

*Anastasiia Pavlova*

REATTRIBUTING  
HERACL. PONT. F 102 SCHÜTR.\*

Heraclides of Pontus, whose prolificacy and scientific versatility have been well-known until the late antiquity, wrote several pieces on Homer, including two books of *Λύσεις Ὀμηρικαί* (*Solutions of Homeric Problems*) according to Diogenes Laertius (5. 88). The very name makes it clear that the work belonged to the well-known philological genre of resolving inconsistencies in the Homeric poems.<sup>1</sup> Five or six of the extant Heraclides' fragments are usually supposed to have their origin in *Λύσεις Ὀμηρικαί* (F 171–175 Wehrli = 99–104 Schütrumpf; Schütrumpf also adds fragment 103 to Wehrli's list), all of them are found in Homeric scholia and can be traced back to Porphyrius' *Ζητήματα Ὀμηρικά*.

In this paper, I would like to dwell on fragments F 101 and F 102 Schütrumpf cited below and challenge the way they are traditionally considered. Historically, F 101 and F 102 have been placed together because both discuss Telemachus' speech in the second book of the *Odyssey*; however, as other evidence suggests, the latter fragment can be reasonably attributed to a different work of Heraclides, as elaborated below.

F 101 is dedicated to the inconsistency of how much Penelope's suitors had there been.

**F 101 Schütrumpf (= 173 Wehrli):<sup>2</sup>**

ἐκατὸν δέκα καὶ ὀκτὼ σχεδὸν τῶν ἀπάντων ὄντων μνηστήρων, ἀπὸ  
τούτων δὲ ἐκ τῆς Ἰθάκης 'δυοκαίδεκα πάντες ἄριστοι' (*Od.* 16. 251)  
ῥηθέντων, ζητεῖ Ἡρακλείδης, πῶς ὁ Τηλέμαχος κατασμικρύνει ἐν τῇ  
δημηγορίᾳ, συστέλλων τὸ πλῆθος εἰς μόνους τοὺς Ἰθακησίους. τί γάρ  
φησι;

---

\* This article was prepared within the framework of Russian Foundation for Basic Research (RFBR), research project № 19-312-90026.

<sup>1</sup> On *Λύσεις* see comprehensive article by Gudeman 1927, especially Sp. 2511–2521; see also Pfeiffer 1968, 69–70; Heath 2002, 253.

<sup>2</sup> Here and onwards quoted after Schütrumpf 2008.

μητέρι μοι μνηστῆρες ἐπέχραον οὐκ ἐθελούση,  
τῶν ἀνδρῶν φίλοι υἱες, οἳ ἐνθάδε γ' εἰσὶν ἄριστοι (*Od.* 2. 50–51).

τὸ γὰρ πολὺ φορτίον τῆς μνηστείας περιήρηκε συστείλας τὸ πλῆθος εἰς  
τοὺς ἐνθάδε, τοὺς ὄντας ἐλάχιστον μέρος τοῦ παντὸς πλήθους.

When it is stated that there are about one hundred and eighteen suitors and “twelve all of them noblest” are said to be from the Ithaca, Heraclides inquires why Telemachus in his speech to the assembly lessens the whole number and reduces it to the Ithacian suitors only. Because what does he say? “The suitors assaulted my mother who did not want it, / the own sons of the men, who are noblest here”. For he takes away a large part of the burden caused by this wooing, reducing the amount to those from Ithaca who make the smallest part of the whole number.<sup>3</sup>

Porphyrus solves this problem as follows: Telemachus talks to the Itacians, that is why he mentions their sons only; had he mentioned all the other suitors, it could have been a mere excuse for the Itacians’ sons because, representing the minority of all the suitors, they would have turned out to be not the only people who had done something reprehensible.<sup>4</sup> Porphyrus does not mention whose explanation he cites, whether his own, or Heraclides’, or someone else’s. It cannot be proven, but, as Heraclides’ *Λύσεις Ὀμηρικαί* could have been written as a dialog,<sup>5</sup> we can assume that it was Heraclides who proposed the solution as well as the statement of the problem.<sup>6</sup> According to F. Wehrli, in the later epic tradition the quarrel happened exclusively between Odysseus and the Itacians, so there were no foreign suitors.<sup>7</sup> The discrepancy in number of the suitors is a “classical” Homeric problem involving an inconsistency in the text.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>3</sup> All translations are mine. – A. P.

<sup>4</sup> Porphyrus, *Quaestiones Homericae ad Odysseam pertinentes* ad 2. 51 (Schraeder 1880, 26. 12 ff.).

<sup>5</sup> Diogenes Laertius (5. 86) states that Heraclides wrote dialogues of great beauty and excellence and his type of dialogue was later appraised by Cicero (Gottschalk 1980, 9–11; Pavlova 2020, 49), however Diogenes’ testimony does not necessarily mean that all the treatises were written as dialogs.

<sup>6</sup> A similar scenario can be observed in Antisthenes’ interpretations of Homer also cited in Porphyrus’ work. Both the statement of the problem and the solution are attributed to Antisthenes, so his original work is supposed to have been a dialog. See Prince 2015, 597.

<sup>7</sup> Wehrli 1953, 122. Commentaries on the *Odyssey* also notice that foreign suitors are rarely mentioned in the poem (Heubeck–West–Hainsworth 1988, 133).

<sup>8</sup> On Heraclides’ *Λύσεις* specifically see Wehrli 1968, 683; Podlecki 1968, 116–117; Gottschalk 1980, 137; Heath 2002, 255–263; Pavlova 2020.

The second fragment F 102 radically differs from the first one in terms of what exactly is being discussed.

### F 102 Schütrumpf (= 174 Wehrli):

αἰτιᾶται ὁ Ἡρακλείδης καὶ τὸ τῆς Τηλεμάχου δημηγορίας ἀνοικονόμητον.  
δέον γάρ, φησὶν, ἄξιοῦν καὶ ἱκετεύειν συνάρασθαι αὐτῷ πρὸς τὴν τῶν  
μνηστήρων τοῦ οἴκου ἀπαλλαγὴν, ὃ δὲ ἐπιπλήσσει λέγων

οὐ γὰρ ἔτ' ἀνσχετὰ ἔργα τετεύχεται, οὐδ' ἔτι καλῶς  
οἶκος ἐμὸς διόλωλε (*Od.* 2. 63–64).

καὶ τὸ ὅτι [εἰ] μὴ πάρεστιν ὁ πατήρ, ταῦτα πᾶσχειν, † ἐπανατεινόμενος †<sup>9</sup>

οὐ γὰρ ἔπ' ἀνὴρ  
οἶος Ὀδυσσεὺς ἔσκεν, ἀρὴν ἀπὸ οἴκου ἀμύναι,  
ἡμεῖς δ' οὐ νύ τι τοῖοι ἀμυνέμεν (*Od.* 2. 58–60).

καί, ἔτι πικροτέρου πρὸς τοὺς Ἰθακησίους ὄντος τοῦ λόγου, καὶ τὴν  
ἀπειλὴν

ἄλλους τ' αἰδέσθητε, φησί, περικτίονας ἀνθρώπους,  
θεῶν δ' ὑποδείσατε μῆνιν (*Od.* 2. 65–66).

Heraclides also censures Telemachus' unarranged speech to the assembly. For, Heraclides says, Telemachus should have asked and begged them to help him redeem his home from the suitors, but he attacks them saying “for things unendurable any longer have happened, and my house has been destroyed utterly and in an inglorious way”. He also censures that he (Telemachus) very prolixly says that he suffers it all because his father is absent “for there is no man, like Odysseus was, who could ward off the ruin from the house, and we are not such people, who could defend it”. And when the speech to Ithacians gets even more bitter, Heraclides censures also the threat “May you be ashamed, he says, before the other people who dwell around and may you fear the wreath of the gods”.

As already mentioned, scholars traditionally attribute F 102 to *Λύσεις Ὀμηρικαί*, like F. Wehrli who brings it in connection with the concepts

<sup>9</sup> F. Wehrli enclosed the participle † ἐπανατεινόμενος † in cruces, Schütrumpf in his edition followed him. According to apparatus criticus in Schrader's edition, the alternative manuscript reading is the aorist participle of the same verb ἐπανατείνω. Its first meaning in LSJ is ‘to stretch out and hold up’, the second is ‘to brandish threateningly’. Applied to words and speech, a new meaning ‘to speak with prolixity’ later develops – LSJ takes Dionysius of Halicarnassus as an example (*Dion. Halic. Rh.* 8. 14: καὶ ἐπανατεινόμενος λόγους τινὰς θαυμαστοὺς ὥς ἐρῶν). While Heraclides' text is retold by Porphyrius and then rewritten by a scholiast, this word usage typical for later authors might be not that dubious.

of *καῖρός* and *πρέπον* in IV century BC rhetorics. Adding on that, M. Heath,<sup>10</sup> who wrote on Heraclides and Porphyrius as well (especially on his rhetorical studies), further suggests that both Heraclides' fragments were taken from the same *Λύσεις Ὀμηρικαί*, but Porphyrius quoted Heraclides selectively in order to disagree with his point, to prove Telemachus a skillful orator and to dismiss Heraclides' explanation (I do not see any explanations in Heraclides, but Heath hypothesizes that, in the following non-surviving text, Heraclides goes on to say that Homer intentionally renders Telemachus' speech not perfect as any other young man's speech would be) – and indeed, right after the long quotation from Heraclides Porphyrius starts to elaborately praise the Telemachus' speech.<sup>11</sup>

However, the style and content of F 102 are very much different to other Heraclides' fragments on Homeric problems: the fragment does not describe a Homeric problem nor provide a solution thereof and also includes no mention of any textual contradictions or improbabilities, but rather discusses the quality of Telemachus' speech. An extended commentary of this kind expands beyond the genre of solutions of Homeric problems, which normally did not contain any kind of in-depth philological criticism.<sup>12</sup> Here Heraclides takes Telemachus' speech as an example and argues about how the speech in the assembly should be held and what kind of mistakes the speaker had made in this particular case. It also should be noted that Heraclides, whether intentionally or not, changes

---

<sup>10</sup> Heath, 2009, 260–261.

<sup>11</sup> Porphyrius, *Quaestiones Homericae ad Odysseam pertinentes* ad 2. 51 (Schrader 1880, 27. 14 – 29. 10): ἀγνοεῖ δὲ ὁ κατήγορος τὴν δύναμιν τῆς δημηγορίας. συμπλέκεται γὰρ βασιλικὸν φρόνημα δεήσει καὶ ἰκεσία. καὶ ἔστιν οὐχ ἀπλῶς ὁ λόγος ἀτυχοῦντος, ἵνα δέησις ἢ μόνη, ἀλλὰ βασιλέως ἀτυχοῦντός τε ἅμα καὶ ἀδικουμένου ὑφ' ὧν ἥκιστα ἐχρήν... διὰ πάντων γούν τούτων μικτὴν τε ὁμοῦ καὶ ποικιλίαν πλήρη ποιήσας τὴν δημηγορίαν δεινοῦ ῥήτορος δυνάμει κεκρημένος φαίνεται. (“The accuser does not recognise the force of the speech. For in this case the truly kingly manner of thought is combined with entreaty and supplication. Moreover, it is not just a speech of someone unfortunate, in which there should have been just entreaty, but the speech of an unfortunate king who was injured by those, who by no means should have done it... Having made the speech mixed and varied by means of all these things, Telemachus thus appears to have performed the power of a skillful orator”.)

<sup>12</sup> The genre of *Λύσεις* is supposed to have its origin in the symposiac intellectual discussions and the custom of *ζητήματα προβάλλειν* (i. e. to interpret some difficulties in Homer's texts). It was amusing in the first instance, so the serious Alexandrian grammarians regarded it as a game (see Pfeiffer 1968, 70). Heraclides' solutions are also far from being taken seriously. H. Gottschalk finds them trivial and superficial and the impression left by them seems to him unfavourable, especially in comparison with Aristotle's solutions (Gottschalk 1980, 136).

the order of verses, probably to make the sequence somehow illogical: Telemachus first being aggressive, then loquaciously complaining and finally threatening. Heraclides' arguments are much more appropriate for a rhetorical treatise than for solutions of the Homeric problems. For this reason, this fragment should be reattributed to some other Heraclides' work, a rhetorical one.

Now, Diogenes Laertius' catalogue demonstrates that Heraclides was not very interested in rhetorics, though Diogenes mentions one rhetorical treatise *Περὶ τοῦ ῥητορεύειν ἢ Προταγόρας*. Unfortunately, not a single fragment could be attributed to this work for certain. F. Wehrli believes it was a dialog and predictably associates it with Plato's *Protagoras*.<sup>13</sup> In this work, according to Wehrli, Heraclides most probably criticised sophists as teachers of rhetorics (although the verb ῥητορεύω may be associated both with public speaking and teaching rhetorics). Anyway, the title *Περὶ τοῦ ῥητορεύειν ἢ Προταγόρας* can somehow hint at the contents, because Protagoras' studies involved rhetorics and literary criticism. This makes the person of Protagoras important for my argument.

According to few extant fragments and testimonies of Protagoras as well as to Plato's dialog, it is known that Protagoras along with rhetorics touched on theory of language (he is sometimes told to have championed this research). He identified three types of nouns (DK 80 A 27) and four types of discourse: wish, question, answer and command (DK 80 A 1 = Diog. Laert. 9. 53–54) which correspond to verb moods in Greek. Some scholars (among them, D. Fehling and A. Rademaker) believe that Protagoras never had a fully fledged linguistic theory, but all his conclusions base on the critical analysis of Homer's and other poets' pieces.<sup>14</sup> In Plato's dialogue, Protagoras states that being well-versed in poetry is a very important part of education (339 a). The extant critical notes by Protagoras refer to the usage of moods (i. e. the usage of the four types of speech he identified) and the connection between gender of nouns and flexions. The crucial notion of his linguistic theory was ὁρθόεπεια (see Plat. *Phaedr.* 267 c = DK 80 A 26) – the correctness, which includes both the correct derivation of word forms and factual correctness in poetry as well as other discourse forms. Here, I cannot help but refer to a *locus classicus* from the 19th chapter of Aristotle's *Poetics* (56 b 15–18):<sup>15</sup>

<sup>13</sup> Wehrli 1953, 69; Wehrli 1968, 678, 45–49.

<sup>14</sup> Rademaker 2013, 87–88; 95–106. In the footnotes 21 and 22 on pages 95–96 Rademaker puts long quotations from Fehling 1965, whose opinion on the development of Protagoras' linguistic studies from criticism he shares.

<sup>15</sup> Quoted after Kassel 1965.

τί γὰρ ἂν τις ὑπολάβοι ἡμαρτῆσθαι ἃ Πρωταγόρας ἐπιτιμᾷ, ὅτι εὖχεσθαι οἰόμενος ἐπιτάττει εἰπὼν “μῆνιν ἄειδε θεά”; τὸ γὰρ κελεῦσαι, φησὶν, ποιεῖν τι ἢ μὴ ἐπιταξίς ἐστιν.

For who would assume that there is something wrong in the passage, which Protagoras censures because Homer when intended to say a prayer made a command “Muse, sing the wreath...”, for he (Protagoras) says that to order to do or not to do something is a command.

This testimony demonstrates that Protagoras not only identified the imperative mood but also regarded it inappropriate when talking to the Muse. The idea of appropriateness and inappropriateness of speech explained using Homeric poems brings the Protagoras’ testimony closer to the F 102 of Heraclides.

While Heraclides’ fragments 101 and 102 both deal with the Telemachus’ speech in the second book of the *Odyssey*, they differ greatly, as in F 102 Heraclides does not solve any inconsistencies in the Homer’s poem, but censures the speech from a rhetorical point of view. This makes it unlikely that both fragments belong to the same work, as it was previously supposed to be, suggesting that the fragment 102 would have rather been taken from a yet unknown rhetorical treatise. According to Diogenes Laertius, Heraclides’ works are known to include a single rhetorical work, a dialog called *Περὶ τοῦ ῥητορεύειν ἢ Πρωταγόρας*. It is also known and well-attested that Protagoras in his studies turned to the exegesis of poets, to rhetorics, to language issues etc. Moreover, there are testimonies that Protagoras distinguished different types of speech and illustrated it with verses of Homer, just as Heraclides did in the F 102. Based on this, I believe that this fragment was taken from *Περὶ τοῦ ῥητορεύειν ἢ Πρωταγόρας*, where Heraclides could have somehow parodied or imitated Protagoras’ style of criticism. When Porphyrius discussed the problem of the number of Penelope’s suitors and referred to Heraclides’ *Λύσεις Ὀμηρικαί* (F 101 Schütrumpf), he could have remembered that Heraclides had written on the Telemachus’ speech in his *Protagoras* and quoted it, which explains why both fragments ended up being nearby.

Anastasiia Pavlova  
Saint-Petersburg State University  
a.v.pavlova@mail.ru

## Bibliography

- D. Fehling, “Zwei Untersuchungen zur griechischen Sprachphilosophie”, *RhM* 108 (1965) 212–229.
- H. B. Gottschalk, *Heraclides of Pontus* (New York 1980).
- A. Gudeman, “Λύσεις”, *RE* 13 (1927) 2511–2529.
- M. Heath, “Heraclides of Pontus on Homer”, in: W. W. Fortenbaugh, E. E. Pender (eds.), *Heraclides of Pontus: Discussion* (New Brunswick, N.J. – London 2009) 251–273.
- A. Heubeck, S. West, J. B. Hainsworth, *A Commentary on Homer’s Odyssey I* (Oxford 1988).
- R. Kassel (ed.), *Aristotelis de Arte Poetica Liber* (Oxford 1965).
- A. V. Pavlova, “Heraclides of Pontus and the Idomeneus Myth”, *Philologia Classica* 15: 1 (2020) 47–53.
- R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford 1968).
- A. Podlecki, “The Peripatetics as Literary Critics”, *Phoenix* 23 (1969) 114–137.
- S. Prince (ed.), *Antisthenes of Athens: Texts, Translations, and Commentary* (Ann Arbor 2015).
- A. Rademaker, “Protagoras on Language”, in: J. M. van Ophuijsen, M. van Raalte, P. Stork (eds.), *Protagoras of Abdera: The Man, His Measure* (Leiden–Boston 2013).
- H. Schrader (ed.), *Porphirii Quaestionum Homericarum ad Iliadem pertinentium reliquias I* (Leipzig 1880).
- E. Schütrumpf (ed.), *Heraclides of Pontus. Texts and Translations* (New Brunswick, N.J. – London 2008).
- F. Wehrli (ed., comm.), *Herakleides Pontikos, Die Schule des Aristoteles 7* (Basel 1953).
- F. Wehrli, “Herakleides der Pontiker”, *RE Suppl.* 11 (1968) 675–686.

The article aims at reattributing the fragment 102 (Schütrumpf) by Heraclides of Pontus, which was traditionally considered together with fragment 101, both being attributed to Heraclides’ *Λύσεις Ὀμηρικαί* (*Solutions of Homeric Problems*). Both fragments deal with Telemachus’ speech in the second book of the *Odyssey*, but while the first one (F 101) discusses an inconsistency in Homer’s poem, as required by the genre of λύσεις, the second (F 102) discusses the Telemachus’ speech from the rhetorical point of view, which seems to be much more appropriate for a rhetorical treatise. Heraclides’ catalogue includes only one rhetorical work *Περὶ τοῦ ῥητορεύειν ἢ Προταγόρας*, probably a dialogue. Although not a single fragment of this dialogue survives, testimonies of Protagoras’ studies in rhetorics and literary criticism suggest that the F 102 by Heraclides originates from *Περὶ τοῦ ῥητορεύειν ἢ Προταγόρας*.

В статье предпринята попытка переатрибуции фрагмента 102 (Schütrumpf) Гераклида Понтийского, который традиционно рассматривали вместе с фрагментом 101 и относили оба к одному и тому же сочинению Гераклида – “Решению гомеровских вопросов”. Оба фрагмента касаются речи Телемаха во второй книге “Одиссеи”, однако если первый из них (F 101 Schütr.) указывает, как того требует жанр λύσεις, на некое противоречие в тексте поэмы, то F 102 представляет собой критику речи Телемаха с точки зрения ее построения. Подобное рассуждение, как кажется, было бы скорее уместно в риторическом сочинении, а единственным таким сочинением у Гераклида был предположительно диалог “О витийстве, или Протагор”. Несмотря на то, что сохранилось только его название, свидетельства о риторических и литературно-критических занятиях Протагора позволяют предположить, что именно это сочинение Гераклида и стало источником фрагмента 102.



## CONSPECTUS

RADIM KOČANDRLE

- Heaven as the Outermost Periphery of the Earth  
in Archaic Ionian Cosmologies ..... 185

CHRISTIAN LAES

- Most Subversive Suffering: Pain and the Reversal of Roles  
in Graeco-Roman Antiquity ..... 213

JENS HOLZHAUSEN

- Kleinigkeiten im *Kyklops* des Euripides ..... 238

NINA ALMAZOVA

- Alexander Polyhistor and Glaucus of Rhegium as Sources  
of Pseudo-Plutarch's Treatise *De musica*. I–II ..... 266

ANASTASHIA PAVLOVA

- Reattributing Heracl. Pont. F 102 Schütr. .... 291

ARINA STARIKOVA

- Posidonius as a Possible Source of Diodorus' Description  
of the Dead Sea (Diod. 2. 48. 6–8; 19. 98–99) ..... 299

MARTIN RACKOW

- Zum Telos des Philänenexkurses in Sall. *Iug.* 79 ..... 316

CARLO M. LUCARINI

- Congetture alle *Metamorfosi* di Apuleio ..... 328

- Keywords ..... 346