implicitly identifies 'Thrinakie,' home to the cattle of Helios, with Trinakria, i.e. Sicily (6.2.2).¹¹⁷ Herodotus had already situated the Lotus-eaters on the North African coast, opposite

¹¹¹ Differently, Cerri 2007: 24-5 assumes that Italy, Sicily, and the Tyrrhenian Sea were unknown to Homer and his public.

¹¹² *Aen.* 3.420-440 (Scylla and Charybdis); 3.570-683 (Cyclopes); 7.10 (Circe); 8.416 (Aeolia).

¹¹³ See esp. Malkin 1998: *passim*.

¹¹⁴ ὤκισθη δὲ ὧδε (sc. Σικελία) τὸ ἀρχαῖον, καὶ τοσάδε ἔθνη ἔσχε τὰ ζύμπαντα. παλαιάτατοι μὲν λέγονται ἐν μέρει τινὶ τῆς χώρας Κύκλωπες καὶ Λαιστρυγόνες οἰκῆσαι, ὧν ἐγὼ οὔτε γένος ἔχω εἰπεῖν οὔτε ὀπόθεν ἐσῆλθον ἢ ὅποι ἀπεχώρησαν· ἀρκείτω δὲ ὡς ποιηταῖς τε εἴρηται καὶ ὡς ἕκαστός πη γιγνώσκει περὶ αὐτῶν.

¹¹⁵ Compare schol. *Od.* 9.106 ἐν Σικελία ὑποτίθενται οἱ νεώτεροι (note the plural) τοὺς Κύκλωπας. See Braccési 1993: 13 (thinking of Hesiod only; cf. Debiasi 2001: 38); Kassel and Austin 2001: 49; Hornblower 2008: 264, 266. Thucydides may also be thinking of contemporary, fifth-century, poets, e.g. Euripides, who situated the Cyclopes at Mt Etna (*Cyclops* 20, *et saepe*); it is unclear whether he had been anticipated in this by Epicharmus (Epicharm. *Cyclops*: fr. 70-2 PCG).

¹¹⁶ On 'Hes.' fr. 150.25-6 M-W (narrating the pursuit of the Harpies by the Boreads), see Hirschberger 2004: 326. Str. 1.2.14 C23, taken in conjunction with 'Hesiod' fr. 150.25-6 M-W, suggests that the association of Etna and the Cyclopes / Polyphemos (perhaps the 'son of Poseidon' mentioned in 'Hesiod' fr. 150.27 M-W) may also have been in earlier hexameter poetry. Cf. Debiasi 2001.

¹¹⁷ On Thucydides' Trinakria and Odyssean Thrinakie, see Heubeck 1989: 133; Hornblower 2008: 268. Compare scholl. *Od.* 11.107.

Italy (4.177).¹¹⁸ Before him, Hecataeus (*BNJ* 1 F82) presupposes the localization of Scylla and Charybdis in the Straits of Messina.¹¹⁹

The question for us is: how early Odysseus' Wanderings were situated in the West?¹²⁰ Are we obliged to see this as a post-Homeric development?¹²¹ In general, neoanalytical scholarship has shown that we must often reckon with the possibility that mythological traditions attested in the archaic period were already known to the Homeric poems.¹²² For this particular tradition of Odysseus' western wanderings, *termini ante quos* are furnished by 'Hesiod,' *Theogony* 1011-16 and 'Hesiod,' *Catalogue* fr. 150 M-W.¹²³ Such early *termini ante quos* enable us to say that the tradition of the Western localization of the Wanderings can be (a) later than the *Odyssey*, but only marginally; (b) roughly contemporary with it; or (c) earlier than it.¹²⁴ The availability of the last two positions means that it is entirely possible that a tradition that localized the Wanderings in the West was known to the poet of the *Odyssey* and his public. Certainly there can be no presumption that, in this instance, the fictionalized geographical setting must be older and primary, the real-world setting more recent and secondary.¹²⁵ Nor can we take the real-world setting to be a late, rationalizing step, first taken only by the mythographers and historians of the fifth century BCE.¹²⁶ That is disproven by the fact that elements are already found in the early hexameter poetic tradition (the *Theogony* and the *Catalogue*). Crucially, we are ignorant of how much chronological depth there is to the

¹¹⁸ Cf. Str. 1.2.17 C25, 17.3.17 C834. M. L. West 2014: 116 and n. 43.

¹¹⁹ Compare also Eur. *Med.* 1342-3; Thuc. 4.24.5 (Charybdis).

¹²⁰ See e.g. Lane Fox 2008: 182-3.

¹²¹ The assumption of, e.g., La Torre 2009: 16-17. See further the scholars cited by Dräger 1997: 15 n. 68.

¹²² See e.g. Dowden 2004: 196-202; Burgess 2015: 12-13.

¹²³ For a defence both of Hesiodic authorship and an early date of both passages, see Dräger 1997: 1-26; Janko 2012: 41-3.

¹²⁴ For the various positions taken on these options in antiquity (by Polybius, Aristarchus, Crates, Eratosthenes), see Cerri 2007: 18-20. Lesky 1948: 52 overstates our knowledge ('Wir wissen heute, was einzelne Gelehrte in der Antike wußten, daß diese Lokalisierung im westlichen Mittelmeer jünger als Homer, aber relativ alt ist').

¹²⁵ Pace e.g. Lane Fox 2008: 182, 184-5. Note, too, that here is a parallel question concerning the Argonautic tradition (though the answer does not have to be parallel): see Heubeck 1989: 4-5; M. L. West 2005: 58.

¹²⁶ Cf. Romm 1992: 184 n. 30.

tradition of Odysseus' wanderings before the *Odyssey*; it may be very shallow.¹²⁷ It is conceivable that the tradition of Odysseus' Wanderings grew up around the Greek colonizing experience of eighth century BCE and that Odysseus' Wanderings were being localized (by some) in Sicily-Italy either from the very inception of the tradition or close to its inception.¹²⁸ This is not to say that other localizations of the Wanderings (for instance, in the Eastern Mediterranean: Crete, Egypt) were not also possible in the tradition that preceded our *Odyssey*.¹²⁹

If, as suggested by 'Hesiod' fr. 150 M-W, the wanderings of Odysseus were situated in Sicily-Italy in early epic poetry, then we should consider the possible significance of that setting. Two works of the fifth century BCE are interesting here. Both Thucydides' narrative of the Sicilian expedition (books 6-7) and Euripides' *Cyclops* imply a conception of heroic-age Sicily as a land of man-eating monsters (viz. Cyclopes, Laestrygonians, Scylla and Charbydis).¹³⁰ There is no reason, however, to think that this conceptualization of a monstrous Sicily-Italy originated with either Thucydides or Euripides, or indeed in the fifth century.¹³¹ It may go back to early epic. Early epic poetry, predating the *Theogony*, may also already have situated the defeated monster Typhon under Mt Etna.¹³² It is tempting to suppose that early

¹²⁷ Heubeck 1989: 6-7; M. L. West 2014: 22; S. R. West 2018: 65-6. Implausible, to my mind, is the thesis of Cerri 2007: 26-7 that the narrative of the Wanderings essentially as we have it attained substantially fixed form in the eighth century BCE in ignorance of the Greek colonization of Sicily-Italy, and that it was faithfully transmitted orally in the succeeding decades, with reference to Sicily-Italy continuing to be excluded.

¹²⁸ Eighth-century Euboean settlers may have been responsible for localizing Odysseus' wanderings in the West: see Braccisi 1993: esp. 14-15, 18; Dräger 1997: 17-18; Lane Fox 2008: 138, 181, 183-4, 357-8; La Torre 2009: 16. For the possible involvement of the eighth(?) century BCE poet Eumelus in the development of the tradition, see Braccisi 2001: 30. In general, the *Odyssey* appears very much aware of the contemporary colonizing process: *Od.* 6.9-10, 9.116-41, with Hall 1989: 49; Dougherty 2001: 129; Cerri 2007: 28-9; Antonaccio 2011.

¹²⁹ Tsagalis 2012; M. L. West 2005: 60-1, cf. 2014: 115-22. Aiaië, situated in the East (*Od.* 12.3-4), is borrowed from Argonautic tradition (Heubeck 1989: 52; M. L. West 2005: 43-5).

¹³⁰ See Mackie 1996: 105 n. 11 (on Thucydides); O'Sullivan 2012: 171 (on Euripides). Kirke could be added to the list of Italian man-eating monsters, if we knew that the transformation into swine was understood as a prelude to consumption of the men transformed: compare Bakker 2013: 85-8; Page 1972: 58-9.

¹³¹ Pace O'Sullivan 2012: 172 and 186. Mastromarco 1998 would see the Cyclops of Euripides' *Cyclops* and of fifth-century comedy as less monstrous, more "civilized", than his epic counterpart.

¹³² Thomas and Stubbings 1962: 309; Currie (forthcoming, 1).

Greek epic typically represented the periphery of the Mediterranean world as uncivilized and/or monstrous.¹³³

If Sicily-Italy typically signified the uncivilized or the monstrous in early Greek epic, and if the poet of the *Odyssey* (and his public) may already have known of such localizations of Odysseus' wanderings in early epic poetry, then we should ask what it may have signified for the *Odyssey*-poet to eschew such localization, in favour of a fictionalized, non-real-world setting for the wanderings.¹³⁴

One possible answer is that Homer wanted to underline that he is not making a real-world discourse. Eratosthenes took approximately this view.¹³⁵ The Wanderings would then be self-consciously fictionalized, presented as "just a story." The decision of the *Odyssey*-poet to present the Wanderings as an embedded first-person narration could be adduced in support of this.¹³⁶ So too could the remarks of Alkinoos to Odysseus in the so-called *intermezzo* (11.362-9), likening Odysseus to a singer.¹³⁷

Another possible answer is that Homer wishes to move away from any notion of Sicily-Italy, or any place at the periphery of the real world, as representing the "Uncivilized."¹³⁸ In the *Odyssey*, the West is not a location for monstrous encounters during Odysseus', but Sicily-Italy is rather a place of eminently civilized relations: of trade, for 'Mentes'; and of (pretended)

¹³³ McInerney 2011: 267 'Cyclopes and Laestrygonians are mythopoetic versions of the indigenous people encountered by the Greeks as they traded and colonized in the western Mediterranean. The Cyclopes, in particular,... represent the demonizing of non-Greeks in epic storytelling.' Compare Hall 1989: 49; Dougherty 2001: esp. 136-8; Mitchell 2007: 49-54; S. R. West 2018: 78-82 esp. 82.

¹³⁴ In general, it seems likely that the *Odyssey*-poet set store on diverging from earlier poetry on Odysseus' homecoming: see Danek 1998 and 2015: 359.

¹³⁵ Frr. 1-8 Roller, esp. frr. 7 and 8, in Str. 1.2.19 C26 and 7.3.6 C299. See above.

¹³⁶ See Heubeck 1989: 3-4, 5-6, 7; Griffin 2004: 159; M. L. West 2014: 96-7. See, in general, Aristot. fr. 163 Rose, for the device of putting into a character's mouth traditional material that the poet did not wish not to endorse in his own voice.

¹³⁷ Goldhill 1991: 47, 54-5; Romm 1992: 183-4. Differently, Hölscher 1989: 136-7.

¹³⁸ Compare Heubeck 1989: 4 'On his wanderings Odysseus encounters beings which, in one way or another, are alien or positively hostile to men, and indeed are on occasion represented as the negation of human values; accordingly, these beings are set in a world which... lies beyond the world of experiential reality assigned to the heroes by the poets' (italics added).

guest-host relations, for Odysseus and ‘Eperitos.’ It is also the place of origin of Laertes’ devoted Sikel carer.

We uncovered earlier (above, section 5) a significant intratextual contrast within the narrative of the *Odyssey* between the Suitors’ negatively valorized attitude to Sicily-Italy, as a fearsome place to deport undesirables, and Laertes’ and Odysseus’ positively valorized attitudes; the narrator and narratee may be assumed to share the positively valorized attitudes of the sympathetic characters. We must now reckon with the possibility that this intratextual contrast works alongside an intertextual contrast. The *Odyssey*’s positively valorized attitude to Sicily-Italy would then contrast with a negatively valorized attitude towards Sicily-Italy (as a location for the monstrous) in early epic tradition outside the *Odyssey*.

The possible mentions of the Italian cities Temese and Alybas at 1.184 and 24.304 respectively come back into play here. If these are indeed the Italian cities (or, at least, Italian and Sicilian cities), then the poem will begin with a mention of a fictionalized voyage to Italy, by Taphian ‘Mentes’ to Temesa, and will end with mention of a fictionalized voyage from Italy (or Sicily), by Sikanian ‘Eperitos’ from Alybas. Beyond the obvious ring-composition, it would be possible (following the arguments of this section) to see in this an acknowledgement of the *Odyssey*’s ἐξωκεανισμός: a nod by the poet towards the traditional peregrinations of Odysseus to and from Sicily-Italy that are here eschewed. Although Odysseus does not himself travel to Sicily-Italy in the *Odyssey*, and even though the poem does not narrate his wanderings as its main story, nevertheless the poem alludes at its start and end to (fictitious) voyages by *others* to and from Italy.

The positive representation of Sicily-Italy in the *Odyssey* resulting from the putative transposition of the cannibalistic monsters of the Wanderings to an only vaguely localized, unreal, world (the ἐξωκεανισμός) would be just one side of the coin. The other has to do with

the depiction of native Ithacans. These, pre-eminently the Suitors, emerge as the new “uncivilized”: figuratively, these are the new “monsters”, the new “Cyclopes.”¹³⁹ Like the Cyclops, the Suitors abuse *xeinia* (*passim*); they disregard the gods (22.39), like the Cyclops (9.272-8). They would have killed Telemachos and are laying waste to Odysseus’ property, rather as the Cyclops killed and ate Odysseus’ men. They are killed, as Polyphemos was blinded, by Odysseus by means of a trick and a disguise. With both sets of enemies, Odysseus must battle against forbidding odds: respectively, against a monstrous giant and against numerically vastly superior enemies, advantages which grant both enemies a misplaced sense of security (9.513-16; 22.12-14). In the final battle, the Suitors and Odysseus and Telemachos are locked in the *megaron*, as were Polyphemos and Odysseus and his men in the cave. (The parallelism between the Suitors in the *megaron* and the Cyclops in the cave is signalled at 20.18-21, when Odysseus explicitly recalls the Cyclops episode.) The Suitors also even eat meat and drink wine that is mixed – first metaphorically (20.348), then literally (22.17-21) – with human blood, like the Cyclops (9.297, 373-4).¹⁴⁰

Ironically, it is only the Suitors in the *Odyssey* who cast the Sikeloi in a negative light, while the inhabitants of Ithaca themselves appear in no very positive light in the poem. Native Ithacans who are not themselves evil, such as Halitherses and his party, are ineffectual to oppose the evil represented by the Suitors (note Mentor at 2.239-41).¹⁴¹ The Ithacans generally are assumed to support the Suitors (24.353-5). In the *Odyssey*, the real “Uncivilized” turns out to be in our midst, not at the world’s periphery.¹⁴² Similar points have been made about the

¹³⁹ For the Cyclopes (and Laestrygonians) as a paradigm of the “uncivilized”, see Hall 1989: 52-3.

¹⁴⁰ For parallels between the Suitors and the Cyclops, see Bakker 2013: 53-7; Alden 2017: 233-46.

¹⁴¹ On “evil” in the *Odyssey*, and its punishment, see Kearns 1982: 7-8; Hankey 1990; Steiner 2010: 17-20; Saïd 2011: 371.

¹⁴² This entails a significant qualification of a common view of the poem. See e.g. Dougherty 2001: 136 ‘Starting perhaps with Odysseus’ encounter with the Cyclopes, Greeks have consistently located cannibals at the edges of the earth’; Voicu 2013: 144 ‘As regards geographical positioning, what is worth observing is the mellowing of the barbarians’ traits as Odysseus approaches Ithaca – the strangers’ attributes are gradually softened, as, having left behind the ruthless Cyclops and Laestrygonians, Odysseus encounters the kind king Alcinous of the Phaeacians, only a night’s journey away from Ithaca.’ Cf. Cerri 2007: 34.

deconstruction of the binary opposition of “Self” and “Other” (involving a “de-Othering” of “the Other” and/or an “un-Selving” of “the Self”) in works such diverse works as Herodotus’ *History*, Attic tragedy (for instance, Euripides’ *Trojan Women*), and the *Iliad*.¹⁴³ It may be significant that Athene-as-‘Mentes’ characterizes the inhabitants of Temese as merely ‘differently speaking’ (1.183-4 ἐπ’ ἄλλοθρόους ἀνθρώπους, / ἐς Τεμέσῃν), a notably more neutral way of registering linguistic difference than Demodokos’ blatantly “Othering” reference to ‘savage-voiced Sintians’ (8.294 ἐς Λῆμνον μετὰ Σίντιας ἀγριοφώνους). The *Theogony*, moreover, gave the speaking name Ἄγριος (‘Savage One’?) to one of the mythical rulers of the Etruscans in Italy, ‘very far away’ (1013, 1015).¹⁴⁴ If it is legitimate to press all this, then there is consistently and strikingly less “Othering” of Sicilians-Italians in the *Odyssey* than we might have expected. We may recall that the *Iliad* has plausibly been argued to show less pro-Greek bias, to be more sympathetic to the Trojans, than pre-Homeric epic is likely to have been.¹⁴⁵ The *Odyssey* may similarly show more sympathy for the heroic-age inhabitants of Sicily-Italy than was usual in its tradition. We may be in touch here with another distinctive “Homeric” feature, a shared peculiarity of these two monumental poems: a tendency to refrain polarizing views of Greeks and non-Greeks in the interests of probing the more disconcerting aspects of human nature.¹⁴⁶

¹⁴³ See Pelling 1997: esp. 64-6; Dougherty 1999: 322-3, 326, 331-2; Hall 1989: 201-23; Mitchell 2007: 27-8.

¹⁴⁴ On Ἄγριος, ‘Savage One’, see Malkin 1998: 185-6; Lane Fox 2008: 183; cf. von Kamptz 1982: 236-7. The name is also born by a giant (Apollod. 1.6.2) and a centaur (Apollod. 2.5.4) – but also by a great-uncle of Diomedes (*Il.* 14.117; ‘Hes.’ *Cat.* F5.52 Hirschberger). The suggestion of Katz 2010: 81-3 that ‘Hes.’ *Th.* 1013 Ἄγριον ἠδὲ Λατῖνον hides a reference to the *ager Latinus* is more ingenious than it is persuasive.

¹⁴⁵ Kakridis 1971: esp. 64-5; Taplin 1986: 70. Compare Hall 1989: 28-30.

¹⁴⁶ The classic discussion of the distinctiveness of the two Homeric poems relative to their tradition is Griffin 1977 (see esp. p. 46, on ‘the treatment of the Trojan enemy as being in no way monstrous or hateful’).

Abbreviations

- HE* *Homer Encyclopedia*, M. Fingelberg (ed.). Vols i-iii. Malden MA, 2011.
LfgrE *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*, B. Snell et al. (eds.). Vols i–xxv. Göttingen, 1955-2010.
LGPN *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*. Vols. i-. Oxford, 1987-.
RE *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, G. Wissowa et al. (eds.). Vols i-xxiv. Stuttgart, 1894-1980.

References

- ALDEN, M. (2017), *Para-Narratives in the Odyssey: Stories in the Frame* (Oxford).
ALLEN, T. W. (1910), 'The Homeric Catalogue of Ships', *JHS* 30: 292-322.
ALLEN T. W. (ed.) (1917), *Homeri opera. Tomus iii Odysseae libros i-xii continens* (Oxford).
ANTONACCIO, C. M. (2011), art. 'Colonization,' *HE* i.171-2.
AUSTIN, R. G. (ed.) (1964), *P. Vergilii Maronis Aeneidos liber secundus* (Oxford).
BAGG, A. M. (2007), *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der neuassyrischen Zeit. Teil I: Die Levante = Répertoire géographique des textes cunéiformes, vol. 7/1* (Wiesbaden).
BAKKER, E. J. (2013), *The Meaning of Meat and the Structure of the Odyssey* (Cambridge).
BEKKER, I. (ed.) (1826-1827), *Pausaniae De situ Graeciae libri decem i-ii* (Berlin).
BILLERBECK, M. (ed.) (2006), *Stephani Byzantini Ethnica: Volumen I: A-Γ* (Berlin and Boston).
BILLERBECK, M. and Neumann-Hartmann, A. (eds.) (2016), *Stephani Byzantini Ethnica: Volumen IV: II-Y* (Berlin and Boston).
BIRASCHI, A. M. (1982), 'Aspetti e problemi della più antica storia di Temesa nella tradizione letteraria', in Maddoli (ed.): 29-39.
BOARDMAN, J. (1964), *The Greeks Overseas* (Harmondsworth).
BOWIE, A. M. (2013), *Homer Odyssey Books XIII and XIV* (Cambridge).
BRACCESI, L. (1993), 'Gli Eubei e la geografia dell'Odissea', *Hesperia: studi sulla grecità di occidente* 3: 11-23.
BRACCESI, L. (2001), *Hellenikòs Kolpos: Supplemento a Grecità adriatica = Hesperia: Studi sulla grecità d'Occidente* 13 (Rome).
BURGESS, J. S. (2015), *Homer* (London and New York).
BURKERT, W. (1992), *The Orientalizing Revolution: Near Eastern Influence on Greek Culture in the Early Archaic Age* (Cambridge, Mass.).
CAMASSA, G. (1984), *Dov'è la fonte dell'argento: una ricerca di protostoria mediterranea* (Palermo).
CAPPELLETTO, P. (2003), *I frammenti di Mnasea: Introduzione, testo e commento* (Milan).
CASEVITZ, M. (ed.) (2002), 'Texte', in Casevitz, †Pouilloux, and Jacquemin 2002: 1-82.
CASEVITZ, M., †POUILLOUX, J. and JACQUEMIN, A. (2002), *Pausanias: Description de la Grèce vi L'Éliade (II)* (Paris).
CASEVITZ, M. (1992), 'La tradition du texte de Pausanias', in M. Casevitz, †J. Pouilloux and F. Chamoux, *Pausanias: Description de la Grèce i L'Attique* (Paris): xxxi-xlvi.
CERRI, G. (2007), 'L'Oceano di Omero: un'ipotesi nuova sul percorso di Ulisse', in E. Greco and M. Lombardo (eds.), *Atene e l'Occidente: I grandi temi: Le premesse, i protagonisti, le forme della comunicazione e dell'interazione, i modi dell'intervento ateniese in Occidente. Atti del Convegno Internazionale, Atene 25-27 maggio 2006* (Athens): 13-51.
CHAINTRAINE, P. (1988), *Grammaire homérique vol. I Phonétique et morphologie* (Paris, 6th edn.).
CLAVIER, E. (ed.) (1814-1823), *Παυσανίου Ελλάδος περιήγησις: Description de la Grèce de Pausanias i-vii* (Paris).
COOK, E. (2014), 'Structure as Interpretation in the Homeric *Odyssey*', in D. Cairns and R. Scodel (eds.), *Defining Greek Narrative* (Edinburgh): 75-101.

- CRIELAARD, J. P. (1995), 'Homer, History and Archaeology', in J. P. Crielaard (ed.), *Homeric Questions* (Amsterdam): 201-88.
- CURRIE, B. G. F. (2016), *Homer's Allusive Art* (Oxford).
- CURRIE, B. G. F. (forthcoming, 1), 'Typhoeus and Etna in Hesiod, Pindar, and "Aeschylus"', in E. Prodi and S. Vecchiato (eds.), *Phaidimos Hektor. Studi in onore di Willy Cingano per il suo 70mo compleanno* (Venice).
- CURRIE, B. G. F. (forthcoming, 2), 'Odysseus and Laertes: Emotionally Reunited', in M. P. de Bakker, J.J.H. Klooster, and B. van den Berg (eds.), *Narratological Approaches to Emotions in Ancient Greek Narrative and Beyond. Studies in Honor of Irene de Jong on the Occasion of her 65th Birthday* (Leiden and Boston).
- D'ALESSIO, G. B. (ed.) (1996), *Callimaco: Aitia, Giambi e altri frammenti* (Milan).
- DANEK, G. (1998), *Epos und Zitat. Studien zu den Quellen der Odyssee* (Vienna).
- DANEK, G. (2015), 'Nostoi', in M. Fantuzzi and C. Tsagalis (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Epic Cycle* (Cambridge): 355-79.
- DENNISTON, J. D. (1950), *The Greek Particles* (Oxford, 2nd edn.).
- DE SANCTIS, G. (1966), *Scritti minori* vol. 1 (Rome).
- DEBIASI, A. (2001), 'Esiodo fr. 150, 25 M.-W.', *Hesperia: studi sulla grecità di occidente* 14: 37-40.
- DILLER, A. (1956), 'Pausanias in the Middle Ages', *TAPA* 87: 84-97.
- DINDORF, W. (ed.) (1855), *Scholias Graeca in Homeri Odysseam* i-ii (Oxford).
- DOUGHERTY, C. (1999), 'The Double Vision of Euripides' *Cyclops*: An Ethnographic *Odyssey* on the Satyr Stage', *Comparative Drama* 33: 313-38.
- DOUGHERTY, C. (2001), *The Raft of Odysseus: The Ethnographic Imagination of Homer's Odyssey* (New York and Oxford).
- DOWDEN, K. (2004), 'The Epic Tradition in Greece', in R. L. Fowler (ed.): 188-205.
- DRÄGER, P. (1997), *Untersuchungen zu den Frauenkatalogen Hesiods* (Stuttgart).
- DUECK, D. (2000), *Strabo of Amasia: A Greek Man of Letters in Augustan Rome* (London).
- DUECK, D. (ed.) (2017), *The Routledge Companion to Strabo* (London and New York).
- DUNBABIN, T. J. (1948), *The Western Greeks. The History of Sicily and South Italy from the Foundation of the Greek Colonies to 480 BC* (Oxford).
- ERBSE, H. (1972), *Beiträge zum Verständnis der Odyssee* (Berlin and New York).
- FORBES, R. J. (1950), *Metallurgy in Antiquity: A Notebook for Archaeologists and Technologists* (Leiden).
- FOWLER, R. L. (ed.) (2004), *The Cambridge Companion to Homer* (Cambridge).
- GIANNELLI, G. (1963), *Culti e miti della Magna Grecia: Contributo alla storia più antica delle colonie greche in Occidente* (Florence).
- GOLDHILL, S. (1991), *The Poet's Voice: Essays on Poetics and Greek Literature* (Cambridge).
- GRIFFIN, J. (1977), 'The Epic Cycle and the Uniqueness of Homer', *JHS* 97: 39-53.
- GRIFFIN, J. (2004), 'The Speeches', in R. L. Fowler (ed.): 156-67.
- GUARASCIO, M. (1982), 'Un contributo di dati e metodi della ricerca geomineraria in archeologia: il caso di Temesa', in Maddoli (ed.): 125-42.
- HALL, E. (1989), *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy* (Oxford).
- HANKEY, R. (1990), "'Evil" in the *Odyssey*', in E. Craik (ed.), '*Owls to Athens*': *Essays on Classical Subjects for Sir Kenneth Dover* (Oxford): 87-95.
- HARDER, A. (2012), *Callimachus Aetia: Introduction, Text, Translation, and Commentary* Vol. 2. *Commentary* (Oxford).
- HEUBECK, A. (1989), *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey. Volume II: Books IX-XVI* (Oxford).
- HEUBECK, A. (1992), 'Books XXIII-XXIV', in J. A. Russo, M. Fernandez-Galiano, and A. Heubeck, *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey Volume III: Books XVII-XXIV* (Oxford): 313-418.

- HIRSCHBERGER, M. (2004), *Gynaikōn katalogos und Megalai ēhoiai: ein Kommentar zu den Fragmenten zweier hesiodeischer Epen* (Munich).
- HÖLSCHER, U. (1989), *Die Odyssee: Epos zwischen Märchen und Roman* (Munich, 2nd edn.).
- HORNBLOWER, S. J. (2008), *A Commentary on Thucydides iii Books 5.25-8.109* (Oxford).
- HORNBLOWER, S. (2015), *Lykophron: Alexandra. Greek text, Translation, Commentary, and Introduction* (Oxford).
- JACQUEMIN, A. (2002), ‘Commentaire’, in Casevitz, †Pouilloux, and Jacquemin 2002: 83-311.
- JANKO, R. (1992), *The Iliad: A Commentary, Vol. 4: Books 13-16* (Cambridge).
- JANKO, R. (2012), ‘πρῶτόν τε καὶ ὕστατον αἰὲν ἀείδειν: Relative Chronology and the Literary History of the Early Greek Epos’, in Ø. Andersen and D. T. T. Haug (eds.), *Relative Chronology in Early Greek Epic Poetry* (Cambridge): 20-43.
- JONES, H. L. (ed., trans.) (1967), *The Geography of Strabo* (Cambridge, Mass.).
- DE JONG, I. J. F. (2001), *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey* (Cambridge).
- KAKRIDIS, J. T. (1971), *Homer Revisited* (Lund).
- KARAGEORGHIS, V. (1982), *Cyprus. From the Stone Age to the Romans* (London).
- KASSEL, R. and AUSTIN, C. (eds.) (2001), *Poetae comici Graeci vol. I Comoedia Dorica, mimi, phlyaces* (Berlin and New York).
- KASSIANIDOU, V. (2004), ‘“And at Tamassos there are important mines of copper...” (Strabo, *Geography*, 14.6.5)’, *Cahiers du Centre d’Études Chypriotes* 34: 33-46.
- KATZ, J. T. (2010), ‘Linguistics’, in A. Barchiesi and W. Scheidel (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Studies* (Oxford): 77-92.
- KEARNS, E. (1982) ‘The Return of Odysseus: A Homeric Theoxeny’, *CQ* 32: 2-8.
- KROLL, W. (1931), art. ‘Metabos’, *RE* xv.1316-17.
- KUHN, J. (ed.) (1696), *Πανσανίου Ἑλλάδος περιήγησις, hoc est Pausaniae Graeciae descriptio accurata* (Leipzig).
- LA TORRE, G. F. (1997), ‘Tavola rotonda e dibattito’, in *Mito e storia in Magna Grecia: atti del trentaseiesimo convegno di studi sulla Magna Grecia: Taranto, 4-7 ottobre 1996* (Taranto): 366-72.
- LA TORRE, G. F. (2006), ‘Temesa, Fondazione degli Ausoni (Strabo VI, 1, 5)’, in *Studi in protostoria in onore di Renato Peroni* (Florence): 532-9.
- LA TORRE, G. F. (2009), ‘Venticinque anni dopo Temesa ed il suo territorio: nuovi dati e prospettive di ricerca’, in G. F. La Torre (ed.), *Dall’ Oliva al Savuto: Studi e ricerche sul territorio dell’antica Temesa. Atti del convegno Campora San Giovanni (Amantea, CS), 15-16 Settembre 2007* (Pisa and Rome): 9-37.
- LANE FOX, R. (2008), *Travelling Heroes. Greeks and their Myths in the Epic Age of Homer* (London).
- LEICHTY, E. (ed.) (2011), *Royal Inscriptions of Esarhaddon, King of Assyria (680-669 BC)* (Winona Lake, Ind.).
- LESKY, A. (1948), ‘Aia’, *WS* 63: 22-68.
- LIGHTFOOT, J. L. (2017), ‘Man of Many Voices and of Much Knowledge; or, In Search of Strabo’s Homer’, in Dueck (ed.): 251-62.
- LORIMER, H. L. (1950), *Homer and the Monuments* (London).
- MAAß, E. (1907), ‘Der Kampf um Temesa’, *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts* 22: 18-53.
- MACKIE, C. J. (1996), ‘Homer and Thucydides: Corcyra and Sicily’, *CQ* 46: 103-13.
- MADDOLI, G. (ed.) (1982), *Temesa e il suo territorio. Atti del colloquio di Perugia e Trevi (30-31 maggio 1981)* (Tarranto).
- MADDOLI, G., NAFISSI, M. and SALADINO, V. (2003), *Pausania: Guida della Grecia. Libro VI: L’Elide e Olimpia* (Milan).
- MALKIN, I. (1998), *The Returns of Odysseus: Colonization and Ethnicity* (Berkeley and London).

- MANFREDI-GIGLIOTTI, M. (1994), *ΤΕΜΨΑ-ΤΕΜΕΣΗ: Memorie storiche sull'antica città di Temesa, con particolare riguardo all'individuazione del suo sito* (Cosenza).
- MASTROMARCO, G. (1998), 'La degradazione del mostro. La maschera del Ciclope nelle commedia e nel drama satiresco del Quinto secolo a.C.', in A. M. Belardinelli, O. Imperio, G. Mastromarco, M. Pellegrino, and P. Totaro, *Tessere: Frammenti della commedia greca: Studi e commenti* (Bari): 9-42.
- MCINERNEY, J. (2011), art. 'Ethnicity', *HE* i.265-7.
- MEINEKE, A. (ed.) (1849), *Stephani Byzantii ethnicorum quae supersunt* (Berlin).
- MEINEKE, A. (ed.) (1877), *Strabonis Geographica* i-iii (Leipzig).
- MEINEKE, A. (1852), *Vindiciarum Strabonianarum liber* (Berlin).
- MELE, A. (1998), 'Culti e miti nella storia di Metaponto', in *Siritide e Metapontino: storie di due territori coloniali. Atti dell'incontro di studio Policoro, 31 Ottobre - 2 Novembre 1991* (Naples and Paestum): 67-90.
- MELE, A. (2009), 'Per una rivisitazione di Temesa', in La Torre (ed.): 79-101.
- MITCHELL, L. (2007), *Panhellenism and the Barbarian in Archaic and Classical Greece* (Swansea).
- NORDHEIDER, H. W. (2008), art. 'Τεμέση', *LfgRE* xxii.394.
- O'SULLIVAN, P. (2012), 'Dionysos, Polyphemos, and the Idea of Sicily in Euripides' Cyclops', in D. Rosenbloom and J. Davidson (eds.), *Greek Drama IV: Texts, Contexts, Performance* (Oxford): 169-89.
- OBERTHUMMER, E. (1932), art. 'Tamassos', *RE* IV.A.2: 2095-2098.
- ORSI, P. (1916), 'Nocera Tirinese. Ricerche al Piano della Tirenese sede dell'antica Nuceria', *Notizie degli scavi* 335-62.
- PAGE, D. (1972), *Folktales in Homer's Odyssey* (Cambridge, Mass.).
- PAPADOPOULOS, J. K. (2011), art. 'Temesa', *HE* iii.845.
- PEARSON, A. C. (ed.) (1917), *The Fragments of Sophocles. Edited with Additional Notes from the Papers of Sir R. C. Jebb and Dr W. G. Headlam* iii (Cambridge).
- PELLING, C. B. R. (1997), 'East is East and West is West – Or Are They? National Stereotypes in Herodotus', *Histos* 1: 51-66.
- PFEIFFER, R. (1968), *History of Classical Scholarship: From the Beginning to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford).
- PHILIPP, H. (1934), art. 'Temesa', *RE* V.A.1.459-60.
- PHILLIPS, E. D. (1953), 'Odysseus in Italy', *JHS* 73: 53-67.
- POCETTI, P. (2012), 'Language Relations in Sicily: Evidence for the Speech of the Σικανοί, the Σικελοί and others', in O. Tribulato (ed.), *Language and Linguistic Contact in Ancient Sicily* (Cambridge): 49-94.
- PONTANI, F. (ed.) (2007), *Scholia Graeca in Odysseam. I. Scholia ad libros α-β* (Rome).
- PUGLIESI CARRATELLI, G. (1982), 'Reflessioni su Temesa', in Maddoli (ed.): 11-14.
- PULLEYN, S. (ed.) (2019), *Homer Odyssey 1. Edited with an Introduction, Translation, Commentary and Glossary* (Oxford).
- RADT, S. (ed.) (2003), *Strabons Geographika Band 2 Buch V-VIII: Text und Übersetzung* (Göttingen).
- RADT, S. (ed.) (2008), *Strabons Geographika Band 7 Buch IX-XIII: Kommentar* (Göttingen).
- REYNOLDS, L. D. and WILSON, N. G. (2013), *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature* (Oxford, 4th edn.).
- RICHARDSON, N. J. (1991), 'Homer and Cyprus', in V. Karageorghis (ed.), *The Civilizations of the Aegean and their Diffusion in Cyprus and the Eastern Mediterranean 2000-600 BC* (Larnaca): 125-8.
- RISCH, E. (1965), 'Ein Gang durch die griechischen Ortsnamen', *MH* 22(4): 193-205.
- ROCHA-PEREIRA, M. H. (1989-1990), *Pausaniae Graeciae descriptio* i-iii (Leipzig, 2nd edn.).
- ROLLER, D. W. (2010), *Eratosthenes' Geography: Fragments Collected and Translated, with Commentary and Additional Material* (Princeton and Oxford).

- ROLLER, D. W. (2015), *Ancient Geography: The Discovery of the World in Classical Greece and Rome* (London and New York).
- ROMM, J. S. (1992), *The Edges of the Earth in Ancient Thought: Geography, Exploration, and Fiction* (Princeton).
- ROMM, J. (2011), ‘Odysseus’ Wanderings’, *HE* ii.584-88.
- RÜSING, T. (1965), art. ‘Ἀλύβας’, *LfgRE* iv.582-3.
- RUTHERFORD, R. B. (1992), *Homer Odyssey Books XIX and XX* (Cambridge).
- RUTHERFORD, R.B. (2013) *Homer* (Cambridge).
- SAÏD, S. (2011), *Homer and the Odyssey* (Oxford) (first published as *Homère et l’Odyssee* (Paris, 1998)).
- SBORDONE, F. (ed.) (1970), *Strabonis Geographica. Vol. secundum: Libri III-VI* (Rome).
- SCHMITZ, T. A. (2019), ‘Epic Apostrophe from Homer to Nonnus’, *SO* 93(1): 37-57.
- SCODEL, R. (2002), *Listening to Homer: Tradition, Narrative and Audience* (Ann Arbor).
- SIEBELIS, K. G. (ed.) (1822-1828), *Πανσανίου Ελλάδος περιήγησις: Pausaniae Graeciae descriptio* i-v (Leipzig).
- SISTAKO, E. (2002), ‘Kallimachos als Homererklärer: Das Beispiel der geographischen Namen’, *WS* 115: 145-73.
- SLATER, W. J. (1989), ‘Problems in Interpreting Scholia on Greek Texts’, in J. N. Grant (ed.), *Editing Greek and Latin Texts: Papers given at the Twenty-Third Annual Conference on Editorial Problems, University of Toronto, 6-7 November 1987* (New York): 37-61.
- STANFORD, W. B. (1958), *The Odyssey of Homer. Vol. ii (Books xiii-xxiv)* (London).
- STEINER, D. (2010), *Homer Odyssey Books XVII and XVIII* (Cambridge).
- STOCKHAMMER, R. (2013), ‘Exokeanismos: The (Un) Mappability of Literature’, *Primerjalna književnost* 36 (2): 123-38.
- TAPLIN, O. (1986), ‘Homer’, in J. Boardman, J. Griffin, and O. Murray (eds.), *The Oxford History of the Classical World* (Oxford): 50-77.
- THOMAS, H. and STUBBINGS, F. H. (1962), ‘Lands and Peoples in Homer’, in A. J. B. Wace and F. H. Stubbings (eds.), *A Companion to Homer* (London): 283-310.
- TRACHSEL, A. (2017), ‘Strabo and the Homeric Commentators’, in Dueck (ed.): 263-75.
- TSAGALIS, C. (2012), ‘Deauthorizing the Epic Cycle: Odysseus’ False Tale to Eumaeus (*Od.* 14.199-359)’, in F. Montanari, A. Rengakos, and C. Tsagalis, *Homeric Contexts: Neoanalysis and the Interpretation of Oral Poetry = Trends in Classics Supplementary Volumes 12* (Berlin and Boston): 309-45.
- VAN THIEL, H. (ed.) (1991), *Homeri Odyssea* (Hildesheim, Zurich, and New York).
- VISINTIN, M. (1992), *Le vergine e l’eroe: Temesa e la leggenda di Euthymos di Locri* (Bari).
- VOICU, S. (2013), ‘Greeks and Barbarians in Homer’s *Odyssey*’, *Diversitate si identitate Culturala in Europa* 10: 135-46.
- VON DER MÜHLL, P. (ed.) (1962), *Homeri Odyssea* (Stuttgart, 3rd edn.)
- VON KAMPTZ, H. (1982), *Homerische Personennamen. Sprachwissenschaftliche und historische Klassifikation* (Göttingen).
- WACKERNAGEL, J. W. (1916), *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer* (Göttingen).
- WEĆOWSKI, M. (2019), ‘An Intentionale Gegenwart? Odysseus’ “False Tales” and the Intellectual Context of the *Odyssey*’, in A. Möller (ed.), *Historiographie und Vergangenheitsvorstellungen in der Antike* (Göttingen): 17-34.
- WEST, M. L. (1966), *Hesiod Theogony* (Oxford).
- WEST, M. L. (2005), ‘*Odyssey* and *Argonautica*’, *CQ* 55: 39-64.
- WEST, M. L. (2011), ‘Poseidon’s Viewpoint (*Od.* V 283)’, *Eikasmos* 22: 11-14.
- WEST, M. L. (2013), *The Epic Cycle: A Commentary on the Lost Troy Epics* (Oxford).
- WEST, M. L. (2014), *The Making of the Odyssey* (Oxford).
- WEST, M. L. (ed.) (2017), *Homerus Odyssea* (Berlin and Boston).

- WEST, S. R. (ed.) (1981), 'Testo', in A. Heubeck, G. A. Privitera, and S. R. West, *Omero Odissea: Volume I (Libri I-IV)* (Milan): 6-174.
- WEST, S. R. (1988), 'Books I-IV', in A. Heubeck, S. R. West, and J. B. Hainsworth, *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey, Volume I: Introduction and Books I-VIII* (Oxford): 51-245.
- WEST, S. R. (2018), 'Odysseus' Eclectic Itinerary', in S. Hornblower and G. Biffis (eds.), *The Returning Hero: Nostoi and Traditions of Mediterranean Settlement* (Oxford): 65-82.

Bruno Currie
Oxford
bruno.currie@classics.ox.ac.uk