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Κεκροπίης τευμήκατ’ ἐπίκυρος Εὐρύκλεια
This was Callimachus fr. anon. 135 Schneider. But Pfeiffer (on his fr. 567) pointed out that
the author can hardly be Callimachus, because of the elision after the third-foot trochee. He
himself suggested Euphorion,¹ who does not object to elision at that point, as found in fr. 78
Powell διαφορόρι καλειάθ’ υποφρίσσοντες ἄνακτας τοῖς ὁποῖοια τοῖς θεοῖς ντεράνθυναι.² Certainly this hexameter, with
its spondaic fifth foot, has the flavour of Euphorion; every word, apart from the first, is a
riddle in itself. τευμήκατ’(o) is glossed by Et.Gen. with παρεκεκνάκατο, ἐτεχνήκατο; LSJ s.v. τευμάομαι translate 'fashioned'. The unique ἐπίκυρος means 'leader' (ἡγεμόν, according to Et.Gen.).³ No guidance is offered for Εὐρύκλεια, but the SH editors are
likely to be right in suggesting that she is Athena, in which case the name would be used as a
title, 'the lady of wide renown', somewhat in the style of Lycophron's Alexandra. Our
poet, whoever he is, must have borrowed τευμήκατ’(o) from Antimachus of Colophon, and
that point too would suit Euphorion.⁴ No doubt he would bear in mind the context of τευμήκατο in Antimachus, who applied it to the cave which Zeus 'fashioned' for the
concealment of Europa (fr. 3 Wyss):

οὐνέκα ὁι Κρονίδης ὡς (τε) μέγα πᾶσιν ἄνάσσει
ἀντρον ἐνι εἰκόνε τευμήκατο, τόφρα κεν εἴη
Φοίνικος κούρη κεκυθημένη, ὡς ρά ἐ ὑπ’ τις
μὴ δὲ θεῶν ἄλλοις γε παρίξ φράσσοιτό κεν αὐτοῦ.

Zeus miraculously fashioned the cave for his own advantage; can we guess what Athena
might have fashioned in SH 1044? There is one obvious possibility, which may receive
some support from Nonnus. I suspect that the designation of Athena as Κεκροπίης ...
ἐπίκυρος may be deliberately recalled in Dionysia 37,320, where Erectheus prays to the
goddess as κοίρανε Κεκροπίης. As so often, we may be able to pick up from Nonnus a
hint of the original context of the lines which he is imitating. Erectheus is engaged in a

¹ a suggestion noted with apparent approval by E.A.Barber, CR N.S. 9, 1959, 102; the editors of SH do
not comment on the authorship.

² The ascription of P.Oxy. 2526 (SH 433-452) to Euphorion is not certain, but made probable by the
general style and the apparent coincidence of subject matter between SH 443,10-11 and Euphorion fr. 115
Powell.

³ cf. Hesychius s.v. ἐπίκυρος (vol. 2, p. 170 Latte), where the glosses offered are ἁρχον, βραβευτής, βοήθης, ἐπίκυος, ἐφόρος, ἐπίκυος. One may doubt whether ἐπίκυος has anything to
do with the corrupt ἐπίκυφον in Call. fr. 567, which Barber (CR 1959, 101) would emend to ἐπί
ekύρατ.

⁴ whose imitations of Antimachus were catalogued in B.Wyss' Berlin, 1936 edition of the latter (p. L).
closely-contested chariot race with Scelmis, son of Poseidon, and appeals to Athena ὡς εὐς Ποσειδάωνο τεῷ νίκης ἀγῶνι (321). This comes in response to Scelmis’ exaltation of his own parent (307-314), which includes derogatory remarks about Athena’s olive (313-314). Perhaps therefore in SH 1044 Athena has fashioned the famous olive, which established her right to the lordship of Attica. This was thought to have been the first of all olives (cf. Herodotus 8,55, Call. fr. 194,66-68 Π. τίς δ’ εὗρ’ ἐλαίην; Ποιλλάς ἦμος ἤριζε | τῶι φυκιοίκωι, κηδίκαζεν ἄρχαιοις | ἀνήρ ὁφε τὰ νέρθεν ὄμφι τῆς Ἀκτῆς); accordingly there was a time when the olive grew nowhere else (Hdt. 5,82). Other details would then fall into place: it is appropriate that Athena should be called Κεκροπίη ... ἐπίκυρος, in the context of her struggle for that land with Poseidon, and appropriate that Attica should be called Κεκροπίη, because Cecrops himself played a vital part in the outcome, whether as judge (Call. fr. 194,67-68 quoted above, Nonnus, Dion. 43,126) or as witness (Call. Hecale fr. 70,11 H. = fr. 260,26 Pf. = SH 288,26).

In view of the strong possibility that the author of SH 1044 was Euphorion, it is worth drawing attention to Euph. fr. 150 Powell, Εὐφορίων ὁ ποιητής ... εἰπεν τὴν ἐλαίην γλαυκόπιν. This too seems to be reflected in Nonnus (Dion. 3,98 γλαυκώπου ὑπὸ σκέσας ἀβρόν ἐλαίης). If by chance Euphorion wrote γλαυκόπιν ἐλαίην | Κεκροπίης τευμήσατ’ ἐπίκυρος Εὐρύκλεια, the identity of the goddess, veiled by Εὐρύκλεια, would emerge from the epithet applied to her olive.
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5 the parallel with Euph. fr. 150 is noted both by Keydell and by Chuvin (in the Budé Nonnus, vol. 2, p. 138).