

## TEXTUAL FLUCTUATIONS AND COSMIC STREAMS: OCEAN AND ACHELOIOS\*

**Abstract:** According to the ancient commentaries, *Iliad* 21.195 was omitted by some sources, thereby making Acheloios, instead of Ocean, the origin of all waters, including the sea: the reasons for and the date of such a version of the text have been debated. In this paper I argue that the version without line 195 actually represents the earlier textual stage. This role of Acheloios is paralleled in the poem interpreted in the Derveni papyrus, and some features of Acheloios' cosmological function, as well as his iconography, find interesting parallels in the Near East. As a 'cosmic' figure, Acheloios was in competition with Ocean, and is only rarely so represented in later preserved texts. His function as the origin of all fresh water and the source of all springs was more persistent, probably due also to his cultic role in Dodona: this, too, is probably reflected in another ancient variant for the text of *Il.* 16.234.

### 1. THE TRANSMISSION OF *ILIAD* 21.195: OCEAN AND ACHELOIOS

THE text of the *Iliad* is notoriously ungenerous in cosmogonic and cosmological details. Where these do occur (most of them are clustered around Books 14 and 15) they offer glimpses of a world somewhat different from the one that came into being and was described in the Hesiodic *Theogony*.

One interesting and puzzling item is offered by Achilles in one of his exuberant war speeches. The whole first part of Book 21 builds up escalating provocations of the hero against Xanthos/Skamandros, and rivers in general, culminating in his physical confrontation with the river. First, he pursues the Trojans until they seek refuge, with their chariots, in the river itself; then he starts slaughtering them in the river, filling its streams with dead bodies and blood. It is by the river that he commits his most brutal killing, that of Lykaon, a naked suppliant. He throws Lykaon's body into the river, so that the fishes may eat him, and while insulting the corpse, adds that the river himself, in whose honour the Trojans had offered many sacrifices, shall not be capable of helping them. It is at this stage that we first hear of Xanthos' wrath at Achilles' behaviour.

The hero's next adversary is Asteropaios, the grandson of another great river, the Macedonian Axios: his strength is increased by the Trojan river. He succeeds in slightly wounding Achilles, but is quickly killed by the Greek hero. Achilles delivers a vaunting speech over his body, the main target of which seems to be Xanthos himself, rather than the dead Asteropaios. The descendants of rivers, says Achilles, cannot compete with those of Zeus. The great river is explicitly defied: καὶ γὰρ σοὶ ποταμός γε πάρα μέγας, εἰ δύναται τι / χραισμεῖν. But it is not possible to compete with Zeus (vv. 194-9):

τῶι οὐδὲ κρείων Ἀχελῷος ἰσοφαρίζει,  
οὐδὲ βαθυρρεῖται μέγα σθένος Ὠκεανοῖο,  
ἐξ οὗ περ πάντες ποταμοὶ καὶ πᾶσα θάλασσα  
καὶ πᾶσαι κρῆναι καὶ φρεῖατα μακρὰ νάουσιν·  
ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅς δειδοῖκε Διὸς μέγαλοιο κεραυνὸν  
δεινὴν τε βροντὴν, ὅτ' ἀπ' οὐρανόθεν σμαραγῆσσι.

195

\* An oral version of this paper was presented as a talk at the Department of the Classics of Harvard University in December 2002: I am grateful to the participants in the discussion on that occasion. Thanks to F. Pomponio for precious advice on the Akkadian texts, to Prof. K. Tsantsanoglou for sending me the text and commentary

of the relevant part of col. 23 of his forthcoming edition of the Derveni papyrus, to B. Acosta-Hughes for revising the English of a previous draft, to J.N. Bremmer for bibliographical advice, to A.C. Cassio, M.S. Funghi and the two readers for the *JHS* for important comments and constructive criticism.

not even powerful Acheloios is a match for him,  
 nor the great strength of deep-flowing Ocean,  
 from whom all rivers and the whole sea  
 and all springs and the great wells flow;  
 yet even he fears the lightning of Zeus the great,  
 and his fearful thunder, when he roars from the sky.

195

Achilles' defiant attitude is soon met by the river's reaction, and Xanthos will prove indeed to be a match for the mortal hero.

In ancient times Achilles' digression on the origin of all streams and the sea, reported above as printed in most modern editions, was current in different textual shapes. Until 1890, all we knew was that 'somebody' (so the T scholia: *τινὲς οὐ γράφουσι τὸν στίχον, θέλοντες ἐξ Ἀχελώϊου ῥεῖν· τὸν γὰρ αὐτὸν Ὀκεανῶι Ἀχελωϊόν φασιν*) or, more precisely, Zenodotos (so the A scholia: *ὅτι Ζηνόδοτος αὐτὸν οὐκ ἔγραφεν*) 'did not write' line 195, mentioning Ocean, so that the origin of all waters would have been Acheloios.

It is basically due to chance that our knowledge about this issue spectacularly increased in the last decade of the nineteenth century. In 1891 J. Nicole published for the first time the scholia contained in a thirteenth-century manuscript, Genavensis 44, once belonging to Manuel Moschopoulos. In a few pages of this volume a much richer version of the scholia to *Iliad* 21 is preserved, which seems to go back to an early Imperial source, different from the one from which the other scholia originated. These give a different account of Zenodotos' position: *ὅτι Ζηνόδοτος τοῦτον ἠθέτηκεν ἄραξ*. The Ephesian scholar is not said 'not to have written' the line, but to have 'athetized it, having taken it away'. The main verb 'athetized' implies that Zenodotos thought that the line was to be kept in the text with a marginal sign, the *obelos*, indicating that it did not really belong there. The participle *ἄραξ*, on the other hand, seems to imply straightforward omission, as possibly *οὐκ ἔγραφεν* did.<sup>1</sup> In the Genavensis this latter verb is used to describe the position of another ancient scholar, the Athenian Megakleides, a late fourth-century follower of Aristotle, whose words are quoted *verbatim*: *ῥᾶποῖον ῥεῖθρον μείζον Ἀχελώϊου, ἐξ οὐπερ πάντες ποταμοί*," ὥστε παρέλιπεν τὸν περὶ τοῦ Ὀκεανοῦ, 'which stream is greater than Acheloios, "from whom all rivers <flow>"?', followed by the conclusion 'so that he omitted the line about Ocean' (F 4b in Janko (2000) 141). This last sentence is potentially ambiguous, and has sometimes been read as if Megakleides had intentionally omitted the line. His own wording, however, certainly implies that he did not know it, as he quoted this very passage in order to show that Acheloios is indeed the source of all rivers. The line, as we learn from the Genavensis, was defended by Krates of Mallos (*fr.* 29 Broggiato), as being in accord with his own theories about Ocean, which he notoriously argued were shared by the author of the *Iliad*. In this context he stated that there were 'some who deleted' (*ἐξαιροῦντες*) the line. It has been argued that Krates did not know Zenodotos' work (*cf.* Broggiato (2001) 193-4). If he was referring to Megakleides (whom he quotes also elsewhere) he was, intentionally or not, misrepresenting his position: he may have known, however, somebody else who, perhaps also on the basis of Megakleides, argued that 195 was to be omitted.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> On the terminological problems involved by the use of *οὐ γράφειν*, *ἀθετεῖν*, *αἶρειν* and similar verbs, *cf.* Nickau (1977) 6-30; Montanari (1998) 7, 9. West (2001) 41 n.36 lists this passage among Zenodotos' omissions, not among his *atheteses*.

<sup>2</sup> The T scholia state that 'some did not write the line, on the ground that Ocean and Acheloios are the same'.

This is certainly not Megakleides' position, and Zenodotos' reason was not stated. The T scholia, in fact, probably simply reflect the explanation given by some of the interpreters who read the text without 195, not the reason why somebody deleted the line: *contra*, Schmidt (1976) 114 and 117-18.

By a singular stroke of luck, a few years later, in 1899 a second-century AD fragmentary papyrus was published, with an extremely rich commentary on *Iliad* 21 (*P.Oxy.* 221, now in the British Library), attributed by a note written transversely between columns 10 and 11 to one Ammonios. This offers material apparently going back, in part, to the same source as the Genavensis. The discussion on line 195 started in the lost portion of column 8, and occupies most of column 9, which is reasonably well preserved. This is by far the most complete ancient treatment of the issue available to us:<sup>3</sup>

σανται[... ] ( ) κα[... ] πασ[... ] ( ) ὕκατέλεξα  
 Ἄχελω[ίου] ἀργυροδ[ί]νεω, / ἐξ οὐ πᾶσα  
 θάλασ[σα]. κ]αὶ Μεγακλείδης δ' [ἐ]ν Ἄ' Πε-  
 ρὶ Ὀμή[ρο]υ γράφει· “ποῖον ρεῖθρο[ν] μείζον  
 Ἄχελώ[ι]ου, ἐξ οὐπερ πάντες ποτ[α]μοί;”. ὁ  
 μέν[τι] οἱ γ' Ἄρισταρχος Ὀμηρικὸν αὐτ[ὸ]ν  
 ἀποφ[αίν]ει· τὰ γὰρ ρεύματα ἐξ Ὠκεαν[ο]ῦ  
 εἶναι. [Σέλ]ευκος δ' ἴεν ε' [Ἡ]ρακλείας· “πῶ[ς]  
 δ' ἐπορ[εύθ]ησ ρεῦμα Ἀ[χ]ελ[ω]ίου ἀργυ[ρο-]  
 δίνα, / Ὠκεανοῦ ποταμοῖο [δι'] εὐρέος ὑγ[ρ]ᾶ  
 κέλευθα;”. τοῦτο δὲ ἐμφαίνε[ι]ν καὶ Πίν-  
 δαρον, λέγοντα τὸν ἀύλητικὸν κ[ά]λα-  
 μον Ἀχελώιο[υ] ὑ[ι]ὸν, ἀντὶ [το]ῦ ὕδατο[ς:]  
 “πρόσθε μὲν ἴξ Ἀχελωίου [τ]ὸν ἀοιδ[ό]τα-  
 τον / Εὐρωπία κράνα Μέλ[α]ν[ό]ς τε π[ο]τ[α]-  
 μοῦ ῥοαὶ τρέφον κάλαμο[ν]” (ἐ)τέρως  
 γοῦν λέγειν· “Ὠκεανοῦ πέτ[α]λα κράνα[ς]”,  
 πολλοὺς τε πρὸ Δήμητρο[ς] θύειν Ἀ-  
 χελώϊω, ὅτι πάντων πο[τα]μῶν ὄνο-  
 μα ὁ Ἀχελῶϊος κα[ὶ] ἐξ ὕδα[τος] ὁ καρπός.  
 Ἔφορος δ' ἐν β' [φησι] τὸ [ἐ]ν Δωδώνη(ι) μ[α]ν-  
 τ(ε)ιον σχεδὸν ἐν ἅπασι τοῖς χρησιμοῖς  
 προστάττειν Ἀχελ[ώ]ϊω(ι) θύειν, ὅθ[ε]ν  
 τοὺς Ἕλληνας πᾶ[ν] ὕδω[ρ] π[ό]τιμον  
 νομίζειν Ἀχελῶ[ο]ν 5  
 10  
 15  
 20  
 25

The preserved portion first quotes at least two fragmentary hexameters to the effect that Acheloios was the origin of the whole sea. Then it goes on with the same quotation of Megakleides' words (F 4a in Janko (2000) 141), without the conclusion 'so that he omitted the line about Ocean' offered by the Genavensis. From the papyrus we also learn that Aristarchos defended the line on the ground that it is Ocean who is the source of all rivers.<sup>4</sup> The rest of the column, to which I shall come back later, does not quote authorities attesting the presence or the

<sup>3</sup> The text is that of Erbse (1977) 93-4, apart from ll. 13-14, where I have integrated ὑ[ι]ὸν (ὑ[λ]η)ν Erbse, longius spatio), and where the papyrus has πρόσθε (πρόσθα all the editors, but against Pindar's usage). For a new text of ll. 1 and 8, cf. below, pp. 20-1 and 30-1.

<sup>4</sup> Aristarchos read οὔτε instead of οὐδὲ at either 195 or at 194 or at both 194 and 195: with any of the two last textual shapes, omission of 195 would be linguistically impossible. The line is omitted also in a twelfth-century

manuscript (R in van Thiel and West): Haslam (1997) 93 n.113 thinks that this omission 'seems more likely to be inadvertent (perhaps due to homeomeson, -ρει-) than induced by scholium or siglum'; Apthorp (1980) 24 thought of a homoiarchon as the cause of the omission. The fact that Pausanias 8.38.10 calls Acheloios ἄρχοντα τῶν ἄλλων ποταμῶν does not necessarily imply that he did not read 195: cf. Apthorp (1980) 24-5.

absence of the line, but rather parallels from authors who (1) identified Ocean and Acheloios; (2) attributed to Acheloios the origin of all fresh water; and (3) explained how the name of Acheloios came to be used for (fresh) water in general.

Most of the modern discussion on this rich material has focused on the problem of whether the positions of the ancient critics quoted in the scholia are based on their knowledge of different textual forms actually circulating at their times, or on their conjectural activity. Very little work has been done in order to understand the implications the different textual forms of this passage may have had within the *Iliad* itself and within the various authors who seem to reflect one or the other of such forms.

I shall dwell only very briefly on the first aspect of the problem: the tendency to read the ancient Homeric scholarship as exercising a purely conjectural, almost ludic approach to the text is exemplified at its extreme in the assessment of the discussion on 21.195 by M. van der Valk (1963-64) 2.364. He is convinced that ‘Zenodotus of course knew that in the Tragedians Ἀχελώϊος occurred in the meaning of “water”. By omitting Φ 195 he could attribute this choice detail to Homer.’ Now, we can only speculate about Zenodotus’ reasons, since he apparently did not explain them in a written work. It is pretty obvious, however, that copies without 195 were circulating in Megakleides’ time, well before Zenodotus. In order to eliminate any suspicion that Zenodotus’ omission may not have been conjectural, van der Valk resorts to the desperate hypothesis that Megakleides ‘remembered the Homeric passage inaccurately and made a mistake of memory’. In his opinion, the unavoidable consequence of the line being absent in pre-Zenodotean manuscripts would be that ‘195 was interpolated in the period between Zenodotus and Arph. Byz., which is practically impossible’. He does not take into consideration that both textual forms, with and without 195, may have been circulating in the pre-Hellenistic period.

Other discussions have been more balanced, and more favourable to Zenodotus.<sup>5</sup> Janko (1992) 23 is of the opinion that ‘Zenodotus apparently followed earlier practice in omitting verses he disliked or found difficult’, though ‘he certainly had MS authority for some of his omissions’, including this one (where Janko refers to the absence of the line in Megakleides). But even so, suspicion still lingers upon his predecessor, Megakleides. According to Haslam (1997) 73, who does not discuss our passage in this context, ‘it seems reasonable to suppose that verses not included by Zenodotus were absent from at least some of his manuscripts; but even this is beyond proof, and there is always the possibility that he had more cavalier predecessors’. In our particular case, for example, Nickau (1977) 56 took into account the possibility ‘dass Zenodot einer Konjektur des Megakleides folgte’. He admitted that this hypothesis is weak, but thought that it cannot be ruled out. More recently, Janko (2002b) 661 raises the question whether Megakleides’ readings (including his omission of *Il.* 21.195) ‘depended on manuscript evidence, and whether such evidence, if it existed, in turn rested on alterations by rhapsodes who were performing according to a fixed text which they had memorized incorrectly’.

In this context I am not particularly concerned with establishing the reasons behind Zenodotus’ and Aristarchos’ choices, and whether manuscript evidence was crucial or not for them. I think they did make use of manuscript evidence, but that this is no guarantee that their readings necessarily represent a much older tradition: every single case must be judged on its own merit.<sup>6</sup> What I believe can be argued without much reasonable doubt is that the ancient

<sup>5</sup> Bolling (1925) 53, 188-9; Pasquali (1934) 226-7; Rengakos (1993) 22.

<sup>6</sup> West (2001) 41 argues that Zenodotus’ omissions (as opposed to his *atheteses*) and his variant readings all derive from his use of a single manuscript, a fourth-century rhapsode’s copy. Some of these omissions are,

according to West, ‘deliberate abridgments of the texts’, while ‘some of them may represent the true text, where interpolations have occupied the vulgate’. He includes the omission of *Il.* 21.195 in this second group, though with a question mark, but in his Teubner edition (Leipzig 2000) he prints the line as genuine.

discussion on *this* passage provides us with ample evidence for inferring that the text read by Megakleides and Zenodotos was in circulation probably already in the Archaic period, and that there are good reasons to think that it may represent an earlier textual stage than the longer version, which supplanted it in the *vulgata*.

The passage from the shorter version to the longer one is much easier to explain than the reverse. The most obvious reason for *not* thinking that Megakleides' and Zenodotos' omission was the result of conjectures is, as Nickau admitted, that the idea that Ocean is the origin of all the gods, or, indeed, of all things, is well known in the *Iliad* (14.201, 246, 302). Acheloios is known from Hesiod as one of Ocean's sons (*Theog.* 337-40): according to Akousilaos he was the eldest and the most venerated of them (*FGrHist* 2 F 1). While the fact that his name might stand for fresh water in general is referred back to Dodonean rituals by Ephoros, and is well attested in fifth-century Athenian drama and in Hellenistic epigrams, the idea that he may have been seen as the origin of the whole sea is much more surprising: for A. Lesky (1947) 81, it was unthinkable that Acheloios might have been seen as the origin of the whole sea. Richardson (1993) 69 is of the same opinion: 'the line is surely genuine. How could Akhelooos be the origin of the whole sea?'

## 2. ACHELOIOS IN THE DERVENI 'THEOGONY'

And yet, as Pasquali clearly saw ((1934) 226-7), this idea was perfectly acceptable not only for Megakleides and Zenodotos, but also, at least, for the anonymous poet quoted at the top of col. 9 in *P.Oxy.* 221. The problem was, as Pasquali remarked, that it did not seem possible to date the author of these verses.

In his time it was indeed very difficult to reconstruct the text transmitted by the London papyrus. Allen (1900) 17 tentatively attributed the verses to Xenophanes. Some of his hexameters (21 B 30) are quoted by the Genavensis in order to show that the sea is the origin of all water, including that carried by clouds, and of the winds. This has nothing to do with the position represented by the anonymous hexameters quoted in the papyrus, and the attribution, though duly quoted in the critical texts, has not been accepted in any edition of Xenophanes (see, most recently, Manetti and Montanari (1999)). Müller (1913) 18 has a very imaginative reconstruction of the two lines as οἴδμασί (vel κύμασί) τ' ἐγκατέλεξα Ἀχελωίου ἀργυροδίνεω / ἐξ οὗ πᾶσα θάλασσα, which he understands as meaning 'ich brachte zu Bett [in den Fluten] des Achelooos'. The line would have been uttered by some unknown hero who sarcastically speaks of his defeated adversaries as having been put to bed in the streams of great Acheloios, who certainly had plenty of room for them. Powell includes the lines in his *Collectanea Alexandrina* among the unattributed hexameters (*ep. adesp.* 5, p.79), and suggests that the context may have been a catalogue (in the first person) of the world's rivers. Very little has been done on these lines since then.<sup>7</sup> It is only recently that an important new clue for the identification of these verses has become available, in the form of another papyrus text.<sup>8</sup> The first of the two fragmentary verses, which in the London papyrus are to be read as

]νασ[ ἐ]γκατέλεξα / Ἀχελωίου ἀργυροδίνεω  
ἐξ οὗ πᾶσα θάλασσα

<sup>7</sup> Hopkinson (1984) 92 attributes the fragment to a Ἡράκλεια, adding that 'presumably the context is Heracles' journey to the Hesperides'. This seems to derive from a confusion between this fragment and the other two hexameters from a Ἡράκλεια quoted later on in the papyrus, and attributed to Panyassis (quoted as *fr.* 28 Matthews in the same note by Hopkinson).

<sup>8</sup> I had checked the reading in the London papyrus and concluded that it was quoting the same line as the

Derveni papyrus, before finding Tsantsanoglou's revised readings of both texts in Bernabé (2000) 59-61. I wish to thank Prof. Tsantsanoglou, who has kindly sent me the relevant portions of his forthcoming edition. The new reading is now adopted also by Janko (2002a) 46, who has independently checked the London papyrus: Janko (2001) 30 was still based on the previous reading of the Derveni text, and did not yet take into account the identification of the two quotations.

1 ]ν : ] π Grenfell and Hunt (1899) 63, Powell (1925) 79, Erbse (1977) 93; ]ν Grenfell and Hunt (1904) 261, Tsantsanoglou, Janko (2002a) 46 / έ]γ: ]κ Π in linea, ]ν Π supra lineam legi (litt. in rasura [κ] legit etiam Janko (2002a) 46): legendum έ]γκατέλεξ' 'Αχελώϊου,

is, as has been seen by K. Tsantsanoglou, practically identical to one of the lines from the Orphic 'Theogony' interpreted in col. 23 of the Derveni papyrus. Previous reconstructions of the relevant portions of this papyrus, too, did not prove entirely reliable,<sup>9</sup> and prevented its identification with the first verse quoted in the London papyrus. Only very recently has a revised transcript of the relevant portion been published. The line now reads:

ἱνας δ' έγκατ[έλε]ξ' 'Αχελώϊου άργυ[ρ]οδίνε[ω].

In the Orphic poem the subject of the third-person verb is Zeus. The first person in the Homeric commentary is probably due to a faulty resolution of the elided form when the scribe divided the verse between two lines, perhaps also misled by the alpha at the beginning of the following word.

There can be no doubt that the two lines were in fact identical. On the other hand, to establish whether the two papyri are referring to the same verse of the *same* poem is quite a different issue. Orphic Zeus was known to have created the whole world out of himself after having swallowed his predecessor, incorporating in this way everything that had been previously created. A similar act of creation may be safely attributed to the creative process of the 'Orphic' cosmogonic poems themselves. It is clear on the basis of the available evidence that such poems were 'recreated' several times, every time making large use of material from their predecessors. Several scholars treat this phenomenon as having produced a limited number of discrete 'Theogonies', and have struggled in the attempt to reconstruct them (in the first place West (1983)). One may perhaps wonder whether such discrete 'Theogonies' were not simply some of the most influential avatars of the same continuously self-generating ἱεροὶ λόγοι. The situation has recently been described by M.S. Funghi (in Laks and Most (1997) 29, after Detienne (1989) 113-15) in these terms: 'what remains of ["Orphic"] literature reveals an inclination not to crystallise the written discourse but rather perpetuate an "open" text (and one whose vitality until the end of paganism may have depended precisely upon its receptivity), one capable of being "contaminated" and at the same time able on its own to permeate different religious modes'. This attitude also implies the need for continuously updated exegetical operations, as for example in the Derveni prose text. Being constantly updated, every version of the ἱεροὶ λόγοι was bound sooner or later to be supplanted by a more recent one.

We may, nonetheless, attempt to pinpoint the chronological level of the poem referred to by the Homeric commentary. If the material preserved in the extant *Iliad* scholia is a reliable basis for comparison, Hellenistic scholars did not usually adduce materials from the Orphic cosmogonic poems in their attempt to establish and explain the text of Homer. In the whole *corpus* included in Erbse's edition, 'Orphic' material is exceedingly scarce and no quotation from the cosmogonic poems is preserved.<sup>10</sup> In the fifth and fourth centuries, on the other hand, recourse to both sets of texts seems to have been fairly common in exegetical practice. The most striking case is the Derveni author himself, who adduces Homeric lines as if they belonged to the same author of the cosmogonic poem, Orpheus. He cannot, of course, have attributed the Homeric poems to Orpheus, but he may well have known that the same verses occurred in texts attributed

<sup>9</sup> Cf. *ZPE* 47 (1982) \*11, where it was transcribed as ἱνας δ' έγ α[ ... σ]σ' 'Αχελώϊου (sic: leg. 'Αχελώϊου) άργυ[ρ]οδίνε[ω]. For the verb in the central lacuna almost everybody has accepted West's έγκατέλασσ'.

<sup>10</sup> On the anonymous quotation in the scholia to 13.589 (T) = *fr.* 291 Kern (Καθαρμοί) with two extra verses, cf. West (1983) 14-15. The scholia to 18.570 c<sup>1</sup> (T) mention a Σφαίρα attributed to Orpheus: cf. West (1983) 33 and n.99.

to Orpheus, and thought that Homer must have been the borrower.<sup>11</sup> A strong interest in Orphic matters has been recognized also in the fragments of one of the earliest Homeric scholars, Stesimbrotos of Thasos, active around the last quarter of the fifth century, who has been mentioned, also for this reason, as the possible author of the Derveni text.<sup>12</sup>

I would argue that the quotation from the Orphic *ἱερὸς λόγος* did not come to the Homeric commentator of *P.Oxy.* 221 as a first-hand quotation of some Hellenistic scholar, but that it went back to an earlier discussion of the Homeric passage, which may well even be roughly contemporary with the Derveni text, if not dating back to the fifth century. It is perhaps not insignificant that this quotation came *before* the quotation of Megakleides (dated to the late fourth century): it may have been preceded by the name of the ancient authority who had adduced it.<sup>13</sup> If this is correct, the verse would belong, if not exactly to the poem discussed in the Derveni papyrus, to some roughly contemporary or not much later version. It is possible, of course, that such verses, or similar successors, may have found their place also in some later form of the *ἱεροὶ λόγοι*. Servius' commentary on Verg. *Georg.* 1.8 quotes Orpheus as authority for the ancient use of *Acheloios* as a general noun for water (*fr.* 344 Kern). Murgia has argued that in this passage *Orpheus* is a scribal mistake for *Ephorus*, who is indeed quoted as authority on this issue by both the London papyrus and, more fully, by Macrob. *Sat.* 5.18.6 (*FGrHist* 70 F 20a).<sup>14</sup> The fact that *Acheloios* has turned up in an Orphic text, where the Derveni author understands it as an equivalent for water, makes this conjecture rather implausible. It remains open whether Servius, or his source, was referring to a contemporary *ἱερὸς λόγος*, or had found the quotation at the beginning of some older doxography, with Orpheus being cited at the start of the list as the most ancient author. The ultimate source may, after all, have been the same as that of the London papyrus.

In any case, the context of the two lines in the *ἱερὸς λόγος* must have been cosmogonic, and, while we cannot be completely certain that the Derveni poem went on with the same line as in verse 2 of *P.Oxy.* 221, this is far from being unlikely. Further corroboration may come from the Derveni text itself, where the *Acheloios* line is preceded by another one representing Zeus in the act of creating Ocean with his mind. The verse has been reconstructed by West (1983) 115, on the basis of its constituent elements quoted in the prose paraphrase, as *μήσατο δ' Ὀκεανοῖο μέγα σθένος εὐρὸν ῥέοντος*, 'and he (*sc.* Zeus) contrived the great strength of wide-flowing Ocean', a verse produced from the same formulaic mould as *Il.* 21.195 and 18.607 (and *εὐρὸν ῥέοντος* occurs four times in the same *sedes* in the *Iliad*, always of Asteropaios' grandfather, the river Axios: once a few lines before our passage, in 21.186). The Derveni author has the unusual

<sup>11</sup> Cf. also *P.Berol.* 13044 (first century BC, date of the prose text unknown), where parts of the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* are quoted as belonging to Orpheus.

<sup>12</sup> See Burkert (1986). For a somewhat different assessment, cf. Janko (1997) 72-5: the whole article surveys a number of fifth-century authors interested in the interpretation of the Orphic poems.

<sup>13</sup> One of the *JHS* readers has suggested that the lines preceding Megakleides' quotation might have been cited by Megakleides himself. I would assume that the scholiast quoted first his source and then the author(s) cited by that source, as happens, for example, in the case of Seleukos, Panyassis and Pindar in *Il.* 8ff. of the same column (discussed below, §§ 5-6), though the reverse would be quite possible. There are no other quotations from Orphic literature in Megakleides, but this is hardly surprising, given the scantiness of what is preserved. The

interest in Orphic poems in late fourth-century Athens is shown, for example, by the fact that Philochoros (*FGrHist* 328 F 185, quoted by Philodemos) cited from the Orphic hymns the same line (*fr.* 398 Bernabé) referred to in the Derveni papyrus, col. 22.11f. (cf. Obbink (1994)): I would be less certain about Obbink's assumption that Philochoros also knew the Derveni 'commentary' (cf. Robertson (2003) 232-3 n.3). Obbink (1994) 130-1 also draws attention to the possible use of the (presumably Orphic) *ἱεροὶ λόγοι* by the Attic historian Kleidemos (*FGrHist* 323 F 25), quoted in the same Philodemos passage.

<sup>14</sup> Murgia (1970) 189 and n.11. The Orpheus quotation in Servius is traced back to a richer version of the *Iliadic* scholia by Mühlert (1965) 114, rightly, as it turns out (but such a version does not necessarily belong, in my opinion, to the D-scholia).

allegorical explanation of Ocean as ἄήρ, this being, in its turn, identified with Zeus himself.<sup>15</sup> Such a daring equation, followed by the more usual one between Acheloios and water, would have been much easier if the latter was seen as the source of all waters in the next line, discharging Ocean from this task.

The Orphic text turns out to be doubly relevant for the discussion of *Il.* 21.194-5: it shares with the shorter version the unique identification of Acheloios with the origin of sea and of all waters; and it shares with the longer version the coexistence of Ocean and Acheloios in two consecutive lines.

### 3. ZEUS AND THE 'SINEWS' OF ACHELOIOS: A NEAR EASTERN BACKGROUND?

It is necessary, therefore, to follow two different threads. The first problem is to investigate the traces of the Archaic Acheloios, seen as the origin of every stream and of the sea itself. A further, if more speculative, problem is the quest for the source of such a tradition (§3). The second is to delineate the equally ancient attempts to reconcile the presence of this figure with the concurrent one of Ocean. The two textual shapes of the *Iliad* passage and the cosmogonic lines from the Orphic ἱεροὶ λόγοι represent different solutions which had an impact on later authors (§§4-5).

Let us look first at the *Iliad* passage in its shorter textual version. This envisages a confrontation between the weather-god, with his lightning and thunder, and Acheloios, a supernatural being described as the origin of all water and the sea, who, in spite of his greatness, is frightened by Zeus's power. The idea that Ocean might have been represented as feeling threatened by Zeus finds no parallel in the way this god was usually portrayed in ancient cosmogonic thought. He was a character *super partes*, who never took active part in any dispute among the gods. He was, technically, a Titan in Hesiod and in later Orphic ἱεροὶ λόγοι. Nevertheless in Hesiod he did not take part in the struggle between the Titans and the Sons of Kronos, and sent his daughter Styx to Zeus's succour. In the Orphic *Rhapsodies* he does not join his brothers in their plot to overthrow Ouranos (*fr.* 135 Kern). This lack of involvement in the gods' matters is reflected also in *Iliad* 20.7: when Zeus summons all the gods to the assembly, Ocean is the only one who does not turn up.<sup>16</sup> Things are different with the combative Acheloios, his struggle with Herakles, Zeus's son, being his best known appearance in mythological tradition. The shorter version of our passage in *Iliad* 21, too, has been seen as possibly reflecting the tradition of an ancient antagonism between Acheloios and Zeus.<sup>17</sup>

Acheloios' mention in the Orphic ἱερὸς λόγος is particularly cryptic. The inclusion of his ἵνες in the world, as the origin of the sea, stands out as the only physical operation in a series of creative acts stemming from Zeus's μῆτις. The image is striking, and requires explanation. In his translation of the Derveni text, Janko (2001) follows Tsantsanoglou's suggestion in taking the expression ἵνας ... Ἀχελωίου as a periphrasis indicating 'the might of silver-swirling Acheloios'.<sup>18</sup> Laks and Most (after West (1983) 92) understand the words as meaning 'the sinews of silver-eddying Achelous'.<sup>19</sup> Both translations are, in a way, correct. The first one is

<sup>15</sup> 'This verse has been composed in a misleading way, and is obscure to most people, but to those who comprehend it aright it is obvious that "Ocean" is Air and that Air is Zeus. Hence one Zeus did not "contrive" another Zeus, but he himself contrived "great strength" for himself. But those who do not comprehend it suppose that "Ocean" is the river, because (Orpheus) added the epithet "wide-flowing". But (Orpheus) indicates his own opinion in everyday and colloquial words. For people say that those who have great power among mankind have "wide influence"' (translation from Janko (2002a) 47).

<sup>16</sup> On Ocean's peculiar role among the Titans, *cf.* Bremmer (2003) 42.

<sup>17</sup> Fontenrose (1959) 232-3.

<sup>18</sup> Janko (2001) 30: 'he put in the might of silver-swirling Acheloüs'. *Cf.* Tsantsanoglou in Laks and Most (1997) 20 n.58: 'and he placed therein the forceful silver-eddying Achelous'.

<sup>19</sup> Followed now by Janko (2002a) 47: 'he laid in it the sinews of silver-whirling Acheloüs'.



based on the probably later use of ἴς Ἀχελωίου as a periphrasis for indicating the Εὐρωπία κρόνα in Pind. *fr.* 249b S.-M., quoted by the grammarian Seleukos in the same column of the London papyrus. There is no doubt that Pindar understood this as an equivalent of 'the strength of Acheloios', since he varies the image in another poem (a *prosodion*, *fr.* 52v.9-10), where a 'sacred little spring' (perhaps Kanathos, near Nauplia) is called ἄλκων Ἀχελωίου.<sup>20</sup> Its ultimate origin may go back to the epic periphrastic use of ἴς, βίη and similar nouns, followed by a genitive of a noun (*cf.*, in particular, ἴς ποταμοῖο of Xanthos/Skamandros in *Il.* 21.356).

This image is certainly lurking behind the line in the Orphic poem: its Greek text, however, cannot be simply understood in this way. The Greek word ἴς ('strength') is frequently used in the nominative and in the instrumental ἴφι, and only thrice in the accusative (*Il.* 5.245, 7.269, *Od.* 9.538), where the form ἴν, though always followed by a vowel, does not seem to stand, from an etymological point of view, for elided ἴνα. The nasal is the desinence of the accusative and does not belong to the root, which is the same as Latin *vīs* (accusative *vīm*). It is only in later lexicographic sources that the word is connected to a root -iv.<sup>21</sup> At least from Homeric epic onwards, on the other hand, another almost homophonic, and probably etymologically connected word was current, both in singular and plural: ἴς (genitive ἴνός, and plural nominative ἴνες), its meaning roughly corresponding to 'sinew'. Both for a Greek poet of this age and for his public, the words ἴνας ... Ἀχελωίου would unavoidably evoke the meaning 'the sinews of Acheloios'. It is plausible, of course, that the homophony between the two words, and the structural role of 'sinews' in the body, may have easily led to a semantic overlap.<sup>22</sup> Pindar says that Achilles 'prepared a bridge for the Atreidai's return, and freed Helen, having cut out Troy's sinews', Τροίᾳς ἴνας ἐκταμών (*Isthm.* 8.52-3). The 'sinews' are identified in the following verses as 'the strength of Memnon, high-minded Hector and the other heroes': there is no doubt that both senses are contributing to the image, but the use of the verb ἐκτέμνειν makes clear that the starting point remains the concrete 'sinews'. In the Orphic ἱερὸς λόγος, too, Acheloios' ἴνες are, at the same time, the god's sinews and the springs that derive from him.

The image of the rivers seen as Acheloios' sinews is unusual. West ((1983) 92 n.39) compares it to that used by Choirilos (probably the tragedian, *TrGF* 2 F 3), who called the rivers γῆς φλέβες, 'Earth's veins'. There are, however, two important differences. First, the use of the veins, which usually convey a liquid substance, as a metaphor for 'rivers' is much more natural than one involving the ἴνες, which, judging from the use of the word in the Archaic period, indicate the 'tendons' or 'sinews'. Secondly, and more importantly, Choirilos sees the veins as part of Earth's body (just as in *fr.* 2 the mountains are described as her bones): this implies that the

<sup>20</sup> On this passage, and on the whole poem, *cf.* D'Alessio (2004) 115-21.

<sup>21</sup> The only occurrence, to my knowledge, of a form unequivocally connected to the root iv- with the meaning 'strength' other than in lexicographical explanations has come to light very recently in Posidippus 21.1 Austin-Bastianini. The text as printed by the editors (νηὶ καθελκομένῃ πάντα πλέος ἰνὶ φανήτω / ἴρηξ) gives impossible Greek (πλέος plus dative, 'all full of strength' in Austin's translation). πλέος itself is a correction, the reported reading of the papyrus being πλεον: against Gronewald's defence of this reading, *cf.* Austin and Bastianini (2002) *ad loc.* The reproduction of the papyrus gives the impression that the traces may well be read as πάντα πλόον, perhaps to be understood as 'on the occasion of every voyage' rather than 'quando la nave è

tratta in mare per un intero viaggio' (so Lapini (2000) 38-9, who proposes the reading as a conjecture, and not as a possible interpretation of the traces). It is very possible that Posidippus innovated (or followed some predecessor), basing this form on current interpretations of Homeric ἴν plus following vowel as an elided ἴνα: ἰνὶ φανήτω, however, does not strike me as a felicitous expression, and I wonder whether the text may not be corrupt.

<sup>22</sup> Shipp (1961) 34-6 argues that the formation of the plural stem, extended with the nasal ('sinews'), out of the singular defective form ('strength'), is a Greek innovation. For an opposite semantic development, *cf.*, e.g., Latin *nervus*, Italian 'nerbo', and English 'sinews'. *Cf.* also Hajnal (1995) 140-7.

Earth is imagined as a body, and the rivers are compared to the veins of that body.<sup>23</sup> In the Orphic poem the situation is different: the sinews belong to Acheloios and it is Zeus who inserts them into his creation.<sup>24</sup>

In the shorter version of the Iliadic passage Acheloios, the god identified with the source of the whole sea and all the rivers, is represented as feeling menaced by the lightning and the thunder of Zeus. In the Orphic poem we find that Zeus uses parts of the body of the same divinity in order to create the rivers. Both features find very close parallels in Near Eastern cosmogonic texts.

The main subject of the Akkadian epic poem *Enūma eliš* is the struggle between the god Marduk, who thanks to this feat becomes the ruler of the other gods, and the primeval divinity Tīāmat, the Sea (and, after her defeat, also the origin of the great Mesopotamian rivers).<sup>25</sup> It is to be dated some time in the second millennium, and undoubtedly was one of the most celebrated poetic works in the Near East. Its annual recitation or re-enactment was part of the 'Temple Programme for the New Year's Festivals at Babylon' until a very late period, as we know from two tablets of the Seleucid period (*ANET* 331-4, p. 332). In this poem Marduk is portrayed as a god of storm: apart from other weapons, he 'put lightning in front of him, his body was filled with an ever-blazing flame' (4.39-40).<sup>26</sup> He is accompanied by several terrible winds and tornadoes, and his chariot is called 'Storm-chariot' (4.50). He defeats Tīāmat thanks to the '*imhullu*-wind' and shoots her with an arrow (4.96-104). With parts of her corpse Marduk creates several elements of the world. This creation involves first 'severing the arteries of her blood, making the North Wind carry it off in a secret place (or as good news)' (4.131-2), after which 'he divided the monstrous shape and created marvels (from it)' (4.136). The most interesting feature for our purpose is the creation of the two great Mesopotamian rivers: 'He opened the Euphrates and the Tigris in her eyes' (5.55). In this case, too, the streams are created out of part of the body of the god. In Akkadian, as is usual in Semitic languages, the same word means both 'eye' and 'spring': this offers a further parallel with the Greek text, where the image is based on the double meaning of the word. I shall come back to this problem later. A further feature shared by Acheloios and Tīāmat is attested not in *Enūma eliš* (which is, anyway, fragmentary in the relevant portion of Tablet 5) but in a seventh-century tablet by the chief exorcist of the city of Aššur, where several mythical items are given ritual esoteric interpretation. It is from this text that we learn that Marduk also broke Tīāmat's horns,<sup>27</sup> an episode comparable to the effect of Herakles' fight against Acheloios, where the Greek hero broke one of the god's horns.

<sup>23</sup> For the rivers seen as the veins of Earth, within a wider comparison between the Earth and the human body, cf. also [Hippocr.] *De hebdomadibus* 6.1, *De victu* 4 (= *De insomniis*) 90.4, and the Zoroastrian cosmological work of the *Greater Bundahishn* chapter 28; Kranz (1938); West (1971), particularly 378, 386-7.

<sup>24</sup> In another myth, located between Cilicia and Mt Kasion, and attested only in [Apollod.] *Bibl.* 1.6.3 and Nonn. *Dion.* 1.492-3 and 510-16, Typhon/Typhoeus temporarily deprives Zeus himself of his sinews (νεῦρα); for the motif, cf. Rocchi (1980) with previous bibliography.

<sup>25</sup> A struggle between the weather-god (*b'l*) and the Sea (*ym*) is also present in Ugaritic texts, where a cosmogonic interpretation seems, however, unlikely: cf. Caquot *et al.* (1974) 114-17; Wakeman (1973) 37-42, and 56-82, on the Sea-Monster in the Old Testament; Day (1985) 7-18 thinks that there was a further Canaanite myth, alluded to but not fully related in any extant text, where the conflict did have cosmogonic value, and that it

has influenced the OT passages; the lack of any cosmogonic connection is stressed once again by Bordreuil and Pardee (1993) 69. A Western Semitic origin for the Babylonian myth had been supposed by Jacobsen (1968), and the victory of the storm-god Addu on the Sea, *Tēmtum*, is now attested for eighteenth-century Aleppo: cf. Durand (1993). For evidence of a similar myth in Hurrian (and Hittite) texts, cf. Rutherford (2001), with previous bibliography: the myth involves the god Teššup and may take place by Mt Ḥazzi, corresponding to Ugaritic Sapan and Greek Kasion; in these texts, too, there seems to be no evidence of a link between the god's conflict with the Sea and the creation of (parts of) the world out of the body of the defeated enemy.

<sup>26</sup> Translations are based on Dalley (2000), with occasional slight modifications.

<sup>27</sup> The text in Livingstone (1989) n.39 rev. 14, 99-102, 101. This same tablet offers a peculiar cosmological theory that, according to Burkert (1994), may have

It does not seem that Tiāmat, in spite of her horns, had been imagined as resembling Acheloius' usual iconography. The Greek god was represented as a bull with a human face, head or torso, but with bull's horns and ears, and a bison-like beard. Tiāmat herself does not seem to have been the object of representation in Mesopotamian art. She must in any case have had some animal features, since she also had a tail.<sup>28</sup> That Acheloius' iconography is derived from Mesopotamian models, on the other hand, has been evident since the very first moment when Western archaeologists caught sight of the monumental figures of human-headed bulls protecting the gates of Neo-Assyrian royal palaces. It has been difficult, however, to trace any functional relationship between the Greek water-god and his oriental model (*cf.* Isler (1970) 93). Now, if it is still difficult to trace any mythological background for the door-guardian figures representing bulls and lions on four legs with human bearded heads,<sup>29</sup> much progress has recently been made for the identification and interpretation of another bull/man type widespread in Mesopotamia, that of the combative standing horned man-headed bull/bison (*cf.* Wiggermann (1986) 103-4, 263-7, 303-14). This type also was erected with apotropaic function in Neo-Assyrian temples,<sup>30</sup> though these were mostly metal figures which, with very few possible exceptions, have not been preserved. It appears also in a series of clay figurines which were used in exorcistic rituals, described in several tablets. Thanks to these texts, his name has been recognized as that of the Akkadian *kusarikku* (Sumerian GUD.ALIM), a mythological figure closely connected with Tiāmat. He belongs to a series of, usually, eleven heroes or monsters defeated by either the god Ningirsu/Ninurta or, later, by Marduk, and brought as trophies to decorate the temple of the god, an *aition* of the presence of such figures in the decoration of the buildings. Most of them appear in *Enūma eliš* as 'the eleven creatures that Tiāmat created' (Wiggermann (1986) 268-85). Their connection with the sea-goddess is probably to be explained within the theological background which led eventually to the composition of *Enūma eliš*, and whose main function is that of investing Marduk with the role of king of the gods, by transferring to him several features previously belonging to other gods (in this case, Ninurta). It is, however, likely that the bull/man was connected with the primeval sea already at an earlier stage, since the hymnic prologue of the Standard Babylonian Version of the *Anzu* epic poem tells that the god Ninurta 'slew the *kusarikku* in the midst of the sea' (1.12), *ina qirib tām̄ti*: the word indicating the sea, *tām̄ti*, genitive of *tām̄tu(m)*, is a different spelling of the name of Tiāmat, the Sea.

Also in *Enūma eliš* the eleven creatures, including the *kusarikku*, become images to be displayed in the Apsū, the cosmic model of Marduk's temple: Marduk 'made images of them and had them set up at the door of the Apsū. "Let this be a sign that will never be forgotten".' A Greek version of the episode is preserved, going back to the early third century BC Babylonian writer Berossos (*FGrHist* 680 F 1, *fr.* 12 Schnabel), who includes also τούρους ἀνθρώπων κεφαλὰς ἔχοντας among Tiāmat's creatures and adds that their images were set up (ἀνακεῖσθαι) in the temple of Βῆλος (Marduk).

inspired Anaximander: *cf.* also Burkert (1999) 53-5. It is quoted as a parallel to the Derveni prose text by West (1997b) 88-9, who also draws attention to the similarity between its subscription formula 'secret of the great gods. One who knows may show it to one who knows; one who does not know must not see it' and the first line of the Orphic ἱερὸς λόγος (as well as a passage of Hippocrates, *Law* 5). It must be said, however, that such subscriptions are fairly common in many kinds of Akkadian tablets, including technical texts, and do not necessarily suggest an initiatory context.

<sup>28</sup> For speculations on her appearance, *cf.* Reynolds (1999) 374.

<sup>29</sup> It seems that these colossal figures may have been indicated with the general noun <sup>d</sup>ALAD <sup>d</sup>LAMMA: *cf.* Engel (1987) 13-15. The representation of the reclining human-faced bison in third-millennium Near Eastern figurines is remarkably similar to that of the reclining human-faced bull attested later in the Western Mediterranean: *cf.* Isler (1981) 31. The mythological background of this third-millennium type is not altogether clear (for a recent assessment, *cf.* Hansen (2001), who defines this too as a *kusarikku* and connects it with a solar cult), and is not necessarily relevant for the influence of its successors on first-millennium Greek iconography.

<sup>30</sup> *Cf.* Engel (1987) 90-1; Wiggermann (1986) 269-70.

The appearance of the *kusarikku* among Ninurta's Slain Heroes provides a further link with the best known story of Greek Acheloios, since it has recently been argued by several scholars that Ninurta's cycle may have in some way served as a model for that of Herakles' labours.<sup>31</sup> In this context, it has been suggested that the fight with the *kusarikku* may have inspired that with the Cretan Bull.<sup>32</sup> Even if it was not included in the canon of the Twelve Labours, I would suggest that his defeat of Acheloios may perhaps offer a closer comparison.

Acheloios seems to have been deeply rooted in Greek cultic practice and imagery from at least the seventh century BC.<sup>33</sup> It would be far-fetched to attribute such an effect only to the successful spreading of an oriental mythical and iconographic inspiration. It is very likely that the connection between rivers and bulls was part of Greek tradition well before any influence of Near Eastern models. I would argue that it may actually have triggered such an influence. Wilamowitz was of the opinion that Acheloios represented the true 'Hellenic' tradition of a water-god, later supplanted by the 'oriental' newcomer Ocean (Wilamowitz (1931-32) 1.93, 189-90, 219). This hypothesis is certainly reasonable if we look at the actual cultic practice, where Ocean scarcely found any place at all. On the basis of the comparative evidence, however, I would suggest that the mythological features of Archaic Acheloios, as well as his iconography, seem to be as oriental as those of his rival.

In this context the unusual image regarding Acheloios in the Orphic theogony may become easier to understand. The comparison involves not only structural typology (the use of parts of the body of the god who represents the origin of water in a cosmogonic context) but can be extended to a striking lexical parallelism, perhaps too striking to be just a coincidence. In *Enūma eliš* 5.55 the act by which Marduk creates the Tigris and the Euphrates is expressed by the words *iptēma ina īnīša* (IGI<sup>ii</sup>-ša) *idPuratta idIglata*, 'and he opened **in her eyes** the Euphrates, the Tigris'. The word meaning both 'eye' and 'spring' is Akkadian *īnu*: its root, *īn-*, is identical in sound to that of the root *iv-* used in the Orphic text with a similar double meaning. In the same seventh-century explanatory work quoted above for Tiāmat's 'horns', the similarity is even more evident: *idIglatu īnān* (IGI<sup>ii</sup>) *imittāša idPurattu īnān* (IGI<sup>ii</sup>) *šumēlāša*, 'the Tigris her **two right eyes**, the Euphrates her **two left eyes**'.<sup>34</sup> One may easily wonder whether the choice of Greek ἵεϛ may not have originally been influenced by the double meaning present in Akkadian *īnān*.<sup>35</sup>

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Cooper (1978) 141-54; van Dijk (1983) 1.11-19; Burkert (1987) 14-19; Brenk (1991) 507-26; West (1997a) 467-70.

<sup>32</sup> West (1997a) 471.

<sup>33</sup> Paus. 1.41.2 mentions an altar in his honour erected by Theagenes of Megara, after he had diverted a local stream. His image becomes popular in figurative arts in the course of the sixth century. In some cases we may be confident that this iconography was meant to depict Acheloios as source of all fresh water, while in other contexts it was perhaps more probably attached to local river-gods. On the whole issue, cf. Isler (1970); Weiss (1984) (with Isler's review, *Gnomon* 62 (1990) 661-3), Weiss (1988); Costabile (1991) 195-226; Carroccio (2000); Mussini (2002); Currie (2002).

<sup>34</sup> The same text as n.27 above, in Livingstone (1986) 82; *id.* (1989) n.39, rev. 3, 101: the double dual, as in Ebeling (1931) 35 – Livingstone has the singular – is based on another passage of the same tablet, where Tiāmat is described as having four eyes and four ears.

<sup>35</sup> Note that the spelling *īnu* is the Babylonian one, while Assyrian had *ēnu*: in Akkadian there is no phonemic opposition between the two sounds (cf. von Soden (1995) 11 and 16).

A connection between the same two roots is found also in the Old Testament: cf., e.g., Genesis 7.11: כַּל-מַעַיִן וְרוּחַ תְּהוֹמֹת (kl-mjynvt thvm: πᾶσαι αἱ πηγαὶ τῆς ἄβύσσου), Ps. 74.15 and Prov. 8.24.2. In all three cases **thvm**, etymologically cognate to Tiāmat, is connected to **mjyn**, a derivative of **jyn**, the same root as Akkadian *īnu*. It may perhaps be argued that the 'borrowing' took place in a Western Semitic context: we have to imagine that the intermediary was a lost text, not, in any case, texts from the OT tradition, where only the derivate **mjyn** is attested in this context. North-western Syria (cf. above, n.25) would be a promising location for contacts with the Greek world. In the present state of knowledge, however, the cumulative evidence for the parallels with the Acheloios story seems to point to Mesopotamia. Moreover, the close similarity with the Mesopotamian lexical form (i.e. without the first radical consonant, since 'ayn' has disappeared) suggests that Akkadian texts may have been involved. If this hypothesis is correct, the borrowing, which presupposes pronouncing ἵεϛ without the initial digamma, must have taken place in an Ionian milieu (I owe this last point to A.C. Cassio).

A direct influence of Akkadian literature on Archaic Greek epic poems has been convincingly suggested by several scholars in the last few years. The most recent collection of possible borrowings and contacts is to be found in Burkert (1992) 88-129 and 200-17 and West (1997a), who does not focus, however, on the Orphic tradition, for which some material was provided by West (1983). Burkert has argued that another part of an Orphic poem, the story of the creation of men from the soot produced out of the defeated Titans, stricken by Zeus's thunderbolt, may have been influenced by a similar story in *Enūma eliš*, where men are created out of the killed hostile god Qingu, and that the name of the Titans may be connected with the Akkadian word for clay (*tītu*), the material used when creating man out of another dead rebel-god (perhaps called *Alla*) in an earlier Akkadian epic poem, the *Atra-ḫasīs*.<sup>36</sup> Some scholars think that this story may not be earlier than the *Orphic Rhapsodies* (late Hellenistic or Imperial age).<sup>37</sup> The similarity with the Akkadian texts may be seen as an indicator of an earlier date (so Burkert (1999) 85).<sup>38</sup> West (1983) 164-6 attributes the story to the 'Eudemian' Theogony, but his reasons for doing so, and for denying its presence in the predecessors of the Derveni poem, are, in this case, weak. It has been argued, and I fully agree, that men's descent from the impious Titans lies behind the eschatological views of Pindar (*fr.* 133 S.-M. = 65 Cannatà-Fera, *Ol.* 2.57) as well as those of the Thourioi 'Orphic' golden leaves, and the more recently discovered one from Pelinna.<sup>39</sup> This brings us back to the early fifth century, certainly before the date West has imagined for his 'Eudemian' Theogony (Athens, second half of the fifth century). I would not rule out the possibility that it may have been told in a poem belonging to the same tradition as the Derveni one.

Further passages in ancient Orphic poems show possible Near Eastern influence. A verse quoted in the Derveni papyrus seems to represent Zeus as having swallowed the phallus of his predecessor. This is remarkably close to an episode in the Hittite Kumarbi myth, much more

<sup>36</sup> A fuller text of the Standard Babylonian Version of the poem has been published by George and Al-Rawi (1996), and a new Late Babylonian manuscript has been published by Böck and Márquez Rowe (1999-2000). It is clear now that, as it was already suspected, in the SB version the slaughtered god was indeed the leader of the rebel-gods: this was very probably the case also in the Old Babylonian and LB versions. In the SB version the name of the god, as read by George and Al-Rawi, is *Alla*, as it was also in a Middle Assyrian bilingual account of the creation (*KAR* 4, 25-6), where the plural, 'the *Alla*-gods', is used. The editors suggest that this may refer to the whole group of dead gods, which include Dumuzi, Kingu, Mummu and Asakku: cf. Livingstone (1986) 194-9. In SB II 104 he seems to have been identified as 'an Enlil of old' (cf. also George and Al-Rawi (1996) 187), suggesting a comparison with 'the Enlils who rebelled' and 'the seven conquered Enlils' of later mythology: cf. Livingstone (1986) 155, 17, 194, 198, rev. 8. The interpretation of his name in the OB version is controversial: <sup>d</sup>PI-e or <sup>d</sup>PI-e-i-la, often read as *Wê* or *Wê-ila*. For his name in the text offered by the new LB tablet, which is perhaps corrupted, cf. Böck and Márquez Rowe (1999-2000) 173-4, who also question the reading 'Alla' (<sup>d</sup>NAGAR) in SB I 42 and II 103, where they would rather read <sup>d</sup>PI-e there as well.

The lexical similarity with Greek *Τιτᾶνες* would be closer, e.g. in a text such as SB II 113, where the rebel-god's flesh and blood are mixed with Nintu's clay (*tītāša*). Burkert ((1992) 38, 94-5 and (1999) 19) notes that, according to some late sources, the names of the Titans was derived from the *τίτανος* ('plaster', with a

short iota, but cf. Akkadian (*tītu*), 'clay', which has the long vowel) with which they disguised their faces when attacking the child Dionysos, and that the vanquished gods were represented by clay figurines in Near Eastern magic ritual (though clay figurines, Akkadian *šalmē ša tīti*, were used for a wider range of purposes and are not particularly connected with the group of the vanquished gods). For new hypotheses on the Near Eastern cultic and mythic background of the Titans, cf. Bremmer (2003), who argues for a contact in Northern Syria.

<sup>37</sup> Brisson (1992), who argues for an Imperial date, and Edmonds (1999): see, *contra*, Bernabé (2003) with previous bibliography. For a different perspective, cf. also Ellinger (1993) 147-95.

<sup>38</sup> Bottéro (1991) makes clear that in the Mesopotamian myths the killing of a god to create mankind cannot be interpreted as a sort of 'original sin' (or as an 'antecedent sin'), but does not rule out the possibility that, subjected to a different interpretation in later times, it may have been the 'source première' of the Orphic tradition. In any case, if, as I believe, the same tradition is also the background of the golden leaves, it appears that the creation from the Titans provides men with both an 'antecedent sin' and a claim to divine origin. In the Akkadian poem it is the presence of the god which guarantees some form of survival for man after death.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Lloyd-Jones (1985), above all 86 n.15, quoting the relevant passages signalled by A. Henrichs: Empedocles seems to offer an original elaboration of the motif: cf. Riedweg (1995), in particular 45, and the qualifications of Di Marco (1998) 47-9.

than the two relevant passages in Hesiod's *Theogony*, where Kronos castrates his father Ouranos, and Zeus swallows his own wife Metis (Burkert (1999) 81-2). The interpretation of the text of the Orphic poem, however, is in my opinion far from certain, and I would not rule out the possibility that West's reading of the passage (West (1983) 85-6), according to which Zeus would be swallowing his predecessor, not just his phallus) may, after all, be right.<sup>40</sup> On either reading, however, the Orphic text remains closer to the Hittite version than Hesiod.

Even leaving Orphic tradition aside, it is not in doubt that the Akkadian epic tradition had a wide-ranging influence on Archaic Greek poetry. What is less clear is the dynamics of such contacts. Both Burkert and West have argued that at least certain cases suggest the possible mediation, at some stages, of bilingual poets.<sup>41</sup> This sounds very reasonable, and I would argue for the possibility that the insertion of Acheloios' ἵνεξ in Zeus's creation as the origin of the sea and the rivers may have been the work of a poet who knew that the two Mesopotamian rivers were created by Marduk from the *īnān* of Tīāmat, the Sea. It is not my opinion that this verbal image was the creation of the composer of our Orphic 'Theogony': he may have taken the image from some older cosmogonic poetic tradition, in its turn possibly influenced, also at a verbal level, by Near Eastern sources.

#### 4. OCEAN AND ACHELOIOS

In the Derveni Orphic poem, Acheloios is not alone, his appearance being preceded by Zeus's mental creation of Ocean. The two figures were obviously in competition. Two Orphic verses are quoted by Plato, *Kratylos* 402b (= *fr.* 15 Kern): 'Oceanus first, the fair-flowing, initiated marriage; / he was husband to Tethys, his own sister from one mother' (trans. West (1983) 118). This implies that, as in *Iliad* 14, in at least some Orphic tradition this also was the primeval couple, a mythological feature which arguably goes back to the primeval couple Apsû/Tīāmat in *Enūma eliš* as well, through some different channel.<sup>42</sup> The two lines quoted by Plato cannot easily fit into the sequence of the Derveni 'Theogony', though they may belong to a similar poem. They show, in any case, that such a tradition was circulating at his time:<sup>43</sup> in the Orphic and in the Iliadic traditions it was impossible to do without Ocean. Both traditions found their own ways to accommodate the two figures. In *Iliad* 21 there are good reasons to think that the shorter version was the earlier one: the longer version represents Acheloios as a power inferior to Ocean, and thereby makes the passage consistent with the role of the origin of all waters that Ocean has in the rest of the poem.

In the Derveni 'second' creation the Acheloios line stands out as being the only one where the act is described as a purely *physical* one, ἐγκατέλεξ', as opposed to the acts of *mental* creation (μῆσατο) used in this section (*cf.* vv. 36 and 38 in West's reconstruction, and the new recon-

<sup>40</sup> This reading of the text, though within a different general explanation, is adopted also by Brisson (2003).

<sup>41</sup> Burkert (1999) 32-4; West (1997a) 621-4. For various possible contexts of bilingual interaction, *cf.* also Haider (1996); Rollinger (1996) 202-10; Weiler (1996) 218-22; Niemeier (2001).

<sup>42</sup> This was first argued by W.E. Gladstone in 1890: *cf.* Burkert (1992) 91-3; West (1997a) 144-8.

<sup>43</sup> It is doubtful, in my opinion, that Orph. *fr.* 15 Kern may properly fit into West's reconstruction of the Orphic 'Eudemian' Theogony, based on the divine genealogy summarized by Plato, *Timaeus* 40e. Ocean may have prominently featured also in other Orphic poems: *cf.* West (1983) 184-90 for an attempt to identify the primeval pair 'water and mud' in the 'Hieronyman'

Theogony (and, in West's reconstruction, also in the 'Protogonos' one) with Ocean and Tethys. The evidence is tenuous, and susceptible of different interpretations. Gregory of Nazianzus in *fr.* 171 Kern is probably conflating in his survey both Zeus and Kronos (*cf.* μισότεκνον): in this case he may be referring to the dissension between Ocean and Kronos attested in the *Rhapsodies*. In any case, if Gregory and, more importantly, Athenagoras, *Pro Christianis* 18 = *fr.* 57 Kern, do imply an Orphic theogony with Ocean and Tethys as the primeval couple, and if Athenagoras' poem is to be identified with the 'Hieronyman' Theogony, I would expect the *Kratylos* quotation to come from a precursor of *that* poem. A consequence of this would be that Plato knew at least two different Orphic Theogonies.

struction of West's v. 45 [= 46] by Tsantsanoglou as [αὐτ]ἄρ [ἐ]πεὶ δ[ὴ] πάν]τα Διὸ[ς φρήν μῆ]σατ[ο ἔργα], in Bernabé (2000) 61), a feature paralleled also in Parmenides' *doxa*-creation, where the Goddess πρώτιστον μὲν Ἔρωτα θεῶν μητίσαστο πάντων (*fr.* 13 DK). This may well suggest the idea that the Acheloios lines were not originally composed for this context: their insertion in the 'μήσατο-sequence' is probably the result of a compromise. The verb suggests physical insertion of a building material into a structure,<sup>44</sup> and recalls the quasi-cosmogonic creation of Achilles' shield with the insertion of Ocean: ἐν δ' ἐτίθει (formulaic introduction) ποταμοῖο μέγα σθένος Ὠκεανοῖο (*Il.* 18.607).<sup>45</sup> The local proverb within the context of the ἱερὸς λόγος may be understood as having its reference in the created world in general, just as the items of the Iliadic passage were inserted into the shield itself. On the other hand, it is possible to connect it more strictly to the last mentioned item: 'Zeus inserted Acheloios' ἴνες within Ocean'. Such an image was to be a fruitful way of solving the problem posed by the competition of the two gods: Acheloios, being *within* Ocean, may easily be identified with Ocean himself.

### 5. FURTHER TRACES OF A 'COSMIC' ACHELOIOS

This is exactly what we can see in the next poetic passage quoted by the London papyrus, two hexameters introduced by the word 'Seleukos in the fifth book of the *Herakleia*':

πῶ[ς] δ' ἐπορ[εύθ]ης ῥεῦμ' Ἀ[χ]ελ[ω]ίου ἀργυ[ρο]δίνα,  
Ὠκεανοῦ ποταμοῖο [δι'] εὐρέος ὑγ[ρ]ὰ κέλευθα;

Somebody seems to be asking somebody else (probably Herakles) 'how did you cross the stream of silver-eddy Acheloios / through River Ocean's wet paths?' Wilamowitz ((1900) 42) argued that the two hexameters do, in fact, belong to a quotation of Panyassis, an opinion shared by Matthews in his edition of the poet in 1974, and, with some doubts, by Bernabé (*fr. dub.* 31). M. West, reviewing Matthews' edition, has argued that the lines may rather belong to some unknown Hellenistic poet called Seleukos.<sup>46</sup> This is very unlikely. That the Seleukos in the London papyrus is Seleukos ὁ Ὀμηρικός, the early first-century AD grammarian quoted thrice elsewhere in this papyrus (col. 6.15-16, col. 15.16ff., 24ff.) and not an otherwise unknown poet, is almost certain. That something has gone wrong in the tradition of the text is shown by the infinitives in lines 11, 17 and 18: a verb of saying has been omitted after Seleukos' introduction in line 8. There are several reasons for thinking that the lines do belong to Panyassis: (a) he is the best known author of a *Herakleia* in several books; (b) Seleukos quotes Panyassis elsewhere (*fr.* 12 Bernabé); (c) Panyassis deals with Acheloios' problems in at least two other fragments: in *fr.* 2.2 Bernabé he mentions Κασταλῆς Ἀχελώϊδος ἄμβροτον ὕδωρ, sharing with many other fifth-century authors the idea that all springs derive from Acheloios; from *fr.* 20 Bernabé it appears that he spoke of Ἀχελήτιδες nymphs when talking of the same Lydian river known as Ἀχελώϊος in most versions of *Iliad* 24.616 (a variant Ἀχελήσιον was known in antiquity, perhaps also connected with the Panyassis passage).<sup>47</sup> Within a *Herakleia*, the lines preserved by

<sup>44</sup> Cf., e.g., Thuc. 1.93 and Call. *fr.* 64.7 Pf. (same metrical sedes).

<sup>45</sup> Ocean's position in the Shield is paralleled by his position in Proserpina's weaving in Claud. *De rapt. Pros.* 1.269-70. West (1983) 257 has argued that *fr.* 115 Kern (ἐν τῶι Διὸς καὶ Κόρης in sch. Dion. Per. p. 430.24 Müller, with Ἥρης instead of Κόρης in Eust. *ad loc.*) may belong to the same episode in the *Rhapsodies*, and the detail may go back to the earlier Orphic Πέπλος, on which cf. West (1983) 10-11.

<sup>46</sup> West (1976) 172-3. I notice that West (2003) 200 has abandoned this hypothesis.

<sup>47</sup> There seems to be independent evidence for the existence of a toponym Ἀχέλης / Ἀκέλης in that zone. The modified reading Ἀχελήσιον is accepted in the text by West: cf. also West (2001) 280. For the etymology of this word and of Ἀχελώϊος, cf. van Windekens (1952) 37-9 and 144-5; *id.* (1960) 7-10, 109-10.

the London papyrus would fit very well when speaking of Herakles' raid against Geryones. We know from *fr.* 9 Bernabé that Panyassis had the hero crossing the external stream with the Sun's cup, which he had obtained from Nereus. According to the manuscript of Athenaios, source of this fragment, this was told in Book 1 of the poem. The number had been doubted well before the discovery of the London papyrus, since this feat can hardly have taken place at the beginning of the poem. According to West (1976), however, even the figure of the London papyrus – five – is too low for one of the very last labours within a fourteen-book poem. This may well be right: it is possible that the textual corruption after the mention of Seleukos in line 8 has affected also the following words; or, perhaps more probably, that the figure five still refers to Seleukos' work, and not to the *Herakleia* – it may well refer to Book 5 of his *Διορθωτικῶν*, quoted by the London papyrus col. 15.24-5 when discussing the athetesis of *Il.* 21.290-2.<sup>48</sup> The textual corruption would have arisen by jumping from one numeral to the other: the original text may have been something like Σέλευκος δ' ἐν ε' <τῶν Διορθωτικῶν τὸν αὐτὸν Ὠκεανῶι τὸν Ἀχελῶιον εἶναι Πανύασσιν ἀποφαίνει λέγοντα ἐν ?> Ἡρακλείας.<sup>49</sup> Another strange feature is the 'Doric' contracted genitive ἀργυροδίνα: we know too little about Panyassis' tradition to doubt whether he may have used such forms, or that they may have crept into his work. In any case, it is worth remarking that in the preserved Panyassis fragments contracted (or, for that matter, uncontracted) Ionic -εω/ -εων forms are never attested: contrast Βεμβινήταιο twice (*fr.* 4 and 5 Bernabé), λαόν and εὐφοροσυνάων (*fr.* 16.8, 19 Bernabé).

The attribution to Panyassis leads us once again to the early fifth century, and offers a further step towards the solution of the Acheloios problem. His idea is not incompatible with one possible reading of the Derveni theogony, where, as we have seen, Acheloios, being *within* Ocean, might easily have been *identified* with him.

In later times there are, to my knowledge, only two texts that still reflect Acheloios' previous cosmic role. One of them is Kallimachos' *Hymn to Demeter*, where at vv. 13-14 Demeter is addressed: 'thrice did you go over silver-eddying Acheloios / and as many times did you cross each of the perennial rivers'. These lines, showing several verbal similarities with the *Herakleia* passage, are best explained if the poet alludes to Demeter's cosmic wanderings, even beyond the world's boundaries, and not only in reference to the north-western Greek river. Kallimachos is, moreover, giving the *aition* for a ritual habit. The clue, once again, is offered by the London papyrus: Seleukos [says] that 'many people sacrifice to Acheloios before sacrificing to Demeter, since Acheloios is the name of all the rivers and the crop comes from water'. In his possibly 'cosmic' setting of the river, Kallimachos may also reflect, as he does elsewhere, Zenodotos' text of the *Iliad*.

Another mention of a 'cosmic' Acheloios is to be found in one of the lyric poems which have been found in an early third-century BC papyrus with a collection of banquet songs from a Greek garrison in Elephantine in southern Egypt (*P.Berol.* inv. 13270). The theme of one of these songs (*PMG* 917 (c)) is a naval metaphor: the speaker fears that the ship may have gone too far abroad and says that drops (δρόσοι)<sup>50</sup> of Acheloios have already touched it (v. 5: [νῆά τ]οι τέγξαν Ἀχελώϊου δρόσο[ι], as supplemented by Wilamowitz). Some have understood this passage as indicating the danger of rain or, more vaguely, stormy waves: it is far more probable that the ship has ventured well beyond usual routes, into the realm of 'cosmic' Acheloios.<sup>51</sup>

<sup>48</sup> Some of his other works were in several books: Ath. 9.398a quotes Book 5 of his *περὶ Ἑλληνισμοῦ*, and the London papyrus col. 15.16-17 Book 3 of his *Against Aristarchos' signs*.

<sup>49</sup> For the central part of the supplement (made e.g.), cf. West (2003) 200.

<sup>50</sup> Perfectly suitable also for salt-water in late Classical and Hellenistic poetic language (cf., e.g., Eur. *IT* 255, 1192; Ferrari (1988) 207-8).

<sup>51</sup> Cf. D'Alessio *ap.* Ferrari (1988) 207 n.63.



## 6. ACHELOIOS, DODONA AND EUROPE

Another Acheloian tradition seems to have been more copious. The equation between the god's name and 'water' in general is well attested since the fifth century. It is fairly common in Attic dramatic texts and continues into Hellenistic epigram. Ephoros (*FGrHist* 70 F 20b), quoted by both the London papyrus and Macrob. *Sat.* 5.18.6 (via Didymos), traces it back to Dodonean ritual usage, where oaths were sworn in Acheloios' name. In this case, too, a Zenodotean variant to an Iliadic passage may help us to insert a couple of further *tesserae* into the mosaic.

In *Iliad* 16.234 Zeus is Δωδώνης μεδέων δυσχειμέρον. The T scholia to this passage inform us that οἱ περὶ Ζηνόδοτον “πολυπίδακος” διὰ τὸ Καλλιμάχου (*fr.* 630 Pf.) “κρηνέων τ' Εὐρώπῃ μισγομένων ἑκατόν”. There are a few obscure aspects in this quotation: οἱ περὶ Ζηνόδοτον in the Homeric scholia usually refers to Zenodotos himself, but, while Zenodotos' text is known to have influenced Kallimachos, the reverse is much more unlikely. So, either in this passage the sentence means that 'Zenodotos' pupils' defended their predecessor's reading with a Kallimachean passage,<sup>52</sup> or the text of the scholion has been badly compressed, and the later Kallimachean parallel has become the reason for the change.<sup>53</sup> In any case, the relation between the Homeric reading and Kallimachos' line is not immediately clear. The latter may be understood against the background of the first, while the reverse, at least in the present stage of our knowledge, is not possible. Kallimachos' Europe must have had something to do with Dodona's many springs.

Once again, discussion has focused on the reasons for Zenodotos' change, taking for granted that it was he who first changed the text in this way. No satisfactory reason has, however, been proposed: Zenodotos is supposed to have thought that 'wintry' was an unworthy epithet for Zeus's domain; or he may have wished to distinguish between a Dodona in Thesprotia (cf. *Il.* 2.750, δυσχειμέρον, without recorded variants)<sup>54</sup> and another one (this one) in Thessaly.<sup>55</sup> Both explanations seem very unlikely to me. Zenodotos' reading does not obviously look like an attempt to solve a problem. It is better explained as having arisen *within* a tradition. At what stage, it is not easy to say, but a fifth-century *terminus ante quem* for a tradition connecting the springs of Dodona with Acheloios and the origin of all waters may safely be argued.

The missing link is offered by the first Pindaric fragment quoted in the London papyrus on 21.195 (*fr.* 249b S.-M.). Pindar is speaking of what used to be the most famous place producing reeds to make *auloi*. This was near Orchomenos, where, by the celebrated (A)kidalia spring, the waters of the rivers Melas and Kephisos mingled together before flowing into Lake Kopais. In Pindar's text the reed is nurtured by the streams of Melas and by ἴς Ἀχελώϊου (...) Εὐρωπία κράνα. There is no other mention of an Europa spring near Orchomenos. Pindar is not giving the spring's name; rather, he is saying that the spring derives from Europe.<sup>56</sup> And from

<sup>52</sup> Rengakos (1993) 83 (after Bergk).

<sup>53</sup> Some confusion may have arisen from the fact that two Zenodotoi seem to have dealt with the problem: Zenodotos of Ephesos, with his reading of the Homeric passage, and Zenodotos of Alexandria, a Homeric scholar and, possibly, commentator of Kallimachos, who dealt with Europa's genealogy (*fr.* 622 Pf.). One of the two *JHS* readers has suggested that Zenodotos of Mallos (also later than Kallimachos) may have been meant.

<sup>54</sup> Same metrical sedes (πολυπίδακος, on the other hand, occurs five times in the *Iliad*, once in the *Hymn to Aphrodite*, and once in the *Cypria*, always referring to Mt Ide, and always occupying the fifth foot).

<sup>55</sup> Rengakos (1993) 83 (after van der Valk); the second explanation in Janko (1992) 239 on the ground that Zenodotos read Φηγωναίε in the preceding line, and that a certain Suidas understood this as referring to a Thessalian cult. Other sources, on the other hand, connect it to the prophetic oak, φηγός, and there is no reason to believe that Zenodotos did not think that Achilles was addressing the god of the Thesprotian sanctuary: for further details, cf. Cappelletto (1999).

<sup>56</sup> Cf. Pfeiffer *ad loc.* and Loscalzo (1989) 23-4.

Kallimachos we know that Europe was the place, obviously close to Dodona,<sup>57</sup> where a hundred springs mingled. In local cult this was certainly identified with a manifestation of Acheloios, and with the origin of all spring-water. Whoever first used the adjective πολυπίδακος in *Il.* 16.234 did not do so in order to avoid δυσχειμέρου. His reason was the desire to have in this passage an allusion to one of the prominent cultic features of Dodona. The variant may well go back to Pindar's time, if not before. The connection of Dodona with the origin of all streams is also reflected in Kallimachos, who may well be also alluding to the Pindaric passage. At a later time, it is against this same cultic, mythic and textual background that Virgil in vv. 8-9 of the first book of his *Georgica* mentions both the *Chaoniam ... glandem* and the *pocula ... Acheloia*. He can with this allude both to the famous oak and to the famous springs, and to famous discussion on famous texts, whose textual streams mingled with each other, producing an abundant textual crop.<sup>58</sup>

## 7. CONCLUSIONS

The shorter version of Achilles' speech in *Il.* 21.184-99, far from being the result of the arbitrary expunging of line 195 by later scholars, reflects an Archaic tradition where Acheloios was seen as the origin of all waters, including the sea. In the Orphic Derveni 'Theogony' Acheloios is also seen as the origin of the whole sea. According to this poem, Zeus inserts into his creation Acheloios' 'sinews', indicating the springs and rivers from which the sea derives. Some of the features present in both passages, as well as the iconography of Acheloios himself as a human-headed bull, find interesting parallels in Near Eastern, particularly Mesopotamian, traditions.

Acheloios, especially as represented in the shorter version of the Iliadic passage and in the Derveni poem, was a figure in functional competition with Ocean. Ocean is much more popular in literary texts, but seems never to have matched Acheloios as an actual object of cult. It is therefore interesting to find that both the tradition of the *Iliad* and the Orphic 'Theogony' found different ways to accommodate the two figures. The combative Acheloios, also identified with an actual, important river in north-west Greece, is, from a rhetorical point of view, a better climax for Achilles' speech in *Iliad* 21, preceding his fight with Xanthos/Skamandros; his focusing on Acheloios is also paralleled by his preference for the Zeus of Dodona in 16.233-5. It is easy to understand, on the other hand, that the unusual cosmological implication of the passage may have been felt to be incompatible with the role played by Ocean in the rest of the poem, notably in Book 14: the longer version, with line 195, represents a solution to the problem. The shorter version is clearly the earlier one. It is possible, however, that the presence of Ocean in this section (line 195) goes back to a period not much later than its appearance within the monumental poem.<sup>59</sup> In the Orphic poem too – where the Acheloios passage, with Zeus inserting his 'sinews'

<sup>57</sup> It may have been connected with the hundred springs on Mt Tmaros' slopes mentioned by Theopompos, *FGrHist* 115 F 319. According to Akestodoros, quoted by Epaphroditos in his commentary on *Aitia* II (*fr.* 53 Pf.), Dodonos was the son of Zeus and Europa.

<sup>58</sup> Virgil's pairing of the oak and the *arista*, under the sign of *alma Ceres*, is probably also an allusion to the pairing of δρῶν and ὄμννια Θεσμοφόρος in Call. *fr.* 1.10 Pfeiffer = Massimilla (if Housman's supplement is, as I believe, correct: on the implications of the Virgilian passage, see now G.B. D'Alessio, 'Intersezioni callimachee', forthcoming in A.-T. Cozzoli (ed.), *Atti della 'Giornata di Studi Callimachei, Roma 14-05-2003'*). The pairing of Ceres and Liber, on the other hand, recalls that of Δαμάτηρ and Διόνυσος in Call. *Hymn* 6.69-71: for a detailed analysis of the Virgil passage, cf. Thomas (1997) 205-9.

<sup>59</sup> One of the two *JHS* readers suggests that 'one could make a strong case for a date [of the longer version] after the late sixth century' (the proposed date for the Derveni 'Theogony'). The fact that the text of the Derveni poem seems to represent the same tradition about Acheloios as the shorter version of the *Iliad* passage, however, does not rule out the possibility that both textual forms might have already been in circulation by the time of its composition. I do not think that the longer version may be exactly dated: the urge to bring consistency among the internal data of the monumental poem may have taken place quite early. The longer version of the *Iliad* passage, the succession Ocean/Acheloios in the Derveni poem and Panyassis' identification of Ocean and Acheloios are, in my opinion, all reactions to the problems raised by the earlier tradition represented in the shorter version.

into the world, shows signs of belonging to a tradition different from the rest of the context, where Zeus's creation is presented as a mental act – both gods appear in succession, though their relationship is differently envisaged.

It seems, in any case, that literary representations of Acheloios as the origin of all the world's waters (including the sea) were giving way to the prominence of Ocean already in the Archaic period. A tradition, first represented by Panyassis, actually identifies him with Ocean. In later texts Acheloios is very rarely presented in his 'cosmic' role. His function as the origin of all fresh waters, on the other hand, has been more persistent, probably due also to his role in the cultic practice at Dodona, leading to the fairly widespread poetic usage of his name as a synonym for 'fresh water'.

G.B. D'ALESSIO  
University of Messina

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, T.W. (1900) 'New Homeric papyri', *CR* 14, 14-18
- Apthorp, M.J. (1980) *The Manuscript Evidence for Interpolation in Homer* (Heidelberg)
- Austin, C. and Bastianini, G. (2002) *Posidippi Pellaei quae supersunt omnia* (Milan)
- Bernabé, A. (1988) *Poetae Epici Graeci. Testimonia et fragmenta* 1 (Leipzig)
- (2000) 'Nuovi frammenti orfici e una nuova edizione degli 'Ορφικά', in M. Tortorelli Ghidini, A. Storchi Marino, A. Visconti (eds), *Tra Orfeo e Pitagora. Origini e incontri di culture nell'antichità* (Naples) 43-80
- (2003) 'Autour du mythe orphique sur Dionysos et les Titans. Quelques notes critiques', in D. Accorinti and P. Chuvin (eds), *Des Géants à Dionysos. Mélanges offerts à F. Vian* (Alessandria) 25-39
- Böck, B. and Márquez Rowe, I. (1999-2000) 'MM 818: a new fragment of Atra-ḫasīs I', *Aula Orientalis* 17-18, 167-77
- Bolling G.M. (1925) *The External Evidence for Interpolations in Homer* (Oxford)
- Bordreuil, P. and Pardee, D. (1993) 'Le combat de Ba'lu avec Yammu d'après les textes ougaritiques', *MARI* 7, 63-70
- Bottéro, J. (1991) 'L'anthropogonie mésopotamienne et l'élément divin en l'homme', in P. Borgeaud (ed.), *Orphisme et Orphée en l'honneur de J. Rudhardt* (Geneva) 211-25
- Bremmer, J.N. (2003) 'Remember the Titans', in C. Auffarth and L. Stuckenbruck (eds), *The Fall of the Angels* (Leiden) 35-61
- Brenk, F.E. (1991) 'The Herakles myth and the literary texts relating to the myth of Ninurta', in D. Musti and others (eds), *La transizione dal miceneo all'alto arcaismo. Dal palazzo alla città* (Rome) 507-26
- Brisson, L. (1992) 'Le corps "dionysiaque": l'anthropogonie décrite dans le *Commentaire sur le Phédon de Platon* (1, par. 3-6), attribué à Olympiodore est-elle orphique?', in *ΣΟΦΙΗΣ ΜΑΙΗΤΟΡΕΣ. Chercheurs de sagesse: Hommage à J. Pépin* (Paris) 481-99 = *Orphée et l'Orphisme dans l'Antiquité gréco-romaine* (Aldershot 1995) ch.7
- (2003) 'Sky, sex and sun. The meanings of αἰδοῖος and αἰδοῖον in the Derveni papyrus', *ZPE* 144, 19-29
- Broggiato, M. (2001) *Cratete di Mallo. I frammenti*, ed. with introduction and notes (La Spezia)
- Burkert, W. (1986) 'Der Autor von Derveni: Stesimbrotos Περὶ τελετῶν?', *ZPE* 62, 1-5
- (1987) 'Oriental and Greek mythology: the meeting of parallels', in J. Bremmer (ed.), *Interpretations of Greek Mythology* (London) 10-40
- (1992) *The Orientalizing Revolution. Near-Eastern Influence on Greek Culture in the Early Archaic Age* (Cambridge, MA) (revised translation of *Die orientalisierende Epoche in der griechischen Religion und Literatur* (Heidelberg 1984))
- (1994) 'Orientalische und griechische Weltmodelle von Assur bis Anaximander', *WS* 107, 179-86
- (1999) *Da Omero ai Magi. La tradizione orientale nella cultura greca* (Venice)
- Cappelletto, P. (1999) 'Le due Dodone e l'esegesi della preghiera di Achille (*Il.* 16.233-5) da Zenodoto a Stefano di Bisanzio', *Sileno* 25, 241-52
- Caquot, A., Sznycer, M., Herdner, A. (1974) *Textes ougaritiques 1: Mythes et légendes* (Paris)

- Carroccio, B. (2000) 'Il toro androprosopo, la cicala e l'incuso reggino', *NAC* 29, 47-69
- Cooper, J. (1978) *The Return of Ninurta to Nippur* (Rome)
- Costabile, F. (ed.) (1991) *I ninfei di Locri Epizefiri* (Catanzaro)
- Currie, B. (2002) 'Euthymos of Locri: a case study in heroization in the classical period', *JHS* 122, 24-44
- D'Alessio, G.B. (2004) 'Argo e l'Argolide nei canti culturali di Pindaro', in P. Angeli Bernardini (ed.), *La città di Argo. Mito, storia, tradizioni poetiche* (Rome) 107-25
- Dalley, S. (2000) *Myths from Mesopotamia. Creation, The Flood, Gilgamesh, and Others* (2nd edn, Oxford)
- Day, J. (1985) *God's Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea. Echoes of a Canaanite Myth in the Old Testament* (Cambridge)
- Detienne, M. (1989) *L'Écriture d'Orphée* (Paris)
- Dijk, J. van (1983) *LUGAL UD ME-LÂM-BI NIR-ĜĀL* (Leiden)
- Di Marco, M. (1998) *Sapienza italiana. Studi su Senofane, Empedocle, Ippone* (Rome)
- Durand, J.-M. (1993) 'Le mythologème du combat entre le dieu de l'orage et la mer en Mésopotamie', *MARI* 7, 41-61
- Ebeling, E. (1931) *Tod und Leben nach den Vorstellungen der Babylonier* (Berlin and Leipzig)
- Edmonds, R. (1999) 'Tearing apart the Zagreus: a few disparaging remarks on Orphism and the original sin', *ClAnt* 18, 35-73
- Ellinger, P. (1993) *La légende nationale phocidienne. Artémis, les situations extrêmes et les récits de guerre d'anéantissement* (Paris)
- Engel, B.J. (1987) *Darstellungen von Dämonen und Tieren in assyrischen Palästen und Tempeln nach den schriftlichen Quellen* (Mönchengladbach)
- Erbse, H. (1977) *Scholia graeca in Homeri Iliadem* 5 (Berlin)
- Ferrari, F. (1988) 'P.Berol. inv. 13270: i canti di Elefantina', *SCO* 38, 181-227
- Fontenrose, J. (1959) *Python. A Study of Delphic Myth and its Origins* (Berkeley and Los Angeles)
- Funghi, S. (1997) 'The Derveni papyrus', in Laks and Most (1997) 25-37
- George, A.R. and Al-Rawi, F.N.H. (1996) 'Tablets from the Sippar Library VI. Atra-ḫasīs', *Iraq* 58, 147-90
- Grenfell, G.P. and Hunt, A.S. (1899) *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 2 (London)
- (1904) *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 4 (London)
- Haider, P.W. (1996) 'Griechen im Vorderen Orient und in Ägypten bis ca. 590 v. Chr.', in Ulf (1996) 59-115
- Hajnal, I. (1995) *Studien zum mykenischen Kasussystem* (Berlin and New York)
- Hansen, D.P. (2001) 'The reclining human-faced bison sculpture from Area SS', in D. Oates, J. Oates and H. McDonald (eds), *Excavations at Tell Brak 2: Nagar in the Third Millennium BC* (Cambridge and London) 257-63
- Haslam, M. (1997) 'Homeric papyri and transmission of the text', in I. Morris and B. Powell (eds), *A New Companion to Homer* (Leiden and New York) 55-100
- Hopkinson, N. (1984) *Callimachus. Hymn to Demeter* (Cambridge)
- Isler, H.P. (1970) *Acheloos* (Bern)
- (1981) 'Acheloos', *LIMC* 1.1 12-36
- Jacobsen, T. (1968) 'The battle between Marduk and Tiamat', *JOAS* 88, 104-8
- Janko, R. (1992) *The Iliad: A Commentary* 4: *Books 13-16* (Cambridge)
- (1997) 'The physicist as hierophant: Aristophanes, Socrates and the authorship of the Derveni papyrus', *ZPE* 118, 61-94
- (2000) *Philodemus. On Poems. Book One* (Oxford)
- (2001) 'The Derveni papyrus (Diagoras of Melos, *Apopyrgizontes logoi?*): a new translation', *CPh* 96, 1-32
- (2002a) 'The Derveni papyrus: an interim text', *ZPE* 141, 1-62
- (2002b) 'Seduta di chiusura', in F. Montanari and P. Ascheri (eds), *Omero tremila anni dopo* (Rome) 653-66
- Kranz, W. (1938) 'Kosmos und Mensch in der Vorstellung frühen Griechentums', *NGG* 2, 121-61 = *Studien zur antiken Literatur und ihrem Nachwirken* (Heidelberg 1967) 165-96
- Laks, A. and Most, G. (eds) (1997) *Studies on the Derveni Papyrus* (Oxford)

- Lapini, W. (2000) [2003] 'Osservazioni sul nuovo Posidippo (P.Mil. Vogl. VIII 309)', *Lexis* 20, 35-60
- Lesky, A. (1947) *Thalatta. Der Weg der Griechen zum Meer* (Vienna)
- Livingstone, A. (1986) *Mystical and Mythological Explanatory Works of Assyrian and Babylonian Scholars* (Oxford)
- (1989) *Court Poetry and Literary Miscellanea* (State Archives of Assyria 3, Helsinki)
- Lloyd-Jones, H. (1985) 'Pindar and the afterlife', repr. with a 1989 addition in *Greek Epic, Lyric and Tragedy. The Academic Papers of Sir H. Lloyd-Jones* (Oxford 1990) 80-109
- Loscalzo, D. (1989) 'Pindaro e la canna auletica della palude Copaide', *QUCC* n.s. 33, 17-24
- Manetti, D. and Montanari, F. (1999) in *Corpus dei Papiri Filosofici Greci e Latini*, I.1.3 (Florence) s.v. 'Xenophanes', 2T (dub.), 878-9
- Matthews, V.J. (1974) *Panyassis of Halikarnassos. Text and Commentary* (Leiden)
- Montanari, F. (1998) 'Zenodotus, Aristarchus and the *ekdosis* of Homer', in G.W. Most (ed.), *Editing Texts—Texte edieren* (Göttingen) 1-21
- Mühmelt, M. (1965) *Griechische Grammatik in der Vergilerklärung* (Munich)
- Müller, O.M. (1913) *Über den Papyruskommentar zum  $\Phi$  der Ilias (Ox. Pap. II 56 ss.)* (diss. Munich)
- Murgia, C.E. (1970) 'Avienus's supposed iambic version of Livy', *CSCA* 3, 185-97
- Mussini, E. (2002) 'La diffusione dell'iconografia di Acheloo in Magna Grecia e Sicilia. Tracce per l'individuazione di un culto', *SE* ser. 3, 65-8, 91-119
- Nickau, K. (1977) *Untersuchungen zur textkritischen Methode des Zenodotos von Ephesos* (Berlin and New York)
- Niemeier, W.-D. (2001) 'Archaic Greeks in the Orient: textual and archaeological evidence', *BASOR* 322, 11-32
- Obbink, D. (1994) 'A quotation of the Derveni papyrus in Philodemus' *On Piety*', *CronErc* 24, 111-35
- Pasquali, G. (1934) *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo* (Florence)
- Powell, J.U. (1925) *Collectanea Alexandrina* (Oxford)
- Rengakos, A. (1993) *Der Homertext und die hellenistischen Dichter* (Stuttgart)
- Reynolds, F. (1999) 'Stellar representations of Tiamat and Qingu in a learned calendar text', in K. van Lerberghe and G. Voet (eds), *Languages and Cultures in Contact. At the Crossroads of Civilizations in the Syro-Mesopotamian Realm* (Leuven) 369-78
- Richardson, N. (1993) *The Iliad: A Commentary 6: Books 20-24* (Cambridge)
- Riedweg, C. (1995) 'Orphisches bei Empedokles', *AuA* 41, 34-59
- Robertson, N. (2003) 'Orphic Mysteries and Dionysiac ritual', in M.B. Cosmopoulos (ed.), *Greek Mysteries. The Archaeology and Ritual of Ancient Greek Secret Cults* (London and New York) 218-40
- Rocchi, M. (1980) 'I *neura* di Zeus', *SMEA* 72, 353-75
- Rollinger, R. (1996) 'Altorientalische Motive in der frühgriechischen Literatur am Beispiele der homerischen Epen. Elemente des Kampfes in der Ilias und in der altorientalischen Literatur (nebst Überlegungen zur Präsenz altorientalischer Wanderpriester im früharchaischen Griechenland)', in Ulf (1996) 156-210
- Rutherford, I. (2001) 'The song of the Sea (*ŠA A.AB.BA ŠIR*): thoughts on KUB 45.63', in G. Wilhelm (ed), *Akten des IV. Internationalen Kongresses für Hethitologie. Würzburg, 4.-8. Oktober 1999* (Wiesbaden) 598-609
- Schmidt, M. (1976) *Die Erklärungen zum Weltbild Homers und zur Kultur der Heroenzeit in den bT-Scholien zur Ilias* (Munich)
- Shipp, G.P. (1961) *Essays in Mycenaean and Homeric Greek* (London, New York and Sydney)
- Soden, W. von (1995) *Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik* (3rd edn, Rome)
- Thomas, R.F. (1997) 'Vestigia Ruris: urbane rusticity in Virgil's *Georgics*', *HSCP* 97, 197-214 = *Reading Virgil and his Texts. Studies in Intertextuality* (Ann Arbor 1999) 229-45
- Ulf, C. (ed.) (1996) *Wege zur Genese griechischer Identität. Die Bedeutung der früharchaischen Zeit* (Berlin)
- van der Valk, M. (1963-64) *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad* (Leiden)
- van Windekens, A.J. (1952) *Le Pélasgique* (Leuven)
- (1960) *Études Pélasgiques* (Leuven)
- Wakeman, M.K. (1973) *God's Battle with the Monster. A Study in Biblical Imagery* (Leiden)

- Weiler, I. (1996) 'Soziogenese und soziale Mobilität im archaischen Griechenland. Gedanken zur Begegnung mit den Völkern des Alten Orients', in Ulf (1996) 211-39
- Weiss, C. (1984) *Griechische Flussgottheiten in vorhellenistischer Zeit. Ikonographie und Bedeutung* (Würzburg)
- (1988) 'Fluvii', *LIMC* 4.1 139-48
- West, M.L. (1971) 'The cosmology of 'Hippocrates'', *De Hebdomadibus*', *CQ* n.s. 21, 365-88
- (1976) review of Matthews (1974), *CPh* 71, 172-4
- (1983) *The Orphic Poems* (Oxford)
- (1997a) *The East Face of Helicon* (Oxford)
- (1997b) 'Hocus-pocus in East and West', in Laks and Most (1997) 81-90
- (2001) *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the Iliad* (Munich and Leipzig)
- (2003) *Greek Epic Fragments* (Cambridge, MA and London)
- Wiggermann, F.A.M. (1986) *Babylonian Prophylactic Figures. The Ritual Texts* (Amsterdam)
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (1900) review of Grenfell and Hunt (1899), *GGA* 162, 29-58
- (1931-32) *Der Glaube der Hellenen* (Berlin)