

STESICHORUS AND THE EPIC TRADITION

by

Alison Dale Maingon

M.A., University of St. Andrews, 1970

M.A., University of Alberta, 1972

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
(Department of Classics)

We accept this thesis as conforming
to the required standard

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

May 1978.



Alison Dale Maingon, 1978

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the Head of my Department or by his representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of CLASSICS

The University of British Columbia
2075 Wesbrook Place
Vancouver, Canada
V6T 1W5

Date 23 MAY 1978

Abstract

In antiquity Stesichorus was labelled "Homeric" by the commentators, but his innovation in myth was also noted. Until the discovery of fragments of his poems among the papyri from Oxyrhynchus there was little material from which any conclusions could be reached regarding the poet's treatment of his inheritance from the epic tradition. In this dissertation, therefore, I have examined the new evidence from the papyri with a view to assessing the poet's reliance upon that tradition in both diction and content, and the extent to which he was innovative.

The poet's language at a morphological level is seen to be almost identical to that of epic, whereas at the level of phonology the intrusion of a Western or "Doric" pronunciation has occurred. The poet's adaptation of Homeric "formulae" reveals a prevalent tendency to avoid the repetition of phrases commonly found in the epic corpus by the introduction of new, unprecedented word-associations.

In chapter VI a detailed examination of four of the fragments of four poems (the Nostoi, the Sack of Troy, the Geryoneis and the Suotherae) indicates the ways in which the poet adapted thematic elements from the epic tradition, amalgamating epic with non-epic, conventional with original material.

The second half of this dissertation is devoted to Stesichorus' treatment of the inherited body of Greek myth. In those poems in which the poet was concerned with the legends of mainland Greece, innovations appear, with the exception of the Palinode, not to alter the basic structure of the myths. However, there is evidence of the poet's interest in elaborating upon or inventing legends located in the Greek

west, notably in poems relating the exploits of Heracles, but also in his Oresteia and Sack of Troy. In so doing the poet would create or give authority to a body of myths specifically relevant to his western audience.

Table of Contents

	Page
Abstract	i
Table of Contents	iii
Abbreviations and Texts	iv
Acknowledgement	v
Chapter I Stesichorus, Homer's heir in the Greek west.	1
Chapter II Stesichorus' "mixed" dialect.	13
Chapter III Verbatim adaptation of Homeric "formulae" in Stesichorus.	53
Chapter IV Stesichorus' modification of "formulae" from Homer.	82
Chapter V "Formulaic" expressions that are found in non-Homeric epic.	137
Chapter VI Structural patterns derived from epic.	157
Chapter VII Stesichorus' adaptation of myth from the epic tradition.	234
Chapter VIII Heracles in the poems of Stesichorus .	265
Chapter IX That infamous <u>Palinode</u> .	300
Chapter X The <u>Sack of Troy</u> .	330
Chapter XI Conclusion .	355
Bibliography	361

Abbreviations and Texts

Throughout this dissertation I have referred to the edition of Stesichorus' fragments made by Page in Poetae Melici Graeci (Oxford, 1962) in the abbreviated form PMG. The new fragments have been cited according to their number in the Oxyrhynchus Papyri volumes, published by the Egypt Exploration Society, in the form P.Oxy. : thus the fragments of the Geryoneis are designated P.Oxy. 2617. The texts of the Iliad, Odyssey and the Hymns are derived from the Oxford Classical Texts series, Homeri Opera vols. I-V, edited by Munro and Allen. The texts of Hesiod are derived from Solmsen's edition, Hesiodi Theogonia, Opera et Dies, Scutum (Oxford, 1970) while the fragments are cited as in Fragmenta Hesiodica, edited by Merkelbach and West (Oxford, 1967) and so indicated by the letters M.&W.

Other abbreviations employed are as follows:

- ABFV : J.Boardman, Athenian Black-Figure Vases (London, 1967).
- ABV : J.D.Beazley, Attic Black-Figure Vase-Painters (Oxford, 1956).
- ARV : J. Beazley, Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters (Oxford, 2nd ed., 1963).
- DK : H. Diels and W. Kranz, Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker (Berlin, 6th ed., 1952).
- FGH : F. Jacoby, Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker (Leiden, 2nd ed., 1957).
- GLP : C.M.Bowra, Greek Lyric Poetry (Oxford, 2nd ed., 1961).
- LGS : D. Page, Lyrica Graeca Selecta (Oxford, 1968).
- LSJ : Liddell-Scott-Jones, A Greek - English Lexicon (Oxford, 9th ed., 1940).
- OCD : N.G.L.Hammond and H.H.Scullard, The Oxford Classical Dictionary (Oxford, 2nd ed.1970).
- PLF : E.Lobel and D.Page, Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta (Oxford, 1955).
- SLG : D.Page, Supplementum Lyricis Graecis (Oxford, 1974).

All Journals are referred to in the conventional abbreviations found in L'Année Philologique.

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank H.G. Edinger for his diligent guidance and encouragement throughout the writing of this thesis. I am also indebted to Mrs E.A.E. Bongie and A.J. Podlecki for their helpful comments in the final stages of this work.

Στασίχορον, ζαπληθὲς ἀμετρήτου στόμα Μούσης,
ἐκτέρισεν Κατάνας αἰθαλόεν δάπεδον
οὗ κατὰ Πυθαγόρα φυσικὰν φάτιν ἂ πρὶν Ὅμηρου
ψυχὰ ἐνὶ στέρνοις δεύτερον ὠκίσσατο.

AP VII 75.

Stesichorus was the first eminent literary figure to emerge from the western Greek world and to make such an impact on the cultural centres of the Greek mainland that his works were ensured preservation for posterity.¹ The poems that brought him fame were primarily his arrangements of epic themes to be performed to the accompaniment of the lyre: hence epici carminis onera lyra sustinentem.² The surviving titles and fragments give us a fair indication of the extent and limitations of the poet's new approach to heroic poetry. Although he may well have been preceded by Terpander (and others unknown) in the invention of musical settings for the traditional epics, his poems on epic themes appear to have been distinctive in their completely "lyrical" form, composed as they were in a triadic structure and adapted to nomoi for the lyre.³ Whether the number "twenty-six" quoted in the Suda refers to volumes or titles known to the author(s) of that lexicon, we know of only thirteen titles of poems on legends from the epic traditions (Athla, Geryoneis, Helen, Palinode, Eriphyle, Europeia, Iliou Persis, Cerberus, Cycnus, Nostoi, Oresteia I and II, Scylla, Suotherae) and, in addition to these, one or two poems composed on a less lofty plane, closer to the sentimental romance of the early "novel" (Calyce, Daphnis, Rhadine).⁴ The poet's reputation in antiquity was wide-spread, if we can believe Cicero : (Stesichorus) qui fuit Himerae, sed et est et fuit tota Graecia summo propter ingenium honore et nomine (Verr. II 2 23).

The precise dates of the poet's life are no more readily available to us than they were to our predecessors, the philologoi of the ancient world, nor are they of direct relevance for an appreciation of the poet's artistic achievement. West rightly criticises the all-too-hasty acceptance of the dates assigned by the Suda, Eusebius, et al., who appear to follow a tradition that Stesichorus was born in the 37th Olympiad and died in the 56th.⁵ The comparative latitude of the 4-year Olympiad has been reduced to a misleadingly exact 632-556 B.C. in many hand-books of Greek literature, with little justification.⁶ Of the various traditions claiming either that Stesichorus was the son of Hesiod, or that his death occurred in the same year as Simonides' birth, or that he was Pythagoras' contemporary, none can be divorced from the context of the lives of other literary figures whose dates are equally uncertain.⁷ A possible source for the Suda may have been a schematising literary history such as that of Apollodorus, in which convenient synchronisations of poets' lives were made.⁸ Apart from the evidence of the Parian Marble, which claims Stesichorus came to Greece in 485/4 B.C.,⁹ chronological associations point to Stesichorus' having been alive and active in the major part of the 6th century. We find allusions to the poet's reaction to an eclipse of the sun, to his relationship with Phalaris, tyrant of Acragas, and to a connection with a conflict between Locri and Croton, all of which may be firmly placed in the 6th century.¹⁰ These allusions, together with Simonides' reference to Stesichorus in a poem,¹¹ outweigh the 5th-century date suggested by the Parian Marble. The early chronographers themselves produced chronological schemes of events in the Greek west which were widely discrepant.¹² There is, therefore, little point in pursuing the matter of the poet's dates further in the present context.

Nor is there a single tradition concerning Stesichorus' place of origin: Mataurus in southern Italy, Himera in Sicily, Pallantion in Arcadia.¹³ The discussions of various scholars have proved that again the evidence is inconclusive. The tradition of a Stesichorus from Himera appears in a number of ancient sources.¹⁴ On the other hand, West, in the most recent compilation of the evidence, is inclined to see a more consistent tradition connecting Stesichorus with Mataurus in southern Italy.¹⁵ In fact, from the scanty remains of biographical information we can assume only that Stesichorus pursued a distinguished career as a poet in the Greek west, associated with Himera in particular, but also known to have travelled and resided in southern Italy. Just as his predecessors, the wandering bards and rhapsodes, gave recitations all over the Greek world, so Stesichorus must have carried his talents to the large cultural centres of both Sicily and southern Italy, even to Greece itself, and hence there arose a number of traditions from different quarters claiming association with the poet. For our present purpose we need only acknowledge the poet's presence in the Greek west in the 6th century.

By the middle of the 6th century many of the original Greek colonies of southern Italy and Sicily were flourishing centres of commercial activity, for example, Syracuse, Zancle, Rhegion, Tarentum, Locri, Croton, Sybaris.¹⁶ Some of these cities had themselves established colonies, particularly in the more westerly areas of Sicily; Selinus, Himera and Acragas were colonies of colonies. Exploration had carried the Greeks into the western reaches of the Mediterranean, to the mineral wealth of Spain and to the shores of the Atlantic¹⁷, so that not only the agricultural richness of the cities of

southern Italy and Sicily, but also their position on the sea-routes to the far west made them of crucial importance commercially to the states of the Greek mainland, particularly Athens and Corinth. As a result of this commercial importance, the city-states of southern Italy and Sicily prospered and their prosperity is duly witnessed by the magnificence of their public architecture and sculpture, their locally produced coinage and pottery, together with the profusion of imported pottery of high quality.¹⁸ It has been noted that the styles prevalent in the mid to late 6th century may have lagged behind the trends of Athens and Corinth, but this fact is by no means indicative of inferior quality in the artistic achievement of the western colonies.¹⁹ The particular tastes of the western market, as much as the distance from the chief centres of artistic activity in the Aegean, may account for what appears to be a slower evolution in forms. It is important therefore to note that prosperity in the west in the 6th century fostered a lively interest in the preservation of the artistic heritage of the mother-country.

We can assume that western interest in its Hellenic inheritance was not restricted to the plastic arts alone. The colonists settling in the west must have imported the traditional religion and myths of their forebears. At any rate, certainly in the 6th century there is evidence of strong ties preserved between the colonies in the west and the religious centres of the mainland of Greece.²⁰ At both Delphi and Olympia treasuries were built by cities such as Syracuse, Tarentum, Sybaris and Gela. From the lists of victors at the Olympic Games we know that athletes came from the west to compete as early as 684 B.C., when a man from Syracuse is recorded as having won the wrestling event.

In 576 B.C. the first seven men to finish in the stadion foot-race were from Croton, and Milon of that same city was one of the most remarkable wrestlers seen at Olympia; his victories spanned six successive Olympiads in the second half of the 6th century.²¹ The famous temples at Selinus, Paestum and Siris, to name but three, were built in honour of deities from the traditional Greek pantheon, testifying to the perpetuation of Hellenic religion in the west.²² It seems, therefore, that in the west in the 6th century there was economic expansion that could have promoted the development of an independent western culture, but, perhaps contrary to expectation, we discover that there is a distinct tendency to turn to and preserve the Hellenic cultural heritage.

Evidence of the importation of the Homeric and other epics into the west is slight; we must simply assume that as part and parcel of the way of life in mainland Greece of the 8th and following centuries the ubiquitous epics were brought to the new land by the colonists who continued to transmit them as verbal embodiments of the excellence of panhellenic culture. Although we have no precise record of the travels of the anonymous reciters of the traditional epics, there is some proof in the western voyage of Arion around the last quarter of the 7th century. Herodotus recounts the story of this poet, who, having arrived at the court of Periander of Corinth from his native Lesbos, later travelled to Italy and Sicily, where he amassed a great fortune.²³ Herodotus' interest in the tale lies in the miraculous incident in which Arion was aided by a dolphin in escaping the murderous hands of the crew on his return to Corinth. The tale does, however, substantiate our assumption that bards could and did sail from Greece to the colonies

in the west. Arion appears to have travelled with the express purpose of improving his financial position, carrying with him on the voyage his lyre and professional garb. Another travelling poet was Xenocritus of Locri, who found his way to the mainland and became noted as one of a group of innovative musicians active in Sparta.²⁴ According to the Parian Marble, Sappho spent time in exile in Sicily.²⁵ Ibycus left the west to take up residence in Samos; Pythagoras left Samos to take up residence in the west. Thus, it was not uncommon for renowned poets or philosophers to travel abroad. The constant sea-traffic between Greece and the colonies made possible the importation of the singers of epic, so that in the colonies as in Greece itself, there were, one imagines, professional entertainers either residing in one place or else following a circuit of performance around the major centres.

The lines of Antipater's poem quoted above reflect the general verdict of the literary critics of antiquity upon Stesichorus. The poet was recognised as an imitator of Homer. The publication of fragments of Stesichorus' poems discovered among the papyri from Oxyrhynchus, containing pieces identified as belonging to the Geryoneis, Iliou Persis, Eriphyle, Suotherae and Nostoi, now provides us with far more concrete material than was available to scholars before the 1950's for a detailed study of the poet's diction and style.²⁶ In this dissertation, therefore, I propose to examine the position of Stesichorus as imitator of the epic tradition and as innovator, bearing in mind the environment in which he composed, namely the times of prosperity in the west that gave rise to a flourishing interest in the arts. We have indicated that there was, on the one hand, a somewhat conservative tendency encouraging the preservation of the cultural inheritance of

the motherland; presumably Stesichorus in his youth was exposed to and influenced by the recitation of the traditional epics. On the other hand, by the 6th century there may also have been some opposition to more conservative attitudes in poetry. Arion, who had gained a reputation for certain innovations in lyric compositions, made an extremely successful tour of the western provinces. The connection between Xenocritus, known as a member of an innovative school of music at Sparta, and Locri, where there appears to have been some sort of "school" of poetry²⁷, again hints at the importation of new ideas in composition into the west.

Thus, in the examination of the fragments of Stesichorus' poems I shall consider the extent to which the poet in his adaptation of epic material adhered to the precedents of the epic tradition in his use of language and myth derived from that tradition and the extent to which he endeavoured to revitalise an art-form that may have begun to stagnate through the constant repetition of the same material. The poet's choice of a new musical medium was in itself a decisive movement away from the intoned delivery of the traditional epic poems.

Unfortunately, nothing has survived of the musical accompaniments to the poems of Stesichorus apart from comments such as that in [Plutarch], de Musica 7, about his use of the Harmatian nome²⁸, so that there is little to be discussed on the subject of the poet's innovations in musical accompaniment. The poet's innovations in metrical schemes and the movement away from the purely dactylic measures towards the sophisticated dactylo-epitrite schemes that are to be found in Pindar's Odes are the subject of an exhaustive study by M. Haslam²⁹. There has not as yet, however, been published a comprehensive study of the poet's

treatment of language and myth in relation to the epic tradition. In the first part of this dissertation, therefore, I shall consider the poet's diction in respect to his "dialect" (chapter II) and his use of "formulaic" expression (chapters III, IV, V) whether imitated from known Homeric phrases, modified from them, or totally alien to the epic convention. By way of a conclusion to the discussion of the poet's use of language, I shall devote a chapter to a detailed examination of four fragments that compares and contrasts their diction and structure with parallel passages in the epic corpus (chapter VI). In the second part of the dissertation I shall consider the poet's adaptation of the traditional myths giving attention to some of the less well-documented poems (chapter VII) and discussing in detail his treatment of the hero Heracles (chapter VIII), of Helen (chapter IX) and of the legend of the Sack of Troy (chapter X). I shall be concerned in particular to note where the poet is consciously avoiding the repetition of epic material and to suggest what might be the possible motivation for his innovations.

Footnotes to chapter I.

1 The Suda's information that the poet was originally called Teisias, whether or not correct, is irrelevant for the study of the poet's work since he was known to antiquity as Stesichorus, e.g. by Plato, Pausanias, Cicero, Quintilian et al. Of his predecessors in the west we know the names of figures such as Xanthus and Xenocritus, but of their works nothing has survived. Cf. A. Lesky, A History of Greek Literature (translated by J. Willis and C. de Heer, London, 1966) p. 151 and C.M. Bowra, GLP² p. 82 ff. G. Vallet, Rhegion et Zancle, (Paris, 1958) p. 312, suggests the possibility of a Locrian "school" of poetry, which is not inconceivable, but lacks the support of external evidence.

2 Quintilian, Inst. Orat. X 1 62; cf. Longinus, De. Subl. 13 3, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Cens. Vet. 2 7, Horace, Odes IV 9 8, all alluding to the epic content of Stesichorus' poems.

3 On Terpander's musical setting for the verses of Homer, see [Plutarch], De Mus. 71 = 1132 c. The citation of Chamaeleon's remarks on the "singing" of Homer, Hesiod, etc., made by Athenaeus XIV 620 c unfortunately does not name the "singer". Chamaeleon was writing a work On Stesichorus, but this does not exclude the possibility of his citing Terpander.

For a discussion of the nomes see M.L. West, "Stesichorus," CQ 21 (1971) pp. 309-311 and T.J. Fleming, "The musical nomoi in Aeschylus' Oresteia," CJ 72 (1976) p. 222f. The Harmateion appears to have been adapted from an auletic accompaniment to a lyrical one.

The τρία mentioned by the Suda is borne out by the evidence of the papyri. A triadic structure of strophe/antistrophe and epode may be seen in the Geryoneis and the Iliou Persis. There already existed a system of strophic responsion before Stesichorus' time, as is witnessed by Alcman's Partheneion, but the Suda may well be correct in ascribing to Stesichorus the invention of a triadic metrical structure.

4 On the authenticity of the Rhadine etc., there is little evidence to support either case. Page, PMG p. 137 endorses the views of H.J. Rose, in "Stesichorus and the Rhadine fragment," CQ 26(1932)pp.82-89, in which he argues that the fragment in Strabo VIII 3 20 can be no earlier than the Alexandrian era. Vallet, op.cit., p. 284ff., sees in these fragments (=PMG 277, 278, 279) traces of popular Sicilian tales.

5 West, art.cit., p. 302.

6 For example, Bowra, GLP² p. 74, or H.Smyth, Greek Melic Poetry, (New York, 1963) p. 255. Many, such as Rose, in his Handbook of Greek Literature (London, 1965)p. 108, qualify the magic numbers 632-556 with an "approximately".

7 On Stesichorus, son of Hesiod, in Aristotle fr. 565 and Philochorus 328 F 213, see West, art.cit., pp. 304-305. Some scholars have associated the tradition of Hesiod's being the father of Stesichorus with the Pindaric(?) epigram quoted by the Suda, under τὸ Ἡσιόδεον γῆρας, that refers to Hesiod's longevity and rejuvenation. For a full discussion of this see M^C Kay, "Hesiod's rejuvenation," CQ 9 (1959) pp. 1-5. According to Thucydides, Hist. III 96, there was a Locrian tradition that Hesiod died there, which West takes together with other allusions to reflect Stesichorus' special association with Italian Locri (art.cit., pp. 304-305). The father-son relationship between the two poets seems to betray signs of popular legend and the tendencies of later chronographers et al. to make convenient synchronisations of the lives of poets. Similarly, Tzetzes' declaration (Vit. Hes. 18) that Stesichorus was a contemporary of Pythagoras looks like a useful synchronism of eminent figures in the Greek west, but may in fact be closer to the truth than is generally believed.

8 See F. Jacoby, Apollodorus Chronik (Berlin, 1902) pp. 196-200.

9 It is recorded on the Parian Marble that Stesichorus arrived in Athens in the year 485/4 B.C., the year of Aeschylus' first victory and of Euripides' birth, when Philocrates was Archon. (Note the rather patent synchronisation of important events concerning literary figures.)

A plausible suggestion for the later date for Stesichorean chronology is proposed by W. Ferrari, in "Stesicoro Imerese e Stesicoro Locrese," Athenaeum 15(1937) p. 235 ff., where he points out that the dichotomies in chronology and place of origin may have resulted from a double tradition of Stesichorus' dates, rather than from there being two poets of the same name, as was argued by Wilamowitz in Sappho und Simonides (Berlin, 1913) pp. 233, 234.

- 10 Pliny, N.H. II 54 and Plutarch de Fac. in Orbe Lun. 19 (=PMG 271) record that Stesichorus was profoundly affected by a total eclipse of the sun which may be identified as that of 19th May, 557 B.C.; cf. West, art.cit., p. 306.

The connection with the tyrant Phalaris is mentioned in an anecdote repeated by Aristotle, Rhet. II 1393 b. Phalaris' dates may be placed ca. 570/65 and 554/49 B.C. (OCD). On the problems of Sicilian chronography, see note 12 below.

It has been argued by some scholars (e.g. F. Sisti, "Le due Palinodie di Stesicoro," Studi Urbinati 39 (1965) p. 313 and A.J. Podlecki, "Stesichorea," Athenaeum 49 (1971) p. 316 f.) that the legend appearing in Pausanias III 19 11 and Conon Narr. xviii in which Stesichorus is informed of the cause of his blindness by one of the generals of the Crotonians after their defeat by the Locrians may refer to the conflict between these two states known as the battle of the river Sagra (Strabo VI 261; cf. Justin, Epitome XX 2 3 ff.) This battle is thought to have occurred between 560 and 540 B.C.: T. Dunbabin, in The Western Greeks (Oxford, 1948) p. 359 ff., although P. Bicknell believes in an earlier date, "The Date of the Battle of the Sagra River," Phoenix 20 (1966) pp. 294-301.

- 11 PMG 564: ὃς δοῦρ' ἅπ' ἄντας
νύκασε νέους, δινάεντα βαλὼν
"Ἀναυρον ὕπερ πολυβροττοῦς ἐξ Ἴωλκοῦ.
οὕτω γὰρ Ὀμηρος ἦδ' Ἰτασίχορος ἔειπε λαοῖς.

These lines give an terminus antequam, although no real indication as to how much before Simonides Stesichorus lived. The association of Stesichorus with Homer need not mean that Simonides thought he was of the same vintage as Homer.

- 12 For example, Antiochus applied a 36-year generation-count, while Ephorus one of 39 years, in their calculations of the foundation-date of Syracuse which had been set as 7 generations of Gamoroi before Gelon. Cf. R. van Compernelle, Études de chronologie et d'historiographie Siciliotes (Bruxelles, 1959) p. 59 ff. and J. Bérard, La colonisation grecque (Paris, 1941) p. 285 ff..

- 13 The Suda gives Himera as the most likely place of origin, quoting other suggestions e.g. Pallantion in Arcadia. Stephanus of Byzantium, under Μεταῦρος, says that this was a Locrian colony in Sicily(?) and calls Stesichorus Μεταῦρῖνος.

- 14 The sources who specify that Stesichorus came from Himera are as follows: Plato, Phaedrus 243 a; Athenaeus XII 512 f.; Pausanias II 22 6, IX 11 1; Aelian VH 10 18; Cicero In Ver. II 2 34; [Plutarch] de Mus. 7; the Suda under Stesichorus. Pollux IX 100

- claims that Stesichorus' tomb was at Himera. Aristotle, Conon (as in note 10 above) and Himerius (Or. 29 3) mention Stesichorus as being responsible for giving the people of Himera advice against tyranny, although the connection does not necessarily imply that Stesichorus came from Himera. Finally there is an inscription on a fragment of a Herm found at Tibur (I.G. 14 1231) that reads "Stesichorus, son of Euclides, of Himera."
- 15 West, art.cit., pp. 302-304.
- 16 See, for example, A.R.Burn, The Lyric Age of Greece (London, 1967) p. 143 ff.; Dunbabin, op.cit., chapters II, III, X; Vallet, op.cit., p. 139 ff..
- 17 See Herodotus Hist. IV 152; cf. Bérard, op.cit., p. 303ff. and Vallet, op.cit., p. 87 ff. .
- 18 See Burn op.cit., p. 151 and M.I.Finley, Ancient Sicily (London, 1968) p. 29 ff. . On the splendid Doric temples of the 6th century, see for example, G. Richter, A Handbook of Greek Art (London, 1969) p. 28 ff. Imported pottery was mostly Corinthian until the beginning of the 6th century, when the Athenian work-shops began to dominate western markets; see M. Robertson, in "The Visual Arts in Greece," in The Greek World, ed. H. Lloyd-Jones (Harmondsworth, 1965) p. 198 f. and for a detailed account of the importations into Rhegium and Zancle see Vallet, op.cit., p. 140ff. . On coinage, see Finley, op.cit., p. 35 ff..
- 19 On the provincialism of western art, see, for example, Robertson, op.cit., p. 196 and 199, Burn, op.cit., p. 151. On local pottery work-shops, see Vallet, op.cit., p. 210 ff. .
- 20 See A.J.Graham, Colony and Mother-city in Ancient Greece (Manchester, 1964) pp. 25 and 30; on Syracuse and Corinth, see p.143 ff.
- 21 On Milon, see Diodorus IV 24 7 and Strabo VI 1 12. On the Crotonians, see Strabo VI 1 12. Cf. H.A.Harris, Greek Athletes and Athletics (London, 1964) p. 110 ff. .
- 22 Finley, op.cit., p.27.
- 23 Herodotus, Hist. I 24.
- 24 [Plutarch], de Mus. 9 (=1134 b) .
- 25 Cf. D.L.Page, Sappho and Alcaeus (Oxford, 1955) p.223 ff. .
- 26 The new fragments appear in the following editions of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri, published by the Egypt Exploration Society in London edited by E. Lobel:
Fr. 2359 (Suotherae) and fr. 2360 (Nostoi) in P. Oxy. v. XXIII (London, 1956) pp. 11-18.
Fr. 2617 (Geryoneis), fr. 2618 (Eriphyle) and fr. 2619 (Iliou Persis) in

P.Oxy. v. XXXII (London, 1967) pp. 1-55.

Fr. 2803 (Iliou Persis) in P.Oxy. v. XXXVII (London, 1971) pp. 3-11.

P.Oxy. 2359 and 2360 appeared before the publication of Page's PMG in 1962 and are therefore included in that collection of the fragments of Stesichorus. The later fragments are collected in Page's SLG (Oxford, 1974) pp. 5-43. In SLG Page assigns P.Oxy. 2735 (published in P. Oxy. v. XXXV (London, 1968) .9-32) to Ibycus, whereas West, "Stesichorus redivivus," ZPE 4 (1969) and R. Führer, "Zum 'Stesichorus redivivus'," ZPE 5 (1970) p. 15 f. believe that the fragment is to be assigned to Stesichorus, as was suggested by Lobel in the editio princeps, possibly deriving from the Helen. On account of the uncertainty of authorship I have not incorporated examples from P.Oxy. 2735 in my examination of the language of Stesichorus.

27 Cf. Vallet, *op.cit.*, p. 312.

28 See page 9, note 3.

29 M.W.Haslam, "Stesichorean Metre," QUCC 17 (1974) pp. 5-57.

Chapter II Stesichorus' "mixed" dialect.

The new papyri of poems by Stesichorus are naturally disappointing in their fragmentary nature. One always hopes for the discovery of a complete poem so that extensive study of all aspects of language and structure may be pursued. As it is, the linear incompleteness of the fragments necessarily curtails the discussion of the poet's language, restricting in particular discussion of those elements of syntax that lie beyond the structuring of phrases. Moreover, since the linguistic evidence derived from the works of a single poet cannot be considered in a vacuum, but rather must be considered in comparison and contrast with other literary works from the period of composition, a further limitation is imposed through the lack of evidence for much of the contemporary or near-contemporary poets who may have influenced, or have been influenced by, Stesichorus. As evidence for possible precedents from oral epic we have the Iliad and the Odyssey, together with a fair representation of Hesiod's works, but from the works of most other epic poets, continental or otherwise, we possess a mere handful of citations. Early elegiac and lyric poetry, although hardly voluminous in its state of preservation, is our only evidence for the linguistic or stylistic affiliations of the poets of the Archaic period. Little before the Odes of Pindar can truly satisfy any scholar investigating the techniques of the early lyric poets, and hence any examination of the evidence that we do possess must remain open to further elucidation or contradiction upon the discovery of new evidence from some forgotten hoard of papyri lurking beneath the sands of Egypt.

Since the diction of the poets of the Archaic period does not belong to one invariable form of the Greek tongue, but rather to one or

more than one of the local dialects of the Greek-speaking areas of the Mediterranean, any discussion of the language or diction of a poet will revolve around the dialectal features found within his poetry. Whatever the limitations imposed by insufficient evidence, the study of the dialects of pre-classical literary figures is justified because of the use of dialect in relation to the particular "genre" favoured by the poet in question. The study of Greek dialects has concentrated primarily on the evidence of inscriptions, whilst the equally complex problems of literary dialect have been somewhat neglected. The new papyri furnish those interested in the development of the so-called literary languages with evidence of a more certain nature than that which is derived from the citations of such later authors as Athenaeus, whose native Attic or Koine has obscured many of the linguistic phenomena belonging to the non-Attic dialects.

We ask ourselves what is "dialect". Inscriptional evidence from the Mycenaean tablets onwards provides us with a relatively limited picture of the dialectal variation in the Greek tongue as spoken by the isolated communities of Greece from the 2nd millenium B.C., revealing a few tantalising facts regarding their temporal and spatial relationships through linguistic affiliations. The distribution of the dialects is a complex problem and can only be adequately understood through elaborate systems such as the factorial analysis suggested by Coleman¹. The ancients, on the other hand, believed in a highly schematic, tripartite division of dialect into Ionic, Aeolic and Doric, a division that derived from some misconceptions of tribal division in the prehistoric period and from assumptions based on the approximate divisions of dialectal affiliation of literary figures in the classical period and later.² It is with caution therefore that we

must approach statements such as that of the Suda, where it is asserted that Stesichorus wrote in the Doric dialect³, and yet ultimately in the study of literary dialect in the Archaic period we discover that it is still to some extent useful to rely on a schematic dialectal division. Recently in the study of early epic it has been suggested that the language of the Homeric epics, whose present form evolved after the migrations to the eastern sea-board of the Aegean, be considered as belonging to a distinct dialect group designated as the Southern dialect group, in contrast to the Northern dialect group which encompasses both the continental epics and the dialects known as Aeolic⁴. A third dialect group, the Occidental or Western, only appears as a distinct entity in the literature of the post-epic era. For Southern dialectal features of the 7/6th centuries we can find testimony in the works of Archilochus and Mimnermus, whose diction, although indebted to the Homeric epics, also exhibits features of their native Ionian dialect⁵. The Northern group is chiefly represented at the literary level by the language of Sappho and Alcaeus⁶. Of the Western group, Alcman's Laconian vernacular is the principal evidence⁷. In his poetry in particular we can observe the admixture of elements from both Southern and Northern linguistic sources with elements of his native dialect, within the structure of a single work.

I propose, therefore, to examine the dialectal features of the language of Stesichorus in the first instance in relation to the features of the Western group, since this corresponds approximately with the "Doric" dialect that was mentioned by the Suda and since one would expect the appearance of certain Western linguistic features in an area that was primarily "Doric"-speaking. I shall then

make a detailed examination of linguistic elements that Stesichorus shares in common with the language of epic, taking into consideration the question of the Northern-group features that have often been called "Doric" until recent studies have demonstrated their possible origins in continental epic⁸.

There are two points to which attention must be drawn in preface to the discussion of dialectal features in literary works. First, local inscriptions give us evidence for features of a local dialect at a particular time. We must note, however, that poets do not necessarily restrict their expression to their native dialect alone. In the case of choral lyric for example, one can sooner find linguistic affiliations between the diction of Pindar and Bacchylides than between the diction of the poet and the dialect of his mother-state. It is, therefore important to distinguish between literary dialect and dialect as testified in inscriptions. Secondly, the inscriptional evidence available to us dates primarily from the 5th century onwards, with the exception of the Linear-B tablets. Evidence from the Archaic period is scanty, and yet it is for the poetry of this period that scholars draw upon inscriptional material for dialectal features. This evidence should therefore be used with caution.

A. Features from the papyri of Stesichorus that are found in the Occidental or Western group.

If we compare certain phenomena occurring in the poems of Stesichorus with the standard features of the Western group of dialects, as seen in the language of Alcman, we discover that the term "Doric" might be legitimately used of certain characteristic features of Stesichorus' language. These features may be listed as follows:⁹

i) Phonology

- a) Original long alpha is preserved throughout.
- b) Short alpha occurs where the equivalent is short epsilon in other dialect groups.
- c) The contraction of $\alpha + \epsilon$ to η , in contrast to long alpha elsewhere.
- d) Dentals remain unchanged before iota, especially in the 3rd person singular of the present indicative of athematic verbs, and in the 3rd person plural of the present indicative of thematic verbs.

The preservation of original long alpha was one of the principal distinctive features of so-called literary Doric in classical times, presumably in pronunciation and therefore orthography, although it is metrically identical to the long eta of Ionic. The new fragments of Stesichorus' poetry contain over 60 examples of this characteristic feature, with only one exception: $\rho\eta\xi\eta\nu\omicron\mu\alpha$ 2619 fr. 1 i 21. Even in citations of Stesichorus in other authors the Atticisation of the long alpha amounts to less than 15%, which is the lowest percentage for all the choral lyric poets¹⁰. It is without doubt, therefore, that antiquity recognised the long alpha as a distinctive trait in the language of Stesichorus, and accordingly where long alpha does not occur, the reason may be attributed to an error in transmission.

Short alpha is witnessed in $\iota\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu$ 2359 fr. 1 ii 6 and $\iota\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu$ 2803 fr. 11 6, this form being the equivalent of $\iota\epsilon\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, and in $\alpha\rho\tau\alpha\mu\iota\varsigma$ 2619 fr. 18 11 for $\alpha\rho\tau\epsilon\mu\iota\varsigma$. Other possible instances, such as $\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$ or $\pi\rho\acute{\alpha}\kappa\omega$ have not turned up in the papyri as yet. In the quotation from the Geryoneis cited by Athenaeus, the MS records: $\alpha\phi\acute{\iota}\kappa\eta\theta' \iota\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \kappa\omicron\tau\acute{\iota} \beta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\theta\epsilon\alpha \lambda\upsilon\mu\eta\tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma \epsilon\rho\epsilon\mu\nu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ PMG 185 3. One may postulate an original $\iota\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, which has not been preserved in the transmission, despite the "Doric" alpha of the genitive singular of $\epsilon\rho\epsilon\mu\nu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$.

Another instance of short alpha may be seen in $\delta\acute{\alpha}\kappa\alpha$ 2617

fr. 4 ii 15, corresponding to ὄτε. The alpha caused the original labio-velar to become a palatal, thus producing the suffix -κα in the western group of dialects, whereas the alternative form with epsilon in the southern group developed into dental -τε.

In the fragments of Stesichorus we find two examples of contraction of α + ε to η : ποταύδῃ PMG 264 and]πύτῃ²⁸⁰³ fr.11 1. Otherwise Stesichorus would appear to follow the epic convention of not contracting vowels of unequal length: hence Εύλατῖδαο 2359 fr. 1 i 9, Ἀλκμῶν 2618 fr. 1 i 3 and Ἀμφιδράος PMG 179 (b). It is no doubt significant, however, that the examples of non-contraction occur only in proper names, derived from epic sources.

In the final category of Occidental features listed above, the retention of the original termination -τε occurs almost certainly in ἔχοντε 2617 fr.6 4 and possibly in]ντε 2619 fr. 1 i 6, whereas the citations present us with the atticised form τῶθῃσι PMG 223 4. Parallel to the preservation of the original termination in τε is the retention of the dental in the second person singular of the personal pronoun: τῷ as opposed to σὺ . Of this feature we find a solitary τεῖν in 2617 fr. 11 5. In view of the lack of further evidence we assume, but cannot assert, that the dental form of the personal pronoun was normal in Stesichorus.

The characteristics considered in the preceding paragraphs are those elements of phonology noted as distinctively Doric by Thumb¹¹. If, however, we examine more recently compiled tables of dialectal characteristics, such as those which Risch, Coleman or Pavesse present¹², then we discover that the long alpha occurs also in the Northern group, namely in the poetry of Sappho and Alcaeus, as well as in the inscriptions

from Thessaly and Boeotia. The short alpha alternating with epsilon also occurs in the Lesbian poets, while the contraction of $\alpha + \epsilon$ to η and the retention of $-\tau\upsilon$ both survive in the later Boeotian inscriptions and may therefore be postulated as characteristic of the Northern group as well as of the Western group. One must pause, therefore, to consider the Northern group of dialects as possible source for the above-mentioned phonological features, before assuming that their affiliations are solely with the Western group.

ii) Morphology¹³

- a) ι -stem nouns retain the iota throughout their declension.
- b) Nouns in $-\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$ have their genitive singular in $-\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$.
- c) Pronouns : $\tau\upsilon = \sigma\upsilon$, $\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\varsigma = \eta\mu\epsilon\iota\varsigma$
- d) Termination of the 1st person plural of the active voice is $-\mu\epsilon\varsigma$.
- e) The so-called Doric future: $\pi\rho\alpha\acute{\xi}\acute{\epsilon}\omega$.
- f) Future passive with active endings.
- g) Verbs in $-\zeta\omega$ have guttural-stem characteristics.
- h) Athematic infinitive in $-\mu\epsilon\nu$.

Of these characteristics we have no evidence for categories a), d), f) and g).

In the case of b), the epic form $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\eta\omicron\varsigma$ 2619 fr. 14 16 is preferred to the Occidental genitive in $-\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$. In the case of e), the example of $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\upsilon\acute{\xi}\omega$ 2360 fr. 1 i 10 would appear to confirm the common Greek formation of the future as opposed to the so-called Doric future in $-\xi\epsilon\omega$. In the case of h), for the termination of the athematic infinitive Stesichorus shows the unparalleled forms $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ 2617 fr. 4 i 7 and $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\mu\epsilon\nu$ 2619 fr. 13 5 for the verb "to be"¹⁴. We lack evidence for

the infinitives of other athematic verbs.

It appears to be only in the case of ϵ), pronouns, that we find the Western or "Doric" formations in the morphology of Stesichorus' language: $\tau\upsilon\nu$ 2617 fr. 1 i 21 and $\delta\mu\tilde{\iota}\nu$ 2360 fr.1 i 3.

Thus, at the level of morphology, Stesichorus' dialectal affiliations with the Occidental group are rather less obvious than at the level of phonology. As we shall see later, Stesichorus shows a greater affinity in this area with the language of epic. Unfortunately, an example of the distinctive termination of the first person plural of the active voice is not found in the fragments. As a rule, later choral lyric does not employ the Occidental $-\mu\epsilon\varsigma$, but follows the epic and common Greek $-\mu\epsilon\nu$ ¹⁵. Alcman alone gives evidence for the use of $-\mu\epsilon\varsigma$ in a literary work, for example $\pi\alpha\rho\eta\sigma\omicron\mu\epsilon\varsigma$ in fr.1 12, but it is possible that Stesichorus, who like Alcman prefers the Occidental formation of the personal pronoun, also used $-\mu\epsilon\varsigma$, although the later choral lyric poets do not. One wonders if Stesichorus might have been more inclined to employ Western forms in passages of direct speech than in narrative ones on account of his presumed background of spoken "Doric".

Of the "Doric" features exemplified by the papyrus text of Alcman, several are notable by their absence in Stesichorus, such as the nominative plural of the article, which in the Occidental group of dialects retains the tau: $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ and $\tau\alpha\upsilon$. Although there are two instances of the spurious diphthong $\bar{\theta}$ being represented by ω , as in Alcman, namely $\acute{\omega}\rho\alpha\nu\acute{\theta}\epsilon\nu$ 2360 fr.1 i 3 and $\gamma\omega\nu\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omicron\mu\alpha\upsilon$ 2617 fr.11 4, the accusative plural of O-stem nouns and of the article is consistently represented in the form $-\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$. The text of Alcman, on the other hand,

contains forms in omega with complete regularity in the genitive singular of feminine nouns in -ω, in the accusative plural of O-stem nouns, in the accusative plural of O-stem nouns, in cases of metrical lengthening, and in lexical instances such as Μῶσα (8 times) and ὠπανός (twice)¹⁶. Similarly in Alcman there is consistent appearance of η for spurious diphthong ε (ἐ), for example in the form of the thematic infinitive παυδόνῃ fr.1 88. In the papyri of Stesichorus, however, there is one such example, φῦγῆν 2617 fr.7 i 2, but this is by no means the norm¹⁷.

There are several lexical items, considered to be of "Doric" or Occidental origin, which it will be convenient to mention here.

a) The conjunction αὐ is a feature of the Western group of dialects, but in fact also occurs in the Northern group, in for example Sappho and Alcaeus, as well as in the later inscriptions of the Thessalian and Boeotian areas¹⁸.

b) Although the particle κα does not itself occur in Stesichorus, the forms ποκα 2617 fr.42 (b) 4 and ὅκα 2617 fr.4 iii 15, suggest that κα as opposed to κε or ᾄν might appear. Apart from its belonging to the Western group of dialects, κα occurs in the Boeotian branch of the Northern group, but not however in the Lesbian poets¹⁹.

c) In both Alcman and Stesichorus instances of the "Doric" ἐγών with nu occur even before a consonant: ἐγών δ' αὖ 2619 fr.13 3 and ἐγών λέγω 2619 fr.16 8.

d) αὐτεῖ, the "Doric" variant for αὐτοῖ occurs in 2619 fr.47 10. Apart from the example of Alcman fr.1 79, the only evidence for this form is to be found in traditionally ascribed "Doric" inscriptions.

e) The preposition κεδῶ occurs in the papyri of Stesichorus at 2619 fr.21

3, while $\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}$ appears in the citation PMG 210. The two forms are linguistically unrelated, $\kappa\epsilon\delta\acute{\alpha}$ replacing the original $\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}$ in an odd assortment of dialects, as far as the inscriptional evidence goes: Lesbian, Boeotian, Arcadian, Argolic, Cretan and Theran. Some of the Western group of dialects preserve $\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}$, for example Corinthian, but in literary works $\kappa\epsilon\delta\acute{\alpha}$ is well established in both Western and Northern groups, occurring in Alcman, Sappho and Alcaeus²⁰.

f) The Occidental form $\kappa\omicron\tau\acute{\iota}$ appears to have been preferred to the alternative $\kappa\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$, occurring eleven times as opposed to two. The instances of the latter in 2619 fr.1 ii 6 and 2617 fr.4 13 may be explained by the influence of the appearance of both forms in epic. In this case the Lesbian poets used $\kappa\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$, parallel to the assibilisation of $\tau\tau$ to $-\sigma\sigma$, whereas the later inscriptional evidence of the other two major branches of the Northern group give examples of $\kappa\omicron\tau\acute{\iota}$ parallel to the usage in the Western groups.²¹

At the level of lexicon in the language of Stesichorus one would perhaps expect some evidence of local influence and the incorporation of vernacular words into poems, as in the case of Alcman. Since, however, Stesichorus' material is derived from a more universal tradition, and since his compositions were intended for a more universal audience, the constant use of vernacular would not be appropriate, although its occasional use could have been turned to the poet's advantage in terms of innovation. In any case, the evidence of the papyri does not indicate that Stesichorus inclined towards the embellishment of his poetry with elements of Sicilian vernacular.

As far as the so-called Doric accent is concerned, it should be noted that the accent marks applied to the texts of Stesichorus by

Alexandrian scribes were based on assumptions that the language of the poems was comparable to the "Doric" of later times with which the scribes were acquainted. There are no means by which one may determine if the peculiar characteristics of the "Doric" pronunciation and the "Doric" intonation reflected by these accent marks are in fact characteristic of the language of choral lyric of the early Archaic period, particularly since the apparent rules of accentuation do not seem to correspond to the apparent metrical phenomena²².

B. Features from the papyri of Stesichorus that are shared with epic features.

Critics both ancient and modern have commented upon the "Homeric" nature of Stesichorus' poetry²³. I shall attempt, therefore, in this section to assess how far this "Homerianness" lies within the phonological and morphological structure of Stesichorus' language, and how far this comment is merely a reflection on the poet's style, developed from the appropriation of words and phrases from the epic poems.

The language of the Homeric poems has long been recognised as a composite one, manifesting elements that are affiliated to more than one dialect-group²⁴. In terms of modern dialect-geography of the Greek language, these elements belong primarily to the Southern group of dialects, the traditional Attic-Ionic and Arcado-Cypriot groups, with a secondary admixture from the Northern group. The fusion of features from different dialectal origins may have taken place at such an early period that, although the resultant "language" was not actually spoken in any one area, it would have been understood by members of different dialectal areas. The hypothesis of fairly wide comprehensibility

can be more easily accepted if indeed linguists are correct in their assumptions that there was less divergence between the various dialects in the prehistoric period²⁵.

I shall begin by listing the distinctive features of the language of the Homeric poems, as suggested by Palmer²⁶, and then proceed to consider these aspects of Stesichorus' language recognisably derived from epic.

i) Southern group

Characteristics of Attic-Ionic

- a) Original long α to η.
- b) Movable nu.
- c) Prepositions not apocopised.
- d) Athematic infinitive with termination -ναι .
- e) Secondary ending of the 3rd person plural = -σαν.
- f) Potential particle is ἄν.

Distinctively Ionic characteristics

- a) Complete change of original long α to η.
- b) Absence of contraction : -εα, -εο, -εω.
- c) Treatment of ν with compensatory lengthening : ξεῖνος.
- d) Gen.sing. of masc. A-stem nouns in -εω.
- e) Gen. plur. of masc. A-stem nouns in -εων.
- f) Analogical genitives: βασιλῆος for βασιλέως
- g) ἦν for Attic εἶν, ἄν.

ii) Northern group

- a) Labio-velars become labials before front vowels: πύρρες .
- b) Doubling of consonants instead of compensatory lengthening of vowels: ἄμμε
- c) Patronymic adjective instead of genitive case: Τελαμώνιος.

- d) $\bar{\alpha}$ for $\mu\alpha$.
- e) Dative plural of the athematic declension in $-\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$.
- f) Double sigma $,\sigma\sigma$ from $-\tau\iota\varsigma, -\theta\iota\varsigma, -\delta\iota\varsigma-$.
- g) Athematic infinitive terminations: $-\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota, -\mu\epsilon\nu$.
- h) Potential particle is $\kappa\epsilon$.
- i) $-\mu\iota$ inflection of contracting verbs: $\phi\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\eta\mu\iota$.
- j) Perfect participle with present participial endings: $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\eta\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\theta\omega\nu$.

Of the six points in the first category, Attic-Ionic, a) is contradicted by Stesichorus' use of original long alpha. b) and c) are observed in Stesichorus, movable nu appearing mostly in the dative plural. There is no evidence for points d) and e), while in view of the occurrence of forms such as $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\alpha$ or $\kappa\alpha\kappa\alpha$ it is most unlikely that we should find $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ rather than $\kappa\alpha$.

Of the seven points in the category of specifically Ionic features only b) is clearly in evidence; the absence of contraction may be observed in $\tau\epsilon\acute{\lambda}\chi\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ 2803 fr.5 7, in $\kappa\omicron\theta\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ 2619 fr.16 12 and in $\acute{\omicron}\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}\alpha$ 2617 fr.4 ii 8. In the case of c), two examples from the papyri contain long vowels betraying the loss of internal digamma: $\Gamma\alpha\rho\acute{\upsilon}\omicron\nu\alpha$ $\gamma\omega\nu\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ 2617 fr.11 2, with, however, the non-epic omega representing the secondary long vowel, and $\acute{\omicron}\lambda\epsilon\sigma\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\rho\omicron\varsigma$ $\alpha\acute{\iota}\omicron\lambda\omicron\delta\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\rho\omicron\nu$ 2617 fr.4 22. Less certain are two further examples from the citations: $\kappa\omicron\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\delta\iota\alpha\nu$ τ' $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omicron\chi\omicron\nu$ PMG 185 4, and $\Delta\iota\delta\varsigma$ $\kappa\omicron\upsilon\rho\alpha$ ($\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}\sigma\iota\nu$) PMG 200 2. In both these examples close parallels from epic may be responsible for the lengthened form, particularly in the case of $\kappa\omicron\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\delta\iota\alpha\nu$, where a short vowel would be metrically unsuitable in dactylic verse. There are two possible occurrences of the lack of compensation in $\mu\acute{\omicron}\nu\alpha\varsigma$ PMG 223 2 and in $\kappa\omicron\rho\alpha\tilde{\iota}\varsigma$ PMG 223 3, which show that there is already the

tendency to neglect the original digamma which became prevalent in later choral lyric.

Points d), f) and g) are contradicted by Western or other non-Ionic forms in Stesichorus, and although there is no evidence for e), it is highly unlikely that this Ionic form would occur.

In the category of Northern features, we find parallels for two of the ten characteristic points. There is one instance of the use of the patronymic adjective, namely 'Οδύσειον 2360 fr.1 i 2, with another possible example in Σκαμάνδριον 2619 fr.27 4. The patronymic in -ωνος is also found in 'Υπεριονύδας PMG 185 1. We find two examples of the dative plural in -εσσυ: μακάρεσσυ θεοῖσυ 2617 fr. 15 1 and in -εσσυ ποιοῦ 2619 fr.15 (b) 13. The former is obviously reminiscent of the epic formula which occurs six times in the dative plural in the Homeric corpus. There are, however, five examples of a normal dative in -συ in Stesichorus, in positions where the form in -εσσυ would have been possible metrically²⁷: χηρσύν 2617 fr.13 1; περὶ βουσὶν ἐμαῖς 2617 fr.13 27; ῥαπασυ 2619 fr.1 i 13; and from the citations ποσὶ PMG 185 6 and πᾶσυ θεοῖς PMG 223 2.

The characteristic doubling of consonants instead of compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel in the treatment of consonant+sibilant clusters appears to be confined in the Homeric poems to forms of the personal pronouns. As we have seen, the personal pronouns in Stesichorus appear to follow the Occidental pattern, and the sole example of a double-consonantal treatment occurs in the anomalous case of κλεωνός, which I shall discuss later²⁸. This Northern characteristic does not therefore generally appear in Stesichorus.

There is no evidence for points a), d), g), h), and i).

Number f) seems to be contradicted by words such as ὀπίσσω 2617 fr.13 24, ἔσχευε 2617 fr.4 ii 8, κερδάσας PMG 181 2, and j) by ὀλωλότες 2617 fr.18 4.

Further remarks on aspects of morphology.

Although we cannot present a complete outline of the declensions and conjugations from the fragments of Stesichorus, the general lack of conformity with the Occidental group of dialects indicates that where the inflection does not belong to one source common to all Greek, we must look to the epic poems for precedents.

i) Thematic declension.

O-stem nouns.

In the genitive singular we find in Stesichorus instances of the peculiarly epic form -οιο, as in Ἀναξάνδοροιο 2618 fr.1 ii 8, as well as epic and later -ου. The Western contraction in -ω found in Alcman does not occur. From the evidence of the fragments Stesichorus seems to have preferred the shorter form in -ου, which accounts for about 70% of the genitives of O-stem nouns as compared with the Homeric use of both forms with equal frequency²⁹.

One assumes that the accusative plural in -ους also derives from epic precedent, since there is not, at any rate, a trace of the Occidental -ως, or of the short form of the accusative in -ος, which occurs in Hesiod and the Homeric Hymns.

In the case of the dative plural, early Greek in general admits the use of both -οισι and -οις, as semantically equivalent³⁰. In epic one tends to find -οισι before a consonant and the shorter -οις

before a vowel, as if it represented an elision of -οιολ. In Stesichorus the two examples of the longer form both bear the nu-ephelesticon: ἐν μεγάροισιν 2359 fr.1 i 3 and]δολκοισιν 2617 fr.21 10. In the case of the A-stem nouns also, Stesichorus apparently prefers the longer form, with nu to avoid hiatus where necessary. Since the Occidental group of dialects seems to have employed the shorter form alone³¹ (at least as far as the later inscriptional evidence indicates) we must attribute the use of the longer form in Stesichorus to epic influence and to the greater convenience of that form in dactylic metres.

A-stem nouns.

In the genitive singular masculine, we find one example of the relatively rare epic form in -ας: Εὐλατῖδας δαΐφρονος 2359 fr.1 i 9. Since the epithet accompanying the proper name is also derived from epic, the use of the epic genitive is hardly surprising in its context³². The Occidental equivalent, which contracts to ᾶ, does not occur in Stesichorus³³.

Stesichorus appears to have employed the dative plural -οισι with more frequency than -οις. One suspects that -οισι simply represents the epic -ηοισι with the characteristic long alpha for eta, rather than the possible formation from short alpha. There is no evidence of "Doric" -ᾶσι.

If we are correct in supposing that in 2619 fr.1 i 16-17, εὐρυπ[ι]α belongs to the common epic εὐρυπῶα | Ζεύς, then we may class this as an instance of borrowing from epic the use of the alternative form of the nominative singular of the A-stem masculine noun in short alpha. The short alpha derives from the vocative singular, but

in this phrase has been lengthened by position. The phrase, commonly placed at the verse-end, must have become well established early in the development of the epic hexameter, since there is no evidence of the original nominative form, Stesichorus presumably adopted the phrase directly from epic. We note, however, that the original confinement of the phrase to the verse-end is not maintained, and that the length of the alpha is left ambiguous, although strictly speaking it is no longer lengthened by position.

ii) Athematic declension.

Nouns with consonantal stems of the athematic declension possess the same terminations in all dialects, with the exception of the dative plural. The papyri fragments contain two instances of the so-called "Aeolic" dative plural in -εσσυ, which was employed in the Homeric hexameter to accommodate certain words to the metre, such as Μῦμυδόνεσσυ. The Homeric device would naturally be suitable for a poet composing in dactylic measures, whether or not hexameter, but as was mentioned above, there are more instances of the simple dative in -συ, which is equally epic in origin.³⁴

There are a few individual points which should be mentioned in this category of the athematic declension:

- a) In the S-stem nouns, such as τεῦχος, Stesichorus follows the epic pattern of not contracting the vowels placed in juxtaposition by the loss of intervocalic sigma: thus one finds τεύχεσσι not τεύχους.
- b) For the declension of πόλις we have only the evidence of the accusative singular and hence no evidence of dialectal variants used by Stesichorus.
- c) βασιλῆος in 2619 fr.14 6 demonstrates again the influence of epic

verse. The eta reflects the original stem-ending $-\epsilon\upsilon\lambda\eta\tau$, whose long vowel was preserved in the Northern group of dialects and in epic. In the Occidental group, however, the original long diphthong was shortened to $\epsilon\upsilon$; hence βασιλέ $\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$ and βασιλέ $\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$ ³⁵. In the dative plural epic verse shows both long and short vowel versions: βασιλε $\upsilon\varsigma$ and βασιλέ $\epsilon\varsigma$, the former being the precedent for βασιλε $\upsilon\varsigma$ PMG 200 2.

d) In the case of νη $\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\nu$ in PMG 192 2, one suspects later correction since in the matter of original alpha, if nowhere else, one finds a consistency of form in the papyri. There is, however, one possible instance of "Doric" ν $\alpha\varsigma$ supplemented in 2619 fr.33 3³⁶.

e) In 2619 fr.1 ii 7, the nominative plural of the adjective πολ $\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$ appears as πολέ $\epsilon\varsigma$, no doubt derived from the athematic declension in epic, which is in fact found side by side with the thematic form. It seems to be the latter that is preferred in the Western group of dialects, however, as in πολλο $\upsilon\varsigma$ in Alcman.

There are one or two instances of special case-endings that derive from epic, namely $-\theta\epsilon\upsilon$ in ὠρανό $\theta\epsilon\upsilon$, 2360 fr. 1 i 3, $-\delta\epsilon$ as in $-\nu\alpha\delta'$ 2618 fr.1 ii 5-6. No instances of $-\phi\iota$, however, have come to light in Stesichorus. The old instrumental case is particularly associated with epic, and is seldom found elsewhere ³⁷.

iii) Conjugation.

From the meagre evidence we possess of the verbal formations and terminations in the fragments of Stesichorus, there are a few instances where we may point out epic influence, but the picture is sadly incomplete. For example, we are lacking the type of personal endings for the first person plural of the active voice, which

could have given us a useful indication of dialectal affiliation. It appears that Stesichorus has imitated the epic convention of omitting the syllabic and temporal augment, almost certainly for metrical reasons. There is no syllabic augment, for example, in 2617 fr.4 ii 10, 2619 fr.1 i 11 and possibly in the case of δὲ μολ' 2359 fr.1 i 6 and ὤατον 2359 fr. 1 ii 11. The temporal augment is omitted in 2617 fr.4 i 5, 2617 fr.4 ii 7 and 2617 fr.6 1. Elsewhere in the fragments the augment is retained, there being six examples of the syllabic augment and five of the temporal.

iv) Miscellaneous variants derived from epic.

a) The variant form of the second aorist of the verb "to go", ἦλυθον, is attested in ἦλυθ' 2617 fr.29 5, and must have originated from the epic corpus, there being no evidence of it elsewhere.

b) ποτέειπεν in 2618 fr.1 i 6 (and also possibly in 2360 fr.1 i 2) is preceded in Homer. Examples from Alcman and later Occidental inscriptions indicate that in the Occidental group of dialects the loss of intervocalic digamma resulted in contraction of the vowels juxtaposed: thus Ἀφελος became Ἄλος. The derivation of the second aorist of *ἔπω is complex³⁸, but the penultimate stage in its prehistoric evolution appears to have been ἐφέπων, with the digamma between the syllabic augment and the diphthong of the stem. In epic the loss of digamma is not followed by contraction, hence the form ἔειπον, which has in turn been adopted by Stesichorus in a passage highly reminiscent of epic.

From this comparison of the language of Stesichorus and that of

the epic poems we may conclude that there is little coincidence of phonological features. Characteristics such as the lack of contraction occur in cases of metrical convenience and where the phraseology is borrowed almost directly from epic. On the other hand, in the poet's morphology there is a much greater incidence of usage parallel with epic, so much so that without the evidence of Occidental ~~poet~~ and without evidence for the terminations of the athematic infinitives, which are anomalous, the general impression given by the language of Stesichorus is of one that is structured on the same morphological base as epic³⁹. At the level of morphology a language is more highly structured and less likely to permit infiltration from alien sources⁴⁰. In the language of Stesichorus' poems therefore one can see that the poet was basically perpetuating the linguistic structures of epic, incorporating very little that may be identified as morphological features of his native dialect. At the same time, however, intrusions at the more susceptible level of phonology may be observed.

C. Features of Stesichorus' language that do not occur either in the Homeric epics or in the Occidental dialect group.

i) Phonology.

There are instances of the treatment of nasal+sibilant clusters in Stesichorus' language that differ from the comparable treatment of such features in epic or in the Occidental dialect-group.

a) In the accusative plural of the feminine A-stem nouns, original- $\alpha\nu\varsigma$ was reduced to sigma, with compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel (the original long alpha having become short as a result of Osthoff's law): in the Southern group and Western group the

result was -ας, while in Lesbian-αυς⁴¹. Occasionally in Hesiod, the Homeric hymns, Alcman and later Theocritus, a short form of the accusative plural of the thematic declension occurs, possibly adopted as a metrical device by analogy with the short α of the accusative plural of the athematic declension and extended from the A-stem to the O-stem of the thematic declension⁴². In Stesichorus we find one example of this short accusative in $\pi\alpha\gamma\alpha\varsigma$ PMG 184 2⁴³. Not one of the other instances of the accusative plural A-or O-stem in the papyri or the citations is of certain length, since they all are followed by words beginning with a consonant or occur at the verse-end. The occurrence of such a short-vowel accusative plural is now recognised as a metrical device employed increasingly in the later epic poets, and not, as was once thought, a feature of "Doric"⁴⁴. Pavese considers the device as one that belongs to the poets of the continental epics, adopted from the Northern dialect (his Setten-trionale) at a time subsequent to the migrations to the coast of Asia Minor⁴⁵. The occurrence of the short-vowel accusative in choral lyric, however, and particularly in Stesichorus, may indicate that the practice was found useful in the composition of dactylic verse, and therefore does not prove any specific dialectal affiliations⁴⁶.

b) The feminine ending of the present participle derives from *-ont- α ⁴⁷, which became -ονσα and in turn followed the same pattern of developments as the accusative plural termination of the A-stem nouns mentioned above. In epic, Attic and Ionic we find -ονσα, the regular product of compensatory lengthening in the Southern dialect-group. In the Western group we would expect to find the secondary vowel represented as ω , as in the case of Μῶσα in Alcman. In Stesichorus and Alcman,

however, both used the form -οῦσα, for the feminine participle, such as is attested in the Lesbian branch of the Northern dialect group.

According to Page⁴⁸, the usage in Alcman is to be explained by orthography and not by phonology: "We have reason to suppose that Alcman himself spelt ἔχουσα fr.37 3 and ἐνθουσα fr.1 73 etc.; how he pronounced them we have little or no idea." The discovery of instances of -οῦσα in Stesichorus, so far unsubstantiated by the same type of compensatory lengthening in other words in which liquid+sibilant clusters are involved, seems to suggest that the occurrence of an apparently "Aeolic" form in Alcman was not merely a quirk of orthography but rather some vestige of an early non-epic tradition. The form also makes an occasional appearance in non-Homeric hexameters such as the lines of Eumelus (ca. 730 B.C.) quoted by Pausanias⁴⁹:

τῶν γὰρ Ἰθωμότα καταθύμιος ἔπλετο Μοῦσα
ἀ καθαράτ' καὶ ἐλευθερά σάμβαλ' ἔχουσα.

Another example may be seen in the hexameter line on the Duris cup⁵⁰:

Μοῦσά μοι ἀμφὶ Σκάμανδρον εὐ(ρ)ῶν ἄρχου' ἀελ(ν)δεν

And a third instance is the dedicatory inscription from the Heraion at Perachora (ca. 650 B.C.)⁵¹: ε[ϋ]μενεουσα ὑποδ[ε]ξατ. The evidence is hardly sufficient to substantiate any theory properly and the problem of the origin of such a form is likely to remain unsolved⁵².

However, the evidence from Alcman (11 examples) and from Stesichorus (7/8 examples)⁵³ does provide grounds for asserting that this particular form of the feminine present participle was the rule rather than the exception in early choral lyric, and that by the time of Pindar and Bacchylides it had almost certainly become the traditionally accepted form, which in turn affected the form of the masculine aorist participle, namely -αυς.⁵⁴

In the poetry of Stesichorus it is not certain whether this formation of secondary long \bar{o} occurred in other words. Later lyric poets, Ibycus, Pindar and Bacchylides, present us with examples of $Mo\bar{o}\sigma\alpha$ ⁵⁵. In Alcman, however, we find the normal Laconian $M\bar{o}\sigma\alpha$ ⁵⁶, but the papyri of Stesichorus have not preserved the word. Later commentators record certain of Stesichorus' invocations, but these appear to be periphrases, not specifically including $Mo\bar{o}\sigma\alpha$ or $Mo\bar{o}\sigma\alpha$ ⁵⁷, or else epithets that Stesichorus applied to the Muse, as in PMG 240 and 250, without any indication of the form of the word Muse itself. What is assumed to be a parody of Stesichorus' introductory lines to his Oresteia in Aristophanes' Peace 755 ff., naturally employs the Attic $Mo\bar{o}\sigma\alpha$ ⁵⁸. Thus there are no grounds other than the form of the present participle for assuming that Stesichorus used $Mo\bar{o}\sigma\alpha$, and the influence of epic in other areas, such as in the form of the accusative plural of \bar{o} -stem nouns and of the masculine article, may have resulted in the use of $Mo\bar{o}\sigma\alpha$ as opposed to $Mo\bar{o}\sigma\alpha$.

c) Another instance of a so-called Aeolism appearing in both Stesichorus and Alcman, again involves the phonological development of a nasal+sibilant cluster⁵⁹. The non-epic adjective $\kappa\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ takes the form of $\kappa\lambda\epsilon\epsilon\nu\upsilon\sigma\alpha$ from an original root $*\kappa\lambda\epsilon\bar{\epsilon}\sigma-$ to which was added the adjectival suffix $-\sigma\upsilon\sigma-$, the latter undergoing phonological change consistent with the group of dialects in question. Thus one would expect to find in Laconian $\kappa\lambda\epsilon\bar{\epsilon}\eta\acute{\nu}\sigma$, which with the loss of intervocalic digamma would contract to $\kappa\lambda\eta\acute{\nu}\sigma$. This does not, however, occur in the texts of Alcman as they have survived. We find $\kappa\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\acute{\nu}\sigma$ in fr.1 44 and what is almost certainly $\kappa\lambda\epsilon\epsilon[\nu\upsilon]\acute{\epsilon}$ in fr. 10 (b) 12. Page believes that the oddity of the former results from the 7/6th century spelling

κλενῶ for κληνῶ which was later interpreted as an error for κλεννῶ⁶⁰.

In fr.10 (b) 12, however, the space in the papyrus allows for the restoration of [νν], hinting that the double nasal from original nasal+sibilant could occur in Alcman. The emergence of the same form κλεεννῶ in Stesichorus 2619 fr.32 7 removes some of the doubts cast upon the veracity of the form in Alcman. As in the case of the feminine present participle in -ουσα, so in the case of the word κλεεννός, its occurrence in early lyric points to some affiliation of the language used by the early lyric poets with the Northern dialectal group, where compensatory lengthening by means of a double consonant is a regular feature. The form κλεεννός recurs in Pindar and Bacchylides⁶¹, and hence one assumes that this particular form of the word had at some point during the development of choral lyric become traditional.

Just as in the use of -ουσα, the treatment of σν to νν seems to be confined to a small linguistic area and is not universally applied⁶³. In the personal pronouns we find in both Alcman and Stesichorus the Occidental form ἄνν (PMG 1 60, and 2360 fr. 1 i 3). It is precisely in the case of these pronouns that the Homeric epics offer the alternative forms parallel to the "Aeolic" double consonant form, as in ἄμμεν. Thus the choice of the termination -ουσα and the form of κλεεννός cannot have been determined by the precedent of Homeric epic, either directly or by analogy. Where did the forms originate? It seems unlikely that Stesichorus invented the forms, or was responsible for the introduction of their usage into choral lyric in view of their appearance in the poetry of Alcman. On the other hand, inasmuch as his poetry may have circulated more widely than that of Alcman, it does seem probable that Stesichorus was

responsible for the survival of the forms as part of the choral lyric apparatus⁶⁴.

ii) Morphology.

a) 2617 fr.13 (a) 1 presents us with an apparently isolated formation of the dative plural of the word for "hand". χεῖρ and its variants have remained a philological mystery, which results primarily from an obvious confusion in the development of the consonantal cluster -ρσ- and the possible existence of two alternative stems: χερ- and χερσ-⁶⁵. On the one hand there are certain words in which -ρσ- is preserved intact, eg. θάρσος, and by analogy dative plurals such as θηρσά occur from Homer onwards. Assuming the stem χερ-, one would consider the epic version of the dative plural χερσά as belonging to this category. On the other hand, there also exists a group of words in which the treatment of the original rho and sigma appears to follow the pattern of such a combination in the sigmatic aorist, namely by the doubling of the rho or by the lengthening of the preceding vowel to compensate for the loss of sigma. Thus we find the Lesbian ἄρραι and Attic-Ionic ἄρραι from ἀρρσαι. By the same token, therefore, from the postulated stem *χερσ- one would expect to derive a double consonant in the Northern dialect group, χερρ-, as exhibited by the Lesbian poets⁶⁶, whilst in the Occidental group, a secondary long vowel, χηρ-. The texts of Alcman provide an instance of the genitive singular χηρός PMG 3 fr.3 ii 80 and PMG 84. We discover, however, that not only in Alcman, but also in Sappho and Alcaeus⁶⁷ the epic form χερσά prevails as the dative plural.

In Stesichorus we find two occurrences of the word in its

oblique cases: $\chi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}$ $\delta\lceil$ 2617 fr.19 ii 8 and $\chi\epsilon\rho\acute{\omega}\lceil$ 2617 fr.47 1, where undoubtedly the short vowel formation from the stem $\chi\epsilon\rho-$ was metrically useful, epic verse providing a precedent for at least the dative singular. It is strange, therefore, in view of Stesichorus' use of the short form in $\chi\epsilon\rho-$ and the general prevalence of $\chi\epsilon\rho\acute{\upsilon}$ in other poets, that we should find $\chi\eta\rho\acute{\upsilon}$ in the papyrus. Metrically $-\acute{\rho}\sigma-$ makes position, thus obviating the need for a special long vowel in the dative plural. Are we therefore justified in assuming that the anomalous form is the hyper-correction of a later scribe? It seems to me that one could argue equally for either case from the meagre evidence we have at present. $\chi\eta\rho$ - appears in texts belonging to the occidental dialect group, although not in Stesichorus and not elsewhere in the dative plural. Secondary long vowel η is testified in the same papyrus in $\phi\acute{\upsilon}\gamma\eta\nu$ 2617 fr.7 i 2, but this word has not escaped the doubts of scholars⁶⁸. Finally, it is not inconceivable that Stesichorus made use of anomalous forms and that, since the variation in possible forms of the word apparently existed from earliest times, the poet had a certain amount of latitude in his choice of the alternative forms and may even have had the license to create a form such as $\chi\eta\rho\acute{\upsilon}$ to suit the particular context.

b) Another confusing picture is presented by the evidence for the termination of the present infinitive of the thematic verb, both contracted and otherwise. $\phi\acute{\upsilon}\gamma\eta\nu$ 2616 fr.7 i 2 represents one instance of the so-called Laconian infinitive. This type of infinitive derives its name from its frequent appearance in the papyri of Alcman, where there are, among several ambiguous instances, two incontestable ones of a secondary long vowel in the thematic infinitive of a

non-contracting verb: φαίνην PMG 1 43 and ἀνδάνην PMG 1 88. (In the case of the former, the papyrus in fact reads φαίνεν, but it is certain that as soon as the introduction of the Attic alphabet made it possible to differentiate between long $\bar{\epsilon}\nu$ and short $\epsilon\nu$, the normal representation of the infinitive was - $\eta\nu$ ⁶⁹.) Similarly in contracted verbs in Alcman we find ἐπαυήν PMG 1 43 and γαμήν PMG 1 17.

In the case of contracted verbs the evidence in Stesichorus is not in accord with the examples cited from Alcman. We find πολεμεῖν 2617 fr.4 i 8, whose termination in - $\epsilon\nu$, if correct, might suggest that φύγην was a hyper-Doricism. Conversely, πολεμεῖν may be erroneous, but we have no other evidence in support of one case or the other. More puzzling, however, is the occurrence of γαμέν 2618 fr.1 ii 9, where the epsilon is incontestably short. An alternative short form of the infinitive, assumed to be derived from the termination - $\epsilon\nu$ added to the zero-grade of the thematic stem, does occur in early Greek. We find examples from literary texts such as in Hesiod, Works and Days 611, ἀποδρέπεν or Pindar Olympian I 3, γαρύεν, but the only instance in which a contracted verb is found with a short termination occurs in Argolic πωλέν (? century)⁷⁰. Page admits that the final syllables of ἐπαυήν and γαμήν are metrically indifferent, but argues for - $\eta\nu$ on the grounds that φαίνην and ἀνδάνην are definitely long and because of the representation of such infinitives in later inscriptions⁷¹. Metrically the termination of γαμέν in Stesichorus is undoubtedly short and hence we are forced again through lack of further evidence to postulate that metrical expediency must be the explanation for the poet's use of the short form of the final syllable of the infinitive, whether or not there was a precedent for such a form in previous poets.

The other instances of the thematic infinitive occur in citations where the risk of contamination makes any judgment uncertain. This is also true of the example of βάλλειν in 2506 fr.26 ii 24, a quotation from a commentary on the Oresteia of Stesichorus. Whether the original Occidental -ην was lost in the course of transmission, or the commentary preserves the original form -ειν, which would betray epic influence, we shall probably never know. If readings such as ζῶ[εῖ]ν 2617 fr.13 18 are correct and φῦγῆν is also possible in view of other Occidental features, then we find ourselves proposing the somewhat untenable hypothesis that the poet used different forms on different occasions according to whim. We must ultimately admit that, although the papyri are more reliable as evidence than the citations, they are not infallible. The evidence as it stands cannot provide the basis for any definite statement on the form of the thematic infinitive in Stesichorus.

c) The two instances that give evidence of the terminations used by Stesichorus for the athematic infinitive are quite unprecedented in literary works and almost unknown in inscriptional material. In 2617 fr.4 i 7 we discover what appears to be πολὺ κέρδιον εἶν. The phrase has epic precedents, although not with the infinitive, and the possibility of epic εἶναι seems to be precluded by the fact that enjambement would demand the division εἶ|ναι. The only parallel for εἶν as infinitive of the verb "to be" occurs in Euboean Ionic, which seems an improbable source for Stesichorus⁷². One therefore suspects some sort of conflation with the thematic infinitive in -ειν, and if this were the case then one would be assuming that the thematic form in-ειν did occur elsewhere in Stesichorus.

Similarly, the form εἴμεν 2619 fr.13 5 suggests the cross-influence of the thematic -εῖν. In the Occidental dialect group the athematic infinitive ends in -μεν, such as in ἦμεν, Alcman PMG 1 45 (from original *ἔσμεν, with Occidental η showing the compensation for the loss of sigma). Archaic inscriptions do attest the form -μην and a Rhodian form ἦμεν also occurs⁷³. It is possible, therefore, to explain εἴμεν as a combination of the athematic -μεν and thematic -εῖν. The Sicilian comic poet, Epicharmus, also presents us with the form εἴμεν⁷⁴, so that it is remotely possible that εἴμεν is in fact a special Sicilian variant, whatever its linguistic origin may be. Unfortunately, we have no evidence as to the frequency of the form in Stesichorus' works. In so far as Stesichorus appears to have employed epic morphemes in preference to Occidental ones, one would suspect that epic terminations for both thematic and athematic infinitives would creep into his poems, but the texts thus far have remained silent.

Of these miscellaneous oddities of language considered above, we find that three appear to have been derived from a source other than the Occidental dialect group or the Homeric epics : namely the short form of the accusative plural, the short form of the thematic infinitive and the feminine participle in -ουσα. Pavese considers all three to have originated in the Northern dialect group⁷⁵. The first two, however, could easily have emerged solely from within the sphere of later epic, whose poets were perhaps lacking the facility in oral composition possessed by their predecessors, and do not necessarily point to stimulus from an outside dialect group. There is a stronger case for interpreting the emergence of the participle in -ουσα as the result of influence from the Northern dialect group, in view of the parallel forms that have survived in the Lesbian poets. Pavese questions the relevance

of the parallel phonological change witnessed in the Lesbian poets⁷⁶, but since there is a certain amount of consistency in their treatment of the -υρ- cluster as opposed to the more or less isolated instance of the feminine participle in the language of Alcman and Stesichorus, the form in the latter case must have been acquired by way of cross-influence or as a loan-formation, as in the case of κλεεννός. The latter does not belong to epic at all, the regular form being κλειτός or κλυτός. I can conclude only that both of these peculiar forms may have been absorbed into a tradition on which both Alcman and Stesichorus drew, a tradition not associated with the Homeric poems but having affiliations with the Northern dialect group at some point.

Thus, from this examination of the limited evidence for the language of Stesichorus, we see that it may be described as morphologically close to the language of the epic poems, while in its pronunciation, to judge from the representation of the vowels in particular, it is akin to the Northern and Western dialect groups. The language of Stesichorus' poems may therefore exhibit a mixture of dialects, but it is important to note that there is on the whole consistency of dialectal affiliation in the phonology and morphology of that language.

In the preceding discussion I have been concerned primarily with distinctive features and linguistic oddities that occur in Stesichorus, without recounting the standard features of what we might call common Greek. Many of the features observable in the epic poems do in fact remain constant throughout the history of the Greek language, and it is therefore not surprising that Stesichorus' language

should show some structural similarity to that of the epic poems, representing as it does a continuation of the Greek language at a literary level in the Archaic period. In the development of the oral tradition itself one can see the amalgamation of elements from different dialectal sources which constitutes a linguistic creation unrepresentative of any one dialect group or branch of a group. Yet within its own special context, that is, the oral performance of the poetic composition, the mixture of dialect would be neither artificial to the performer nor incomprehensible to the audience. As a literary creation the epic is not an artificial conglomeration of incongruous elements, but a unified reality. From a historical or linguistic point of view, the scholar may reduce the whole to a number of components, determined by some artificial frame of reference for his own specific purpose. He must not, however, forget that the audience for whose ears the poem was intended would hardly have questioned whether the language represented to them a linguistic unity or not. Hence the similarities of morphology seen in the language of Stesichorus and that of epic should be thought of only in terms of a continuation of the traditional literary language in which the distinctive elements from Northern or Southern dialect groups were no longer recognised.

On the other hand the phonology of Stesichorus' language is distinctly Western in its affinities, with an admixture of features identified as belonging to the Northern dialect group. Although it has been suggested that choral lyric has developed out of the continental epic tradition and has absorbed dialectal features from the Northern dialect group that were later misunderstood to be of "Doric" or Western origin,⁷⁷ there is another, less complicated explanation for

the consistent appearance of long alpha and other phonological features that may be either of Northern or Western origin in the poems of Stesichorus. With the importation and dissemination of the Homeric and also the continental epics into the west through large cultural centres such as Syracuse⁷⁸ it is hard not to imagine that professional bards would emerge from the western colonies whose native dialect belonged to the Western group and that their pronunciation of the epic poems could have been influenced by their native dialect. Features such as the preservation of long alpha, the equivalent of eta in the Homeric poems, would make no difference to the structure of the hexameter line. It would be possible, therefore, for a Sicilian version of the epic poems to influence a poet wishing to create a novel form of verse or at least revitalise the time-worn epic tradition with western material that included linguistic elements from the dialects of the western communities. The proximity of Stesichorus' metres to the hexameter also suggest that the hexameter epic was the direct predecessor of his verse. Whether or not certain metrical patterns of choral lyric were derived from the hexameter verse is open to debate⁷⁹, but poems such as the Geryoneis, with its purely dactylic measures, together with the proximity of the morphological structure of Stesichorus' language to that of epic, point to a very close relationship.

The hypothesis that an epic background with overtones of the Occidental dialect formed the basis of Stesichorus' mixed literary dialect does not exclude the possibility of simultaneous influence from non-epic compositions. Choral odes appear to have some affiliation with cult-songs composed for performance in religious festivals, and are

particularly associated with the "Dorian" communities⁸⁰. There are some indications in the remarks of later grammarians that Stesichorus also composed Hymns⁸¹, and the preeminence apparently given to Apollo might be interpreted in the light of the importance of his cult in the Greek west⁸². Evidence for poetic composition in the west prior to Stesichorus' time is meagre. The presence in the west of Xenocritus of Locri, of Xanthus, a Sicilian writer of Dithyramb, and of Arion,⁸³ gives some indication of the existence of poetic forms other than the epic in the west from the 7th century onwards. Such compositions may have been in part responsible for the superimposition of non-epic elements in the poems of Stesichorus, particularly if he himself also composed works other than the lyrico-epics that have survived. The suggestion of non-epic influence, particularly as an explanation of some of the odd linguistic forms that have been discovered in Stesichorus, runs contrary to Pavese's theory of the relationship between continental epic and the emergence of choral lyric. Indeed, while it is true that the assumption of a continental epic tradition displaying features from the Northern dialect group may account for non-Homeric forms in Hesiod and the Hymns that were hitherto considered "Doric", and may account in part for isolated forms in choral lyric in mainland Greece, the evidence is insufficient to prove conclusively that the whole tradition of choral lyric derived from it⁸⁴. It is interesting to note, for example, that in Alcman the two instances of the feminine participle in -οῦσα that appears to be preceded in the quotation from Eumelus, do not occur in dactylic measures. Whether one thinks of Eumelus or Arion as possible sources for the introduction of the Northern form -οῦσα in Stesichorus, theories cannot at present transcend the boundaries of

speculation. We can state, however, that Stesichorus in his creation of lyrico-epic poems was not only well-versed in the structure of epic language in general, but , as we shall see in the ensuing chapters, had also an excellent knowledge of the Iliad and Odyssey specifically. One cannot consider his poems to have belonged to a tradition that evolved from the continental epics alone.

Footnotes to chapter II.

- 1 R. Coleman, "The Dialect Geography of Ancient Greece," TPhS (1963) pp.58-126. In this lengthy article Coleman elaborates upon the theories put forward by W. Porzig in "Sprachegeographische Untersuchungen zu den altgriechischen Dialekten," IF 61 (1954) pp. 147-169) and by E. Risch in "Die Gliederung der griechische Dialekte in neuer Sicht, " MH 12 (1955) pp. 61-76, regarding the distribution of dialects in ancient Greece, showing the inadequacy of a simple tripartite system, since it failed to account for the interrelationships of the sub-dialects of one group with the sub-dialects of another group, in particular the various affiliations of the Thessalian/Boeotian/Lesbian group.
- 2 Certain distinctions between Ionic, Doric and Aeolic were recognised as early as Herodotus' time (cf. Hist.I 142 and Thucydides, Hist. III 112 and VI 5), although Strabo (VIII i 2) appears to have been largely responsible for the traditional concept of a tripartite division which was generally adopted by scholars until the investigations of Porzig and Risch in the 1950's. On the history of Dialectology, see J.B.Hainsworth, "Greek view of Greek Dialectology," TPhS (1968) pp.62-76 and A.Bartonek, "Greek Dialects of the Second Millenium B.C.," Eirene 9 (1971) pp. 49-67.
- 3 See the Suda s.v. Στησίχορος ... καὶ ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ τὰ ποιήματα Ἀπορίδου διαλέκτως ἐν βυβλίοις κς'. Thucydides speaks of a "mixed" dialect spoken at Himera, which he attributed to the fact that it was colonised by Chalcidians from Zancle (Ionic) who were joined by a group of Syracusans (Doric) (Hist. VI 5). Possibly the concept of the "mixed" dialect of Himera was Thucydides' solution to the problem raised by the language of a poet, supposedly from a colony of at least partial "Ionian" origin, which was ostensibly "Doric" on account of features such as the long alpha. Thucydides' suggestion has been followed by some scholars (eg. by Holsten, De Stesichori et Ibyci dialecto et copia verborum , Stralsund, 1884) in theories that the dialectal mixture in the language of Stesichorus and Ibycus resulted from some sort of hybrid vernacular spoken at Himera and Rhegion. However, inscriptional evidence from Himera is minimal on account of its sack in 409 B.C. and in any case we are not even certain Stesichorus came from Himera. The recognisably "literary" nature of the poet's language renders such speculations on the nature of the vernacular in Himera or wherever, totally pointless.

- 4 For this theory, see C.O. Pavese, Tradizione e Generi poetici della Grecia Archaica (Rome, 1972) pp. 16-19. Cf. also J.A. Notopoulos, "Studies in early Greek Oral Poetry," HSPH 68 (1964) pp. 18-64.
- 5 For the literary dialect of Archilochus a useful summary is to be found in A. Bonnard, Archilogue (Paris, 1958) pp. lvii-lxi. See also A. Scherer, "Die Sprache des Archilochos," in Archilogue, Entretiens Hardt X (Geneva, 1964) pp. 89-116.
- 6 For the dialect of the Lesbian poets, the standard work is E.M. Hamm, Grammatik zu Sappho und Alkaios (Berlin 1957) . A short summary of the main features is given in D. Page, Sappho and Alcaeus (Oxford, 1955) pp. 327-329.
- 7 The language of Alcman is dealt with extensively by Page, in Alcman: the Partheneion (Oxford, 1951) pp. 102-163 and subsequently by Risch, "Die Sprache Alkmans," MH 11(1954) pp. 20-37. Recently W.F. Wyatt in "The Aeolic substrate in the Peloponnese," AJPh 94 (1973) pp. 37-46, traces the relics of Aeolic features back to a proto-stage of Greek which arrived in the Peloponnese with a migration of Greek-speaking peoples southwards in the second millenium B.C. His theory does not however take into account the controversial appearance of -οοοα in the language of Alcman (cf. page 33 ff.) .
- 8 Cf. note 4.above.
- 9 See A. Thumb, Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte (2nd ed. rev. by E. Kiéckers, Heidelberg, 1932) p. 70f. Cf. C.D. Buck, The Greek Dialects (Chicago, 2nd ed., 1955) p. 154 f..
- 10 M. Nöthiger, Die Sprache des Stesichorus und des Ibycus (Zürich, 1971) p. 72.
- 11 Thumb, op.cit., p. 70 ff.
- 12 Risch, art.cit., pp. 61-76, Coleman, art.cit., p 58 ff., and Pavese, op.cit., in the tables at the end of the book.
- 13 Thumb, op.cit., pp. 71-73.
- 14 See page 40 f. of this chapter.
- 15 Pavese, op.cit., p. 94: choral lyric poets, with the exception of Alcman, use -μεν.
- 16 Page, Alcman..., p. 131 f. and Nöthiger, op.cit., p. 74.
- 17 Nöthiger, op.cit., p. 75 and see page 38 f. of this chapter on the thematic infinitives.
- 18 Nöthiger, op.cit., p. 5.
- 19 Nöthiger, op.cit., p. 47. Buck, op.cit., p. 22, identifies the suffix -χα equivalent to -τε and particle χα equivalent to κε, as

exemplifying Occidental short alpha where the other dialect groups have short epsilon. In the case of the former the original consonant was a labio-velar, while in the latter a pure palatal; hence the change to a dental in the case of Ionic etc. In "Doric" verse the lengthened α would appear to stem from metrical expediency.

20 Nöthiger, op.cit., p.52.

21 Nöthiger, op.cit., p.12.

22 There are four peculiarities of the so-called Doric accent, of which 2 are borne out by the accent-marks occasionally inserted in the papyri of Stesichorus:

1) Short accusative plurals of O- and A-stem nouns seem to have been considered long for purposes of accentuation, eg. $\nu\delta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\acute{o}\varsigma$ Pindar, Ol. II 71. There are no certain examples of this short accusative in the papyri of Stesichorus, and $\pi\alpha\gamma\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ in PMG 184 is accented "normally" on the ultima.

2) Final diphthongs $\alpha\iota$ and $\omicron\iota$ in the nominative plural of O- and A-stem nouns appear to have been counted long in "Doric" accentuation:

$\delta\phi\iota\gamma\acute{o}\nu\alpha\iota$ $\tau\epsilon$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\delta\sigma\pi\alpha\sigma\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota$ 2359 fr. 1 i 2 ; $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omicron\iota\sigma\alpha\iota$ 2617 fr.1 2.

3) Final short syllables considered as long: $\acute{\iota}\zeta\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\nu$ 2359 fr.1 ii 2. $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\eta\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\theta\omicron\nu$ 2617 fr. 29 3.

4) Certain adverbs and the genitive plurals of nouns receive a circumflex on the ultima: cf. $\pi\alpha\nu\tau\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ 2735 fr.1 6, of Ibycus?

23 The author of the treatise On the Sublime 13 3 places Stesichorus together with Archilochus as the "most Homeric" after Plato. Cf. Dio Chrysostom, Or. ii 33, Quintilian X 1 62 and the verse from the Palatine Anthology VII 75.

Of the remarks made by modern scholars, we may point for example to Lesky, op.cit., p. 151 or Fränkel, op.cit., p. 320. Bowra, GLP pp.78-80 describes Stesichorus' debt owed more to Hesiod and later epic poets than to Homer himself. Cf. however, C. Santini's article "Omerismi in Stesicoro," GIF 22 (1970) pp.71-76.

24 See L.R. Palmer's article, "The language of Homer," in A Companion to Homer, edd. Wace and Stubbings (London, 1962) p. 97 ff. and P. Mazon, Introduction à l'Iliade (Paris, 1948) p. 110 ff..

25 See Bártonek, art.cit., p. 58 ff. and Risch, art.cit., p. 63.

26 Palmer, op.cit., p. 85 ff..

27 Nöthiger, op.cit., pp.33-34.

28 See page 35 f. of this chapter.

29 See Nöthiger, op.cit., p 46, Pavese, op.cit., p.49, for the usage in Stesichorus, and P. Chantraine, Grammaire Homérique I pp. 46, 69 and 200 for the Homeric usage and H. Troxler, Sprache und Wortschatz Hesiods (Zurich, 1964) p.58 ff. for Hesiodic usage.

30 P. Chantraine, Morphologie historique du Grec (Paris, 1967) p.40.

- 31 Chantraine, op.cit., pp. 40-41 and Nöthiger, op.cit., p. 19 ff. .
- 32 See page 220, chapter V.I.
- 33 There is no evidence for the form of the genitive plural, which in the Homeric dialect was uncontracted : -ων . There are two very doubtful possibilities of the Occidental contracted form in Stesichorus: Ἀλκιόδων 2619 fr.28 2 (but the accusative singular is more probable) and δων 2803 fr. 4 5. In P.Oxy. 2735, whose authorship is controversial, we find the form Μολιῶν fr.1 14. Pavese (op.cit., p.87,8) is inclined to think that the uncontracted forms are of Northern origin on account of their appearance in Hesiod.
- 34 See page 26 of this chapter.
- 35 Chantraine, op.cit., pp. 99-100. The reason for shortening original long diphthongs is uncertain. M. Lejeune, Traité de phonétique grecque (Paris, 1955) p. 196 , believes that this phenomenon is analogous with the shortening of εῖ to εἰ in the final position.
- 36 M.L.West, "Stesichorus redivivus," ZPE 4 (1969) p. 141.
- 37 Chantraine, op.cit., p. 119, according to whom the usage even in Homer had become redundant and artificial.
- 38 A possible derivation of the stages from *wek^w may be stated as follows, beginning with the reduplicated aorist of the zero-grade of the root : *we-wk^w > e - we - wk^w -> e-we-uk^w -> e-weik^w -> εἰεῖπ- > εἰεῖπ- .
- 39 Cf. the statement made by Page in his article, "Ibycus' poem in honour of Polycrates," Aegyptus 31(1951) pp. 162-164, which was written before the publication of P. Oxy. vol. XXXII . Although the limitations of the fragments prevent a full synopsis of the phonology and morphology of Stesichorus' language, we can now see the truth of Page's supposition that in Ibycus' case "the dialect" is in fact basically that of epic, with a veneer of "Doric" and a slight admixture of "Aeolic", and that the same was true for Stesichorus, except that there were no "Aeolisms" in the latter. At the time there was no evidence of the forms -οῖσα and κλεεινώς in Stesichorus.
- 40 Coleman, art.cit., p. 64 ff. .
- 41 Lejeune, op.cit., pp. 112-113 and Chantraine, op.cit., p. 50.
- 42 For example, Theogony 60, 267, 401, 534; Works and Days 564, 663, 675; Hymn to Mercury 106. See Nöthiger, op.cit., pp. 100-101.
- 43 Cf. however, Haslam's suggestion that if the colometry of PMG 184 were revised, the final syllable of παῖς would be without doubt short (art.cit., p. 17).
- 44 The question of the short accusative plurals in Hesiod is discussed by A.Morpurgo-Davies in "'Doric' features in the language of

Hesiod," Glotta 42(1964) pp. 138-165, The old theory that features such as the short accusative and the short form of the thematic infinitive were of "Doric" origin is dismissed and it is suggested that metrical expediency of a short form in an altered variation on an old formulaic expression might explain the creation of such features on the possible analogy of the double form of the preposition ἐς / εἰς.

45 Pavese, op.cit., p. 38 ff. .

46 In early choral lyric the form in fact only makes sporadic appearances; apart from Stesichorus' παγός in PMG 184, it occurs in Alcman PMG 17 5. Later examples from Pindar often occur where there are alternative readings, eg. in Ol. I 53 or II 71 or Nem. I 24.

47 See Lejeune, op.cit., p. 110 ff., Nöthiger, op.cit., p. 89-95, Page, Alcman..., p. 133-134 and Risch, "Die Sprache Alkmans," MH 11 (1954) p. 31 ff. .

48 Page, op.cit., p. 133.

49 Pausanias, IV 33 2. Cf. Pavese, op.cit., p. 104.

50 Risch, art.cit., p. 37. P.K. Kretschmer, Griechischen Vaseninschriften (Gütersloh, 1894) p. 104 f., no. 87.

51 SEG XI 233.

52 Page, op.cit., p. 133-134, believes that historical connections between Cyrene and Thera, and between Thera and Laconia make it possible that the language of Alcman and the Cyrenean dialect had a common ancestor in "old Laconian", which would explain the appearance of the feminine participle in -οοσα in Alcman and in the dialect of Cyrene. However, the inscriptional evidence from Cyrene is much later than Alcman, the earliest being a 4-th century oath. Cf. the objections to Page's theory expressed by Risch, art.cit., p. 31 ff. There may be some significance that the odd occurrence of -ονσαοοσα is confined to the feminine participle. Does it perhaps stem from some formulaic expression in a choral tradition restricted to female performers?

53 For example, Alcman, PMG 1 61,73; 3 fr.3 ii 5 and 15, and Stesichorus, 2360 fr.1 i 1, 11; 2617 fr.1 2; fr.4 11 16,17; fr.11 3; fr.43. 6.

54 For example, Pindar, Pyth. III 50 : λύσαυς.

55 Ibycus, PMG 282 (a) 23; Pindar, Ol. I 112, III 4, XIII 22 etc. Bacchylides, 5 4; fr. 55 2. In Pindar there are 40 examples of Μοῦσα and not one instance of Μοῦσα, whereas Bacchylides prefers Μοῦσα, of which there are 12 examples, as opposed to one certain and one doubtful example of Μοῦσα.

- 56 Alcman PMG 30; 5 fr 2 i 22; 80 9; 46.
- 57 P. Oxy. 2506 fr. 26 i 10,11.
- 58 PMG 210.
- 59 Lejeune, op.cit., p. 110; Page, op.cit., pp.107-108; Nöthiger, op.cit., pp.41-42.
- 60 Page, op.cit., p. 107.
- 61 Pavese, op.cit., p. 93.
- 62 For example, Pindar, Pyth. V 20, IX 15 and Bacchylides 2 6; 5 182. Also, Simonides, 136 3D.
- 63 ~~φ~~έννα is recorded in Alcman PMG 62, other than the example of κλεεννός cited above. In Stesichorus only the form κλεεννός occurs as an example of this treatment of the nasal+sibilant cluster.
- 64 It appears that the highest percentage of these so-called Aeolisms occurs in Pindar (although the impression may in part be due to the greater amount of his poetry surviving in comparison to that of the other lyric poets. The principal examples are: a) the feminine participle in -ουσα; b) the aorist participle in -αις; c) Μοῦσα = Muse; d) 3rd person plural of the present indicative in -ουσι; e) personal pronouns ἄμμες etc.; f) the infinitive of the verb "to be" : ἔμμεναι g) consonantal doubling in κελαδεννός, φαεννός, κλεεννός.
- 65 Lejeune, op.cit., p. 106 and Chantraine, op.cit., p. 79.
- 66 χέρρες, Sappho, PLF 90 (1) ii 21; χέρρα Alcaeus, PLF C1 21.
- 67 Sappho, PLF 81 (b) 2; 96 29; Alcaeus, PLF B 13 6.
- 68 On the papyrus, a "corrector" has written εἰ beneath η(ν). Since other infinitives seem to have been written -εἶν, eg. πολεμεῖν 2618 fr.4 i 8, one wonders whether this is a case of correction, or an explanatory gloss.
- 69 Page, op.cit., p. 121f.
- 70 See F. Bechtel, Die Griechischen Dialekte II (Berlin, 1923) p. 449.
- 71 Page, op.cit., p. 122.
- 72 See Bechtel, op.cit., vol. III p. 180.
- 73 Chantraine, op.cit., p. 276; Bechtel, op.cit., vol. II p.646.
- 74 Epicharmus, fr. 99 2 (Kaibel); cf. the form πέκοσχα which is found in both Stesichorus (PMG 261) and Epicharmus (fr. 11 Kaibel).

- 75 Pavese, *op.cit.*, p. 88 ff..
- 76 Pavese, *op.cit.*, p. 106.
- 77 See page 33 of this chapter, with notes 44 and 45.
- 78 Note that the epic poet Eumelus came from Corinth. Could the source of the feminine participle in Stesichorus have been the recitation of Eumelus' poems in the chief Corinthian colony in the Greek west?
- 79 Cf. M.L. West, "Greek Poetry 2000-700 B.C.," *CO* 23 (1973) pp. 179-192, in which he relates the division of the various types of Greek poetry and their modes to their dialectal origins: Ionic, Lesbian and Doric. The Lesbian mode derived from the Northern dialect group in late Mycenaean times, while Ionic and Dorian developed out of the Southern group, the latter being absorbed by the post-Mycenaean infiltration of the Occidental dialect group. According to his theory the metrical evolution of the hexameter was late: not much before the 8th century and thus heresy to those who believe in the Mycenaean origin of the Catalogue of Ships. As West himself admits his hypothesis must remain speculative. What the poetic forms of non-epic compositions were in the dark ages we shall probably never know.
- 80 A. Méillet, Aperçu d'une histoire de la langue grecque (Paris, 1948) p. 200. Cf. Vallet, *op.cit.*, p. 305.
- 81 Clement of Alexandria, Strom. I xvi 78 (PMG 276); cf. Athenaeus VI 250b.
- 82 Vallet, *op.cit.*, pp. 305-306. Cf. PMG 232.
- 83 See chapter I, note 1, with page 7 and note 27.
- 84 Cf. Pavese's own admission of the limitations of his theory, *op.cit.*, p. 108.

Chapter III Verbatim adaptation of Homeric "formulae" in Stesichorus.

In this and the following chapters I shall examine the nature of Stesichorus' diction in relation to its epic precedents, specifically in terms of that feature considered distinctive to oral epic, namely the "formula". The generic, stylized and repetitive nature of the language of Greek epic is in itself totally evident and undisputed¹. Parry in his original statistical examination of the function of the traditional, fixed epithet in the Homeric poems introduced the word formule, with his own specific definition of the word, indicating its technical application within the framework of his thesis². His study of the nature of the repeated phrases, their extension and their economy, in the narrowly limited area of noun-epithet expressions gave the initial impetus to the extensive investigations into the integral constituents of oral techniques in the composition of heroic verse. The term "formula", initially employed as a technical term, whose usefulness is immense, provided that its definition is clearly understood, has in recent years come under a barrage of criticisms and warnings against the misconceptions and erroneous connotations that may be construed with regard to the nature of oral composition. Nonetheless, the word has become sufficiently well established in the jargon of Homeric studies that it is acceptable as a generic term, on the understanding that the author will and must define his own specific application of the term in his particular area of research.

Modern scholarship in Homeric diction has produced two theories of particular relevance to this examination of Stesichorus' adaptation of Homeric "formulae". Firstly, Nagler, in his generative approach to the study of "formulae" has attempted to remove the whole 'issue' of "formulae"

from statistical counts of repetitions and purely structural affiliations of phrases with metrical patterns³. Deriving his method of approach from the generative view of speech habits developed in transformational linguistics, he suggested applying a theory of a pre-verbal Gestalt to oral composition in which each formulaic repetition would be considered as a particular manifestation on a particular occasion of performance, generated out of, or realised from a mental, not verbal "form" that is, as it were, inherent in the poet⁴. The theory, subject as it is to the criticism of being applicable to poetic composition of a non-oral nature also, has far-reaching implications in terms of the poetic process in general, and especially in literary traditions in which imitation is acclaimed and not castigated. In the case of poets such as Stesichorus, whose literary formation has been strongly influenced by the traditional epics from their cultural heritage, we can, by Nagler's theory, interpret the poet's choice of phrase in a given context as in part generated out of the traditional associations of that context.

The second and more important theory is that of Hainsworth in which he considers the "bond of mutual expectancy" as being integral to the concept of a "formula" as a repetition of content⁵. "Mutual expectancy admits of infinite gradations. Words, at first fortuitously combined, by recreation slowly become regularly associated."⁶ One must note that Hainsworth places emphasis on the words, the content. Mutual expectancy depends on content, not form, and this is of particular relevance when one considers the treatment of Homeric "formulae" by later poets. Since the metrical structure of the phrases, considered of prime importance in the theories of some scholars on the nature of oral improvisation⁷, is not always functional in non-hexameter composition, the poet's use of

the traditional "formulae" must depend on content. The traditionally associated word-groups may be imitated by the poet on the basis of content not structure. Just as in oral improvisation the "formula" is a device that cannot be divorced from its end, namely the narrative, so in later, non-epic composition, the adaptation of such "formulae" by the poet is dictated by the content and by the specific association of noun and epithet in a specific context.

Thus I define the "formula" as a repeated word-group; that is, a group of words that occur together more than once in similar contexts in the poems of the epic corpus. By virtue of the repetition of these word-groups the bond of mutual expectancy established between a certain noun and epithet can become firmly set in the subconscious of both a poet and his audience through continual exposure to the repetitions. Thus, the bond of mutual expectancy will operate outside the specific context of the hexameter poems. The poet may repeat the "formulae" in one of several ways that we shall see in the course of examining Stesichorus' adaptation of "formulae". It must be noted that the "formula" is no longer part of the technique of the oral $\alpha\omicron\upsilon\delta\omicron\varsigma$, but rather one of the tools of a $\mu\omicron\upsilon\eta\tau\eta\varsigma$ who creates as well as imitates; the formulaic inheritance from his predecessors.

I propose to examine the diction of Stesichorus in terms of his use of "formulae", which will be divided into various categories according to the relation of the phrases to their Homeric precedents:

- a) word-groups that have recognisable precedents in the Homeric poems, and have been imitated verbatim by Stesichorus; b) those word-groups that have recognisable precedents, but that have been modified by the poet; c) phrases that have precedents in sources other than the Iliad

and Odyssey⁸. In this chapter I shall examine those "formulae" that have acted as precedents for Stesichorus' phrases directly from the Iliad and Odyssey. I have subdivided the word-groups into the following categories, and within each category the order is determined according to the alphabetical order of the nouns in each group:

- a) Noun-epithet groups
- b) Noun + genitive of possession
- c) Double noun groups, linked by καί or τε ... καί
- d) Noun-epithet groups in which one element is supplemented
- e) Miscellaneous
- f) Word-groups occurring only once in the Homeric corpus.

- a) Noun-epithet groups⁹.

1. γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνα 2617 fr.3 3.

There seems little doubt that the supplement first proposed by Lobel in P.Oxy. volume XXXII is correct. In the Iliad there are over 30 instances of the "formula" in the nominative case, at the verse-end, and in the Odyssey over 50 instances. In lyric, however, there are very few examples of the association of γλαυκῶπις with Ἀθήνα. Page believes that the context of this fragment is a council of the gods¹⁰, and if this is correct, then one imagines that perhaps here Athene was speaking on Heracles' behalf, in a way that recalls her defence of Odysseus in the first book of the Odyssey.

2. κουριδίαν τ' ἄλοχον PMG 185 4 (SLG 17 6)

We find this word-group in the Iliad thrice in the accusative, twice in the genitive case, but in the Odyssey only once in the genitive

case and once in the dative. The epithet *κουρίδιος* is almost always restricted to *ἄλοχος* in the feminine, *ἄνθρωπος* or *πόσις* in the masculine. *ἄλοχος*, however, possesses a variety of epithets : *μνηστή*, *ἀντιθέη*, *κεδνή*, *θυμαρής*, but particularly the almost insignificant *φύλη*. The additional association with children is best exemplified in the *Iliad* by the lines: *ἐνθ' ἄλοχόν τε φύλην ἔλεπον καὶ νήπιον υἱόν* or *εὐφρανέειν ἄλοχόν τε φύλην καὶ νήπιον υἱόν* (*Iliad* V 480, 688; VI 366). The association of "wife" and "children", though natural, is not in every case appropriate, as for example when Briseis is described as *κουριδίην ἄλοχον* (*Iliad* XIX 298). It would seem, however, that in this fragment of Stesichorus we have in *παύδας τε φύλους* a variation of the formulaic *καὶ νήπιον υἱόν*, in which the poet employs an alternative word-group, not previously associated with *κουριδίην ἄλοχον* or *ἄλοχόν τε φύλην*.¹¹

3. *δέπας* ... *χρῦσεον* PMG 185 1,2 (SLG 17 1,2)

The "formula" *χρυσέωι δέπαϊ* occurs 6 times in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and need hardly surprise us since golden drinking cups and bowls are fitting in any heroic society¹². The image of the colossal cup of gold floating upon the streams of Ocean is not found in the Homeric corpus. Helios departs to Ocean for the duration of the night but the vehicle of transport goes unmentioned : he returns *ἐξ ἀναλαρρείται βαθυρρόου Ὠκεανοῦ* (*Odyssey* XIX 433 ff., cf. XXIV 11,12.). From Athenaeus one discovers that the poet who wrote the *Titanomachia* was the first to describe the Sun's nightly transport as *λέβης* and that one Theolytus also used this term¹³. In the epic tradition relating to Heracles' exploits, Peisander (7th/6th century) and later Panyassis tell of Heracles capturing the Sun's cup, *δέπας* or *φιάλη*, but no further details are given of the cup's composition. In Mimnermus' version of

the Sun's journey back to the East, a different, although logical image is found:

τὸν μὲν γὰρ διὰ κύμα φέρει πολυήρατος εὐνή,
 ...κούλη Ἥφαϊστου χερσὶν ἐληλαμένη
 Χρυσοῦ τιμήεντος ...

Believing that this "hollow bed" in which the Sun sleeps resembles the hollow of a cup, Athenaeus includes this fragment in his collection of "cups". In this instance the association of gold is explicit: the bed has been fashioned by the blacksmith of the gods, in precious metal appropriate for the furniture of the gods.

One might think that the association of "gold" and "sun" was obvious. It is perhaps surprising that the epithets of Helios in the Iliad and Odyssey are few, and those that do occur describe the sun's luminosity: φαέθων, φαεσίμβροτος, λαμπρός. Golden, on the other hand, qualifies various material goods - armour, clothing, thrones, cups - and is occasionally transferred to deities such as Aphrodite. There is one isolated comparison between the sun and gold; a necklace brought by one of the suitors for Penelope is described as : χρύσειον, ἡλέκτροισιν ἐερμένον, ἥελιον ὥς (Odyssey XVIII 296). From a later date, the Hymn to Helios XXXI (7/6th century) reveals a stronger association between the brightness of the god and his golden helmet (lines 9/10) and his golden-yoked chariot (line 15). Even though there is this later association of gold with the sun, as he shines on the earth, there is no logical reason for the vessel that carries him after he has ceased shining upon the world to be created out of bright gold. I conclude rather that the amazing cup of the Sun was described as golden because cups of the gods and heroes were naturally and traditionally made of gold.

Since the dates of Peisander of Rhodes, those of the poet of the Hymn to Helios and those of Stesichorus all belong somewhat nebulously

to the 7th or 6th centuries, it is difficult to determine where the image of the golden cup first originated, and what part, if any, the golden bed of Mimnermus' poem played in the creation of the image. The aptness of presenting the Sun's nocturnal transport as a cup, which Heracles could "hijack" for his expedition to the west, is interestingly explained by Athenaeus as a joke on the part of poets¹⁴; in view of Heracles' propensity for cups of wine, what could be more fitting than a colossal cup in which to traverse the Ocean? The motif did recur later in a context which may not have been concerned with Heracles, namely in a fragment of Aeschylus' Heliades¹⁵. Both Pherecydes and Apollodorus repeat the tale of Heracles borrowing the golden cup of the sun and their accounts may have been derived from Stesichorus¹⁶. Whether or not Stesichorus was the inventor of the image of the Sun's unusual vessel, he may have been the first to explore the possibilities of using the traditional association of δέπας and χρῦσεον, thus presenting his audience with a far more concrete picture of the Sun's nightly voyage than is given in the Odyssey.

4. μακά[ρῃ]σσυ θε[ο]ῖσι 2617 fr.13 25

Of this formulaic association there are in the dative plural alone 6 examples in the Iliad and 7 in the Odyssey, of which a total of 7 occur at the verse-end. A further 5 examples may be added from the Hymns and 2 from Hesiod. There is, however, only one instance that may have acted as a precedent for the sentiment expressed in this fragment of Stesichorus, namely in Odyssey I 82: εἰ μὲν δὴ νῦν τοῦτο φίλον μακάρεσσυ θεοῖσι. In this same fragment of Stesichorus, 7 lines above, we find a similar association in θε[ο]ῖν μακάρω[ν]. Generally in the case of the genitive plural θεῶν, the epic poets preferred to leave the noun

without any epithet attached, presumably on account of metrical convenience. However, regardless of position or frequency of this word-group in particular cases, the association of μάκαρες with θεοί is sufficiently obvious for us to identify Stesichorus' usage as "Homeric".

5. ἐπ' ἀκροτάταν κορυφάν 2617 fr.4 ii 10,11

This word-group constitutes an imitation of a Homeric "formula" if one compares it with ἀκροτάτην κορυφῇ πολυδαιράδος Οὐλύμποιο (Iliad I 499, V 754, VIII 3) and ἐπ' ἀκροτάτης κορυφῆς Σάμου (Iliad XIII 12). Outside the actual Homeric corpus, the combination is found in the Hymn to Pan : ἀκροτάτην κορυφὴν μηλοσκόπον εἰσαναβαλόντων (XIX 12). In the epic tradition, however, the word κορυφή is used primarily in the sense of physical mountains such as Olympus or Ida. The secondary meaning of "head", of an individual creature, does occur once in the Iliad, as VIII 83, also in the context of a combat between heroes. In this instance the epithet ἄκρην indicates the possibility of its application to the word κορυφή in both its senses. The passage in Stesichorus appears to involve the shooting of one of Geryon's three heads by the hero Heracles. Doubtless it is the head that towers highest above the hero, as is suggested by some of the early representations of the scene on vase-paintings¹⁷. The poet has employed κορυφή in its less common sense of "head", and in retaining the epithet most frequently associated with the word in its sense "mountain" he has deliberately suggested both potential meanings, magnifying the dimensions of the monster. Knowing the popular epic usage ἀκροτάτην κορυφῇ, the audience would automatically compare the height and size of Geryon's head to a mountain peak. They could envisage the hero faced by a massive, grotesque mountain of a monster. Thus we may observe that in the case of ἐπ'

ἀκροτάτων κορυφών, Stesichorus has obviously copied a "formula" from the epic corpus, but the usage can hardly be termed blind imitation. The word-play facilitated by the double meaning of κορυφή, depends upon the audience's awareness of the traditional, or more frequent context of ἀκροτάτη κορυφή and its recognition of the implications of the "formula" when applied to Geryon.

6. μέλι χλωρόν

PMG 179 2

The association of χλωρόν and μέλι does occur twice in the Homeric poems, at Iliad XI 630 and Odyssey X 234¹⁸, and hence we may count this as a "formula" precedented in Homer. The epithet χλωρός however, is more often applied to grass and leaves, particularly young shoots, as in χλωρὰς ῥῶπας, (Odyssey XVI 47) and also to luxuriant undergrowth or even to ὄρος, as in the Hymn to Apollo 233. In its second sense of "pale" or "pallid", χλωρός occurs in a metaphorical context with ἀχλὺς (Hesiodic Scutum 264) and with δέος (Iliad VII 479). It is assumed by LSJ that μέλι qualified by χλωρόν must be understood as a reference to the "yellow" of the honey, but there seems no reason why "paleness" is not intended as the sense of the epithet. The phrase μέλι χλωρόν, therefore, demonstrates how Stesichorus may derive a word-group from the Homeric poems, but his choice may represent an association of noun and epithet that is less common than other possible combinations of either the noun or the epithet.

7. καὶ δα φύλον

2619 fr. 16 18

καὶ δας τε φύλους

PMG 185 4

Although there are precedents for this word-combination in the Homeric poems, it seems that the "formula" φύλον τέκος was much more common, primarily in singular contexts. Statistically, of a total of

57 instances of the singular, there are 5 examples of *παῖδα φύλον/ην* in the *Iliad* and 3 in the *Odyssey*. Indeed, over half of the instances occur without any accompanying epithet. Accusative *φύλον υἷόν* on the other hand, appears 21 times in the *Iliad* and 8 in the *Odyssey*, while nominative *φύλος υἷός* 6 times in the *Iliad* and 22 in the *Odyssey*. In Hesiod also, only one instance of *παῖδα φύλον* stands beside 7 cases of singular *παῖς* without any epithet and 4 of the plural. It would appear that the group *παῖδα φύλον* became popular only in later poets.

8. *φύλου πατ[ρ]ός*¹⁹ 2360 fr.1 i 11

The association of *φύλος* and *πάτηρ* exists in all grammatical cases in the Homeric poems, although the genitive singular is more often avoided on account of metrical awkwardness. This difficulty, however, may be overcome by the insertion of a preposition between the epithet and its noun, as for example in *φύλου μετὰ πατρός ἀκουήν* (*Odyssey* XVII 43) or by the use of the longer form of the masculine genitive in *-οιο*. Stesichorus' metre allowed him to retain the traditional association without making use of these alternatives.

9. *ἐν νηυσὶν εὐσσελμοῖς* PMG 192 (SLG p. 156, corr.)

Despite the fact that this "formula" occurs in a quotation from Plato, which may not be totally accurate in representing the poet's words, I include the word-group in this category since the association of *εὐσσελμος* with *ναῦς* is well attested in epic and its recurrence in this fragment of Stesichorus (in some form) must be considered an imitation of the Homeric "formula". It is noteworthy, however, that in the majority of cases of this "formula" in the epic poems the preposition *ἐπὶ* is found. *ἐν*, if correct, may reflect a necessary change, *metri gratia*.

10. τέκνα φύλα

2359 fr.1 ii 3

In the plural one frequently finds the epithets ἀγλαά or νήπια qualifying τέκνα in the Iliad and the Odyssey. τέκνα φύλα occurs twice in the Iliad and not at all in the Odyssey, but Stesichorus doubtless relied upon the association's being recognisable from the prevalence of the vocative φύλα-τέκνον. The most common word-group involving τέκνον is in fact τέκνον ἔμον, its versatility demonstrated by its occurrence at three different positions in the hexameter line. In 2617 fr. 19 7 one reads τέκνον followed by a break in the papyrus. There is every possibility that, since this fragment appears to belong to a personal address or exhortation, the common phrase τέκνον ἔμον occurred.

11. ἐπ' εὐρεῖαν χθ[ό]να

2260 fr.1 ii 18 (PMG 233)

In the Homeric poems this noun-epithet group occurs in the nominative case alone, 4 times in the Iliad (and thrice in the Hymns) in all instances taking the final position in the line: ὅσα τρέφει εὐρεῖα χθών. (Iliad IV 182 etc.). When the accusative is given an epithet the sole candidate appears to be πολυβότειραν (cf. dative βωτιανείρη and μελαίνη), but the accusative occurs more often without an epithet. If we turn to the scope of εὐρεῖα, we discover that in the Odyssey, perhaps naturally, the epithet is applied mostly to the sea rather than to the land, and similarly in the Iliad, with the exception of its association with Troy: ἐνὶ Τροίῃ εὐρεῖη. I assume that in Stesichorus' metrical scheme εὐρεῖαν χθόνα was possible, although unprecedented in the hexameter, and that the word-group arose from the pattern set by the nominative εὐρεῖα χθών.

b) Noun+genitive of possession groups.

1. θεῶς ὑδάτι 2619 fr.15 (b) 4

In the Homeric poems this word-group normally takes a less precise form, θεῶν ὑδάτι. Barrett's supplement suggests that the goddess who is exerting her will is Athena²⁰, and I interpret this instance of Stesichorus referring to a specific deity, rather than to the gods in general, as one of a number of characteristic attempts to regenerate phrases that had become meaningless in the Homeric poems on account of continual repetition. In this way the poet could render his episodes in his poems with greater vigour and immediacy, despite their reliance on the epic tradition.

2. ποταμοῦ παρὰ παγᾶς PMG 184 3,4

The word πηγῇ is rare in the Homeric poems, but there are three instances of this notion of the "streams of rivers": αὖ τ' ἄλσέα καλὰ νέμονται | καὶ πηγὰς ποταμῶν καὶ πύσσα πολέεντα (Iliad XX 8,9; Odyssey VI 123,4). There πηγῇ is not given an epithet, while in this fragment of Stesichorus' Geryoneis we discover that the "streams" are ἀπείρονας and ἀργυροπόρους, and that the identity of the river is specified. I shall deal with this passage in greater detail in the discussion of word-groups that contain elements from the epic tradition with new juxtapositions and associations²¹. We may note here that the epic "formula" πηγὰς ποταμῶν was probably influential in the construction of the Stesichorean phrase, but that the poet required a specific reference, and so replaces the plural with the singular ποταμοῦ and introduces the locality of Tartessus: another example of the particularisation of a general statement.

3. παῦς Διός

PMG 185 6

By calling Heracles "son of Zeus" Stesichorus is apparently following the Hesiodic tradition, as exemplified in the Theogony and the Shield²², but of the 11 instances the use of παῦς is confined to παῦς τε Διὸς μεγάλου in the Shield 371. Elsewhere υἱός occurs. In the Iliad and Odyssey there are indeed precedents for the combination of παῦς and Διός, but there too υἱός is more prevalent. Heracles is chronologically too early to make a legitimate appearance in the Trojan cycle, but Odysseus' journey to the Underworld gave the poet an excellent opportunity to incorporate many of the heroes who lived prior to that era. The fact of Heracles' being the son of Zeus is made pertinent to the situation; he has to suffer despite his lineage: Ζηνὸς μὲν πάῦς ἦα Κρονίωνος (Odyssey XI 620)²³. It is perhaps odd however that in both Odyssey XI and Theogony 952 it is Heracles' "companion" ~~He~~ who is identified as παῦδα Διὸς μεγάλου, and not Heracles.

As regards the completion of the line in accordance with Page's proposed colometry²⁴, it is possible that αἰγυόχου occurred, αἰγυόχοιο/ου and μεγάλου/ου being the two most prominent epithets that accompany Διός. It seems, however, from the texts that survive, that for metrical or other reasons, the second, μεγάλου, was the epithet employed in phrases containing πάῦς/παῦδα, whilst αἰγυόχοιο most frequently occurred in the "formula" describing Athena: κούρην Διὸς αἰγυόχοιο (11 times in the Odyssey). Alternatively, one might expect that the proper name Ἡρακλῆς would appear in this nine-line sentence, but for such an assumption one would need a great deal more evidence on Stesichorus' methods of structuring sentences.

I conclude, therefore, that in his choice of this "formula" the poet again appears to make use of the less common word-group for the

expression "son of Zeus".

4. φῶς ἡελίου

2619 fr.13 8

φῶς ἡελίου occurs 18 times in the final two and a half feet of the hexameter line in the Iliad and the Odyssey. If the colometry of this fragment has been correctly reconstructed²⁵, Stesichorus appears to have retained the final position in the line, although for metrical reasons he was forced to use the shorter form of the genitive. There are three contexts in which this "formula" appears in the Homeric poems:

1) with reference to the setting sun; 2) with reference to an individual being alive, that is, looking upon the light of the sun; 3) with reference to an individual dying, that is, departing from the light of the sun. The third of these contexts seems most likely in this fragment of Stesichorus, in view of κατ'αἶσαν two lines below. One is reminded perhaps of Achilles' speech at the beginning of Book XVIII of the Iliad, in which the hero reflects upon the fated death of Patroclus:

ὥς ποτέ μοι μήτηρ διεπέφραδε καὶ μοι ἔειπε
Μυπηιδόνων τὸν ἄριστον ἔτι ζῶντος ἐμεῖο
χερσὶν ἔπο Τρώων λεῦπειν φῶς ἡελίου

Iliad XVIII 9-11

However, although imitation of Homeric "formulae" is quite evident in this fragment, the precise context is only a matter for speculation.

c) Double noun groups linked by καὶ or τε ... καί.

In this category there are few examples. Two groups, βίαι τε καὶ αἰχμαῖ 2619 fr.1 i 6 and θώρακά τε καὶ βροτοῦντι[α μέλας 2617 fr.4 ii 13, properly belong to the category of new juxtapositions and will be considered in chapter IV²⁶.

1. μάχαι τ' ἄνδρο[κτασίαι

2617 fr. 17 6

There are two parallels for this pair of nouns in conjunction

to be found in Iliad VII 237 and XXIV 548:

αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν εὖ οἶδα μάχας τ' ἀνδροκτασίας τε.

αἶετ' τοι περὶ ἄστυ μάχαι τ' ἀνδροκτασῖαι τε.

An extension of this association exists in Odyssey XI 612: ὑσμῖναί τε μάχαι τε φόνοι τ' ἀνδροκτασῖαι, with general reference to the exploits of Heracles, and the same line, or "formula" appears in the Theogony in a personification of these abstractions as the children of Eris (line 228). Thus the association of μάχαι and ἀνδροκτασῖαι was probably well-established in the epic corpus, and in this instance Stesichorus has borrowed the phrase directly. Unfortunately the fragment is insufficiently complete, so that its content remains obscure. One suspects that the description of the horrors of war may have been applied to Heracles' adventures in the west in a way similar to line 612 of Odyssey XI.

2. σάρκα [καλ] ὁ[στ]ῆα 2617 fr.4 ii 8

There is some question as to whether there is sufficient space in the lettering on the papyrus to include the καί between the alpha and omicron, but there seems to be little alternative, particularly in view of the two precedents for the conjunction of σάρκας with ὀστέα in the Odyssey: thus ἔγκατά τε σάρκας τε καὶ ὀστέα μυελόεντα (Odyssey IX 293) and οὐ γὰρ ἔτι σάρκας τε καὶ ὀστέα ἔντες ἔχουσιν (Odyssey XI 219). σάρξ, however, is not common in the Homeric poems, and tends to occur in the plural, as in the lines quoted above. The only instance of the singular occurs in Odyssey XIX 450,451: πολλὸν δὲ δολήφυσε σάρκος ὀδόντι | λικριφὺς ἄψας, οὐδ' ὀστέον ἔκειτο φωτός. One could seek an epithet agreeing with σάρκα for the mutilated part of the line, but there is no evidence for an epithet regularly attached to σάρξ. In view of the emphasis placed upon the penetration of the arrow, by means of the repetition of δολά in lines 8 and 10, it seems more likely that the bones as well as the skin were

pierced. Hence I read σάρκα καὶ ὀστέα as an imitation of the Homeric σάρκας τε καὶ ὀστέα assuming that the poet employed the singular rather than the plural of σάρξ on account of the metrical requirements and that the scribe perhaps compressed the letter-spacing of the καί.

d) Noun-epithet groups in which one element must be supplemented.

In this category I have included noun-epithet groups of which one element is missing in the text of the papyri, but of which, for most cases, the traditional "formula" from the epic corpus gives a good indication of a probable supplement in the context. In some cases the association is restricted in such a way in the Homeric corpus that, given a similar context in Stesichorus, the probability of the same phrase being imitated by Stesichorus is higher. This section, however, is speculative in content, and its only value is that it incorporates all the epithets from the fragments that are preceded in epic. In each case the probability of Stesichorus' imitating the "formula" precisely is considered in as far as the context may be determined from what survives of the fragments. (It will be more convenient in this section to arrange the phrases by alphabetical order of the epithets rather than the nouns.)

1. ἀγκυλοτόξου 2619 fr.1 i 9

This epithet occurs only twice in the Homeric poems, in Iliad II 848 and X 428, in both cases qualifying Παύονες and thus suggesting the supplement Παύονες ἀγκυλοτόξου in this fragment²⁷. Elsewhere the epithet appears with Μήδεοι (Pindar, Pyth. I 78) and Κυμερῶν (Anacreon, PMG 504), neither of which would be particularly relevant to the Trojan theme.

2. ἀλιπόρφυρον 2619 fr.16 7

The word ἀλιπόρφυρος is not common in the Homeric poems, occurring only thrice, and appears to be associated with the colour of garments. The context of this fragment appears to involve Aphrodite, [K]υπρογενής (line 6), but there is no tangible clue as to the person or thing described as ἀλιπόρφυρον.

3. γαιήοχος 2619 fr.18 9

In the Homeric poems, γαιήοχος refers specifically to Poseidon, whether in conjunction with Ποσειδάων or with the periphrasis Ἐννοσίγαιος. In the Iliad there are six instances of the latter combination, one of the former and three in which the epithet occurs without any substantive. There is also one example of all three combined: ἀλλὰ Ποσειδάων γαιήοχος ἔννοσίγαιος (Iliad XIII 43). In the Odyssey there are six instances of the epithet with Ποσειδάων and one with Ἐννοσίγαιος. Ποσειδάων or Ἐννοσίγαιος are therefore possible conjectures in this fragment. Barrett, West and Führer join this fragment with 2803 fr.11 which contains the Doric form of Ἐννοσίγαιος, namely Ἐννοσίγας²⁸.

4. δ]υσώνυμος 2619 fr.19 4

An uncommon word, as is indicated by there being only three instances of it in the Homeric poems, without any perceptible fixed associations. δυσώνυμος might from the context here refer to Paris (cf. δύσπαρις in Iliad XIII 760). If this were the case, the application of the epithet may be original.

5. ἐπασσύτεροι 2803 fr.7 7

The occurrences of this epithet in Greek are almost totally confined to epic, nor are they frequent there. One formulaic precedent

might be recognised in πάντας ἐπασσύτερους πέλασε χθονὶ πουλυβοτείρῃ (Iliad XII 194, XVI 418, VIII 277). The context of the fragment itself sheds no light as to what the associated noun might have been, but since the fragments of 2803 are related to the Trojan cycle, we might consider a possible parallel from Iliad I. Between lines 5 and 7 of this fragment a later hand has inserted a remark or gloss :]οβρυμ[followed by]τοξοτ.[.. , possibly referring to ὁ τοξ in line 5. The apparent allusion to an "archer" is reminiscent in this context of the situation at the beginning of Iliad I where Apollo ἀργυρότοξος in his anger (cf. the possible supplement κεχολῶμενος in line 4 of this fragment) spreads fatal disease through the Greek camp by means of a κακὸν βέλος. The epithet used to describe the mass of people who succumbed to death as a result is ἐπασσύτερος:

... τοῦτο δ' Ἀπόλλων
εὐξαμένου ἤκουσεν, ἐπεὶ μάλα οἱ φύλος ἦεν
ἦκε δ' ἐπ' Ἀργείοισι κακὸν βέλος οἳ δὲ νῦν λαοῦ
θνητῶσιν ἐπασσύτεροι, ... (Iliad I 380 ff.)

The other word identifiable in the marginal note is ὀβρυμο-.

In its simple form this epithet is applied to Ares (Iliad V 845), Achilles (XIX 408) and Hector (VIII 473), but not to Apollo. In the Homeric Hymn VIII, Ares is called ὀβρυμόθυμος (line 2), but he is traditionally associated with the spear not the bow.

6. εὐκτιμε[ν-

2619 fr. 32 7

εὐκτιμένον is consistently associated with πολέεθρον, 7 times in the Iliad and 3 times in the Odyssey. Moreover, there is an interesting precedent for the Stesichorean expression in :

Ταλίου { ἐκπέρσαντες } εὐκτιμένον πολέεθρον (Iliad IV 33 = VIII 288, XXI 433). We shall see in the later discussion of κλεῖνον in line 6 of this fragment that Stesichorus has taken the familiar line from the epic

tradition, and while retaining some of the elements has introduced others that are foreign to the Homeric poems, such as κλεοννός and even Τροῖας instead of Ἰλίου, to break the expected formular pattern²⁹.

7. εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς 2619 fr. 1 i 16

The frequency of this "formula" in the Homeric poems (and in addition in Hesiod and the Hymns) makes the supplement virtually certain. εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς is in control of the fate of Troy, as is expressed in the words of Achilles: μάλα γάρ ἐθεν εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς | χεῖρα ἔην ὑπερέσχε (Iliad IX 419, 420).

8. εὐτροχ[2619 fr. 41 1

The usage of this epithet is obviously restricted. Its regular association with ἄρμα or ἄμαξα in the epic tradition would suggest such a context in this fragment.

9. [] ποκέλευθον 2617 fr. 3 5

This epithet occurs only in the Homeric poems, and its application is severely limited, namely to Patroclus in Iliad XVI 126, 584 and 839. The subject-matter of the Geryonēis would suggest that Stesichorus did not imitate this specialised use of the epithet, but in fact made a novel application of it.

10. μενεχάρμα[ι 2359 fr. 1 ii 9

Five of the six instances of this epithet in the Homeric poems are in the singular, referring to specific individuals. There is, however, a single case of Ἀτῶλοῖ μενεχάρμα (Iliad IX 529) which occurs within the context of the war between the Ἀτῶλοῦ and Κουρῆτες, in which Meleager fought. The context of the Stesichorean fragment appears to be related to the legend of the Calydonian Boar hunt³⁰, but whether the

poet followed the particular version of Iliad IX , which has been adapted to suit the situation of Achilles' refusal to fight, cannot be determined³¹.

11. πευ]καλῖμο[- 2617 fr.46 11 5,6

The epithet πευκαλῖμος has survived only in epic sources, there being 4 instances in the Iliad, all in the dative plural qualifying φρεσῖ. This limitation of scope suggests, therefore, that the conjectured masculine πευκαλῖμοισιν does not belong to an imitation of the Homeric "formula" φρεσὶ πευκαλῖμηισι.

12. κύμα πολυ[φλοῦσβου θαλάσσης 2619 fr.25 5,6

This "formula" is a combination of categories a) and b) discussed above. In terms of category b), noun+genitive of possession, the unit πολυφλοῦσβουο θαλάσσης occurs with κύμα or κύματα in Iliad II 209, VI 247, XIII 798 and also in the Hymn to Aphrodite VI 4 and the Kypria fr. VII 8 (Allen). κύμα combined with θαλάσσης unqualified is more common, as in Iliad IV 422, X 574, XV 381, XVIII 66, 145, XXIV 96; Odyssey XIII 88. On the other hand, πολυφλοῦσβουο θαλάσσης occurs most frequently with παρὰ θῦνα (Iliad I 34 etc.).

In terms of category a), noun+epithet groups πολυφλοῦσβος is confined to the genitive singular, long form, qualifying θάλασσα 6 times in the Iliad, 2 in the Odyssey, together with 2 instances in the Hymns and one in Hesiod. Hence the supplement of θαλάσσης is assumed to be correct. I note therefore that Stesichorus had again probably repeated a "formula" from the epic corpus, although, as far as one can tell, he has chosen a less common grouping.

13. πον]τοπόρου[- 2619 fr.25 2

From its sense alone, this epithet must refer to a ship, and

indeed in the epic corpus its application is restricted to ναῦς. In the Odyssey there are 4 examples of the "formula" in the nominative singular, 2 in the genitive, and in the Iliad 2 examples of the genitive and 11 of the dative plural : ἐν ποντοπόροισι νέεσσι (III 46 etc.) and παρὰ νήυσιν ... ποντοπόροισιν (VII 72 etc.). If Stesichorus used a word other than ναῦς for "ship", we have no evidence of it.

14. ῥηξήνορα 2619 fr.1 i 21

This attribute is applied solely to the hero Achilles, 4 times in the Iliad, once in the Odyssey and once in the Theogony: καὶ μετ' Ἀχιλλῆα ῥηξήνορα θυμολέοντα (Iliad VII 228 = Theogony 1007). In the context of a debate prior to the Trojans' acceptance of the wooden horse into their city, column i of this fragment preserves part of a speech of encouragement from one of the Trojans who is suspicious of the horse and who advocates reliance on their fighting strength. ῥηξήνορα in this context could refer to the dead Achilles as no longer being a threat to the Trojan victory. Alternatively, the epithet may have been applied to one of the Trojan heroes who has subsumed the Homeric attribute of Achilles.

15. στυγε[ρ]οῦ | θανάτου]ο 2617 fr.4 ii 1,2

The supplement in this line is derived from an interlinear note made by a later hand. The combination of στυγερός and θάνατος occurs only twice in the Odyssey:

μνηστήρων στυγερόν θάνατον καὶ κῆρ' ἐνέπουσα (Odyssey XXIV 414) and πάντες μὲν στυγεροὶ θάνατοι δειλοῦσι βροτοῖσι (Odyssey XII 341).

Thus we may say that the association is "formulaic", but we find that στυγερός more often qualifies substantives, such as σκότος, which imply death, or others such as νοῦσος, ἄτη, γῆρας, the precursors of death.

In the Iliad κακός and μέλας are the most common epithets of death. In this fragment, therefore, it can be seen that Stesichorus has adopted a word-group whose elements are subject to an indirect bond of mutual expectancy, in as much as the particular relationship of στυγερός and θάνατος is infrequent in the epic poetry that has survived.

16. τῖ ἐρπικερα [υν- 2617 fr.49 2

If the poet here follows the traditional "formula", one would expect that the epithet is applied to Zeus, as is the case without exception in the epic corpus: Ζεὺς τερπικέραυνος or Διὺ τερπικεραῦνον occurs 8 times in the Iliad, 7 times in the Odyssey, 5 times in the Hymns and 3 times in the Hesiodic corpus.

17. ὑπερθύμοι 2359 fr.1 ii 5

This epithet in the plural is regularly applied to Trojans in the Iliad (7 times) and to θεράποντες in the Odyssey (3 times). In the context of the Calydonian Boar Hunt, the Trojan association is highly unlikely, nor is the single instance of its application to the Lapiths (Iliad XII 128) a possible precedent. The poet has most probably transferred the epithet from its customary position with the Trojans to some other group deserving of the title. It is less likely that the epithet was applied to θεράποντες in the context of a list of heroes.

e) Miscellaneous word-groups.

1. ἀλλ' ἄγε δῆ 2619 fr.1 i 7

2. τοῦ δ' ἀπὸ κρατὸς 2617 fr.4 i 14,15

3. ἐπὶ χθόνα 2617 fr.1 3

4. κατ' αἴσαν 2619 fr.13 10

There is little to note regarding these "formulae" other than that their Homeric origin was probably recognised by the poet's audience on account of their frequent appearance in the epic poems. Number 2 is particularly close to Iliad XVI 793 in context : τοῦ δ' ἀπὸ μὲν κρατὸς κυνέην βάλε φοῦβος Ἀπόλλων . Noteworthy is the parallel use of the article as a relative of connection. Number 4 occurs 4 times in the Iliad, but κατὰ μοῦραν appears to be the more frequent usage (21 times in the Odyssey and 9 times in the Iliad).

f) Word-groups occurring only once in the Homeric corpus.

By Hainsworth's definition a phrase occurring only once in the epic poems does not constitute a "formula", and yet the adaptation of such a phrase by later poets such as Stesichorus would indicate that the said phrase was constructed of "formulaic" elements; that is, of words and groups of words that were suitable for incorporation into "formulae", but were never required. Alternatively, such a phrase may have occurred more than once in the epic corpus as a whole, but other instances of it have been lost. The following four word-groups from Stesichorus' poems occur only once each in the Homeric corpus.

1. αἶματι πορφύρεω 2617 fr.4 ii 12

In the single instance in which πορφύρεος is applied to αἶμα (Iliad XVII 360-361) we find a description of the earth stained with the purple-dark blood around the body of Patroclus, over whom a fierce battle has been raging with Ajax the foremost defender of the corpse. Although the epithet πορφύρεος is more frequently employed to describe articles of clothing or blankets of such a colour, or else the sea (which was the original source of the dye), there exists an interesting extension of the

idea of darkness in ἔλλαβε πορφύρεος θάνατος καὶ μοῦρα κραταΐη (Iliad XVI 334 = V 83). Epithets conveying the sense of the darkness of blood are generally μέλαν (Iliad XVI 529), κελαινόν (Iliad I 303, VII 329) and κελαινεφές (Iliad XVI 667). Thus, Stesichorus has adopted a less common association, preceded only once as far as we can tell, which may incorporate the sense of the profusion of the blood pouring from the monster's wound as well as its colour on account of the common use of πορφύρεος with πόντος.

The verb employed by Stesichorus in this fragment, μιαύνω, often occurs in the Homeric poems in the context of both αἷμα and κονίη. For example, the helmet of Patroclus lies on the ground, its plumes befouled with blood and dust: μιάνθησαν δὲ ἔθειραι αἵματι καὶ κονίησιν (Iliad XVI 795,6). In Stesichorus' description, however, the θῶραξ is still worn by Geryon, so that the formulaic "with blood and dust" would be inappropriate.

2. ἵπ[ο]πόκομος τρυφάλει' 2617 fr.4 i 14

The phrase ἵπποκόμων τρυφαλείων appears once in the Homeric poems, in a battle-scene in which the noise of clashing shields and plumed helmets reaches the heavens: αὐτὴ δ' οὐρανὸν ἔκε | βαλλομένων σακέων τε καὶ ἵπποκόμων τρυφαλείων (Iliad XII 38,39). More frequently associated with κόρυς and φάλος (Iliad XIII 132 and XVI 216), ἵπποπόκομος may without difficulty be extended to qualify τρυφάλεια, itself a compound of φάλος. τρυφάλεια in the epic corpus, for reasons probably metrical, tends to occur without an epithet.

3. φύλοπις ἀργαλέα 2617 fr.17 4

A strictly epic word, φύλοπις occurs only once qualified by the epithet ἀργαλέα (Iliad XI 278), whereas its epithet αἰνή, regularly found in the position at the verse-end, is repeated not only in the

Homeric corpus, but also in Hesiod's Works and Days 161, Shield 200 and in the Hymn to Demeter 267. The list of nouns qualified by ἀργαλέος in Homer is lengthy, but its association with, for example, ἔρως or ὑσμίνη in the Iliad, and in particular with the sound-word στόνος, may account for the transference of the epithet to φύλοπς, the "din of battle". Stesichorus has again chosen an apparently infrequent noun-epithet combination.

The fragment belongs to a context of full-scale warfare, as not only this line, but also μάχαι τ' ἀνδρο[κτασίαι (line 6) suggests. Whether part of the Geryoneis incorporated another ergon of Heracles, in which he participated in some great battle, or whether these lines fall in a simile, we cannot tell. Their relation to the encounter between Heracles and Geryon himself is not entirely obvious.

In 2617 fr. 18 3 the papyrus breaks after the alpha in φ[υλοπινα[. Did ἀργαλέα or αἶνά follow? Brief though the fragment may be, the context again appears to be one of a battle on a large scale, with individuals (plural) perishing,]ολωλοτε[ς (line 4), possibly with helmets or bodies rolling in the dust,]ν κονύα[ς (line 1), in a scene perhaps comparable with one of the battle-scenes in Iliad XVII. According to the structure of the Geryoneis proposed by Barrett and Page³², the major part of the poem was concerned with the encounter between Heracles and Geryon. Thus, assuming that fragments 17 and 18 do belong to the same poem as the identifiable fragments of 2617, I conclude that these elements of a battle-scene belong to a simile or digression.

4. δὲ ' Ἰκαενοῦτο περᾶσας PMG 185 2 (SLG 17 3)

Apart from one example of δὲ ' Ἰκαενοῦτο περήσῃς (Odyssey X 508), one can cite several indirect parallels for this phrase such as

περῶ with πόντος (Iliad II 617, Odyssey XXIV 118) or else διαβὰς πόντον Ὀκεανοῦ (Hesiod, Theogony 292). The other sphere in which one finds the verb περῶ with the preposition διὰ is that of a missile piercing the breast of a hero (Hymn to Mercury 45) or his forehead (Iliad IV 502): ἥ δ' ἐτέρου διὰ κροτάφοιο πέρησεν / αἶχμή χαλκεή. Accordingly, although the phrase used by Stesichorus has but one extant precedent, it is by no means unusual in its structure or associations. It is noteworthy, however, that the phrase occurs in anon-Homeric context and amid a series of distinctively modified Homeric phrases³³.

Three other "formulaic" phrases, δι' αἰθέρο[ς ἀτ]ρυγέτας 2360 fr.1 i 4, δαζ|μονος ἄλσα 2617 fr.4 8,9 and πυκιν[άς]..φρ[έ]νας 2619 fr. 1 i 19 also have single precedents in the Homeric corpus, but will be noted only here and dealt with in greater detail in chapter V on account of their relationship to phrases in Hesiod and the Hymns.

From the collection in this chapter of word-groups that have recognisable precedents in the Iliad and Odyssey I conclude that Stesichorus could and did employ regular "formulaic" expressions drawn from the monumental epics. I note, however, that not all of the examples cited are particularly frequent, or the most common expression that the poet could have selected.

In category a), of the eleven noun+epithet "formulae", only seven appear to be highly frequent in their occurrence. Number 3, δέπας χρύσεον, is original in its usage, although the traditional association of χρύσεον and δέπας plays an important part in the new context. Number 5 is likewise an example of a "formula" that in the Stesichorean context has a significance additional to that of its usage in epic, through the

poet's play on words. Number 6 occurs only twice in the Homeric poems, but by Hainsworth's definition of a "formula", may be considered as an imitation thereof. In number 11 the association of εὐρεῖα and χθών has been established firmly enough for the nominative case to confirm that the Stesichorean phrase in the accusative must rely on the Homeric precedent. Of the other seven word-groups, numbers 7 and 10 are demonstrably less frequent in their appearance in the Homeric poems than other "formulae" involving one or other of their particular components.

In category b), of the four instances cited, number 2 is rare in the Homeric poems and number 3 appears to follow the Hesiodic tradition. In category c) neither example is overtly frequent, as far as our evidence goes. In category d), of the 17 supplemented phrases with epic parallels, 8 are rare. In category e), number 4 is an example of the poet's choice of an alternative phrase that was less common.

The additional 7 examples of Homeric phrases that occur only once in the Homeric poems further support the view that Stesichorus apparently preferred to copy or imitate "formulae" of a less stereotyped nature.

Footnotes to chapter III

1 J.B.Hainsworth, Homer, Greece and Rome Surveys 3 (Oxford, 1969) p.19.

2 M. Parry, L'epithète traditionnelle chez Homère (Paris, 1928) p. 16, in which he gave the following definition:

Dans la diction des poèmes aèdiques la formule peut être définie comme une expression qui est régulièrement employée, dans les mêmes conditions métriques, pour exprimer une certaine idée essentielle.

3 M.N.Nagler, "Towards a Generative View of the Oral Formula," TAPhA 98 (1967) pp. 269-311 and also in Spontaneity and Tradition: a study

in the oral art of Homer (Berkeley, 1974).

- 4 Nagler, art.cit., p. 311.
- 5 Hainsworth, "Structure and content in epic formulae; the question of unique expression," CQ 14 (1964) p. 155.
- 6 Hainsworth, The Flexibility of the Homeric Formulae (Oxford, 1968) p. 35 ff. and p. 42.
- 7 For example in the work of E.G.O'Neill Jr., "The localisation of metrical word-types in the Greek Hexameter," YCLS 8 (1942) pp. 103-178, or more recently in that of J.A.Russo, "The Structural Formulae in Homeric Verse," YCLS 20 (1960) pp. 219-240.
- 8 In this chapter, by Homeric poems we mean the Iliad and the Odyssey. Although I shall take separate account of the phrases related to parallels from Hesiod and the Hymns and the so-called epic Cycle, in chapter V, I shall mention where necessary instances of phrases that occur in both Homeric and non-Homeric epic sources.
- 9 Note that variation in inflection, word order etc., is regarded as modification which does not, however, alter the basic bond of mutual expectancy.
- 10 D.L.Page, "Stesichorus' Geryoneis," JHS 93 (1973) p. 147.
- 11 On καίδας τε φύλους see number 7 below.
- 12 Cf. N.R. Collinge, "Mycenaean di-pa and δέπας," BICS 4 (1954) pp. 55-59.
- 13 Athenaeus' Deipnosophistae XI 469e-470d. The fragments mentioned in the following discussion on the Sun's cup all derive from Athenaeus' collection of examples of a cup called a Ἡρακλεῖον.
- 14 Athenaeus, XI 469d refers to καίζοντες οἱ ποιηταὶ
- 15 The fragment of Aeschylus appears in Athenaeus XI 469f.
- 16 Pherecydes, as quoted by Athenaeus, XI 470c and Apollodorus Bibl. II 5 10 both refer to a χρύσειον δέπας, ἐν ᾧ τὸν Ἕκτορα δειπνέσας.
- 17 Cf. the discussion by M. Robertson in "Geryoneis : Stesichorus and the Vase-painters," CR 19 (1969) p. 208 ff. .
- 18 Cf. Hymn to Hermes 560.
- 19 On φύλου πατ[ρ]ὸς υἱόν see page 109, chapter IV.
- 20 Barrett in Page's SLG p. 26.
- 21 See page 122 chapter IV.

- 22 Theogony 316; Shield 66, 110, 150, 163, 320, 371, 392, 413, 424, 447.
- 23 See page 267 ff., chapter VIII.
- 24 Page, art.cit., p. 146 ff. .
- 25 West, "Stesichorus redivivus," ZPE 4 (1969) p. 135.
- 26 See page 115, chapter IV.
- 27 E. Lobel, P.Oxy.vol.XXXII, p. 37.
- 28 See West and Führer in ZPE 7 (1971) pp. 262-264 and pp. 265-266 respectively. Page argues against the join in PCPhS 19 (1973) p. 51ff.
- 29 See page 106 f., chapter IV.
- 30 Lobel, P.Oxy. vol. XXIII, p.11, suggested that at least the first column of 2359 might belong to the Suotherae of Stesichorus. For a full discussion of the fragment see 215 ff., chapter VI.
- 31 Cf. M.M.Wilcock, "Mythological paradeigmata in the Iliad," CQ 14 (1964) pp. 147-153.
- 32 See Page's article "Stesichorus' Geryoneis," JHS 93 (1973) p. 148 f..
- 33 See page 110 ff. and 119 ff., chapter IV.

Chapter IV Stesichorus' modification of "formulae" from Homer.

This chapter examines word-groups in Stesichorus that have the outward appearance of Homeric "formulae", but are in fact new combinations, unprecedented in the epic tradition as far as the extant corpus indicates. The five subdivisions into which these word-groups may be categorised are as follows:

- I Noun+epithet : groups that comprise new combinations of individual elements from Homeric "formulae".
- II Noun+epithet : groups of which one element is non-Homeric, thus providing evidence for new associations of elements from "formulaic" contexts in the epic tradition with elements from outside the epic tradition.
- III Longer units that constitute expansions of simple noun+epithet groups.
- IV Noun+epithet : groups in which both elements are foreign to the epic tradition.

As in the previous chapter, the basic unit with which we are dealing consists of a noun together with its associated epithet, and also of a noun with accompanying genitive of possession, since such word-groups show the highest number of individual connections with the "formulae" of epic. Again, we are primarily concerned with the precedents observable in the Iliad and Odyssey, although parallels from the Hymns and the Hesiodic corpus are taken into account where relevant.

I New combinations of traditional elements

a) Non-supplemented

1. $\rho\alpha\delta\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\kappa\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma$ PMG 243

The epithet $\rho\alpha\delta\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\varsigma$ is not common in the epic corpus, occurring once in Homer, to describe a whip (Iliad XXIII 538), once in Hesiod (Theogony 195) and once in the Hymns (Hymn to Demeter 183), both of

these instances describing feet. The accusative singular ἄκοντα regularly attracts the epithet ὀξύ, while the plural sometimes appears with ἐύξεστοι and θαμέες, but more frequently without an epithet. The combination ῥαδινοὺς ἄκοντας is a unique "formula", if one grants that the epithet has formulary potential on account of its association with πόδες on two occasions.

Unfortunately the significance of the epithet is lost, other than indicating the "slender" appearance of the spears, since the scholiast who gives this example in his list of the occurrences of ῥαδινώδης, does not include the context of the Stesichorean phrase¹. Ibycus, however, according to the scholiast, described οἱ τὸν οὐρανὸν βασταζόντες κλώνες as ῥαδινοὶ instead of εὐμεγέθεις. This, therefore, is one of several instances in which the same unusual epithet is attested for both poets, although in this case their application of the epithet is markedly different. Stesichorus' striking use of ῥαδινώδης may have held the same implications of size that one finds in Ibycus' use, but the emphasis on the tall, slender nature of the warriors' spears is more likely when one notes that in Theocritus the same epithet describes the cypress tree: tall, dark, slender and, indeed, spear-like². Stesichorus' association of ῥαδινώδης with spears may have influenced his Sicilian descendant in the choice of this epithet highly appropriate for the cypress tree.

2. ἄριστον ἀοιδόν

2618 fr.1 i 4

Examples of the use of epithets with ἀοιδός come from the Odyssey for the most part³ and we note that there the most prominent attribute of the bard is to be θεῖος (10 times), with less common alternatives περικλυτός and ἐρύηρος. ἄριστος, on the other hand, is used predominantly as a substantive (ἄνθρωπος/ἄνηρ being omitted), rather than

as an epithet, and hence the combination of ἀριστος with δοῦδος is not preceded even by a parallel of a different noun qualified by ἀριστος. Although it is easy to assume that ἀριστος is more or less the equivalent of θεῖος, both epithets reflecting the singer's excellence, the latter also has connotations of divine associations, particularly in view of the belief that the poet was divinely inspired. The mortal nature of the bards is more apparent in the Hesiodic corpus, which fact is perhaps indicative of a slightly different attitude to the substance of poets. Inspiration may come from the Muses and Apollo (cf. Hesiod, Theogony 95 and fr. 305 2, M.&W.), but the bards themselves are mortal. ἀριστος is distinctly "mortal" in its associations, and hence it may be that Stesichorus in his choice of this particular epithet wishes to stress the fact that the bard is a man, granting him responsibility for his own excellence rather than assuming total reliance upon divine inspiration⁴.

3. ἐρῶντες Ἀχαιοί 2359 fr.1 ii 3,4

ἐρῶντες is an epithet found almost exclusively in conjunction with ἐταῖροι, the sole exception being the word-group ἐρῶντων δοῦδων which occurs thrice in the Odyssey⁵. The exact meaning of ἐρῶντες is uncertain, although it is generally assumed that it derives from ἀραρίσκω to "fix", with ἐρ-, an intensifying prefix, and hence, in the context of ἐταῖροι, ἐρῶντες would be sensibly translated "steadfast" or "faithful". Would such connotations be meaningful in the context of Ἀχαιοί in this passage from the Suotherae?⁶ The Ἀχαιοί, when they do receive an epithet in the Iliad, are qualified most frequently by εὐκνήμιδες or καρηνομόωντες. The Ἀχαιοί in this passage, however, are more likely to be the people from the area Achaea, in the northern Peloponnese, since the list of participants in the Boar Hunt appears to be a regional one.

Since each of the regional groups listed receives an epithet appropriate to renowned warriors, namely αἰχματαί, μενεχάρμαι and ὑπερθύμοι, I would suggest that ἐρύηρες in this passage has the meaning of "steadfast" or "determined in battle". In view of the frequent association of ἑὺκνήμιδες and καρηκομόωντες with Ἀχαιοί (=Greeks), the word-group ἐρύηρες Ἀχαιοί would have doubtless struck the audience as unusual.

4. π[αγχρ]ύσεια δώματ' 2617 fr.6 (a) 3,4

The obvious model for the entire phrase παγχρύσεια δώματ' ἔχοντι must be Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχουσι/ἔχοντες (10 times in the Iliad, 3 in the Odyssey, 5 in the Hymns) and one is reminded particularly of those instances that refer to the Muses, for example in Iliad II 484 and XI 218. Naturally the halls of the Hesperides, situated in the far west, will require a descriptive epithet other than Ὀλύμπια. παγχρύσεια appears to be in unique combination with δώματα, the common groupings being δώματα κλυτὰ or δώματα καλά, or else a phrase such as δώματ' Ὀδυσσεύος θεοῦο or δώματα Κίρκης in which the owner of the house is indicated. παγχρύσεος occurs infrequently in the epic poems; there is but one example in the Iliad, at II 448 θύσανοι παγχρύσειοι, and none in the Odyssey. In the Hymns one finds one instance of the epithet qualifying τόξα (XXVII 5) and one qualifying ἄρμα (IX 4). In fact, compounds with παν as first element are not common in the epic corpus. Thus the association of παγχρύσεια and δώματα is new, as far as the surviving evidence shows.

The association of gold with the Hesperides is hardly surprising since, from Hesiod onwards, they are the guardians of the golden apples that were presented as a wedding-gift to Zeus and Hera:

Ἑσπερίδας θ', ἧς μήλα κέρην κλυτοῦ Ὀκεανοῦο

χρύσεια καλά μέλουσι φέροντά τε δένδρεα καρπόν. (Theogony 215,216).

In later tradition, possibly beginning with Peisander⁸, and certainly adopted by the Hellenistic poets such as Apollonius of Rhodes, there is also a guardian snake watching over the apples... This snake must surely be the result of a conflation of the tradition of the Hesperides' duty with that of the snake in the Theogony 335, who guards παγχρύσεα μήλα of no specific origin. There is no evidence in the extant fragments of Stesichorus of any guardian snake. What may be original, however, is the poet's transference of the expected epithet that qualifies the apples of the Hesperides to their abode, their παγχρύσεα δώματα.

5. ξ] ανθα δ' 'Ελένα

2619 fr.14 5

As an attribute of a person in the Iliad and Odyssey ξανθός belongs primarily to Menelaus (16 times in the Iliad and 15 in the Odyssey) while it is used in the feminine of Demeter (twice), of Agameme (once) and of Ariadne (once, in the Theogony). The epithets of Helen tend to be rather uninformative about her physical appearance: 'Αργείη gives her place of origin; καλλιπάρης and καλλίκομος/ῆύκομος indicate that she has beautiful cheeks and hair, without giving any frame of reference from which one might determine what aspect of these was considered beautiful. One further epithet, τανύπεπλος, is likewise no more distinctive, since most of the Argive or Trojan women of noble origin presumably wore long flowing robes⁹. The epithet ξανθός denotes a reddish-brown colour when describing hair¹⁰, but without more evidence of Stesichorus' depiction of Helen, I cannot claim that his use of this epithet is significantly more specific than the Homeric ones. Thus, although non-Homeric, the application of ξανθός to Helen is not surprising, but effective enough that later poets such as Sappho and Ibycus also called Helen ξανθή

rather than repeating one from the epic corpus¹¹. It is possible that the firm association of ξανθός with Menelaus in the Homeric poems is significant; Stesichorus probably intended the relationship between Menelaus and Helen to be accentuated (perhaps ironically) by this transference of the epithet regularly expected with Menelaus to his misguided wife.

The context of this fragment seems to be a scene in Troy¹², in which some reference is made to the ultimate destruction of Troy by fire, whether in prospect, or immediately before the event. This being the case, the presence of Helen shows that the Iliou Persis and the Palinode were separate poems and that in the former Helen was depicted in fairly traditional manner¹³. It is possible, however, that even in the Iliou Persis, the poet was perhaps consciously striving to move away from the firmly established vision of Helen by his introduction of the epithet ξανθός in his vision of her.

6. κύρκον ταυσόπτ[ερον] 2619 fr.1 ii 20

Of the four occasions on which a κύρκος appears in the Iliad and Odyssey, in two the bird is described as ἐλαφρότατον πετεηνῶν, "the swiftest of winged creatures" (Iliad XXII 109 and Odyssey XIII 87). ταυσόπτερος is applied to birds in general in Odyssey V 56 and to thrushes specifically in Odyssey XXII 468, but not to the κύρκος. The κύρκος apparently belongs to the species of ῥοῖξ¹⁴, and we note that Hesiod calls the ῥοῖξ: ὠκυέτης ῥοῖξ, ταυσόπτερος ὄρνις (Works and Days 212). The species is in general remarkable for its long slender wings and for its speed, and hence it is not an unexpected application of the epithet ταυσόπτερος that we find in Stesichorus, although it is unprecedented in the Homeric epics.

7. ἡπιόδωρος Κύπριδος PMG 223 2

The epithet ἡπιόδωρος occurs only once in the Homeric poems:

ἔνθα οἱ ἡπιόδωρος ἐναντίη ἦλυθε μήτηρ (Iliad VI 251) referring to Hecuba. Otherwise, it makes one later appearance in Oppian¹⁵.

Κύπρις, as a periphrasis for Aphrodite, is not common in the Homeric poems, there being only 5 instances of it in the fifth book of the Iliad, all without epithets. The only instance to occur in the Hymns falls in the second line of the Hymn to Aphrodite, as one of the titles of the goddess. The name Ἀφροδίτη itself is frequently accompanied by the epithets φιλομειδής, πολυχρῆσος or Διὸς θυγάτηρ in this Hymn. If one considers the formation ἡπιό-δωρος to be a close parallel to the equally rare compound ἀγλαό-δωρος, which qualifies Demeter in the Hymn to that goddess (lines 54,192,492) together with its association with Hecuba. in the Iliad, one notices that Stesichorus' use of this particular epithet has connotations not present in any of the other epithets commonly found in descriptions of the goddess of love. The epithet is suggestive of the image of a gentle, all-giving mother, which appears to be an entirely new attitude towards Aphrodite.

8. περικαλλέ[α ν]ᾶσον 2617 fr.6 (a) 2

The epithet περικαλλής, referring to overall beauty, is applied in a variety of spheres in the Homeric poems: to inanimate objects δῶρος, κῆθαρις, πέπλος and βωμός; to women, as for example in Iliad V 398 or XVI 85. A geographical context of the sea presents itself in Ἡέλιος δ' ἀνόρουσε, λιπὼν περικαλλέα λῆμνην (Odyssey III 1). Since among the epithets qualifying νῆσος we find ἐϋκτιμένη, δενδρήεσσα, ὕληεσσα and ἐρήμη, but not περικαλλής, I assume that the poet has created yet another new word-group of a "formulaic" nature, possibly hinted at by the Homeric

περικαλλέα λύμνην.

The περικαλλέα νᾶσον belongs to the gods; it is an island beyond the limits of human habitation, a magical isle. On this island dwell the Hesperides, guardians of the golden apples and their abode, according to Stesichorus, is all-golden on this account and presumably because gold is associated with the possessions of the gods (cf. χρύσειον δέπας, Iliad VI 220 and XXIV 101). It appears that, from the earlier sources available to Stesichorus, principally Hesiod, the poet absorbed the notion that the Hesperides lived beyond Ocean, but since the poet in this fragment gives a more detailed description of the island, I assume that he, or some not too distant predecessor, elaborated upon the elusive abode "beyond Ocean" to create a distinctive island, of which we catch a glimpse in this fragment.¹⁶

The only parallel instance of this word-group, περικαλλέα νᾶσον, is to be found in Theognis, 1277: τῆμος Ἐρως πολυπῶν Κύπρον, περικαλλέα νῆσον, in which the poet refers to Cyprus as such. Is the parallel entirely coincidental, or has Theognis derived the phrase directly from Stesichorus? In an article on poetry in Sicily in the Archaic period, A. Garzya reconsiders the theory that Theognis' Megara was in fact Megara Hyblaea in eastern Sicily¹⁷, and if this were the case, then linguistic reminiscences of Stesichorean expressions in Theognis would be somewhat easier to explain.

9. πῦ κρὸν ὀλεθρον

2617 fr.4 i 11

The Homeric epithets associated with ὀλεθρος are λυγρός and αἰκνός, while πικρός is applied almost exclusively to ὀϊστός (10 times in the Iliad, 1 in the Odyssey) in its primary sense of physical "piercing". In Stesichorus' manipulation of the regularly associated words one can

observe a transition from the physical to the metaphorical sense of *πικρός*, as it is found in later authors, namely as "causing bitterness"¹⁸. As the *ὄλεθρος* of Geryon contemplated by the hero will in fact be perpetrated by an arrow, the choice of the epithet *πικρός* cleverly foreshadows this and is consequently highly appropriate; it is both piercing and ultimately grief-causing. A further connotation inherent in *πικρός* is the bitterness of the poisonous gall of the Hydra in which the arrow had been dipped. That the arrows of Heracles were indeed smeared with this poison is indicated in the elaborate description of the arrow as *πεφορυγμένος αἵματι [...] τε χολᾷ, ὀλεσάνορος αἰολοδε[ίρ]ου ὀδύναισιν ὕδρας*, in the second column of fragment 4, lines 5,6¹⁹. The transference of the epithet *πικρός* as seen in this fragment is highly significant in that it demonstrates clearly the poet's intentional selection of an epithet, possibly hackneyed in its traditional association with *ὄϊστός*, in an imaginative, effective manner that relies on the audience's awareness of its original usage in epic.

10. χρυσόπτερε παρθένε 2506 fr. 26 (PMG 193)

In the epic tradition the sole recipient of the epithet *χρυσόπτερος*, appears to be Iris, in *Iliad* VIII 398, XI 185 and in the *Hymn to Demeter* 314. One finds *παρθένος* little used, its epithets being as follows: *αἰδοῦνη*, once in the *Iliad* and twice in the *Hymns*; *ἄδυής* twice in the *Odyssey* and twice in the *Hymns*.

From the context of Chamaeleon's remark on the two *Palinodes*, one would suppose that this vocative address was an introductory invocation, parallel to *θεᾷ φιλόμολπε*. The latter is undoubtedly a reference to the Muse, in accordance with normal epic practice of calling upon the goddess of inspiration. We have evidence from the citations

that elsewhere Stesichorus invoked the Muse by various titles. According to Atheneaeus (V 180e = PMG 250) Stesichorus called the Muse ἀρχεσόμολπον, presumably in an invocation and doubtless derived from the tradition of addressing the Muse at the beginning of a song (although equally possible is the meaning "queen of song"). Moreover, Eustathius, on the first line of the Iliad (9 43) remarks that not only Hesiod, but also Stesichorus began his poems with an invocation to the Muse: δεῦρ' ἄγε Καλλιόπεια λύγεια (PMG 240). Stesichorus was apparently aware of the tradition found in Hesiod, but not in Homer, that distinguished Calliope as chief of the Muses and patroness of epic²⁰. None of the fragments from the papyri, however, contain what may be identified as an exordium of a poem, but there is reason to believe that the lines of Aristophanes' Peace called Stesichorean by the scholiast, namely 775 ff., were composed as a parody of the invocation from one of Stesichorus' poems, thought by some to be the Oresteia²¹:

Μοῦσα σὺ μὲν πολέμους ἀπώσαμένα μετ' ἐμοῦ
κλείουσα θεῶν τε γάμους ἀνδρῶν τε δαΐτας
καὶ θαλάσας μακάρων (as arranged in PMG 210).

It is noteworthy that there is no decorative epithet such as λύγεια or φιλόμολπος, but the lines do attest the poet's movement away from the traditional invocation of the Homeric poems. The rejection of one topic for another more appropriate one is more akin to personal lyric than to the epic tradition²².

Thus, in view of the above-cited Stesichorean invocations, it would not be surprising for Chamaeleon to have identified the two Palinodes by their invocatory first lines, nor that there were in these lines un-Homeric features. If χρυσόπτερε παρθένε was intended as a periphrasis for the Muse of Stesichorus' poetry, then we have a new and unusual vision of the Muse. In the Homeric tradition epithets are rarely applied to the

Muses. Their Olympian domicile is indicated in 'Ολυμπία δώματ' ἔχοντες, or else their kinship with Zeus: in κούρας Διὸς ἀγυλόχοιο. Μοῦσα λύγεια occurs once in the Odyssey and three times in the Hymns, while a further description of their vocal talents appears in the phrase Μοῦσαι δ' ἐννέα πᾶσαι ἀμειβόμεναι ὀπλὶ καλῇ (Odyssey XXIV 60 and Hymn to Apollo 189). In the Hesiodic tradition the nature of the Muses and their method of inspiration is enlarged, but the description of them nowhere mentions golden wings²³. One could perhaps explain the association of gold through their relationship with Apollo, who is known in lyric as χρυσοκόμης, χρυσότοξος or χρυσοφόρμιγξ. In lyric the Muse is χρυσέα (Pindar) and χρυσόθρονος (PMG 953 and 1023). Sappho summons the Muses: δεῦρο δηῦτε Μοῦσαι χρύσειον λέποισαι ... (PLF 127), where χρύσειον possibly qualifies δόμον. Thus the use of an epithet compounded from χρυσο- is not in itself exceptional, but the symbol of wings is unprecedented. The Muses are not responsible for ἔπεα πτερόεντα, but rather for song that lasts²⁴. Thus if χρυσόπτερε is intended to invoke the Muse it is certainly untraditional²⁵.

11. Χαρίτων ... καλλικόμων PMG 212 1

The epithet καλλικόμος occurs once in the Odyssey of Helen (XV 58) and once in the Iliad of a concubine (IX 449), both in the long form of the genitive at the verse-end. The epithet is also rare in the Hesiodic poems, although its application to the Ἑρπαι, Works and Days 75, is interesting in that the Ἑρπαι are closely related to the Graces in that passage. The Graces are not unnaturally renowned for their beauty, as comparisons such as Χαρίτων ἀμαρύγματ' ἐχούσαν or Χαρίτων ἀπὸ κάλλος ἔχουσι (fr. 70 38, 196, 215) which occur particularly in the Eoiai, indicate. Their overall beauty inevitably presupposes fine tresses, and the Graces are described as εὐπλόκαμοι, which is more or less synonymous

with καλλύκομαι, in the Hymn to Apollo 194. Indeed, in Iliad XVII 51ff. the son of Panthous, who lies blood-bespattered in the dust, smitten by the sword of Menelaus, is described as having had hair like that of the Graces, although it is now befouled with blood and grime. Thus, the beauty of the hair of the Graces must have been proverbial. The word-group Χαρίτων καλλυκόμεν is therefore unprecedented, but not unexpected.

12. χθόνα πυροφόρον 2359 fr.1 ii 7

The epithet that most commonly accompanies χθόνα and χθονί in the Homeric poems is πολυβοτείραν/η²⁶, although χθόνα in the accusative occurs frequently without an epithet. In the nominative case, as was noted earlier, εὔρεῖα χθών is the expected "formula", πυροφόρος is rare, appearing in the genitive with πεδύλοιο (Iliad XXI 602), with ἀρούρης (Iliad XXI 314) and in the nominative plural with ἀρούραι (Iliad XIV 123), while in the Odyssey III 495 the form πυρηφόρος replaces πυροφόρος to suit the metrical requirements: ἔξον δ' ἔς πεδύλον πυρηφόρον instead of . . . καὶ ἀρούρης πυροφόροιο.²⁷ The limited application of this epithet in the Homeric poems presents no problem to Stesichorus, particularly since an extension of association from πεδύλον to χθόνα entails no difficulties of logic. From the reconstruction of the colometry proposed by Snell²⁸, it would appear that χθόνα πυροφόρον lies in apposition to ἱερὰν Βοιωτίδα; the dwellers in the "wheat-bearing land" are in fact the Boeotians. Consequently, it is a little odd that the poet chose the epithet πυροφόρος, which implies cultivation, when πολυβοτείρα, which implies grazing land, would have been more appropriate, given that the origin of the name Βοιωτία lies in the fact of her having cattle-pastures. However, the epithets distributed throughout this small portion of the list of participants in the hunt on the whole create new word-groups, alien to the traditional "formulae" of the Homeric poems.

In Iliad V 710 the Boeotians are called the owners of $\pi\acute{o}\nu\alpha\ \delta\eta\mu\omicron\nu$, which as a geographical description is not very specific and therefore allows a certain amount of latitude to later poets in their choice of descriptive epithets. That Stesichorus had little or no knowledge of the terrain of Boeotia is possible, but irrelevant from the standpoint of literary compositions.

b) Noun+epithet groups containing supplemented readings

13. $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\gamma\acute{o}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}[\gamma\alpha\lambda]\mu\alpha$ 2619 fr.1 ii 10

The word $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\lambda\mu\alpha$ seldom occurs in the Homeric poems, its frequency being limited to once in the Iliad and 7 times in the Odyssey, and its accompanying epithets are not distinctive: $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\alpha$ and $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\kappa\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$, and in the plural, $\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\lambda\acute{\alpha}$. An $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\lambda\mu\alpha$, cognate with $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega$, may be something that brings glory or delight to its recipient or owner, or in general to the gods. Thus, the ivory cheek-plate for a horse is described as a work of art: $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\lambda\mu\alpha$, $\acute{\alpha}\mu\phi\acute{o}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu\ \kappa\acute{o}\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma\ \theta'\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\omega\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\tau\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\ \tau\epsilon\ \kappa\upsilon\delta\omicron\varsigma$ (Iliad IV 144,145). However, the association of $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\lambda\mu\alpha$ with the gods is indicated, for example, in the description of the bull dedicated by Nestor to Athena: $\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\lambda\mu\alpha\ \theta\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\ \kappa\epsilon\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\omicron\iota\tau\omicron\ \acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha$ (Odyssey III 438). The fact of the bull's being sacred or dedicated to the god seems to have been implicit in the noun $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\lambda\mu\alpha$ itself. In such a case any epithet such as $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\acute{o}\nu$ or $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\gamma\acute{o}\nu$ would be tautologous.

The epithet $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\eta\eta$ is generally restricted to the goddesses Artemis and Persephone, in the Odyssey and the Hymns. In such instances it has been assumed that the epithet must mean "chaste" and certainly its later use in Alcman and Pindar, referring to "maidens", would not contradict this view. If, however, in this instance, one interprets the epithet "revered" or "commanding due respect" as a god or as belonging to a god

(cf. its association with a grove dedicated to a god, or a festival in honour of a god) then the combination of ἄγνόν and ἄγαλμα may be considered logical, although as a "formula" it is unprecedented.

In Aeschylus' Eumenides 55, θεῶν ἄγάλματα appears to mean "images", and by Herodotus' time the word ἄγαλμα had come to signify an actual statue of a god, dedicated to the god (cf. Histories I 131 and II 42). At some point therefore, after the age of epic, the word ἄγαλμα gained a more concrete meaning in the Greek language, and it is possible that the meaning of "statue" was implicit or understood in the usage of ἄγνόν ἄγαλμα in Stesichorus' poem with reference to the wooden horse, the latter being an image created by the Greeks at the instigation of Athena in order to make their final assault upon the city of Troy by guile, and dedicated to Athena by the unwitting Trojans. Perhaps the epithet ἄγνόν was deliberately used in an ironical fashion: what the Trojans believed to be an innocent, sacred gift to the goddess was in fact the source of their destruction.

It is also interesting that Tryphiodorus in his Capture of Troy uses precisely this phrase, in an almost identical context of the Trojans bringing the horse into their city. Either Tryphiodorus borrowed the phrase directly from Stesichorus, which would be plausible if Tryphiodorus were writing in the 2nd or 3rd century A.D. in Egypt²⁹, at a time when the papyri of Stesichorus' poems were apparently being circulated there, or else both poets had access to a common source.

The epithet ἄγνός also occurs in P.Oxy. 2619 fr.18 9, apparently as a title of Poseidon, who is alluded to by the periphrasis 'Εννοσίδας³⁰. In this usage Stesichorus follows a practice common to both epic and lyric poetry which makes ἄγνός the attribute of a god or goddess. There is, however, no surviving precedent for the application of the

epithet to Poseidon. Similarly, in P.Oxy. 2619 fr.16 7, ἀγν[άν appears in a context suggesting that the epithet may be applied to Aphrodite, and if this be the case, then the accepted translation "chaste" as designated to Artemis and Persephone would hardly be appropriate. It is likely, therefore, that Stesichorus has reallocated a traditional epithet, with some alteration of meaning, or else with a rather different concept of the attributes of Aphrodite³¹.

14. ἀπαλὸν [δέμας 2617 fr.4 ii 16

In the Iliad, ἀπαλός is found governing αὐχὴν and δειρή, that is, a specific part of the body, the neck or throat. In the Hymns, ἀπαλός is also applied to feet: ἡ δ' ἕσθ' ἔσθ' ἔσθ' ἀπαλοῦσι (Hymn to Demeter 287). If Page is correct in supplementing δέμας, which is acceptable in both context and metrical scheme, the association is new. δέμας occurs primarily in the phrase εἶδος τε δέμας τε or else δέμας ἀθανάτοισι ὁμοῖος, but there seems to be no exact parallel for the proposed meaning of a flower spoiling its "shape", the closest being τὴν σὴν οὐ κατασχύνω φύσιν in Sophocles, Electra 609.

One of the necks of Geryon has already slumped to one side (in line 14 of the fragment) and thus the closely associated epithet of αὐχὴν has apparently been transferred from its expected juxtaposition with αὐχὴν (as in Iliad XVII49 = XXII 327) into the framework of the simile, where it describes the object to which Geryon's fallen head is compared: the poppy. The possibility of ἀπαλός being applied to plants is supported by an example in Sappho, in which she describes chervil as καὶ ἀπαλ' ἀνθρώπου (PLP 96 13), no doubt on account of its delicate foliage. I shall return to discuss the simile of the poppy in chapter VI.

15. εὐρύ]χρος [ο]υ Τροάδας 2619 fr.15 (b) 11

εὐρύχορος describes cities in Greece, and even Greece itself, but is never associated with Troy, either in epic or in lyric poetry. Epithets for Troy in the Iliad and the Odyssey include: εὐρείη, ἐριβώλαξ, εὐρυάγυια, εὐτείχεος, εὐπυργος and ὑψίπυλος. The combination of εὐρύχορος with Τροά would appear to be a conscious departure from the traditional epithets applied to the city of Troy, without actually losing the expected association of the εὐρυ-element, as found in at least two of these traditional epithets.

16. πυκινὰ [ῦ]ς περὶ ὕγεσσι 2619 fr.1 ii 19

There is one "formula" from the Homeric corpus whose sense is virtually identical to that of the given phrase, although there is no actual precedent for πυκινὰς περὶ ὕγεσσι as such. περὶ πυκνὰ occurs in Odyssey II 151, Iliad XI 454 and XXIII 879, and in the longer form πυκινὰ περὶ in Odyssey V 53, in all of which πυκινός/πυκνός has the sense of "crowded together" or "closely overlapping" of plumage. The use of πυκινός in place of πυκνός in Stesichorus may simply be a matter of accommodation to the new demands of the metre, since in Odyssey II 151 περὶ is used to signify "wing" rather than "plumage". It is possible, therefore, that one might consider this word-group under the category of Homeric parallels, since the law of mutual expectancy operates in this instance, with only the minor variation of form, a variation that may be explained as metrically necessary.

- c) Other types of word-group : noun+genitive of possession.

17. π]ολέμου [τε]λευτά 2619 fr.1 i 18

If we are correct in assuming the supplement of the noun τελευτά,

then the word-combination is a new one. In the Iliad one finds, for example, βιότοιο τελευτή (VII 104, XVI 787) while in the Odyssey an instance without the accompanying genitive: ἡ δ' οὐτ' ἀρνεῖται στυγερὸν γάμον οὔτε τελευτήν ποιῆσαι δύναται (I 249 = XVI 126). Synonymous with πολέμου τελευτά would be τέλος πολέμου/οιο, and although it does occur twice in epic, this phrase is far less frequent than τέλος θανάτοιο. Thus although the combination of τελευτά and πολέμου is unprecedented, it is nonetheless predictable in a context in which the end of the fighting is considered. The expression is almost prosaic, as is witnessed by its use, for example, in Thucydides' Histories I 13. The phrase as it appears in Stesichorus would be impossible to incorporate into the metrical scheme of the hexameter, and hence one finds in the Batrachomyomachia 303 the alternative τελετή ; καὶ πολέμου τελετή μονοημέρον ἐξετελέσθη.

II Combinations of traditional and non-traditional elements.

a) Non-supplemented

1. Βασιλεὺς Πλεισθενίδας PMG 219 2

There is no reference to Pleisthenes in Homer. Stesichorus, however, may have derived the tradition of Pleisthenes in the family-tree of the Atreides from the Hesiodic corpus, where one finds him recorded as the son of Atreus and father of Agamemnon and Menelaus ³². βασιλεὺς is generally found in epic with a genitive of the place or the people over whom he rules: βασιλῆα πολυχρῦσοιο Μυκῆνης (Iliad VII 180). Comparable is the line ἐν δέ σφιν 'Ρῆσος βασιλεὺς, πᾶς 'Ηῤονῆος (Iliad X 435) but nowhere is there a precise precedent for this use of βασιλεὺς followed by the patronymic in apposition. It is interesting to note, however, that

the precise expression βασιλεὺς Πλεισθενίδας recurs in the poem in honour of Polycrates attributed to Ibycus (PMG 282 21), a fact that gives some indication that Ibycus may have imitated phrases from his western predecessor³³.

2. ἱερὰν Βοιωτίδα [α 2359 fr.1 ii 6

ἱερός³⁴, when applied to place-names, qualifies cities rather than larger geographical regions, the most frequent being Troy itself (for example in Iliad VII 20). Other cities so described are Pylos (Odyssey XXIV 108), Thebes (Iliad I 366, Hymn to Apollo 226) and Pergamum (Iliad V 446). However, for metrical reasons, the shorter form ἱρός/ή is more commonly found with Ἰλῖος (21 times in the Iliad and twice in the Odyssey). Boeotia in the Iliad is referred to only indirectly by the name of its inhabitants (V 710) and the form Βοιωτῖς is rare, occurring otherwise only in Xenophon, Hellenica V 1 36. Thus the word-group ἱερὰν Βοιωτίδα may be seen as a new formation in which the poet has employed a common Homeric epithet in an entirely new context, with a non-Homeric noun³⁵.

3. χειροβρῶτι δεσμῶι PMG 180

In the Iliad and Odyssey there is no single, distinctive epithet of δεσμός: ἀργαλέος occurs twice, as does κρατερός. The epithet χειροβρῶτι is a unique and vivid composition. The construction of the compound is unusual in that the majority of compounds whose second element consists of -βρωτ-, "eating" or "eaten", belong to the thematic declension; for example παιδόβρωτος, κεφαλόβρωτος or φθειρόβρωτος, none of which, however, is found in epic, being impossible in the metrical scheme of the hexameter. Nor are compounds whose first element is based on χειρο- found in the epic tradition. Hence the word χειροβρῶτι is not only a

hapax legomenon but is highly unusual in its formation³⁶.

According to Zenobius, the phrase refers to boxing thongs, but is better applied to δεσμόν in the case of an individual bound to a rock. Since the commentator's remarks are somewhat vague, and his allusion to the beginning of Stesichorus' Athla as likely to be guesswork as based upon factual evidence, we are left in a state of uncertainty as to the original use of the phrase by Stesichorus. It is possible that the poet described thongs as "hand/arm-gnawing" and at the same time drew a comparison with the bonds of Prometheus.

4. θεᾶ φιλόμολπε 2506 fr.26 i 10 (PMG 193)

There has survived only one other instance of the epithet φιλόμολπος, namely in Pindar's Nemean VII 9, where it described the island of Aegina. Compounds in -μόλπος are not common, but two others also occur in Pindar, both referring to a Muse: ἑρασμόλπος and φιλησμόλπος. From the epic tradition in the Hymns λυγύμολπος (Hymn XIX 19) may have served as a model for φιλόμολπος, although the Hymn to Pan is thought to be later than Stesichorus and hence its evidence is of doubtful value in assessing the traditional material available to Stesichorus³⁷. As was noted above, epithets for the Muses in the Iliad and Odyssey are not frequent, whereas in Hesiod, and therefore possibly in a mainland tradition, there existed a greater variety of "formulaic" attributes of the Muses. Whatever the epic background in this case, the occurrence of a compound epithet such as φιλόμολπος in choral lyric is to be expected in a situation in which the goddess is invoked to preside not only over poetic creation, but also over musical composition. With the emergence of new poetical and musical forms in the age of lyric, appropriate epithets had to be invented to encompass the wider

jurisdiction of the poets' patronesses, the Muses³⁸.

5. ἀπειρεσίολο κυνυλαγμοῖο PMG 255

ἀπειρέσιος occurs infrequently in Homer, and seems to be confined to numerical contexts meaning "limitless" or "countless"; for example in Odyssey XIX 174, of men, or in Iliad XX 58, of the earth³⁹. οὐζύν is described as "unending" in Odyssey XI 621, and it is in this sense of the word that one must in all probability understand ἀπειρεσίος in relation to κυνυλαγμός. The word κυνυλαγμός is itself unique, constructed by analogy with ὀλολυγμός, although the changes in vowels, κυνο- to κυνυ- and -λυγ- to -λαγ-, are inexplicable other than as some peculiar dialectal variation of South Italian or Sicilian Doric.

6. ἀρχεσύμολπον [Μοῦσαν] PMG 250

The epithet ἀρχεσύμολπος is not attested elsewhere in extant Greek literature, and, as was noted in the case of φιλόμολπε above, compounds in -μολπος are few and with the possible exception of λυγύμολπος, belong to a non-epic tradition⁴⁰. In the epic tradition it was customary to invoke the aid of the Muse or Muses at the outset of a poem, occasionally at certain important points in the course of the narrative, or else in the introduction of a poem within a poem, as in the case of the Catalogue of Ships in the second book of the Iliad. In the Hesiodic corpus one finds that the invocation of the Muse had evolved into an elaborate proem such as at the beginning of the Eoiai (fr. 1, M. & W.) and particularly at the beginning of the Theogony, where the poet sings a formal hymn in praise of the Muses before officially requesting their aid. While the situation of the Hymns is somewhat different in that the initial invocation must be addressed to the particular deity being honoured, as in Δήμητρ' ἡΰχομον, σεμνήν θεόν, ἄρχου' ἀείδειν (Hymn to

Demeter 1), several of the Hymns also incorporate an address to the Muse, as for example in the Hymns to Hermes and to Aphrodite, XIV, XVII etc.. However, the increased frequency in the Hymns and presumably in later epic, of the "formula" ἄρχοι' αἰεδοῖν seems to hint at a movement away from the assumption that the Muse alone was in control of the song about to be performed. Nonetheless, tradition did exert sufficient influence that the Muses were never ousted from a place in the first lines of a song, as we see in Alcman and the later choral lyric poets, and it seems that the epithet ἀρχεσύνολπος specifically reflects this tradition. As was noted in the case of φιλόμολος, the invention of new epithets for the Muses was also determined by their expanded sphere of influence.

7. ἀνύφαλον καύδα

PMG 249

This epithet is not found elsewhere in Greek, and the verb *ἔπτομαι is not common⁴¹. We noted in the previous chapter that there was a prevailing tendency in the Iliad and Odyssey for καὺς and its oblique cases to appear devoid of epithets, so that ἀνύφαλον καύδα is non-Homeric.

b) Noun+epithet groups containing supplemented material.

8. Χρυσόδορος ἀθανάτοιο

2617 fr. 13 3,4

The conjectured supplement Χρυσόδορος ἀθανάτοιο is reasonable in view of the context in which a second speaker (τὸν δ' ἀπαι[εῖ] [εὐβόμενος] / ποτέφα line 2f.), whose parentage is given (genitive ἀθανάτοιο indicating "son of immortal..."), discusses the relative merits of living as a coward, or risking almost certain death and refers to himself as χρυσ[ό]ρο[ς] υἱ[ὸς] in line 24 of the same fragment. In the epic tradition ἀθάνατος, as an epithet, occurs primarily in association with the word θεός, but more often occurs as a substantive synonymous with θεός, "the

immortal ones". Only occasionally in the epic poems does the epithet qualify an individual: Zeus for example in Iliad II 741, or Proteus in Odyssey IV 358. The less common association of ἀθάνατος with a second epithet ἀγήρως, as a double adjectival phrase, is occasionally applied to an individual, as for example to Calypso (Odyssey V 218) and particularly to Heracles in the Hesiodic tradition (fr. 25 28 M. & W.). This phrase does in fact occur in Geryon's argument (line 9 of fr. 13) and in view of the importance of the immortality or otherwise of Geryon, the use of ἀθάνατος as an epithet for his father is significant. Geryon is apparently unsure whether he is immortal or not. The poet indicates that his father certainly was, but divine parentage was not enough to guarantee immortality, since the state of being ἀθάνατος καὶ ἀγήρως had to be conferred upon the individual by the gods⁴². Heracles himself bewails the fact that despite his being the son of Zeus, he has to suffer with the rest of mankind in the gloom of the Underworld (Odyssey XI 601ff.). In the later tradition of the Hesiodic Great Eoiai, however, we find that Heracles has been granted immortality and dwells among the gods. The latter tradition is the more generally accepted one, and it would be more logical on the part of the poet in this passage to strike an indirect comparison between Heracles and Geryon; both are of divine parentage at least on one side, and yet by the will of the gods Heracles will succeed and gain immortal glory, while Geryon is doomed to be defeated, and presumably destined to live apart from the gods, in the Underworld.

9. ἀλώσιμον ἥμαρ

2619 fr. 15 (b) 11

Formulaic expressions with the noun ἥμαρ in Homer present a large array of epithets, the most frequent association being observed in the word-group νόστιμον ἥμαρ, which describes the long-awaited day of

return for Odysseus after his wanderings (11 times in the Odyssey). Of the other word-groups, two are based on an almost identical pattern of vowel-sounds, namely αἰσιμον ἥμαρ (3 times in the Iliad and once in the Odyssey) and μόρσιμον ἥμαρ (once in the Odyssey). αἰσῖμος is a post-Homeric epithet, constructed as other adjectives derived from abstract nouns in -σις, for example χρήσιμος from χρήσις. Thus αἰσῖσις, which is also post-epic, produces the epithet αἰσῖμος, whose usage is primarily confined to the dramatists and later. One early instance of the epithet occurs in the poem to Polycrates (PMG 282 14)⁴³: Τροίῃας θ' ὑπεκύλοιο αἰσῖμοιο | ἄρ' ἀνώνυμον. The poem constitutes an extended praeteritio in which the poet rejects a number of epic themes related to the Trojan cycle. One finds a series of expressions based upon Homeric "formulae", and as in the case of Stesichorus, some in which the word-association is not Homeric.⁴⁴ In common with phrases found in Stesichorus is ξανθῆς Ἑλένας and a reference to the Pleisthenid dynasty to which Agamemnon belongs.⁴⁵ It is interesting to note that the ancient commentators were sometimes confused in assigning poems or expressions to either Stesichorus or Ibycus, as in the case of the Athla (Athenaeus IV 172d = PMG 179). The epithet αἰολόδευρος is attested for Ibycus (PMG 317 a) and has now appeared in one of the papyri of Stesichorus (2617 fr.4 ii 5). The recurrence of both Stesichorean ξανθῆς Ἑλένας and αἰσῖμον ἥμαρ in PMG 282 suggests that Ibycus, or an imitator of Ibycus⁴⁶ borrowed phrases from Stesichorus.

In the Homeric poems the end of the war is contemplated in terms of πέρθω/πέρις; for example, Achilles in Book I of the Iliad declares: ὅππότε 'Αχαιοὶ | Τρώων ἐκπέρσω' εὐνατόμενον πολίεθρον (163,164). Elsewhere there are two common "formulae" for the end of the siege and the

capture of the city: τέλος πολέμου (although cf. page 98 above) and τεκμήρ 'Ιλίου (9 times in the Iliad). The context of the phrase in Stesichorus is a reference to the ultimate plot to capture Troy by means other than open warfare. The man inspired in cunning by Athena (line 6) could be Epeius, the inventor and builder of the wooden horse that was to bring the Trojan war to a close. Such a theme is beyond the temporal scope of the Iliad, and, moreover, the sections of the Odyssey describing the final capture of Troy do not dwell in great detail on the theme. It is therefore not surprising that Stesichorus did not adapt any known phrase from the Homeric corpus. One should note, in addition, that the expression for the city of Troy, εὐρυχόρου Τροίας employs a Homeric epithet in an un-Homeric association. Thus Stesichorus either follows another tradition for the "formulaic" phrase that expresses the capture of Troy, or else fabricates a new phrase on the basis of other epic word-groups such as νόστιμον ἦμαρ, and in the process introduces a new association of the epithet εὐρύχορος with Τροία. The poet of PMG 282, on the other hand, in his use of ἀλώσιμον ἦμαρ, employs a phrase for Troy that is found in the Homeric poems with reference to its capture: ὑψίπυλον Τροίην is found in such a context in Iliad XVI 698 and XXI 544, which appears to indicate his preference for maintaining certain appropriate associations in an intentionally Homeric passage. In the Stesichorean fragment, from a metrical point of view, the poet could have employed ὑψίπυλου, but, as is found in other examples, appears to have preferred to avoid the expected epithets. The poet of PMG 282 may have been motivated to repeat some of the well-known "formulae" verbatim in order to make his final rejection of the composition of epic poems more emphatic, or perhaps the repetition was simply unconscious⁴⁷.

Stesichorus, on the other hand, was consciously striving to avoid repeating "formulae" verbatim.

10. ἀρηΐφιλος [ν χρ[υσά]ορα 2617 fr.25 4

This epithet, whose singular form is used almost exclusively of Menelaus in the Iliad and similarly in the Hesiodic corpus⁴⁸, is in this fragment of Stesichorus given to Geryon's father, Chrysaor. Elsewhere, Chrysaor is μέγας (Theogony 281) or κρατερός (Theogony 979) and hence this Homeric epithet ἀρηΐφιλος that belongs to a glorious warrior is not totally unfitting for one who was "born with a golden sword", a son of Poseidon. The combination of ἀρηΐφιλον with χρυσάορα is nevertheless unprecedented, and doubtless the connections of the epithet with Menelaus imprinted in the minds of the audience would have caused them to make a subconscious comparison between Chrysaor and Menelaus. Unfortunately the context of the fragment does not permit us to determine whether this comparison was intended to be taken seriously or ironically.

11. Τρωΐας κλεεγνα [ς 2619 fr.32 7

Both in this fragment and in 2619 fr.15 (b) the spelling of Τρωΐας and Τρωας with omega has been transmitted. West⁴⁹, assuming that the iota has simply been omitted in the latter, supplements Τρωΐας and grants that for his metrical scheme the omega must be scanned as short before another vowel. Pindar, according to LSJ, used the Doric(?) form Τρωΐας scanned as trisyllabic with a shortened omega, but in their editions both Bowra (OCT) and Snell (Teubner) read Τροΐας⁵⁰ and it is this convention that Page has adopted in SLG 89 and 118. It is, however, impossible to ascertain what the original form may have been. Regardless of the alternative orthography, the text reads as a genitive singular feminine of the word for Troy, and it is apparently qualified by κλεεγνα⁵¹.

Although Stesichorus does not always confine himself to the Homeric practice of allotting a single epithet to every noun, the evidence of the fragments tends to confirm that a noun+ single epithet was the commonest type of grouping in Stesichorus. In 2617 fr. 32 one finds an aorist participle, plural "having set fire to;.." followed by the epithet εὐκτμε[ν]-, which is frequently associated with πολίεθρον. πολίεθρον, if it occurred, could have been preceded by a genitive of the name of the city, as for example in 'Ιλίου ἐκπέρσαι εὐνατόμενον πολίεθρον. (Iliad II 133)⁵² and it would be natural to expect an epithet with Τρωΐας rather than a second epithet with the noun that is already qualified by εὐκτόμενος. Hence Τρωΐας κλεεννῶς.

κλεινός or κλεεννός⁵³ is a post-Homeric epithet, whose epic equivalent would be κλυτός or κλειτός. Neither of these adjectives, however, is used to qualify cities in the epic tradition. κλυτός is commonly associated with δώματα in the Odyssey, with τεύχεα in the Iliad, while κλειτός occurs in the Iliad alone, with ἐκατόμβη or ἐπικούρου. It is only in the later tradition of lyric composition that κλυτός and κλειτός are even rarely applied to cities. κλεινός, on the other hand, may have been introduced to supply an epithet with the meaning of "famed" or "renowned", cognate with κλέος "glory", but without the associations of, for example, τεύχεα or δώματα inherited from the epic tradition and still employed in those particular contexts.

12. τανυπ[έ]πλου 2359 fr.1 i 7

The name of the person who possesses this epithet has not survived the mutilation of the papyrus, but from its context, that of the poem the Suotherae, it is unlikely that the person was either Helen or Thetis, who alone receive this epithet in the Iliad and the Odyssey.

Thus we have here an instance of the use of certain epithets outside the Homeric corpus for prominent figures other than those with whom the epithet is habitually associated in the Homeric corpus. The non-Homeric word-group in this case may have been derived by the poet from an epic tradition that was distinct from the Trojan cycle, but may equally have been invented by Stesichorus.

III Longer units that constitute expansions of simple noun+epithet groups or noun+genitive groups.

a) Combinations of noun+epithet and noun+genitive.

1. κ[ύ]μαθ' ἄλδος βαθείας 2617 fr.6 (a) 1

κῦμα/κύματα is found twice in conjunction with ἄλδος in the Odyssey (XII 68, XXIII 387) and once in the Iliad (VI 136). The more common genitival extension of κῦμα is, however, with θαλάσσης (twice in the Odyssey and 12 times in the Iliad). Thus the use of ἄλδος in this fragment appears to be an alternative synonym that is less stereotyped. Epithets that are expected with ἄλδος are ἀπρυγέτοιο (5 times in the Odyssey and 3 in the Iliad) and πολυῆς/οὔο (6 times in the Odyssey and 10 in the Iliad). Although βαθείης occurs once as an epithet of ἄλδος (Iliad XIII 44) the notion of depth is also conveyed by the expressions containing βένθος, obviously cognate with βάθος and therefore partially suggestive of it : κατὰ βένθος ἄλδος (Iliad XVIII 38, 49) and ἐν βένθεσσι ἄλδος (Iliad I 358, XVIII 36). Strangely, LSJ think that ἄλς generally indicates shallow waters, near the shore. Although Odyssey IV 270 describes a ship being dragged down to the shoreline, the ship would shortly have entered deeper waters (and in any case, the shores of the Greek coast shelve swiftly and steeply into quite deep water). Moreover, not only is there the example of βαθείης ἐξ ἄλδος cited above, but also expressions

such as ἀλὸς ῥήγμινά βαθείαν (Odyssey XII 214) in which βαθύς/εὔα is associated with ἄλς, although not directly qualifying it. Thus there are precedents for the use of κύμαθ' with ἀλός and of βαθείας with ἄλός, neither of which "formula" is the most frequent combination of these individual words. The resultant grouping of all three elements may be considered as an innovative expansion that takes advantage of the expectancy of two particular associations with ἀλός; element b) ἀλός generates the expectancy of either a) κύμαθ' or c) βαθείας⁵⁴. In the epic tradition we find either the one or the other; Stesichorus has combined both.

2. φύλου πατ[ρ]ὸς υἱόν 2360 fr.1 i 11 (PMG 209)

The Homeric affiliations of φύλου πατρός were considered above and it was also noted that the combination of φύλον with υἱόν was more common than the equivalent expression with παῖδα⁵⁵. It appears that in this instance the poet has adopted the elements of two "formulae", φύλος with πατήρ and φύλος with υἱός. By conflating the elements of both he has produced a phrase not itself found in epic, but again with strong epic associations.

3. ὠκέα τέκνα Ποδάργας PMG 178 1

The epithets most expected with neuter plural τέκνα are: νήπια (11 times in the Iliad and 3 in the Odyssey) and ἀγλαά (twice in the Iliad, 3 times in the Odyssey and 4 times in the Hymns). The epithet ὠκέες occurs in frequent combination with ἵπποι, particularly in the Iliad (28 times). Thus Stesichorus appears to have transferred the epithet commonly found with ἵπποι to horses who are identified as the τέκνα Ποδάργας. The poet has also named these horses as φλόγεον and Ἄρπαγον, which differs from the Homeric version in Iliad XIX 400, where two horses called Εἰνθεός and

Βαλῦος are said to be the τέκνα Ποδάργης.

b) Noun+epithet groups with verbal element.

4. ἐς ἄλσος ... δάφναισι κατασκιόεν
PMG 185 5 (SLG 17 8,9)

κατάσκιον, the traditional reading of the MSS of Athenaeus, cannot stand in the revised colometry of the Geryoneis⁵⁶. Barrett suggested the alternative κατασκιόεν⁵⁷, which could have been mistakenly written as κατάσκιον by the simple omission of the epsilon in the course of transmission. The epithet κατάσκιος is not unknown, though rare. It is applied to δέρμα in Hesiod's Works and Days 513 and, more interestingly, is the epithet describing the courier in Clytemnestra's speech in the Agamemnon 493: the man is darkly shaded with olive branches, κήρυκ' ... κατάσκιον κλάδοις ἐλαίας. The metrical scheme of the Geryoneis, however, demands an added syllable and hence the lines read:

ὁ δ' ἐς ἄλσος ἔβα δάφναισι κατα-
σκιόεν ποσὶ παῦς Διὸς [-υυ-] (SLG 17 8,9)

The compound form κατασκιόεις does not occur in Homer, but simple σκιόεις is used in a variety of contexts referring to the casting of shade particularly with ὄρεα (Iliad I 157, Odyssey VII 268 and also Hymn to Apollo 34, Hymn to Hermes 70, 79). The epithet conveys not only the sense of the mountains being covered by trees with the result that their slopes are shaded from the sunlight, but also the connotation of the shadows cast by the mountains themselves. σκιόεντα occurs only once with ἄλσος, in the Hymn to Aphrodite 20, and hence we might consider the association of κατασκιόεν with ἄλσος in Stesichorus as being preceded in epic only indirectly, noting however that the extension from the simple to the compound form is significant and not merely a metrical necessity.

In the Iliad and the Odyssey ἄλσος generally attracts the

epithets ἀγλαόν or κλυτόν⁵⁸, neither specifically indicating the physical aspect of the grove. In the Hymn to Apollo, however, there are six instances of the phrase ἄλσέα δενδρήεντα (at for example line 76, 245) where the epithet may seem redundant, but may also convey the impression of the density of the trees in the grove. When one turns to Odyssey XX 278 one finds a closer parallel to the Stesichorean phrase:

.... τοὶ δ' ἀγέροντο κάρη κομόωντες Ἀχαιοὶ
 ἄλσος ὑπο σκιερὸν ἑκατηβόλου Ἀπόλλωνος.

The grove of Apollo is σκιερὸν, an adjective that is cognate with σκιδεύς, but there is no specific mention of the type of trees that cause the shade. Hence, although the precise phrase used by Stesichorus is not found in the epic corpus, it is possible that phrases such as the one cited from the Odyssey XX and the one from the Hymn to Aphrodite exercised some indirect influence upon his composition.

Intimately connected with κατασκιδέν in the Stesichorean fragment is the dative δάφνασι: bay trees were responsible for the gloom in the grove. The laurel or bay was sacred to Apollo primarily in his capacity as god of prophecy, as in Hymn to Apollo 396 and in later literature, but in Hesiod it belongs to the Muses alone⁵⁹. These goddesses, Hesiod tells us in his hymn to the Muses at the beginning of the Theogony, presented him with a branch of laurel symbolising the gift of poetry. Apart from being the symbol of poetry and prophecy, the laurel was early recognised as useful in more mundane matters. In the Hymn to Hermes 109 that god is discovered using a stick of laurel to make fire, a function of the laurel that is mentioned by Theophrastus in relation to its hardness and resistance to wear⁶⁰. One assumes that the advice of Hesiod for the construction of a plough with poles of laurel or elm is related to this same fact of durability (Works and Days 435). The only reference to the

laurel in Homer, however, comes from the description of the Cyclops' cave, which is ὕψηλόν, δάφνησι κατηρεφές, "high and shaded over with laurel" (Odyssey IX 183). An evergreen, the laurel has dark, luxuriant foliage and hence it created a natural vaulted canopy at the entrance of the cave. Stesichorus' phrase δάφνησι κατασκιόεν conveys the same notion of foliage casting darkness down over the hero's head as is found in Odysseus' impression of the Cyclops' cave.

One envisages a similar setting for the lair of the Pytho at Delphi, as it is described by Euripides, in Iphigeneia Taurica 1245 ff.:

ὅθι ποικιλόνωτος οἶνοπὸς δράκων
σκιεραῦ κατάχαλκος ἐμφύλλωι δάφναι
γᾶς πελώριον τέρας ...

Euripides succinctly conveys the image of the murky place through the epithets σκιερός and ἐμφύλλος in sharp contrast with the glittering scales of the monster. Although the reference to the laurel is intentional on account of its association with Apollo, who vanquished the Pytho and assumed sovereignty over Delphi, the connotations of darkness in the image must also be significant. The traditional association of the laurel and darkness is also repeated in the epithet μελάμφυλλος that Anacreon uses to describe the laurel (PMG 443).

I conclude, therefore, that Stesichorus in his creation of the word-group ἄλσος δάφνησι κατασκιόεν calls to mind the traditional association of groves and shade, but also diverges from that tradition. Groves and laurel are both firmly linked with Apollo in the Hymn to Apollo and the former also in Odyssey XX 278, but Heracles can hardly be entering a grove sacred to Apollo as he descends from the Sun's cup onto the island of Erytheia in search of Geryon. The gloom of the grove is perhaps intentionally set in antithesis to the brilliance of the Sun's golden cup. It is noteworthy also that the force of the prefix κατα-,

suggestive of something that hangs down over one's head, just as in the case of κατηρεφές describing the foliage that hung over the entrance to the Cyclops' cave, creates a rather sinister atmosphere. The image of the darkness that is about to envelop the hero foreshadows the impending encounter between the hero and Geryon, as the hero disembarks from the Sun's glowing cup and thus leaves the brightness of day⁶¹.

5. π[αγχρ]ύσεια δώματ' ἔχοντι 2617 fr.6 (a) 3,4

Earlier in the chapter I considered the originality and appropriateness of παγχρύσεια as an epithet for δώματα⁶². Strictly speaking the verb ἔχοντι plays an integral part in the phrase, based as it is on the "formula" 'Ολύμπια δώματ' ἔχουσι. Thus in the entire phrase we have a non-Homeric combination of παγχρύσεια with δώματ' in juxtaposition with Homeric ... δώματ' ἔχουσι, the latter word, however, having been translated as it were from ἔχουσι to ἔχοντι.

6. δ]αίωι πυρὶ καίμεν[2619 fr.14 8

Unprecedented is the association of the participle καίμενος with the noun πῦρ qualified by δῆϊον. δῆϊον as an epithet of πῦρ is much less frequent than the combination with ἀκάματον or θεσπιδαές, and the word-group is not found in the dative case in the Homeric poems. πυρὶ in the dative, without accompanying epithet, regularly appears with the verb ἐμπρήθω (cf.]πρησαντας in the following line of this fragment), although its association with some form of καίω is not unprecedented: φῆ πυρὶ καίμενος (*Iliad* XXI 361) or ὅπῳτ' ἄν Τροίη μαλερώι πυρὶ πᾶσα δάηται καίμενῃ (*Iliad* XX 317 = XXI 376).

West conjectures πόλι after ἐκέλευσε in line 7, and supplements καίμεν[αι in agreement with it⁶³. If this were correct, then it would appear that some individuals have been ordered to set fire to the city,

and that the city is Troy, as in the lines of the Iliad quoted in the previous paragraph, may be deduced from the reference to Helen in line 5 of the fragment. Page, on the other hand, is perhaps overly cautious in his doubts that the fragment belongs to the same poem as fragment 1 and 15 on the grounds that the metrical schemes are not identical⁶⁴.

Whatever the text may have been, it is clear that Stesichorus has preserved and combined the double affiliation of πῦρ with δῆλον and with καίόμενος, in the same manner as example 1 above. The occurrence of ἐμ] πρησάντας in the following line suggests that perhaps the poet was sometimes guilty of redundant expansion.⁶⁵

7. κάρα βεβρωμένος ἄκρον PMG 219 1

The perfect participle βεβρωμένος occurs only once in Homer, in a description of the blood-stained armour of the dead souls in Odyssey XI 41. The association of ἄκρον with κάρα is unprecedented, although suggested by the use of the epithet ἀκροτάτην with κορυφήν, which as we saw in the previous chapter was the model for the poet's description of Geryon being wounded by the arrow of Heracles⁶⁶. In this phrase, however, κάρα, applied more commonly to the head of a man rather than to an animal, especially in the phrase κάρη κομώντες Ἀχαιοί, emphasises the human association of the snake, which in the dream of Clytemnestra represents the murdered Agamemnon⁶⁷. Thus, although there are precedents for the appearance of a bloody snake in epic (for example in Iliad II 308 or XII 202), the poet has created a unique expression here, employing conventional associations to underline the double nature of the snake.

c) Groups linked by τε ... καί.

8. βίαι τε καὶ αἰχμῶν | ... πεπολεσότες
2619 fr.1 i 6,7

In the Homeric poems one finds examples of πεποιθότες appearing with i) abstract attributes such as ἀλκή, κόρτευ or σθένει (for instance in Iliad XVII 329), or else with ii) tangible things: a) parts of the body, ποσύν or χειρέσσιν and b) weapons, which are an extension of parts of the body, as in τόξουσιν καὶ ἐϋστρεφεῖ ὄζος ἄώτῳ ...πεποιθότες (Iliad XIII 716,717). Although the juxtaposition of type i) and type ii) with πεποιθότες is without parallel, in Iliad III 431 βύη καὶ χερσὶ καὶ ἔγχει are grouped together with the comparative φέρτερος, which does provide a precedent for the combination of abstract and concrete in a similar context of warriors trusting in their physical strength as well as their weapons⁶⁸.

9. θώρακά τε καὶ βροτόεντᾱ μέλεα 2617 fr.4 ii 13

As far as the evidence from the epic corpus indicates, θώρηξ is never found in conjunction with another noun. The supplement μέλεα is not based upon any Homeric parallel, since the epithet βροτόεντα in the neuter plural is regularly associated with ἔναρα (8 times without exception). Whatever the noun that followed βροτόεντα was, the word-group thus formed must have been un-Homeric.

10. Τρῶες πολέες τ' ἐπῆκ[ου]ροι 2619 fr.1 ii 7

Since in the Iliad the word ἐπῆκουροι "allies", is restricted to a context linked with Τρῶες, this phrase follows the Homeric pattern of lines such as : κέκλυτε μεῦ, Τρῶες καὶ Δάρδανοι, ἥδ' ἐπῆκουροι (Iliad III 456 = VII 348 = VII 368 = VIII 497) or Τρῶες ὑπέρθυμοι τηλεκλειτοῦ τ' ἐπῆκουροι (Iliad VI 111 = IX 233 = XI 563). In such cases, however, the most common epithet of ἐπῆκουροι is the compound τηλεκλειτοῦ (together with one instance each of πολύκλειτοῦ and ἀγακλειτοῦ, and occasionally the simple form κλειτοῦ). One reason for the change of epithet in Stesichorus

was the metre, since the length of his line required a shorter unit than the Homeric "formula". πολέες is seldom used with any great significance in the epic poems, as for example in the phrase πολέες πὲρ ἐόντες (*Iliad* V 94 etc.) where it is only natural that a hero would be pitted against countless odds. Stesichorus therefore in this phrase appears to have modified the stereotyped epic "formula" to suit his metrical scheme and if there was a special significance in the choice of πολέες it cannot be determined from what remains of the passage.

11. πεφορυσ[γ]μένος αἵματι[ι] ..[...], τε χολαῦ
2617 fr. 4 ii 3,4

The association of φορῦσσω with αἵματι, meaning "defiled with blood", occurs only once in the *Odyssey*: φορῦξας αἵματι πολλῶι (XVIII 336). There are, however, several instances of the perfect participle of the related verb φύρω that may be considered as indirect precedents for this phrase; for example πεφύρμενος αἵματι πολλῶι (*Odyssey* IX 397). One may compare this also with αἵματι καὶ λυθρῶι πεκαλαγμένον (*Odyssey* XXII 402, XXIII 48). αἵματι must have been followed by an epithet that qualifies χολαῦ, but since in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* the masculine χολός alone occurs, predominantly in the metaphorical sense of "anger" as opposed to the literal sense of "gall" in this fragment, it is unlikely that the traditional epithets associated with χολός, namely ἀργαλέος and ἄγριος, occurred in the lacuna⁶⁹. Doubtless the epithet chosen by the poet indicated the impending pain or even death that the χολά would cause to the person pierced by the fatal arrow-tip. None of the epithets later linked with χολή will fit the lacuna, either in number of letters or metrically, so that, whatever the poet used, the resultant combination must have been untraditional, just as the overall description of the poisoned arrow has no surviving precedent.

In this word-group, therefore, one can observe the expansion of a known "formula", πεφύρμένον αἵματι πολλῶν, by means of the new juxtaposition of αἵματι and χολαῦ, together with what I assume to be the introduction of an untraditional epithet to qualify χολαῦ.

d) Larger units of noun+epithet groups.

12. θ' ἱερὸν Βοιωτῖδ[α ν]αῖον
χθόνα πυροφόρ[ον.] 2359 fr.1 ii 6,7 (PMG 222)

I have already discussed under separate entries the noun+epithet groups ἱερὸν Βοιωτῖδα and χθόνα πυροφόρον, observing that both constitute new word-groups based upon unprecedented juxtapositions of elements from Homeric "formulae". As a structural precedent for the entire phrase one may cite Iliad II 535: οὐ ναίουσι πέρην ἱερῆς 'Ευβοῖης. In this line ἱερός is applied, unusually, to a geographical area, as in the Stesichorean line. Both passages belong to catalogues that indicate the provenance of the participants in a contest or battle. Hence it is possible to consider ναῖον as "formulaic". In Iliad II the expression with ναῖω occurs 7 times in the Greek list and 3 times in the Trojan list. It is noteworthy, however, that forms of ἔχω or νέμω/ομαι in similar contexts are far more numerous. Thus Stesichorus' expression has "formulaic" overtones, but the entire clause, with its double noun+epithet group describing Boeotia, is an expansion of the type of phrase that occurs with ναῖω in the context of a catalogue, as well a new application of traditional epithets.

13. σκύφιον ... δέπας ἔμμετρον ὡς τριλάγυνον
PMG 181 1

The close association of χρύσειον with δέπας, at least in the dative case, was noted in the previous chapter, although the most common "formulaic" expression is undoubtedly δέπας ἀμφικύπελλον (8 times in the

Iliad, 6 in the Odyssey). The meaning of ἀμφικύπελλον was ambiguous even to scholars in antiquity⁷⁰. If Stesichorus understood the epithet as meaning "with a double cup", connected with κύπελλον, one of the many words for cup, then it is possible that he coined the adjective σκύφον as a play on words, deriving the epithet from another word for "cup", σκύφος, just as the adjective regularly associated with δέπας had been.

An interesting explanation is suggested in Collinge's theory that Greek δέπας derives from Mycenaean di-pa⁷¹. δέπας, he maintains, was originally a large type of vessel for storing liquid, and although the semantic field of the word had changed by the time of the Homeric poems, there do remain two vestiges of the older use of the word, not as a cup to be held in the hand, but as a large mixing bowl or cauldron. The famous cup of Nestor in Iliad XI 632 and the witches' cauldron of Circe in Odyssey X 316 are containers of the latter sort, in which one mixed various ingredients and boiled them. Nestor's cup is used for the preparation of a wine-and-cheese concoction, Circe's for an immortalising potion for Odysseus: both of them are golden, as is to be expected in the heroic or divine context. In this fragment of Stesichorus, the centaur Pholus offers Heracles a drink from the δέπας that is described as σκύφον. Collinge suggests that in fact the centaur presented Heracles with a mixing-bowl (comparable to the κρατήρ one finds in the Theocritean version in Idyll VII 150) and that the epithet was necessary to indicate that the bowl was presented in lieu of a cup.

As is not uncommon in Stesichorus' style, the noun δέπας in fact receives a second epithet, ἔμμετρον. This epithet, like σκύφον, is unique, but in perfect keeping with the image of the centaur passing Heracles an enormous drinking-vessel. Heracles' avidity for food and drink later became proverbial, and it appears that Stesichorus too depicted these

heroic aspects of Heracles' character. The cup that was ἔμμετρον was thus "proportional" to his appetite, measuring as it did three flagons, ὡς τριτάγυνον. It is possible to interpret ἔμμετρον as "measuring", taken closely with the measurement ὡς τριτάγυνον that follows. Such an interpretation seems prosaic and less effective than the former suggestion.

As I understand this phrase, therefore, the poet has diverged quite widely from the traditional expression δέπας ἀμφικύπελλον, fabricating a new epithet σκύφον and expanding the phrase to incorporate the notion that the vast dimensions of the "cup" were equal to Heracles' vast capacity for wine.

14. ἀφύκουθ' ἱερᾶς ποτὶ βένθεα νυ-
κτὸς ἐρεμνᾶς

PMG 185 3 (SLG 17 4,5)

This unit provides another example of the compounding of word-groups in new, non-Homeric associations. The unit basically consists of a noun+genitive group, which may be broken further into a noun (in the genitive) with double epithet group. The combination of βένθεα and νυκτός does not occur in the epic tradition, where βένθος in singular and plural is almost totally restricted to the context of the sea, with θαλάσσης and ἄλος (altogether 10 times in the Homeric corpus and once in the Hymns). Since the Sun is about to cross Ocean, ὄφρα δὲ 'Ἦ κεανοῖο
72
περάσῃς line 2, so that he might reach the place of murky night, which therefore coincides with the place that lies beyond the known limits of the world, beyond the depths of Ocean, the phrase βένθεα νυκτός incorporates both factors: the place across the Ocean, beyond the sunset, is one of inevitable darkness, where Ocean and darkness are almost indistinguishable.

ἱερᾶ as an epithet of νύξ is also unprecedented, but the

association is doubtless derived from the use of ἱερὸν with ἥμαρ (Iliad VIII 66), with φάος (Hesiod, Works and Days 339) and especially with κνέφας as in δῦηι τ' ἥελος καὶ ἐπὶ κνέφας ἱερὸν ἔλθῃι (Iliad XI 194, 209, XVII 455). The transference of the epithet commonly associated with κνέφας to νῦξ is quite natural.

The final epithet, ἐρεμνᾶς, which occurs once in the Homeric poems in conjunction with νῦξ in the dative (Odyssey XI 606), as well as with, for example, γαῖα, is readily associated with νῦξ through the frequent combination of the cognate adjective ἐρεβεννός with νῦξ. ἐρεμνός is in fact the shorter adjectival form of ἐρεβεννός, evolving from the root ἐ-ρεβ-, to which was added the adjectival suffix -vo-. The resultant juxtaposition of voiced labial beta and nasal nu caused the assimilation of the former to the latter; hence ἐρεμνός. It appears that the longer form of the epithet was more suitable metrically in the hexameter line, and therefore it prevailed over the shorter form in the Homeric epics. For Stesichorus, however, the shorter form was more convenient.

The verb ἀφύκουτο may also be considered as deriving indirectly from the "formulaic" associations of ἐπὶ κνέφας and ἔλθῃι. There are two "formulae" that may be cited as indirect precedents for the expression: ἥμος δ' ἥελος κατέδυ καὶ ἐπὶ κνέφας ἦλθεν (6 times in the Odyssey and once in the Iliad) and with a slight variation on the previous quotation, δῦηι τ' ἥελος καὶ ἐπὶ κνέφας ἱερὸν ἔλθῃι (3 times in the Iliad). The context of the setting sun in these lines may have influenced Stesichorus' choice of the epithet ἱερός to qualify νῦξ, and he has chosen ἀφύκουτο, a variant whose meaning differs very little from ἔλθῃι/ἦλθεν.

Thus we see in this line of Stesichorus how his description of the Sun's arrival in the west is related indirectly to "formulaic" lines in the Homeric corpus, but how, through a series of possibly conscious

alterations and the introduction of the metaphor "depths of darkness" with its double entendre, the poet has revitalised the traditional commonplaces from the epic corpus that describe the setting of the sun, relying on his audience's subconscious or semi-conscious expectation of certain word-associations.

15. σχεδὸν ἀν-
τιπέρας κλεινᾶς Ἐρυθείας
Ταρτησσοῦ ποταμοῦ παρὰ παγὰς
λίγαν ἀπείρονας ἀργυρορύτους
ἐν κευθμῶνι πέτρας PMG 184 3,4 (SLG 7 3,4)⁷³

Although there was, as noted in the previous chapter, a prototype for the phrase ποταμοῦ παρὰ παγὰς in πηγὰς ποταμῶν, in the Homeric phrase πηγαί appears to mean the "source" rather than the waters of the river, but it is this latter meaning that scholars wish to apply to the Stesichorean phrase.⁷⁴ It is generally assumed that "source" would be illogical if the reference in the previous line to a place "almost opposite" the island of Erytheia implied that the birthplace of Eurytion was on or near the coast. It was suggested by Bergk⁷⁵ that the lines could be transposed as follows:

Ταρτησσοῦ ποταμοῦ σχεδὸν ἀντιπέρας κλεινᾶς Ἐρυθείας
ἐν κευθμῶνι πέτρας παρὰ παγὰς ἀπείρονας ἀργυρορύτους

and that the word παγὰς meant "veins of ore", as it was used in Aeschylus' Persae 238 with reference to the silver-mines at Laurion. However, the context of the fragment in Strabo implies that the geographer interpreted the lines as referring to the source of the river Tartessus, since the lines are introduced in his account of the river's source being near a mountain called Castalo, famed for its silver-mines⁷⁶. The fragment as it stands in the text of Strabo does not fit exactly into the proposed metrical scheme of the Geryoneis and it seems therefore that something may be missing from the text, possibly after Ἐρυθείας⁷⁷. By eliminating the

immediate juxtaposition of σχεδὸν ἀντιπέρασ κλεινᾶς Ἐρυθείας and the παγὰς of the river Tartessus in the following line one might remove the potential illogicality of geographical location, but is there any justification for demanding of a poet the precision of a cartographer?

The epithet ἀπείρων could be applied to παγὰς in either of its senses. ἀπείρων is regularly found with γαῖα (8 times in Homer, 3 in Hesiod). Not inappropriate of a large body of water, the epithet is also found in the phrase ἐπ' ἀπείρονα πόντον (Iliad I 350) and in κατὰ πόντον ἀπείρονα (Odyssey IV 510). The epithet is therefore naturally associated with both earth and water, and could presumably be applied to the waters of a river or the source. In such an application, however, the meaning of the epithet would be "inexhaustible" or "never running dry", rather than "boundless" or "limitless" as in the phrases with γαῖα or πόντον.

The unique coinage ἀργυροπόρους suggests that the noun it qualifies has its roots or origins in silver (cf. ὕδατορύζος, Parmenides B 15 a)⁷⁸. Wilamowitz believed that such an epithet must qualify πέτρας and not παγὰς⁷⁹; in other words he suggested that Eurytion was born in a cave with silver ore in it. Without more of the context and more certainty as to the colometry of the fragment, the possibility of reading ἀργυροπόρου with πέτρας must remain open. Since, however, the juxtaposition of two epithets that qualify the one noun is found elsewhere in Stesichorus⁸⁰, I am inclined to accept the reading of the accusative plural. As such, the epithet may be understood as an ingenious variation on the expected ἀργυροδόνης, which is commonly employed in epic to describe rivers (for example in Iliad II 735, XXI 8, 130; Theogony 340; cf. Bacchylides 8 26) and on whose analogy this compound must have been formed. The expected epithet denoting the silvery ripples of the water has been replaced by one which may, by analogy, recall that epithet, but

which immediately calls attention to the stream's source lying in silver-bearing rock. If the use of *καὶ* in the sense of "veins of ore" was current in Stesichorus' time, then the entire phrase may have been intended to express both the obvious description of never-flowing, silvery streams that at their source resemble the root-work of a tree, and an allusion to the location of the cave in mountains where there was an apparently inexhaustible supply of silver, in veins that were similar to the root-work of a tree. In other words the poet may have created an elaborate phrase that may be perfectly understood in two separate ways.

The entire fragment demonstrates the poet's technique of combining Homeric with non-Homeric elements. *κλεινὰς Ἐρυθείας* is non-Homeric⁸¹, while *ἐν κευθμῶνι πέτρας* occurs only in the epic tradition outside the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*⁸². The location of the birthplace of Eurytion is identified by an allusion to the area of the Tartessus in Spain where silver had been discovered in the 7th century by the Greeks, an allusion referring to that wealth in the epithet *ἀργυρόριζος* which must have been recognised by at least some of the poet's audience.

16. θε[ῖ]ον ἐξαίφνης τέρας 2360 fr.1 i 1

In the Homeric poems, expressions such as *πορφυρέην ἱερὴν θνητοῖσι τανύσσην* | *Ζεὺς ἐξ οὐρανόθεν, τέρας ἔμμεναι* ... (*Iliad* XVII 547, 548) or *θεῶν τεράεσσιν ἐκείσας* (*Iliad* IV 398, VI 183) or *Διὸς τέρας αἰγυλόχοιο* (*Odyssey* XVI 320) reveal the natural assumption that the gods were responsible for the appearance of portents⁸³. The epithet *θεῖος* is never applied to the word *τέρας*, although a parallel situation may be cited in the case of heaven-sent dreams (*Odyssey* XIV 495 and *Iliad* II 22): the god has sent the dream or caused it to appear before the eyes of the mortal, and hence it is *θεῖος ὄνειρος*. Thus, Stesichorus' use of

θεῖον to qualify τέρας reflects the traditional view of the origins of portents without relying directly on any "formulaic" word-group from the Homeric poems.

The verb φαίνω is regularly associated with τέρας as in ἡ νῦν τόδ' ἔφηνε θεὸς τέρας ἦε σοὶ αὐτῷ (*Odyssey* XV 168) or in ἡμῖν μὲν τόδ' ἔφηνε τέρας μέγα μητίετα Ζεὺς (*Iliad* II 324) where the god causes the portent to appear. The use of the adverb ἐξαίφνης in Homer is confined to the sudden outburst of flames : τὸ δὲ φλέγει ἀκάματον πῦρ ὀρμενον ἐξαίφνης (*Iliad* XXI 14) or πῦρ, τὸ τ' ἐπεσσύμενον πόλιν ἀνδρῶν ὀρμενον ἐξαίφνης φλεγέθει (*Iliad* XVII 738). Portents, however, were not conceived of as appearing suddenly. The choice of ἐξαίφνης may therefore result from a play on words, since the adverb is based on the root and is thus reminiscent of the association of φαίνω in the context of τέρας in the Homeric poems. The adverb, which strictly speaking modifies the participle ἰδοῦσα, is placed within the noun+epithet phrase θεῖον ... τέρας thus underlining the suddenness of the bird's appearance and the impact of the portent in the minimum amount of words.⁸⁴

17. πεφορυ-
 γ) μένος αἵματι[.....] ..[. .]ι τε χολᾶι,
 ὀλεσάνορος αἰολοδε[ύου] ου
 ὀδύναισιν *Υόρας' 2617 fr.4 ii 3-6

In the previous section of this chapter the innovative elements of αἵματι ... τε χολᾶι with πεφορυγμένος were considered⁸⁵. Linked to this word-group through the dative ὀδύναισιν, which is also dependent on the participle πεφορυγμένος, is the final word-group of a series of phrases that describe the arrow piercing Geryon, namely ὀλεσάνορος αἰολοδεύου ὀδύναισιν *Υόρας. If we disregard for the present the dative ὀδύναισιν the genitival phrase may be considered one of the few totally non-Homeric associations of a noun and epithet in Stesichorus. Of the two epithets,

which are both foreign to the epic tradition, ὀλεσῆνωρ occurs in Theognis and the late epic of Nonnos⁸⁶. In the former, the epithet has taken on a metaphorical sense in the context of perjury, qualifying ὅρκος, and seems far removed from the literal sense in Stesichorus. I assume that the epithet in Stesichorus is to be understood literally; in any folklore it is an essential characteristic of a monster to be "man-slaying". It is possible that the epithet was coined by Stesichorus, since although the individual elements of the compound do have precedents in Homer, the word does not occur in the early epic tradition at all. The form ὀλεσ- occurs once only, in ὀλεσέκωρος (Odyssey X 510) where the lengthened first syllable is dictated by the metrical requirements of the line. The second element, -ηνωρ, however, is more frequently found: φθισῆνωρ occurs 5 times in the Iliad, as does ῥηξῆνωρ, the epithet of Achilles, which Stesichorus himself employed in fragment 1 of 2619⁸⁷. Indeed, φθισῆνωρ may well have acted as a model for the construction of ὀλεσῆνωρ in which the poet chose to replace the commonly associated element with another of the same meaning, but less frequently found.

For the individual elements of αἰολοδέωρος, there are again precedents, though rare, in both Homer and Hesiod: αἰολοθήρηξ (Iliad IV 489), αἰολομήρης (Iliad V 707), αἰολόμητις (Theogony 511), δουλιχόδεωρος (Iliad II 460) and ποικιλόδεωρος (Works and Days 203). In the case of compounds in -δέωρος, both in the epic poems and in later instances (ποικιλόδεωρος in Alcaeus PLF 345 and αἰολόδεωρος itself in Ibycus, PMG 317 (a) 2) the context of the epithets is restricted to the description of birds; long-necked swans, or nightingales with spotted throats. The simple adjective αἰολός is used once of a snake in Iliad XII 208 and later, in Sophocles' Trachiniae of the Hydra⁸⁸, which description may have been influenced by Stesichorus' choice of epithet in

this passage. The only instance extant of a description of the Hydra prior to Stesichorus' Geryoneis is to be found in the Theogony, where the monster is identified as Λερναίην after its abode at Lerna, and as λυγρὰ ἰδούαν (313f.), neither of which expressions give any physical picture. Stesichorus' description of the monster as αἰολόδευρος may therefore be an innovation, the epithet implying both the shiny aspect of the snake-like neck of the monster, and also the mottled effect produced either by scales or by several colours⁸⁹.

Since ὀδύναισιν occurs in the epic poems as frequently without as with an epithet, the usage here is not exceptional, and no example specifically suggests itself as a precedent for the Stesichorean passage. The dative ὀδύναισιν follows πεφορυγμένος, linking the αἷματι and the χολαῖ with their origin, namely the Hydra. It was in the blood and gall of the dying monster that Heracles dipped his arrows to make them infallibly lethal for future trials, and so the word ὀδύναισιν hints at the imminent death-agonies of Geryon as well as referring to the source of the potential death-agonies, the αἷμα and χολά of the Hydra.

IV Noun+epithet groups in which both elements are foreign to the epic tradition.

1. κλεινῶς Ἐρυθείας PMG 184 1

The epithet κλεινός is post-Homeric⁹⁰, applied frequently to cities in Pindar, although a parallel relevant to Stesichorus' use may be cited in Solon, fragment 7 3 (Diehl): κλεινῆς ἀπὸ νήσου in which he refers to the island of Cyprus. The island Erytheia is not known in the extant epic corpus, but it is perhaps significant that Hesiod, according to Servius' commentary on Aeneid IV 484, calls one of the Hesperides Erythea, since the Hesperides live on an island in the far west, beyond

the pillars of Heracles⁹¹.

2. ὀλεσάνορος αἰολοδέου ... ὕδρας
2617 fr.4 ii 5,6

As was noted in the previous section, the epithets ὀλεσάνορος and αἰολοδέου are both non-Homeric, although their formation may be traced to similar compounds in the epic corpus⁹². The Hydra's appearance in Greek mythology is confined to the exploits of Heracles and therefore did not occur in the Homeric corpus.

In this chapter 46 instances of noun+epithet groups, whose individual elements, if isolated, may be cited as Homeric, demonstrate that the poet availed himself freely of his linguistic inheritance, the Homeric corpus. However, when these noun+epithet groups are considered as unities and, where possible, within their individual contexts, it can be seen that the poet has created new juxtapositions of noun and epithet that as unities have no precedent in the Homeric corpus. The poet seems deliberately to have broken established word-associations in which many epithets had become trite or ineffective through constant usage in a set position. In such an adaptation of epic diction the poet has succeeded in preserving the character and tone of epic, while at the same time has created something original by his infusion of vitality into moribund "formulae", and to do so he appears to have relied upon his audience's reaction, whether conscious or subconscious, to the association of a particular epithet in an unexpected environment or to the application of novel epithet in a traditional environment. In the case of πικρὸν ὄλεθρον

for example (2617 fr.4 i 11 = section I, no. 9), the epithet is reminiscent of its habitual association with ὀϊστός in its new position with ὀλεθρός. At face value, Geryon's death would be πικρός, physically painful, because of the poison on the tip of the arrow. It would also be grief-causing, because Geryon's mother is close to the scene of combat.⁹³ However, πικρός also recalls the fact that the instrument of death is an arrow, because of the association of πικρόν and ὀϊστόν in the Homeric poems.

Although the examples of word-groups based on elements that do not appear in conjunction in Homer, or of which one element is foreign to Homeric epic, outnumber those of direct imitation, there is little evidence of Stesichorus' employing word-groups, all the elements of which are alien to epic. I have found only two such cases, noted in section IV above. Both examples contained epithets that do not occur in the Homeric corpus, where there is no mention of the Hydra or the island of Erytheia. As proper names, however, the two substantive elements of the phrases are less significant than if they had been common nouns, for the poet's expansion and innovation in myth would inevitably involve the incorporation of new names such as the island of Erytheia. Apart from the proper names, the only example of a non-epic substantive is κυνυλαγμός (PMG 255 = section II, no. 4) whose accompanying epithet is Homeric. Thus the poet tended to work within the lexical inheritance of the Homeric corpus; he may have created innovatory compound epithets, but, as far as the evidence shows, did not show much preference for non-epic or newly coined nouns.

Footnotes to chapter IV

- 1 The scholiast commenting on the ῥαδυνῆς χερσός of Hēra in Apollonius' Argonautica III 106, gives all the instances of the epithet known to him, including examples from Ibycus and Anacreon, but without helpful contexts.
- 2 Theocritus, Idylls XI 45, XXVII 146.
- 3 The Iliad, unlike the Odyssey, has no occasion to present a picture of the bard at work, apart from the funeral of Hector, in XXIV 720 ff. It is often supposed that the greater concentration upon the figure of the bard in heroic society is evidence for later composition of the Odyssey, but this is questionable (cf. Fränkel, Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy (Oxford, 1975) p. 10).
- 4 On invocations see page 90 ff. "Inspiration" is perhaps a misleading term, since the bard requests factual information from the Muses, presupposing either that the format came together with the information, or else that he was in that respect αὐτοδίδακτος, as Phemius once claimed. As far as the bards' own contribution to the composition of epic is concerned, we can glean virtually nothing from the Iliad or the Odyssey. It was simply a matter to be taken for granted as the gift of the δαίμων. It is only later, in Hesiod, that the poet's personality emerges. Hesiod claims that when he met the Muses, they presented him with the symbols of poetic composition. Once in possession of the rod of laurel and the "breath" of the Muses, the poet becomes in part responsible for the use he makes of the gift; he is not merely a mouth-piece of the Muses.
- 5 The adjective ἐρῆνος is heteroclite.
- 6 In the first publication of 2359 (P.Oxy. vol XXIII, p. 11) Lobel was uncertain as to the relationship of column ii to column i, which he ascribed definitely as a piece of the Suotherae on the grounds of names appearing therein, such as the sons of Thestius. B. Snell, in "Stesichorus' Συοθηραί," Hermes 85 (1957) pp. 248-251, demonstrated that from the metrical structure the two columns belonged to the same poem, and Führer followed this, with variations of metrical interpretation in "Zur metrische structur von Stesichorus' Suotherae," Hermes 97 (1969) pp. 115-116. An alternative identification was suggested by H. Lloyd-Jones in CR 8 (1958) p. 17, namely that the fragment belonged to the Athla on the grounds that ἐνθεν μὲν ... ἐνθεν δὲ... could refer to spectators. Bowra (GLP p. 96 f.) adopted the theory of spectators, but retained the identification of the Suotherae for the fragment. It seems to me, however, that the epithets might be more appropriate of participants rather than spectators.
- 7 Cf. page 113.
- 8 Peisander of Rhodes, according to the Suda, lived in the 7th century B.C., but his dates are not verifiable. He appears to have written an epic about Heracles, including the mission to fetch the Golden Apples of the Hesperides. Pherecydes of Athens, as quoted by the scholiast on Apollonius of Rhodes (Jacoby FGH 3 16 (a)) records the fact that the

apples were guarded by the nymphs (Hesperides) and by a snake whose name was Ladon. It is likely that Pherecydes was drawing upon Peisander and Stesichorus for his material. (See also note 16).

- 9 The guests at the wedding of Peleus and Thetis depicted on the François vase are dressed in elaborate long gowns. Ordinary women, as opposed to goddesses, are also depicted on vases wearing flowing robes as for example in figure 85 and 196 of J. Boardman's Athenian Black Figure Vases (London, 1974).
- 10 The application of the epithet ξανθός suggests that it may be understood as referring to a reddish-yellow colour rather than "blonde", which in English tends to be equated with Nordic fairness.
- 11 Sappho, PLF 23 5 ; Ibycus, PMG 282 5.
- 12 Cf. West, "Stesichorus Redivivus," ZPE 4 (1969) p. 139 ff., although there he is primarily concerned with the metre, and not the anomalies in structure. Page, in PCPhS 19 (1973) p. 58 expresses some doubt that fragment 14 belongs to the same poem as fragment 1.
- 13 If the assumption is correct that Helen is in Troy in this fragment, and that it belongs to the Iliou Persis, then the Palinode, in which Helen does not go to Troy, must be separate from the Iliou Persis. On the problems of the Palinode, see page 302f., chapter IX.
- 14 The ὄρηξ is a more general word for "hawk"; see D'A. W. Thompson, A Glossary of Greek Birds (Oxford, 1936) pp. 65-67. Cf. Odyssey XIII 87.
- 15 Oppian, Haliutica IV 7, where the epithet adorns the Muses, in the poet's verbose invocation:
 τερπλαῖς οἴησιν ἐμὸν νόον ἠπιόδωροι
 Μοῦσαι κοσμήσαντο καὶ ἐξέστεφαν ἀοιδῆς
 δῶρωι θεσπεσίωι ...
- 16 G. Huxley, Greek Epic Poetry (London, 1969) p. 101, believes that Peisander of Rhodes was perhaps the inventor of the labour in which Heracles had to fetch the Hesperides' apples, dating that poet to 648 B.C. from the information given in the Suda. Bowra, on the other hand, in GLP p. 91, believes that Stesichorus preceded Peisander, and was the inventor of the tale. Since the precise dates of both poets are far from certain, I hesitate to make any firm assertions as to the inventor of the legend. The independent expansion of themes found in Hesiod or the epic corpus is not impossible.
- 17 See A. Garzya, "La poesia lirica greca nella Magna Grecia," P&I 10 (1968) pp. 247, 248.
- 18 Cf. πικρὸν λόγος in Euripides' Helen 481.
- 19 See page 116 f. of this chapter.
- 20 In Theogony 79 Hesiod calls Calliope ἡ δὲ προφερεστάτη ἐστὶν ἀπασέων.

- 21 There are some grounds for believing that this passage in the Peace derives from the Oresteia of Stesichorus, as Bergk first proposed in his PLG II (1843); there are two other allusions that the same scholiast has recognised as deriving from the Oresteia at lines 799 and 800 of the comedy (= PMG 211 and 212).
- 22 Cf. Sappho, PLF 16 or Ibycus, PMG 282.
- 23 In his Hymn to the Muses at the beginning of the Theogony Hesiod describes various attributes of the Muses: they have ποσσ' ἀπάλοισιν and τέρενα χρῶα; they sing with περικαλλέα ὄσσαν, or δὲ λειριοέσση; they attend princes and bring joy to man amid his sorrows and so on, but nowhere are they golden-winged. Later in Bacchylides one finds an isolated allusion to a golden feather, χρυσεόν πτέρον, dropped by the Muse (fr. 20 B 3,4) but there is no indication as to whether this came from a Muse's golden wings or not. If so, has Bacchylides adopted Stesichorus' image?
- 24 The motif of the lasting nature of song is found predominantly in Pindar (e.g. Pythian VI 5-18 and III 113), but there are instances in earlier poets; for example, in Sappho PLF 55 1 or Ibycus PMG 282 48. In the latter poem, the whole point lies in the fact that the epic legends have survived through the medium of poetry and so will the fame of Polycrates.
- 25 It has been suggested that the goddess invoked is not one of the Muses, but Iris, on the grounds that the epithet "golden-winged" belongs to that deity in the Iliad and the Hymn to Demeter (cf. page 90 above) and because of her associations with the announcement to Menelaus of Helen's flight in both the Cypria and Apollodorus' Epitome III 6 (Podlecki, "Stesichorea," Athenaeum 49 (1971) p. 322 ff.). Iris more frequently receives the attribute of swiftness, whether in the phrase πόδας ὠκέα (11 times in the Iliad), ποδηνέμος ὠκέα (8 times in the Iliad) or ταχέα (4 times in the Iliad). The use of the less common epithet would in fact be characteristic of Stesichorus, but since we find no other instance of a deity invoked for inspiration other than the Muse or Apollo in this type of poetry, I suspect that Stesichorus has chosen a novel epithet for the Muse.
- 26 Also in Hesiod, Works and Days 157, 252.
- 27 Also in the Hymn to Apollo 228.
- 28 Snell, art.cit., pp. 248-251.
- 29 Tryphiodorus, according to West (OCD) belonged to the 3rd or 4th century A.D., a native of Egypt. Malcolm Campbell of the University of St. Andrews suggested that he may have been earlier, 2/3 rd century A.D. P. Oxy. 2617, 2618 and 2803 are dated by Lobel to the 1st century A.D., while 2619 is dated to the late 2nd or 3rd. On the back of 2617 Lobel found the remains of a document that he dated to the late 2nd or early 3rd, which gives some indication of the life-span of some of the papyri. Thus it is not inconceivable that Tryphiodorus may have had access to a papyrus of Stesichorus' Iliou Persis.

- 30 I think that there are sufficient grounds for accepting the combination of 2619 fr. 18 and 2803 fr. 11, supported by West, Führer and Barrett, cf. Haslam, art.cit., p.57, against the doubts cast by Page in PCPhS 19(1973) pp. 47-65. γαλαόχος, however, is sufficient indication that the god intended to receive the epithet was Poseidon.
- 31 Cf. page 88 of this chapter.
- 32 See page 262 of chapter VII, footnote 36.
- 33 Cf. note 43 of this chapter. Also in PMG 282 appear the phrases ξανθὰ Ἑλένα (cf. page 86 f.) and ἀλώσιμον ἄμαρ (cf. page 103 ff.).
- 34 For Doric-form ἑαρός see page 17, chapter II.
- 35 See also page 113 of this chapter.
- 36 Nöthiger does not discuss this epithet.
- 37 See Richardson, The Homeric Hymn to Demeter (Oxford, 1974) p. 11.
- 38 The fragments of Alcman furnish a variety of new epithets for the Muses that do in part account for their new spheres of activity:
Μῶσ' ἄγε Μῶσα λύγη πολυμελές
αἶέν ἀουδὲ μέλος
νεοχμὸν ἄρχε παρσένους αἰείδην PMG 14 (a)
 Cf. PMG 27, which describes their activities, but not through epithets:
Μῶσ' ἄγε καλλιόπα θυγάτηρ Διὸς
ἄρχ' ἐρατῶν φεπέων, ἐπὶ δ' ἕμερον
ὕμνῳ καὶ χαρίζεντα τίθη χορόν .
- 39 The more frequent form is ἀπείρων ; cf. page 122.
- 40 On the formation of ἀρχεσίμολπος see Nöthiger, op.cit., p. 155.
- 41 Future ἔσεται occurs in Iliad II 193 and the second aorist at Iliad I 454 and XVI 237. Cf. Pseudo-Theocritus, Adoneis 19.
- 42 Calypso promised to make Odysseus immortal : ἥ δὲ ἔφασκον | θήσειν ἀθάνατον καὶ ἀγήρων ἦματα πάντα (Odyssey V 135,136 = VII 256,257 = XXIII 335,336 . Cf. τὴν δὲ οὐ ἀθάνατον καὶ ἀγήρω θήκε Κρονίων (Theogony 949). The group also occurs in Iliad VII 538,539, where Hector wishes that he were immortal.
- 43 On the question of authorship of P. Oxy. 1970 + 2801 (= PMG 282), Page remarks that the poem is of type of courtier-verse that was commonly associated with the name of Ibycus, and that it makes little difference to us whether the poem was indeed the work of Ibycus or not - "Ibycus' poem in honour of Polycrates," Aegyptus 31 (1951) p. 168.
- 44 See A.E. Harvey, "Homeric epithets in Greek Lyric Poetry," CO 7 (1957) p. 222 f.
- 45 See page 256, chapter VII.

46 Cf. Page, art.cit, p. 168.

47 On the "infelicity" of some of the phrases in PMG 282, see Harvey, art.cit., p. 222 f.

48 ἀρηϊφύλος is applied to Menelaus in Iliad II 21, 52, 69, 90 etc. It is also found in the fragments of Hesiod, 195 5, and 204 86, 89 and 93 (M. & W.).

In 2618 fr.1 7 there is another instance of the epithet, whose bearer is lost in the lacuna, but must have been a hero other than Menelaus.

49 West, in ZPE 4 (1969) p. 141.

50 Pindar, Nemean II 14, III 60.

51 In Lobel's first edition of the fragments (P. Oxy. vol. XXXII, p. 52) one finds κλεοννο[printed, but from an examination of the photograph of the fragment, I believe that the possibility of reading alpha is not excluded. What remains on the papyrus is the top half of the letter and from a comparison with other instances of omicron and alpha in the fragments of 2619 (e.g. in fragments 18 4, 32 2, 23 3 and 30 3 on plate III) the shape of the letter is too angular for omicron and there is no evidence of any rounding necessary for the lower part of an omicron.

52 Cf. Iliad XIII 380. Another variation on this general theme can be seen in the line 'Ιλίου ἐξάλδαπαζαι εὐκτύμενον πολίεθρον (Iliad IV 33 = VIII 288). Stesichorus again appears to have conflated elements from more than one "formula" into unprecedented groupings.

53 See page 35, chapter II.

54 Note the shortened form βαθέας metri gratia in Stesichorus.

55 See page 61f., chapter III.

56 Metrical schemes for the Geryoneis are given by R. Führer in "Die metrische Struktur von Stesichoros' Γηρυονηΐς," Hermes 96 (1968) p. 675ff., by Page in "Stesichorus: the Geryoneis," JHS 93 (1973) p. 146 ff. and by Haslam in "Stesichorean Metre," QUCC 17 (1974) p. 11 ff. Although there is some dubiety regarding the correct placement of the first two lines of the stanza of PMG 185, as quoted by Athenaeus, the lines under discussion here are generally recognised as belonging to the final section of the strophe/antistrophe (8,9), given the replacement of a missing syllable.

57 Barrett delivered a paper in 1968 on "Stesichorus and the story of Geryon" that has not yet been published. Page in his article in JHS 93 (1973) made extensive use of Barrett's notes and acknowledges his conjectures in the critical apparatus of LGS and SLG.

58 In Iliad II 506 and Odyssey VI 291 ἄλσος is qualified by ἀγλαόν and in Odyssey VI 321 by κλυτόν.

59 The laurel is nowhere in the Iliad or the Odyssey associated with poetry or prophecy.. In these epics the Muses are invoked as the poet's source for factual information, such as the enumeration of peoples and ships that went to Troy (Iliad II 484) or in answer to the question "Who first ...?" (Iliad XI 218, XIV 508), as well as in the formal invocation at the outset of each poem. Twice the Muses are linked with Apollo as patrons of poets. Perhaps it was the Muse, or perhaps Apollo who taught Demodocus (Odyssey VII 488), but in both instances the association is vague. In contrast to this, it is more specifically stated in the Hymn to Apollo (131, 183ff., 201ff.) and in the Theogony that Apollo's concern is the lyre, while the Muses are responsible for the content of the song.

When Hesiod encounters the Muses he receives from them a branch of laurel and with it the power to tell $\tau\acute{\alpha} \tau' \epsilon\sigma\sigma\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha \pi\rho\acute{o} \tau' \epsilon\acute{o}\nu\tau\alpha$ (line 32). This formulaic expression is repeated at line 38 in the following section of the poem and it is noteworthy that such an expression is identical to the description of the activities of a seer, as of Calchas $\delta\varsigma \eta\delta\eta \tau\acute{\alpha} \tau' \epsilon\acute{o}\nu\tau\alpha \tau\acute{\alpha} \tau' \epsilon\sigma\sigma\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha \pi\rho\acute{o} \tau\epsilon \epsilon\acute{o}\nu\tau\alpha$ (Iliad I 70). In Hesiod therefore poets and prophets are virtually equated, especially insofar as the laurel became symbolic of both. That the laurel is apparently in the hands of the Muses before Apollo establishes his sanctuary and oracle at Delphi, $\chi\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omega\nu \epsilon\kappa \delta\acute{\alpha}\phi\nu\eta\varsigma \gamma\upsilon\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omega\nu \upsilon\pi\omicron \Pi\alpha\rho\nu\eta\sigma\omicron\iota\omicron$ (Hymn to Apollo 396) suggests that the god with whom the laurel was primarily associated in later literature originally absorbed the symbol from another source, namely the Muses.

60 Theophrastus, Hist. Plant. V 9 7.

61 In this interpretation I concur with Gentili's remarks contra Page (JHS 93 (1973) p. 145) in his review in Gnomon 48 (1976) p. 746, where he indicates that PMG 185 probably comes from that part of the poem when Heracles lands at Erytheia and reaches Mt. Abas for his encounter with Geryon.

62 See page 85 of this chapter.

63 West, in ZPE 4 (1960) p. 140.

64 Page, in PCPhS 19 (1973) pp. 54 and 58.

65 Cf. Quintilian X 1 62 on redundancy in Stesichorus.

66 See page 60 f. of chapter III.

67 See page 255, chapter VII.

68 Stesichorus substitutes $\alpha\lambda\chi\mu\acute{\alpha}$ for its synonym $\epsilon\gamma\chi\omicron\varsigma$.

69 There are several epithets that qualify $\chi\omicron\lambda\acute{o}\varsigma$ in the epic corpus, although none of them is frequently repeated: $\theta\upsilon\mu\alpha\lambda\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\alpha$ (Iliad XI 250, 561), $\alpha\lambda\pi\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$ (Iliad XV 223), $\alpha\gamma\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ (Iliad IV 23, VIII 446, Odyssey VIII 304) and $\alpha\rho\gamma\alpha\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\varsigma$ (Iliad XVIII 119, X 107).

70 Aristotle, HA 494a 5 compares $\alpha\mu\phi\iota\kappa\upsilon\pi\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omicron\nu$ with the cells of honey-combs, implying that the word means a double cup, but Aristarchus and Athenaeus believe the epithet to mean "double-handled" (LSJ).

71 N.Collinge, "Mycenaeen di-pa and δέπας," BICS 4 (1954)pp. 55-59.

72 In SLG Page prints -αυς for the aorist participle masculine. In Pindar and Bacchylides this is the regularly accepted orthography, but we have little evidence for its appearance in earlier choral lyric. Since the appearance of the -ουσα form of the feminine participle of the present stem derives from a parallel treatment of nasal and sibilant clusters, Page has assumed a similar treatment of the aorist, hence παρδάσας. Cf. however the possible]πασιν in 2619 fr.1 i 13.

73 Colometrical arrangement as in SLG rather than PMG.

74 Cf. Page, PMG p. 100, πηγαί hic aquae non fontes; cf. Iliad XXIII 148.

75 Th. Bergk, Poetae Lyrici Graeci III (Leipzig, 1884), Fragment 5 of Stesichorus.

76 Strabo III 2 11.

77 Haslam, art.cit., p. 16.

78 Cf. Nöthiger, op.cit., pp. 149-150 on the originality of the epithet which he claims must be interpreted as "Wurzeln in Silber habend" or "im Silber wurzelnd", not as "Silber-Wurzeln habend".

79 Wilamowitz, "Parerga," Hermes 14 (1879) pp. 169-170), although he does not follow Bergk's theory that the poet is referring to veins of silver in the word παγάς.

80 Cf. 2617 fr.4 ii 5.

81 See page 126 of this chapter.

82 See page 144 of chapter V.

83 Cf. Διόθεν τέρας, Hesiod, fr. 141 28 (M. & W.).

84 See the discussion of this fragment in chapter VI, page 160.

85 See page 116 of this chapter.

86 Theognis 399 : αἶδεῖσθαι δὲ φίλους φεύγειν τ' ὀλεσθήνορας ὄρκους. Nonnus, Dionysiaca 28 273 λυσσαλέης προχέων ὀλεσθήνορα βόμβον ἰῶης. Cf. Nöthiger, op.cit., pp. 157-158.

87 Cf. also the apparent coinage λιπεσάνορας PMG 223. On the composition of such compounds, see Nöthiger op.cit., pp. 156-157.

88 Sophocles' Trachiniae 833 ff.: προστακέντος ἰοῦ | ὃν τέκετο θάνατος, ἔτρεφε δ' αἰόλος δράκων.

89 The artist of a Corinthian skyphos (580B.C.) now in the Louvre has depicted the Hydra with scales or lines representing splotches of colour similar to the appearance of a python (cf. K. Schefold, Myth

and Legend in Early Greek Art (London, 1966) fig. 54 c).

- 90 Cf. page 107 of this chapter.
- 91 Hesiod, fr. 360 (M. & W.).
- 92 Cf. page 125 of this chapter.
- 93 See page 280ff. of chapter VIII.

Chapter V "Formulaic" expressions that are found in non-Homeric epic.

Recent study in the development of Greek epic has inclined towards the theory that there was a tradition of epic composition on the Greek mainland possessing features alien to the Ionian tradition, to which the Homeric Iliad and Odyssey belonged¹. I shall therefore examine those phrases of Stesichorus that show resemblances to phrases in the Hesiodic corpus and the Hymns in this chapter to see whether or not any significance may be attached to their distinctiveness from phrases that have Homeric associations.

In chapter II, on the dialectal features of Stesichorus' diction, I considered the theory proposed by Pavese that certain of the so-called Doric intrusions in Hesiod that are repeated in the tradition of choral lyric, may be explained as deriving from the Northern dialect-groups, having developed after the Southern groups (of which Ionic was a later branch) had crossed the Aegean². I concluded that in the case of Stesichorus, apart from the "inorganic" features of later Doric attributable to the poet's place of origin, peculiarities such as κλεωνός and ἔχουσα might still be explained as isolated loan-words (or formations) from literary precedents³. In the third part of his book, Pavese proceeds to examine the "formularly" diction of epics of this mainland tradition, including a section on "formulaic" expressions recurring in choral lyric⁴. I too, therefore, shall consider word-groups in Stesichorus that may be related to this mainland tradition and compare my findings with the general conclusions reached by Pavese. The categories to be considered are as follows:

I Word-groups that are preceded in Hesiod alone;

II Word-groups that are preceded in the Hymns alone;

III Word-groups that occur in the Epic cycle alone;

IV Word-groups that belong to more than one of the previous categories (including single instances in the Homeric corpus).

I Word-groups that are preceded in Hesiod

1. λακέρυζα κορώνη 2360 fr.1 i 9.

The occurrence of the word-group λακέρυζα κορώνη twice in the Hesiodic corpus, in Works and Days 747 and in fr. 304 1 (M. & W.), fulfills the requirements of a "formula" both in the repetition of the particular association of epithet and noun and in the repetition of position at the end of the hexameter. The context of neither instance, however, belongs to the heroic world. In Works and Days 747, Hesiod gives Perses advice based upon a superstition from folk-lore:

μηδὲ δόμον ποιῶν ἀνεπύξεστον καταλείπειν
μή τοι ἐφεζομένη κρῶξι λακέρυζα κορώνη.

It was presumably bad luck, not to mention exceedingly annoying, to have a black crow cawing raucously from a perch on one's house. The five verses quoted by Plutarch in De Defectu Oraculorum 11 (= fr. 304) likewise belong to the world of folk-lore:

έννέα τοι ζῶει γενεὰς λακέρυζα κορώνη
ἀνδρῶν ἡβώντων· ἔλαφος δέ τε τετρακόρωνος·
τρεῖς δ' ἐλάφους ὁ κόραξ γηράσκειται· αὐτὰρ ὁ φοῖνιξ
έννέα τοὺς κόρακας· δέκα δ' ἡμεῖς τοὺς φοῖνικας
νύμφαι εὐπλόκαμοι, κοῦραι Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο.

And that the λακέρυζα κορώνη was renowned for its longevity is repeated later in Aristophanes' Birds 609, where the κορώνη is considered superior to man since it lives five times as long. Despite the variation in numbers of generations cited (nine in Hesiod and five in Aristophanes) it would appear that, if Aristophanes did not rely on Hesiod for the tradition of the longevity of the κορώνη, then both authors must have looked back to some source now buried with the oral folk-tradition of

the Greeks.

The κορώνη is mentioned in the Odyssey, but in each instance in the context of the sea; it is a sea-bird⁵ whose most frequent epithet εἰνάλιος serves to underline its habitat, as in κορῶναι εἰνάλιναι, τῆλιν τε θαλάσσια ἔργα μέμηλεν (Odyssey V 66,67). The λακέρυζα κορώνη as a land-bird would, therefore, appear to be alien to the Homeric epic tradition. λακέρυζα is a rare epithet found, apart from Hesiod and Aristophanes, in obscure Hellenistic literature such as Aratus (for example in 949 of the Phaenomena, where again κορώνη is a sea-bird). The verb λακερύζω is attested in the lexica of Photius, Hesychius and the Suda, of making noise, and once we find the epithet used of a dog, PMG 987 (a) 1. Without further evidence of its occurrence in early literature other than Hesiod we can suppose only that Stesichorus did indeed derive the phrase from Hesiod.

Why did Stesichorus adopt this apparent folk-motif in a passage with obvious heroic associations? The fragment belongs to a poem that was concerned with Telemachus' travels in the Peloponnese in search of his father and with his sojourn in the house of Menelaus at Sparta. The only known title amongst the works of Stesichorus that might have contained such an incident as this would be the Nostói; the poet may, however, have written a Telemacheia⁶ of which we hear nothing in the ancient commentators. Nonetheless, it is still possible to compare this fragment with the corresponding episode in Odyssey XV 160 ff., where Helen also, as in this fragment of Stesichorus, interprets for Telemachus the significance of the appearance of an omen from above. In Stesichorus' version there is no specific mention of an eagle, or any other bird, but the verb κατέπτατο the participle κέκλαγγώς and the fact that there are blood stains connected with whatever is screaming suggest that some type of bird of

omen, perhaps symbolising Odysseus, had appeared⁷.

The λακέρυζα κορώνη, however, is clearly not related to the actual portent. The interpretation of the omen came to an end at line 8 of the fragment, with a final reference to Athena that seems to balance the introductory θεῖον τέρας. The speech, however, continues with Helen's own thoughts on the matter: "(I shall not go on) lest you think 'She's a chattering old crow' .. I shall not detain you here ... Penelope (will be glad or relieved) seeing again the son who is dear to his father ...". At this point Stesichorus departs totally from his Homeric model, with the introduction of advice to Telemachus from Helen. Since the λακέρυζα κορώνη is proverbial in Hesiod for being noisy as well as for its longevity, it would be appropriate here if the poet combined both aspects of the expression, using it to symbolise the old woman who chatters incessantly and senselessly. Thus the image of the chattering old crow stands in sharp contrast with the heroic dimensions of the portent that has just been described, with its obvious reminiscences from the Odyssey. It is just possible that Telemachus had at some previous point expressed scepticism in portents and hence Helen is telling Telemachus that even if he is not convinced by the interpretation of the omen he should at least believe Helen when she says that his mother is probably anxious for his return.

The introduction of this phrase from a non-Homeric source is one of several non-Homeric elements introduced by the poet into this scene essentially based upon a Homeric model. The folk-loric associations of the λακέρυζα κορώνη appear to have been used significantly by the poet in his particular depiction of the scene. Stesichorus may have derived material from post-Homeric authors such as Agias of Troezen, who also wrote a Nostoi, but the expansion of Helen's role in this episode

may well be his own invention.

2. μεμλγμένα δ' ἐσθλὰ κακ[οῦσιν 2618 fr.3 i 4

I include this phrase in the category of Hesiodic word-groups since the immediate juxtaposition of the two neuter plurals, describing conditions of well-being or otherwise, as opposed to the use of the epithets in value-judgments of individuals, does not occur in the Homeric corpus, but only in Hesiod (Works and Days 179) prior to later instances, notably in Theognis and Simonides of Cos.

The polar opposition of ἀγαθός/ἐσθλός and κακός/δευλός lies naturally imbedded in the lexical structure of the language, and hence one does find the antithesis of ἐσθλός and κακός applied to individuals in the Homeric poems, but these examples tend to occur in contexts of value-judgments (actual or implied). Thus Achilles in Iliad IX 318 ff. counters Odysseus' pleas for his return to the battlefield with the argument that death comes to a man whether he is ἐσθλός or κακός:

ἴση μοῖρα μένοντι, καὶ εἰ μάλα τις πολεμίζου·
ἐν δὲ ἴῃ τιμῇ ἡμὲν κακὸς ἥδ' ἐσθλός·
κάτθαν' ὁμῶς ὃ τ' ἀεργὸς ἀνὴρ ὃ τε πολλὰ ἐοργῶς. (IX 318-320)

There is, however, another example from the Homeric corpus, again from the words of Achilles, that may bear a closer relationship to the Hesiodic ἐσθλὰ κακοῦσιν, namely in Iliad XXIV 527 ff. In the possession of Zeus there are two pithoi, one containing κακῶν, the other ἐσθλῶν, from which Zeus apportions to man his lot:

ὦ μὲν κ' ἀμμεύξας δώηι Ζεὺς τερπικέραυνος
ἄλλοτε μὲν τε κακῶι ὃ γε κύρεται, ἄλλοτε δ' ἐσθλῶι. (XXIV 529,530)

It seems here that even the ἀγαθός man, such as Peleus, Achilles' father, receives a mixture of what is κακόν and what is ἐσθλόν; that is a mixture of success and failure, of good and ill fortune.

Although Hesiod's Works and Days presents a world of men whose

social values and duties are radically different from those of the Homeric heroes⁸, the juxtaposition of the neuter plurals ἐσθλά and κακά (in the non-ethical context of line 179, in his myth of the ages of Man) does bear a resemblance to the passage from Iliad XXIV quoted in the previous paragraph. The poet describes the generation to which he belongs in dark, pessimistic tones: the gods have dealt to man their share of χαλεπὰς μερῶνας (178) that make life in general miserable. Line 179 offers but a minute piece of consolation: ἀλλ' ἔμπης καὶ τοῖσι μεμεύξεται ἐσθλὰ κακοῖσιν. Among the "evils" are mixed some "goods"; that is to say, a small amount of prosperity amongst all the ill fortune allotted by the gods. Presumably the ἐσθλά are to be gained through hard work, as Hesiod later explains to Persēs (line 293 ff.). But the κακά may also include what we would consider "evils" in the ethical sense of the word κακός, for in the passages following line 179 the poet describes the present race of men and how they will be destroyed by Zeus on account of their injustice. The section that follows is confusing, but seems to say that justice will be totally overthrown, leaving men only with κακά, so that the idea of mixture of ἐσθλά with κακά hinted at in line 179 is weakened and man's state becomes wholly κακός, in both physical and moral terms.

The idea of mixture is also explicitly expressed in the work of Theognis, again in a context of the upsetting of the social balance:

χρήματα γὰρ τιμῶσι. καὶ ἐκ κακοῦ ἐσθλὸς ἔγνημεν
καὶ κακὸς ἐξ ἀγαθοῦ ...
... σὺν γὰρ μύσγεται ἐσθλὰ κακοῖς (189-192)

The ἐσθλά that are mixed with the κακά in Theognis' poem still refer to the traditional qualities of the aristocratic society of the Homeric poems in so far as the standards are based on nobility of birth as opposed to inferiority of birth. What it would be interesting to determine is the status of these terms in Stesichorus' poem. Presumably the passage

in question involved some sort of reflective judgment, after the weighing of the respective merits and demerits of a situation, either through the words of a character within the narrative structure of the Eriphyle⁹ or else through the poet's own comments on man's position in the world as exemplified by the actions described in his narrative poem. The ἐσθλὰ κακοῦσιν may refer to a state of partial prosperity as one finds in the Works and Days. More probably the terms ἐσθλός and κακός reflect something of the social values of the epic tradition in so far as the poet is reproducing myths from the heroic tradition. It is possible, however, that in his use of the terms the poet has incorporated the ethical connotations of the terms ἀγαθός/ἐσθλός and κακός, as found in Simonides only a generation later¹⁰. One would expect some sort of development from the epic use of the terms, that reflected the particular concept of ἐσθλός and κακός in Stesichorus' times, but as far as evidence of this is concerned the surviving fragments are disappointing in their lack of material.

II Word-groups that occur in the Hymns alone.

1. ἐν κευθμῶνι πέτρας PMG 184 3 (SLG 7 5)

The emendation from ἐν κευθμῶνων πέτρας in the MSS of Strabo seems certain, although the exact position of all the elements of this fragment have caused scholars some concern¹¹. It is evident that either Strabo was guilty of extracting only appropriate material and omitting part of the verse, or else he had a faulty memory. From Ταρτησσοῦ to ἀργυροπόρους forms a compact/rhythmical unity, but the relation of ἐν κευθμῶνι πέτρας to it is ambiguous. As Haslam points out, ... ἀργυροπόρους ἐν κευθμῶνι .. if continuous, contravenes Stesichorus' normal avoidance of consecutive contractions of bicipitia¹², and is therefore highly unlikely.

As an indirect parallel for the phrase ἐν κευθμῶνι πέτρας one can cite γαίης ἐν κευθμῶνι (Theogony 158), which is in turn associated with another phrase in the epic corpus through κεῦθος, cognate with κευθμών: ὑπὸ κεύθεα/κεύθεσι γαίης (Iliad XXII 482; Odyssey XXIV 204; Hymn to Demeter 340, 415). In the above examples from Homer and the Hymn to Demeter, one finds that the halls of Hades are situated ὑπὸ κεύθεσι γαίης doubtless conceived of as some great cave in the heart of the earth. Similarly depicted is the Cretan birth-place of Zeus in the Hesiodic tradition: ἀντρωι ἐν ἡλιβάτῳ, ζαθέης ὑπὸ κεύθεσι γαίης (Theogony 483). The monster Echidna, who dwells deep in the earth in her cave κάτω κοῖλῃ ὑπὸ πέτρῃ, simply remains in the surroundings in which Ceto gave birth to her:

σπῆι ἐνὶ γλαφυρῷ θεῖνῃ κρατερόφρον' Ἐχιδναν,
 ἥμισυ μὲν νύμφην ἐλικώπιδα καλλιπάρηον,
 ἥμισυ δ' αὖτε πέλωρον ὄφιν δεινὸν τε μέγαν τε
 αἰόλον ὠμηστήν, ζαθέης ὑπὸ κεύθεσι γαίης. (Theogony 297-300)

The single instance of the association of κευθμών and πέτρα occurring in the Hymn to Hermes 229: πέτρης ἐς κευθμῶνα βαθύσκιον, also belongs to the context of a deity's birth-place. It seems, therefore, that in his description of Eurytion's birth-cave, Stesichorus was following a traditional description of famous birth-places of supernatural beings located in caves within the uttermost depths of the earth, a tradition that is alien to the Homeric poems, where the only parallel notion of a cave ὑπὸ κεύθεα γαίης is associated with Hades. If Stesichorus did imitate the phrase that appears in the Hymn to Hermes, there is no evidence that he also adopted the unusual epithet βαθύσκιον that qualifies κευθμῶνα since the quotation breaks after this phrase in Strabo.

2. ὀψύγονοι τε καὶ ἀσπασί|οι 2359 fr.1 i 2

In the Homeric poems ὀψύγονος refers to posterity, as in καὶ

ποτέ τις εἴπησι καὶ ὀψιγόνων ἀνθρώπων (Iliad VII 87, Odyssey I 302).

On the other hand, in the two instances of the word in the Hymn to Demeter ὀψιγόνος refers to the fact that a son had been born later in the life of his parents (lines 165 and 219). Moreover, one of these instances occurs in close association with ἀσπάρτος, the second epithet in the Stesichorean word-group in question:

τηλυγέτος δέ οἱ υἱὸς ἐνὶ μεγάρῳι εὐπήκτω
ὀψιγόνος τρέφεται, πολυεύχετος ἀσπάρσιός τε. (164,165)

Either Stesichorus imitated the line in the Hymn to Demeter directly, or else the same tradition, presumably non-Homeric, was known to both poets.

3. ἐς ἄλσος ... κατασκήδεν PMG 185 5 (SLG 17 8,9)

As a possible precedent for the combination of ἄλσος and κατασκήδεν one may turn to the sole instance of the Hymn to Aphrodite 20: ἄλσεά τε σκήδεντα δικαίων τε πόλιν ἀνδρῶν. In my discussion of this phrase in the previous chapter I already noted the significance of the compound form of the epithet¹³.

4. πόλιν ἡμερόεσσαν 2803 fr.11 11

If West's supplement be correct¹⁴, the only instance of a parallel expression in the epic corpus occurs in the Hymn to Apollo 180: καὶ Μύλητον ἔχεις, ἔναλον πόλιν ἡμερόεσσαν. There are, however, instances of the word-association in poets such as Tyrtaeus whose elegiac verses must have owed something to his epic predecessors of whom some are now lost. Thus in fragment 4 (Bergk) one finds οἷσι μέλει Σπάρτης ἡμερόεσσα πόλιν.

Barrett, however, reads ἡμερόε¹⁵, and if this be correct, ἡμερόε - (from ἡμερόω?) as part of an epithet would be unlikely to qualify πόλιν.

III Word-groups that occur in the Epic Cycle alone.

There are no "formulaic" expressions in the fragments of Stesichorus that may be identified as parallel to expressions that have survived in the remnants of the Epic Cycle exclusively, without precedents in the Homeric corpus also. As far as Homeric phrases as concerned, number d) 12 of chapter III occurs in Kypria VII 8 (Allen), κατὰ χῦμα πολυφλοῖσβόλο θαλάσσης and number d) 13 occurs in the Little Iliad XIX 10 (Allen), ἐν νηυσὶν ... ποντοπόροισιν.

IV Word-groups that belong to more than one of the previous categories.

1. οὐ' αἰθέρο [ς ἀτ]ρυγέτας 2360 fr.1 i 4 (= PMG 209)

The epithet ἀτρυγέτος in the epic corpus, commonly applied to ἄλς or πόντος (predominantly in the genitive case, 5 times in the Iliad and 11 in the Odyssey), appears with αἰθήρ only once, in Iliad XVII 425. αἰθήρ in Homer tends to occur without an accompanying epithet. The association of αἰθήρ and ἀτρυγέτος does occur in the Hesiodic corpus, fr. 150 35, and in the Hymn to Demeter 67 and 457, which indicates a possible non-Homeric source for Stesichorus' choice of phrase. There are two points of importance to note. In the first place the poet has not preserved the termination in -οιο, common to all the examples that have survived in epic, and this must be explained as the poet's adaptation of the phrase to a new metrical scheme¹⁶. Secondly, although one may point to identifiable precedents of the association of ἀτρυγέτος with αἰθήρ none of the contexts of this phrase is in any way related to the description of a portent sent by the gods. In the Hymn to Demeter 67, the goddess hears her daughter's cries through the ἀτρυγέτος air and in Iliad XVII, the terrible clangour of battle reaches the ears of the gods

through the ἀτρυγέτος air. On neither occasion does the air carry good news, and so it may be that the epithet has not only connotations of unfruitfulness but also of unfriendliness. Similarly, when the goddess is sent as messenger to bring Demeter back to the company of the gods, thus restoring fertility to the earth, the use of ἀτρυγέτος to describe αἰθήρ through which she must travel to reach the earth reflects the fact that the whole earth is in the grips of famine as a result of Demeter's withdrawal from her duties, and is therefore both unfruitful and unfriendly to man.

It is possible, therefore, that the unfriendly connotations of the epithet, applied in general to the sea, are deliberately transferred in these instances to "air", and that Stesichorus intended to recall the implications of unfriendliness when he chose this unusual association of ἀτρυγέτος with αἰθήρ in the context of his bird-portent. Whether Odysseus is already at home, or about to return¹⁷, his unexpected arrival is presumably represented by the flight of the bird through the "unfriendly air", boding ill for the suitors entrenched in his house. The portent, with its apparent allusion to Odysseus' return and indication of some imminent misfortune would be designed to indicate the urgency for Telemachus' own return, whether or not Telemachus himself chose to believe it¹⁸.

2. δαίμονος αἶσα

2617 fr.4 ii 8,9

In its single occurrence in Odyssey XI 61 and then in the Hymn to Demeter 300, the phrase δαίμονος αἶσα appears to be a modification of Αὐδὸς αἶσα, which is itself not frequently found (namely 3 times in the Homeric epics, of which only Iliad IX 608 is in the dative case). It is noteworthy that the example from Odyssey XI, ἴσέ με δαίμονος αἶσα κακῇ,

preserves the epithet κακή with αἶσα, which we may compare with κακή
 Διὸς αἶσα παρέστη (Odyssey IX 52). Stesichorus and the poet of the Hymn
to Demeter chose not to include an epithet for αἶσα, which in fact occurs
 more frequently in the epic tradition without epithets. The alternative
 of δαίμονος αἶσα for Διὸς αἶσα in epic is not apparently dictated by
 position, since both phrases fall at the verse-end¹⁹. The distinction
 between δαίμονος and Διός appears to be insignificant in such contexts in
 the Homeric poems, the δαίμων being an extra-terrestrial power who has
 control over man's destiny, sometimes equated with the gods (Iliad I 222),
 sometimes distinguished from them (Odyssey III 27).

It is through the δαίμονος αἶσα that Geryon receives the fatal
 arrow-wound from Heracles. The description of the wounding of Geryon is
 strongly reminiscent of Homeric passages relating the fall of a hero,
 generally as a result of a spear-wound²⁰. It is interesting to note,
 however, that in the Homeric passages there is no mention ever made of
 αἶσα or the δαίμων. I assume that, although the hero who received the
 wound did so through his fate, the poet's immediate concern was to enhance
 the skill of the victorious hero. Stesichorus, on the other hand, in
 introducing this phrase, did not intend to detract from the bravery or
 skill of Heracles, but rather meant to underline the mortality of Geryon.
 αἶσα is what is allotted to man by divine powers and is always associated
 with mortals²¹. Fragment 13 of 2617 is plausibly assigned to a discussion
 between Geryon and another character in which Geryon expresses uncertainty
 as to whether or not he has inherited his ancestor's immortality²². Thus,
 in remarking that the arrow pierced Geryon's flesh δαίμονος αἶσα, the
 poet draws attention to an important aspect of Geryon, namely that he was
 subject to the αἶσα of a mortal, a fact that would not require mention in
 the case of the heroes in the parallel scenes from the epic tradition.

3. βούλαυς Ἀθάνας 2360 fr.1 i 8 (=PMG 2209)

In the Homeric poems one finds in general Διὸς βουλή or θεῶν βουλαί, with one instance of the dative plural Διὸς βουλευουσιν (Iliad XIII 524). On one occasion Athena is mentioned specifically: εἰς ὃ κ' Ἀχαιοὶ | Ἴλιον αἰπὺ ἔλοισεν Ἀθηναίης διὰ βουλᾶς (Iliad XV 70,71). The Hesiodic corpus, however, furnishes several references to the βουλή of Athena: βουλευουσιν Ἀθηναίης ἀγγελείης (Theogony 318; cf. fr. 33 (a) 19, 43 (a) 78 and 70 11, all with singular βουλή). It seems more likely, therefore, that Stesichorus derived the phrase from the Hesiodic tradition.

4. πυκνύ[ας] τε φρένας 2619 fr.1 i 19

The φρένες are generally the seat of passions such as ὄχος, πόνος and ἔρως, although less frequently the word is used with reference to the volitional faculties: ἀλλὰ σὺ μή μοι ταῦτα νόει φρεσὶ (Iliad IX 600). It must be in the latter sense of φρήν that the epithet πυκνός, "shrewd" or "sagacious", is applied, and the expression may be compared with πυκνὸν νόον (Iliad XV 461). Only three instances of the word-group may be cited (1 in the Iliad and 2 in the Hymn to Aphrodite) and in each the context is almost identical: the πυκνὰ φρένες of Zeus (Iliad XIV 294, Hymn to Aphrodite 38) and of Aphrodite (Hymn 243) are "veiled" and fail to function properly on account of excessive emotion, ἔρως or ὄχος. For example, in Iliad XIV 294 Hera distracts and beguiles Zeus with her beauty so as to draw his attention away from the battlefield, and this is expressed in terms of enveloping or veiling his πυκνὰς φρένας.

The Stesichorean passage is unfortunately fragmentary but appears to come from a speech in the Trojan debate on the fate of the Wooden Horse abandoned by the Greeks. The speaker has been advocating reliance on fighting ability by criticising the Trojans' lack of warlike

spirit. His speech concluded with the words ὡτ[ρ]υνε μέγαν φοβ[ο]ν ἐν ... (line 22). In the latter part of the speech, the close proximity of a reference to Zeus, εὐρύσ[τ]α Ζεὺς (lines 16, 17) and an allusion to the end of the war, in τέλος (line 16) and π[ο]λέμου [τῆ] λειψιᾶ (line 18), suggests that the argument followed by the speaker might have included some mention of the situation as described in Iliad XIV. Zeus favoured the Trojans and Hera's seduction of Zeus was designed to allow the Greeks to gain some advantage over the Trojans while Zeus' thoughts were distracted as he lay at Hera's side on Mount Ida. The return of Zeus' πυκινὰς φρένας would ensure the success of the Trojan endeavour and the end of the war. The flight of the Greeks and the abandonment of the Wooden Horse could be interpreted as a sign that Zeus was again supporting them.

On the other hand, one cannot discount the possibility that the πυκινὰς φρένας belong to a mortal; perhaps the speaker calls upon the πυκινὰς φρένας of the Trojans to be applied to their present situation, or else refers to the flight of the Greeks with their πυκινὰς φρένας. Without more of the context there can be little possibility of reaching a certain interpretation.

In the preceding pages I have presented the few instances of "formulaic" expression ostensibly adopted by Stesichorus from non-Homeric sources, together with three instances of phrases observable in non-Homeric sources and occurring once also in Homer. The number of word-groups that remain entirely without precedent in the Homeric corpus is strikingly small: two possible parallels in Hesiod, and three in the Hymns. On the other hand, it is noteworthy that many of the phrases with recognisable Homeric precedents occur also in Hesiod or the Hymns. The following list enumerates these instances:

i) Of the Homeric "formulae" copied by Stesichorus (accounted for in chapter III) the following are also found in the Hesiodic corpus:

in category a) : 1, 4, 8, 9, 11 (i.e. 5 instances out of 11)

b) : 3, 4 (i.e. 2 instances out of 4)

c) : 1 (i.e. 1 instance out of 2)

d) : 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, (12), 13, 14, 16, 17 (i.e. 10/11
out of 17)

e) : 1 (i.e. 1 instance out of 4)

Thus in four of the five categories one observes that approximately 50% of the Homeric phrases employed by Stesichorus also appear in the Hesiodic corpus.

ii) Of the Homeric "formulae" copied by Stesichorus, the following are also found in the Hymns:

in category a) : 1, 2, 3, 4, ... (all are represented by one or more than
one example in the Hymns)

b) : 1, 2, 3, 4, ... (all are again represented)

c) : none

d) : 3, 4, 6, 7, 12, 13, 16 (7 instances out of 17)

e) : none

The fact that all of the Homeric phrases in categories a) and b) also occur in the Hymns reflects the fact that the latter are linguistically closer to the Homeric corpus than Hesiod is.

The subject-matter of certain of Stesichorus' poems indicates that the poet in all likelihood drew upon material particular to the Continental tradition of epic rather than from the tradition to which Homer belonged. For, apart from the universally known Trojan cycle, themes that were popular in non-Ionic communities occur in his poetry: poems on the exploits of Heracles such as were composed by Spartan poets Demodocus and Cinaethon, as well as Rhodian Peisinous and Peisander, were, as far we can tell, relatively infrequent in the repertoires of Ionian poets²³.

I assume that not only did the wandering rhapsodes of the 7th and 6th centuries bring Homer to the western Greek world, but also the works of Hesiod and probably of other Continental poets of prominence.

Just as there are distinctive features in the language of Continental epic at the levels of phonology and morphology, so are there "formulaic" expressions alien to the Homeric corpus at the level of poetic diction. Krafft's statistical analysis shows that 15.3% of the repeated phrases in Hesiod do not occur in Homer²⁴. Should one expect to find such a percentage reflected in the relationship of "formulaic" phrases in Stesichorus derived from epic? Bowra hazarded a guess that Stesichorus' language was more akin to that of Hesiod than to that of Homer²⁵. Pavese would have us believe that the development of choral lyric and of citharodia followed a direct line of descent from the Continental epic tradition²⁶. A mere two word-groups out of the approximately 100 considered thus far falls considerably short of the 15.3% of distinctively Hesiodic "formulae" from the entire epic corpus. Even if one groups together the four examples common to the Hymns and the two instances of phrases totally non-epic in origin²⁷, the resultant percentage of 8 is hardly sufficient basis on which to found a theory of an unbroken continuation of tradition from Continental epic to the poetry of Stesichorus. Thus, as was seen in the examination of the phonological and morphological aspects of Stesichorus' language, so with regard to his use of "formulae" one finds that the evidence affords no really conclusive proof of the influence of the Continental epic tradition. One must assume rather that the poet looked to the epic tradition as an integral whole and was not especially influenced by what we choose to distinguish as representative of the Continental tradition alone.

Pavese's theory of a continuum may be valid in the case of Pindar, but not necessarily in the case of other lyric poets. In the section in which Pavese compares "formulaic" expressions common to Hesiod and lyric, but alien to Homer, he cites 63 examples²⁸, which may seem a large or small number depending upon its frame of reference. Without some indication of the relationship between this figure and the possible number of phrases of Homeric origin, there is little significance to the number. It is significant, however, that 41 of the 63 examples derive from Pindar. The next highest number of instances from any one poet is 5 in the case of Alcman and 5 in the case of Theognis, followed by 4 from Bacchylides. Again, for a proper understanding of these figures one would need to know whether the ratios 41 : 63 and 5 : 63 were in fair proportion to the extant material of the respective poets. The fragmentary nature of the works of all poets concerned makes accurate numerical analyses impossible. The conspicuous imbalance of the evidence in the case of Pindar does indeed result from the greater proportion of his work surviving, but another factor may also be influential. Under examination Pindar's language will show closer affiliations with the Continental tradition, which is basically founded on attestations from the language of Hesiod because both Pindar and Hesiod belong to the same geographical locale, Boeotia. If one believes Notopoulos, Boeotia was an important cultural centre in the Continental epic tradition²⁹. Since in his language, Pindar adopts and adapts from his local heritage of oral poetry, whether directly or through intermediary sources now lost, one would expect some evidence of parallels between Pindar and Hesiod. One cannot infer from this that a poet such as Alcman was similarly influenced for one might more reasonably expect him to have relied on Laconian epic traditions. As for the work of such poets as Cinaethon, our vision is

restricted by the lack of evidence.

Pavese lists two examples from Stesichorus among the 63 instances of expressions common to Hesiod and lyric; the *λακέρυζα κορώνα* and a supposed linguistic reminiscence in Stesichorus' verses on the faithless daughters of Tyndareus (PMG 223) of Hesiod fr. 176 (M. & W.). Both citations of the latter example stem from the scholiast's commentary on Euripides' *Orestes* 249 indicating that both poets wrote on the same theme. There are, however, no obvious similarities of diction apparent in the verses quoted. As regards the *λακέρυζα κορώνα*, Stesichorus' imitation of that Hesiodic "formula" can be seen as an example of a mixture of elements from different sources. As far as we can tell, the *λακέρυζα κορώνα* belongs to a folk-tradition and its context is non-heroic. If distinctively non-heroic, its appearance in the context of the heroic narrative of Telemachus' search for his father and his sojourn at Sparta would be all the more striking. Thus I believe that since the number of recognisable imitations of what may be called "Continental formulae" is so small, one must view these instances rather as part of the pattern observed in the preceding chapter. The poet in his adaptation of heroic legends chose in his diction to juxtapose Homeric with non-Homeric elements, creating new associations in an attempt to remain within the heroic tradition and yet at the same time to revitalise some of the well-worn themes.

Footnotes to chapter V

1 See in particular J.A. Notopoulos, "Studies in Early Greek Oral Poetry," *HSCP* 68 (1964) pp. 1-77 and C.O. Pavese, *Tradizioni e generi poetici della Grecia arcaica* (Roma, 1972):

2 See page 32 ff. of chapter II.

- 3 See page 42 of chapter II.
- 4 Pavese, op.cit., pp. 111-196.
- 5 On the types of κορώνη see D'Arcy Thompson, A Glossary of Greek Birds (Oxford, 1936) p. 168 ff. The λαίερα κορώνη belongs to the family of Corvus Corone, while the κορώνη that appears in the Odyssey is known as Puffinus Anglorum or Puffinus Yelkman.
- 6 W. Peek, "Die Nostoi de Stesichoros ," Philologus 102 (1958) p. 117, questions the assignation of this fragment to the Nostoi in view of the length of the episode described therein. J.L. Calvo-Martinez, in "Estesicoro de Himera," Durius II (1974) p. 320, suggests the possibility of an Odyssey or Telemacheia following the same argument proposed by Peek, and citing the remark made by West in ZPE 4 (1969) p. 143, footnote 6, that "the amplitude of the narrative may suggest a separate Odyssey". If, however, Stesichorus had composed an Odyssey, one might reasonably expect to hear some mention of it in one of the later commentators, either as an innovative version of its famous counterpart in the Homeric epic, or as an imitation of that great poem. Less attention might have been paid to a Telemacheia. The possibility of the fragment belonging to other than the Nostoi poem, must remain open.
- 7 I shall make a detailed comparison of the two versions in the following chapter.
- 8 A. Adkins, Moral Values and Political Behaviour in Ancient Greece (London, 1972) p. 12 ff.
- 9 The identification of the fragment as deriving from the Eriphyle was proposed by Lobel in P. Oxy. vol. XXXII, p. 30f. on the basis of the occurrence of the name of Alcmaon , son of Amphiaraus.
- 10 On the moral implications of ἀγαθός etc. in Simonides' famous poem quoted by Plato in the Protagoras and the fragment found in P.Oxy.2432, see W. Donlan, "Simonides, fr. 4 D and P.Oxy. 2432," TAPhA 100 (1969) pp. 71-95.
- 11 See page 121 ff., chapter IV.
- 12 Haslam, art. cit., p. 16.
- 13 See page 110ff., chapter IV.
- 14 See West, ZPE 7 (1971) p. 263.
- 15 See the apparatus criticus in SLG 143, p. 41.
- 16 Note that the form ἀτρυγέτας has a feminine termination, not masculine, as would be expected in the case of what is generally known as a "two-termination" compound adjective.
- 17 See page 163 chapter VI.
- 18 Cf. the hint of scepticism suggested by Helen's words "lest you think

'She's a chattering old crow' ", page 140 of this chapter.

- 19 There are 6 instances of αἶσιν at the verse-end in the Iliad, for example τετυμῆσθαι Διὸς αἶσιν (Iliad IX 608). One also finds the accusative ὑπὲρ Διὸς αἶσαν (XVII 321) as the verse-end. Although there is a single example of δαίμονος αἶσα, occurring in the first half of the line, its metrical value in the dative could easily stand after the bucolic caesura, as in the Hymn to Demeter 300.
- 20 See page 200 ff., chapter VI.
- 21 Fränkel, op.cit., p. 163: "Aisa (for Alcman) establishes our human limitations firmly and places us far below the gods."
- 22 According to the Theogony 287, Geryon's parents were Chrysaor and Callirhoe. The latter was the daughter of Oceanus, the god of the sea, and hence immortality could have been inherited from his mother's side of the family. His father, however, sprang from the blood of Medusa, the mortal member of the trio of Gorgons.
- 23 See Pavese, op.cit., p. 219. On the development of the legends of Heracles see page 266 ff., chapter VIII.
- 24 F. Krafft, Vergleichende Untersuchungen zu Homer und Hesiod (Göttingen, 1963) p. 163 ff., where he lists 164 examples of a total of 1073 of "formulaic" phrases that occur only in Hesiod.
- 25 Bowra, GLP² p. 79.
- 26 Pavese, op.cit., p. 77 ff.
- 27 See page 126f., chapter IV.
- 28 Pavese, op.cit., pp. 159-164.
- 29 Notopoulos, art.cit., p. 25.

Chapter VI Structural patterns derived from epic.

In the previous chapters we have seen how the poet in his diction was indebted to the language of epic, that of Homer and of the mainland tradition alike, and have noted the ways in which he modified noun-epithet "formulae" in particular, so that the new associations of words would be more striking or effective in jarring his audience out of their conditioned expectancy. In this chapter I shall consider the way in which the poet mixed traditional with new associations in the contexts of poems, or parts of poems, that have recognisable Homeric precedents and of those that do not.

Four of the longer fragments offer material for such an examination:

I P.Oxy. 2360 (PMG 209) is an incident with a recognisable parallel in Odyssey XV, namely the bird-omen that occurred at the point of Telemachus' departure from Sparta.

II P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 1 and fr. 15 (SLG 88 and 89) belong to a poem on the sack of Troy through the stratagem of the Wooden Horse. Thus the context of the fragments is not immediately Homeric, but does belong to the Trojan cycle.

III P.Oxy. 2617 fr.4 (SLG 15) contains a description of Heracles' fatal wounding of one of Geryon's heads with an arrow. The ensuing simile of the poppy has a precedent in Iliad VIII 306-308.

IV P.Oxy. 2359 (PMG 222) represents part of a pre-contest catalogue in the legend of the Calydonian Boar Hunt. The incident is mentioned in Iliad IX, although little emphasis is given there to the Hunt itself. The device of the catalogue is preeminently epic in character, the most famous example being the Catalogue of the Ships in Iliad II.

I P.Oxy. 2360 : an omen is sent to Telemachus at Sparta.

The context of 2360 is clearly the observation and interpretation of a portent sighted at the time when Telemachus had been delaying too long away from Ithaca. Since this very episode has survived in its Homeric version in Odyssey XV, it is possible to compare Stesichorus' treatment of an incident familiar to him and to his audience from the Odyssey with the actual account in the epic source. I propose to give a phrase by phrase comparison in tabular form, followed by comments on the similarities and differences of expression and subject-matter in the two versions. Apart from the Homeric parallels from Odyssey XV 160ff., parallel expressions from elsewhere will be listed where relevant.

Stesichorus : 2360	Epic (principally <u>Odyssey</u> XV)
1' θε[ι]ον ἐ[ξ]αίφνας τέρας	ἡ νῶϊν τόδ' ἔφηνε θεὸς τέρας ... XV 168
... ἰδοῦσα νύμφα	... οἱ δὲ ἰδόντες γήθησαν XV 164,165
2 ὦδε δ' ἐ[ει]ψ' Ἑλένα φωναῖ	τὸν δ' Ἑλένη τανύπεπλος ὑποφθαμένη φάτο μῦθον XV 171
ποτ[ι] παῖδ' Ὀδύσειον	- (τὸν = Πεισίστρατον, XV 171)
3 Τηλέμαχ[.]τις ὅδ' ἀμὲν ἄγγελος	Τηλέμαχ', οὗ τοι ἄνευ θεοῦ ἔπατο δεξιὸς ὄρνις XV 531
ἀμὲν	ἡ νῶϊν ... ἦε σοὶ αὐτῶι XV 168
ὅδ' ... ἄγγελος	κίρκος, Ἀπόλλωνος τὰχὺς ἄγγελος XV 526
ὠρανόθεν	... οὐρανοῦ ἐκ κατεπᾶλτο ... <u>Iliad</u> XIX 351

4 δι' αἰθέρο[ς ἀτ]ρυγέτας

κατέπτατο

βα δ[

5 φοινῶι κεκλαγγω[ς

6 ἐς ὑμετέρους δόμους προφαν[εῖς
'Οδυσσε]ὺς

8 βο]υλαῖς 'Αθάνας

9 λακέρυζα κορώνη

10 οὐδ' ἐγώ σ' ἐρύ[ξ]ω

11 Παν]ελόπα σ' ἰδοῦσα φύλου πατρ[ὸς
ὕδ' οὐ

12, 13 πόρ[ου] τέλος ἐσθλ[όν]

cf. χάλκεον οὐρανὸν ἔκε δι'
αἰθέρος ἀτρυγέτοιο
Iliad XVII 425

ὥς δ' ἄρα οἱ εἰπόντι ἐπέπτατο
δεξιὸς ὄρνις
XV 160, 525

... οὐρανοῦ ἐκ κατέπαλτο δι'
αἰθέρος
Iliad XIX 351

cf. αὐτὸς δὲ κλάγξας πέτετο
πνοιῆς ἀνέμοιο
Iliad XII 207

ὥς 'Οδυσσεὺς ...
οὔκαδε νοστήσει καὶ τίσεται ...
XV 176, 177

cf. πλεονές κε μνηστῆρες ἐν
ὑμετέροισι δόμοισι
Odyssey XVIII 247

βουλῆσιν 'Αθηναίης
Theogony 318

βουλῆ 'Αθηναίης
Hesiod fr. 33 (a) 19 =
43 (a) 78

cf. Ἴλιον αἰπὺ ἔλοιεν 'Αθηναίης
διὰ βουλᾶς
Iliad XV 70

λακέρυζα κορώνη
Works and Days 747

Τηλέμαχ' οὐ τί σ' ἐγώ γε πολὺν
χρόνον ἐνθάδ' ἐρύξω
XV 68

cf. φύλου μετὰ πατρὸς ἀκουήν
Odyssey XVII 43

ὥς τοι Ζεὺς τελέσειεν
XV 112

From this table it is possible to see that a few of the word-groups, particularly in the earlier part of the fragment, have recognisable parallels in the Homeric version, although if the phrases are compared closely with Homeric usage, we shall discover that many of them diverge from epic practice.

Line 1:

The expression θεῶν τέρας is not found in Homer¹, but the sense of it is certainly precedented, as Odyssey XV 168 shows: ἦ νῦν τόδ' ἔφηνε θεὸς τέρας ἧε σοι αὐτῶι. The adverb ἐξαίφνης, occurring only twice in the Homeric corpus in the restricted context of sudden fires², creates a greater tension in the description than does ὥς ἄρα οἱ εἰπόντι ... in the Homeric version, and bears with it the connotation of "appearance", which may be compared with ἔφηνε of Odyssey XV 168.

The participle ἰδὼν commonly occurs in the context of someone spying or observing a portent in the skies (for example in Iliad IV 81, VIII 76; Odyssey XV 532), but note the non-Homeric form of ἰδοῦσα³.

νύμφη of Helen occurs only once, at Iliad III 130: δεῦρ' ἔτι, νύμφα φύλη

Line 2:

This line constitutes the equivalent of a speech-introduction that has drawn upon elements from several models in the Homeric poems, but is not identical to any one such line from epic⁴. The unusual use of ὧδε referring to what follows as opposed to what has already preceded is, however, to be observed in the "formulaic" line that occurs in a context of sighting some phenomenon in the skies: ὧδε δέ τις εἵπεσκεν ἰδὼν ἐς πηλείων ἄλλον (Iliad IV 81; cf. VII 201).

The phrase ποτὶ παῖδ' Ὀδύσειον is Homeric in nature, but not actually precedented in the Odyssey⁵.

Lines 3,4:

The problematic space of two letters between Τηλεμαχ[and]τις has not been satisfactorily filled. The reading of Τηλέμαχ[ε ἦ]τις ...⁶ as defended by Führer seems preferable to the reading of Τηλέμαχ' [ὅσ]τις⁷ by Peek, who is followed by Page . Although the latter reading, as an indirect interrogative, has parallels such as ὅστις ὅδ' ἐστὶν in Iliad III 167 or 192 , it relies on the supposition that ἐστὶ was suppressed in the Stesichorean passage and that in line 5 or 6 the speaker made some declaration on the lines of αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ μαντεύσομαι (Odyssey XV 172) . There is no precedent for ἦ followed by indefinite τις, but fairly close is ἦ τι μέγ' ἀθανάτους μάκαρας (Shield 79) . The line with supplement ἦ τις makes sense as follows: "Telemachus, this is surely some sort of messenger that has descended from the skies....".

Two other possibilities present themselves:

- a) Τηλέμαχ' [αὖ]τις ὅδ' ἀμὲν ἄγγελος ὠρανόθεν : "again has this messenger descended from the skies to us". In this instance one must suppose that an omen has already been seen whose implications may or may not have been understood. It is possible that the description of the flight is comparable to what happened before, while the βᾶ δ[ε] in line 4 introduces a new and significant detail that clarifies all.
- b) Τηλέμαχ' ὥς τις ὅδ' ἀμὲν ἄγγελος ὠρανόθεν : "just as this is some messenger from heaven that has descended to us ". In Homer instances exist of declarations of prophecy in which the statement of what actually occurred is introduced by ὥς, and then the ensuing interpretation of the omen is introduced by a corresponding ὥς . Thus:

ὥς ὅδε χῆν ἦρπαξ' ἀτιταλλομένην ἐνὶ οἴκῳ
 ἐλθὼν ἐξ ὄρεος, ὅθι οἱ γενεή τε τόκος τε
 ὥς 'Οδυσσεὺς κακὰ πολλὰ παθὼν καὶ πόλλ' ἐπαληθεὺς
 οἴκαδε νοστήσει καὶ τίσεται

Odyssey XV 174ff.

or ὥς οὗτος κατὰ τέκνα φάγε στρούθοιο καὶ αὐτήν
 ὀκτώ, ὅτ' ἀρ' μήτηρ ἐνάτη ἦν, ἣ τέκε τέκνα,
 ὥς ἡμεῖς τοσσαῦτ' ἔτεα πολεμίζομεν αὖθι
 τῷ δεκάτῳ δὲ πόλιν αἰρήσομεν εὐράγυιαν

Iliad II 326 ff.

In the case of Stesichorus one would suppose that the corresponding clause that gives the interpretation of the portent would commence at the end of line 5 or in line 6 of the fragment. However, it is not entirely clear what stood in the missing portion at the beginning of line 6. At least seven letters may have preceded the sigma and these must be divided into three syllables to fit the metrical pattern - υ ἔς ὑμέτερούς⁸. It is perhaps difficult to see what word with a single short vowel could have followed ὥς. Certainty is impossible.

ἄγγελος, we see from Odyssey XV 526, need not refer to a person,⁹ and hence is plausibly interpreted as designating a bird such as κύρκος or αἰετός in the Stesichorean version, just as a bird, the αἰετός, was the focal point of the amen in Odyssey XV. The two subsequent phrases, ὠρανόθεν and δι' αἰθέρος ἀνρυγέτας that describe the passage of the "messenger" through the skies, are not employed in bird-portents in the Homeric poems, and for this reason it has been questioned whether the "messenger" is in fact a bird in Stesichorus' version¹⁰. οὐρανόθεν may be used in the case of a god's descent, and occasionally of natural phenomena, but never of birds. The goddess Athena descends in Iliad XIX 351 in a fashion remarkably similar to the description of the "messenger's" descent in this fragment :

ἣ δ' ἄρ' ἔκλυ' ἐκκυῖα τανυπτέρυγι λιγυφώνῳ
 οὐρανοῦ ἐκ κατέπαλτο δι' αἰθέρος

Iliad XIX 350,351

The verb in this quotation, κατέπαλτο, was responsible for the reading of κατέπαλτο mistakenly assumed by Lobel and others where the papyrus clearly shows the remains of κατέπτατο¹¹. The latter is now correctly printed in SLG.

Line 5:

The verb κλάζω often refers to the noise made by birds, and its occurrence in this passage would tend to confirm that the portent described by the poet was that of a bird. The association of κλάζω with birds-of-omen is preceded in Iliad X 275 f., where Odysseus and his companions do not see the heron sent by Athena as a sign to them, on account of the darkness, but they do hear its scream: τοῦθ' οὐκ ἴδον ὀφθαλμοῖσι
νύκτα δι' ὀρφναΐην, ἀλλὰ κλάγξαντος ἄκουσαν. Similarly it is the scream of an eagle flying high above the Trojans in Iliad XII 207 that spreads panic amongst them: αὐτὸς δὲ κλάγξας πέτετο πνοῆς ἀνέμοιο .

In the last-mentioned omen the eagle holds in its claws, not a goose as in Odyssey XV, but a bloody snake still convulsing:

αἰετὸς ὑψιπέτης ἐπ' ἀριστερὰ λαὸν ἑέργων
φοινῆεντα δράκοντα φέρων ὀνύχεσσι πέλωρον
ζῶν ἐτ' ἀσπαύροντα καὶ οὐ πω λήθετο χάρμης. Iliad XII 201-203

Thus it would seem that the appearance of the rare epithet φοινός¹² in the fragment of Stesichorus reflects the sort of image depicted by the blood-bespattered snake in Iliad XII 202. Neither of the closest parallels to the Stesichorean version mentions the blood drawn from the victim, but as in the case of ὠρανόθεν and δι' αἰθέρος ἀτρυγέτας, there could be nothing to hinder the poet from conflating traditional elements from a variety of scenes in epic.

Line 6 ff.:

Lobel indicates that one may find parallels for the use of ὑμέτερος in an address to one person in Odyssey XVIII 247 and Iliad XXIII 84¹³. Presumably the metrical scheme in this line required the longer form offered by the plural. It is assumed by Lobel and others that this line refers to Odysseus' home-coming, potential or actual¹⁴, an idea that

is put forward by Helen in Odyssey XV:

ὥς 'Οδυσσεὺς κακὰ πολλὰ παθὼν καὶ πόλλ' ἐπαληθεὺς
οὔκαδε νοστήσει καὶ τίσεται· ἤε καὶ ἤδη
οἴκοι, ἀτὰρ μνηστῆρσι κακὸν πάντεσσι φυτεύει. Odyssey XV 176-178

The verb προφαίνω is also used of Odysseus' unexpected arrival in Odyssey XXIV 159,160: οὐδέ τις ἡμεῶν δύνατο γινῶναι τὸν ἐόντα ἐξαπίνης προφανέντ', so that its occurrence in Stesichorus' version of Helen's prophecy is not improbable.

Lines 7,8:

For line 7 Peek suggests the supplement εὖ τόδ' ἔγνων ἅτε μάντις ἀνὴρ¹⁵, a statement that would corroborate Helen's interpretation, but the reference to herself as masculine, μάντις ἀνὴρ, is hardly appropriate and without parallel. ἀνὴρ is more likely to stand in apposition to 'Οδυσσεύς; that is, line 7 would stand in apposition to the previous line.

Line 8:

The βοῦλας 'Αθήνας¹⁶ must be held responsible for the sending of the portent, although the specific grammatical relationship between this line and the preceding ones cannot be determined. Athena is in direct control of Odysseus' fate throughout the Odyssey and hence some reference to her handiwork at this point would not be out of place. There is also the possibility that in this passage Stesichorus is conflating the material from the Homeric portent-scene in book XV 170 ff. with the scene earlier in that book in which Athena appears to Telemachus at night to prompt him to return to Ithaca(XV 10ff.).

Line 9:

This line bears no relation to the prophecy-scene in Odyssey XV. The phrase λακέρυζα κορώνη is found in the Hesiodic corpus alone¹⁷, and I shall return later to its part in the speech of Helen here.

Line 10:

The words of this speech are still apparently uttered from the lips of Helen. I note, therefore, that the words οὐδ' ἐγώ σ' ἐρύξω, which are reminiscent of Menelaus' declaration in XV 68 : Τηλέμαχ', οὐ τί σ' ἐγώ γε πολὺν χρόνον ἐνθάδ' ἐρύξω, suggest the probable conflation of diverse elements from Odyssey XV into this single episode.

Line 11:

Peek notes that the short form Πανελόπια is un-Homeric¹⁸. The combination of φύλου πατρός and υἱόν, almost tautologous, is an amalgamation of the elements of two common "formulae"¹⁹. In the Odyssean version Helen makes no mention of Penelope when she divines the significance of the eagle and the goose. Athena, in her words to Telemachus, did refer briefly to Penelope, but Stesichorus has created an appeal to Telemachus' mother in a novel way: Helen is saying that even if Telemachus does not trust in the portent, it is time that he returned home, for his mother's sake, since she would be anxious at his long absence, lest he follow his father's foot-steps.

Line 12:

If the suggested supplement is correct²⁰, this is another example of a non-Homeric association of epithet and noun. The τέλος ἐσθλόν would refer to the successful outcome of Telemachus' search.

The second column of 2360 contains the description of an object of gold and silver, ἀργυρέαν τετ[(line 1) and χρυσῆν ὑπερθε (line 2), possibly booty from Troy (cf. ἐκ Δαρδανυδ[line 3). Peek and Bowra assume that this object must be a gift presented to Telemachus by Menelaus on his departure from Sparta, such as we find in Odyssey XV 115 ff.²¹. In the Odyssey Menelaus offered Telemachus various gifts

(183 ff.), but finally presented him with a bowl of silver and gold that had been given to him by the king of the Sidonians:

δώσω τοι κρητῆρα τετυγμένον· ἀργύρεος δὲ
 ἐστὶν ἅπας, χρυσῶι δ' ἐπὶ χεῖλεα κεκράνται,
 ἔργον δ' Ἡφαίστου.
Odyssey XV 115-117

In this fragment the object of silver with gold overlay²² may have been a departure gift; if so, it is noteworthy that its description and presentation take place after the prophecy, whereas in the Homeric version the presentation occurred before the portent was seen²². It is equally possible, however, that the poet is describing vessels such as the basin of silver and the golden jug mentioned in Odyssey XV 135 ff.:

χέρνιβα δ' ἀμφίπολος προχόωι ἐπέχευε φέρουσα
 καλῇ χρυσείῃ, ὑπὲρ ἀργυρέοιο λέβητος,
 νύφασθαι.

or the golden cup from which a libation was poured before departure : ἐν δέπαῳ χρυσέῳ (Odyssey XV 149). There is too little of the Stesichorean text in column ii to draw any certain conclusions.

In the preceding discussion of the fragment, line by line, I have indicated the similarities and differences between the two versions of the episode in which an omen is sent to Telemachus at Sparta and I conclude that Stesichorus must have been amalgamating elements from other portent-scenes in the epic tradition, as well as compressing the more prolonged version of Odyssey XV. In the Odyssey, after Athena has first come to Telemachus to urge him to return, Telemachus reveals his intentions to his host and as a result Menelaus prepares to send him back with due sacrifice and presentation of gifts according to the code of good hospitality. It is precisely at this point of Telemachus' departure that the omen is observed, propitiously on the right, hinting at a safe journey and the successful outcome of his search.

In the Stesichorean version, it seems that the omen itself prompts Telemachus to make his return. Helen interprets the omen, which was almost certainly the flight of a bird-of-prey, as a sign for Telemachus to return home. Whether she refers to Odysseus as already home, in the past, or whether in the future or even potential mood, we cannot tell. She apparently alludes to the machinations of Athena, and in this we are reminded of Athena's protection of Odysseus in the epic tradition. Thus Stesichorus may have intended to incorporate into one episode Athena's part in urging Telemachus to return, which belongs to an incident separate from the portent-scene in Odyssey XV, thus retaining Athena's traditional role as divine helper of both father and son.

In line 9, at the beginning of the antistrophe, there appears to be a distinct interruption in the delivery of the prophecy. There may have been a change of speaker, but the limited space of half a line for the conclusion of one speech and the introduction of another by means of traditional or semi-traditional expressions gives strong grounds²³ for arguing against this and for favouring the continuation of the same speech. Who or what is referred to as a λακέρυζα κορώνη? The only sensible answer seems to be that the αὐτὰ is Helen and the λακέρυζα κορώνη has nothing to do with the bird-portent, but rather with the person who has just explained it. Peek supplements plausibly μὴ φ]ηὶς αὐτὰ λακέρυζα κορώνη : 'lest you say "this woman is nothing but a cackling crow"²⁴. The proverbial or folk-loric nature of the expression is borne out by its usage in Hesiod Works and Days 747. As a term for something that made a lot of noise to no purpose the phrase could be appropriately given to a person who chattered volubly with nothing pertinent to say. Hence the general sense of line 9 ff. would be " and in case you think this is the

babbling of an old crow, (I shall tell you what I think) : I have no intention of keeping you here Your mother will be glad to see her dear son return home.". There is no precedent for this sort of remark in the Homeric version . Menelaus did express his desire not to prevent Telemachus' returning home if that was his wish. In Stesichorus, however, the thoughts are attributed to Helen. She implies that whether Telemachus believed the omen or not, there was another very good reason for his immediate return, namely his mother whom he had abandoned to the tender mercy of the suitors.

Thus, not only has the poet introduced new elements into the portent-scene, such as the blood-smeared prey of the bird, and conflated material from various portent-scenes in the Homeric corpus, but he has also extended the part that Helen plays in the scene. She is the first to catch sight of the omen. She then gives her interpretation, but follows it with her own advice to Telemachus, to the effect that there was nothing to keep him in Sparta when he ought in fact to return to protect his mother, until Odysseus' home-coming.

Führer discusses the first column of this fragment in relation to the epic conventions of a prophecy speech in his monograph, Formproblem-Untersuchungen zu den Reden in der frühgriechischen Lyrik, using as a model for the structure of the traditional speech, Helen's words in Odyssey XV²⁵. He attempts to demonstrate that Stesichorus adhered to the traditional pattern with particular care. Of the six categories he establishes for a traditional prophecy-speech, he believes Stesichorus to have employed the four major ones. These are:

I Anrede or address, appearing in line 2 of the fragment.

II Legitimation der Voraussage, or identification of the prophecy, lines 2 and 3.

III Bezugnahme auf das Vorzeichen, or reference to the omen, line 5.

IV Eigentliche Prophezeiung, or prophetic statement, lines 6-8.

In line 2, although the vocative Τηλέμαχ' is not so emphatic as κλυτε or κέκλυτε (cf. Odyssey XV 172, II 161; Pindar Pythian IV 13 ff.) the expression ἦ is almost as arresting. I assume that Führer categorises lines 2-3 as "proof of identity" on account of the ἀμύν and possible parallel, ἡμῖν μὲν τόδ' ἔφηνε τέρας μέγα μητίετα Ζεύς in Iliad II 324, but the lines are not close to the principal example cited by Führer, ὥς ἐνὶ θυμῷ | ἀθάνατοι βάλλουσιν ... (Odyssey XV 172,173).

I would rather take lines 2-5 closely together, as the equivalent of what Führer designates as his third category. In other words, the speaker first declares what he has seen "This is surely some messenger that has swooped down ..." (lines 2-5), and then proceeds to give an interpretation, namely the return of Odysseus, through the machinations of Athena (lines 6-8).

Although I do not agree entirely with Führer's division of the fragment into his established categories of a prophecy-speech, I do accept that Stesichorus is following some of the conventional features of a portent-scene, including the delivery of the prophecy, from the epic tradition. But the poet steps beyond the limits of tradition and the Odyssean version of this episode in his characterisation of Helen. She is no longer the mere mouthpiece for the interpretation of the omen, but seems to have been portrayed as showing an awareness that despite the omen there was some urgency for Telemachus' return, and also that it was possible that the youth might question or disbelieve the interpretation of omens as the sort of thing in which old wives dabble. It is important, therefore, to note how the poet has developed a traditional theme in a novel way, conflating traditional and non-traditional diction.

II P. Oxy. 2619 fr.1 and fr.15 : the Wooden Horse at Troy.

2619 has produced fragments, the content of which is ostensibly Trojan, but from that part of the saga when the city was finally captured. This event falls beyond the scope of the Iliad, but is alluded to briefly in the Odyssey VIII 500ff., where a summary is given of the song that was performed at the court of the Phaeacians by Demodocus to entertain Odysseus. The bard sang of the Wooden Horse that the Trojans dragged into their city, of the divided opinion as to its fate, of the final decision to dedicate it to the gods and of the fatal outcome of that decision for the Trojans. According to Proclus there was a post-Homeric poem comprising two books composed by Arctinus of Miletus, entitled the Sack of Troy, which began with a debate among the Trojans over the Wooden Horse abandoned by the Greeks. The summary in Proclus, like that which appears in Odyssey VIII, mentions the opposing points of view of the Trojans : some were in favour of destroying the image, others were in favour of dedicating it to Athena. Clearly fr.1 of 2619 belongs to such a debate, as part of Stesichorus' Iliou Persis. Thus, with this context in mind I shall consider, as before, the possible parallel expressions from the epic corpus, to determine the extent to which the poet adapted or modified expressions from the Homeric poems in his treatment of a theme outside the scope of those poems.

a) Stesichorus : 2619 fr.1 col i

Epic

6,7 βίαι τε καὶ αἰχμῶν ...
πεποιοῦσας

κάρτεϊ τε σθένει τε πεποιοῦσας
ἡνορέη τε

Iliad XVII 329

ἀλλ' ἄρα τόξουσιν καὶ εὖστρεφεϊ
οἷος ἁώτῳ

"Ιλιον εἰς ἅμ' ἔποντο πεποιοῦσας
Iliad XIII 716, 717

7 ἄλλ' ἄγε δή

9]ονες ἀγκυλοτόξου

11 διάσταν

16 τέλος εὐρύο[πα Ζεύς

18 π]ολέμου τε]λευτᾶ[

19 πυκιν[άς] τε φρ[έ]νας

21 ῥηξήνορα

22 ὦτρ]υε μέγαν φρ[α]σίν ἐν

24 μετέ]πρεπε καὶ πιν[υ]τᾶι

b) 2619 fr. 1 col. ii

6 πρὸς ναδν ἐς ἀκρ[όπο]λ[υ]ν
σπεύδοντες

7 Τρῶες πολέες τ' ἐπύκ[ου]ροι

Iliad III 441, IV 418, V 249

etc.

cf. Παίονας ἀγκυλοτόξους

Iliad II 848 = X 428

-

... ἐπεὶ οὐκέτι δήετε τέκμωρ
"Ιλίου ἀπείνῃς" μάλα γάρ ἐθεν
εὐρύοπα Ζεύς
χεῖρα ἐὴν ὑπερέσχε ...

Iliad IX 418-420

ἐν γὰρ χερσὶ τέλος πολέμου,
ἐπέων δ' ἐνὶ βουλῇ

Iliad XVI 630

... ὥς μιν ἔρως πυκινὰς φρένας
ἀμφεκάλυψεν

Iliad XIV 294

(cf. Hymn to Aphrodite 38,

243)

καὶ μετ' Ἀχιλλῆα ῥηξήνορα
θυμολέοντα

Iliad VII 228

Theogony 1007

ὥς εἰπὼν ὄτρυνε μένος καὶ θυμὸν
ἐκάστω.

Iliad V 470 = VI 72

μᾶλλον ἐποτρύνω, καὶ οὐ μένος ἐν
φρεσὶ θείω

Odyssey I 88

ὃς καὶ πᾶσι μετέπρεπεν

ἰδομὸσύνηλιν

Theogony 377

αἱ δ' ὅτε νηὸν ἔκλονον Ἀθήνης ἐν
πόλει ἄκρη

Iliad VI 297

αὐτοὶ γάρ μιν Τρῶες ἐς ἀκρόπολιν
ἐρύσαντο

Odyssey VIII 504

(cf. VIII 494)

Τρῶες καὶ Δαρδάνοι, ἥδ' ἐπύκουροι

Iliad III 456 = VII 348, 368

Τρῶες ὑπέρθυμοι, τηλεκλειτοὶ τ'
ἐπύκουροι

Iliad VI 111 = IX 233 = XI 563

8 ἔλθετε

μη[δ]ὲ λόγο[ις] π[ε]ιθώμεθ' ὅπως

10 ἄγγόν ἄ[γαλ]μα [θε]ῶς

10,11 καταλ[σχ]ύνωμε[ν ἃ] εἰκ[ε]λ[ι]ως

12 μᾶ[ν]έν δεὁ]πιζώμεσθ' ἄ
Ἀθανάνας

15,16 ὡς]φά[τ]ο, τοῦ[...]
φ[ρ]άζοντο

19 πυκνὰ [ι]ς περ[ύ]γεσσι

21 κίρκον τανυσύπ[τερον]

ἀλλ' ἄγεθ' ὡς ἂν ἐγὼ εἴπω,
πειθώμεθα πάντες

Iliad II 139 etc.

πῶς τίς τοι πρόφρων ἔπεσιν
πέλθεται Ἀχαιῶν
Iliad I 150

αἶεϊ δὲ μαλακοῖσι καὶ αἰμυλίοισι
λόγοις
θέλγει, ὅπως Ἰθάκης ἐπιλήσεται...
Odyssey I 56, 57

ἢ ἔάν μ' ἐγ' ἄγαλμα θεῶν
θελκτήριον εἶναι
Odyssey VIII 509

-
cf. μή τι κατασχύνειν πατέρων
γένος
Odyssey XXIV 508

...Διὸς δ' ἐποπίζεο μῆνιν
Odyssey V 146

τῶν (= θεῶν) ὃ γ' ὀπίζετο μῆνιν
Shield 21

cf. ὡς ἔφαθ', οἳ δ' ἄρα πάντες
ἐπόμενον ὡς ἐκέλευεν
Odyssey XV 437

cf. πτέρα πυκνά
Iliad XI 454
Odyssey II 151

ᾠκυπέτης Ἰρηξ, τανυσύπτερος
ὄρνις
Works and Days 212

With the help of possible parallels observable in the epic corpus, one can make some sense of the fragmentary first column of 2619. That the first column represents a discussion is suggested by the phrase ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ (line 7), by the verb δαδσταν (line 11), by the reference to an exhortation ἄτρυνε μέγαν φρασὶν ἐν ... (line 22) and by the final ὥς φάτο in line 15 of the second column. The first of these phrases occurs frequently in the Iliad in exhortations such as that of Diomedes, ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ καὶ νῦν μεδώμεθα θούριδος ἀλκῆς (IV 418) or of Sthenelus, ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ χαζώμεθ' ἐφ' ἔκπων, μηδέ μοι ... (V 249). With the phrase ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ a speaker marks a turn in the direction of the speech, almost dismissing what has preceded with "well, anyway, let us ...". Thus in Stesichorus' speech in the passage in question the speaker is probably changing his tack to exhort the company he addresses in some other way. Preceding the phrase we have the words βύαι τε καὶ αἰχμῶν ... πεποιθότες, but unfortunately no indication as to whether they were accompanied by a negative or not. ἦντι may belong to the preposition ἀντί, which generally governs the genitive in the Homeric poems and may follow its noun²⁶. Hence this participial phrase may have belonged to a statement including "... having trust in the strength of your spears instead of ...". Otherwise ἦντι may be the "Doric" form of the termination of the 3rd person plural of the imperfective aspect (primary sequence)²⁷. If the participial phrase has been expressed in some sort of negative statement, then the speaker could be criticising the fact that those he addresses have not put their trust in their physical strength and fighting ability, but ought to do so, or else, did so in the past, but no longer do so when the occasion demands it. Alternatively, but less likely in view of what we know of the summarised versions of Odyssey VIII and Arctinus' Iliou Persis, this speaker may be advocating peace, on the grounds that those

he addresses put trust in their spears in the past to little avail and hence other measures ought to be adopted.

The verb δικάσταν (line 11) is used in the Iliad of two individuals or things standing at variance: for example in ἐξ ὧ δὴ τὰ πρῶτα διαστήτην ἐρίσαντε | Ἀτρεΐδης ... (Iliad I 6,7) the word refers to the argument between Achilles and Agamemnon (cf. Iliad XXI 436 in which Hera asks Apollo why they must be at odds: Φοῦβε, τίη δὴ νῶϊ δαίεσθαιμεν;). In the context of this fragment, therefore, one suspects a reference to two conflicting opinions, whether in the narrative or within the words of the speaker of the exhortation ἀλλ' ἄγε δῆ .

A speaker continues with some remarks about the end of the war, τέλος εὐρύοπα Ζεύς (line 16), invoking Zeus, or perhaps pointing out his responsibility in bringing the ultimate conclusion to the war. As was noted in chapter III, the epithet εὐρύοπα is exclusively associated with Zeus in the epic corpus²⁸. A second reference to the end of the war, π[ο]λέμου [τε]λευτά makes use of a variation on the epic phrase τέλος πολέμου²⁹. The occurrence of τέλος in line 16 above may have affected the poet's choice of phrase and avoidance of the repetition of τέλος.

Although we cannot be certain of the context of the phrase πυκινός τε φρένας, its limited associations in epic³⁰ hint at there being a deliberate reminiscence of the situation described in Iliad XIV or else a complete departure from the tradition at this point. Similarly the application of the epithet ῥηξήνορα (line 21) is restricted in the poems of Homer and Hesiod to Achilles³¹: if Achilles is not mentioned here, then we have another example of the extension of the use of restricted epithets.

The speech on the end of the war is concluded in the framework of the narrative with the words ὠτρύνε μέγαν φρασὶν ἐν ... (line 22), which

bear a distinct resemblance to the recurring epic line: ὥς εἰπὼν
 ὄτρυνε μένος καὶ θυμὸν ἐκδάσσει (e.g. in Iliad V 470, VI 72) and were
 undoubtedly derived from that model.

The speaker who follows is characterised by his shrewdness
 as the words μετέ]πρεπε καὶ πλν[υ]τᾷ (line 24) suggest. μετέπρεπε in
 Homer generally applies to material possessions, such as in Iliad XVI
 596, but there is one example in Hesiod which comes close to the expression
 in this fragment : Πέρσῃν θ', ὃς καὶ πᾶσι μετέπρεπεν ἰδομοσύνησιν
 (Theogony 377).

The second column of the fragment is better preserved than the
 first and these lines demonstrate well the expansive style of the poet.
 If we assume that the columns of the papyrus were 27 lines long³²,
 column ii must contain the continuation and conclusion of the speech
 beginning at line 25 of column i.

Line 6:

It is an odd coincidence that the only occasion on which the
 form ἀκρόπολις, as opposed to πόλις ἄκρη, appears in the Homeric poems
 happens to be in the description of this precise incident as reported
 the poet Demodocus in Odyssey VIII 504: αὐτοὶ γὰρ μιν Τρῶες ἐς ἀκρόπολιν
 ἐρύσαντο, which answers Odysseus' request referring to the Wooden Horse
 in Odyssey VIII 494: ὃν ποτ' ἐς ἀκρόπολιν δόλον ἤγαγε δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς.
 We find specific mention of the temple of Athena on the Trojan acropolis
 in the following terms: νηὸν Ἀθηναίης γλαυκῶπιδος ἐν πόλει ἄκρηι (Iliad
 VI 88; cf. VI 297), while other references to the Trojan acropolis employ
 the noun-epithet group rather than the single ἀκρόπολις (Iliad VI 257,
 317, VII 345). In his use of this expression, therefore, Stesichorus
 appears to depend on the traditional title for the Trojan capitol, one not
 associated with any Greek city in the Iliad or the Odyssey, but employs a

form that is rare both in epic and in Archaic lyric . It is interesting to note, however, that the word recurs in Tryphiodorus in the same context of bringing the Horse into the city: ἔλκετ' ἐς ἀκροπόλιν μεγάλην χρυσήνιον ἵππον (Capture of Troy 301).

Line 7:

The address to the Trojans here appears to have been derived from the Homeric versions: Τρῶες ὑπέρθυμοι τηλεκλειτοὶ τ' ἐπίκουροι (Iliad VI 111 etc,) or Τρῶες καὶ Δάρδανοι ἡδ' ἐπίκουροι (Iliad III 456 etc.)³³ together with a line such as πολλοὶ γὰρ κατὰ ἄστυ μέγα Πριάμου ἐπίκουροι (Iliad II 803). Since the metrical scheme of Stesichorus' poem could not accommodate the complete address as found in the hexameter line, the shorter epithet πολέες was introduced, possibly from a line such as the last quoted above.

Line 8:

The command ἔλθετε³⁴, not commonly found in poetry , appears in epic to be restricted to the context of entering or leaving a house: ὑμεῖς μὲν νῦν ἔλθετ' ἐξ ὑκτιμένον δόμον εἴσω (Odyssey XXIV 214, cf. XIX 68).

πειθόμεθα appears frequently in the "formulaic" line quoted in the table above (10 times in the Homeric poems). In this passage the speaker demands that the assembled crowd not obey the words of unspecified others. In epic one finds πείθω followed by ἔπεισι (Iliad I 150) or μύθῳ (Odyssey XVII 177) or μύθους (Iliad XXIII 157), but never λόγοις . λόγος only occurs twice in the Homeric corpus, with the connotations of trickery and deceit³⁵. In one of these instances the noun is qualified by the epithet that is traditionally associated with it in the Hymns and Hesiod, namely αἰμυλῖος :

αἶεϊ δὲ μαλακοῦσι καὶ αἰμυλίοισι λόγοισι
θέλγει, ὅπως Ἰθάκης ἐπιλήσεται ...

Odyssey I 56,57.

In this line from the Odyssey λόγος is followed by ὅπως with a subordinate clause in the future indicative and I assume that a similar construction was employed by Stesichorus, but with the subjunctive rather than the future indicative: καταυ[σχ]ύνωμε[ν] (line 11)³⁶. It is quite conceivable that Stesichorus in his choice of λόγους and not ἔπεσι intended the speaker to hint at the trickery and deceit in the mind of his opponent in the debate on what to do with the Horse. The suggestion of his opponent must have been to destroy the Horse, whether by burning it or hurling it into the sea, or wrecking it with axes, as appear in later versions of the legend³⁷. The proposal to destroy the Horse that is mentioned in Odyssey VIII and Arctinus includes throwing it from the heights of the citadel, but in these versions the Horse had already been dragged within the walls, whereas in the Stesichorean passage the Horse still stands on the plains. The adverb αὐτεῦ would indicate that the present speaker has been angered or shocked at some suggestion that involved destroying the image on the spot.

Line 9:

This line contains the object of either κατασχύνωμεν (lines 10,11) or some verbal form, possibly a participle following ὅπως (line 8) and is plausibly reconstructed as τοῦδε κα.[....].ν ἔπ[ι]ον, in which there was an appropriate epithet κα- for ἔπικον.³⁸ Several suggestions for the epithet have been proposed by West³⁹, the main difficulty being to find a word beginning with κα- to fit the space of 4 letters between fr. 1a and 1b. κατάσπον is attested in Aeschylus' Agamemnon 1598, meaning "fateful"; καθάρσπον, "purifying", frequent in tragedy, might, according to West, just be squeezed into the space and would certainly suit the context of the ἄγνον ἄγαλμα. Whatever the poet's choice was, the noun-epithet association must have been a non-Homeric one, since in

the Odyssey we are presented with either δούρατεός (VIII 493 and 512) in the context of the sack of Troy, or ξεστός (IV 272) in Menelaus' tale, as epithets for the Horse.

Line 10; 11:

The expression ἄγνὸν ἄ[γαλ]μα [θε]ῶς may be in part indebted to Odyssey VIII 509, where the third and prevailing proposal was to revere the Horse as a holy image: ἧ ἑῶν μέγ' ἄγαλμα θεῶν θελκτῆριον εἶναι. It is interesting that this expression, apparently unprecedented in epic in its use of the epithet ἄγνός⁴⁰, reappears in Tryphiodorus' version of the Sack of Troy, in which Sinon persuades Priam that the Trojans will avert the wrath of Athena by placing the Horse in her temple (line 298 ff): εἰ δέ μιν ἄγνὸν ἄγαλμα λαβῆν νηοῦσιν Ἀθήνη.

The appearance of the non-Homeric form αὔτε⁴¹, being metrically equivalent to Homeric αὐτοῦ, testifies to the acceptability of mixing elements from various dialectal sources.

In fr.4 of P.Oxy. 2617 Stesichorus uses the verb κατασχύνω of the spoiling of the poppy's delicate shape. In this context of desecrating the ἄγνὸν ἄγαλμα, its implications of sacrilege, particularly with the reinforcement of the adverb ἀεικέλως, are also incorporated. Neither verb nor adverb is common in the Homeric poems.

Line 12:

Nothing is certain in this line, although the sense of West's μά]νιν δὲ[βαρεῖαν ὀ]πιζώμεσθ' Ἀθήνας cannot be far from the truth⁴². One would expect to find a parting shot in the argument against the proposal to destroy the Horse perhaps in the form of a threat of the consequences of the wrath of the goddess that might fall upon the heads of the destroyers. The association of (ἐπ)οπίζομαι with Διὸς μῆνιν may be seen in Odyssey V 146, XIV 283, Hymn to Aphrodite 290 and in the

Hesiodic Shield 21. Page, on the other hand, reads ἀζόμεσθ' ἀνδράσ[σας], criticising West's iota⁴³. Both readings in fact convey the same general sense, namely that the goddess to whom the Horse has been dedicated by the Greeks must be held in awe. For such threats one may turn to the version in Virgil: nam si vestra manus violasset dona Minervae, / tum magnum exitium ... (Aeneid II 198 f.) or the words of Tryphiodorus: (296,297):

εἰ μὲν γὰρ μιν ἔατε μένειν αὐτοῦ ἐνὶ χώρῃ
Τροίην θέσφατόν ἐστιν ἔλεῦν πόλιν ἔγχος Ἀχαιῶν.

The expression found in Quintus Smyrnaeus XII 386 might corroborate the reading proposed by Page : ἀζόμενοι μεγάλοι Διὸς κρατερόφρονα κούρην.

Line 15:

With the conventional punctuation by means of ὥς φάτο, the speech advocating the acceptance of the Horse is drawn to a close and the Trojans apparently consider the various proposals, φ[ρ]άζοντο (line 16), or perhaps contemplate how to drag the Horse to the city's acropolis. The following line contains the word ἵπ[π]ον as the object of some verb, possibly ἐρύω (cf. Odyssey VIII 504) or ἔλκω (cf. Tryphiodorus 300 f.).

Line 18 ff.:

The epithet φυλλοφορ- is not Homeric, and in fact no compound adjective whose first element is φυλλο- occurs in Homer, although the olive-tree is described as τανύφυλλος (Odyssey XII 102, XIII 346, XXIII 190, 195). The sole instance of the epithet φυλλόφορος in lyric appears in Pindar, Olympian VIII 76, where it governs ἀγώνων in close association with στέφανος. In view of the description of garlands thrown around the neck of the Horse in Tryphiodorus 316 ff., I suppose that this line also contained some allusion to the way in which the Trojans decorated the image.

There is an indirect Homeric parallel for the association of

πυκνός with πτέρυξ (line 19) and I assume that the metrical scheme caused the poet to prefer πυκνός to πυκνός⁴⁴.

The association of τανυσίπτερος with κέρκος (line 20) is unprecedented⁴⁵. In Hesiod however the epithet is applied to the irex, ἰρηξ being the generic name for the "hawk" family to which the κέρκος belongs.

Line 21:

Despite its linguistic associations with the verb to "croak", the simple form κράζω and its compound ἀνακράζω could be used of human cries, if the single instance in Odyssey XIV 467 and the single instance in Pindar Nemean VII 76 represent a general trend. The supplement ψῶρες proposed by Barrett and Page⁴⁶ would, therefore, represent an exceptional, rather than a regular usage. West's supplement Τρῶες⁴⁷ follows the examples given above in making the subject of ἀνακράγον human. These alternative supplements depend upon the interpretation given to the passage. In the case of the former, the context would have been that of a simile, while in the case of the latter, Τρῶες, one must suppose that a portent had occurred, at which the Trojans cried out in amazement or fear. The fragment is unlikely to yield firm evidence in favour of one interpretation as opposed to the other, but I shall discuss presently the place of either a simile or portent in the context of the passage insofar as its structure may bear some relation to parallel scenes in the epic corpus.

Although there is no specific model to which we can turn in the epic corpus for this episode in Stesichorus, it is possible to observe the use the poet made of stock motifs for a scene in which a debate is staged. We find in the Stesichorean fragment expressions from

conventional speeches in epic such as ἀλλ' ἄγε δή. The speech that occupied the latter part of column i is concluded with a line derived from the conventional ὡς εἰπὼν ὤτρυνε μένος καὶ θυμὸν ἐκάστου, although the poet does not imitate it word for word. Expressions such as πεποιθότες, "relying on ..." or π]ολέμου [τε] λευτὰ referring to the end of the war likewise have epic precedents in close but not identical forms. Some of the noun-epithet groups demonstrated the poet's preference for new associations, as in κέρκον τανυσύπτερον or ἄγνδν ἄγαλμα, both phrases being alien to the epic corpus. There are also a number of verbs found generally in prose rather than verse: δαδσταν and ἔλθετε.

The structure of the episode in its entirety may be compared with episodes in the Iliad such as II 53 ff., where Agamemnon calls an assembly to reveal the dream that was sent to him. Agamemnon's speech is followed by a brief exhortation from Nestor, concluded with the words: ἀλλ' ἄγετ', αὖ κέν πως θωρήσομεν ὕλας Ἀχαιῶν (Iliad II 83). After the interchange of speeches, activity follows:

ὣς ἄρα φωνήσας βουλῆς ἐξ ἤρχε νέεσθαι
οἳ δ' ἐπανεστήσαν πεύθοντό τε ποιμένι λαῶν
σκηπτοῦχου βασιλῆες ἐπεσσεύοντο δὲ λαοί. (II 84-86)

The description of the activity among the Greeks is amplified by a simile derived from nature:

ἥ τε ἔθνεα εἴσι μελισσῶν ὠδινάων
πέτρης ἐκ γλαφυρῆς αἰεὶ νέον ἐρχομένων
βοτρυδὸν δὲ πέτονται ἐπ' ἄνθεσιν εἰαρινοῦσιν
αἳ μὲν τ' ἔνθα ἄλυσ πέποτῆται, αἳ δέ τε ἔνθα
ὡς τῶν ἔθνεα πολλὰ νεῶν ἀπο καὶ κλισιάων
ἡῶνος προπάρουθε βαθείης ἐστιχόωντο
ἑλαδὸν εἰς ἀγορήν. II 87-93

Another example of a discussion ending in an exhortation, followed by activity that is amplified by a simile may be found in Iliad II 433 ff. In fact three similes follow immediately upon one another, describing the activity of the heralds calling the Achaeans to arms and

the clamour of the Achaeans themselves. One of these similes is derived from the noise made by birds flying hither and thither around the streams of Caÿster:

Τῶν δ', ὡς τ' ὀρνέθων πετεηνῶν ἔθνεα πολλὰ
 χηνῶν ἢ γεράνων ἢ κύκνων δουλιχοδεύρων,
 Ἀσζῶν ἐν λειμῶνι, Καῦστρίου ἀμφὶ ῥέεθρα
 ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα ποτῶνται ἀγαλλόμενα πτερύγεσσι
 κλαγγηδὸν προκαθιζόντων, σμαργεῦ δέ τε λειμῶν
 ὡς τῶν ἔθνεα πολλὰ νεῶν ἀπο καὶ κλισιάων
 ἐς πέδιλον προχέοντο Σκαμάνδριον.

Iliad II 459-465⁴⁸

Does the allusion to the πυκινὰς πτερύγεσσι and κύρκον τανυσόπτερον in lines 19 and 20 of column ii belong to a portent or a simile? We have just noted above two instances from the Iliad in which there appears to be an observable sequence of a speech of exhortation that results in activity followed by a simile to amplify that activity. There are Homeric precedents for the κύρκος or ὄρηξ in the context of a simile throwing its prey into panic. In Iliad XVII 755 ff., the Achaeans flee before Aeneas and Hector as jackdaws and starlings before a hawk, amid clattering confusion:

τῶν δ' ὡς τε φαρῶν νέφος ἔρχεται ἢ κολοιῶν
 οὖλον κεκλήγοντες, ὅτε προΐδωσιν ἰόντα
 κύρκον, ὃ τε σμικρῆισι φόβον φέρει ὀρνέθεσσιν,
 ὡς ἄρ' ὑπ' Αἰνεΐαι τε καὶ Ἑκτορι κοῦροι Ἀχαιῶν
 οὖλον κεκλήγοντες ἔσαν, λήθοντο δὲ χάρμης.

Iliad XVII 755-759

Similarly the ὄρηξ is responsible for causing panic amongst jackdaws and starlings in a simile in which Patroclus is compared to the hawk as he pursues the Trojans in anger:

ἔθυσεν δὲ διὰ προμάχων ὄρηκι ἐοικῶς
 ὠκέϊ, ὃς τ' ἐφώβησε κολοιούς τε ψηράς τε
 ὡς ἰθὺς Λυκίων, Πάτροκλεες ἱπποκέλευθε...

Iliad XVI 582-584

These two similes may have influenced Tryphiodorus when he described the excitement of the Trojans around the Horse, though they do not flee:

θαύμασαν ἀμφοιχυθέντες, ἅτ' ἠχήμεντες ἰδόντες
 αἰετόν ἀλκήεντα περικλάζουσι κολοιοῦ

Capture of Troy 248-9

The κύρκος also appears in a simile in Iliad XXII 139 ff. in which Hector the dove falls prey to Achilles the hawk:

ἥντε κύρκος ὄρεσφιν, ἐλαφρότατος πετεηνῶν,
 ῥηϊδύως οὔμῃσιν μετὰ τρήρωνά πέλειαν,
 ἢ δέ θ' ὕπαιθα φοβεῖται, ὃ δ' ἐγγύθεν ὀξύ λεληκῶς
 τάρφε' ἐπαΐσσει, ἐλέειν τέ ἐ θυμὸς ἀνώγει.

Thus, in view of the structural possibility of a simile occurring as in epic precedents of similar episodes and in view of the appearance of the κύρκος in a number of similes in the Iliad, one could suppose that in this episode Stesichorus had adapted a bird-simile from epic to enhance his picture of noise and movement arising out of the Horse's entry into the city. The cries could be those of excited Trojans eager to dedicate the Horse and rejoicing at the termination of the war, or else could be those of apprehensive Trojans, filled with foreboding. Indeed, Tryphiodorus in his description of the entry of the Horse into the city resorts to yet another bird-simile to suggest the ensuing pandemonium :

θῆαι δ' ἀφνειοῦτο μετ' ἡλυσες Ἰλίου πύργου
 χεῖματος ἀμφύπολοι, γερῶνων στίχες ἡεροφῶνων
 κύκλον ἐπογμεύουσιν ἀλήμονος ὀρχηθμοῦ
 γελοπόνους ἀρότῃσιν ἀπεχθέα κεκληγυῖται
 ὥς οὔγε κλαγγῇ ... 352-356 (cf. Iliad III 2ff.)

The κύρκος also appears as a bird-of-omen, ill or otherwise, in the Homeric poems. At Odyssey XV 525, for example, the hawk grasping a dove and scattering its plumage represents the power of the house of Odysseus in Ithaca :

ὥς, ἄρα οὐ εἰπόντι ἐπέτατο δεξιὸς ὄρνις
 κύρκος Ἀπόλλωνος ταχὺς ἄγγελος ἐν δὲ πόδεσσιν
 τίλλε πέλειαν ἔχων, κατὰ δὲ πτερὰ χεῦεν ἔραζε. XV 525-527

In the portent observed by Telemachus in Odyssey II 146 ff. there is again a reference to the plumage of birds, in this case the birds being two eagles clawing at one another:

ὣς φάτο Τηλέμαχος, τῷ δ' αἰετὼ εὐρύσπα Ζεὺς
 ὑψόθεν ἐκ κορυφῆς ὄρεος προέειπε πέτεσθαι

τὼ δ' ἦός ῥ' ἐπέτοντο μετὰ πνοιῆς ἀνέμοιο
 πλησύν' ἀλλήλοισι τιταίνομένω περὺ γέσσιν·
 ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ μέσσην ἀγορὴν πολύφημόν ἰκέσθην,
 ἐνθ' ἐπίδυνηθέντε τιναξάσθην περὰ πυκνά,
 ἐς δ' ἰκέτην πάντων κεφαλᾶς, ὅσσοντο δ' ὄλεθρον. Odyssey II 146-152

It is conceivable that the πυκινὰς περὺ γέσσι in Stesichorus depict the same image as occurs in this description of the two eagles. West, in presenting arguments in favour of interpreting this passage as a portent, cites the omen of the κύρκος in Quintus, book XII 11 ff.⁴⁹. There, however, the omen occurs in the context of Odysseus' sudden conception of the stratagem of the Horse. He seems to suggest that the omen of a κύρκος, considered good for the Greeks, was unfavorable for the Trojans and thus the appearance of one as they dragged the Horse into the city gave rise to cries of fear. Apart from this possibility of a coincidental association of a κύρκος with the Wooden Horse, West does point out a technical objection to φᾶρες. The reading φᾶ would affect the metrical scheme of the previous line, making -- υ -- , where there are four, possibly five instances preserved of -- υ υ . The mute+liquid of Τῶρες need not make position. Moreover, I would add to West's argument the observation that the verb ἀνέκραγον appears to belong to human rather than animal contexts.

Thus one can point to possible parallels for either a simile or a portent in the context of the poem, but since we have already observed that Stesichorus was free to adapt Homeric phrases and motifs, with slight alterations, we cannot be certain how far this passage represents the precise elements of its Homeric precedents and how far the poet has conflated elements from both portent and simile in its epic precedents. It is clear that the poet followed the speeches and the decision of the Trojans with either a modification of a conventional simile from epic or a modification of a conventional bird-portent from

epic. One cannot be more specific.

In the Odyssean version of the final capture of Troy, the Trojans had already dragged the Horse within their walls before any discussion as to its fate was held. The same chronology occurred in Arctinus' Sack of Troy, if Proclus was not assuming that this was the case because in the supposedly preceding work, the Little Iliad, the Horse had been brought into the city, and reappears in Apollodorus' Epitome. Fragment 1 of 2619 sets the debate before the Horse is removed from the plains, which is the same time-sequence as we find in the poems of Virgil, Tryphiodorus and Quintus Smyrnaeus. The schematic accounts that appear in Odyssey VIII and in the précis of Arctinus' poem merely mention the conflicting opinions about the Horse, without naming any specific person. They do include two alternative suggestions for the method of destroying the Horse, and it may be that Stesichorus' version contains not one, but two speakers before the final one, whose speech commences at line 25 of column i. Of the later sources who mention the Trojans' indecision, Virgil names the speakers. There is in the Aeneid an initial discussion amongst the Trojans in which Thymoetes encourages the Trojans to drag the Horse within their walls (II 32-34). He is opposed by Capys and others:

at Capys, et quorum melior sententia menti,
aut pelago Danaum insidias suspectaque dona
praecipitare iubent subjectisque urere flammis,
aut terebrare cavas uteri et temptare latebras Aeneid II 35-38

However, it is Sinon's lengthy and guileful speech that finally persuades Priam and the Trojans to preserve the Horse. Tryphiodorus and Quintus Smyrnaeus follow Virgil in giving this important role to Sinon.

The concluding speech in column ii of the Stesichorean fragment urges the Trojans to bring the Horse within their walls to the temple of Athena in the acropolis of the city. Who delivers the successfully

persuasive speech? The speaker is characterised as one endowed with a shrewd mind amongst other things, μετέ] πρεπε καὶ πινυ[τῶν (line 24), and was presumably named in the first half of line 24 or 25 that is now lost. Sinon appears in the later epics as a master of deception. Virgil first introduces him as fidens animi atque in utrumque paratus/ seu versare dolos seu certae occumbere morti (Aeneid II 61,62) and his long speech arguing for the dedication of the Horse to Athena is concluded with the words: Talibus insidiis periurique arte Sinonis / credita res, captique dolis lacrimisque coactis ... (II 195, 196). In Tryphiodorus we find him as ἀπατήλιος ἥρως (220) and his confidence-trick a δολοπλόκον ... μῦθον (264). Quintus calls him δολοφρονέων (XII 374).

As far as Stesichorus' version is concerned, the speaker of the command Τρῶες πολέες τ' ἐπύκουροι, ἔλθετε ... (lines 7,8) need not be a Trojan. He seems convinced that the goddess will be angry if the image of the Horse is desecrated (line 10 ff.) and this was the warning conveyed to the Trojans by Sinon in the later versions of the tale. Such a conviction in the context might be the result of a premonition, but suggests rather some previous knowledge of the destiny of the Horse, Sinon is first mentioned in the summary of Arctinus' poem, as the one who gave the signal to the Greeks that the coast was clear for their surreptitious return, after entering Troy by pretence, πρότερον εἰσεληλυθὼς προσκούητος. However, there is no reference in that summary to Sinon as an artful deceiver who persuaded Priam not to destroy the Horse. Virgil may have been the first to develop the character of Sinon, but there is the possibility that his role had already been extended beyond that of signal-man by Stesichorus in his Sack of Troy.

In the final speech of fragment 1, however, we find together with the command ἔλθετε in the second person of the imperative, the

exhortation $\mu\eta\delta\epsilon\ \kappa\epsilon\iota\theta\acute{\omega}\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$ in the first person, which suggests that the speaker considers himself one of Trojans and not an outsider. Virgil does name a Trojan who was in favour of taking the Horse into the city:

... primusque Thymoetes
 duci intra muros hortatur et arce locari
 sive dolo seu iam Troiae sic fata ferebant. Aeneid II 32-34

Thymoetes' point of view is explained by some dolum or else by the fact that Troy's fate had been sealed. It is possible that the source from which Virgil derived this character Thymoetes was Stesichorus and that the man who is called "shrewd" in line 24 is this same person. In view of the previous speeches in the fragment that advocate the continuation of a martial frame of mind on the part of the Trojans towards achieving the end of the war, it seems more likely that the speaker of the final words begging the Trojans not to be persuaded by those who want to destroy the Horse be a Trojan. However, the reference to the wrath of the goddess suggests that some explanation of the Horse and its dedication to Athena by the Greeks had already been given prior to the debate. This explanation was given by Sinon in the later epic versions, in which the initial indecision and warnings of Laocoon are arrested by the appearance of Sinon with his crafty tale designed to convince the Trojans that they must not offend Athena by destroying the Horse.

Thus it seems that the final speech in Stesichorus' poem was delivered by a Trojan, but since part of his argument appears to have been based on knowledge that the Horse had been dedicated to Athena by the Greeks, it would seem that such information had already been conveyed to them through another character, and the most probable candidate is Sinon. Fragment 1 of 2619 gives a good indication that Stesichorus expanded the scene of the Trojans' debate from the versions of his epic predecessors and paved the way for later poets who elaborated upon the role of Sinon

in the legend.

In fragment 15 of 2619 one can again observe the poet's adaptation of Homeric diction in a situation that has no precedent in the Homeric poems themselves. The context appears to be one in which a person, probably Trojan, bewails the fact that Troy has been betrayed by a cunning stratagem, namely that of the Wooden Horse. The ἀνὴρ mentioned in line 6 as the one responsible for the construction of the Horse is undoubtedly Epeius⁵⁰.

2619 fr.15

- 5 νῦν δ' ἄσεν χαλεπῶς
 5,6 δύναι[ς] Συμόεντος πα[ρὰ] καλλιρόους
 7 θ[ε] εἰς ἰ[σ]τατι δαεὺς σεμν[ῆς] Ἀθάνας
 7 ... δαεὺς ...
 μέτρα τε καὶ σοφίαν του[τ]

Epic parallels

- παρ' ὀχθησιν Συμόεντος
Iliad IV 475
 cf. ἐν δύνησι βαθείησιν μεγάλησι
Iliad XXI 239
 θεῶν ἰότητι (7 times in Iliad and Odyssey)
 ... τὸν Ἐπειὸς ἐποίησεν σὺν
 Ἀθήνῃ
Odyssey VIII 493
 τέχνῃ καὶ σοφίῃ δεδαημένος
 ἐξερεεύνῃ
Hymn to Hermes 483
 Ἰδρος, ὃν Ἥφαιστος δέδαεν καὶ
 Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη
 τέχνην παντοῖν, χαρίεντα δὲ
 ἔργα τελείει
Odyssey VI 233, 234
 =XXIII 160, 161
 cf. ... ὅς ῥά τε πάσης
 εὖ εἶδῃ σοφίης ὑποθημοσύνησιν
 Ἀθήνης
Iliad XV 411, 412

9,10 ἀντὶ μάχα[ς
καὶ] φυ[λόπ]ιδος κλέο[ς]

11 εὐρυ]χόρ[ο]υ Τροχέ[υ]ας

ἀλωσιμ[ο]ν ἡμαρ

βὰν δ' ἔμεν ἔνθα μάλιστα μάχη καὶ
φυλόπις ἦεν
Iliad XIII 789

τῷ δ' ἄμα ἔέμενοι πολέμουδ' τε
φυλόπιδός τε
Shield 23

cf. δι' Ἑλλάδος εὐρυχόροιο
Iliad IX 478
Τρούη ἐν εὐρείῃ
Odyssey I 62 etc.

νόστιμον ἡμαρ (11 times in
the Odyssey)

Line 5:

χαλεπῶς seems certain and presumably means not "with difficulty" but rather "cruelly", a use not found in epic, although the related adjective is found with the meaning "harsh" or "cruel" (e.g. Odyssey XVII 388). The verb governed by χαλεπῶς is far from certain. West follows Barrett with ἄσεν⁵¹ and compares it with ἄω Odyssey X 68 for an instance of this verb having a personal subject. Page remains uncommitted in SLG. ἄω would require an object in epic; here the object "us" must be understood, if any sense is to be made of ἄσεν. In examples of ἄω such as Iliad IX 116 or Odyssey XI 68 the verb incorporates the connotation of the individual as victim of ἄτη or αἶσα and as entirely without responsibility for his actions. Here the destruction of Troy is blamed upon the machinations of Athena and the ἀνὴρ, so that one hesitates to accept ἄσεν, except on condition that Stesichorus must have altered its sense somewhat, removing the involvement of ἄτη/αἶσα.

Lines 5,6:

The poet gives the location of the origin of the Trojans' down-

fall as being "beside the swirling streams of the Simoeis". This river was one of the two that flowed across the plain of Troy and tends to be named in conjunction with its counterpart, the Scamander or Xanthus (Iliad V 774, VI 4). Once in the Iliad one finds the location of a hero's birth as παρ' ὀχθησιν Σιμόεντος (Iliad IV 475); otherwise references to its waters are given in phrases such as Σιμόεντος ... ῥοάων (VI 4, cf. V 774). Although δύνας and related epithets δυνήεις and βαθυδύνης are commonly associated with rivers in the epic corpus, they are not found in conjunction with the Simoeis. If an epithet for δύνας followed, it is unlikely, on metrical grounds, to have been the adjective βαθεύα which alone qualifies δύνη in the Iliad. Whether metrically suitable καλλιρόους occurred, as is supplemented by West and Page⁵² by analogy with the phrase καλλιρροον ὕδωρ (Iliad II 752, XII 33) or ποταμοῦ καλλιρόου (Odyssey V 441) or κρουνὴ καλλιρρόω (Iliad XXII 147), or some other appropriate epithet, such as εὐρρεής, the phrase κα[ρὰ καλλιρόους(?)] δύνα[ς] Σιμόεντος is constructed from elements from known Homeric "formulae" in unprecedented juxtaposition.

Line 7:

On the phrase θεῶς ἰότητι it has already been mentioned that in the epic poems of Homer the sense of the phrase was generally conveyed by the less precise θεῶν ἰότητι⁵³. Since Athena's agency in the development of the stratagem of the Horse is an integral part of the plot of the Sack of Troy it appears that the poet has conflated the idea expressed in Odyssey VIII 493, τὸν Ἐπειδὲς ἐποίησεν σὺν Ἀθήνῃ, with this conventional expression for divine approbation. The extension of the phrase to include σερμ[ῶς Ἀθήνας] again shows the poet's assimilation of Homeric and non-Homeric elements. The epithet σερμῶς is post-Homeric, first appearing in the Hymn to Demeter, of Demeter herself (line 1), and is rarely found

as an epithet of other goddesses in later epic.

Line 7,8:

For the participle δαεῖς there is no relevant parallel that can be cited from the Iliad or the Odyssey, but the association of man's acquisition of skill with his hands from Athena is to be seen in the repeated lines:

Ἰδρύς, ὃν Ἥφαιστος δέδασεν καὶ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη
τέχνην παντοῖην, χαρίεντα δὲ ἔργα τελεῖει. Odyssey VI 233,234 =
XXIII 160,161

While Athena is not mentioned in the example from the Hymn to Hermes 483, τέχνη καὶ σοφίη δεδαημένος ἐξερεῖναι, one does find therein a precedent for the association of σοφία as well as τέχνη with "learning" to do something, and the same association is preserved in the later traditions of elegiac and lyric verse; for example in Solon:

ἄλλος Ἀθηναίης τε καὶ Ἥφαιστου πολυτεχνέω
ἔργα δαεῖς χειρῶν συλλέγεται βίοντον. fr. 13 49,50⁵⁴.

In Olympian VII 51 ff., Pindar describes how Athena restored to mankind the ability to create works of art and he concludes this description with the sententia: δαέντι δὲ καὶ σοφία μείζων ἄδολος, meaning that the man who has learnt through acquiring τέχνη does not look on σοφία, art, as something miraculous or achieved through trickery. However, I also note a striking similarity between the Stesichorean expression and that used by Quintus in a related context: δέδασεν δέ μιν ἔργον Ἀθήνη (XII 83).

μέτρα occurs naturally in the epic poems as elsewhere of physical measurements and hence it is not surprising to find here the poet giving Athena the credit for inspiring the master-carpenter Epeius with the correct measurements for the construction of the Wooden Horse. It is perhaps mere coincidence that the only use of the word σοφία of technical skill in Homer appears in a simile describing a carpenter's activity:

ἀλλ' ὥς τε στάθμη δόρυ νηΐον ἐξελθύνει
τέκτονος ἐν παλάμῃσι δαήμενος, ὅς ῥά τε πάσης
εὖ εἶδητ' σοφίης ὑποδυμοσύνησιν Ἀθήνης, Iliad XV 410-412

Here too Athena stands in her conventional role as patroness of craftsmen..

Following the participial phrase δαεῖς | μέτ[ρα] τε καὶ σοφίαν is a relative clause in which τοῦ refers back to the ἀνὴρ, that is, presumably, Epeius, the builder of the Wooden Horse. The general sense of the clause must have been to the effect "by whose trickery in the form of the Wooden Horse instead of tumultuous battle he has brought himself renown for accomplishing the capture of Troy...". In drawing attention to the artful stratagem of the Wooden Horse that resulted in the fall of Troy, as opposed to open warfare, ἀντὶ μάχα [ς | καὶ] φυ[λόπ]ιδος, the speech may have been intentionally phrased so as to be reminiscent of the words of the speaker in fragment 1, column i, who advocated reliance on fighting ability βύαυ τε καὶ αἰχμῶν ... πεποιθότες (lines 6,7) and who may have tried to persuade the Trojans that the departure of the Greeks was a trick and that the Horse should be destroyed (cf. line 8 of column ii).

Line 10 ff.:

One passage in the Iliad provides an instance of the conjunction of μάχη and φύλοπις, namely Iliad XII 789: βὰν δ' ἔμην ἔνθα μάλιστα μάχη καὶ φύλοπις ἦεν. Elsewhere one finds μάχη linked with πόλεμος, as for example in Iliad XIII 635 and in the Hesiodic Shield 23. Given the space following κλέο[ς], in which I assume there must have been the predicate of the clause, it seems unlikely that there was an epithet accompanying φυλόπιδος, as there was in fragment 17 4 of 2617: φύλοπις ἀργαλέα. It is possible that κλέος is the object of ἔθηκεν, in which case one would require a preposition or the like to keep the words εὐρυ]χόρ[ο]ν Τροίας etc. syntactically related and give the sense

"... gave glory (to this man, or to the Greeks) for the capture of Troy". The subject would lie hidden in the lacuna after τοῦ in line 8 above. However, it seems more likely that it was the ἀνὴρ who gained the glory for himself through the capture of Troy and the verb ἔθηκεν therefore belongs to a clause that continues into the following epode.

There are instances in the Iliad that show the verb τέθημι used in the sense of someone bringing harm and suffering to the enemy: for example, ...ἡ μὲν Ἰφιδάμειος Ἀχαιοῦς ἄλγε' ἔθηκε (Iliad I 2) or πᾶσι δ' ἔθηκε πόνον, πολλοῖσι δὲ κῆδ' ἐφῆκεν (Iliad XXI 524). This may be the sort of remark made by the speaker in the context of the capture and destruction of Troy, particularly when πόνου occurs in line 12. However, I can offer no solution that fits the metrical structure as it is accepted by Page West and Haslam⁵⁵.

On the non-Homeric association of εὐρύχορος with Τροία and of post-Homeric ἀλώσιμος with ἄμαρ (?) see the discussion of these phrases in chapter IV⁵⁶.

These two fragments of Stesichorus "Sack of Troy" demonstrate the way in which the poet was in part influenced by the structure of conventional episodes in the epic corpus. As in the case of the diction the poet might adopt or adapt traditional material depending on his purpose in any given context. In the first fragment he has apparently been influenced by conventional phrases from pre-battle speeches of exhortation and has adapted them to fit the context of a debate over the destruction or preservation of the Horse. The activity of the Trojans following the close of the last speech may have been described through the device of a simile; alternatively, a portent might have occurred at what was a crucial turning point in the fate of the Trojans. Both

would be characteristic of epic, as the examples of each quoted above show. The second fragment is less close to any specific scene, although one can still detect similarities with epic convention; for example, Athena's guidance of the builder of the Horse. There is the possibility, however, that Stesichorus' poem on the Sack of Troy was to some extent indebted to incidents in the saga as depicted by the post-Homeric poets such as Arctinus. The affiliations between Stesichorus and the post-Homeric tradition are unfortunately irretrievable, since the poems have not survived. As far as we can tell from Proclus' summary of Arctinus, however, Stesichorus' version of the Sack does appear to have differed in content, as the debate-scene demonstrates.

III P.Oxy. 2617 fr. 4 : Heracles attacks Geryon.

P.Oxy. 2617 fr. 4 contains that part of Stesichorus' Geryoneis in which Heracles launches a successful attack with his bow against one of the heads of the monster, Geryon. The subject matter of the poem as a whole is alien to the Homeric corpus, but in his description of this encounter, the poet has absorbed certain aspects of typical battle-scenes in the Iliad⁵⁷, integrating them with non-Homeric material, linguistic and structural.

The scrappy remnants of the first column of the fragment appear to belong to an account of Heracles' hostile approach and decision to fight by stealth: ... νόωι δέελε[ν (line 5) and πολὺ κέρδιον εἶν λάρσας πολέμε[εν (lines 7,8). He presumably calculates how most effectively to employ his bow and bring death to Geryon: καταφράζετο οὐ

... πλ]κρὸν ὄλεθρον (lines 10,11). The use of the epithet πικρός to qualify ὄλεθρον, must reflect the common association of πικρός with ὄϊστός⁵⁸ and hence it may be supposed that these lines refer to the decision of Heracles to use his bow. In accordance with epic convention Geryon holds his shield in front of his chest : στέρνων ἐκεν ἀσπίδα πρόσ[θ' (line 12). The following lines contain a description of a helmet, ἵπ]πόκομος τρυφάλει' (line 16), presumably falling to the ground, (cf. ἐπὶ ζαπέδω in line 17), from Geryon's (?) head, τοῦ δ' ἀπὸ κρα[τὸς (lines 14, 15). Page interprets these lines as a description of Heracles' initial stealth in throwing a stone to knock one of the helmets from Geryon's three heads in order to facilitate his chances with his bow.⁵⁹

After ἐπὶ ζαπέδω, the epode and the first five lines of the following strophe are missing, in which the hero must have aimed and fired his bow at Geryon, for at lines 1 ff. of the second column of the fragment we find an account of the fatal arrow already on its course towards Geryon's unprotected head.

In discussing the second column of fragment 4 I have divided it into three sections : a) the description of a fatal weapon or missile; b) the wound received; c) the simile of the poppy. I shall as before list parallels from epic in tabular form and then proceed to a discussion of the relationship of the Stesichorean passage to epic scenes of a similar structure and content, both in the Homeric poems and in this case the Hesiodic Shield.

a) The fatal arrow (lines 1-6)

1,2]ων στυγε[ρ]οῦ | θανάτου] ο τέ[λος

Parallels in Homer and the Hesiodic Shieldμνηστήρων στυγερόν θάνατον καὶ
κῆρ ἐνέπουσαOdyssey XXIV 414διχθαδίας κῆρας φερέμεν
θανάτοιο τέλοςδεIliad IX 411ὥς ἄρα μιν εἰπόντα τέλος
θανάτοιο κάλυψενIliad XVI 502, 855, XXII 361

θανάτοιο λαθιφθόγγοιο δοτῆρες

Shield 131

3 κ]εφ[αλ]αί περὶ [πότμον] ἔχων

πρόσθεν μὲν θανάτον τ' εἶχον καὶ
δάκρυσι μῦρονShield 1323,4 γ]μένος αἵματι [.....] τε χολαῖ
πεφορμ-

πεφορμένον αἵματι πολλῶι

Odyssey IX 3975,6 ὀλεσάνορος αἰολοδε[ίρ]ου
ὀδύναισιν ὕδρας

-

φορύξας αἵματι πολλῶι

Odyssey XVIII 336

Lines 1,2:

A marginal note that appears to give variant combinations of the genitive singular masculine terminations in -ου and -ουο testifies to the supplement στυγεροῦ θανάτοιο⁶⁰. Barrett further suggested that τέλος could have been the accompanying nominative/accusative on the basis of the "formula" τέλος θανάτοιο from the Homeric poems, particularly in the line ὥς ἄρα μιν εἰπόντα τέλος θανάτοιο κάλυψεν (Iliad XVI 508, 855; XXII 361; cf. V 553)⁶¹. It can be inferred from the following lines, which refer to the murderous potential of the arrow, that the sense of these lines must have been similar and I would suggest the possibility of reading φέρ]ων before στυγεροῦ . φέρω in the sense of "carrying death" may be found in Iliad IX 411: διχθαδίας κῆρας φερέμεν θανάτοιο τέλοςδε.

It is to the Hesiodic Shield, however, that we must look for possible precedents in the description of Heracles' lethal arrows, since the Iliad offers little information on arrows and their potential. In the Shield there occurs a stock motif of the hero donning his armour and weapons, similar to instances such as the arming of Achilles in Iliad XIX 364-424. In Heracles' arsenal it is the bow that is alien to the conventional arming scenes of the Iliad, where the principal missile is a spear⁶². The poet of the Shield gives four lines of elaboration on Heracles' arrows, the first (131) referring to their killing potential:

κοῦλην δὲ περὶ στήθεσσι φαρέτρην
καββάλετ' ἐξόπιθεν· πολλοὶ δ' ἔντοσθεν οὔστοι
ρύηλοι, θανάτοιο λαθιφθόγγου δοτῆρες
πρόσθεν μὲν θάνατόν τ' ἔλχεν καὶ δάκρυσι μῦρον
μέσσοι δὲ ξεστοί, περιμήκεες, αὐτὰρ ὀπίσθε
μόρφονοιο φλεγῶα καλυπτόμενοι πτερύγεσσιν. Shield 129-134

The sense of the Stesichorean passage must have been similar to line 131 of the quotation above, although the poet appears to have employed a rather more pedestrian epithet with θάνατος than the compound λαθίφθογγος. The epithet στυγερός is twice associated with θάνατος in the Odyssey alone. Neither instance is particularly comparable with the situation in this fragment, although it is true that the μνηστήρων στυγερόν θάνατον (XXIV 414) is accomplished by Odysseus with his great bow (cf. Odyssey XXII 1 ff.).

Line 3:

For κεφαλὴ meaning the head of a weapon I can find no parallel in epic, yet there seems to be little alternative for its meaning in the context of a description of an arrow that has been dipped in the poisonous gall of the Hydra. In the passage of the Shield quoted above there is specific reference made to the arrows "holding death in front": πρόσθεν μὲν θάνατον τ' ἔλχον καὶ δάκρυσι μῦρον (132). There is no actual word for the tip of the arrow in this line; it is simply indicated by the

adverb πρόσθεν . The verb ἔχειν is used alike by the poet of the Shield and by Stesichorus, but, whereas the former repeats the word θάνατος, Stesichorus apparently preferred a shorter word, possibly πότμον, which fits the metre and the space available. Indeed, πότμος, evil fate, is generally found in close association with θάνατος as in ὄφρα πρόσθ' ἄλλων θάνατον καὶ πότμον ἐνύσπηι (Iliad II 359). It is noteworthy, however, that the parallels from epic attribute the cause of death to the hero rather than the weapon, as in this instance.

Lines 3,4:

Although there is no form πεφορυγμένος as such in the epic corpus⁶³, an indirect parallel for this expression may be cited in the stake that is smeared with blood, μοχλὸν ... πεφύρμενον αἵματι πολλῷ (Odyssey IX 397), where the perfect participle of φύρω rather than of φορύσσω is used. However, the extension of the description of the "blood" as the product of the death-agonies of the Hydra, together with whatever word-group χολᾷ belongs to, is without precedent in battle-scenes in the Iliad; nor are the arrows of Odysseus ever described thus⁶⁴. Moreover, when the epic poet depicts Heracles in the Underworld (Odyssey XI 607 ff.) he passes quickly over the hero's bow and proceeds to describe the elaborate design carved into the golden sword-strap. Only the Hesiodic Shield concentrates upon Heracles' arrows, but even it does not elucidate upon the source of their fatal power.

Lines 5,6:

Not only are the epithets ὀλεσάνορος and αἰολοδεύρος alien to epic⁶⁵ but so too is the Hydra, at least in the Iliad and Odyssey. The ὀδύναισιν, death-agonies, of the Hydra may be compared with the agony of the dying dragoness in the Hymn to Apollo 357,358:

... ἡ δ' ὀδύνησιν ἐρεχθομένη χαλεπήσσει

κεῖτο μέγ' ἀσθμαίνουσα κυλινδομένη κατὰ χῶρον.

Apart from this parallel use of ὀδύνησιν, the entire phrase, lying in apposition to αἵματι and χολᾷ, is unepic.

In the conventional battle-scenes of the Iliad combat with bow and arrow appears to be considered inferior to combat with sword or spear, almost unheroic⁶⁶. There are therefore no model descriptions of arrows. In the Odyssey a different attitude to the bow is detectable. Odysseus' great bow is the central symbol of the later books in which Odysseus finally expels the suitors from his halls. The ancestry of the bow is worthy of description (XXI 1ff.), but the arrows are given no exceptional qualities. The reference in Odyssey I 261 to the poisoning of Odysseus' arrows appears to have been forgotten and all attention is concentrated upon the strength and skill of the bowman himself. In fact, apart from the single instance mentioning a poisoned arrow-tip in Odyssey I 261, nowhere in the Homeric poems does a hero shoot poisoned arrows, nor does the line in the Shield necessarily imply any more than that the barb of the arrow could fatally wound, just as a sword or spear. Stesichorus may have had the Hesiodic description of Heracles' arrows in mind when he composed the Geryoneis and may also have thought of the φάρμακον ἀνδρόφονον with which Odysseus could anoint his arrows, but he has elaborated upon the rather general allusion of the former and may have been the first to employ the detail of poison derived from the Hydra⁶⁷. Indeed, the epithet ὀλεσάνορος may have been intended to imply the "man-slaying" power of the blood and gall of the creature and as such is reminiscent of its synonym ἀνδρόφονον in the Odyssean passage.

b) The successful bow-shot (lines 6-13)

6,7 σιγαῖ δ' ὄ γ' ἐπικλοπάδαν

7 [ἐ] νέρεισε μετώπῳ

8 διὰ δ' ἔσχισε σάρκα [καὶ] ὁ[σ]τ' ἔα

8,9 δαύμονος αἷσαι

10 διὰ δ' ἀντικρὺ σκέθεν οἷ[σ]τος

10,11 ἐπ' ἀκροτάταν κορυφάν

12,13 ἐμίαινε δ' ἄρ' αἵματι πορφύρεω
θώρακά τε καὶ βροτόφεντ[α] μέλεα.

Parallels in Homer.

cf. βῆ δὲ ...
σιγαῖ, πάσας δὲ Τρωάδας λάθην
Iliad III 419,420

οἱ μὲν μοχλὸν ἐλόντες ἐλάτνους
ὄξυν ἐπ' ἄκρῳ
ὀφθαλμῷ ἐνέρεισαν.
Odyssey IX 382,383

ἐν δὲ μετώπῳ πῆξε, πέρησε δ' ἄρ'
ὀστέον εἴσω
αἶχμῃ χαλκεῖη.
Iliad IV 460,461

διὰ μὲν ἀσπίδος ἦλθε φαεινῆς
ὄβριμον ἔγχος,
καὶ διὰ θώρηκος πολυδαίδαλου
ἠρήρειστο.
Iliad III 357,358

... περὶ δ' ἔγχους
αἶχμῃ
νεῦρα διεσχίσθη.
Iliad XVI 315,316

ἔγκατά τε σάρκας τε καὶ ὀστέα
μυελόεντα
Odyssey IX 293

πολλὸν δὲ διήφυσε σαρκὸς ὀδόντι
λίκριφίς· αἶξας, οὐδ' ὀστέον
ἔκετο φωτός.
Odyssey XIX 450,451

-

... διὰ δ' ἔπτατο πικρὸς δῦστός,
ἀντικρὺ δὲ διέσχε, παλάσσετο δ'
αἵματι θώρηξ.
Iliad V 99,100

ἀντικρὺ δὲ διέσχε ... ἀκμῇ
Iliad XI 253

ἀντικρὺ δὲ διέσχε ... αἶχμῃ
Iliad XX 416

... τὸν βάλεν ἰῶ

ἄκρην καὶ κορυφὴν.
Iliad VII 81,83

... παλάσσετο δ' αἵματι θώρηξ
Iliad V 100

12,13 ἐμίαινε δ' ἄρ' αἵματι πορφυρέω
θώρακά τε καὶ βροτόθεντ' αἶμα μέλα

... μιλάνθη αἵματι μηροῖ
εὐφυέες κνημαί τε ἰδὲ σφυρὰ
κάλ' ὑπένερθε.
Iliad IV 146,147

... μιλάνθησαν δὲ ἔθειραι
αἵματι καὶ κονίησι
Iliad XVI 795,796

... αἵματι δὲ χθὼν
δεύετο πορφυρέω
Iliad XVII 360,361

Lines 6,7:

σιγῇ is most commonly applied to situations in which silence is opposed to the noise of talk. There are, however, two instances of σιγῇ in the context of stealthy action: βῆ δὲ κατασχομένη ... σιγῇ, πάσας δὲ Τρωῖας λάθεν (Iliad III 419,420; cf. Odyssey XXI 388). The conjunction of σιγῇ with ἐπικλόπαδαν, a unique form related to the epithet ἐπύκλωπος, having the stealth and cunning of a thief, has no parallel, although the word-association is oddly antithetical to a usage of ἐπύκλωπος in Iliad XXII 281, where the cunning of an individual lies in his glib tongue: ἀλλὰ τις ἀρτιεπὴς καὶ ἐπύκλωπος ἔπλεο μύθων.

It was assumed by Lobel in the editio princeps⁶⁸ that ὁ γ'... referred to Heracles: "Silently, he cunningly stuck it in (his enemy's) forehead." Since, however, the previous sentence describes the arrow smeared with the poisonous gall of the Hydra and the following sentence describes the course of the fatal arrow, it seems more plausible that ὁ γ'... stand for οἷστος, arrow. Hence Barrett translates⁶⁹: "In silence and stealthily it thrust into his forehead ...". In this case Heracles has already shot the arrow and this sentence relates its initial impact on the monster's head, which makes better sense of the verb ἐνεπεύδω. Lobel himself admitted that ἐνέρευσσε would be more appropriate of a weapon that was thrust, such as a sword or spear, and not of a missile. He pointed

to the only instance of ἐνερείδω in the Homeric corpus, in the scene in which Odysseus and his companions blind the Cyclops:

οἱ μὲν μοχλὸν ἐλόντες ἐλάτυνον, ὅξυν ἐπ' ἄκρῳ,
ὀφθαλμῶι ἐνέρεισαν.

Odyssey IX 382,383.

He then noted that πήγνυμι represents the general usage for piercing in the context of both arrows and spears in the Homeric poems. Thus we find:

ἐν δὲ μετώπῳ πῆξε, πέρησε δ' ἄρ' ὀστέον ἐΐσω
αἰχμῇ χαλκεύῃ.

Iliad IV 460,461

ἶδ' ἀποπροΐει, βάλε δὲ στήθος παρὰ μαζόν,
ἐν δέ οἱ ἦπατι πῆξε θοδὸν βέλος.

Odyssey XXII 82,83.

(ἐν)ἐρείδω is more often found of a hero leaning against his spear, or pressing it into the ground.

There is one description of a spear driving its way through armour that bears a resemblance to Stesichorus' use of ἐνερείδω of the driving force of the arrow in this fragment. In Iliad III 357 ff., Menelaus casts his spear at Paris, transfixing his opponent's shield. The spear continues onwards, buries itself in the thorax and even tears the tunic beneath:

διὰ μὲν ἀσπίδος ἦλθε φαεινῆς ὄβριμον ἔγχος
καὶ διὰ θώρηκος πολυθαυδάλου ἠρήρειστο·
ἀντικρὺ δὲ παρὰ λαπάρην διέμνησε χιτῶνα
ἔγχος.

The use of ἠρήρειστο is not common⁷⁰, but the passage provides an interesting parallel for this fragment of Stesichorus. In the first place, ὄβριμον ἔγχος is the subject of the sentence, which would corroborate the interpretation offered by Barrett that ὁ γ'... must refer to the arrow. Moreover, although details such as the type of missile used and the armour that is pierced differ, the general structure is the same. The missile is cast and strikes its target; then the piercing of the target is described in three stages as the missile forces its way through all that it encounters. The repetition of the preposition διὰ and the use of

ἀντικρύ are present in both accounts (cf. lines 8-11).

μετώπῳ is parallel to ὀφθαλμῷ in the example cited above from Odyssey IX 382, and is itself the target of the hero's spear in Iliad IV 460, also cited above.

Lines 8,9:

διασχίζω is not commonly found in poetry, and there is only one example of its use to refer to the severing of some part of the body, causing the ultimate death of the recipient of the wound:

... περὶ δ' ἔγχεος αἰχμῇ
νεῦρα διασχίσθη· τὸν δὲ σκότος ὄσσε κάλυψε. Iliad XVI 315,316

As was noted in chapter III, there are two precedents for the phrase σάρκα καὶ ὀστέα⁷¹, neither in the context of the wounded hero. Another episode in which σάρξ and ὀστέον are associated, though not directly juxtaposed, might be more informative. Odysseus' famous scar, by which he was instantly recognised by his nurse Eurycleia, was inflicted on him by the gashing blow of a boar's tusk and is described by Homer thus:

... πολλὸν δὲ δολήφυσε σαρκὸς ὀδόντι
λικριφὺς ἄλγας, οὐδ' ὀστέον ἔκετο φωτός.

It seems to be implied in this account that since the tusk failed to penetrate the bone, the wound was not a fatal one. On the other hand, Sarpedon caught the spear of Tlepolemus in his thigh and it grazed the bone, ὀστέῳ ἐγχρυμθεῖσα (Iliad V 662). The wound would have proved fatal but for the intervention of Zeus, πατήρ δ' ἔτι λογιὸν ἄμυνεν. Thus the arrow that penetrated Geryon's flesh and bones was likely to be fatal in accordance with epic convention, not to mention common sense, although the expression used by Stesichorus is itself an exaggerated expansion of a less common word-group from the epic repertoire.

Geryon was wounded in accordance with fate, δαίμονος αἴσα.

It is interesting to note that in Homeric scenes that describe the

wounded hero there is never any reference to αἶσα.. As was suggested above, it seems likely that the poet wished to underline the mortality of Geryon by introducing this phrase into his description of the wounding of Geryon⁷². One should note in passing, however, that Apollo, the patron god of archers, is referred to as δαύμων by Teucer, when that god knocked the bow from Teucer's hand lest he strike Hector:

ὦ πόποι, ἦ δὴ πάγχυ μάχης ἐπὶ μῆδεα κεύρει
δαύμων ἡμετέρης, ὃ τέ μοι βλὸν ἔκβαλε χειρός. Iliad XV 467,468

His brother's reply reechoes the allusion to the δαύμων with the word θεός : ἐπεὶ συνέχευε θεὸς Δαναοῖσι μεγήρας (XV 473). In their eyes some δαύμων or θεός had the ultimate decision as to whether an arrow ever reached its target or not. Perhaps Stesichorus' use of δαύμονος αἶσα also reflects this notion.

Lines 10,11:

There is one parallel expression in epic for the combination of ἀντικρὺ with δαείχω in a description of an arrow passing straight through an individual:

... διὰ δ' ἔπιτατο πικρὸς ὀϊστός·
ἀντικρὺ δὲ δαείσχε, παλάσσετο δ' αἶματι θώρηξ. Iliad V 99,100

The "formula" ἀντικρὺ δὲ δαείσχε at the beginning of the hexameter verse is repeated twice in the context of a spear-wound:

ἀντικρὺ δὲ δαείσχε φαεινοῦ δουρὸς ἀκωκή Iliad XI 253 and
ἀντικρὺ δὲ δαείσχε παρ' ὀμφαλὸν ἔγχεος αἶχμή Iliad XX 416.

In διὰ δ' ἀντικρὺ σχέθεν, therefore, Stesichorus adopts almost verbatim a conventional expression for the straightness and sureness of the missile as it pierces its target.

In only one instance in the Homeric poems does κορυφή refer to the head of a creature, as opposed to a mountain peak, and in that instance we find a context that is in part parallel to this fragment:

In Iliad VII 78 ff., all the foremost Greek heroes have fled from Hector except Nestor, whose horse succumbs to fatigue. Paris succeeds in striking with one of his arrows the top of the horse's head, ἀκρην καὶ κορυφήν, although the strike is accidental. Thus the parallel consists in a creature being struck in the head by an arrow. Admittedly there is little similarity between the calculated shot of Heracles and the straying arrow from Paris' bow, but it is interesting to note that this is the only instance in which κορυφή means a "head". Otherwise the "formula" ἀκροτάτη κορυφή is restricted to the context of the topmost peaks of mountains (for example in Iliad I 499) and on this account I believe that the poet intended to convey the idea of the mountainous dimensions of the monster, relying on the habitual association of the phrase with mountains⁷³.

Lines 12,13:

In conventional Homeric battle-scenes the hero's death subsequent to his sustaining a fatal wound may be indicated through one of a number of euphemistic expressions: for example κατὰ δὲ σκότος ὄσσε κάλυψε (Iliad XVI 325), ἀπὸ δ' ἔπτατο θυμός (Iliad XVI 469) and τοῦ δ' αὖθις λύθη ψυχὴ τέμενος τε (Iliad V 296) etc. Scenes of wounding and death may naturally also involve descriptions of the flow of blood from the wound or onto the victor's weapon or onto the earth: for example αὐτίκα δ' ἔρρεεν αἷμα κελαυνεφῆς ἐξ ὠτελῆς (Iliad IV 140). The association of the epithet κορυφύρεος with αἷμα occurs only once (Iliad XVII 360,361)⁷⁴, while its frequent combination with κόνις probably influenced the poet's choice of such an epithet with its connotations of vastness to convey the picture of the profusion of blood pouring from the monster's wound. In one of the few passages in the Iliad that describe an arrow-wound, we find that the piercing of the flesh is followed by a description of the blood spattering the thorax (Iliad V 100), which may be compared

the more closely, therefore, with the Stesichorean passage. The latter, however, contains the verb ἐμύαινε instead of παλάσσειτο, apparently derived from passages such as:

τοῦτοῦ τοῦ, Μενέλαε, μιάνην αἵματι μηροῖ
εὐφύεες κνημαῖ τε ἰδὲ σφυρὰ κάλ' ὑπένερθε Iliad IV 146,147

or ἡ δὲ κυλινδομένη καναχὴν ἔχε ποσσὶν ὑφ' ἱππων
αὐλῶπις τρυφάλεια, μιάνησαν δὲ ἔθειραι
αἵματι καὶ κονίησι· πάρος γε μὲν οὐ θέμις ἦεν
ἱππόκομων πῆληκα μιάνεσθαι κονίησιν,
ἀλλ' ἀνδρὸς θεύτοιο κάρη χαρίεν τε μέτωπον
ρύετ' Ἀχιλλῆος Iliad XVI 794-799.

These passages, and in particular the former, could have provided a model for Stesichorus' depiction of the blood staining Geryon's armour.

The epithet βροτόεντα occurs in eight of its nine instances with ἔναρα in the Iliad, but this phrase is unlikely in the context of Geryon's death, since the spoils that Heracles would take as his prize were the cattle of Geryon. Page suggested μελέα⁷⁵, which would be possible as a word-group composed of Homeric elements in new juxtaposition. Whatever the supplement, however, there is evidence here of a certain degree of redundancy: "it stained with purple-dark blood the thorax and bloody....". Stesichorus has therefore in the process of expanding and conflating elements from different sources fallen back on repetition, either for emphasis on a point now no longer obvious or else because of metrical exigencies.

Few heroic encounters in the Iliad involve combat with the bow, and where they occur, it is generally a Trojan who draws his bow at a Greek with little or no success. One episode, from which we have just cited certain expressions parallel with those employed by Stesichorus, is Pandarus' attack on Diomedes in book V 95 ff.:

τὸν δ' ὥς οὖν ἐνόησε Λυκάονος ἀγλαὸς υἱὸς
 θύνοντ' αἶμ πεδίον πρὸ ἔθεν κλονέοντα φάλαγγας,
 αἴψ' ἐπὶ Τυδείδῃ ἐπιταίνετο καμπύλα τόξα,
 καὶ βάλ' ἐπαΐσσοντα τυχὼν κατὰ δεξιὸν ὤμον,
 θώρηκος γυάλον· δὲ δ' ἔπιτο πικρὸς οἷστος,
 ἀντικρὺ δὲ διέσχε, παλάσσετο δ' αἵματι θώρηξ.

The structure of the scene from line 97 ff. is as follows:

- a) the Trojan hero bends his bow, fires and strikes his target;
- b) the arrow flies through (i.e. through the joint at the shoulder of the thorax);
- c) the thorax is besprinkled with blood.

The Homeric version is much briefer than the Stesichorean counterpart, since I assume that the aiming and release of the arrow was described in the missing lines that preceded the words $\sigma\tau\upsilon\gamma\epsilon[\rho]\omicron\upsilon \mid \theta\alpha\nu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\upsilon] \circ$ (col. ii 1,2). In Homer the arrow is simply $\pi\iota\kappa\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, whereas Stesichorus gives a prolonged account of the lethal power of the arrow-head derived from the poisonous blood and gall of the Hydra. The ambiguous use of $\delta\epsilon\lambda\alpha\ \delta'\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\tau\omicron\tau\omicron$ in line 99⁷⁶ has been replaced by $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\iota\sigma\epsilon$ in Stesichorus, the verb $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\rho\epsilon\iota\delta\omega$ being drawn from the image of a spear-thrust (cf. Iliad III 375 ff.). In both passages the missile holds its course straight through the flesh of the victim (although in the Homeric account $\delta\epsilon\lambda\alpha\ \delta'\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\tau\omicron\tau\omicron$ has no direct object). In both passages the flow of blood ensues, but again the Stesichorean version is more expansive in comparison with the concluding half line of Iliad V 100.

The similarity of the passages lies only in their basic structure: the shooting of the arrow, its piercing of its target and the inevitable flow of blood. Not only is Stesichorus' description more elaborate, but the consequences of the arrow-wound are entirely different. The ensuing death of one of Geryon's bodies, figuratively related in the simile of the poppy (see the following section c.) is totally removed from the unexpectedly speedy recovery of Diomedes after Sthenelus had

extracted the arrow from his shoulder.

Elsewhere in the Iliad bow-shots are equally ineffective in killing their targets. Helenus' arrow glances off Menelaus' armour:

Πριαμίδης μὲν ἔπειτα κατὰ στήθος βάλεν ἰῶν
θώρηκος γυάλον, ἀπὸ δ' ἔπιτο πικρὸς ὄϊστός. Iliad XIII 586,587

Menelaus had previously survived a wound from an arrow that had pierced his thorax, καὶ διὰ θώρηκος πολυδαυδάλου ἠρήρειστο (Iliad IV 136). In the latter passage we again encounter certain similarities with the Stesichorean fragment. In Iliad IV there is a more detailed account of all that the arrow pierced than was noted in Iliad V 99 above: thus

ἐν δ' ἔπεσε ζωστήρι ἀρηρότι πικρὸς ὄϊστός·
διὰ μὲν ἄρ' ζωστήρος ἐλήλατο δαιδαλέοιο
καὶ διὰ θώρηκος πολυδαυδάλου ἠρήρειστο
μύτρης θ' ἣν ἐφόρει ἔρυμα χροός, ἔρκος ἀκόντων
ἧ οἱ πλεῖστον ἔρυτο· διαπρὸ δὲ εἷσατο καὶ τῆς.
ἀκρότατον δ' ἄρ' ὄϊστός ἐπέγραψε χροά φωτός·
αὐτίκα ἔρρεεν αἷμα κελαινεφές ἐξ ὠτειλῆς. Iliad IV 134-140

Stesichorus undoubtedly relied upon a passage such as this one for the anaphoric repetition of διὰ in line 8 and 10 of fragment 4 column ii. In Iliad IV the repetition of διὰ in lines 135 and 136 is reechoed in διαπρὸ in line 138. Again, however, the outcome of the wound is not fatal in the Homeric passage; as a result the parallelism between the Stesichorean account and the Homeric passage is more obvious at a structural level. Both poets enrich their descriptions with a simile, the choice naturally depending upon the context. In the case of Menelaus, the blood that flows from the wound is compared with dye that is used to stain ivory, while Stesichorus' simile is directly related to the dying Geryon.

In the Iliad the bow was considered a weapon of inferior status on the whole, and when bowman is pitted against spearman, it is the spearman who wins (cf. Iliad VIII 300ff., XIII 581 ff.). In Iliad VIII 300ff.,

Teucer, the archer par excellence on the Greek side, is wielding the bow. He is partially successful, unlike his Trojan counter-parts, insofar as he does mortally wound one of his opponents, although not his original target, Hector. When he shoots at Hector (300, 301) he misses, but strikes Gorgythion, another of Priam's sons, and it is the dying Gorgythion who is compared to a drooping poppy in a simile that is apparently imitated by Stesichorus in this fragment. Teucer, thereafter, again attempts to strike his original target, but misses once more, this time killing Hector's charioteer, Archeptolemon. Enraged, Hector strikes the bow from Teucer's hand with a stone (line 327) and would have ended his life with a cast of his spear had not Aias protected his brother with a shield. In this incident of a successful bow-shot in the Homeric poems, the only point of comparison with the Stesichorean version is the simile used for a dying warrior. The epic poet in this case makes no mention of the arrow actually piercing Gorgythion or Archeptolemon.

In his second aristeia, Teucer is again successful in part. He kills Kleitos, striking him in the neck, but again there is no elaborate description of the wound:

..... τάχα δ' αὐτῷ
 ἦλθε κακόν, τό οἱ οὐ τις ἐρύκακεν ἱεμένων περ,
 αὐχένι γάρ οἱ ὄπισθε πολύστονος ἔμπεσεν ἵος Iliad XV 449-451

However, as soon as he levels his bow at Hector he is doomed to failure, since Hector has the protection of Zeus (line 461) and his bow mysteriously falls from his hand (465). Such an episode could hardly be farther from Stesichorus' purpose, namely to depict the victorious archer-hero Heracles subduing the monster Geryon.

Thus, although one can find a few instances of a hero wounded by an arrow-shot that might have provided a conventional model for Stesichorus, no single passage is obviously the direct ancestor of the

description in fragment 4. Instead, the poet has drawn on several "formulaic" expressions from conventional descriptions of dying heroes in the Iliad, heroes wounded in combat with spear or sword. Other elements, such as the notion of the arrow's stealthy silent path as it pierces Geryon, are alien to the Homeric corpus, as was the description of the fatal arrow-tips. Thus in its general structure the passage may rely on some Homeric models, but in the finer details and in the word-associations created by the poet we can observe a departure from epic conventions.

c) The simile of the poppy
(lines 14-17)

ἀπέκλινε δ' ἄρ' αὐχένα γὰρ [υ]όνας
ἐπικάρσιον, ὥς ὅκα μ[α]μή[ν]
ἄτε κατασχύνουσ' ἀπαλὸν [δέμας
αἴψ' ἀπὸ φύλλα βαλοῦσα ν[

14 ἀπέκλινε δ' ἄρ' αὐχένα

15 ἐπικάρσιον

ὥς ὅκα μάκων

16 ἄτε κατασχύνουσ'

ἀπαλὸν [δέμας

Iliad VIII 306-308

μήκων δ' ὥς ἐτέρωσε κάρη βάλεν
ἧ τ' ἐνὶ κήπῳ,
καρπῷ βριθομένη νοτίηυσί τε
εἰαρινῆυσιν,
ὥς ἐτέρωσ' ἦμυσε κάρη πῆληκτι
βαρυνθέν.

Epic parallels apart from Iliad
VIII 306-308

ἧ καὶ ἀνακλινθεὶς πέσεν ὕπτιος
αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα
κεῖτ' ἀποδοχμῶσας παχὺν αὐχένα...
Odyssey IX 371,372

ἐκλίνθη δ' ἐτέρωσε κάρη ...
Iliad XIII 543,
cf. Odyssey XXII 17

ἐξ ὀρέων ἐπικάρ
Iliad XVI 392

ἦριπε δ', ὥς ὅτε πύργος, ...
Iliad IV 462

-

ἀντικρὺ δ' ἀπαλοῖτο δι' αὐχένος
ἦλυθ' ἀκωκή
Odyssey XXII 16
Iliad XVII 49, XXII 327

17. ἀπὸ φύλλα βαλοῦσα

cf. φύλλα τὰ μὲν τ' ἄνεμος
χαμάδ' ἔχει ...
Iliad VI 147
φύλλα δ' ἔραζε χέει, πτόρθοι δ'
τε λήγει
Works and Days 421

Lines 14, 15:

Although a direct parallel for the simile of the poppy is detectable in Iliad VIII 306 ff., Stesichorus has not imitated the simile detail for detail. The bowed neck of Geryon is reminiscent of the picture of the sleeping Cyclops:

ἦ καὶ ἀνακλινθεὶς πέσεν ὕπτιος, αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα
κεῖτ' ἀποδοχμώσας παχὺν αὐχένα, καὶ δέ μιν ὕπνος
ἦρει πανδομάτῳ.
Odyssey IX 371-373

Similarly, Antinous keels over to one side as he is shot through the neck by Odysseus: ἐκλύνθη δ' ἐτέρωσε... (Odyssey XXII 17). As in the expression quoted above, the simple form κλύνω is far more common than compounds ἀποκλύνω or ἀνακλύνω. The former occurs only once, in Odyssey XIX 556, but the poet presumably chose this compound to emphasise the comparison with the poppy shedding its petals, ἀπὸ φύλλα βαλοῦσα.

The adverb ἐπικάρσιον is unique, although similar to ἐπικάρ (Iliad XVI 392), which apparently means "headlong". If ἐπικάρσιον is to be distinguished from ἐτέρωσε in Iliad VIII 306 or Odyssey XXII 16, then it may indicate that the head had slumped forwards, not sideways.

Line 15:

Stesichorus follows the conventional epic introduction to a simile with the words ὥς ὅκα, where Western dialect form ὅκα is identical to epic ὅτε. It is possible that no finite verb occurred in the ὅκα clause,

as, for example, in Iliad IV 462: ἦρκε δ' ὥς ὅτε πύργος, ἐνὶ κρατερῇ
 ὑσμίνῃ⁷⁷, although it is impossible to tell whether a verb did occur
 after the participial phrases in lines 16 and 17 or not.

Line 16 :

The poet again employs a compound form, κατασχύνουσα⁷⁸, that
 is unusual in epic. It occurs only twice, in the same context of
 ruining a feast: ἀλλήλους τρώσῃτε κατασχύνητέ τε δαῖτα (Odyssey XVI
 293 = XIX 12).

If the supplement ἀπαλον δέμας is correct, then the use of the
 epithet ἀπαλός is interesting in view of its close association with αὐχὴν
 in the epic corpus⁷⁹. The poet has consciously transferred the epithet
 that might be expected to occur with αὐχένα of Geryon (line 14) into the
 framework of the simile, to govern the object of comparison, the flower.
 In this way he would bind the simile more closely to its counterpart in
 reality, in the same way as the use of ἀπέκλυε is reflected by ἀπὸ ...
 βαλοῦσα.

In the Homeric simile in Iliad VIII 306 ff., the falling head
 of Gorgythion is compared to the drooping head of a poppy that is laden
 with fruit and with moisture from the rain in spring. Thus, although the
 context of the simile in Stesichorus is identical to that of Iliad VIII,
 namely the collapse of an individual mortally wounded by an arrow, the
 integral parts of the simile are not identical. Stesichorus has augmented
 the image, although we cannot tell to what extent on account of the break
 in the papyrus at the end of the third line of the simile. In the
 Homeric version we find a simple one-to-one analogy between the head of
 the dying man and the head of the poppy, the one weighed down by a helmet,
 the other by fruit and moisture. Stesichorus, on the other hand, selects

another feature of the poppy with which to compare the falling head of Geryon, namely its loss of petals, whether in a storm or in the late summer. To a certain extent Stesichorus' application of the simile is the more appropriate of a dying creature. The flower's head laden with fruit represents not the termination of life, but the promise of renewal, of rebirth, whereas the loss of petals represents the destruction of the form of the moment, the visible, tangible flower. Moreover, it seems likely that the poet had the intention of striking a parallel between the loss of the multiple heads of the monster and the petals falling from the stem of the flower, however bizarre the image may appear to our taste. Thus we can observe in this fragment the poet adapting a simile from the Homeric corpus, from a context almost identical with the episode of the shooting of Geryon in his own poem, and altering the traditional material with his own individual twist.

That the simile from Iliad VIII influenced Stesichorus in this passage is fairly certain. It would be too great a coincidence in view of the relative dearth of episodes in which a successful bow-shot is described in the Iliad if Stesichorus' simile referring to the collapse of one of Geryon's heads, struck by an arrow, were totally independent of the Homeric version. The poet's acquaintance with the epic tradition of the Iliad and the Odyssey is evident through his imitation and modification of "formulae" and his reliance on his audience's awareness of them. The alteration of the simile is best explained in terms of the poet's desire for variation and also as an attempt to suit the simile to his particular context. It is impossible to tell whether the introduction of the simile was intended, as the Homeric one supposedly was, not only as a reminder of the frailty of mortal creatures, but also as a contrast to the violence of the preceding scenes in the battle.⁸⁰ In Iliad VIII the sudden

transition to a peaceful image tends to intensify the horrors of war. In the Stesichorean passage the simile may have been designed to create a diversion from the grim struggle.

The arrow-shot that lodged itself in one of Geryon's three heads described in this fragment appears not to have been the final wound that destroyed the monster utterly. The poet, therefore, when considering the most appropriate simile or metaphor for the destruction of one of the heads, possibly the first, but not the entire body, could hardly select one of the more frequent similes employed in the epic corpus for the falling body of a hero or monster, that is, the simile of the falling oak-tree:

ἦρκε δ' ὥς ὅτε τις δρυς ἦρκεν ἢ ἀχερωΐς
 ἢ ἐκύτῳ, βλωθρή, τὴν τ' οὐρεσι τέκτονες ἄνδρες
 ἐξέταμον πελέκεσσιν ἀνέχεσσι νήϊον εἶναι. Iliad XVI 482-484

These lines are used to describe the fall of Sarpedon struck by Patroclus and that of Agius struck by Idomeneus (Iliad XIII 398-391). In both cases the oak is felled by woodsmen. It is significant too that in the Hesiodic Shield Cycnus' collapse is depicted in similar terms, except that the tree has been struck by a thunderbolt of Zeus:

ἦρκε δ' ὥς ὅτε τις δρυς ἦρκεν ἢ ὅτε πεύκη
 ἡλύβατος, πληγεῖσα Διὸς φολόθεντι κεραυνῷ. 421,422,

(cf. ὥς δ' ὅθ' ὑπὸ πληγῆς πατρὸς Διὸς ἐξερέπη δρυς Iliad XIV 414).

It may be, therefore, that the final collapse of the monster Geryon was depicted in similar fashion, possibly with added embellishment in keeping with Stesichorus' practice of expansion that we have observed elsewhere. Such a simile would not have been appropriate at this point in the narrative, however, when only one of Geryon's heads has been overwhelmed.

P.Oxy. 2617 fr. 4 thus provides further evidence for the

poet's adaptation and modification of Homeric diction and thematic material, in this case in the framework of an episode that has no immediate parallel in the Homeric corpus, namely the legend of Heracles' labour to fetch the cattle of Geryon. For his description of the arrow piercing the monster's head, Stesichorus has in part derived expressions from conventional scenes in which a Homeric warrior wounds his opponent with a spear. Since, however, the use of the bow in the Iliad is rare and generally unsuccessful, the descriptions of such events would not provide Stesichorus with enough appropriate material. The closest precedent for an account of a fatal arrow is to be found in the post-Homeric Shield, although the description of the origins of famous weapons is conventional in epic. The simile of the poppy that depicts the falling head of the monster is adapted from a similar scene in Iliad VIII 306-308, but has been altered and embellished by the poet to suit his context.

IV P.Oxy. 2359: Catalogue of heroes at the Calydonian Boar-hunt.

Both columns of this fragment, assigned to the Suotherae of Stesichorus, contain the names of heroes or of regional groups, present at a great event, presumably the boar-hunt in Calydon⁸¹. In the first column we are told the names of some heroes who came, as well as some of those who were too young. In the second, which must represent a continuation of the narrative after approximately 25 lines from column i 10⁸², we are told of the stationing of the groups of heroes, presumably before the hunt commences.

a) 2359 fr.1 col.i

2 ὄψιγόνου τε καὶ ἀσπασύ|ου

3 ἐν μεγάροισιν

3,4 πόδας ... ἀγαθοῦ

6 ἐκ φθ[]ας δὲ μόλ' [E] ὕρυτίων

7]ς τανυπέπλου

9 Εἰλατίδαο δαΐφρονος

b) 2359 fr.1 col. ii

1,8 ἔνθεν μὲν ... ἔνθεν δ' αὖ

2 ἱζανον

αἶχμηταὶ

3 τέκνα φύλα

Epic parallels

τηλύγετος δέ οἱ υἱὸς ἐνὶ μεγάρῳ
εὐπήκτω
ὄψιγονος τρέφεται, πολυεύχετος
ἀσπασίδος τε
Hymn to Demeter 164,165

ἐν μεγάροισιν ἐγείνατο
Hesiod fr.26 28

ἡ τέκεν ... ἐν μεγάροισιν
Hesiod fr.23 (a) 15
fr. 204 96

cf. καὶ ῥ' ὁ μὲν ἐν δόμῳ μένει

Iliad IX 634

θηλύτεραι δὲ θεαὶ μένον αἰδοῦ
οὔκοι ἐκάστη
Odyssey VIII 324

cf. βοὴν ἀγαθός (23 times of
Menelaus, 22 of
Diomedes)

πόδας ὠκὺς (29 of Achilles,
ὠκέα 9 of Iris)

-

cf. τὸν δ' Ἑλένη τανυπέπλος ...
Iliad III 228
cf. Odyssey XV 171

cf. εὖρ' υἱὸν Πριάμοιο δαΐφρονος
Ἑκτορα δῖον
Iliad XV 239

ἔνθεν γὰρ Σκύλλη, ἐτέρῳι δὲ δῖα
Χάρυβδις
Odyssey XII 235

ἔνθ' ἄρα τοῦ γ' ἕζοντ' εἰλυμένοι
αἴθοπι χαλκῷ
Iliad XVIII 522

cf. αἶχμηταὶ μεμαῶτες ...
Iliad II 543

αἶχμηταὶ Δαναοὶ ...
Iliad XII 419

οὕτω νῦν, φύλα τέκνα, φυλάσσετε
Iliad X 192

3,4	ἐρ[ε]ήρες Ἀχαιοὺ	cf. ... κόμισαν δ' ἐρήρες ἑταῖρου <u>Iliad</u> III 378 etc. ... εὐκνήμιδες Ἀχαιοὺ <u>Iliad</u> V 668 etc. ... κάρη κομόωντες Ἀχαιοὺ <u>Iliad</u> IV 261 etc.
5	ὑπερθύμους	cf. Τρῶες ὑπερθύμους, ... <u>Iliad</u> XI 564
6	θ' ἱερὰν Βοιωτὶδ[α] αἶον	... οἱ θαύουσι πέρην ἱερῆς Εὐβοίης <u>Iliad</u> II 535
7	χθόνα πυροφόρ[ον]	cf. ἄλλες δὲ οἱ ἦσαν ἄρουραι πυροφόροι <u>Iliad</u> XIV 122,123
8,9	... Ἀρύσπ[ος] τε καὶ Αἰτω λοὺ μενεχάρμα[τι]	Κουρήτες τε μαχόνται καὶ Αἰτωλοὺ μενεχάρμαι <u>Iliad</u> IX 529

Line 2, col. i :

The two closely bound epithets that describe the younger sons of Thestius are also found in conjunction in the Hymn to Demeter 165: (ὕλδς) ὀψύγονος τρέφεται, πολυεύχεται ἀσπασίδς τε, but not in the Homeric corpus⁸³. Moreover the meaning of ὀψύγονος as "late-born" as opposed to referring to posterity is also similar to the usage in the Hymn to Demeter, but is alien to the Homeric poems.

Line 3 ff.:

The phrase ἐν μεγάροισιν is common to all epic, whether in conjunction with a reference to the birth of some hero, or in some other context. The former is frequent not only in Homer, but also in the fragments of the Hesiodic Catalogue of Women. In that poem, which is essentially an elaborate list of the women who were consorts of the gods, and who gave birth to their children, we find lines such as: Εὐρυτον ἐν μεγάροισιν ἐγένετο φίλτατον υἱόν (fr. 26 28; cf. fr. 17 (a) 14; 23 (a)

15 and 17 etc.). There are a few instances in the Homeric poems of individuals remaining at home as opposed to participating in some event, as for example in Iliad XI 76, XX 634 and Odyssey VIII 324, which could have acted as a precedent for the expression μένο]ν ἐν μεγάροισιν although these are not common, nor does one find ἐν μεγάροισιν in such contexts.

Prokaon and Glytius are described as ἀγαθοῦ (line 4) and it would appear that πόδας in line 3 is an accusative of specification linked with ἀγαθοῦ, referring to the sphere in which the heroes excelled. The association of ἀγαθός with πόδας is not, however, found in epic. In the Iliad (and in the Odyssey to a lesser extent) there are numerous instances of the phrase βοὴν ἀγαθός as an attribute of Menelaus and Diomedes⁸⁴. Otherwise, there is the single example of πύξ ἀγαθός in Odyssey VIII 130. πόδας when incorporated in an expression of attribute is associated with the epithet ὤκυς, mostly describing Achilles in the Iliad, but also Iris⁸⁵. Thus the phrase in Stesichorus appears to have been created on the analogy of two well-known "formulae", without being preceded itself.

Snell's conjecture ἀνορέα]ν τ'ἀγαθόν (line 4)⁸⁶, in which concrete (πόδας) and abstract (ἀνορέαν) are juxtaposed, might be compared with phrases elsewhere in Stesichorus such as βίαι τε καὶ ἀλχηῶν ... πεπολθότες (2619 fr.1 i 6). Again the grouping has no precedent in epic other than βοὴν ἀγαθός.

Line 6:

The second aorist μόλ'⁸⁷ is not common in epic and does not occur in the context of an individual's provenance, where a verb such as (ἐξ)ἵκεσθαι is generally employed (for example in Iliad IX 479). The poet's list probably contained other verbs of "arrival" by way of variation. One suggested supplement, νεέσθαι in line 5⁸⁸, does

correspond to an opposition of μένειν and νέεσθαι seen in Iliad II 298:
 αἰσχρόν τοι δηρόν τε μένειν κενεόν τε νέεσθαι. For a parallel situation
 of a list of heroes arriving at the scene of a great event one may cite
 Pindar Pythian IV 171 ff.:

τάχα δὲ Κρονίδαο Ζηνὸς υἱοὶ τρεῖς ἀκαμαντομάχαι
 ἦλθον Ἀλκίμανας θ' ἐλικογλεφάρου Λήδας τε, δοιοὶ δ' ὕψιχαῖται
 ἄνδρες, Ἐννοσίδω γένος, αἰδεσθέντες Ἀλκάν
 ἔκ τε Πύλου καὶ ἀπ' ἄκρας Ταυνάρου· τῶν μὲν κλέος
 ἔσλόν Εὐφάμου τ' ἐκράνθη σὸν τε, Περικλύμεν' εὐρυβία.
 ἐξ Ἀπολλῶνος δὲ φορμυγκτὰς δαιδᾶν πατὴρ
 ἔμολεν, εὐαῖνητος Ὀρφεύς.

πέμπε δ' Ἑρμᾶς χρυσόραπις διδύμους υἱοὺς ἐπ' ἄτρυτον πόνον,
 τὸν μὲν Ἐχίωνα, κεχλάδοντας ἦβαι, τὸν δὲ Ἑρυτον. ταχέες
 ἀμφὶ Παγγαίου θεμέθλους ναυετάνοντες ἔβαν.

In this passage the poet uses three different verbs to relate the arrival
 of the heroes who participated in the expedition of the Argo. Both Pindar
 and Stesichorus have relied on the epic convention of giving a catalogue
 as prologue to an important event, but both poets show a tendency to
 introduce non-epic variations in their diction .

Line 7:

The epithet τανύπεπλος one would expect to accompany the name of
 a woman, as for example it is found in the Iliad and Odyssey with Helen.
 Mention of a hero's descent on his mother's side rather than his father's
 is less common in the Iliad, but is part of the essential structure of the
 Hesiodic Catalogue of Women. It may be that Hesiod's poem provided the
 genealogy for Eurytion, but no fragment has survived giving the mother's
 name, and it is equally possible that Stesichorus invented Eurytion's
 parentage, giving his mother, whatever her name, a conventional epithet
 for a woman to gain credence for his invention.

Line 8:

We do not know which of the Eilatides was meant, and it would
 be surprising if the phrase were intended to continue the description of

Eurytion's parents⁸⁹. It is of interest that the epithet δαΐφρων can occur in a similar type of context in epic, namely in an account of the ancestry of a hero: for example Εὐρύτιδον Πριάμοιο δαΐφρονος, Ἕκτορα δῖον (Iliad XV 239) or Εὐρύμαχον, Πολύβοιο δαΐφρονος ἀγλαὸν οὐδόν (Odyssey XV 519).

b) If the first column lists the heroes who came to Calydon, the second appears to represent either a separate list that gives the positioning of the heroes at the beginning of the hunt or else one that acts as a summary or recapitulation of that list, identifying the heroes through their regional origins, as Locrians, Achaeans, and so on. There still occur certain features that are characteristic of a catalogue in the epic tradition: the groups receive martial epithets, or else in the case of line 2, a lineage.

Line 1:

Adverbial ἔνθεν μὲν followed by ἔνθεν δ' αὖ in line 8, is not precedented in the Homeric poems, where ἔνθεν primarily indicates "from that place" or "from which", as in Odyssey IX 62, 105 : ἔνθεν δὲ προτέρω πλέομεν ἀκαχήμενοι ἦτορ. There appears to be only one instance comparable to the usage "on the one side ... on the other", namely in the description of Scylla and Charybdis: ἔνθεν γὰρ Σκύλλη, ἑτέρωθεν δὲ δῖα Χάρυβδις (Odyssey XII 235; cf. ἔνθεν δ' αὖθ' ἑτέρωθεν νέου κώμαζον ὑπ' αὐλοῦ Shield 281). In the Odyssean line, however, one notes that the second adverb is ἑτέρωθεν. The repetition of ἔνθεν is restricted, it would seem, to prose usage, from Herodotus onwards, apart from this example in Stesichorus. The repetition of the adverb in this fragment may be explained as an anaphoric device that helps to bind together the list into a composite whole.

The verb ἵζάνων must have had a semi-technical sense such as is found in prose in the verb ἵζομαι⁹⁰. In the Homeric poems the verb ἵζάνω is used intransitively of a person sitting, but unless Bowra and Lloyd-Jones are correct in supposing that this passage refers to some sort of assembly of spectators⁹¹, then the sense of sitting must be wrong. Cognate ἵζομαι, on the other hand, may be used in the context of men taking up hostile position against the enemy, as in Iliad XVIII 522: ἐνθ' ἄρα τοῦ γ' ἵζοντ' εἰλυμένοι αἰθοπι χαλκῶι. Here the poet describes cattle-raiders setting their ambush. In a comparable description in Iliad IV 392, the aorist of cognate ἕζω is used: ἄψ ἄρ' ἀνερχομένωι πυκινὸν λόχον εἷσαν ἄγοντες. Thus it is possible that Stesichorus made use of ἵζάνω in a similar way: the warriors take up their positions for the attack against the boar, presumably in silence, much as a secretive ambush would be set. Stesichorus has employed a mainly epic verb, but in such a way as is not preceded in extant epic.

αἰχμηταί, primarily an epic word, is in the plural most frequently applied to the Greeks, as in αἰχμηταὶ Δαναοί (Iliad XII 419; cf. VIII 33, 464, 472). More specifically in the Catalogue of the Ships the noun appears in apposition to the Abantes of Euboea: αἰχμηταὶ μεμαῶτες ὀρεκτῆϊσιν μελίσσι (Iliad II 543). Elsewhere the word-group ἀνδρῶν αἰχμητῶν occurs. There is no hint as to whom Stesichorus calls αἰχμηταί. I presume that either he found a specific association in lines of epic now lost, or more likely, created a new association by analogy with αἰχμηταὶ Δαναοί.

Line 3:

The phrase τέκνα φύλα generally occurs in the Iliad in the vocative case, as does the frequent association of the singular φύλε τέκνον⁹². It would appear that in this context the poet has devoted a

line to the genealogy of one of the groups cited, perhaps the same one that is called αἰχμαῖται. Although the Catalogue of Ships and other such lists contain statements of lineage, they are usually found in the context of an individual who is specifically named and not as here in the context of regional groups. Thus this intrusion into the list of Locrians, etc., of an account of their descent appears to be a departure from normal practice. However, this fact leads one to suppose that the poet, when speaking of Locrians, Dryopians and others, is not referring to the people in general, but rather to those heroes whom he has already named as having come from Locris, Aetolia and elsewhere.

Line 4:

The phrase ἐρύνες Ἀχαιοῦ does not occur in the Iliad⁹³, although it is metrically equivalent to the common "formula" ἐρύνες ἑταῖροι. The Achaeans in the Iliad generally receive the attribute εὐκνήμιδες or κάρη κομόωντες. The application of the epithet ἐρύνες to Ἀχαιοῦ is nonetheless appropriate here among an assortment of epithets describing the martial qualities of the heroes present.

Line 5:

The plural of the epithet ὑπέρθυμος in the Iliad is regularly applied to the Trojans, in the Odyssey to θεράποντες⁹⁴. In the context of the Suotherae the epithet certainly did not accompany Τρῶες, and although it is possible that retainers were included in the list, it seems more likely that the poet has removed an epithet from its traditional, restricted sphere and reapplied it in an epic context to another noun.

Lines 6,7:

The phrases ἱερὰν Βοιωτίδα and χθόνα πυρόφορον were discussed above in the chapter on novel associations of Homeric epithets⁹⁵. The former, in its context, is reminiscent of the line that identifies the

Locrrians in Iliad II 535: Λοκρῶν, οὗ ναίουσι πέρην ἱερῆς 'Ευβοίας.

This structural precedent and the fact that we find a similar type of expression in Pindar's catalogue of heroes in Pythian IV 180 (quoted above) suggest that these poets were following a traditional, though less frequently used, pattern for expressing such information. As was observed in chapter IV, the use of ἔχω or νέμομαι was much more common.

Lines 9,10:

If the supplement Αἰτωλοῖ μενεχάρμαι is correct, then the poet does employ a Homeric "formula", although only one instance in the Iliad is attested⁹⁶. In the story of Meleager, as told by Phoenix in Iliad IX, one finds a reference to the Αἰτωλοῖ μενεχάρμαι at line 529. The context of the legend is in fact an extended mythological exemplum in which Achilles is compared to Meleager in his refusal to take part in the fighting. This episode in the legend of Meleager falls after the Boar-hunt and for the purposes of the parallel situation between Achilles and Meleager it is enhanced while the hunt itself is reduced in significance. The hunt provides only the indirect cause for the fight between the Curetes and Meleager's Aetolians over the spoils of the dead boar. If the epithet μενεχάρμαι is traditionally associated with the Aetolians, then Homer and Stesichorus may both have appropriated it from the epic tradition of mainland Greece that incorporated the legends of Meleager of Calydon. Whatever the source, the epithet is functional in the pre-contest list as a suitable attribute for great warriors.

The catalogue is one of the most distinctive features of epic composition and a device that was adopted by the lyric poets as well as by later epic poets⁹⁷. Elaborate lists such as the Catalogue of Ships within the Iliad, or separate poems such as the Catalogue of Women by

Hesiod testify to the fascination that monumental catalogues held for the bards of prehistoric Greece. The catalogue could provide the framework for a lengthy and digressive poem such as Hesiod's Catalogue of Women in which the "formulaic" listing of women ἢ οἶαυ κοῦρα... acts as a springboard for the narration of the myths of gods and men. The Theogony too is structured on a basic catalogue, although the "formulaic" repetitions are not so immediately apparent. Lists on a small scale, such as of gifts, could be incorporated into longer poems.

The Catalogue of Ships in Iliad II by its position acts as a pre-battle catalogue in the same way as the list of heroes who entered the Wooden Horse does in the post-Homeric epic tradition⁹⁸. Stesichorus' catalogue indicating the deployment of the various groups of heroes at the hunt belongs to a similar tradition structurally, whether or not he⁹⁹ relied on a previous account from a Meleager-epic. The structure of the Catalogue of Ships in the Iliad can be used as a point of departure for examining the features of the catalogue-technique employed by Stesichorus in this fragment. Each section follows a set pattern:

- a) X leads/commands groups A,B,
- b) group A consists of those who live in ... and those who live in
- c) the number of ships they brought was:

In section a) the verb ἤρχε(ον) is generally used, with variants ἦγε or ἠγεμόνευε. In some instances the lineage of the commander may be given, and he may receive one of a number of appropriate epithets. Thus Ascapalus and Ialmenus are designated as υἱες Ἄρῃος | οὓς τέκεν Ἀστυόχῃ δόμῳ Ἄκτορος Ἀγεῖδω (Iliad II 512,513; cf. II 518,566,623 or 714). In the Catalogue Diomedes is given the adjectival phrase by which he is characterised in the later accounts of the fighting, βοὴν ἀγαθός (II 567). Menelaus is also βοὴν ἀγαθός (II 586). Idomeneus is δουρικλυτός (II 645),

Protesilaus is μεγάρυμος and ἀρήϊος (II 706,708), Polypoetes is μενεπιόλεμος (II 740).

In section b) an expansion on the group stated in section a) is given in which are listed the various cities to which they belong in terms of ἔχον/εἰχον "hold", νέμονται "cultivate" or (ἐ)ναίον "inhabit". Of these expressions the first two are far more common than the third. The places mentioned may receive one of a number of epithets such as ἐρατεινή or εὐκτιόμενον (πολύεθρον), or as in the case of Athens (II 546 ff.) the city may be identified by a specific legend that is attached to it. By way of variation, no generic name may be given, but rather a periphrasis in the form of "those who hold/cultivate/ inhabit ...". Only occasionally do the groups receive any epithet, the Cephallenians (II 631) being an exception to the general pattern: Κεφαλλῆνας μεγαθύμους .

In section c) there is simply an enumeration of the ships accompanying each contingent, with little variation in expression.

The separate entities of the list are bound together by the anaphoric repetition of οἱ δέ /οἱ δ' ἄρ' at the beginning of the lines, as well as by the limited number of verbs used to express either the command of the heroes or the dwelling of the groups in their various cities. Variation is introduced into the basic pattern of a/b/c by the inversion of the sequence , as in the account of the Mycenaean under Agamemnon , line 569 ff., where section a) follows section b).

The lists in Stesichorus' Suotherae are not exactly parallel to the Catalogue of Ships in Iliad II. The first, in column i, appears to represent part of a catalogue of heroes who came to help Meleager, while the second appears to be either a recapitulatory summary or the deployment of the heroes at the nets before the hunt began. Some features, however, are characteristic of the epic catalogue. The heroes of the first

list are identified by their parentage and are given epithets describing their worth. It is likely that the provenance of some was recorded, as in the possible supplement ἐκ φθ[]ας δὲ μὶλ' (col. i 5). One part of the list as it now survives is not preceded in other extant catalogues, namely the statement that certain of the Thestiadae were too young to participate and therefore remained at home (lines 2,3).

The account of the deployment of the groups in column ii, identified by the areas from which they came, approaches closer to the type of catalogue we find in Iliad II. The poet mentions the Locrians and Aetolians(?), the Achaeans, and in a periphrastic clause those who live in Boeotia. Boeotia receives the epithet ἱαπὸς in a word-group not preceded in the epic corpus, and the descriptive phrase in apposition, χθόνα κυρτόροπον, is likewise a novel combination. One notable difference between Stesichorus' list and the Catalogue of Ships is that many of the groups designated by their regional origins, such as Locrians and Achaeans, receive commending epithets similar to those granted to the individual heroes in the Homeric list, but seldom to groups.

Catalogues are bound closely together by the repetition of certain words or phrases, particularly by anaphora at the beginning of the verse, as for example the repetition of οὐδέ / οὐτε accompanying the names of peoples in Iliad II. In Odyssey XI the list of women encountered by Odysseus in the Underworld contains the repetition of τὴν δὲ μέτ' ... ἔδον (lines 260,266,305) or simply the repetition of the verb ἔδον (lines 235,271,321,326) or ἐἔδον (lines 281,298). In 2359 column ii, the anaphoric repetition of ἐνθεν belongs to the same convention, binding together the list of heroes and their position at the outset of the hunt.

This fragment of the Suotherae, therefore, reveals the same characteristic technique of the poet that we have already observed in the other three fragments discussed in this chapter. The poet has employed a conventional device from epic composition, in this case a catalogue, but with the same propensity for modification and departure from the standard forms of his Homeric models.

Footnotes to chapter VI

- 1 See pages 123,124, chapter IV.
- 2 Cf. Iliad XVII 738 and XXI 14.
- 3 See page 33 ff., chapter II.
- 4 In this line I follow Page's conjecture ᾧδε δ' ἔ[ει]φ' Ἑλένα. The alternative, ᾧδε δ' ἔπειθ' proposed by Lloyd-Jones in CR 8 (1958) p. 17, depends on the assumption that φωνᾷ is a verb, which seems less likely to me than the reading of φωνᾷ as a noun (cf. Hymn to Demeter 20,432).
In the Homeric corpus there are several standard lines that mark the end of one person's speech and the beginning of another. Examples with the main verb προσέειπε, προσεφώνεε or προσέφη are as follows:
 1. ὡς ἐφάρμην, ὁ δέ μ' αὐτίκ' ἀμειβόμενος προσέειπεν.
 2. τὸν δ' αὖτε προσέειπε { θεὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη
πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς
 3. τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσεφώνεε φαίδιμος υἱός
 4. ἡ δ' αὖ Τηλέμαχον προσεφώνεε ὃν φίλον υἱόν
 5. τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς
 6. τὸν δ' ἄρ' ὑπόδρα ἰδὼν προσέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς
 7. καὶ μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα πτεροέντα προσηύδα

This list is by no means exhaustive of all the variations and combinations of subject and verb. It is interesting to note however, that Stesichorus' line employs simple εἶπε with the προσ-element taken closely with the person addressed, as a preposition. In the noun φωνᾷ there is a reminiscence of the formulaic προσεφώνεε. The formulaic lines in the Homeric corpus employ one verb or the other, but seldom a combination of both. Only in example 7 above is there a possible precedent, but in that line a verb of saying from a totally different root is employed, προσηύδα. Stesichorus has therefore absorbed elements from "formulaic" speech-introductions, but has not reproduced a line that imitates directly any one of these lines in Homer.

- 5 As was noted on page 62 of chapter III, παῖδα more frequently than not has no accompanying epithet. The adjectival form ὀδύσειος is not common in the Homeric poems.

- 22 Cf. Peek, art.cit., p. 174, who postulates that Menelaus did not arrive on the scene until after Helen had explained the prophecy.
- 23 As P.Oxy. 2619, fr.1 demonstrates, Stesichorus appears to have been inclined to adapt conventional speech-introductions from epic that occupied entire lines.
- 24 Peek, art.cit., p. 170.
- 25 Führer, op.cit., pp. 116-121.
- 26 Cf. however, P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 15 9.
- 27 See page 18, chapter II.
- 28 See page 71, chapter III.
- 29 See page 98, chapter IV.
- 30 See pages 149,150, chapter V.
- 31 See page 73, chapter III.
- 32 See West, "Stesichorus Redivivus," ZPE 4 (1969) p. 137.
- 33 See page 171 above.
- 34 West, art.cit.(1969) p. 137, read ἔλκετε, following Barrett's suggestion. ἔλκω would be an attractive choice on account of the appearance of the expression in the same episode in Tryphiodorus, line 301. He retracted the reading in favour of ἔλθετε in ZPE 7(1971)p. 262,
- 35 In the Hymn to Hérmes 317 λόγος occurs in the context of trickery and cunning: αὐτὰρ ὁ τέχνησιν τε αἰμυλίοισι λόγοισιν . In Works and Days ψεύδεά θ' αἰμυλίου τε λόγους καὶ ἐπύκλοπον ἦθος(78, cf. 789) we find the same association. In Theogony 229, the personified Λόγους are linked with Νεύκεια and Ψεύδεια, and at lines 889 and 890 the phrase αἰμυλίοισι λόγοισι .
- 36 The future is more common in Homer,; cf. Schwyzer II p. 670. For an example of the subjunctive see Iliad III 10.
- 37 On the later versions as found in Virgil, Apollodorus and Tryphiodorus, see pages 331 ff., chapter X.
- 38 West, art.cit.(1969) p.139, after Barrett.
- 39 Ibid. Page, in "Stesichorus : the 'Sack of Troy' and the 'Wooden Horse'," PCPhS 19 (1973) p. 48 maintains that West's καταίστιον and καθάρσιον are both too long and on δεκατήτιον remarks, "I do not know why the Wooden Horse should be so described."
- 40 See pages 94,95, chapter IV.
- 41 See page 21, chapter II.

- 42 West, ZPE 4 (1969) p. 138.
- 43 Page, PCPhS 19 (1973) p. 41.
- 44 See page 97, chapter IV.
- 45 See page 87, chapter IV.
- 46 Barrett is quoted in West's article in ZPE 4(1969) p. 139. Page prints the supplement in the text of SLG 88 (page 26).
- 47 West, art.cit., p. 139.
- 48 Other examples of this sequence of exhortation-activity-simile may be found in Iliad IV 411ff., XI 291ff., XII 277ff., XV 262ff., XVI 210 ff. .
- 49 West, art.cit., p. 139.
- 50 Although the Horse was Odysseus' brain-child in the traditions of the Odyssey and of the Little Iliad, and followed by later traditions, all mention the master-builder Epeius, under Athena's guidance. That Epeius played a role in Stesichorus' Sack of Troy is substantiated by the citation in Athenaeus X 456 ff. (=PMG 200). This quotation appears to fit the metrical scheme of the Sack of Troy as Epode 2 to mid 3 (Haslam, art.cit., p. 25).
- 51 West, art.cit., pp. 140, 141.
- 52 West, *ibid.*; Page, SLG p. 26.
- 53 See page 63, chapter III.
- 54 Cf. the following couplet in this poem of Solon, with reference to poetic composition:
 ἄλλος Ὀλυμπιάδων Μουσέων παρὰ δῶρα διδαχθεῖς
 ἡμερτῆς σοφῆς μέτρον ἐπιστάμενος. 13 51,52.
- 55 West, art.cit.(1969); Page, PCPhS (1973) and SLG pp. 24,25; Haslam, art.cit., pp. 24-26.
- 56 See pages 97 and 103-105 of chapter IV.
- 57 For an extensive account of this topic see B. Fenik, Typical Battle-Scenes in the Iliad : Hermes , Einzelschriften 21(Wiesbaden, 1968).
- 58 See pages 89,90, chapter IV.
- 59 Page, "Stesichorus: the Geryoneis," JHS 93(1973) p. 151.
- 60 See pages 73,74, chapter III.
- 61 Barrett, in Page's article in JHS 93(1973) p. 142.
- 62 See Armstrong, "The Arming Motif in the Iliad," AJPh 79(1958) pp.337-354.

- 63 On the entire phrase see pages 116,117, chapter IV.
- 64 See page 124, chapter IV.
- 65 See page 127, chapter IV.
- 66 See Erbse, "Betrachtungen über das 5 Buch der Ilias," RM 104 (1961) p. 172.
- 67 Cf. the later description in Sophocles' Trachiniae 574.
- 68 Lobel, P. Oxy. vol XXX.I, p. 6.
- 69 Barrett, in JHS 93 (1973) p. 152.
- 70 The pluperfect occurs in Iliad III 358, IV 136, VII 252, XI 436, all repetitions of the same line: καὶ δὲ θῶρηκος πολυδαδάλου ἠρήρειστο.
- 71 Cf. Odyssey IX 293 and XI 219; see pages 67,68 of chapter III.
- 72 See pages 147,148, chapter V.
- 73 See pages 60,61, chapter III.
- 74 See pages 75,76, chapter III.
- 75 Page, in JHS 93 (1973) p. 142, on the analogy of ἔθελρα in Iliad XVI 795 or ἡπόρ in Iliad IV 146.
- 76 The verb πέτομαι in the context of an arrow occurs only here and at Iliad XIII 587 and 592. In the latter episode the arrow of Helenus misses Menelaus and flies off to the side, a more appropriate usage of ἔπτατο. It is possible that in Iliad V 99, therefore, δὲ δ' ἔπτατο has been adapted to the description on the analogy of more obvious descriptions such as that of XIII 587. Stesichorus may not have used the verb for one of a number of reasons. Perhaps, for example, his description of the lethal head of the weapon follows a reference to its flight through the air.
- 77 Lobel, op.cit., p. 7.
- 78 One finds a parallel usage of κατασχύνω in Pindar Pythian IV 264, where the woodsman spoiled the ὄρους of the oak-tree with his axe.
- 79 See page 94, chapter IV.
- 80 On this type of simile, see Scott, The Oral Nature of the Homeric Simile (Leiden, 1974) p. 82.
- 81 Lobel, P.OXY. vol. XXIII, p. 11. See page 129, note 6, on the identification of the fragment.
- 82 I assume that the column was 35 [±] lines, the top line of each column lying at the top of the fragment. Column i begins with Strophe 7 (Haslam, after Führer in Hermes 97 (1969) pp. 116-117.) which would be

followed by its antistrophe of 7 lines and an epode (beginning at line 9 of column i) of between 6 and 8 lines long. This triad would be followed by another complete triad before the next triad begins with strophe 1 as the top of column ii.

83 See page 145, chapter V.

84 In the Iliad 23 times of Menelaus and 22 times of Diomedes. There is also one instance of the phrase applied to Ajax, at Iliad XV 249 and two instances of it applied to Hector, Iliad XIII 123 and XV 671.

85 The phrase occurs 29 times of Achilles and 9 times of Iris. There is also one instance of the phrase applied to Iris in Hesiod, Theogony 780.

86 Snell, "Stesichorus' Συοθήραι" Hermes 85 (1957) p. 250.

87 A marginal note in the papyrus corrects the accent on δ' ἔμολ' in the text and affirms the reading δὲ μόλ'. See Lobel, op.cit., p. 12.

88 Page, PMG p. 119 printed a supplement in accordance with the longer metrical scheme proposed by Snell (Hermes 85(1957)), but in the corrigenda of SLG p. 157 follows a shorter version of the metrical scheme, suggesting -ος τε νεῖσθαι. Cf. Führer, art.cit., p. 116: -ος τ' ἀφύκεισθαι.

89 Lobel, op.cit., p. 12, expresses puzzlement at the genitive in line 7 ff. We know of Aktor or Ixus as Eurytion's father from elsewhere, but there is no Elatus in his genealogy. One Elatid who appears in Ovid's list of Hunters in Met. VIII 301 ff. is Caeneus, notorious for having changed sex. Lobel thinks that τανυπέπλου might refer to his former state. In Ovid's list, Eurytion and Caeneus are separated by the names of eleven other heroes and in this fragment it seems more likely that the Elatid was the father of yet another hero whose name is lost. Cf., however, Page, in CR 7 (1957) p. 192, who suggests the loss of something like βύα to account for the genitives.

90 See A.A. Barrett, "P.Oxy. 2359 and Stesichorus' Συοθήραι," CPh 67 (1972) p. 118.

91 Bowra, GLP p. 98, believes that ἔσανον can only mean "sat" and that the two parties described as being ἐνθεν μὲν ... ἐνθεν ... were onlookers. Cf. Lloyd-Jones' misgivings on the assignment of col. ii to the Suotherae stemming from the interpretation of ἔσανον (art.cit., p. 17).

92 See page 63, chapter III.

93 See pages 84,85, chapter IV.

94 See page 74, chapter IV.

95 See page 99, chapter IV for ἱερὰν Βουωτύδα and page 93 for χθόνα πυρόφορον.

- 96 See page 71, chapter III.
- 97 See Fränkel, *op.cit.*, p. 517.
- 98 Cf. Lesches, Little Iliad, fr. 10 (Allen).
- 99 See J. Kakridis, Homeric Researches (Lund, 1949) p. 1 ff. on a pre-Homeric Meleager-epic. Cf. chapter VII, pages 241 ff.

Chapter VII Stesichorus' adaptation of myth from the epic tradition.

According to the ancient commentator whose work is preserved in P. Oxy. 2506, fr. 26¹, Stesichorus made innovations in his versions of the traditional legends: οὕτως δὲ ἐκ[α]λυνοποίησε τ[ὰς] ἱστορίας [αἰ]στέ ... (= PMG 193). This sentence follows the controversial section of that fragment in which the commentator reports that Chamaeleon believed in the existence of not one, but two Palinodes. He continues his list of instances of Stesichorean innovations with the information that Demophon was carried off to Egypt and that his mother was Iope. In the fragmentary portion of the papyrus below that, other variations were reported, of which we can recognise only the names of Acamas, Helen, Amphilochous and possibly Hippolytus, son of the Amazon, but no reference to the titles of the poems in which they appeared. In several other citations (also collected in PMG) we find authors commenting upon incidents in legends in which Stesichorus is at variance with Homer, Hesiod, or else the "first" to have made use of a particular theme, as for example in his depiction of Heracles as a highway-man with club, bow and lionskin:

... τοῦτον οὖν, φησὶν, οἱ νέοι ποιητὰς κατασκευάζουσιν ἐν ληιστοῦ σχήματι μόνον περιπορευόμενον ξύλον ἔχοντα καὶ λεοντῆν καὶ τόξα· καὶ ταῦτα πλάσαι πρῶτον Στησίχορον τὸν Ἱμεραῖον. PMG 229

Antiquity, then, recognised Stesichorus as an innovator. In this part of my study of Stesichorus' poems in relation to the epic tradition I therefore propose to examine the evidence of the papyri together with what is already known from the citations in order to assess the extent to which Stesichorus' versions diverged from the epic traditions that preceded him; I shall also examine the possible motivation for these innovations where they do occur.

By the time of Stesichorus the Greek world had already been

exposed to a movement away from the rigid conventions of epic for the telling and retelling of the inherited corpus of myths, or traditional legends. We find in the choral poetry of Alcman the juxtaposition of mythic narrative and contemporary content as the choir sing of the encounter between Heracles and the Hippocontids and then draw a moral from the legend as they proceed to describe the animosity between two rival girls' choirs (PMG 1). Sappho could allude to the heritage of myths in drawing parallels with her own experience (PLF 16). Her description of the wedding of Hector and Andromache (PLF 44) shows that she too might indulge in narrative poetry, but although her turn of phrase may at times be reminiscent of the style of Homeric epic, the impression is not one of the unconscious flow of hexameter verse, but of a creation totally dominated by her own choice of theme and expression.

The direction taken by Stesichorus is different again. His poems are more strictly narrative than personal as far as the evidence shows, but his narratives have been converted into new shapes. The metrical patterns based upon dactyls and compounded dactyls repeat themselves in triads that give a sense of a finite structure, as opposed to the open-ended style of the non-stanzaic hexameter verse. The musical accompaniment brought a further dimension to the poetry that was not so prominent in the epic tradition. Thus, even when the legends may follow the epic convention, and as we shall see this was not always the case, the poet's individual artistry operated at several levels to produce a far more complex, more highly structured narrative. The narrative could, moreover, act as a medium for the poet's own reflection on the significance of legends to the contemporary audience. The study of Stesichorus' treatment of the inherited corpus of traditional tales will be confined to the literary associations of the content of his poems², as poems composed

by a particular individual for a particular occasion or with a particular purpose. Elements of originality will be examined in relation to the tradition from which they emerge and diverge and in relation to the poet's individual purpose as artist, entertainer and possibly even moraliser.

The Suda records that there were 26 poems composed by Stesichorus, presumably known, if not actually surviving, about the end of the 10th century A.D. when that literary lexicon was compiled. It is not clear whether this number refers to rolls of papyri or individual titles, for we know that there were 2 books (rolls?) of the Oresteia (PMG 213, 214). The Geryoneis is easily long enough, as it stands, to fill one roll and, if it incorporated Heracles' grand tour of Sicily, may also have stretched to more than one roll. That poems such as Europeia or Eriphyle were remembered by their individual content would indicate that unlike the poems of Sappho or Alcaeus, which were referred to by the number of the volume in which they appeared, Stesichorus' poems were known and numbered by their individual titles. This being the case, there have survived the titles of 13 poems dealing with heroic legends and of three others of a rather different nature, considered spurious by some³.

The poems on heroic topics are as follows:

- a) Helen and Palinode; Iliou Persis; Nostoi : belonging to the Trojan cycle.
- b) Cycnus; Cerberus; Scylla; Geryoneis : on the theme of Heracles' exploits.
- c) Europeia; Eriphyle : related to the Theban sagas.
- d) Suotherae : belonging to the Meleager-saga and that of the Calydonian Boar-Hunt.
- e) Athla : from the Argonautic cycle.
- f) Oresteia : being the sequel to the Trojan cycle.

All of these legends may be traced back to origins in Mycenaean times, if

not before, connected as they are with such strongholds of pre-historic Greece as Mycenae, Tiryns, Thebes and Calydon. However, such distinctive connections have been obliterated by the passage of time and the intrusion of later material into the traditions. The crucial importance of Apollo and the Delphic oracle in the legends of Orestes and Cadmus has been suggested as one such later addition⁴. The dissemination of the epic traditions throughout the major city-states of the Greek-speaking world from the 8th century onwards made the heroic legends the property of a pan-Hellenic culture, while the individual city-states continued to preserve and extend the cults of particular heroes.

Of the groups of heroic legends in Stesichorus' poetry, those from the Trojan cycle and those dealing with Heracles offer sufficient material in the fragments of the papyri and the citations to be considered in separate chapters: one on Heracles, one on the Iliou Persis and one on the question of the Helen and the Palinode that has provoked so much discussion over the years. Of the other legends, I shall give an account in this chapter of innovations made by Stesichorus in the following poems: i) Europeia and Eriphyle; ii) Suotherae; iii) Athla; iv) Oresteia.

i) Europeia and Eriphyle

The title Europeia suggests that the scope of the poem was broad. The disappearance of Europe and the subsequent search for her by her brothers, primarily Cadmus, was indirectly related to the foundation of Thebes. The foundation-legend was retold by Stesichorus, for the scholiast on Euripides' Phoenissae 670 reports that Stesichorus altered the generally known version of the sowing of the dragon's teeth, making Athena herself perform the task of sowing, as opposed to Cadmus: ὁ μὲν

Στησίχορος ἐν 'Ευρωπαϊαί τήν 'Αθηνᾶν ἐσπαρκέναι τοῦς ὀδόντας φησὶν (PMG 195). Athena's involvement in the legend is testified to by the phrase in Euripides' Phoenissae 674, where the goddess prompts Cadmus to sow the teeth (cf. Apollodorus III 4 1). The direct participation of the goddess by sowing the teeth is hard to explain, since her role in the epic tradition tends to be that of protectress of heroes, and she might therefore be expected to be responsible for the divinely inspired ingenuity that the hero required to solve a problem or overcome a difficulty. She does not, however, normally stoop to perform any part of the tasks herself. Nor would such an action lend majesty and mystery to the incident, as Bowra suggested⁵. If there was some special cultic significance, it has now been lost, and the version certainly did not appeal to later authors. One could suggest that perhaps Stesichorus considered such strange antics as sowing teeth beyond the realm of human activity, but we are no closer to any solution.

One of Cadmus' children was Semele. Pausanias tells us, without citing any title for his source (IX 2 3), that Stesichorus accounted for the death of Actaeon as a result of his attempted seduction of his aunt Semele. The death of Actaeon in Stesichorus' version happened when he accidentally caught sight of Artemis bathing and she, insulted, threw a stag's skin over him so that he was torn to pieces by his own dogs: ἐλάφου περιβαλεῖν δέρμα 'Ακταίωνι τὴν θεόν (PMG 236). The 6th century mythographer, Acusilaus, supposedly told a version of the tale in which Actaeon was killed by Zeus for courting Semele.⁶ It seems, therefore, that Stesichorus has either conflated two independent legends, or has perhaps invented the punishment of Actaeon at the hands of Artemis. It is noteworthy that in later versions of the death of Actaeon, his involvement appears to have been

with Artemis alone (Euripides' Bacchae 339-340, Diodorus Siculus IV 81 4), suggesting that the connection with Semele was either considered unsuitable or redundant. It is possible that Stesichorus incorporated his version of the death of Actaeon in the poem Europela as a legend that was associated with the generation that followed that of Cadmus.

It seems from Pausanias' words that Stesichorus did not envisage Actaeon as being totally metamorphosed into a stag as in the most famous version of the legend in Ovid, Metamorphoses III.⁷ If such a legend were already in existence before Stesichorus, then one might interpret Artemis' action of throwing the deer-skin over Actaeon as a rationalisation of the legend: man's form cannot be changed, but hounds may be fooled by the scent of a dead stag. If Artemis' punishment were Stesichorus' invention, then it is still noteworthy as a rational, if repulsive, explanation of the death of Actaeon.

Nothing more of Stesichorus' treatment of the early days of Thebes is known, but the title Eriphyle points to his continuation or resumption of the legends of Thebes in the generation of the Seven or in that of the Epigoni. P. Oxy. 2618 is identified as part of this poem otherwise known only from various allusions to its containing the story of Asclepius (PMG 194). The first column of 2618 contains a caustic exchange between Adrastus, brother of Eriphyle and sole survivor of the expedition of the Seven, and Alcmaeon, son of Eriphyle and Amphiaraus. Antagonism between the two would be predictable, since Adrastus plotted against Alcmaeon's father (cf. Apollodorus III 6 2), but the situation in column i of 2618 could be one of several clashes. The scenes in the fragment presumably occur before Alcmaeon's matricide, since the mother mentioned in column ii is most likely to be Eriphyle herself, although her activities as a matchmaker are totally obscure, $\mu\upsilon\alpha\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\omicron\lambda\omicron\alpha \mu\eta\tau\eta\rho$

line 7). Nothing is known from the epitome of Apollodorus or from elsewhere of the name Anaxander (line 8) or his child. The possibility remains open that Stesichorus has introduced a completely new theme, one that was not adopted by later writers.

Page suggests that P.Oxy. 2618 comes from the generation of the Epigono⁸, but the citations that refer to Stesichorus' account of the resurrection of Capaneus and Lycourgus by Asclepius (PMG 194) indicate that the poem at least looked back to the time of the Seven: Στησίχορος μὲν ἐν'Εριφύλῃ εἰπὼν ὅτι (Ἀσκληπιὸν) τινὰς τῶν ἐπὶ Θήβαις πεσόντων ἀνίσταται ... (Sextus Empiricus, Adv. Mathem. α 261.). Capaneus was the assailant at the second gate, who was struck by a thunderbolt of Zeus (Apollodorus III 6 7; Aeschylus Seven against Thebes 423 ff.). Asclepius' successes in the art of healing prompted him to attempt the ultimate, namely to raise the dead, for which unnatural practice he was punished by Zeus. The tradition was open to variation. Stesichorus, in an account of the expedition of the Epigono⁹, may for his own purpose have wished to revive from the dead one or more of the original expedition. The theme appears to be unique among the various accounts of the second expedition against Thebes, but the context and the poet's motivation remain obscure.

Vürtheim suggested⁹ that Lycourgus in this context is the one mentioned by Pausanias in III 18 7, but this is hardly verifiable. He also suggests that the reference to Amphilo¹⁰chus in Eustathius (PMG 228) might indicate that in Stesichorus the murder of Eriphyle was perpetrated by both brothers, Amphilo¹⁰chus and Alcmaeon: cf. Apollodorus III 7 5, ἔνιοι μὲν λέγουσι σὺν Ἀμφιλόχῳ τῷ ἀδελφῷ κτεῖναι τὴν Ἐριφύλην, ἔνιοι δὲ ὅτι μόνος (Ἀλκμαίων). The account of Alcmaeon's matricide sanctioned by Apollo and of his travels in search of purification, pursued by his

mother's Erinyes (Apollodorus III 7 5)¹⁰, appears to be a doublet of the Orestes-legend. Certainly in the latter myth Stesichorus appears to have developed the theme of matricide and the resultant need for purification. One can, however, only speculate as to his interest in the theme of the matricide in the legend of Eriphyle.

ii) The Suotherae

It is agreed that the Suotherae must have involved the Calydonian rather than the Erymanthian Boar-Hunt, on account of the identification of the sons of Thestius in P.Oxy. 2359. I have already considered the linguistic and structural affiliations of 2359 with the epic conventions of a pre-contest catalogue¹¹. As far as the poet's innovations inserted into the traditional version of the legends are concerned, we are restricted in our vision both by the lack of evidence of Stesichorus' poem and of the account of the myth in epic form before Stesichorus' time. The legend of Meleager that appears in the Iliad, in book IX, has been introduced into the narrative as an eminently suitable exemplum that will direct Achilles' attention to the potentially sinister outcome of his sulking¹². It is not the boar-hunt itself that is of importance in Phoenix's anecdote, but the dissension that arises between the Aetolians and the Curetes over the remains of the boar. The strife results in Meleager's killing his uncle Thestius, which in turn brings down his mother's curse upon his head. As Meleager sulks, his city comes close to being utterly destroyed, which is the point of contact with the situation in Iliad IX. In Homer there is no reference to the firebrand that symbolises and controls the life of Meleager. If it belonged to a pre-Homeric version, as a motif from folk-lore¹³, then one assumes that the poet of the Iliad rejected it as unsuitable for the aspect of the legend

he wished to emphasise. Of Stesichorus' treatment of that part of the legend we have no evidence. Pausanias refers to the legend of the fire-brand as used by Phrynichus in such a way as to indicate that the motif was not an innovation in that dramatist (X 31 4). It may therefore have already been revived, or possibly invented, by Stesichorus in his poem.

P.Oxy. 2359 ii, interpreted as an account of the arrangement of groups of heroes at the nets¹⁴, suggests that Stesichorus' poem included a graphic and probably lengthy description of the hunt itself (cf. PMG 221). I assume that some account was given of the reason why the boar was sent to devastate Calydon. Again we are entirely ignorant of Stesichorus' treatment of this and of ensuing events. Later accounts tell of Meleager's gift of the boar's hide to Atalanta, even of Meleager's passion for Atalanta¹⁵. The tale of the strife that followed is so intimately connected with the legend in the other sources that it is hard to imagine that Stesichorus should not have included it and an account of the death of Meleager. If, however, he saw fit to introduce original material, no-one saw fit to record it for posterity. It is perhaps worth noting a piece of negative evidence: none of the names that are identifiable in the first column of the Stesichorean fragment appear among the names that accompany the depiction of the hunt on the François vase¹⁶. This suggests that the poet probably introduced characters who might not have been included in other traditions of the legend. It does seem, however, that the portion of the list that is represented by 2359 column i belongs to the end of the list, in which case the principal heroes who participated in the hunt would have already been mentioned.

Bowra suggested that the second column refers to the spectators watching the fight between Meleager and the sons of Thestius over the spoils of the boar, which Stesichorus chose to depict as a personal quarrel

rather than as a full-scale war between the Calydonians and the Curetes, but this does not seem very likely¹⁷. The theory would require that in the space between column i and ii, which is at most 30 lines¹⁸, there was an account of the hunt, the successful shots that killed the boar and the presentation of the spoils that gave rise to the quarrel. For what one would imagine to be the central theme of a poem entitled Suotherae and given the potential length of over 1000 lines, this would be an extremely brief account.

iii) The Athla or Funeral Games for Pelias.

In PMG 179, Athenaeus, or more likely his source, is uncertain whether the lines referring to honey and sesame cakes came from an Athla by Stesichorus or by Ibycus, whereas a few lines later he states that the line about Meleager and Amphiaraus came from the poem by Stesichorus. Stesichorus' authorship is supported further by two other citations, one in Zenobius (PMG 180) and one in the Etymologicum Magnum (PMG 178). None of these fragments tells us much of the structure of the poem, its possible sources or innovative material. It is odd that Simonides, in the lines quoted by Athenaeus IV 172d, should cite Homer as a precedent for the reputation of Meleager as a javelin-champion, but this is generally accepted as a vague reference to an epic poem whose subject matter included athletic games¹⁹. By analogy with the similarities in structural composition between the list of hunters at the Calydonian Hunt and the Catalogue of ships in Iliad II, I suppose that Stesichorus may have turned to the games for Patroclus in Iliad XXIII 262 ff., or to a similar episode in the epic tradition now lost, for models for his poem. Events in Iliad XXIII include a chariot-race, something hinted at in PMG 178, boxing (PMG 180?) and javelin-throwing (PMG 179 (b)), although the long-jump in which

Amphiaraus triumphed according to Stesichorus' poem (PMG 179 (b)) is not among the contests held at the games for Patroclus. It has been suggested that the honey and cakes mentioned by Athenaeus belonged to a context of the wedding of Pelias' daughter, Alcestis, to Admetus²⁰, a reference which hints at the poem's wider scope, but otherwise there is nothing of significance revealed as far as the poet's innovations are concerned.

iv) The Oresteia

Far more tantalising than the previous fragments are those belonging to Stesichorus' Oresteia, a narrative poem on the subject of Orestes' matricide and its consequences. Although Stesichorus is reputed to have followed the elusive figure of Xanthus in his composition of the Oresteia (πολλὰ δὲ τῶν Εἰνθου παραπεποίηκεν ὁ Στησίχορος καὶ τὴν Ὀρέστειαν καλουμένην PMG 229), it is evident that the poet contributed much to the evolution of the legend of Orestes from the bare bones of a leitmotiv found in the Homeric Odyssey, and in doing so was influential in its later treatment by the Attic tragedians. The commentator of P.Oxy. 2506 fr. 26 ii states that Stesichorus made use of the narratives of Homer and Hesiod, while the later dramatists made use of his (i.e. Stesichorus'). In his comparison between Stesichorus and the dramatists, the commentator claims that Electra's recognition of Orestes through the lock left on the tomb of Agamemnon (cf. Aeschylus, Choephoroi 167) was derived from Stesichorus. He then proceeds to quote from Euripides' Orestes 268:

ὁδὸς τόξα μοι κερουλκά, δῶρα Λοξίου
οὔς εἴπ' Ἀπόλλων μ' ἐξαμύνασθαι θεάς²¹

which he follows with a quotation from the Stesichorean parallel:

τόξα [] τάδε δώσω παλά[μα]ισιν ἐμαῖσι κεκασμένα
.. [ἐ]πικρατέως βάλλειν.

Of this relationship between Stesichorus and Euripides something was already known from the scholion on line 268 of the Orestes: Στησιχόρῳ ἐπόμενος τόξα φησὶν αὐτὸν εἰληφέναι παρὰ Ἀπόλλωνος.

Let us first consider what material may have offered Stesichorus a model in the epic tradition. In the Odyssey the theme of Orestes as the avenger of his father's murder is introduced into the complex design of the narrative as a foil to the dominant plot of the Telemacheia in books I-IV. Athena spurs Telemachus on (I 298) by citing Orestes' decisive action against the usurper of his father's throne, Aegisthus. In Nestor's account of events at Mycenae during and after the Trojan war, Aegisthus is painted totally black, while Clytemnestra is virtually exonerated of all responsibility for marrying Aegisthus. Orestes is again the avenger slaying his father's murderer (III 254 ff; 306 ff.). In these books the focal point is the theme of the avenging son and his justified killing of Aegisthus (cf. I 29 ff.). There is no direct accusation levelled against Clytemnestra, nor any direct mention of Orestes' matricide. In Nestor's schematic account Orestes kills his father's murderer (masculine πατροφονῆα, Αἰγίσθον δολόμητιν III 307, 308) and then buries both Aegisthus and his mother (μητρός τε στυγερῆς καὶ ἀνάγκιδος Αἰγίσθῳ III 310).

On the other hand, when Odysseus meets the shade of Agamemnon in the Underworld, the latter delivers an extended vituperation against his shameless wife for the gory reception he was given. It is the guilt of Clytemnestra that dominates the speech: she is δολόμητις (XI 422), κυνῶπις (424) and:

ὥς οὐκ αἰνότερον καὶ κύντερον ἄλλο γυναικὸς
ἢ τις δὴ τοιαῦτα μετὰ φρεσὶν ἔργα βάληται. Odyssey XI 427,428

Aegisthus, still instigator of the deed, is mentioned only to be dismissed,

overshadowed by the formidable character of his paramour: (XI 409-410).

The divergent emphasis in these two sections of the Odyssey may be explained as resulting not from two separate epic traditions of the murder of Agamemnon, but from the artistic intentions of the poet of the Odyssey²². In the first four books of the Odyssey what more obvious parallel could there have been to underline Telemachus' hesitation in coping with the situation at Ithaca and the need for positive action than Orestes? However, the shameful adultery of the wife awaiting her husband's return would be totally inappropriate. Agamemnon's speech in Odyssey XI is a lament on the perfidy of most women: Clytemnestra and Helen are diametrically opposed to the loyal and long-enduring Penelope. Within the rhetorical structure of the speech the theme of Aegisthus' guilt is not immediately relevant. However, in neither part of the Odyssey (i.e. the Ionian epic tradition) is it stated explicitly that Orestes kills his mother.

The summary of the Nostoi supposedly written by Hagias is uninformative other than telling of Agamemnon's murder at the hands of Aegisthus and Clytemnestra, followed by the vengeance exacted by Orestes and Pylades.

In the tradition of the Hesiodic Catalogue of Women, all the daughters of Tyndareus are guilty of deserting their husbands, namely Timandre, Clytemnestra and Helen (fr. 176 M. & W.). There is no hint of any reluctance on Clytemnestra's part, or of any coercion on the part of Aegisthus. In another fragment we find Orestes again portrayed as the avenger of his father's death:

ὅς ῥα καὶ ἠβήσας ἀπε[τεύσατο π]ατροφο[ν]ῆα
κτεῖνε δὲ μητέρα [ἣν ὑπερὶν]ορα νηλεί [χαλκῶι fr. 23 (a) 29,30

Here it is explicitly stated that Orestes killed his mother, although it

does appear that she is considered merely as Aegisthus' accomplice: κτεῖνε δὲ μητέρα (line 30). There are a few points of similarity between this fragment and Odyssey XI: for example, Κλυταῖμνήστρη κυανῶπις (fr. 23 (a) 14, 27) echoes ἡ δὲ κυανῶπις (Odyssey XI 424), although in the same metrical position we find Κλυταῖμνήστρη δολόμητις (XI 422). The Catalogue as evidence for any tradition is of limited reliability, being schematic by nature and easily subject to later addition²³. The poet apparently knew of a tradition in which Clytemnestra was unquestionably guilty of adultery and was killed by her son, although Aegisthus is still the primary target for Orestes' revenge²⁴. We have no record of any formal composition in the mainland epic tradition that explored in any depth the character of Clytemnestra as chief murderer, or of Orestes as avenger but in turn guilty of matricide.

The commentator of P.Oxy. 2506, in a sweeping generalisation, establishes a chain of literary influences: Homer/Hesiod → Stesichorus → dramatists. In the case of the Orestes-legend, which the commentator appeared to have had in mind when he made the statement, the epic tradition appears to have offered a restricted and not always consistent account (that is what he calls Homer and Hesiod). At the other end of the chain there have survived works by all three major Attic dramatists on the theme of Orestes²⁵, by which time a character such as Electra²⁶, who is not to be found in the epic tradition, plays a principal role in the legend, and the dominance of Apollo and the Delphic oracle is structurally important in the resolution of the moral dilemma presented by Orestes' matricidal revenge. It remains therefore to establish at what position in the chain between epic and tragedy Stesichorus' version of the Oresteia may be placed. In other words, can we determine how much influence Stesichorus exerted in the movement away from the acceptance of retributive justice as found in

the Ionian epics - a son's duty to avenge the death of his father - towards the preoccupation with bloodguilt and purification of the Archaic age that is central to Aeschylus' Oresteia.

From the citations concerning the Oresteia of Stesichorus found in later authors, from the versions that occur in the dramatists and from Epitome VI of Apollodorus, one can deduce a possible outline of the content of Stesichorus' poem. After an invocation introducing the theme of the poem (PMG 2107) and possibly explaining the occasion of the performance (PMG 211,212), the narrative may have begun with the celebration of Agamemnon's return from Troy to Sparta, during which he was barbarously slain by Aegisthus (Odyssey III 193ff., IV 529 ff.; Nostoi; cf. Pausanias II 16 6) or by Clytemnestra (Aeschylus, Agamemnon 1379 ff.; Pindar, Pythian XI 17 ff.) or by both (Sophocles and Euripides; Apollodorus, Epitome VI). One of the factors contributing to Clytemnestra's hatred was Agamemnon's sacrifice of their daughter Iphigeneia, whom he had summoned to Aulis under the pretext of her marriage with Achilles (cf. PMG 215; P.Oxy. 2506 fr.26 ii 25; Cypria; Aeschylus, Agamemnon 190 ff.; Pindar, Pythian XI 22 f.). Orestes as a boy had been sent away from the palace (Aeschylus, Agamemnon 877 ff.) or else was conveyed out of harm's way by a servant (Pindar, Pythian XI 17) or by his sister Electra (Sophocles, Euripides, Apollodorus). On the advice of Apollo (cf. P.Oxy. 2506 fr. 26) Orestes returns in secret and is recognised by Electra through the lock that was left on their father's tomb (P.Oxy. 2506 fr.26 ii 7f.; Aeschylus, Choephoroi 164 ff.). Together they plan their revenge (Choephoroi, etc.). Clytemnestra's subconscious anxiety manifests itself in a dream that hints at the return of Orestes (PMG 219; cf. Aeschylus, Choephoroi 526 ff.; Sophocles, Electra 417 ff.). Orestes avenges the death of his father (Homer, Hesiod, etc.) and as a result is driven into

an exile of torment, pursued by the snake-Erinyes to remote lands . (In Aeschylus he flees to Delphi and Athens, in Euripides' Orestes to Arcadia, but in the Iph. Taur., to the Scythian Chersonnese, which is repeated by the Epitome of Apollodorus . The scholiast of Theocritus, Idylls, claims he went to Scythia, Italy and Sicily .) Driven insane by the implacable Erinyes Orestes prays to Apollo for release and for the bow previously promised him (P.Oxy. 2506 fr. 26; Euripides Orestes 268 f.). Whatever Stesichorus' conclusion to the trials of Orestes may have been it is unlikely that the Athenian episode of Aeschylus' trilogy, which influenced later Athenian versions, was part of his poem. On the contrary, Stesichorus, composing for a western audience, might more probably have introduced a conclusion that associated Orestes with the western Greek world²⁷. Such then is a bare outline of the episodes that must have been constituent elements in Stesichorus' Oresteia. I shall now consider the ways in which the poet has stepped beyond the epic tradition and brought new dimensions to that tradition.

Bergk assigned to the Oresteia the lines that were supposedly derived from an invocation to one of Stesichorus' poems and imitated in Aristophanes' Peace 775 f. (PMG 210)²⁸. Certainly the dismissal of martial themes might suggest that the poet was declaring that the Trojan war was over, which would be a suitable beginning for the Oresteia. If that were the case, then the feasting alluded to might be in celebration for Agamemnon's return home, but one would have to understand underlying irony. The celebrations (cf. Odyssey XI 410 ff.) were soon to be interrupted by the inglorious slaughter of Agamemnon, ὡς τις κατέκτανε βοῦν ἐπὶ φάτνῃ. As a dismissal of wars contemporary with the performance, the proem or invocation might have been applied to one of a number of tales in which the weddings of gods and mortals were constituent, for example Zeus and

Leda or Peleus and Thetis. Therefore, despite the close proximity of this scholion to another which refers to the Oresteia of Stesichorus (Peace 797 =PMG 212) the source of this invocation is by no means incontestable.

That the poet depicts Clytemnestra subjected to nightmares suggests that she may have been the perpetrator of the murder in Stesichorus' version. The lengthy description of the death of Geryon in 2617 gives some indication of the characteristic detail with which the poet might have managed the scene. On metope 24 from the Heraion at the Sele river, the woman brandishing an axe, being restrained by a second figure, has usually been identified as Clytemnestra about to strike Agamemnon, derived from the Stesichorean version of this episode²⁹. It seems likely that Stesichorus expanded upon hints of Clytemnestra's complicity in the deed found in the tradition behind the Catalogue of Women, thereby creating a prototype for the character of Clytemnestra in Pindar and Aeschylus, the prototype of a tragic figure³⁰.

To what extent the theme of Clytemnestra's hatred for Agamemnon was derived from the sacrifice of Iphigeneia in Stesichorus' version is hard to assess³¹. We do know from Philodemus (de Pietate p. 24 Gomperz) that in the Oresteia Stesichorus followed Hesiod's story of Iphigeneia's apotheosis: she was transformed into Hecate. The Hesiodic account occurred in the Catalogue of Women, as the interpretation of Pausanias testifies (I 43 1) and the new fragment of the Catalogue confirms (fr. 23 (a) 21 ff. M. & W.). In the latter source the words τὴν δὴ νῦν καλέουσι ... | Ἄρτεμιν εἰνοδύ[ην] (lines 25,26) may account for the later conflation of Hecate and Artemis in some cult-traditions and may also provide an explanation for the later tradition of Orestes' bringing a cult-statue of Artemis to the shores of Italy from the land of

the Taurians, as recorded in the scholiast's argument to Theocritus' Idylls³². That Stesichorus conceived of and portrayed the sacrifice of Iphigeneia as Clytemnestra's reason (or one of the reasons) for the murder of Agamemnon gains some support from P.Oxy. 2506 fr.26 ii, where the scraps of lines 25-27 suggest that Euripides' version of the pretext of Iphigeneia's marriage to Achilles (Iph. Aul. 18 ff.; cf. Pindar, Pythian XI 22 f.) was related to a similar account in Stesichorus' poem. In the beginning of the Agamemnon the chorus is afraid of the storm brewing within Clytemnestra on account of the sacrifice :

μῦμεν γὰρ φοβερὰ παλίννοτος
οἰκονόμος δολίᾳ, μνάμων Μῆνις τεκνόποινος. Agamemnon 154,155

The allusion presupposes that the audience was familiar with the story of the sacrifice. However, the profound psychological effect of the incident on Clytemnestra was probably not developed so fully in Stesichorus.

Orestes' nurse was called Laodamia in the poem by Stesichorus (PMG 218). There are two possible episodes in which she might have been given a part: in the removal of the boy Orestes from the palace, or (if metope 24 at the Heraion at Siris³³ has been correctly identified) in hindering Clytemnestra's axe-wielding attack on Agamemnon. The theme of the faithful old nurse recurs time and again in tragedy, but may be traced back to epic, the archetypal nurse being found in the character of Eurycleia in the Odyssey. The exile of Orestes was known in the epic tradition: in both the Telemacheia and the Nekuia there is mention of Orestes' absence from the palace of Agamemnon. Stesichorus may well have been the first to introduce the role of the nurse, as he also enlarged on the tradition of Orestes' boyhood exile³³. Later in Pindar, Sophocles and Euripides, a faithful servant or Electra instigated the removal of Orestes from his mother's blood-stained clutches. In the Agamemnon, however, it

was Clytemnestra herself who sent the boy to Phocis (879 ff.), presumably to obviate any hindrance to her love-affair with Aegisthus³⁴.

The name given to the nurse, Laodamia, had caught the attention of the scholiast commenting on Choephoroi 733, but although the name is known to have some connection to one of the royal houses of Sparta³⁵, it is difficult to see a reason for the poet's use of a Spartan name other than perhaps to substantiate his setting of the poem in Sparta (PMG 216), just as the introduction of Pleisthenes (PMG 219) possibly reflects a Laconian tradition³⁶.

In the Oresteia of Aeschylus, Apollo's support is Orestes' chief sanction for the killing of his father's murderer. A scholiast tells us that the motif of the bow of Apollo, promised to Orestes, was derived from Stesichorus (on Euripides Orestes 268) and P.Oxy, 2506 fr. 26 ii supplies us with part of the passage from Stesichorus that Euripides is supposed to have imitated. Thus it would appear that as early as the Stesichorean version of the legend, Apollo and the oracle at Delphi played a significant role in the progression of the narrative. Orestes' consultation of the oracle belongs to a post-Homeric tradition and its importance may reflect the growing influence of Delphi as a pan-Hellenic as well as Dorian religious centre³⁷, as projected in the Hymn to Pythian Apollo (7th century). I assume that in the Stesichorean version Orestes went to Delphi before his return to Sparta, and that there Apollo made his promise: τόξα ... τόδε δώσω παλάμαισιν ἑμαῖσι κεκασμένα, 2506 fr. 26 ii 22-23. Apollo had used his bow to overcome the female snake at Delphi in the version of the Hymn to Pythian Apollo in which the god's establishment of his oracle at Delphi is related:

ἀγχοῦ δ' ἐκρήνη καλλίρροος ἔνθα θράκαιναν
κτεῖνεν ἀναξ Διὸς οὐδὲ ἀπὸ κρατεροῦ βιοῦ
ζατρεφέα μεγάλην τέρας ἄγριον,...

Hymn to Apollo 300-302

That he made use of his bow is discovered from the recapitulation:

πρὶν γέ οἱ ἴδον ἐφῆκεν ἄναξ ἐκδεργὸς Ἀπόλλων
καρτερὸν. ἥ δ' ὀδύνηισιν ἐρεχθομένη χαλεπήσῃ ... 357,358

As a weapon that is capable of overcoming a powerful chthonic daimon in the semblance of a snake, the bow would be well suited to counter Orestes' antagonist. By the time of Aeschylus' Choephoroi and Eumenides, the Erinyes have taken a semi-human form, like Gorgons with snake-swarming heads (Choephoroi 1050). Before that, however, the embryonic Erinyes was in fact a snake. The snake that raises its bloody head in Clytemnestra's dream (PMG 219) may be indentified as the unavenged spirit of the murdered Agamemnon. Thus, Orestes too in his turn, guilty of matricide, would be tormented by a snake and it has been suggested that the man depicted on metope 26 from the Heraion at Siris is Orestes entangled in the coils of a snake³⁸. It is possible, therefore, that in the Stesichorean passage Apollo referred to the bow's excellence in combating such chthonic creatures: τόξα ... κεκασμένα ... ἐπικρατέως βάλλειν .

I assume from the fragment referring to the bow of Apollo in its context of the commentary on Euripides' Orestes that Stesichorus gave an account of Orestes, errant, in search of expiation and ritual purification from the pollution of kindred blood on his hands. In the epic tradition there appears to be no condemnation of Orestes' killing Aegisthus in revenge for his father's death. The pollution incurred from his matricide is not mentioned in the Hesiodic fr. 23 (a) . Cato, Varro and the scholiast on Theocritus knew of a tradition in which Orestes makes a voyage to the west in search of purification³⁹. After completing his purification in a river in southern Italy (a river that constituted the confluence of seven rivers and was thus an obvious magnet for cult-associations), Orestes apparently dedicated his sword to Apollo, building a sanctuary to the god. The identification of the river as one

near Mataurus, with which Stesichorus is in some traditions connected, suggests that Mataurus could have been the specific cult-centre for which Stesichorus composed his Oresteia that culminated in the hero's purification in that area and thus established an authoritative account for the establishment of the cult of Apollo there⁴⁰. Precise evidence is lacking, but as we shall see in the case of the Geryoneis also, Stesichorus appears to have been concerned at some point in his literary career in implementing traditional legends from the Greek mainland with local material or in transposing traditional themes to a new western environment⁴¹. The Greek colonists of the 8th and 7th centuries had brought their legends and religious beliefs together with their goods and chattels to the west, and these also had to be set in a new environment. It would not be surprising therefore if Stesichorus' narrative of the wanderings of Orestes carried him to the west in search of purification. Such a conclusion for the Oresteia would naturally have no relevance for the Athenians of the early 5th century and hence Aeschylus would have altered that part of his predecessor's version of the legend.

Did Stesichorus reject the tradition that was prominent in Sparta in the early 6th century, that Orestes' bones lay somewhere in Arcadia⁴²? Although there is evidence of Stesichorus' setting the Oresteia in Sparta (PMG 215) and an allusion to the Laconian legend of Orestes in the βασιλεὺς Πλευθενύδας (PMG 219), which hint at least at the poet's knowledge of a Laconian version, it is again a matter of speculation whether or not Orestes, after a sojourn in the west, returned to the Peloponnese and how the poet might have handled it. But can the surviving evidence prove that the Oresteia of Stesichorus has an essentially Peloponnesian character from which it may be concluded that the poem was designed for political propaganda in Sparta⁴³? It is as easy to suppose

that the Peloponnesian influence was derived from the Spartan colony at Tarentum⁴⁴. Ferrari may be closer to the truth when he attributes the Spartan colouring to the non-epic (he calls it Dorian) poetic tradition in which the legend of Orestes was emerging⁴⁵. In the final analysis we must not accept too readily one hypothesis before another on such infinitesimally small amounts of evidence regarding the poem itself.

One of the more fascinating of the fragments of Stesichorus' poem that have survived is the two-line quotation preserved in Plutarch, De sera numinis vindicta 10, as an example of aggression under the influence of misguided passion giving way to terror and superstition. In this way Plutarch explains why Clytemnestra dreamt of a snake rearing its blood-smeared head, from which emerged a Pleisthenid king:

ταῦ δὲ δράκων ἐδόκησε μολεῖν κάρα βεβρωτῶμένος ἄκρον
ἐκ δ' ἄρα τοῦ βασιλεὺς Πλεισθενίδας ἐφάνη PMG 219

Plutarch's interpretation only partially explains the nature of the dream, but clearly he knew of the circumstances of the dream within its context, namely that Clytemnestra was tormented with fear after having murdered her husband under the influence of misguided passion. Clytemnestra's justification for her action, namely retribution for the sacrifice of her daughter, was being undermined by internal anxiety that manifested itself in dream-form. Clytemnestra's past was haunting her in the shape of a snake-Erinyes.

The first line of the quotation refers to Agamemnon, the snake being the unavenged spirit of the dead returning in the shape of a chthonic creature. The head of the snake is bloody, symbolising the fact that the murdered man was struck on the head. The snake, as a symbol of sexual significance, may also represent a reawakened desire in Clytemnestra for her dead husband, while as a symbol of regeneration represents

the progenitor of the βασιλεὺς Πλεισθενίδας in the second line of the quotation⁴⁶.

The interpretation of the second line of the quotation has been plagued by a lack of certainty in identifying Pleisthenes⁴⁷. If the patronymic is to be taken literally in accordance with the pseudo-Hesiodic tradition, later followed by Ibycus, then the son of Pleisthenes is Agamemnon⁴⁸. Traditions however vary as to the place of Pleisthenes in the Pelopid family-tree, and the interpretation that Pleisthenes was son of Atreus, father of Agamemnon and Menelaus, whose convenient death resulted in their being reared by Atreus, is late. Aeschylus, on the other hand, refers to the Pleisthenid dynasty in far more general terms and it is probably in the same way that we must understand the usage of the patronymic in this line of Stesichorus⁴⁹. In other words the reference is to one of the royal Pleisthenids, and the fact that he seems to spring from the snake-Agamemnon suggests that it is Orestes, Agamemnon's son.

It has been objected that Orestes was never "king"⁵⁰. If, however, the term βασιλεὺς is understood in a proleptic sense, in as much as Orestes was Agamemnon's legitimate heir, born into the line of Pleisthenids, and as such would ultimately claim the throne that had been usurped by Aegisthus, then there is no difficulty in understanding what the poet meant by the phrase βασιλεὺς Πλεισθενίδας. Both Aeschylus and Sophocles repeat the theme of Clytemnestra's ominous dream in the context of Orestes' imminent return. In each case, the dreamer has seen a vision that must represent Orestes, although the focal point of each differs. Aeschylus maintains the image of the snake: Clytemnestra dreams that she has given birth to a snake that draws milk from her breast along with clots of blood, a premonition that the child will draw his mother's

blood in death (Choephoroi 526 ff.). Sophocles, on the other hand, is more concerned with the dynastic element than the guilt and fear of retributive justice that afflicted the psyche of Clytemnestra in Aeschylus' version. From the royal sceptre sprouts a young shoot (Orestes) that grew to cast a shadow across all of Mycenae's lands (Electra 417 ff.). The underlying implication of the threat from Orestes in both these dreams suggests that in their precedent in Stesichorus' poem the Pleisthenid emerging from the snake-Agamemnon was also Orestes, and not Agamemnon.

Thus the dream of Clytemnestra in Stesichorus' Oresteia manifesting her latent anxiety on account of the murder confirms that the poet did depict Clytemnestra as the murderer of Agamemnon and elaborated on her fears for the inevitable return of Orestes to claim his rightful inheritance and to exact retribution for the murder of his father. The precise context of the dream is unfortunately lost and the individual circumstances of the relation of Clytemnestra's dream in the two dramatists is unlikely to be informative. For example, we cannot tell whether the Aeschylean version, in which Orestes himself boldly projects his own intentions onto the vision of the snake as reported to him indirectly by the chorus, owes its inspiration to Stesichorus' version or not. In the versions of both tragedians an interpretation is given within the framework of the play. One suspects, therefore, that in the course of Stesichorus' narrative some explicit significance would have been attached to the dream.

It is interesting to note the difference between the type of dream in Stesichorus' poem and dreams in the epic tradition. The latter tend to be of an objective, instructional type⁵¹, in which the dreamer is informed of something that is necessary for the progression of the

narrative; they do not, with the exception of Penelope's dream of the eagle and the geese (Odyssey XIX 451 ff.) transcend the limitations of the overt. Penelope's dream does constitute a symbolic type of experience comparable with Clytemnestra's dream in Stesichorus and the dramatists. Within the structure of the narrative, however, it is treated in the same fashion as omens in epic: the eagle assumes the voice of Odysseus and explains the symbolism of the dream just as Calchas interprets the omen of the serpent and sparrows (Iliad II 368 ff.), or Helen the omen of the eagle and the hawk (Odyssey XV 172 ff.). The poet of the Odyssey was concerned with the chrematistic aspect of the dream, namely the imminent return of Odysseus. By the same token, therefore, although Clytemnestra's dream may be interpreted as reflecting her guilt, it is also possible that the dream's function within the structure of the poem was literary, as a device to foreshadow Orestes' return.

It is unfortunate that we have so little evidence of Stesichorus' use of the dream-motif. As it stands, we can see that this example from the Oresteia does not conform to the standard convention of objective dream-experience found in epic, nor are the lines stylistically close to epic diction. As a manifestation of Clytemnestra's guilt the dream certainly progresses far beyond the amoral visitations of gods or ghosts in the Iliad or Odyssey. Both the dream of Clytemnestra and the development of the theme of Orestes' blood-guilt that requires ritual purification suggest that in this poem Stesichorus reflected the ideology of the Archaic age⁵². The thematic material of the Orestes-legend belongs to that age, rather than to the world of the Iliad. In view of the use Stesichorus made of Homeric diction in other poems, the survival of even a few fragments of the Oresteia on papyrus would be highly informative regarding the poet's treatment of such non-epic themes as this. In the citations, for

example, there appears to be a higher percentage of unepic phraseology, but the evidence is hardly sufficient to make any assertive statement⁵³.

From the preceding pages it can be seen how comparatively few instances among the citations there are of Stesichorean innovations in proportion to the number and length of his poems, and how in most of these instances the precise function of the innovation cannot be determined. One suspects that in some cases new names or genealogies were introduced simply for the sake of variety or as exotica. On the other hand, new versions, and in particular those with western associations may have had significance for the audience that we cannot hope to retrieve. The citations relating to the Oresteia have provided a little more material for speculation, partly on account of the preservation of later versions of the theme in tragedy. Again, however, the conclusions reached are mostly speculative. The legend revolving around the blood-guilt of Orestes is very much the product of the Archaic age, and if, as is assumed, Stesichorus was one of the first to develop the legend in poetic form out of the schematic and indirect accounts in the epic tradition, then one would expect there to have been a considerable amount of original material in terms of both content and diction in the Oresteia of Stesichorus.

Footnotes to chapter VII.

- 1 See Page, The Oxyrhynchus Papyri XXIX (London, 1963), pp. 11 and 36.
- 2 Greek myth is understood in the context of this study as the body of traditional tales that has evolved beyond its prehistoric, oral state into a literary mould. See G.S. Kirk, The Nature of Greek Myths (Harmondsworth, 1974) pp. 27 ff. and 95 -112 on the difference between myth in its primary and secondary stages, between the study of myths of pre-literate societies and those of Greek society. For the most part the study of Greek myths tends to be diachronic as opposed to the synchronic field-studies of the anthropologists and structuralists.

- 3 The Rhadine (PMG 276) and the Calyce (PMG 277) were deemed spurious by H.J. Rose, "Stesichorus and the Rhadine fragment." CO 26 (1932) pp. 88-92, on the grounds that the fragments from Strabo VIII 3 20 must be no earlier than the Alexandrian epoch. Page follows the castigation in his PMG. The tradition that Stesichorus wrote bucolic poetry in the Alexandrian sense may be suspect, confusion arising from the tradition of a Stesichorean Daphnis (PMG 279), who might be equated with the herdsman of that name in Theocritus. One cannot state categorically that Stesichorus did not compose verse other than the epico-lyrical with which we are acquainted, and that he was not influenced by local traditions as well as the pan-Hellenic inheritance of heroic tales. Vallet makes an interesting point when he suggests that the atmosphere of such poems may have been similar to the sentimentally heroic tragedies of Euripides (op.cit., pp. 285, 286).
- 4 On the post-Mycenaean dating of Apollo's supremacy at the Delphic oracle see Kirk, op.cit., p. 147. Dietrich, The Origins of Greek Religion, (New York, 1974) pp. 308, 309, devotes a short appendix to the evidence for a Mycenaean religious centre at Delphi, but reserves judgment as to when Apollo appeared on the scene.
On Cadmus, see Kirk, op.cit., p. 158 f., and on Orestes see p. 166.
- 5 Bowra, GLP p. 99.
- 6 Jacoby, FGH 3 fr. 33; cf. Apollodorus III 30.
- 7 Cf. Rose, "De Actaeone Stesicoreo," Mnemosyne 59 (1932) pp. 431-432, where he claims that περιβαλεῖν is metaphorical and that in Stesichorus' poem Actaeon was transformed into a stag. On the other hand there is a B.F. lekythos (Beazley ABV p. 568) that shows Actaeon dressed in a skin with one of the seven dogs attacking the dead beast, and a later depiction on a metope from Temple E at Selinus (2nd quarter of the 5th century) again shows the dogs attacking a skin that is thrown over Actaeon.
- 8 Page, "Ibycus, Stesichorus, Alcman," PCPhS 19 (1971) p. 98.
- 9 Vürtheim, op.cit., p. 33.
- 10 P. Zancani Montuoro, Heraion alla foce del Sele II (Rome, 1954) p. 295, cites a B.F. depiction of Alcmaeon pursued by a Fury in snake-form, immediately after he murders his mother.
- 11 See page 224, chapter VI.
- 12 Cf. M. Willcock, art.cit., pp. 147-153.
- 13 Kakridis, op.cit., p. 1 ff on the motif of the firebrand as a pre-Homeric theme of a Meleagris.
- 14 See page 221, chapter VI.
- 15 For example, Ovid, Metamorphoses VIII.
- 16 See Bowra, op.cit., p. 97.

- 17 Ibid., p. 98.
- 18 See page 231, footnote 82, chapter VI.
- 19 J.A. Davison, "Quotations and Allusions in Early Greek Literature," Eranos 53 (1955) pp. 132,133.
- 20 Vürtheim, op.cit., pp. 5 ff., who points to the depiction of this wedding, together with Admetus as a competitor in the chariot-race on the Chest of Cypselus, as described by Pausanias in book V. Among other speculations he suggests that the reference to the χειροβρωτι δεσμῶι (PMG 180) derived from a description of Prometheus bound to a rock, emending the crux in Zenobius thus: βέλτιον δὲ τὸν <τοῦ Δεσμῶτος Προμηθέως> δεσμὸν ἀκούειν τὸν ἀποβιβρώσκοντα τῷ χειρὶ, ἐδέθη γὰρ ἔν τινι πετραίῳ... Bergk had previously suggested Tyro as a possibility for the person mentioned. She was the mother of Pelias and at one point her sons had to rescue her from the tortures of Sidero. Bowra avoids the problem by assuming that the phrase simply refers to a boxing-match (GLP p. 101). Speculation is inconclusive.
- 21 Cf. the consensus of MSS on line 269: οἷς μ' εἴπ' Ἀπόλλων ἐξαμύνασθαι θεός.
- 22 On the problem of lateness and multiple authorship in the Telemacheia and the Nekuia see Lesky, A History of Greek Literature (London, 1966) p. 50 ff. for a general account. Scholars from antiquity onwards have considered certain parts of the Odyssey to be later interpolations. W. Ferrari, "L'Oresteia de Stesicoro," Athenaeum 16 (1938) pp. 2 ff., maintains that, although there are certainly points of similarity between the account of the murder of Agamemnon in the Telemacheia and the Nekuia, there is an essential difference in the attitude towards Clytemnestra. On the other hand, I. Düring, "Klutaimestra νηλῆς γυνή: a study in the development of a literary motif," Eranos 41 (1943) pp. 104 ff., demonstrates plausibly that one poet could alter the emphasis for his own ends in different sections of the poem, and this is quite feasible given the paratactic structure of oral epic. On the whole, however, it is believed that the depiction of Clytemnestra in the Nekuia is late (cf. Vallet, op.cit., p. 267 and footnote 6).
- 23 See J. Schwartz, Pseudo-Hesiodica, (Leiden, 1960) pp. 265 ff. on late additions in the Catalogue.
- 24 Ferrari, art.cit., p. 21. could cite only fr. 176 M. & W. and hence adopted the position that in this tradition Clytemnestra was portrayed as having adopted the initiative.
- 25 Namely Aeschylus' Oresteia, Sophocles' Electra, Euripides' Orestes and Electra and Iphigeneia among the Taurians.
- 26 On Electra, see Düring, art.cit., p. 107.
- 27 See page 245 of this chapter; cf. Vallet, op.cit., p. 266.
- 28 See page 91, chapter IV and note 21.
- 29 See Zancani Montuoro, op.cit., pp. 269ff., for a description of this

metope. She also suggests the possibility that someone tries to restrain Clytemnestra from attacking Orestes who is about to kill Aegisthus.

- 30 Düring, art.cit., p. 93, is primarily concerned with the development of the character of Clytemnestra in Pindar and Aeschylus. He does not believe that Stesichorus went much beyond the Homeric position : her responsibility was recognised but her character was by no means as fully developed as in Aeschylus (p. 108). The other main thesis proposed by Düring is the reliance of Pindar Pythian XI on Aeschylus, given that the former was composed in 454 B.C. .
- 31 Düring's criticism (op.cit., p. 104 and 107) of Wilamowitz ("Die beiden Electra," Hermes 18 (1883) p. 214) is countered by the evidence of P.Oxy. 2506, to some degree, although concrete evidence is still lacking. On the originality of Stesichorus in using the Iphigeneia-motif see Ferrari, op.cit., p. 14.
- 32 Vallet, op.cit., pp. 266, 267, according to whom the Taurian tradition cannot be prior to the founding of the Megarian colony in the Taurian Chersonnese at the beginning of the 5th century. If this be true, then the westward journey of Orestes depicted in the poem of Stesichorus would not have incorporated the bringing of the cult-statue of Artemis from Taurus.
- 33 Cf. Ferrari, art.cit., p. 22, who believes that the exile of Orestes was an innovation of Stesichorus. His absence is known in the epic tradition, but nothing in more detail. His coming from Athens in Odyssey III 307 may well be a later addition.
- 34 Cf. G. Devereux, Dreams in Greek Tragedy (Oxford, 1976) p. 208.
- 35 Bowra, GLP p. 114, basing his argument on a reference to one Laodamia mother of Triphylus ... III 19 6, thinks that " ... it looks as if she appealed to Stesichorus as a suitably national figure to save the child Orestes from death". As nothing else is known about her, we can hardly be sure that she was a national figure. Bowra, however, made this one of his three principal arguments that the Oresteia was composed as political propaganda for the Spartans in the context of Spartan aspirations for hegemony in the Peloponnese in the early 6th century. His other two arguments, that of the setting in Sparta, and the introduction of Pleisthenes into the Pelopid dynasty (p. 113 f.), are equally insignificant, taken in the context of the whole poem, which was probably over 1500 lines long.
- 36 Ferrari, art.cit., p. 18. Traditions vary : the scholiast on Pindar Olympian I 144 places Pleisthenes in the generation of Atreus ; Hesiod fr. 194 M. & W. places him between Atreus and Agamemnon, as does the scholiast on Iliad II 249; Hyginus, Fabulae 88, 244, 246, makes him son of Thyestes. The use of the name in the Agamemnon of Aeschylus suggests that Pleisthenes is an eponymous hero, not specifically placed, but whose affiliations were indeed Laconian (Agamemnon 1598-1602).
- 37 Kirk, op.cit., p. 109. It is not necessary to postulate a Delphic epic , as Wilamowitz did (Aischylos: Orestie II (Berlin, 1896)p. 247).

- 38 See Zancani Montuoro, "Riflessi di una Oresteia anteriore ad Eschilo" RAAN 26 (1951) pp. 270 ff. ; cf. op.cit., p. 273 ff. .
- 39 Vallet, op.cit., p. 266 ff. . For the identification of the river as being near Mataurus, see page 136 ff .
- 40 There is no evidence for a cult of Apollo at Mataurus, although there are meagre remains of an archaic temple (whose deity is unidentified) near modern Gioia Tauro according to Bérard, op.cit., pp.228,229.
- 41 See note 62, page 299 of chapter VIII.
- 42 Herodotus, Histories I 65-68.
- 43 See Bowra, GLP pp. 112 ff. . Ferrari, art.cit., pp.10 ff.and Vallet op.cit., pp. 269-270 leave the question open.
- 44 There had been a Laconian colony at Tarentum from the end of the 8th century (Bérard, op.cit., p. 176) and there appears to have been some contact between these Tarentines and the Locrians at the foundation of Epizephyrian Locris in the first quarter of the 7th century (Bérard, op. cit., p. 221). According to Diodorus VIII fr. 32 and Justin XX 2 10, the Locrians sought the help of the Spartans when confronted with Crotonian aggression and through the aid of the Dioscuri (?) overcame the Crotonians at the Sagra, though heavily outnumbered. Lastly, the Locrians extended their territory to found Mataurus on the western side of the toe of Italy (Bérard, op.cit., p.228). In one tradition at least, Stesichorus was supposedly born at Mataurus (cf. page 10, note 13). Thus, if some of the Laconian traditions had filtered through to places such as Locri or Mataurus in southern Italy, by way of Laconian settlers or even commercial connections, then there is no reason why Stesichorus should not have heard of them and made use of them, without necessarily going anywhere near Sparta itself.
- 45 Ferrari, art.cit., pp. 10 ff. .
- 46 Devereux, op.cit., pp. 169-170, where he gives a psycho-analytical interpretation of Clytemnestra's dream, adducing a multitude of symbols that lurk beneath the vision of the blood-bespattered snake . According to Devereux the dream is psychologically probable.
- 47 Cf. footnote 36.
- 48 Hesiod fr. 194 M. & W. . Cf. Ibycus PMG 282 21, where the phrase βασιλεὺς Πλεισθενίδας refers to Agamemnon. Such is the argument put forward by Ferrari, art.cit., p. 15 f. Wilamowitz, op.cit., p. 249, believed that the second line was merely a realisation of the first and therefore the Pleisthenid king was Agamemnon. Düring, art.cit., p. 106 also interprets the Pleisthenid king as Agamemnon. Vürtheim, op.cit., p. 52, thinks that the identification is not necessary. Bowra, GLP pp. 114 ff. admits that the text is ambiguous, but suspects that Orestes is meant rather than Agamemnon.
- 49 Clytemnestra in Agamemnon 1569 speaks of the daemon of the Pleisthenids in fairly general terms, not necessarily equivalent to the

Atreides. Aegisthus quotes the curse of Pelops : οὕτως ὀλέσθαι πᾶν τὸ Πλεισθένους γένος (Agamemnon 1602), which may be interpreted either as meaning that Pleisthenes came before Pelops, or else as part of the family of Pelops who ultimately produced Atreus' immediate kin, but not Thyestes, from whom Aegisthus was descended. The former seems more likely, if one takes Aegisthus' remark as ironical, in that he too was one of the Pleisthenids cursed by Pelops.

- 50 Cf. Wilamowitz, *op.cit.*, p. 249; Vürtheim, *op.cit.*, p. 53.
- 51 On dreams see Dodds, The Greeks and the Irrational (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1968) pp. 104 ff.
- 52 Dodds, *op.cit.*, p. 29ff. on the increased preoccupation with divine phthonos and the need for purification as a result of the insecurity of the human condition in the Archaic age.
- 53 See pages 98 and 114 of chapter IV for two examples of unprecedented word-groups in the fragment cited in Plutarch (PMG 219). In the same fragment ἐκ δ' ἄρα τοῦ is Homeric insofar as it exemplifies the epic convention of using the article as a relative pronoun. ἐφάνη, although not a commonly occurring verb in Homer, is used in the context of a portent in Iliad II 308. Neither ἐδόκησε nor μολεῖν is common in epic. Similarly the phrase παλάμασιν ἐμαῖσιν κακασμένα (PMG 217 22) has no direct precedent in Homer, although in this instance one can compare the expression with Hesiod fr. 343 3 (M. & W.) πάντων παλάμησι κεκασμένον Οὐρανίωνων.

Chapter VIII Heracles in the poems of Stesichorus.

The multiple facets of the character of Heracles in the traditions of epic and folklore of the Greek peoples offered poets of the 7th and later centuries vast scope for their compositions on the exploits of that hero¹. From one tradition, at one time, he emerged as the knight in shining lion-skin, from another at another time, as the drunkard, lecher and glutton. Within one figure resided the potential for good and evil, order and chaos, "culture" and "nature".

The origins of Heracles are not easy to determine: many scholars have sought, but few have found any solution that is truly satisfactory². For, despite having the credentials of a hero, he has no real place in the world of the Homeric hero, a world created by and for the aristocratic elite of the Mycenaean era. Rather he appears to have come from a folk-tradition, as a champion of the people whose exploits represent the struggles of the enslaved against tyranny. Chadwick's theory may not be so far from the truth when he suggests that Heracles may have been the popular hero of the "Dorian" communities, that is, the populace of the Greek mainland who became subject to a Minoanised ruling-class of Mycenaean Greeks in the middle of the second millenium B.C.³. Within this frame of reference one may interpret Heracles' enslavement to Eurystheus as symbolising the subjection of the social group to which he belonged to the ruling-class in Mycenae or Tiryns of whom Eurystheus was a member. One may see the legend of Hera's hastening the birth of Eurystheus so that he might benefit from the position of power that Zeus had intended for Heracles as representing the situation in which rights were unfairly withheld from people born into a social group suppressed by the established ruling class. The performance of incredible feats, in

which the hero captures or slays imaginary monsters may represent the endeavours of an individual to free his people from the impositions of a tyranny⁴. In such circumstances those in power might have met the threat from below with the imposition of hard labour, or else with banishment of those offering the threat to the far quarters of the earth, even into unknown areas. In turn, the triumphs of the champion of the people, a Heracles, may in part represent a wish-fulfillment of their struggle against the impositions of the ruling class and in part exempla to sustain their hopes of ultimate release.

To explain the origins of the trials to which Heracles was subjected and the journeys he undertook as lying in the tradition of the subjugated classes of the Greek mainland would concur with the meagre evidence of the mostly hostile references to Heracles in the Ionian epic tradition. In the Iliad, it is true that Heracles is thought of as belonging to the generation that preceded the Trojan heroes, and this is chronologically sound if, for example, he is supposed to have murdered all the sons of Neleus except Nestor; Nestor is represented as father or grandfather in relation to the other heroes at Troy. Heracles' son Tlepolemus participates in the expedition, recalling his father's expedition and destruction of Troy when claiming his reward from Priam's father Laomedon (Iliad V 638; cf. XX 145), an exploit which does not appear in the most favorable light, despite the Greeks' ultimate intention of destroying the city of Priam. The Heracleidae appear as part of the contingent from Rhodes in the Catalogue (II 654 ff.). The characteristic brute strength of Heracles is expressed formulaically in βύην 'Ηρακλεεύην (V 638, XV 640, XVIII 117), but the epithets associated with him are not always complimentary, as for example θρασυμένονα and θυμολέοντα (Iliad V 639, repeated in Odyssey XI 267). The poet of the Iliad

found the legend of Heracles appropriate as a mythological exemplum and used it much in the same way as the legend of Meleager (Iliad IX 529 ff.). Achilles in Iliad XVIII 117 reflects on his own fate through the parallel of Heracles, who even though a favourite of Zeus, was still subject to the wrath of Hera and to Fate. Clearly the poet intended his audience to see the parallel between the two heroes as sons of the union between god and mortal, who did not inherit immortality, and thus could not escape death; on other counts the two are poles apart.

Heracles was guilty of certain crimes that contravened the code of ethics of a Homeric hero, and therefore he is invoked as an example not to be emulated. In the Iliad he is criticised for having drawn his bow against and even wounding two of the gods, Hera and Hades (V 392ff.). The challenge offered to the established deities is referred to in the Odyssey where Odysseus recognises that the activities of the previous generation are not always in accord with his own time (Odyssey VIII 225 ff.). Those who threaten the gods are duly punished: οὐρα καὶ δεινότεροισιν ἐπέζεσκον περὶ τόξων ... (VIII 225). The tradition that incorporated tales of a hero challenging the supernatural or extra-terrestrial powers was alien to the human plane of the Homeric epics. In the Odyssey another contravention of the rules of Homeric society is charged against Heracles: he killed his host Iphitus (XXI 11-41). This unthinkable behaviour serves to underline by analogy the horror of the situation in Ithaca, for there too the suitors are guilty of unabashed exploitation of the institution of guest-friendship, as they consume vast quantities of Odysseus' wealth in kind and even attempt to murder their absent host's son.

Textual difficulties surround the episode of Odysseus' encounter with Heracles in the Underworld (Odyssey XI 601 ff.). The deification of

Heracles, referred to in lines 602-604, is probably an interpolation based on the evolution of the legend of Heracles after the 7th century⁵. The incompatibility between the suggestion of ultimate reward after the burdens of life hinted at in the deification of Heracles and the general view of Heracles elsewhere in the Iliad and Odyssey, as well as in the gloomy address directed at Odysseus in lines 617 ff. is problematic. Artistically it would be effective to have an encounter between the two heroes and this may well have been within the scope of Homer's account of the descent of Odysseus to the Underworld, but what remains of that version is impossible to extract.

Thus the epic tradition of the Homeric corpus presents a hostile rather than favourable attitude towards Heracles which may be in part accounted for by the origin of the legends of Heracles in a milieu different from that of the Homeric epics. By the time of the composition of the Iliad and the Odyssey as we have them, the activities of the hero Heracles could hardly have been ignored, but were largely at variance with the accepted code of the aristocratic elite that constitutes the basis for the Homeric heroes' way of life. It is interesting to note that in the later Hymn to Heracles part of the hostile attitude from the Homeric poems is preserved in the words: πολλὰ μὲν αὐτὸς ἔρεξεν ἀτάσθαλα, πολλὰ δ' ἀνέτλη (Hymn XV 6).

The attitude towards Heracles in the Theogony is quite different, quite removed from that found in the Homeric poems. That the hero played an important role for the social group to which Hesiod belonged or from which he was descended is surely indicated by his repeated appearance in the Theogony, by way of digression outside the chronological structure of the poem. He is the saviour-figure, slaying outlandish monsters such as Geryon, the Lernaean Hydra, the Nemean Lion, or the eagle that tormented

Prometheus. The lion is described as a plague to mankind that continued to cause destruction to those who lived in the area of Nemea and Apesas until Heracles subdued it (Theogony 329 ff.). It is possible too that Hesiod dealt with some of the material from the Theban background in which Heracles is deliverer of Thebes from Orchomenus, but of this no fragments have survived⁶.

The poem entitled the Shield of Heracles that has survived among the fragments of the Hesiodic Catalogue may owe its origin to a reference made within the list of the sons of Zeus to the killing of Cycnus, a head-hunting highwayman from Pagasae. In the introductory section the poet attributes to Zeus the idea of begetting an averter of evil:

πατήρ δ' ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε
ἄλλην μῆτιν ὕφαινε μετὰ φρεσὶν, ὥς ῥα θεοῦσιν
ἀνδράσιν τ' ἄλ' ἡστηῶσιν ἀρῆς ἀλκίῃρα φυτεύσαι. Shield 27-29

This view of Heracles as ἀλκίῃρ may have originated in the Hesiodic concept of Heracles as recorded in the Theogony, although the Shield as it now stands, with its elaborate digression describing the shield of Heracles, appears to be an early 6th century composition.⁷

Other fragments of the Catalogue contain incidents in the life of Heracles, some of which record his triumphs, others certain of his less exemplary activities: his marriage to Deianeira and his unheroic death (fr. 25 M. & W.); the attack on Pylus (fr. 33 (a) and 35)⁸. Since the dates and authorship of parts of the Catalogue and the final part of the Theogony are questioned⁹, we cannot point with certainty to what Stesichorus may or may not have found in the corpus of poems attributed to Hesiod. If, however, the 6th century is, as West argues¹⁰, the most likely period for the editorial activity in which the Catalogues were compiled or expanded, then the fragments are at least of interest by way of comparison, where possible, between Stesichorus' handling of the traditional material

and the trends prevalent in the composition of epic in his day.

Apart from the material in the Homeric poems and in the Hesiodic corpus, there have also survived titles such as the Capture of Oechalia and the Aegimius and a series of references in later commentators to Heracleia by Cinaethon, Conon, Démodocus, Diotimus, Phaedimus and Peisinus, of whom nothing is known. Peisander of Rhodes is the first name of whom a meagre amount of information is preserved. His dates, however, are contestable. Huxley believes his floruit to have been around the middle of the 7th century¹¹, and if this were the case, then Stesichorus may well have been influenced by his Heracleia. Other scholars, however, would place him in the 6th century¹², and since we know relatively little apart from the few citations, it is not of crucial importance whether he preceded Stesichorus or not. I suspect the life-span of the two poets overlapped closely enough for antiquity to have been uncertain as to which was the older or as to which influenced the other. It remains an open possibility that the two poets composed upon the Heracles-theme independently of one another¹³.

We have record of four titles of poems by Stesichorus that dealt with the exploits of Heracles. All of them indicate their subject-matter by the name of the particular monster that he captured or slew. All of them involve his travels away from the Argolid, or Thebes, the Cycnus alone supposedly taking place in mainland Greece. Stesichorus' Heracles is thus in part the saviour figure that appears in the Theogony. However, the poet was also interested in conveying the hero to distant lands, particularly the west, and the motive behind the emphasis on this aspect of the Heracles-legend may well have been the poet's desire to bring some of the traditional tales from mainland Greece into a western environment. Before we can consider the poet's motivation,

however, we must examine the content and possible affinities of the individual poems.

a) Cerberus

The capture of the dog Cerberus from the gates of the Underworld was ultimately classified as one of the canonical labours of Heracles. The antiquity of the legend is witnessed by the reference to it in Iliad VIII 362 ff., where Athena complains that Zeus has forgotten the many occasions on which she ensured Heracles' success in his tasks including the capture of the hound of Hell. The origin of the legend lies in a motif common in myth, namely the encounter between the hero and Death¹⁴, and this motif takes several forms in the Heracles-tradition: for example, the theft of Geryon's cattle and the wounding of Hades with an arrow. A later version of the same struggle occurs in Heracles' fight for the life of Alcestis in Euripides' play of that name. Perhaps the capture of the dog was intended originally to be proof to his "task-master" of his entrance into and return from the land of the dead.

The single citation from this poem, PMG 206, refers to an unusual word employed by Stesichorus to designate the leather wallet or pouch carried by Heracles on his travels, but gives no clue as to the structure or content of the poem. We can assume that Heracles' journey would have been described, but where Stesichorus placed the entrance to Hades is unknown¹⁵. If it was in the west, in Sicily or in Spain, there is no report of it. Later accounts of this exploit include the encounters between Heracles and the dead heroes Meleager and Theseus. Again one can only suppose that, if the poem were a lengthy one, such encounters might have been described by Stesichorus. Finally, there would have been a description of the capture of the dog, perhaps after

the hero had sought and obtained Hades' permission¹⁶, and lastly the presentation of the beast to Eurystheus. Such a topic captured the imagination of vase-painters such as the painter of the Caeretan hydria on which Eurystheus cowers in a huge pithos, with only head and shoulders visible, as Heracles restrains the fearsome dog¹⁷.

In his description of the dog, Stesichorus may have created some unique features¹⁸. In other accounts of the dog one finds variation particularly with regard to the number of heads with which the creature was endowed. In the Theogony Hesiod mentions the gruesome, flesh-eating dog that guards Hades : σαύνει ὁμῶς οὐρῇ τε καὶ οὐασὶν ἀμφοτέρωσιν (771), in which it is implicit that the dog has only one head. However, the offspring of Typhon and Echidna is fifty-headed:

Κεῖβερὸν ὠμηστήν, Αἴδεω κύνα χαλκεόφωνον,
πεντηκοντακέφαλον, ἀναυδέα τε κρατερὸν τε' Theogony 311,312

According to the scholion on this line Pindar described the dog as having one hundred heads. The three-headed version that appears in the tragedians Sophocles and Euripides, therefore, might have had its origin in Stesichorus' description, or equally in that of Pisander, who apparently attempted to rationalise some of the more fantastic elements of monster-legends¹⁹. Attic Black-figure representations, such as that of the Andocides-painter (ABV 255, 8), portray only two heads, sometimes with snakes as locks²⁰. This latter feature is mentioned by Apollodorus together with dragon's tail, which the dog may have inherited from its parents in the Hesiodic tradition²¹. Although Apollodorus does appear to reflect some of the details of Stesichorean versions²² we cannot be certain whether Stesichorus was his source in this particular case.

b) Scylla.

As in the case of the Cerberus, only one reference to the poem has survived, from which one discovers that Stesichorus, in a poem entitled Scylla, named the mother of Scylla as Lamia (PMG 220) ²³. Stesichorus has therefore introduced a version of the parentage of Scylla that differs from both Homer, where the mother is called Crataeis (Odyssey XII 124) and from the Hesiodic Catalogue, where Scylla is the daughter of Phoebus and Hecate (fr. 262 M.& W.).

Heracles' encounter with Scylla is not mentioned in Apollodorus or elsewhere. The traditional habitat of the monster Scylla at the straits of Messina and the western association of Lamia ²⁴ seem to suggest that Stesichorus may have developed local legends in his poem. Among a multitude of obscure pieces of information, the commentary on Lycophron's Alexandra mentions that Scylla robbed Heracles on his return from the conquest of Geryon of one of the cattle he was herding back to Greece, for which Heracles killed her. Diodorus Siculus also records that Heracles supposedly crossed the straits of Messina on his return with Geryon's cattle (IV 22 1-5). The source of this legend may have been Stesichorus, or alternatively, Stesichorus may have expanded upon a local legend of Heracles' killing the Scylla. It seems unlikely, however, that this single incident could have occupied an entire poem of the dimensions of the Geryoneis. The possibility of an excerpt from a longer poem receiving its own title is suggested by the apparent title on the reverse side of P.Oxy. 2803: "the Wooden Horse". P.Oxy. 2803, according to Barrett and West, may be fitted to the same metrical scheme as 2619, the Sack of Troy ²⁵, thus giving precedent for the possibility that at some point in the transmission of the poems an incident might have been extracted from a longer poem and have been given a specific title of its

own. Bowra suggested that perhaps the Scylla was a sequel to the Geryoneis²⁶, but it might be more plausible to imagine that the incident in which Scylla stole one of the cattle occurred in the final sections of the Geryoneis itself. Perhaps Heracles' travels in Sicily after the Geryon-expedition were transmitted as a separate poem that received a title from the first incident, namely that of Heracles' encounter with Scylla.

c) Cycnus

Although again there is only a single citation of the poem Cycnus (PMG 207), derived from a commentary on Pindar, Olympian 10, an interesting piece of information emerges regarding Stesichorus' treatment of traditional material. An account of Heracles' fight with Cycnus and his father Ares is known to us through the version in the Hesiodic Shield, from the Catalogue of Women. In the present form of the poem the encounter itself has become the spring-board for an elaborate description of the construction of the shield, but doubtless an earlier version provided the outline of the actual struggle between Heracles and Cycnus. If the report of Megacleides be correct²⁷, then Stesichorus must have been acquainted with the poem in some form to have assigned it to Hesiod.

From the commentary on Pindar's Olympian X we discover that Stesichorus expanded the narrative of the encounter to include an initial set-back for Heracles. When Cycnus was aided by Ares, the opposition was apparently too much for Heracles, so that he fled. Only at the second attempt, some time later, when Ares had presumably gone, did he finally overcome Cycnus. This expansion of the narrative beyond the single episode of the Shield undoubtedly served to increase the tension of the poem and prolong the action, particularly if we are to consider the poem

even half as long as the Geryoneis. The suggestion that Heracles fled from Ares diverges radically from the version of the Shield in which Heracles boasts of his previous encounter with the god at Pylus, when he had wounded him with his spear and through Athena's aid had put the god to flight (Shield 357 ff.)²⁸. Heracles' challenge to and wounding of the gods were considered unseemly in the epic poems of the Homeric corpus. It is possible therefore that Stesichorus' revision of the story was motivated by his desire to bring the hero Heracles into line with the conventional attributes of the Homeric hero.

d) The Geryoneis.

The story of Heracles' expedition against Geryon is far better documented than the preceding poems of Stesichorus were primarily because of the discovery of P.Oxy. 2617. Moreover, the legend was apparently very popular in the second half of the 6th century, as the artistic representations in sculpture and on vase-painting testify²⁹. The popularity of the theme on Attic Black-figure ware of the second half of the 6th century may point to the dissemination of poems about Heracles' exploits, including those of Stesichorus in the major centres of mainland Greece. Of particular interest, however, in the area of artistic representations, is the appearance on two Chalchidian vases dated to the mid 6th century of the monster Geryon depicted with wings, a detail that occurs only in Stesichorus (PMG 186)³⁰.

The origins of the legend may be traced back to the Theogony in which Hesiod describes the son of Chrysaor as the three-headed Geryon who was slain by Heracles on his island-home, when that hero came to drive his cattle back to Tiryns (Theogony 287-294)³¹. To reach Erytheia, Heracles had crossed Ocean: $\delta\upsilon\alpha\beta\delta\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \pi\acute{o}\rho\omicron\nu\ ' \ \Omega\mu\epsilon\alpha\nu\omicron\tau\omicron$ (294), which indicates

that in the Hesiodic tradition the home of Geryon was established somewhere in the far west, but no more precise details are given, imaginary or otherwise. Moreover, if Geryon were originally the herdsman of Hades, then the tale in which Heracles was sent to fetch the cattle of Geryon would be a doublet of the capture of Cerberus³². By Stesichorus' time, however, the two legends were quite distinct and Stesichorus' interest in developing the expedition of Heracles against Geryon probably lay in the western setting of the tale at a time when exploration and the establishment of trading routes beyond the straits of Gibraltar aroused interest in the western seas³³. Later, Herodotus and Strabo identified the island of Erytheia as being near Gadir on the Atlantic coast of southern Spain. Some poet after Hesiod, therefore, must have been responsible for giving a more precise location for the story.

The best representation of the tenth labour of Heracles is to be found in the outline of that legend in Apollodorus' Library II 5 10³⁴:

Δέκατον ἐπετάγη ἄθλον τὰς Γηρυόνης βόας ἐξ Ἑρυθείας κομίζειν. Ἑρύθεια δὲ ἦν Ἰκεανοῦ πλησίον κειμένη νῆσος, ἣ νῦν Γάδειρα καλεῖται. ταύτην κατοικεῖ Γηρυόνης. Χρυσάορος καὶ Κάλλιρροῆς τῆς Ἰκεανοῦ, τριῶν ἔχων ἀνδρῶν συμφυῆς σῶμα, συνηγμένον εἰς ἓν κατὰ τὴν γαστέρα, ἐσχισμένον δὲ εἰς τρεῖς ἀπὸ λαγόνων τε καὶ μηρῶν. ἔλχε δὲ φοινικᾶς βόας, ὧν ἦν βουκόλος Εὐρυτίων, φύλαξ δὲ Ὀρθος ὁ κύων δικέφαλος ἐξ Ἐχιδνῆς καὶ Τυφῶνος γεγεννημένος. πορευόμενος οὖν ἐπὶ τὰς Γηρυόνης βόας διὰ Εὐρώπης, ἄγρια πολλὰ ζῶα ἀνελὼν Λιβύης ἐπέβαινε, καὶ παρελθὼν Ταρτησὸν ἔστησε σημεῖα τῆς πορείας ἐπὶ τῶν ὄρων Εὐρώπης καὶ Λιβύης ἀντιστοίχους δύο στήλας. θερόμενος δὲ ὑπὸ Ἥλιου κατὰ τὴν πορείαν, τὸ τῆξον ἐπὶ τὸν θεὸν ἐνέτεινεν. ὁ δὲ τὴν ἀνδρείαν αὐτοῦ θαυμάσας χρύσειον ἔδωκε δέπας, ἐν ᾧ τὸν Ἰκεανὸν διεπέρασε. καὶ παραγενόμενος εἰς Ἑρύθειαν ἐν ὄρει Ἀβαντι αὐλίζεται. αἰσθόμενος δὲ ὁ κύων ἐπ' αὐτὸν ὄρμα. ὁ δὲ καὶ τοῦτον τῷ ῥοπάλῳ παύει, καὶ τὸν βουκόλον Εὐρυτίωνα τῷ κυνὶ βοηθοῦντα ἀπέκτεινε. Μενούτις δὲ ἐκεῖ τὰς Αἰδοῦ βόας βόσκων Γηρυόνη τὸ γεγονός ἀπήγγειλεν. ὁ δὲ καταλαβὼν Ἡρακλέα παρὰ ποταμὸν Ἀνθεμοῦντα τὰς βόας ἀπάγοντα, συστήσας μάχην τοξευθεὶς ἀπέθανεν. Ἡρακλῆς δὲ ἐνθήμενος τὰς βόας εἰς τὸ δέπας καὶ διαπλεύσας εἰς Ταρτησὸν Ἥλῳ πάλιν ἀπέδωκε τὸ δέπας.

There is reason to believe that here and elsewhere the author of the Library was acquainted with Pherecydes' handbook of "myths" in which he

recorded the legend of Heracles' voyage in the Sun's bowl³⁵. Presumably Pherecydes was acquainted with the poems of Stesichorus as well as those of Peisander of Rhodes. Because of the uncertainty in dating these poets there is some difficulty in determining who influenced whom. It is possible too that Apollodorus may have derived material from Pherecydes' younger contemporary, Panyassis, who also wrote a Heracleia, in which he probably followed Peisander³⁶, although the possibility of his knowing Stesichorus' versions of Heracles' exploits remains open.

The summary of the tenth labour given in Apollodorus follows the pattern of a series of paragraphs containing the type of information one would find in a hand-book of contents of poems or plays. Each section, though it may vary in length, reveals a similar structure: a) declaration of what Eurystheus ordered; b) place specified; c) account of the parentage of the monster; d) description of the above; e) Heracles' journey to the place of trial; f) preliminary encounters with other obstacles; g) encounter with his major opponent; h) return to Eurystheus. In some instances the return is prolonged by farther adventures, as in the case of the tenth labour, while in others the journey is intricately bound with the main theme, as in the quest for the golden apples of the Hesperides. In the summary of the capture of Geryon's cattle very little information is given about the actual battle between Geryon and Heracles: ὁ δὲ καταλαβὼν Ἡρακλέα παρὰ τὸν ποταμὸν Ἀνθεμοῦντα τὰς βόας ἀπάγοντα, συστησάμενος μάχην τοξευθεὶς ἀπέθανεν. The author of the précis mentions in as much space the death of the dog Orthus, smitten with Heracles' club, and the subsequent death of Eurytion. From the fragments of P.Oxy. 2617, according to the arrangement suggested by Page and Barrett³⁷, it appears that the poet devoted a large section of the later part of the poem to the overwhelming of each head of Geryon separately. If the epitomiser were

relying on Stesichorus' poem alone for his account of the tenth labour, then it is surprising that he says only τοξευθεὶς ἀπέθανε. Thus, as no more than an indirect reflection of the poem, the summary cannot provide us with very much that is of appreciable help other than for a schematic sequence of events. However, if the summary is taken in conjunction with what we can see and conjecture from the fragments themselves, one can reconstruct something of the content of Stesichorus' version of the legend.

From PMG 185 we know that in Stesichorus' poem Heracles is transported across the ocean in the Sun's bowl, a device that was also used by Pisander and reported in Pherecydes' handbook. Page believes that this fragment quoted by Athenaeus represents Heracles' giving back the Sun his bowl after he returns to Tartessus with the cattle, whereas I agree with Barrett and Gentili that it is more probable that this quotation came from near the beginning of the poem³⁸. The island of Erytheia lay in Ocean, but not apparently far from the coast; the Sun would therefore still have to cross Ocean to reach his wife and children, and return to the east to begin a new day. It seems unlikely that the Sun would be left at Tartessus, stranded, while Heracles sailed to Erytheia, supposedly spent the night and then concluded his task the following day. The Sun, therefore, reentered his cup to continue his journey for that night while Heracles disembarked and began his search for Geryon. The limited evidence, however, renders certainty of interpretation impossible.

On his crossing from Spain it is possible that Heracles touched on other islands before he reached Erytheia. The scholiast on Apollonius of Rhodes Argonautica I 211 mentions that Stesichorus spoke of an island in the Atlantic called Sarpedonia (PMG 183). The island of

the Hesperides was also located somewhere in Ocean³⁹, and the reference to it in P.Oxy. 2617 fr. 6 (SLG 8) might belong to the poet's digression to describe the island and those who came to it, διὰ κύμαθ' ἄλδος βαθέας ἀφίκοντο, whether Heracles (and the Sun?) on this occasion, or others at another time. M. Robertson suggested that the persons who arrived, ἀφίκοντο, on the island were in fact Eurytion as a boy with his mother Erytheia, one of the Hesperides⁴⁰. If this were the case, then the poet would seem to have digressed at some length on the history of a relatively minor character, Eurytion, whom Heracles kills at the outset of his journey in the territory of Geryon. Certainly the birth-place of Eurytion was mentioned, as Strabo reports (PMG 184), but if the poet chose to mention his birth-place as being fairly close to Erytheia, thus providing a reason for his being in the vicinity of Geryon, why take him island-hopping? To this question, however, there is no solution without more evidence. Digression at length is not uncommon in epic composition and it is not improbable that Stesichorus inclined in that direction.

No fragment has survived that obviously belongs to the slaying of the herdsman Eurytion and the removal of Geryon's cattle, as we know of the incident from the précis of Apollodorus. Also involved in that encounter was the two-headed dog Orthus, whom Heracles slew with his club (cf. Theogony 293). Fr. 31 of 2617 has the beginning of two lines preserved as follows:

ὁ δὲ δεύτερ[ο
ρόπαλον κ[

This might refer to an attack on the second head of Geryon⁴¹, but might equally belong to a description of an attack on the second head of the dog, if Stesichorus followed the same tradition as is recorded in Apollodorus or was responsible for it.

Again relying on the account from Apollodorus, Page and Barrett assign fr. 42, 25 and 13+14+15 to a context in which Menoites, herdsman of Hades, comes to report the theft of the cattle to Geryon⁴². Fr. 42 (b) 4 refers to an ἄνθρωπος, which in this world of semi-divine creatures and monsters must mean Heracles. Heracles, it thus appears, is designated as a mortal man, and one, as we shall see, who has certain affiliations with the Homeric hero.]δοκα in line 2 of fr. 42 (b) could belong to the word οὔστοδόκα or ὑοδόκα (Barrett), in which case the text would appear to be dealing with Heracles' armament, his quiver filled with the lethal arrows. Thus, κε]φαλάς in the previous line might refer to the lion-skin that Heracles wore on his back (cf. PMG 229) with the beast's head over his in place of a helmet, as is depicted on some of the Black-figure vases of the 6th century (for example, the Caeretan hydria, Louvre E 701).

Barrett suggested that fr. 25 might derive from a context in which Menoites begs Geryon not to fight, but to think of his parents (i.e. of how he could deprive them of their dear son). Gentili, on the other hand, accepting Snell's conjectured joining of fr. 25 and fr. 21⁴³ believes the context to be that of Geryon's mother pleading with her son: ἀλλ' ὦ φίλε, ματ[ρὸς ἄκουσον (line 6). But the space between χ.[...].ρας and ἀ]δύκοισιν is misleadingly large in Snell's supplement. Dative ἀρηιφύλους would appear to be combined with dative ἀ]δύκοισιν, totally unepic in association, and whose sense in the context, such as it is, is uncertain. I am inclined to think that Barrett's suggestion is more probable: the fragment hints at the grief that will befall the mother (if not the father too) of Geryon at the outcome of his encounter with Heracles.

Fragments 19 and 11 are certainly to be assigned to a speech or speeches by Geryon's mother, as she pleads with her son not to fight

Heracles. For a parallel scene in epic one may turn to the episode in Iliad XXII where Priam and Hecuba plead with Hector not to leave the city, not to meet Achilles⁴⁴. The first lines of fragment 19 may be

compared with Priam's first catching sight of Achilles in gleaming armour thus: ... πε]φυλαγμέ[ν]... ὕδο[ι]σ]ά τε νισόμε[νον] (fr. 19 2,3)

cf. τὸν δ' ὁ γέρων Πρίαμος πρῶτος ἶδεν ὀφθαλμοῖσι
παμφαίνονθ' ὥς τ' ἀστέρ' ἐπεσσύμενον κεδύλοιο...
ῥῆμαξεν δ' ὁ γέρων ...

Iliad XXII 25-26,33

There is not enough of the context of the fragment to tell whether Geryon's mother has just caught sight of Heracles approaching on guard, πε]φυλαγμέ[and ready for the fight, νισόμε[νον], or whether it is her son. The former seems more likely since the arrival of Heracles would have undoubtedly caused Callirhoe's heart to start with fear, just as the sight of Achilles terrified Priam in Iliad XXII 33 ff.. Heracles would be on his guard watching for Geryon to challenge his theft of the cattle.

The first line of the antistrophe appears to be the beginning of a speech in which the speaker, Callirhoe, predicts the victory of Heracles and the inevitable conclusion, the death of Geryon.. We may again compare this with the prediction of Hector's death made by Priam in Iliad XXII 40 ff. : the epithet στυγερός in line 5 of the fragment may accompany the word θάνατος⁴⁵. Possibly one of Callirhoe's arguments was that Heracles was the son of Zeus (cf. αὐ]γλοχο-lines 9, 10), or else that Zeus had ordained that Heracles be victorious. In the epode there may be a reference to Geryon's mortality οὐκε[θανατ[(lines 14,15)⁴⁶. Geryon is not immortal and therefore any encounter with Heracles would prove fatal.

Fragment 11 falls at least one triad later in the poem than fragment 19 and may derive from the climactic conclusion to Callirhoe's speech. She depicts herself as totally wretched, in terms more

reminiscent of tragedy than epic:

.....] ἐγὼν [μελέ]α καὶ ἄλασ-
τοτόκος κ]αὶ ἄλ[ασ]τα παθοῦσα
.....] ἀρυόνα γωνάζομα [ε
αὐ' ποκ' ἐμ]όν τιν μαζ[όν] ἐ[πέσχεθον fr. 11 lines 2-5

She makes her appeal the more forceful by invoking the very breast that fed the child (line 5) and this may be compared with the words of Hecuba in Iliad XXII 83: εἰ ποτέ τοι λαθικηδέα μαζὸν ἐπέσχον. After Priam had failed to dissuade his son from fighting Achilles, the mother made one last effort, and laying bare her breasts she pleaded with Hector, invoking the very source of his life. Callirhoe's appeal to Geryon in Stesichorus' poem must have recalled to the audience the parallel scene in Iliad XXII, but Stesichorus has in characteristic fashion intentionally elaborated upon the expression of the mother's grief with the repetition of ἄλαστα in ἄλαστατόκος (lines 2-3). The garment πέπλ[ον mentioned in line 10 suggests that Stesichorus also followed the Homeric parallel of depicting the mother casting aside her robe to uncover her breasts: cf.

μήτηρ δ' αὖθ' ἐτέρωθεν ὀδύρετο δάκρυ χέουσα,
κόλπον ἀντεμένη, ἐτέρηφι δὲ μαζὸν ἀνέσχε. Iliad XXII 79,80

Barrett and Page suppose that fragment 13+14+15 belongs to a conversation between Menoitēs and Geryon (cf. Apollodorus II 5 10), comparing it with the conversation between Glaucus and Sarpedon in Iliad XII 323-328⁴⁷. In that passage Sarpedon points out that if immortality were theirs simply by their avoiding battle then they would not be fighting in the midst of the fray. However, since as mortals they have not the power to escape death ever, then, though death be the inevitable result (for one or the other), they should fight and die with glory. For Geryon too the question is one of the honourable thing to do, although the alternatives of immortality as opposed to mortality are more pertinent in that there is a chance that Geryon inherited immortality from his divine

parents. Geryon (cf. line 24) is speaking in answer to someone who has brought up the subject of his possible death : μή μου θάνατον ... (line 5 ff.). He weighs up two alternatives, αἰ μὲν γὰρ ... ἐν Ὀλύμπῳ, | κρέσσον ... (lines 8-15) and αἰ δ' ὧ φέρε ... | νῦν μοι πολλὸν καλῆρόν ἐστι πάθεῖν | ὅ τε μόρσιμον ... (lines 15-24). His ultimate decision is the same as that of Sarpedon, namely to fight and risk death as fate decrees. However, although the opposition of mortality and immortality is introduced in both arguments, Geryon's position is somewhat different from that of Sarpedon. For Geryon there is the possibility that he cannot be killed by Heracles. Unfortunately the papyrus breaks after κρέσσον in line 11, to be followed in the next line by ἐλέγχεται (12). Barrett and Page are themselves in disagreement over the interpretation of this part of the argument. The former suggests that the sense of the lines from κρέσσον ... was likely to be " it is better to endure disgrace and allow Heracles to make away with my cattle". If Geryon were immortal it would be impossible for Heracles to kill him and thus the argument proposed by Barrett makes little sense, particularly after the imperative μή μου θάνατον (line 5 ff.). Moreover it would be in the second of the alternatives, αἰ δ' ὧ φέρε ... , if anywhere, that one would expect Geryon to consider the possibility of avoiding battle. There is, however, no doubt in Geryon's mind that he must meet his fate and avoid the disgrace of showing cowardice. It seems, therefore, that Stesichorus has portrayed Geryon , for all his three bodies and six wings, with the characteristic concern for his reputation of a Homeric hero; even if he is immortal, it would still be better to fight and avoid reproach (lines 10-12).

This concern to avoid reproach is to be observed in Hector's soliloquy as he awaits Achilles in Iliad XXII 91 ff, and ponders whether he should yield to his parents' pleas. He predicts that Polydamas will

be the first to cast ἐλεγχέειν at him if he retires within the walls. He had refused to retreat before, and hence to do so now would bring greater shame. Worse still, a more evil-minded person might lay the entire blame for Troy's destruction on his shoulders. Thus he makes his decision:

έμοι δὲ τότ' ἂν πολὺ κέρδιον εἴη
 ἄντην ἢ Ἀχιλλῆα κατακτείναντα νέεσθαι
 ἢ ἐκὲν αὐτῷ ὀλέσθαι εὖκλειῶς πρὸ πόλης . Iliad XXII 108-110

He contemplates further on the possibility of making peace with Achilles (lines 111-122) but rejects his thoughts. Achilles would show him no mercy:

βέλτερον αὖτ' ἔριδι ξυνελαυνέμεν ὅττι τάχιστα
 εὔδομεν ὀπποτέρῳ κεν Ὀλύμπιος εὖχος ὀρέξηι . 129-130

It is important that he die gloriously, εὖκλειῶς.

Geryon comes to a similar conclusion. Whether he is mortal or immortal, he must fight. To act otherwise would be shameful. He is not afraid of death if that is his lot: νῦν μοι πολὺ κάλλιον ... ὅ τι μόρσιμον ... (lines 20,21). Again the theme of ὀνειδέα occurs, this time amplified with the thought that his potential shame will be handed down for generations παντὶ γένει...ὀπίσω (lines 23,24). Thus the circumstances of Hector's and Geryon's speech may be compared. Both are in the position of having to decide between facing odds that are unknown but potentially fatal and retreating to safety with the reproaches of those around them and of future generations. Both have just received advice from another party who tried to persuade them to follow the latter course. Their decision, however, is to place their reputation first: to die rather than to be guilty of unheroic action. It is possible therefore that the poet intended the speech of Geryon to be reminiscent of Hector's soliloquy as well as to reflect Sarpedon's speech in book XII. Moreover, in view of

the similarities noted above between the appeal made by Geryon's mother in fr. 11 and the appeal made by Hecuba at the beginning of Iliad XXII, it is conceivable that the context of fr. 13+14+15 is not Geryon's reply to the warnings of Menoites, as suggested by Page and Barrett, but rather Geryon's reply to the appeal not to fight made by his mother, as represented by fragments 11 and 19.

The introduction to the speaker in fr. 13, derived from the "formulaic" speech introduction in epic,] δ' ἀπαμ [εμβόμενος | ποτέφα ...⁴⁸ (lines 2-3), follows the word χηρσύν (line 1) in an antistrophe that belongs to a triad beginning in the previous column of the papyrus (number X, by Page's reckoning⁴⁹). This triad could in fact be that which began with fr. 11 line 10, where Callirhoe, having made her final appeal to her son, appears to act in the same way as Hecuba, uncovering her breasts. Perhaps the poet also depicted her falling to the ground and clasping the knees of Geryon as she declares ἀλλά σε Ἰ]αρυόνα γωνάζομα[(fr. 11, line 4) or tearing her hair with her hands, χηρσύν (fr. 13, line 1), as does Priam (Iliad XXII 77,78: πολὺς δ' ἄρ' ἀνὰ τρύχας ἔλκετο χερσὶ | τύλλων ἐκ κεφαλῆς.). Geryon, in answering her, τὴν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος | ποτέφα (lines 2-3), demands that she not try to frighten him with threats of imminent death, μὴ μοι θά[νατον (line 5 ff.) which may be compared with οὐκε[| θανατ[(fr. 19, line 13 ff.), and that she cease from beseeching him μὴ δέ με λ[ύσσειο (fr. 13, line 7), corresponding to ἀλλά σε Ἰ]αρυόνα γωνάζομα[(fr. 11, line 4 f.). Geryon then proceeds to present his position if he were immortal (lines 8 ff.) and his position if he were mortal and fated to die (lines 16 ff.) Whichever be the case, he does not wish to suffer the reproaches of having been a coward, not to be remembered as such in later generations (lines 23 ff.). Presumably he continued his speech with a declaration of how he would meet Heracles.

Gentili, in his review of SLG⁵⁰, suggested that this fragment belonged to a pre-battle exchange between Geryon and Heracles, in which he presumably sees Geryon answering the threats of death delivered by Heracles himself. He draws attention to the scholiast's remark on Iliad XXI (=PMG 273) that heroes in Stesichorus made long speeches as they were about to die. Gentili therefore proposes that the speech in fr. 13 might be interpreted in the light of Lycaon's speech of supplication as Achilles stands over him preparing for the final kill (Iliad XXI 74 ff.). Geryon's speech would be addressed to Heracles, and the vocative ὦ φύλε was intended to reflect Achilles' sarcastic reply to Lycaon (Iliad XXI 106: ἀλλὰ, φύλος, θάνε καὶ σὺ τῇ ὀλοφύρεαι οὕτως). However, the general tenor of the speech appears to be one of defiance, not abject supplication as in the case of Lycaon's speech. It may well be that Geryon on the point of death at Heracles' hand did beg for mercy, but fr. 13 does not suit such a context. The possibility of a pre-battle exchange between Geryon and Heracles would not be inappropriate in the epic atmosphere of the poem. One can point to instances of exchanges between two opponents in Iliad V 627 ff., where Tlepolemus and Sarpedon address one another before fighting. The heroes Achilles and Aeneas in Iliad XX 156 ff. speak at some length before casting their spears. However, neither of these passages presents any obvious parallel for the speech of Geryon in fr. 13. Thus there is little in favour of Gentili's suggestion that fragment 13 represents a pre-battle exchange between Geryon and Heracles and the remark of the scholiast on which he bases his argument might easily refer to some episode in the Sack of Troy of Stesichorus.

In the case of the interpretation of Page and Barrett, namely that the fragment represents a conversation between Geryon and Menoites, there are observable precedents in the Iliad of discussions between hero

and companion or servant. For example, Aeneas and his companion Pandarus discuss whether they do in fact see the mortal Diomedes or whether they are faced by some god in disguise (Iliad V 165 ff.). Pandarus hopes that their opponent is mortal, for then he will send him to Hades. Since he had come to Troy he had been unsuccessful with his bow and was eager to use it to some avail before becoming so totally disheartened as to throw it into the fire. In the following scene in book V, fearing that Diomedes in his haste might be killed, Sthenelus attempts to dissuade him from an encounter with Aeneas, who claims to be the son of Aphrodite (Iliad V 243 ff.). Diomedes is quick to retort :

μή τι φόβονδ' ἀγόρευ', ἐπεὶ οὐδέ σε πεισέμεν οἶω.
οὐ γάρ μοι γεύναϊον ἀλυσκάζοντι μάχεσθαι
οὐδέ καταπτώσσειν· ἔτι μοι μένος ἔμπεδόν ἐστιν. V 252-254

He is not at that moment concerned with the possibility of his opponent's immortality, but with the glory that they will gain if they capture the horses of Aeneas: εἰ τοῦτω κε λάβοιμεν, ἀρούμεθα κε κλέος ἐσθλόν (V 273). It is a similar sort of defiance that is projected in the speech of Geryon, although the details of the argument differ.

As a parallel for the proposition of the alternatives, mortal or immortal, Page and Barrett point to the speech of Sarpedon in Iliad XII 322 ff. . The poet might also have intended to echo the sentiments expressed by Achilles in Iliad XXI 99 ff. . Despite his having an immortal mother, he, like any other man, will die. He accepts this as the choice he made, knowing that by coming to Troy he had selected the more glorious of the δυχθαδύας κῆρας (Iliad IX 411). The alternative had been to remain at home and live to a ripe old age:

εἰ μὲν κ' αὖτις μένων Τρώων πόλιν ἀμφιμάχωμαι,
ᾧλετο μὲν μοι νόστος, ἀτὰρ κλέος ἄφθιτον ἔσται.
εἰ δέ κεν οὔκαδ' ἔκωμαι φύλῃν ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν,
ᾧλετό μοι κλέος ἐσθλόν, ἐπὶ δὴρδν δέ μοι αἰὼν
ἔσσεται, οὐδέ κέ μ' ὄκα τέλος θανάτοιο κιχέη.

Iliad IX 412-416

Again we are dealing not so much with a precise parallel or precedent for the arguments of Geryon, as with a structural parallel, where the speaker presents the alternative possibilities to be chosen, whether the situation of being immortal or otherwise, or the course of action more or less honourable.

As in the case of the bird-portent in P.Oxy. 2360, there appears to be in this fragment of Geryon's speech a collation of allusions to various situations in the Iliad. Page and Barrett have selected the speech of Sarpedon as the closest parallel; Gentili has chosen the incident between Achilles and Lycaon. Of these two the former is more convincing. However, there seems to be more evidence to support the interpretation that Geryon's speech is made in answer to his mother's pleas, based upon the scene at the beginning of Iliad XXII. Not only are there certain linguistic similarities, but also evidence of the correlation of topics in fr. 13 and the two fragments identified as part of Callirhoe's speech. It is clear too that Geryon, like Hector, confronts the situation with a hero's sense of duty; it would be ignominious to withdraw. His fear is not of death but disgrace.

Fragment 3 of 2617 tells us that Stesichorus adapted the epic convention of divine machinery and devoted part of his poem; possibly at the moment of the climax of the major encounter between Heracles and Geryon, to a "council" of the gods. Athena and Poseidon appear to be defending their respective protégés before Zeus, παραλ Δία παμ[βασιλῆα] (lines 1,2). The epithet Ἰπποκλέουθον (line 5) betrays the presence of the god Poseidon in the debate, and this is not surprising since he is grandfather of Geryon. The speaker is Athena (line 3), who calls upon Poseidon to remember something regarding Geryon, presumably a promise not to protect him from death ... μεμναμένος ἄ[ν] περ ὑπέστας] | ... Γαρυ]όναν

ἠ[αὐ]δίου (line 8). Such a scene is reminiscent of many of the discussions on Olympus in the Iliad, but particularly of Athena's intercession on Odysseus' behalf in Odyssey I 45 ff. . There too she is opposed by the god Poseidon, who is angry at Odysseus for his treatment of the Cyclops. The tradition of Athena's protection of Heracles is mentioned in Iliad VIII 358 ff., where Athena noted how Zeus has failed to recall all the times that she has helped his son in the past, as he permits the Trojans to gain the upper hand. Thus Stesichorus has followed epic practice in his use of divine intervention and control of his characters on the earthly plane, but we have little evidence of his treatment of the device or of the extent to which he employed it.

The climax of the poem was the decisive encounter between Heracles and Geryon, of which fragment 4 gives a description of Heracles' initial attack by stealth and his successful bow-shot against one of Geryon's heads. I have already given a detailed account of Stesichorus' debt to epic in this passage in the previous chapter, concluding that the poet adopted and modified several stock situations from battle-scenes to suit the unepic victory of the archer against the monster. If the hero disposed of each head individually and in a different manner I assume that since the description of the bow-shot against the first head took at least 60 lines (=two columns of the papyrus), the other two would occupy approximately double that space, if not more. I would also expect that to balance the simile amplifying the fall of the first head, there would be one to describe the collapse of the whole body. Thus, the entire scene could have been as long as 250 lines. Other fragments that clearly derive from descriptions of combat are : 1, 17, 18, 31, 41, 43, and 45; fragments 2, 7, 12, 13 (b) and 73 are less certainly from such contexts. Phrases such as φύλοπις ἀργαλέα and μάχαι τ' ἀνδρο[χτασίαι

(fr. 17, lines 5 and 7) indicate the monumental scale on which Stesichorus conceived the struggles in which Heracles was involved, whether against Geryon, Eurytion or Ocean⁵¹.

One citation from Athenaeus (PMG 181) suggests that Heracles' infamous drinking-bout with the centaur Pholus was included in the Geryoneis. Fragment 46 (b), with its reference to wine in a cup(?) being "given" : δῶκε[... | ἐνθ' ἐν[... | οἶνον[(lines 2-4) may belong to the same episode. The incident would have occurred on the return-journey to Tiryns⁵².

In the précis of Apollodorus there is included an account of Heracles' travels through Italy and Sicily as he returns to Greece, and it is presumably this same tradition that Diodorus reflects in book IV 22. Since the combat with Geryon took place fairly late in the poem according to Page's scheme, only if the poem extended far beyond the projected 1800 lines would it be likely that Stesichorus incorporated an extensive description of Heracles' return through Italy and Sicily. As was noted above⁵³, there is the possibility that the poem entitled Scylla may have dealt with Heracles' sojourn in Sicily on his return with the cattle of Geryon. As a separate poem, it would offer plenty of scope for the inclusion of material of local origin, relevant to the people of the western Greek world, whereas as a subsection of the Geryoneis the emphasis on Heracles' role in Sicily might be diminished.

In the preceding pages I have considered the possible contexts of the fragments of the Geryoneis within a framework derived primarily from the summary of Apollodorus, since no other substantial account has survived. If Stesichorus developed the plot of the Geryon-labour on the lines of some predecessor who also wrote a poem about this labour, we have no evidence of it. The predominant feature of Stesichorus' treatment of

Heracles' adventure is the use of recognisable Homeric motifs, of typically epic themes such as divine intervention on the human plane, or the description of the fatal wound received by a hero, or a mother pleading with her son to avoid an encounter that is destined to prove fatal for him. And yet, as I have demonstrated, the themes are not imitated from the Homeric corpus verbatim; the language adapted by the poet to his new medium shows a conscious effort on the poet's part to modify the Homeric to the non-Homeric situation. Geryon, although grotesque in appearance, with his triple body and six wings, is nonetheless human in his responses, perhaps brashly defiant before imminent defeat at Heracles' hands, but as concerned as Hector or Diomedes or any other self-respecting Homeric hero to preserve a reputation as one who did not shrink from battle through fear of death.

In all of the fragments considered above there is unfortunately little evidence of Stesichorus' depiction of Heracles himself. Athenaeus⁵⁴ reports that Megacleides placed Stesichorus among the younger generation of poets who represented Heracles neither in Homeric nor Hesiodic fashion, nor as he was depicted by those who made Heracles the general of an army, who captured many cities, but rather as a solitary, wandering outlaw, dressed in a lion-skin and carrying a club and a bow. According to Megacleides Stesichorus was the first to create this new image of Heracles; he did not follow his predecessor Xanthus in this respect at least⁵⁵. Strabo, on the other hand, claims this innovative depiction of Heracles as the work of Peisander⁵⁶. Antiquity was obviously uncertain, and we are hardly in a good position to clarify the matter. Nonetheless the fragments of the Geryoneis do confirm that Stesichorus did portray Heracles as Megacleides suggested: Heracles appears to be alone; his initial attack on Geryon

appears to have been a crafty manoeuvre in which a stone was thrown to displace the helmet of Geryon's first head to enable his arrow-shot to find its mark (fr. 4, columns i and ii); he attacks either the second head of Geryon, or possibly the second head of the guard-dog Orthus with a club (fr. 31). The scene in which Pholus presents Heracles with a drinking-cup to suit his huge capacity for wine is also consistent with Megacleides' view of the pleasure-loving Heracles: "ὅς μεθ' ἡδονῆς πλείστης τὸν μετ' ἀνθρώπων βίον διετέλεσε ... (Athenaeus XII 512e).

Two of the four poems on the Heracles - theme considered above would appear to present the hero as the Hesiodic averter of evil, the later ἀλεξικακός⁵⁷; as such he is the champion of the people. In the Scylla one assumes that he encountered and disposed of the charming lady who devoured men from ships that sailed through the straits of Messina. If the poem also incorporated tales of Heracles' travels in Sicily associated in later traditions with Heracles' return from Erytheia with Geryon's cattle, then Stesichorus may also have told the tale of his victory over Eryx and the restitution of the lands to their rightful owners, the "native people"⁵⁸. In the Cycnus Heracles challenges and ultimately defeats the son of Ares, terminating his anti-social practice of way-laying travellers to provide building material for his temple of skulls.

In all of the themes chosen by Stesichorus Heracles appears as the heroic individual, performing incredible feats, single-handed, in remote corners of the earth. From his display of fear in the Cycnus one can see that the poet did not present Heracles as totally impeccable or exemplary, a ἥρωες θεός in the Pindaric view of the hero⁵⁹. We do not know in what way, if at all, the poet justified Heracles' theft of Geryon's cattle and the killing of Geryon himself⁶⁰. The fragments that have survived of the combat between Heracles and Geryon indicate that the poet intended to give his

narrative the dimensions of an epic, adopting material from similar scenes of combat in the Iliad. As far as we can tell, the effect of the epic diction, moulded as it is to the new circumstance of the victorious archer, is one of elevation. Hence the poet's justification for the expedition may simply have been that it was fated, just as two great heroes, Achilles and Hector are destined to meet in the field of combat through no fault of their own. It would appear then that the poet combined heroic elements, in order to obviate the hostile criticism of Heracles in the Ionian epic tradition with a characterisation of Heracles on a more human level, as one who knew fear, did not challenge Olympic deities and displayed a predilection for wine that may have enhanced his popular image as much as his heroic feats. In the Geryoneis one may have a curious juxtaposition of a Homericised hero with the precursor of the Aristophanic drunkard.

Of Heracles' apotheosis, an important development of the legend and cult of Heracles in the 7th and 6th centuries ⁶¹, we have no evidence in Stesichorus. It is possible, in view of the fact that the four surviving titles are rather remote from the traditions concerning the hero's death, that the poet concentrated only upon the hero's wanderings, particularly in the west. It seems unlikely, however, that he would have avoided Heracles' apotheosis altogether, when the topic was popular on the mainland of Greece at the time when Stesichorus was composing. We must remain ignorant on this point through lack of evidence.

The stimuli for Stesichorus' choice of Heracles as the central figure in several poems must have been multiple and certainly interdependent. It is generally supposed that the communities of the "Dorian" west that flourished in the 8th to 6th centuries in Sicily and southern Italy adapted the cults of gods and heroes of their mainland ancestors to their new environment ⁶². The poet's task in society involved

the perpetuation of the established legends and cults and also their integration, possibly with the help of preexisting local legend, into a meaningful context for the Greeks in the west⁶³. Since the Hesiodic tradition already referred to the western exploits of Heracles, the cult of this hero was perhaps more readily transposed to the western world. Areas that had been to the Greeks of the mainland a fairy-tale region filled with unworldly creatures were visited and described by sailors and traders. Their mythical dimensions were perhaps not totally lost as the poet hastened to embellish unimpressive details. Once again the poet's imagination could have factual basis. Eurytion's birth-place was marked specifically by the allusion to Tartessus' wealth in silver (PMG 184)⁶⁴. In that fragment Erytheia is simply called κλεῖνας, but elsewhere the island was probably described in greater detail. It is worth noting, however, that σχεδὸν ἀντιπέρασ κλεῖνας Ἐρυθείας would not be taken too literally, and to try to discover whether or not Teneriffe in the Canary Islands was its location is a fruitless task⁶⁵.

Thus, from the point of view of entertainment, the adventures of Heracles in the west would have topical interest, and from the point of view of religion, the elaboration of vague allusions already existing in the literary tradition was necessary to promote the establishment of that hero's cult in the west. It was in the hands of the poet to enhance the hero's activities in the west, and even to create new adventures depending on the needs of the communities for whom he composed. Perhaps Stesichorus, living in Himera close to the non-Greek territory of north-western Sicily, was responsible for the creation of Heracles' tour of Sicily that culminated in his duel with the eponymous ancestral king of Eryx⁶⁶. His victory in that area would act as a sanction for Greek claims to that part of the island, which was not yet in their power. In composing such poems, the

poet would employ scenes and diction reminiscent of the most popular of the traditional epics to give his poems the atmosphere of antiquity and therefore authority, as well as an artistically sound base. It is undoubtedly true that although the form of epic was no longer the popular medium for the expression of the traditional heroic legends, Stesichorus' poetry points to an interest in the revival of heroic tales in a new, musical form that blended echoes from the epic tradition with innovative elements in both diction and subject matter.

Footnotes to chapter VIII.

- 1 The diversity of themes in Heracles' mythical life is well discussed in Kirk, The Nature of Greek Myths (Harmondsworth, 1974) pp. 176-212. K. Galinsky, The Heracles Theme (Oxford, 1972) pp. 9-100 considers the evolution of the hero in his various roles in archaic and classical literature. The most comprehensive account of all the legends of Heracles is Preller/Robert Griechische Mythologie II: Die Griechische Heldensage (Zurich, 1967) pp. 422 ff. .
- 2 See Kirk, op.cit., p. 176 ff. and also Myth, its meaning and functions in ancient and other cultures (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1970) pp. 184 ff. See also Galinsky, op.cit., p. 9.
- 3 Chadwick, "Who were the Dorians?" pp 31 (1976) pp. 103-117.
- 4 Cf. the later traditions of Heracles freeing peoples of Spain from Chrysaor and his three sons, or freeing the "native peoples" in Sicily from King Eryx as Diodorus reports in Book IV 18 and 23 of his Histories.
- 5 See Kirk, op.cit., p. 117 ff. and contra Kirk, Galinsky, op.cit., pp. 12, 13. Galinsky does not entertain the possibility of a later tradition but believes that the passage at Odyssey XI 601 ff. is artistically defensible as it stands; the eidolon of Heracles was created by the poet for the occasion. The problem is compounded however by the appearance of the same lines in a fragment of the Catalogue of Women in the Hesiodic corpus (fr. 25 25 ff. M. & W.). Lines 26 ff. of this fragment as they appear in P.Oxy. 20 are obelised and appear to be related to the post-Hesiodic final part of the Theogony in which Heracles is again placed on snowy Olympus after his toils on earth. For the discussion of the date of lines 900 ff. of the Theogony, see West, Hesiod: the Theogony (Oxford, 1966) pp. 48 ff. . Allen, in "Miscellanea," CQ 22 (1928) p. 73, considers the possibility that Onomacritus (6th/5th century) may have been responsible for interpolations in the text of Hesiod and also in the case of the deified Heracles in Odyssey XI.

- 6 See Kirk, *op.cit.*, pp. 183 ff. .
- 7 See R.Cook, "The date of the Hesiodic Shield," CQ XXXI (1937) pp. 204-214. Cf. J.A. Davison, "Quotations and allusions in early Greek literature," Eranos 53 (1955) p. 137.
- 8 This legend of Heracles' attack on Pylus may reflect an uprising against one of the Mycenaean strongholds. Alternatively, the story may have arisen out of the confusion between the name of the city and a reference to the gate of the Underworld where Heracles shot at Hades according to Iliad V 395 f. Cf. Kirk, *op.cit.*, p. 191.
- 9 See West, *op.cit.*, p. 398 ff. . On the Catalogue, see Schwartz, *op.cit.*, p. 265 ff. and especially 485 ff. .
- 10 West, *op.cit.*, pp. 49, 50.
- 11 Huxley, Greek Epic Poetry (London, 1969) p. 101. Cf. page 130, footnote 16, chapter IV.
- 12 Bowra, GLP p. 91.
- 13 The uncertainty of antiquity is demonstrated by the disagreement between Athenaeus, reporting Megacleides XII 512, who attributes to Stesichorus the invention of the new appearance and arming of Heracles, and Strabo XV 688, who attributes it to Peisander. Cf. Schwartz, *op.cit.*, p. 557, who points out that the two poets may have developed their themes independently, while later scholars confused the two on small points such as the carrying of a club. It is possible too that both poets had a common source, while being independent of one another.
- 14 See Kirk, Myth, its meaning ..., p. 182 and The Nature... p. 191.
- 15 Apollodorus II 5 12, claims the entrance to Hades was at Taenarum (cf. Sophocles' lost Satyr-play Heracles at Taenarum). There are variant suggestions as to the place where Heracles returned from Hades : at Hermione (Pausanias II 35 10) or Mt. Laphystius in Boeotia (Pausanias IX 34 5) or Troezen (Apollodorus II 5 12).
- 16 Apollodorus II 5 12. Bowra, GLP p. 120, mentions the scene on a Middle Corinthian Korymbos from Argos, 600-575 B.C., which depicts Hades, Persephone and Hermes approached by Heracles in the Underworld with Cerberus. For other representations of the Cerberus-legend, see F. Brommer, Herakles (Münster/Köln, 1953) pp. 92-94.
- 17 Caeretan Hydria in Paris, Louvre E 701 = CV III F a' Taf. 8., depicts Heracles with club and lion's skin (the head of the lion over his, like a helmet) grasping a three-headed Cerberus, while only the upper part of Eurystheus is visible above the rim of a huge pithos (date, ca 530 B.C.).
- 18 Cf. for example, the unique creation of Geryon with 6 wings, mentioned by the scholiast on Hesiod's Theogony 287 = PMG 186.
- 19 Peisander's rationalisations are mentioned by Pausanias, II 37 4, in the context of the head of the Hydra.

- 20 Cf. Apollodorus II 5 12.
- 21 Echidna was part nymph, part snake (Theogony 298,299), while Typhon (=Typhoeus) had 100 snake-heads (Theogony 825).
- 22 On Apollodorus' version of the Geryon-legend, see pages 276 ff. and on the Sack of Troy, pages 332,3.
- 23 See Vürtheim, op.cit., p. 26.
- 24 See Bowra, GLP pp. 94 f.; Vürtheim op.cit., p. 27.
- 25 See West, "Further light on Stesichorus' Iliu Persis," ZPE 7 (1971) p. 262. Page, in "Stesichorus' the Sack of Troy and the Wooden Horse," PCPhS 19 (1973) pp. 59 ff. accepts that Stesichorus could have written two separate poems, but rejects the identification of the metrical correspondence between P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 1 and P.Oxy. 2803.
- 26 Bowra, GLP p. 94.
- 27 PMG 269 : Megacleides appears to be responsible for the statement that appears in the argument to the Shield that Stesichorus considered the poem to be by Hesiod. Cf. Schwartz, op.cit., p. 557.
- 28 The poet of the Shield appears to have conflated two separate incidents that are described in Iliad V 385 ff. Ares was imprisoned by Otus and Ephialtes ; Hera and Hades were both wounded by arrows from the bow of Heracles . In Iliad V there is no mention of Ares being wounded by Heracles.
- 29 On the depiction of the Geryon-legend see Brommer, op.cit., pp. 90-92; also Bowra, GLP pp. 100 and 121. Apart from the vase -paintings of ABV, Corinthian and Caeretan wares, we know of such scenes depicted on the Chest of Cypselus and on the throne at Amyclae, as reported by Pausanias (V 19 1 and III 18 13). The most important recent discussion on the evidence of the vase-painters is that of Robertson, "Geryoneis : Stesichorus and the vase-painters," CQ 19 (1969) pp. 207-221.
- 30 Robertson, art.cit., pp. 208 ff. .
- 31 The repetition of the information at Theogony 979 ff. belongs to that part of the poem recognised as a later addition.
- 32 Kirk, Myth, its meaning ... p. 186; The Nature ... p. 191.
- 33 Huxley, op.cit., p. 101, sees in Peisander's interest in Heracles' voyage to the far west a reflection of Rhodian exploration in the western Mediterranean. See also Galinsky, op.cit., pp. 20 and 22, with note 20. The major part of the colonisation of Sicily and southern Italy took place from the 3rd quarter of the 8th century (Cf. Bérard, La colonisation grecque (Paris, 1941) pp. 285 ff.) Preceded by the Phoenicians, the Greeks in Sicily would have heard of land farther to the west. Tartessus is traditionally supposed to have been founded by a Samian, Colaeus, around 630 B.C. (Herodotus IV 152) so that Greek expeditions were probably exploring the western Mediterranean in the mid 7th century

(Bérard, op.cit., pp. 82 f. and 303).

- 34 Page, "Stesichorus: the Geryoneis," JHS 93 (1973) pp. 144-146, following Barrett, makes much use of the version from Apollodorus in his reconstruction of the Stesichorean version.
- 35 Pherecydes of Athens, 6/5th century, tells the story of Heracles' voyage and his threat to Ocean with his bow (Athenaeus XI 470 c,d), not mentioned in Apollodorus' précis.
- 36 On Peisander and Panyassis including in their versions of the acquisition of the Sun's cup through an intermediary, see V.J. Matthews, Panyassis of Halikarnassos (Leiden, 1974) pp. 58,59.
- 37 Page, art.cit., pp. 148,149.
- 38 Barrett, as reported by Page, art.cit., p. 149 and Gentili, in his review of PMG, LSG and SLG in Gnomon 48 (1976) p. 746.
- 39 Cf. Theogony 215: κέρην κλυτοῦ Ῥακεανοῦ.
- 40 Robertson, art.cit., pp. 214 ff. .
- 41 Cf. Page, art.cit., p.153.
- 42 Page, art.cit., p. 147.
- 43 Gentili, art.cit., p. 747. Snell, in his review of The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, vol.32, Gnomon 40 (1968) pp. 118,119.
- 44 Cf. Lobel, The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, vol. 32 (London, 1967) p. 10. Cf. also, Gentili, art.cit., p. 746.
- 45 See page 73, chapter III.
- 46 Reading & | θαναρ[lines 14-15. There is synapheia at this point in the epode in frs.11, 13, 20 and PMG 184, although not in fr. 4 of 2617.
- 47 Page, art.cit., pp. 149,150.
- 48 Cf. page 227 , footnote 4, chapter VI.
- 49 Page, art.cit., p. 148.
- 50 Gentili, art.cit., p. 747.
- 51 Cf. note 35 above.
- 52 Page, art. cit., p. 149.
- 53 See pages 273-274.
- 54 Athenaeus XII 512 c,d =PMG 229. I have given a brief account of the representation of Heracles in Homer and Hesiod in the beginning of this chapter. What Megacleides and Athenaeus meant is not entirely certain,

for Megacleides goes on to hint that the bow was part of Stesichorus' innovative account of Heracles, whereas he certainly carried a bow in Iliad V and was renowned as a bowman in Odyssey XXI. The reference to those who made Heracles "leader of armies" may include Peisander, but more likely means Hecataeus among, presumably, others, known for his rationalising tendencies. Clearly Diodorus knew of such a tradition, for in IV 17 ff. of his Histories Heracles leads an army against Chrysaor and his three sons, in Spain.

- 55 The elusive figure of Xanthus apparently described Heracles in Homeric and Hesiodic fashion; but did he make Heracles a leader of armies?
- 56 Strabo XV 688; cf. footnote 13 above.
- 57 Galinsky, op.cit., p. 16. Cf. Theogony 527: κακὴν δ' ἀπὸ νοῦσον ἄλλανεν.
- 58 Diodorus IV 23.
- 59 Pindar , Nemean III 22.
- 60 See Bowra, Pindar (Oxford, 1964) pp. 74 f. on the Geryon fragment, 169 1-8 (Snell); Galinsky, op.cit., pp. 30 ff. . In a fragment of Aeschylus (74, Nauck) Eurytion and Geryon are called "unjust" to justify Heracles' slaughter: βοτῆρας τ' ἀδίκους.
- 61 Kirk, The Nature..., p.191.
- 62 Whether or not the legends of Heracles' travels alluded to in Hesiod may be traced back to Minoan or Mycenaean contacts with the western Mediterranean in the latter part of the 2nd millenium B.C., the settlers of the 8th and 7th centuries were only conscious of their immediate situation. Gods, myths and rituals would be transported from Greece along with their dialects, scripts , technology and political and social institutions, (cf. Finley, A History of Sicily I (London, 1968) p. 27). E. Sjöqvist, "Heracles in Sicily," ORom 4 (1962) pp. 117-123 gives a fairly sober account of Heracles' adventures originating in the relatively short lived, yet substantial enough contacts between Mycenae and Sicily. (For a less sober theory, see J. Schoo, Hercules' Labors, Fact or fiction ? (Chicago, 1969) pp. 88 ff.). The material evidence points to some Mycenaean, but no Minoan contacts in Sicily, but these are in areas that are not in any way prominent in the Heracles legends from Sicily (Finley, op.cit., pp. 10 ff.) and hence the theories have little if any support.
- 63 Vallet, op.cit., pp. 264 ff..
- 64 Cf. note 33 above.
- 65 Schoo, op.cit., pp. 85 ff. argues that Geryon , the "roarer", owes his origin to the volcano Pico de Teyde on the island of Tenerife in Canaries as part of his theory that the labours of Heracles symbolise man's struggle against the forces of nature?
- 66 Finley, op.cit., p. 27.

Chapter IX That infamous Palinode.

In this and the following chapter I shall consider Stesichorus' treatment of material concerned with the Trojan War. The poems in which the Trojan theme would have been available to Stesichorus other than the Iliad and the Odyssey have not survived except in the late epitomes of Apollodorus and Proclus. While the monumental poems were preserved virtually intact and resisted being superseded by alternative versions, the same is not true of the corpus of mainland epic¹. The uncertainty of authorship of poems such as the Cypria² probably arose because of the circulation of more than one version. Whatever the form of these legends concerning the preliminaries and aftermath of the Trojan War, Stesichorus in his Helen, Sack of Troy and Nostoi apparently remoulded them into a new literary shape, conflating old material from the epic traditions with new elements. Innovations noted by commentators, such as Stesichorus' inclusion of one Klymene among the prisoners taken at Troy (PMG 197) might not have penetrated the basic structure of the legends. On one occasion, however, Stesichorus did introduce what amounted to a revolutionary version of the legend of Helen by declaring that Helen did not go to Troy (PMG 192). Such an innovation called into question the entire mythical basis for the legend of the Trojan War.

Authors from Plato onwards³ testify that Stesichorus originally followed the traditional version of Helen's adultery, which is underplayed in the Homeric Iliad, but which is condemned in the Cypria and in later allusions to it in Sappho and Alcaeus. That the poet embellished his predecessors' recriminations is hinted at in the biographical tradition of his blinding. Unfortunately through lack of any tangible evidence from the citations or from the papyri that would shed some light on the nature or structure of the infamous Palinode, the course of Stesichorean

scholarship on this topic has taken a perilous route through gloom-filled valleys of speculation. The ancient testimonia of the topic are confusing and incompatible one with another as the following tabulated resumé demonstrates:

a) Biographical information	Authors
Poet follows Homeric version of Helen's part in the Trojan Cycle	Plato; Dio Chrys.
Poet insults Helen (no mention of Homer)	Isocrates; Horace (+ schol.) Maximus of Tyre; <u>Suda</u>
Poet blinded by Helen by Dioscuri	Plato; Isocrates; Horace; <u>Suda</u> Dio Chrys.; Conon; Pausanias (Hermeias) schol. on Horace
Realisation and admission of error informed of error by a message from Helen informed through a dream	Plato; Isocrates Conon; Pausanias; (Hermeias) <u>Suda</u>
Recantation: Palinode named a later, second song	Plato; Isocrates; Chamaeleon; Pausanias; Philostratus; Maximus of Tyre; Hermeias; <u>Suda</u> Dio Chrys.
Sight restored : immediately on retraction of insult later	Plato; Isocrates Schol. on Horace; Dio Chrys.; Conon; Pausanias; Hermeias; <u>Suda</u>
b) Content of Palinode	
Helen did not go to Troy	Plato; (Chamaeleon); Dio Chrys.; (Philostratus) (Aristeides + schol.); (Maximus); (Athenaeus); Tzetzes
the eidolon	Plato; Chamaeleon; Aristeides + schol.; Tzetzes
Helen remains in Egypt with Proteus Helen went nowhere	Chamaeleon; schol. on Aristeides; Tzetzes; Dio Chrys.
Words quoted : οὐκ ἔστ' ἔτυμος λόγος οὗτος	Plato; Philostratus; Maximus of Tyre; Athenaeus; Cicero
Encomium of Helen	(Isocrates); schol. on Aristeides; <u>Suda</u>

The texts of the authors listed in the table above are all quoted in PMG 192, apart from Chamaeleon, for whom see PMG 193 and Hermeias, whose commentary on Plato's Phaedrus discusses the passage in question, Phaedrus 243 a.

There are basically four questions that arise out of the evidence as it stands.

- i) What was the relationship of the Palinode to the Helen? (This problem was further confounded by the astounding remark of Chamaeleon, discovered in P.Oxy. 2506 fr. 26, that there were two Palinodes.)
- ii) What was the structure and content of the poems?
- iii) What motivated the poet's repentance?
- iv) Was the poet really blinded?

On the first of these questions there have emerged a multiplicity of theories, some of which required recantation in the light of P.Oxy. 2506 fr. 26. We are presented with almost every possible permutation of the titles Helen, or Helen I and II, and Palinode, or Palinode I and II. The views of scholars may be summarised thus⁴:

- 1) The Helen and Palinode are alternative names for the same poem:
 - a) as one poem : Bowra (1), Davison (1), Kleine, Vürtheim and Bergk (for whom the recantation was a post-script).
 - b) as one poem,
in two parts : Bertini, Vallet, Woodbury.
- 2) The Helen and Palinode are separate poems:
 - a) one Helen and one Palinode : Alsina Clota, Pisani, von Premerstein.
 - b) one Helen, one Palinode
divided into two parts : Farina, Leone, Smotricz.
 - c) one Helen, two Palinodes : Bowra (2), Cataudella, Page, Sisti.
 - d) two Helens, two Palinodes : Calvo-Martinez, Doria, (West).

3) Other suggestions:

- a) two Palinodes, no Helen (the poet began a poem entitled Helen, but never completed it) : Davison (2).
- b) two Palinodes only (the first being part of another poem, the second a poem in its own right) : Podlěcki.

The confusion arises from the fact that no single author mentions both the Palinode and the Helen together. Allusions to the two books of a Helen in the scholiast's introduction to Theocritus Idyll XVIII, in Dio Chrysostom, Orationes XI and Philostratus, Life of Apollonius VI 11, together with the report of the two Palinodes known to Chamaeleon, are countered by the reference to a single Palinode in Plato and Isocrates. The problem is simply insoluble and the attempts of scholars must inevitably be inconclusive. Woodbury's words of caution are particularly apt⁵:

It is probably fair to say that, if we count the ancient witnesses on either side of the question, the preponderant testimony is in favour of two different poems, but no judgment of this kind can be decisive.

Many of the later sources probably relied on Plato's Phaedrus, which account is purposely restricted in the information it imparts. : the Palinode was undoubtedly well-known in Plato's day, as τὴν καλουμένην Παλινωιδίαν indicates (Phaedrus 243 a). That none of our later sources saw fit to expand upon the information we find in Plato (apart from Conon and Pausanias) suggests that they knew little if anything beyond what they had read in Plato or Isocrates. Athenaeus' position, however, is odd. He knew of Chamaeleon as a biographer of Stesichorus (XIV 620c) and is also able to quote from the Geryoneis, the Athla, the Sack of Troy, as well as the Helen, which he names twice (PMG 187, 188). Nowhere does he mention the Palinode, not even when he quotes the famous line οὐκ ἔστ' ἔτυμος λόγος οὔτος (XI 505b), which he appears to consider Plato's in the context of the eulogy of Menon.

What we know of the structure of the Palinode is minimal.

Sources are content to follow a tradition that states that the poet, blinded, composed a second poem in which he retracted his previous slanderous remarks. Some of the sources quote the words that appear in Phaedrus 243 a, but these words became so commonplace that knowledge of them is no indication of any knowledge of the poem itself. Even Cicero quotes them in a letter to Atticus (IX 13 1).

The lines quoted by Plato could not have come from the very beginning of the poem, for Chamæleon supposedly gave two separate invocations for the two Palinodes he knew and these are specifically indicated as first lines:

δουτταὶ γὰρ εἶσι παλινωδῶσαι διαλλαττουσαι, καὶ ἔστιν ἡ μὲν ἀρχή·
 δεῦρ' αὖτε θεὰ φιλόμολπε, τῆς δέ ' χρυσόπτερε παρθένε ,
 ὥς ἀνέγραφε Χαμαιλέων. P.Oxy. 2506 fr.26 i 7-12

Thus, when Plato claims that Stesichorus immediately composed the lines on discovering his error (ἀλλ' ὅτε μουσικὸς ὦν ἔγνω τὴν αἰτίαν, καὶ ποιεῖ εὐθύς), we realise that, unless Plato invented the lines himself⁶, he must have taken them as a famous quotation from the poem and inserted them into his own dramatic picture of Stesichorus creating the Palinode. I conjecture therefore that the Palinode did have the structure of a formal poem, and that it began with an appropriate invocation of the Muse: δεῦρ' αὖτε θεὰ φιλόμολπε⁷. The significance of δεῦρ' αὖτε⁸ may be intended to underscore the fact that the poet had already summoned the assistance of the Muse for the same theme at an earlier time, but whether this was on the same occasion of the performance of the Palinode is not certain. It seems more probable that the composition of a poem castigating Helen occurred at an earlier date in the poet's literary career.

It is possible that the invocation was followed by a statement of the contents of the poem. Not only do we find such an introductory

section in Iliad or Odyssey I, and in the Catalogue of Women (fr. 1 6 ff. M. & W.), but also in lyric, as for example in the shape of a priamel in Ibycus, PMG 282. The second line of Pindar's Olympian II also gives in briefest fashion an outline of themes: τῖνα θεόν, τῖν' ἥρωα, τῖνα δ' ἄνδρα κελαδήσομεν; In addition, or alternatively, there might have been some personal remarks made by the poet before he embarked upon his narrative, such as one finds in Alcman fr. 3 8 : δέ μ' ἄγει πεδ' ἄγων' ἔμεν ... or in Pindar Olympian III 6-9:

ἔπει χαῖταισι μὲν ζευχθέντες ἐπὶ στέφανου
 πρῶσσοντί με τοῦτο θεόδοματον χρέος,
 φόρμιγγά τε ποικιλόγαυρον καὶ βοᾶν αὐλῶν ἐπέων τε θέσιν
 Αἰνησιδάμου παιδὶ συμμῆσαι πρεπόντως, ἃ τε Πίσσα με γεγωνεῖν.

Hesiod's introduction to the Theogony comprises a hymn to the Muses and a declaration of his subject within which is interwoven a personal element in the form of a description of his encounter with the Muses on Helicon (lines 22 ff.). Pindar in the first Olympian, after a preamble in praise of Olympia, of Hieron and an invocation to the lyre requesting a suitable myth, declares (line 36) that he will tell quite a different tale from that told by his predecessors: οὐδ' Ταντάλου, σὲ δ' ἀντὶα προτέρων φθέγξομαι. He then summarises the rejected version (lines 37-51), recoils at having even let it cross his lips (line 52) and predicts potential misfortune in the gnomic ἀκέρδεια λέλογχεν θαμινὰ κακαγόρος (line 53).

It is thus possible to imagine a similar introduction in Stesichorus' Palinode. After his invocation of the Muse, he could have combined an outline of or allusion to his previous version, with self-criticism for reiterating the Homeric version, accusing himself of having been "blind", as Homer literally was, to believe that Helen went to Troy. The demonstrative οὗτος, which qualifies λόγος, is generally used in reference to what has preceded, so that the poet must have stated the erroneous version and then proceeded to deny its truth with the words:

οὐκ ἔστ' ἔτυμος λόγος οὗτος. A parallel use of λόγος οὗτος is to be found in Pindar's Olympian IX 30 ff.⁹. After an introductory section praising Opous and the power of poetry that leads to the sententia, ἀγαθοὶ δὲ καὶ σοφοὶ κατὰ δαίμον' ἄνδρες ἐγένοντ' (line 28), he begins to demonstrate the intercession of the daemon in the case of heroes:

Heracles was able to challenge the gods Poseidon, Apollo and Hades. In the space of five lines the poet conflates three separate encounters between Heracles and gods in the epic tradition¹⁰. Then he stops himself: ἀπό μοι λόγον τοῦτον, στόμα, ῥῦψον, (lines 35,36). Such legends of strife among the gods are to be eschewed (cf. Olympian I) as misrepresentative. There should be no wars on Olympus: ἔα πόλεμον μάχαν τε πᾶσαν χωρὶς ἀθανάτων (lines 40-41). With this admonition he reverts to the major theme of the ode, namely the legend of the city of Opous. The section on Heracles (lines 30 ff.) has a complex relationship with the rest of the ode, but at one of its less oblique levels it constitutes a rejection of myths recounting any discreditable action of the gods or of Heracles ἥρως θεός¹¹.

In his argument that the Palinode of Stesichorus was a poem in which the poet corrected himself in mid-stream, Woodbury cites Pindar's Olympian I, lines 52,53, as an example of such a "recantation in the archaic linear style"¹². Although the instances in Solon and Hérodoteus may indeed demonstrate a "correction in stride"¹³, Pindar's first Olympian is not correctly so termed. The poet did mention in line 36 previously that he was about to tell a different tale; he must first repeat in an outline the content of the accepted version in order to emphasise the horrifying implications of cannibalism imputed to the gods. He proceeds to his own version of the legend of Tantalus' downfall using the exclamation ἐμοὶ δ' ἄπορα ... ἀφύσταμα (line 52) as a transition. In this

Pindar is correcting the erroneous or blasphemous statements of others in which he refuses to acquiesce, ἀφύσταται ; he is not correcting himself. Another example of Pindar's criticism of his predecessors occurs in his observation in Nemean VII 22 ff. that the power of poetry can mesmerise a man and lead him astray, while man himself is blind to the truth :

σοφία δὲ κλέπτει παράγουσα μύθους· τυφλὸν δ' ἔχει
ἦτορ ὄμιλος ἀνδρῶν ὁ πλεῖστος. εἰ γὰρ ἦν
ἐ τὰν ἀλάθειαν ἰδέμεν ... Nemean VII 23-25

He states the aspect of the myth in question that he felt to be wrong, namely that Ajax committed suicide because of the unfair judgment in awarding the armour of Achilles to Odysseus and not to him . Then by praising him as mightiest after Achilles in battle, he endeavours to "rehabilitate" the hero whose honour and prowess came closer to Pindar's ideal of the heroic than the devious machinations of Odysseus. Again the poet gives the version that is erroneous or misleading, and it is interesting that in this case Pindar employs the same metaphor that Stesichorus appears to have, namely blindness to the truth. It is not unreasonable to suppose that, in view of the use of "blindness to the truth" in such instances as the Pindaric ode just mentioned, Stesichorus did indeed employ a similar metaphorical expression, and that the tradition of Stesichorus' blindness sprang from seeds sown by the poet's own declaration of his being ignorant or unaware of the true legend in this way¹⁴.

The lines quoted by Plato reveal that in the Palinode Helen did not go to Troy. Until the discovery of P.Oxy. 2506 there were two schools of thought as to what happened to Helen in Stesichorus' poem. The eidolon of Helen went to Troy, that was certainly part of Stesichorus' poem, and probably his invention¹⁵. But what of Helen herself? Some sources maintained that she was in Egypt (scholia on Aristeides and Tzetzes), but this possibility was faulted on the grounds that Herodotus

made no mention of Stesichorus in his report of the Egyptian tradition of Helen (Histories II 112 ff.). Dio clearly excluded Stesichorus from those he understood to have written of Helen going to Egypt with Paris (Euripides primarily), declaring that she went nowhere at all in Stesichorus' version. The inconsistency in the ancient testimonia was partly resolved by Chamaeleon's statement:

... ὡς ἀνέγραψε Χαμαιλέων. αὐτὸς δέ φησιν ὁ Στησίχορος
τὸ μὲν εἰδῶλον ἐλθεῖν ἐς Τροίαν, τὴν δ' Ἑλένην παρὰ
τῷ Πρωτεῦ καταμεῖναι. P.Oxy. 2506 fr.26 i 12-16

Thus, if Chamaeleon's testimony is acceptable, and there seems little cause for him to be misleading as to the whereabouts of Helen, then one can assume that Stesichorus' poem included some account of Helen's sojourn in Egypt with Proteus. Some scholars have forwarded various hypotheses as to how Helen reached Egypt¹⁶, while others have sought for parallels between Stesichorus' poem and Euripides' Helen¹⁷, which is specifically devoted to Helen in Egypt, but the contents of Stesichorus' narrative lie beyond our ken.

Inversely proportional to the amount of discussion on the Helen and the Palinode is the small number of surviving quotations. The citations from later authors number six, possibly seven (PMG 187-191 and 223, placed in the section of Incerti loci by Page, but believed by Bergk to belong to the Helen). The fragments do point to a poem in which there occurred some derogatory remarks about the daughters of Tyndareus, including Helen, and to episodes that might belong either to what we assume to be the poem that caused offence or to the poem that gave the revised version of the legend.

From scholiast A on Iliad II 339 (=PMG 190) we learn that Stesichorus told the story of the wooing of Helen and of the oath that her father Tyndareus demanded of the suitors to respect and protect Helen's

marriage. In accordance with the oath the unsuccessful suitors joined forces to sail against Troy when Helen was abducted by Paris:

καὶ μετ' οὐ πολὺ ἀρπασθείσης αὐτῆς ὑπὸ Ἀλεξάνδρου
ἐκοινῶνησαν τῇ στρατείᾳ διὰ τοὺς γενομένους ὄρκους.
ἡ ἱστορία παρὰ Στησιχόρῳ.

PMG 190

Thus the commentator presupposes that Stesichorus composed a poem on the events that preceded Helen's marriage, on the marriage itself and the subsequent elopement to Troy. If Proclus' summary of the Cypria is a fair quantitative representation of the eleven books of Stasinus or Hegesias, it would appear that little attention was paid in that epic to the development of the tale of Helen's marriage. From the dispute among the goddesses and the celebrated judgment of Paris, the poet proceeded to the preparations of Paris about to sail to Greece and his arrival at the house of the already married Helen and Menelaus. Menelaus himself instigates the expedition of the foremost princes in Greece to recover Helen. Somewhat less than half of the summary (20 lines out of 77 in the OCT) gives an account of the expedition's activities before the beginning of the Iliad. None of the citations refers to the wooing or marriage of Helen and it is interesting to note that Athenaeus (III 334b) quotes lines from the Cypria giving Helen's parents as Nemesis and Zeus. There is no mention of Tyndareus' oath, and it seems that he was not represented in that tradition as the father of Helen. He may well have never been mentioned in the poem¹⁸.

For Stesichorus, on the other hand, Tyndareus was all important. He makes Tyndareus himself responsible for his daughter's adultery by incurring the wrath of Aphrodite through the simple omission of a sacrifice (PMG 223). As an indirect cause of the Trojan War, this version differs from that of the Ionian epic tradition, in which the displeasure of Eris is blamed. Both versions, it is true, trace the cause of strife

back to a goddess's displeasure at being forgotten: variations on the identity of the goddess and the circumstances in question can easily be adapted to the basic structure. Stesichorus' choice of Aphrodite seems to accentuate the root-cause of the war as sexual passion or desire, and not the remote impersonality of Eris. In the Iliad, on the whole, Helen's culpability is played down. None of the Greeks expresses any reproach against her, apart from Achilles, who for his own selfish reasons objects to fighting for another man's wife (Iliad IX 337 ff.) and implies her responsibility for the senseless and debilitating war (XIX 320 ff.; cf. I 152 ff.). The Trojan elders on the wall would see her gone, but Priam quickly intercedes, claiming that she is in no way culpable in his eyes (III 145 ff.)¹⁹. However, in Stesichorus, it is both Helen and Aphrodite who are responsible for the war. Aphrodite's gift of beauty caused Helen to be attractive to, and attracted by, various heroes other than her husband Menelaus. Stesichorus also portrayed the power of her devastating beauty in the episode in which some Greeks, incensed with hatred for the cause of the war, were about to stone her, but at the very sight of her dropped the stones in wonder (PMG 201).

Hesiod had already moved away from the Homeric view of Helen, passing moral judgment on her responsibility for the downfall of the race of Heroes (Works and Days 165)²⁰. The scholiast on Euripides' Orestes 249 mentions Hesiod in conjunction with Stesichorus as one who represented the daughters of Tyndareus faithless to their husbands (fr. 176 ; cf. fr. 23 (a) 30 possibly being κτεῖνε δὲ μητέρα [ἦν λυπεσὴν] οὐρα ...). The extensive section of the Catalogue of Women devoted to the arrival of the suitors at the house of Tyndareus suggests that Stesichorus may have turned to that tradition for material for his poem²¹.

Another possible source for the Tyndarid tradition would be

Sparta. In Alcman's Partheneion, lines 3-11, appear the names of ten sons of Hippocoon, in a catalogue of those slain in the feud between Hippocoon and Heracles, or Tyndareus. The latter was reinstated on the Spartan throne by Heracles after one such war (cf. Pausanias III 15 3 ff. and Apollodorus II 7 3 ff.), but Page is probably correct in his assumption that this passage in Alcman deals with Tyndareus himself in a legend of which we possess a small hint in Plutarch's Theseus²². There, one of the sons of Hippocoon, Enarsphorus, whose name appears in line 3 of the Partheneion, had raped Helen when she was still a child. The conflict described in the Partheneion could belong to the story of Tyndareus' retribution for the rape, after Tyndareus was again ruler in Sparta. Such an interpretation would also account for the presence of Polydeuces, who would have no logical place in the earlier legend of Heracles' feud with Hippocoon. It is also suggested that the moral drawn by the poet at line 16 ff. (μή τις ἀνθρώπων ἐς ὠρανὸν ποτήσῃω μηδὲ κηρήτω γαμήν τῶν Ἀποδύτων) might have some bearing upon the rape of Helen and the punishment inflicted, if Helen were regarded as divine rather than human, and particularly if she were connected with the cult that is being celebrated by the chorus²³. There is, however, no apparent association with Stesichorus' legend of Tyndareus' insult to Aphrodite.

It is unfortunate that we do not possess more of Alcman's poetry that might give us some indication of his treatment of the legend of Helen. Fragments of commentaries on Alcman testify to his treatment of the legend surrounding the cult of the Dioscuri and of Helen and Menelaus; PMG 7, in particular, concurs with the evidence from the scholiast on Euripides' Troades 210 and Harpocration that Alcman wrote a poem dealing with the cult of Helen and the Dioscuri at Therapne. There is no indication that Alcman did not follow the epic tradition of Helen's flight

with Paris²⁴. It does seem probable that he composed on the theme of Helen's wedding, to which PMG 19 (quoted by Athenaeus III 110f) referring to cakes at a wedding, might belong. A little later in the same book, Athenaeus follows his quotation of the lines from Stesichorus' Helen on the Cydonian quinces (PMG 187) with the words: καὶ Ἀλκμάν ... (PMG 99). Since the apple or quince had erotic connotations and the ripe apple could symbolise the bride ripe for marriage (cf. Sappho PLF 105 (a))²⁵, it seems more than likely that Alkman's reference to Cydonian quinces derived from the context of a wedding, possibly that of Helen.

Of the wedding of Helen and Menelaus in Stesichorus' poem we have only the evidence of PMG 187, but these three lines suggest that the procession of the ἀναξ, Menelaus, was described in some detail. Schematic accounts of such processions do occur in epic, as represented on the shield of Achilles, Iliad XVIII 491 ff, and on that of Heracles in the Hesiodic Shield 272 ff., in which the gleaming torches, the music of flutes and lyres and the chant of the ὑμέναιος dominate the scene. The music and song were undoubtedly prominent in Stesichorus' description of the wedding also. Traditional songs from wedding celebrations have been preserved among the fragments of Sappho's epithalamia²⁶. One fragment (PLF 44) shows the way in which Sappho has integrated the conventions of a wedding ceremony into a narrative poem of epic quality. The procession of Hector and Andromache advances joyfully amid strains of the flute and songs (lines 24 ff. and 31 ff.), while the air is laden with the fragrance of incense (line 30). Andromache's dowry included fine garments and jewels (line 8 ff.) which she no doubt wore on this grand occasion, together with the ubiquitous garlands of delicate flowers (cf. Himerius, Orationes IX 4). In this fragment Sappho has blended the diction of epic with that of epithalamia in her treatment of a theme that was not, as far as we know,

precedented in epic. Under Sappho's masterful touch, the scene sparkles with life. Stesichorus' depiction of the procession of Menelaus is perhaps more akin to the atmosphere of epic. The diction of PMG 187 displays the typically Stesichorean adaptation of formulaic phrases, as for example ὦν τε κορωνίδας οὔλας or ῥοδύνους στεφάνους²⁷. The erotic symbolism of the apple is non-epic in origin and the garlands described are more closely associated with non-epic themes, such as the drinking-party²⁸. However, the use of ἀνακτε and the hints that the description of the procession included all the accoutrements of a wedding-scene on a magnificent scale, preserve the elevation of epic atmosphere with renewed vigour.

The commentator who wrote the introductory preface to the eighteenth Idyll of Theocritus believed that the poet had included material from Stesichorus' first book of the Helen (or from the first version of the Helen?). Theocritus' poem represents the song sung outside the bedroom of Helen and Menelaus, and so it has been inferred that Stesichorus' poem included such a song, presumably distinct from the processional song from which PMG 187 derives. Both the commentator and Athenaeus knew of a poem, the Helen, in which the wedding of Helen and Menelaus was celebrated. Neither citation mentions anything of an offensive poem. Athenaeus, however, quotes the lines that appear in the Phaedrus, but makes no reference to the Palinode (XI 505b). In one other place Athenaeus mentions the Helen, to quote λιθαργύρεον ποδανικτῆρα (. X 451d = PMG 188). If the Helen and the Palinode were the same, why did he not cite his source? There are two possible answers: either he found the lines in Plato, without a title other than τὴν καλουμένην Παλινωιδίαν or else he knew the lines οὐκ ἔστ' ἔτυμος λόγος did not belong to the Helen. Both these alternatives at least indicate the likelihood of the Helen and the Palinode being separate poems.

The reference to Helen's affair with Theseus, reported by Pausanias II 22 (=PMG 191), presumably belongs to that part of the legend that the poet later retracted, since the episode would correspond to one of the three marriages alluded to in the epithet *τρυγάνους* (PMG 223). Again, the outline in Pausanias could constitute the summary of a fairly lengthy episode (cf. ... ἔπη ποιήσαντες, πρότερον δ' ἔτε Σιτησύχορος ὁ Ἰμεραῖος) which hints at the existence of a full-scale poem on the version of the myth of Helen later rescinded in the Palinode.

Such then is the meagre evidence of the poet's composition on the legend of Helen²⁹, amongst which there are allusions to episodes that may have been potentially offensive in some quarters. Thus it seems to me more than likely that there existed a distinct poem, the Helen, the content of which was later rejected in a second poem, the Palinode.

As far as the evidence of P.Oxy. 2506 is concerned, it may be that Chamaeleon, detecting Stesichorus' criticism of Hesiod in some other poem, not in the infamous Palinode, drew attention to the fact by claiming that the poem was also a Palinode, a separate, second Palinode, giving it the title by analogy with the one mentioned by Plato in the Phaedrus. Chamaeleon appears to have had a penchant for the sensational in tracing and repeating scandalous anecdotes about literary figures, including the accusation levelled by Sophocles at Aeschylus for drunk and disorderly behaviour³⁰. In P.Oxy. 2506 fr. 26, Chamaeleon appears to have been interested in the fact of one poet criticising another poet's version of a particular myth. We are told only of the aspects of Homer's version that the poet criticised, not those of Hesiod's. It is noteworthy, however, that there is no mention of the poet's blindness. It may be, therefore, that by a huge stretch of his imagination Chamaeleon converted a passing reference made by Stesichorus against a particular story in

Hesiod into an entire Palinode , but did not, and could not, elaborate upon the version that was "recanted" ³¹.

The third and fourth problems indicated above, namely the poet's blindness and motivation for composing the Palinode are in part interdependent in their possible solutions. The poet's blindness is given in the ancient sources as an affliction resulting from his slanderous misrepresentations of Helen in a poem. His sight is restored after the composition of a recantation ; by atoning for his sin he was duly cured. The poet's recantation in their eyes was motivated by a desire to regain his sight as much as to rehabilitate Helen.

Interpretations of the poet's motives for composing the Palinode depend upon one's interpretation of the poet's "blindness". If, for example, the poet had been genuinely blinded, stricken with a physical failure of his ability to see, then can we believe the accounts of Plato and Isocrates, in which the poet in the course of performing his poem recognised the cause of his sudden affliction, and just as suddenly regained his sight upon composing the Palinode, all on one occasion? Nor is the belief in a later cure, after a period of time, or on the later completion of the Palinode, any more convincing, despite Devereux's efforts to explain the story in terms of self-purification after a fit of hysterical blindness ³². The legend of the poet's blindness must be a biographical fiction, which the ancients were wholly uncritical in accepting.

It is generally accepted that the reference to the loss of vision must be a figurative use of "blindness" in the sense of ignorance, and this is particularly clear in view of the words with which Plato introduces the Palinode in Phaedrus 243 a:

ἔστιν δὲ τοῖς ἀμαρτάνουσι περὶ μυθολογίαν καθαυτοὺς ἀρχαῖος ὃν
 Ὅμηρος μὲν οὐκ ἤσθετο, Στῆσίχορος δέ. τῶν γὰρ ὁμμάτων στερηθεὶς
 διὰ τὴν Ἑλένης κακηγορίαν οὐκ ἠγνόησεν ὥσπερ Ὅμηρος, ἀλλ' ἄτε
 μουσικὸς ὢν ἔγνω τὴν αἰτίαν καὶ ποιεῖ εὐθεὺς ...

The statement that poetry glorifying the past for the edification of the future generations is nothing without the Muses (Phaedrus245a) seems to reflect the implication in 243a in μουσικὸς that Stesichorus had the blessing of the Muses in his realisation of the truth. It would appear that Plato may have remoulded a figurative allusion that Stesichorus made to his "blindness" into an actual event in order to create a better parallel for the progression from ignorance to the truth in the three stages represented by Homer, Stesichorus and Socrates. Homer was blind (it is implied) because he was ignorant of his misrepresentation of the gods, in his repetition of legends that were not true. Stesichorus might have suffered the same fate through repeating what he found in Homer, but he knew how to retract what he had said on realising that he has uttered grave untruths. Through his realisation and recantation he had averted permanent blindness. Socrates would be even wiser, σοφώτερος (243b); he would prevent blindness from the outset, composing his recantation immediately. From this we can see how Plato has integrated the theme of the Palinode thoroughly into the structure of the dialogue and it would therefore not be surprising if he had tinged the background to Stesichorus' recantation with touches of his own brush³³. The poet's blindness was probably intended to be taken at both literal and metaphorical levels. The antithesis of Homer's blindness to the truth and Socrates' vision could be enhanced by an intermediary stage in which the poet (Stesichorus) regains his lost vision under the guidance of the true Muse.

The Muses were the poet's source of information, but they could, at will, supply him with false information. Hence in the Theogony

they declare:

ποιμένες ἄγραυλοι, καὶ ἑλέγχεα, γαστέρες οἶον,
 ἴδμεν φεύδεα πολλὰ λέγειν ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα
 ἴδμεν δ', εὖτ' ἐθέλωμεν, ἀληθέα γηρύσασθαι. Theogony 26-28

While they graced Hesiod with their presence and breathed into him the
 αὐδὴν θέσπιν, they also had the power to deprive a poet such as
 Demodocus of his sight (Odyssey VIII 64) or Thamyris of his poetic vision
 whether or not this included his actual vision (Iliad II 599,600). The
 poets of the Archaic age apparently elaborated on the notion of blindness
 as the correlative of ignorance and falsehood, the most significant being
 Pindar. Pindar twice uses the motif of blindness to the truth with
 regard to the poet's treatment of myth. In the fragment of Paeon VII
 he invokes the Muses, for without them the aspirant poets are blind in
 their φρένες

ἐπεύχομαι δ' οὐρανοῦ τ' εὐπέπλωι θυγατρὶ
 Μναμῶσυναι κόραϊσι τ' εὐμαχανίαν δίδομεν.
 τυφλαὶ γὰρ ἀνδρῶν φρένες
 ὅρτις ἀνευθ' Ἑλικωνιάδων
 βαθεῖαν ἐλθ[όν]των ἐρευν[α] σφοδαίς ὁδόν.
 ἐμοὶ τοῦτο[ν] δ[έ]δω[καν] ἀθάνατ[ο]ν κόνον Paeon VII 1-6

The poet requires a certain vision to perform his allotted task. The
 immortal task that Pindar has inherited is that of conveying the truth. In
 one instance already mentioned, Olympian I, he criticises previous poets
 for telling false tales of the gods. The motif of blindness recurs in
Nemean VII where he claims that the power of Homer's words have deceived
 men into believing ill of Aias. Unlike Hesiod, he does not allow the
 poet to shirk his responsibility by pretending that the Muses can if they
 will impart false as well as true things. Rather he criticises the common
 herd for their blindness, their inability to see the truth under the spell
 of Homer's beguiling words:

ἐγὼ δὲ πλέον' ἔλπομαι
 λόγον Ὀδυσσεὸς ἢ πᾶσαν διὰ τὸν ἀδυσπῆ γενέσθ' Ὀμηρον'

ἐπεὶ ψεύδεσσι οὐ ποτανῶι <τε> μαχανῶι
 σεμνὸν ἔπεστί τι· σοφία δὲ κλέπτει παράγοισα μύθοις· τυφλὸν δ' ἔχει
 ἦτορ ὁμιλὸς ἀνδρῶν ὁ πλεῖστος. εἰ γὰρ ἦν
 εἰ τὰν ἀλάθειαν ἰδέμεν, οὐ κεν ...

Nemean VII 20-25

In this ode, Pindar employs the motif of blindness to indicate how misconceptions can occur, as a foreshadowing of his own recantation of the way in which he has presented Neoptolemus in another poem, Paeon VI ³⁴. Pindar's recantation is couched in a series of allusive statements that seem to hint that he was not totally convinced of what he said, but was concerned to strike a compromise, thus offending no one. The poet; therefore, reinforces an illusion that he is recanting his earlier statements about the murderous Neoptolemus by incorporating the misrepresentation of Aias in Homer, of which he was convinced. By referring to Aias' part in the expedition specifically to retrieve Helen,

ὃν κράτιστον Ἀχιλλεύς ἄτερ μάχαι
 ξανθῶι Μενέλαϊ δάμαρτα κομίσαι θοαῖς
 ἐν ναυσὶ πόρευσαν εὐθυπνόου Ζεφύροιο πομπῇ
 πρὸς Ἴλιου πόλιν.

Nemean VII 27-30

rather than demonstrating Aias' prowess in the actual fighting or in the Funeral Games for Patroclus, in close association with the motif of blindness to the truth, Pindar may have intended to make an oblique reference to Stesichorus' criticism of Homer and his recantation of the myth of Helen ³⁵.

Stesichorus' use of the motif of blindness must have lain somewhere between that of the belief in the literal blindness of Thamyris, deprived of his poetic skills, and Pindar's concept of the τυφλὰ φρένες of those attempting to ascend the steep path without the aid of the Muses, or of men unable to discern truth from falsehood in poetry. Woodbury believes that the allusion to blindness made by Stesichorus was referring to his loss of poetic vision, that is the cessation of his poetic vision, the

essential tool of his trade as a professional bard, but only within the context of a single performance³⁶. This theory would be more cogent if Stesichorus is to be thought of as an oral bard, which he is not³⁷, and is designed to explain the situation as described in Plato and Isocrates, in which the actual performance is halted momentarily by the poet's affliction. Since, however, we have seen that the evidence of the citations could point to the existence of a Helen that was circulated as an actual poem before the composition of the Palinode and that Plato, followed by Isocrates, may have been responsible for a dramatisation for his own purposes of the poet's allusion to his "blindness", there is no reason opposing the supposition that the poet had suffered from loss of poetic vision over a period of time. In other words the poet underwent a "bad spell" in which his success as a public entertainer declined.

Assuming that the poet's blindness was a figurative expression for his loss of skill as a popular entertainer, can we understand his motivation for producing a revised version of the myth of Helen other than as an attempt to draw the public eye in his direction as the creator of a revolutionary account of the myth of Helen? Plato gives as his reason the offence against Helen, neatly parallel with Socrates' fictitious offence against Eros. Isocrates too maintains that it was the insult to Helen, since he is writing a panegyric of that lady. These explanations fall strictly within the structural limits of the respective works of Plato and Isocrates. A variety of theories have been propounded that give some external motivations for the poet's change in attitude. Most centre upon a semi-religious, semi-political base³⁸. A poet who held the ear of the masses through his capacity as an entertainer might be usefully employed as a medium for propaganda, whether at the instigation of the priesthood at Sparta, or in Magna Graecia, who were desirous of promoting

the cult of the deified Helen and her brothers, the Dioscuri. The change in religious atmosphere might or might not have political overtones. Sparta certainly had ulterior motives in the acquisition of the bones of Orestes, namely to sanction her bid for hegemony in the Peloponnese. However, Stesichorus' links with Sparta are somewhat tenuous, nor are the political implications of a purified Helen in Sparta entirely clear.

Some scholars are of the opinion that a political background to the Palinode can be extracted from the situation of rivalry among some of the city-states in southern Italy³⁹. One of the few traditions connected with the legend of the poet's blindness that is not in any way related to the Platonic and Isocratean version is to be found in Conon and Pausanias⁴⁰. These authors were aware of a tradition that linked Stesichorus' recovery of his sight indirectly to the war that was fought between the cities of Locris and Croton. The Locrians were heavily outnumbered, and yet on being instructed to pray to the Dioscuri by the Spartans from whom they had sought military aid⁴¹, they defeated the Crotonians. It was a Crotonian general who supposedly conveyed the information to Stesichorus after the battle that the defamation of Helen was the reason for his affliction. From this statement it would appear that Stesichorus had been in the employ of the people of Croton, possibly composing counter-propaganda to encourage them in the face of the confidence inspired in the Locrians by the Dioscuri⁴². Such propaganda could have included insidious remarks about the woman, Helen, supposed sister of the Dioscuri. Croton was expected to win through superiority of numbers, and we may well have some reminiscence of Stesichorus' words directed at the Locrians in the warning recorded by Aristotle in Rhetoric II 21:

... οἷον εἴ τις λέγει ὅπερ Στησίχορος ἐν Λοκροῖς εἶπεν ὅτι οὐ
δεῖ ὑβριστὰς εἶναι, ὅπως μὴ οὐ τέττιγες χαμόθεν αἰδῶσιν.

Stesichorus may have warned the Locrians that their presumption would bring destruction to their lands, The ἐν Λοκροῖς in Aristotle may have been a misunderstanding of Stesichorus' position ⁴³. Aristotle or his source might have naturally assumed that the warning was delivered by Stesichorus while in Locris, but in a situation of hostility between Locris and Croton, Stesichorus, in the employ of the Crotonians, could have uttered the warning as part of his encouragement to the people of Croton, without being anywhere near Locris.

If it were the case that Stesichorus composed a poem slighting the sister of the Dioscuri on account of the Locrian confidence in their aid, it is possible to see why Plato used such a strong word as κακηγορία, which hardly seems appropriate for a direct imitation of the story of Helen as found in Homer. For, other than presenting Helen at Troy with Paris, the Homeric epic tradition does not offer a harshly critical or incriminating view of Helen, but is almost sympathetic towards her. Her character may have been denigrated in the Cypria and in the continuing tradition from continental epic into later poets, as for example Sappho and Alcaeus. For his unfavourable account of Helen, Stesichorus either drew on sources other than the Homeric epics, or else indulged his own imaginative talent. In such a hypothesis of a poem composed for the people of Croton, one can explain the confusion in later writers. Plato and Isocrates knew of the poem in which offensive things had been uttered but if they knew of the specific context, they chose not to repeat it, being more concerned with the recantation itself. Woodbury's theory of the loss of poetic vision could be explained either as the poet's own awareness that his poem had failed in its purpose, since the Crotonians lost the day, or as a result of the people of Croton giving the poet a bad reputation : he could have been "black-listed". The Crotonians, incensed

at their unexpected defeat, may also have shelved the blame onto their official bard for his indiscretion in castigating Helen, forcing him to retract or be fired. Whatever the reason, the poet would have no wish to be remembered for his failure and hence a recantation would restore his public reputation.

This hypothesis rests solely on the fact that Pausanias and Conon mention a link between Stesichorus' supposed blindness and the battle at the river Sagra⁴⁴. The question is not without its problems, one of the most crucial being the uncertainty as to the dates of the battle in relation to the far from certain dates of Stesichorus' lifetime. It has also to be admitted that the likelihood of the offensive poem being preserved in such a situation is slight. We should then have to suppose that the information imparted by the scholiast on Theocritus and others was based on hearsay and that the quotation in PMG 187, known to Athenaeus as the Helen, was in fact the Palinode. Thus, attractive though it may be to envisage an Italian background to the origin of the Palinode, the evidence and the unanswered or unanswerable questions permit it to be no more than a hypothetical solution.

Woodbury alone considered in detail the problem of the poet's blindness, its cause and the motivation for its cure, in literary terms, from a point of view quite removed from any political or religious impositions on the poet from external sources. It is perfectly conceivable that the poet resolved his affliction, the blindness in his *ορφνες*, as a purely personal matter. Although we can see political motivation influencing Pindar in his alteration of the legend of Neoptolemus, rehabilitation of Aias and his refusal to repeat the legend in which the gods are served goulash of Pelops by Tantalus, it is the poet's personal beliefs and taste that are responsible, not some external agency.

Similarly the criticism levelled against Homer's and Hesiod's treatment of the gods by Xenophanes (DK 21 B 11) was based primarily on that philosopher's world-view and metaphysical theory of monotheism (DK 21B 24, 25+26)⁴⁵. In his prescription for the type of poetry that is acceptable Xenophanes anticipates the view of Plato on the subject:

χρή δὲ πρῶτον μὲν θεῶν ὕμνεῖν εὐφρονας ἄνδρας
 εὐφρόνους μύθοις καὶ καθαροῖσι λόγοις
 σκεῖσάντας δὲ καὶ εὐξαμένους τὰ δίκαια δύνασθαι
 κῆρσαι. ταῦτα γὰρ ὦν ἔστι προχειρότερον. DK 21 B 1 13 ff.

Stesichorus' recantation could be described in such terms and may have been prompted by a change in personal beliefs, whether or not influenced by the increased popularity of Helen and the Dioscuri as cult-figures in southern Italy (and Sicily) in the 6th century⁴⁶. Certainly by the latter half of the 6th century in southern Italy there was not only the critical approach to the old legends presented by Xenophanes, but also the growth of the Pythagorean communities whose reverence for Helen and the Dioscuri as the personification of heavenly phenomena⁴⁷ gives the impression of an attempt to incorporate some elements of popular religion into their philosophical systems. Both Pythagoras and Xenophanes were exiles from the eastern Greek world, for reasons not altogether clear. They both undoubtedly found the climate of southern Italy more tolerant of their views (although Xenophanes found Pythagorean beliefs, such as metempsychosis, an equally suitable target for his criticism⁴⁸). Criticism and revision of traditional legends may not have been an entirely novel activity. As was suggested in chapter VIII⁴⁹, myths had to be accommodated to a new environment. Once the habit of changing or altering myths had become an established pattern, necessity could give way to personal whim as a reason for the introduction of new elements. It is possible, therefore, that in the generation prior to the arrival of Pythagoras and Xenophanes in the west (in the latter half of the 6th century), Stesichorus in the course of

having introduced innovations in other legends became convinced that the generally accepted version of the myth of Helen was wrong, and that he had been wrong to follow it in his treatment of the myth in the past. It may have been the case that his convictions were also founded in part on the need to revive his waning popularity. Perhaps the poet in his old age attempted to regain his popular image by turning to a new, revitalised and purified version of the legend of Helen. About this innovation we can say that, unlike the alterations the poet introduced into the traditional versions of myths, alterations that did not affect the basic structure of those myths, the revision of the legend of Helen completely denied all previous epics on the Trojan theme and must have created a momentous impact. It is therefore all the more unfortunate in the case of the Palinode that we do not know the background to this total volte-face, for we might learn from it much about the poet's attitude to his function in relating the traditional myths to his audience in whatever form he chose.

Footnotes to chapter IX.

1 See Allen, "Miscellanea," CQ 22 (1928) p. 74.

2 Stasinus according to the scholiast A on Iliad I 5 (=Allen fr. 1). Athenaeus gives the alternatives of Hagesias or Stasinus, XV 682e (= Allen fr. 4 of the Cypria). Other ancient authors, for example, Pausanias and the scholiasts on Euripides and Pindar refer to the poets who wrote the Cypria. Huxley, op.cit., p. 141, assumes a plurality of authors.

3 Plato, in the Phaedrus 243 a gives the earliest account of the Palinode, preserving three lines from that poem. Some scholars have thought that Isocrates' Helen was written before the Phaedrus (e.g. Hackforth, Plato's Phaedrus (Cambridge, 1952) p. 34, note 2), but the two authors, being contemporaries, may have had independent knowledge of Stesichorus' poem (cf. Woodbury, "Helen and the Palinode," Phoenix 21(1967) p. 169, note 26) and in any case it makes little difference to the overall question which came first.

The major ancient testimonia are listed in chronological order by Page in PMG 192, pp. 104, 105, to which one should add Photius,

Bibliotheca 186, summarising Conon (= Jacoby, FGH 26 F 1) and Hermeias, on Plato's Phaedrus (ed. Cuvreur, Paris, 1901).

- 4 Bergk, PLG III (Leipzig, 1882) pp. 214-218 and Vürtheim, op.cit., pp. 64 ff. give some account of the earlier scholarship of the relationship of the Palinode and the Helen. M. Doria, "le due Palinodie di Stesicoro," PP 18 (1963) pp. 82 ff. and Woodbury, art.cit., p. 157 note 1, give full bibliographies to date. The major works that I cite by author on the subject of the Helen and the Palinode are as follows:

J. Alsina Clota, "La Helena y la Palinodia de Estesicoro," Eclás 4 (1957) pp. 169-170; Th. Bergk, PLG III (Leipzig, 1882) p. 218; F. Bertini, "L'eidolon di Elena," Mythos. Scripta in honorem Marii Untersteiner (Genoa, 1970) pp. 84-89; C.M. Bowra, "Stesichorus in the Peloponnese," CQ 28 (1934) pp. 115-119 (= Bowra 1), "The two Palinodes of Stesichorus," CR 13 (1963) pp. 245-252 (= Bowra 2); J.L. Calvo-Martinez, "Estesicoro de Himera," Durius 2 (1974) pp. 327-328; Q. Cataudella, "Lyrica Greca in Sicilia; Stesicoro," ASSO 64 (1968) pp. 97-101; J.A. Davison, "De Helena Stesicori," QUCC 1 (1966) pp. 80-90 (= Davison 1). "Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 2506," Atti dell' xi Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia (Milan, 1965) pp. 96-106 (= Davison 2); M. Doria, art.cit., pp. 81-93; A. Farina, Studi Stesicorei I: il mito di Helena (Naples, 1968) p. 15 ff.; O. Kléine, Stesicori Himerensis Fragmenta (Berlin, 1828) p. 91 ff.; P. Leone, "La Palinodia di Stesicoro," AFLN 11 (1964-1968) pp. 5-28; D.L. Page P. Oxy. 2506 (London, 1963) pp. 35, 36; V. Pisani, "Elena i l'eidolon," RFC 6 (1928) pp. 476-490; A.J. Podlecki, "Stesichorea," Athenaeum 49 (1971) pp. 321-326; F. Sisti, "Le due Palinodie di Stesicoro," Studi Urbinati 39 (1965) pp. 301-313; A. Smotricz, "Utrum Stesichorus duas Palinodias conscripserat," Meander 20 (1965) pp. 445-450; G. Vallet, Région et Zancle (Paris, 1958) p. 273 and note 3; J. Vürtheim, op.cit., pp. 64-72; M.L. West, "Stesichorus Redivivus," ZPE 4 (1969) pp. 148, 149; L. Woodbury, art.cit., pp. 161 ff. and 168 ff.

- 5 Woodbury, art.cit. p. 168.
- 6 On the possibility of Plato's invention see Grégoire's introduction to the Budé edition Euripide V (Paris, 1950) pp. 32 ff. Cf. P. Vicaire, Platon, critique littéraire (Paris, 1960) p. 133: Plato might have been the author of a "mystification". However, the allusion to the eidolon in Republic 586 c makes it certain that the poem did exist. Haslam, art.cit., pp. 43, 44, discusses the metrical problem of the three lines and concludes that Plato has probably misquoted slightly.
- 7 See page 100, chapter IV; cf. pages 90-92 of chapter IV.
- 8 See Page, Sappho and Alcaeus (Oxford, 1955) pp. 12, 13.
- 9 Cf. also Nemean X 11 and Pythian IV 59.
- 10 On Heracles against Poseidon, see Iliad XI 690 ff; Hesiod, fr. 33 (a) (M. & W.); (cf. Heracles against Ares at Pylos in the Hesiodic Shield 359 ff.). On Heracles against Hades, see Iliad V 397-399; cf. pages 271, chapter VIII. On Heracles fighting Apollo, apart from this allusion in Pindar, there is only later testimony in Apollodorus II 6 2 and Pausanias II 21 8, VIII 37 1 and X 13 7.

- 11 Cf. Bowra, Pindar (Oxford, 1964) p. 54 ff. .
- 12 Woodbury, art.cit., p. 175.
- 13 See Lattimore, "The First Elegy of Solon," AJPh 68 (1947) pp. 161-179, and "The Composition of the History of Herodotus," CPh 53 (1958) pp. 9=21. In the former article, Lattimore discusses the structure of Solon's poem as a progression from idea to idea, each generated by the last and shows how, because of his intellectual honesty, Solon felt obligated to correct himself, once he had run into problems. The structure of Pindar's Olympian I is rather more subtle than that of Solon's poem.
- 14 On the metaphor of blindness in Stesichorus, see Bergk, PLG III p. 215. Bowra GLP, p. 108, dismisses the question as remaining outside the scope of the poem. I shall return to the question of the figurative use of blindness as traditional on pages 315 ff.
- 15 On the question of the eidolon as the invention of Hesiod or Stesichorus, see inter al. Vallet, op.cit., pp. 276 ff., Schwartz, op.cit. pp. 554-556 and Bertini art.cit., pp. 81-96. The evidence for the Hesiodic version of the eidolon is late (Tzetzes on Lycophron, M. & W. fr. 358) and contains recognisable errors (cf. Grégoire, op.cit., p. 34 and note 2). The Catalogue of Women of Hesiod, from which the scholiast would have derived his information on the eidolon is not necessarily earlier than Stesichorus (Schwartz, op.cit., pp. 485 ff. and 554 f.). Mme Ghali-Kahil, Les enlèvements et le retour d'Hélène (Paris, 1956) pp. 287, 288, points out that Hesiod's use of the motif of the eidolon need not necessarily have occurred in the context of a rehabilitation of Helen. There is in the final analysis no conclusive evidence as to the origins of the eidolon.
- 16 For example, Bowra (2), p. 250, concludes that Helen was transported through divine agency to Egypt (cf. Hermes' task in Euripides' Helen). Podlecki, art.cit., p. 323, suggests the possibility of Iris, through her identification with natural phenomena, occasionally a cloud, but there is no hint of this in the surviving evidence.
- 17 For example, Farina, art.cit., pp. 24-29; Bertini, art.cit., pp. 90 ff., who uses the parallels between Stesichorus and Euripides, and those between Hesiod and Euripides to confirm the veracity of the statement by Chamaeleon that the second Palinode criticised Hesiod .
- 18 The legend of the oath occurs neither in the Homeric tradition, nor in the Cypria : see L.J. Lindsay, Helen of Troy (London, 1974) pp. 96, 97.
- 19 On Helen in Homer, see Lindsay, op.cit., pp. 13-56; also Woodbury, art.cit., p. 166.
- 20 Lindsay, op.cit., p. 100.
- 21 Although Schwartz, op.cit., pp. 485 ff. dates the fragment on the suitors of Helen later than Stesichorus, the author of those lines must have composed his poem from already formulated material on Helen's marriage in a non-Ionian tradition, to which both Stesichorus and the author of the Hesiodic frs. 196-204 (M. & W.) turned.

- 22 Page, Alcman: the Partheneion (Oxford, 1951) pp. 26 ff. . Ancient sources are Pausanias III 15 1, Apollodorus II 7 3, Plutarch, Theseus xxxi and Diodorus Siculus IV 33 5f. .
- 23 On the cult-associations of the Partheneion, see Page, op.cit. p. 69. He does not however link the cult specifically with Helen, as does L. Ghali-Kahil, op.cit., p. 39, on the possible allusion to Helen in the Partheneion, lines 82,83. See also Bowra, GLP pp. 52 ff. and Lindsay, op.cit., pp. 117-118.
- 24 Ghali-Kahil, op.cit., p. 39.
- 25 Lindsay, op.cit., pp. 182,183. Sappho, fr. 105 (a) describes the bride, for a time out of reach, as the topmost apple on the tree, soon to be plucked.
- 26 On the wedding-songs of Sappho, see Page, Sappho and Alcaeus (Oxford, 1955) pp. 119 ff. and Fraenkel, op.cit., pp. 172ff. .
- 27 οὔλος occurs in Homer in the sense of "woolly" or "curly", but is never associated with garlands, while κορώνη is not a substantive in epic and is associated with ships alone, e.g. παρὰ νηυσὶ κορωνίσι Iliad XVIII 338 or Odyssey XIX 182. The word στέφανος is rare in epic (once in Homer, Iliad XIII 736, in a military context); garlands belong to the world of lyric. The epithet ῥόδινος is not found in epic.
- 28 In Anacreon, PMG 434 we find the precise phrase στεφάνους ... ῥοδίνους apparently in the context of a banquet. Ibycus PMG 315 describes flowers entwined in a garland, including ῥόδα. Garlands abound in the poems of Sappho, epithalamia and others, for example, fr. 94 12 ff; fr. 98 6ff.; 81 b.
- 29 West, in ZPE 4 (1969) pp. 142 ff, proposed to attribute P.Oxy. 2735 fr. 1 to one of the Helens of Stesichorus, as the conclusion of the poem, in which the poet dismissed the topic of the Trojan war itself and ended with a eulogy of Sparta. However the diversity of themes and metrical patterns among the various other fragments of 2735 argue against there having been a long narrative poem on the papyrus. Page, in PCPhS 15 (1969) pp. 69 ff. argues against the identification of the fragments as the work of Stesichorus, and favours Ibycus, if any, as their author. As far as the linguistic evidence is concerned, although there is an apparent admixture of epic and non-epic phraseology, the content of fragment 1 and others appears to belong to an ambience quite remote from the Stesichorean heroic lyric. The evidence is frankly too limited to reach any positive conclusions.
- 30 See Woodbury, art.cit., pp. 160-161.
- 31 Cf. A.M.Dale, Euripides: Helen (Oxford, 1966) p. xxi.
- 32 Dévereux, "Stesichoros' Palinodes : two further testimonia and some comments," RM 116 (1973) pp. 208,209.
- 33 In the context of the Phaedrus, Socrates cannot allow Phaedrus to remain bewitched by the speech of Lysias and by his own "unfinished"

version on the harmfulness of irrational love. He claims that his sign has instructed him to purify himself of the blasphemous depiction of the god Eros: what he said was not true, Stesichorus knew of a means of purification of such blasphemies against divinity, exemplified by his recantation of what he said of Helen. Socrates would therefore do the same, with a speech for which he claims to be indebted to Stesichorus Himeraius, namely to vindicate Eros, god of Desire. The parallel situation of Socrates and Stesichorus is too precise to be coincidental. In his claim to have received a speech from Stesichorus we are reminded of the claim that the Funeral speech of the Menexenus was supposedly taught him by Aspasia. Again in the Phaedrus the speech of Socrates is intended as a parody of the florid style and questionable argumentation of the professional orators such as Lysias and Isocrates. Details such as the play on words in Himeraius and the name of Stesichorus' father being Euphemus are all part of Plato's creation of a vivid account as a light contrast to the more serious content of the dialogue.

- 34 See Bowra, Pindar (Oxford, 1964) pp. 71-74.
- 35 Cf. the passing reference to Heracles' fight with Cynus, in Olympian X 15 and to the dogs of Geryon in Isthmian I 13. Stesichorus appears to have had some connections with Locris, although they are confused in the traditions (cf. West, in CQ 21(1973) pp. 302-303) and Pindar's tenth Olympian for Hegesidamus of Locris in southern Italy speaks of the associations of Calliope, Muse of epic, as being dear to Locris (line 14) and in the following line refers to Κύνεα μάχη which the scholiast identifies as an allusion to Stesichorus' version of the encounter between Heracles and Cynus. It seems likely therefore that Pindar had some acquaintance with the poems of Stesichorus.
- 36 Woodbury, art.cit., pp.169ff., who believes firmly in the testimony of Plato and Isocrates as firm evidence for the recantation occurring in the process of the performance of the offending poem.
- 37 Since we have shown that the poet's use of Homeric diction betrays a deliberate, conscious effort to revitalise the stereotyped "formulaic" phraseology of the epic tradition, the poet cannot be considered "oral" in the sense that is applied to the improvisations of the epic bards.
- 38 Exponents of a Delphic religious background to the poems of Stesichorus are, for example, Schmidt-Stälin, Geschichte der griechischen Literatur I I (Munich, 1959) pp. 147 ff; on Wilamowitz, von Premerstein, et.al. see Alsina Clota, art.cit., pp. 171 ff. and Woodbury, art. cit. p. 166. The majority of scholars find the theory of Spartan religious and also political motives attractive: Alsina Clota, Bowra, Ghali-Kahil, Davison, West. On the south Italian connections, see Vallet, op.cit., pp. 305-313 and Calvo-Martinez, art.cit., pp 323-325 and 327-328 on the religious side, Sisti, art.cit., p. 313 and Podlecki, art.cit., pp. 316-316 on the political side.
- 39 Sisti, art.cit., p 313, Podlecki, art.cit., pp. 316-317.

- 40 Conon, in Photius Bibliotheca 186, cf. Jacoby, FGH 26 F1 xviii, and Pausanias III 19 11-12. On the independence of these two accounts see Davison, "Stesichorus and Helen," in From Archilochus to Pindar (London, 1968) p. 203.
- 41 On Sparta's relations with Locris, via Mataurus and Tarentum, see footnote 44, page 263, chapter VII.
- 42 See Podlecki, art.cit., p. 317.
- 43 It is generally supposed, for example, by West, in CQ 21 (1971) pp. 302-303, that Stesichorus must have been actually in Locris when he delivered the warning. On the reliability of Aristotle's information on Stesichorus, see Ferrari, "Stesicoro Imerese e Stesicoro Locrese," Athenaeum 15 (1937) p. 251, postscript.
- 44 See Dunbabin, The Western Greeks (Oxford, 1948) pp. 357 ff, who dates the battle around 540 B.C.; Vallet, op.cit., pp. 309 ff. follows him. Ferrari, op.cit., pp. 244 ff. prefers an earlier date before the middle of the 6th century, as does P.C. Bicknell, in "The date of the battle of the Sagra river," Phoenix 20 (1966) pp. 294 ff, on the basis of Justin XX 2,3. Again we are faced with a situation where arguments are based on evidence that is insufficient.
- 45 Fragments are referred to by their numbers in Diels-Kranz, Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker (6th ed. Berlin, 1951). Cf. Fraenkel, op.cit., p. 327 ff. on Xenophanes' philosophy.
- 46 Vallet, op.cit., p. 311.
- 47 D  tienne, "La l  gende pythagoricienne d'H  l  ne," RHR 152 (1957) pp. 133 ff. discusses the Pythagorean belief in Helen as the Moon. He traces links between Stesichorus and the Pythagoreans in southern Italy and postulates that the Pythagoreans were responsible for the legend of the Palinode explaining Stesichorus' recantation in accordance with their own beliefs, hence the introduction of the eidolon (cf. p. 146). That the Pythagoreans grasped onto Stesichorus' rehabilitation of Helen is by no means impossible. From a Pythagorean source must have come the tradition that Homer was reborn in Stesichorus, which may be explained in simple literary terms as poetic inheritance, but also fits neatly into their theory of metempsychosis (cf. AP VII 75). On other connections between Stesichorus and the Pythagoreans see the schematic, but clear account in West, in CQ 21 (1973) pp. 302-304.
- 48 Cf. DK 21 B 7, in which a man claims to recognise his friend's voice in the yelpings of a dog.
- 49 See pages 293,294, chapter VIII.

Chapter X The Sack of Troy.

According to Dio Chrysostomus, Alexander found Stesichorus a tolerable poet inasmuch as he was an imitator of Homer, and author of a Sack of Troy described as being of some merit (PMG 203)¹. I assume that by "imitator" of Homer, Dio meant that Stesichorus reproduced the style of Homer and not that in composing his Sack of Troy he repeated the precise content of an actual poem composed by Homer. Although Odyssey VIII does allude to the existence of poems on the final destruction of the city of Troy, to which tradition the poem assigned to Arctinus belonged, nothing has survived of the early tradition and antiquity did not know of such a poem authentically assigned to Homer. The compliment paid to Stesichorus on his "Homerianness" is therefore calculated in terms of the poet's success in emulating the epic style that had assured Homer fame as an outstanding poet, in comparison with the stylistically inferior imitations of poets such as Arctinus.

In the detailed discussion of P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 1, in chapter VI, it was seen that although aspects of the structure of scenes in the poem were comparable to similar scenes in the Iliad and the diction employed by the poet was largely derived from the corpus of epic poetry to which the Iliad belonged, there were nevertheless proportionally more instances of phrases in which the expected word-associations had been broken in favour of new noun+epithet groupings². One important factor that gave the poet the opportunity to remould old worn phrases was the metrical scheme employed. The metrical scheme of the Sack of Troy approaches the dactylo-epitrite patterns found in Pindar³, offering the poet greater flexibility than he had in the almost purely dactylic scheme of the Geryoneis. Stylistically therefore the fragments of the Sack of

Troy are of some importance for estimating the poet's integration of traditional and innovative elements.

As far as the structure and content of the Sack of Troy are concerned, the fragments of P.Oxy. 2619 and 2803 have proved disappointing in comparison with those of the Geryoneis. The subject-matter of the fragments is undoubtedly Trojan and there are fair grounds for believing that the fragments do belong to one poem, despite Page's misgivings on fragments such as 13, 18 and 37 of 2619⁴. West and Haslam have shown that the scribe of 2619 was not at all consistent in his colometrical divisions and was careless enough to omit a line in fr. 18 between lines 6 and 7⁵. However, for a proposed outline of the poem of Stesichorus, we must still rely for the most part on what we know of earlier and later treatments of the theme of the final destruction of the city of Troy. In the following table I have listed the basic episodes known from other epic sources to indicate those that are identifiable in the fragments of 2619 and 2803, as well as the citations, and those that may or may not have been part of Stesichorus' poem.

(Key: H. = Homer, Odyssey VIII 500 ff.

L. = Lesches, poet of the Little Iliad, summarised in Proclus' Chrestomathy (Allen, Homeri opera, V, pp. 127 ff.).

A. = Arctinus, poet of the Sack of Troy, summarised by Proclus (Allen, op.cit., pp. 137 ff.).

V. = Virgil, Aeneid II.

Ap. = Apollodorus, Epitome V 14 ff.

Q.S. = Quintus of Smyrna, Posthomerica XII 353 ff.

Tr. = Tryphiodorus, Halosis Iliou 295 ff.)

a) The Wooden Horse

Content	Epic authors	Stesichorus
Epeius builds the Horse with Athena's aid	H. L. V. Ap. Q.S. Tr.	<u>PMG</u> 200 P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 15
The Greeks abandon the Horse leaving their best warriors in it, burn their tents and depart	H. L. V. Ap. Q.S. Tr.	<u>PMG</u> 199
Curious, the Trojans emerge to investigate	H. A. V. Ap. Q.S. Tr.	(Implied from 2619 fr.1)
The Horse is dragged into the city (before any deliberation)	H. L. Ap.	-
Debate gives rise to various opinions: 2 ways to destroy the Horse, and suggestion to dedicate it to the gods, generally Athena	H. A. V. Ap. Q.S. Tr.	P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 1 col. i 27 ff.; col. ii 1-15
Those who favour the dedication of the Horse prevail	H. A. Ap.	P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 1 col. ii 16 ff.
Sinon's deception of the Trojans	V. Q.S. Tr. (A.)	?
Celebrations	H. V. (Ap.) Q.S. Tr.	?
Warnings of Laocoon and Cassandra	A. V. Ap. Q.S. Tr.	cf. P.Oxy. 2619 fr.15
Death of Laocoon and sons	A. V. Ap. (Q.S.) Tr.	?
Sinon gives the signal for the Greeks to return	A. V. Ap. Q.S. Tr.	?
The Greeks leap from the Horse and the slaughter begins	H. A. V. Ap. Q.S. Tr.	P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 18 cf. fr. 32

b) The fate of the Trojans

Content	Epic authors	Stesichorus
Neoptolemus kills Priam at the altar of Zeus, in front of Hecuba	L. A. V. Ap. Q.S. Tr.	?
Menelaus takes Helen to the ships (after killing Deiphobus)	(L.) A. Ap. Q.S. Tr. H. A. Ap. (Tr.)	(cf. <u>PMG</u> 201) P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 14,15
Ajax rapes Cassandra at the foot of Athena's temple	A. V. Ap. Q.S. Tr.	?
Murder of Astyanax by Neoptolemus by Odysseus	A. (V.) Q.S. L. A. Tr.	<u>PMG</u> 202
Polyxena sacrificed at Achilles' tomb	A. (V.) Ap.	cf. P.Oxy. 2803 fr.3 fr.5
Demophon and Acamas find Aethra	(L.) A. Ap. Q.S. Tr.	P.Oxy. 2506 fr.26
Andromache taken by Neoptolemus	A. (V.) Ap. Q.S.	?
Hecuba taken by Odysseus	Ap. Q.S.	cf. <u>PMG</u> 198
Cassandra taken by Agamemnon	Ap. Q.S.	?
Laodice disappears into the earth	Ap. Q.S. Tr.	?
Aeneas escapes with his father Anchises	V. Ap. Q.S. Tr.	?
Aeneas journeys to the west.	V. Tr.	cf. the <u>Tabula Iliaca</u>

From the list of episodes thus constructed we can see the limitations of what we actually know of Stesichorus' version and what we may surmise he included in that version. Few of the fragments provide more than a schematic indication of the episodes included, and since the evidence of Arctinus' and Lesches' poems is likewise in the form of summaries we can deduce very little about the specific treatment of

individual episodes in Stesichorus' poem in comparison with individual episodes as treated by his predecessors. Stesichorus' poem must have begun at least with the plan to construct the Wooden Horse, as the device by which the Greeks would gain entry into the city of the Trojans. Presumably the poet described the departure of the Greeks and the emergence of the Trojans to examine the strange creature abandoned on the plain. The Horse was duly dragged into the city after the decision of the majority to dedicate it to Athena. Again we assume that the poet described the Trojans' revelry, which was followed by the night attack bringing fire, slaughter and rape on the helpless Trojans and the ultimate recapture of Helen.

The poet's prolix style, observable in fr. 1 of 2619, serves as an indication that, although we can postulate a basic outline of the content of Stesichorus' poem, the details of individual scenes are beyond our reach and may well have contained innovative material of which there is no hint in the poet's general adherence to episodes that we find in the epic tradition. For example, the lines quoted by Athenaeus (PMG 200) regarding Epeius point to the poet's own expansion of the legend in the epic tradition (cf. Odyssey VIII and the Little Iliad of Lesches) in which Athena implants the idea of the Wooden Horse in the mind of Epeius. In that tradition Epeius is little more than a name connected with the construction of the Horse, although as a contestant in the Funeral Games for Patroclus he does appear with appropriate heroic epithets $\delta\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ and $\mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha\lambda\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma$ (Iliad XXIII 685, 694). Stesichorus depicted Epeius as a menial slave in the household of Agamemnon, a water-carrier unfit for military service, until the patroness of craftsmen, Athena, took pity on him, endowing him with the skills of a master-craftsman. Fragment 15 of 2619 appears to refer in retrospect to the Horse built by

a man beside the banks of the Simoeis. It seems likely that Stesichorus did in fact describe the actual construction of the Horse, but of this we have no concrete evidence. The poet increased the magnitude of the Horse, if we can trust the tradition that there were one hundred warriors in the Horse according to him (PMG 199). Athenaeus, the source of this information, does, however, point out that one cannot find an enumeration of the individual names of the heroes within the Horse in Stesichorus' version. This omission is perhaps surprising in view of the poet's propensity for lists as demonstrated by the fragment of the Suotherae (2359) and possibly by fragments from the Athla (PMG 178 and 179)⁷. For whatever reason, the poet apparently did not wish to dwell at great length on the preparations of the Greeks after the construction of the Horse, but seems to have proceeded onwards to the Trojan scene.

The debate occurring in P.Oxy. 2619 fr.1 is set outside the walls of Troy, as the Trojans decide upon the fate of the Horse. In the earlier versions of the legend (those of Homer, Lesches and Arctinus) the discussion took place after the Trojans had already dragged the Horse within their walls. In the later accounts of Virgil, Quintus of Smyrna and Tryphiodorus, this discussion occurred, as in Stesichorus, outside the city-walls. It is possible that Stesichorus was responsible for the introduction of this variation in the tradition, together with an expansion of the series of speeches in the debate. I suggested in an earlier chapter that one reason for the modification of the debate-scene could have been the creation of the role of Sinon⁸. Although we have no substantial evidence for Stesichorus' use of this character in his poem, we do know that he already played some part in the legend according to Arctinus. His access to the city was achieved by deceit, πρότερον εἰσεληλυθὼς προσποιήτος, but the means is not explained in Proclus'

summary. The magnification of Sinon's role in the later poets may be indebted to Stesichorus rather than to Arctinus. A Greek left behind on the shore, Sinon appeared at the crucial moment to influence the Trojans' decision on the fate of the Horse. The location of the debate outside the walls would create a more plausible opportunity for the entrance of Sinon with his pre-arranged sob-story and perfidious yarn designed to persuade the Trojans that it was in their interests not to destroy the Horse.

Of the Trojans' premature celebrations and the gloomy but unheeded predictions of Cassandra and Laocoon that occur in the later epic versions we know next to nothing from the fragments of Stesichorus. P.Oxy. 2803 fr.1. with its supplement $\kappa\alpha\sigma\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon\iota$ - at line 6-7 occurs near the beginning of the poem (or excerpt of the poem?) and might therefore come from a passage in which the prophetess delivers one of her warnings of impending doom⁹. Fr. 18 of 2619 appears to belong to that part of the narrative where the Greeks descend from the Horse to begin their final assault upon the Trojans' city¹⁰. In the lines that follow $\epsilon\kappa\theta\acute{o}\rho\omicron\nu$ (line 8) one finds a list of deities, which may be related to a division of gods and goddesses according to those who support the Trojans and those who support the Greeks; that is, Ares, Artemis, Apollo, Aphrodite for the former, and Poseidon, Hera, Athena, Hermes and Hephaestus for the latter, as in Iliad XX 31 ff. . The negative $\omicron\upsilon\delta'$ in line 6 (=12) in the context of Artemis and Aphrodite, and probably also Apollo from the previous line, might refer to the cessation of their powers to protect the city whose fate had been sealed. Even Zeus could not prevent the destruction of the city : $\tau\rho\omega\tilde{\omega}\nu\ \pi\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\ \text{Ze}\tilde{\upsilon}\varsigma\ldots$ (line 14), although this might equally refer to the ultimate fate of the city being in the hands of Zeus (cf. 2619 fr. 1 i 15 and 17). Thus, as in the Geryoneis, the poet has preserved the divine plane of action and

acknowledged the intervention of the gods on behalf of the Greeks and the Trojans.

The principal episodes associated with the destruction of the city listed in the epitomes made by Apollodorus and by Proclus (cf. section b) of the table above) are represented also in the evolution of a series of tableaux from the 6th century onwards¹¹. Scenes such as the murder of Priam by Neoptolemus, the rape of Cassandra, the recovery of Helen and the flight of Aeneas with Anchises appear particularly frequently. How far Stesichorus, Arctinus or Lesches directly influenced the artists of, for example, the Olympian shield-reliefs, or the Black and Red Figure vase-paintings, or monumental works such as the Iliou Persis of Polygnotus at Delphi, we cannot ascertain. The artist's medium whether in two or three dimensions, is restricted, unlike that of the poet, to the representation of a moment or series of moments in the progression of the myth¹². On the other hand, it is reasonable to suppose that the popularity of a particular poem might have considerable effect in the public demand for vases depicting scenes from that poem. It is noticeable, for example, that on Black-figure ware of the 6th century representations of scenes from the legend of the Sack of Troy and the Little Iliad far outnumber those depicting scenes from the Iliad, a fact that gives some indication of the demand of the market¹³.

The artistic tradition of representations of the legend of the Sack ultimately found expression in the Roman world in the form of a number of stone-sculptured tablets called Tabulae Iliadae on account of their subject matter¹⁴. The anonymous artist of one of these, the Tabula Iliaca Capitolina¹⁵, included in his version scenes from Homer's Iliad, but in the central panel of the stone he depicted scenes from the Sack of Troy and the flight of Aeneas, under the title ΙΑΙΟΥ ΠΕΡΕΙΕ ΚΑΤΑ

ΕΤΗΙΧΟΡΟΝ. The panel contains traditional scenes within the walls of Troy that we know from the fragments were included in Stesichorus' poem: the Wooden Horse, Demophon and Acamas, the pursuit and recovery of Helen, Sinon(?) and the murder of Astyanax (?). It would be most surprising if the murder of Priam and the rape of Cassandra, also depicted, did not occur in Stesichorus' poem. Doubts, however, have been cast on the authenticity of the statement κατὰ Στσηύχορον¹⁶, principally because of the prominence given to Aeneas' flight in the panel together with the depiction of Anchises carrying a box supposedly containing the ancestral Penates, and the appearance of the trumpeter Misenus. Aeneas' flight with Anchises on his back under the guidance of Hermes is placed in the centre of the panel to which one's attention is also drawn by the fact that the group appears to be passing through the main portal of the city-walls. In the lower right-hand section of the panel the inscription

Αἰνῆας σὺν τοῖς ἰδοῦσι ἀπαύ[ρ]ων εἰς τὴν Ἑσπερίαν ...
Μισηνός ... Ἀγγέλης καὶ τὰ ἱερὰ

accompanies a picture of Aeneas' group, including Misenus, as it is about to board a ship. It is generally accepted that the prominence given to the legend of Aeneas in its later form, as developed by Virgil, results either from the open or subconscious influence of imperial propaganda or from stories concerning the origins of Rome¹⁷. The panel is thus interpreted as a conflation of what the sculptor thought the poem of Stesichorus contained (whether through his immediate model Theodorus, or through hearsay) with what he knew of the legend of Aeneas popular at Rome in the 1st century B.C. and the 1st century A.D. . The attribution of the scenes to the poem of Stesichorus rather than to that of Virgil might have arisen from what the sculptor saw written on Theodorus' version, or else from his own notion that an "ancient" Greek source for

his inspiration was a more prestigious authority.

Whatever the sculptor's source of inspiration, it is not inconceivable that Stesichorus in his poem did bring Aeneas to western shores. As was noted in the case of the Geryoneis and the Oresteia, the poet could and apparently did introduce western themes into his poems¹⁸. In this instance, however, the meagre evidence dictates that the hypothesis remain speculative¹⁹. We know of the popularity in Italy of the theme of Aeneas' flight from its depiction on Black-figure vases of the 6th century, imported into Etruria, and from locally manufactured terracotta figurines of Aeneas, some of which also date from the 6th century²⁰. Aeneas appears to have been an Etruscan hero long before he took pride of place in Rome. The earliest literary reference to Aeneas' voyage west occurred in the Troika of Hellanicus, the 5th century logographer²¹. His particular version of the Trojan legend was believed by Dionysius of Halicarnassus to be the most trustworthy of a number of versions circulating. Nothing is said of Hellanicus' source for the legend of Aeneas' western voyage, but the account is phrased in such a way that it cannot have been invented by Hellanicus²². Moreover, his acquaintance with the information on the early peoples of Italy and Sicily suggests that he may have had some knowledge of a western tradition concerning Aeneas also²³. Galinsky proposes that in Stesichorus' poem there was only a vague reference to Aeneas' travels westwards, one that left his ultimate destination unspecified²⁴. If this were the case, Stesichorus must merely have mentioned the departure of Aeneas en passant, for the poet would have been well-equipped with material for elaborating upon a western voyage of Aeneas, without resorting to vague allusions, had he been so inclined²⁵. If he were interested at all in bringing Aeneas to the west, it seems unlikely that he would have left the

destination of the hero totally without name or location. If he mentioned Hesperia, as the sculptor of the Tabula Iliaca Capitolina claimed, it is reasonable to suppose that the vagueness of location is the result of the sculptor's attempt to give a title to the scene which was as general as possible, and not a result of the poet's vagueness, intentional or otherwise. I believe, therefore, that Stesichorus probably did elaborate upon a tradition that brought Aeneas to the west, but without further evidence it is impossible to determine what aspects of the legend the poet introduced or what routes he described Aeneas as following.

Although Stesichorus probably maintained the principal outline of events of the Sack as indicated in the table above, as in his other poems he introduced variations within episodes at the level of specific detail. For example, the fate of Hecuba is variously described in the different traditions, and Stesichorus is noted for having his own innovative treatment in which Hecuba is transported to Lycia. This detail is ingeniously interpreted by Vürtheim as suggesting that the poet had Apollo rescue the mother of his son (cf. PMG 224), even though he could not rescue Hector himself²⁶. Hector is thus given semi-divine parentage and one wonders if in the course of the Sack of Troy Stesichorus included a section on the death of Hector in retrospect, and if so how he treated that incident in comparison with the version that we know from Iliad XXII²⁷.

Of the fragments of P.Oxy. 2619 and 2803, we can assign to contexts in section b) only one or two, on the basis of themes dealt with by earlier or later authors. The sacrifice of Polyxena at the tomb of Achilles was already a part of the tradition as testified by the summary of Arctinus' poem. In fr. 3 of 2803 we find πολυξε[(line 5) and in fr.5

ἦ] πως Ἀχαιῶν [(line 3), which suggest that the poet did include some aspect of the story of Polyxena, the details of which are lost²⁸.

Fr. 14 of 2619 contains a reference to an ambush, λόχο[accompanied by deictic τόνδε (line 2), suggesting that the speaker is Trojan, or at least not part of the Greek attacking force. ξανθὰ δ' Ἑλένα (line 5) appears to be in the company of someone related to Priam ἦρ[αμ ... | βα]σιλῆος ἀοιδὸν... [(lines 5-6). There follows an allusion to the burning city, δ]αῖψι πυρὶ καλομέν[... | ἐμ]πρήσαντας (lines 8,9) presumably occurring in a context after the Greeks had begun their assault from the Horse with the aid of the rest of the army, secretly returned. The precise context is not clear²⁹; someone is apparently trying to persuade Helen to flee the burning city τ]ῶν δ' ἐκέλευσε... [(line 7). It is possible that this person is Deiphobus, son of Priam, and Helen's "husband" after Paris, whom Menelaus slays, according to Arctinus, before he regains possession of his wife.

One of the major scenes in this part of the poem must have been the encounter between Helen and Menelaus. Both Lesches and Arctinus described the recovery of Helen, according to the summaries of Proclus, but details of these episodes are lost. Numerous examples from the collections of Black and Red-figure vases of the 6th and 5th centuries indicate the popularity of this motif in Attic and other markets in the century and a half following Stesichorus floruit³⁰. Of Stesichorus' version of the recovery of Helen we know only from the indirect reference to the episode in which the Greeks, on finding Helen, were about to stone her, doubtless out of bitter hatred for the arduous war fought over her, but were so astonished at the sight of her beauty that they simply let the stones fall from their hands (PMG 201). The scholiast on Euripides' Orestes mentioned the Stesichorean version while remarking on the

metaphorical image of the swords of the Greeks struck dumb or blunted by the beauty of Helen: ἄρ' ἐς τὸ κάλλος ἐκκεκώφηται ἑύφη; (Orestes 1287). Euripides' image appears to derive from a conflation of this episode in Stesichorus, where unspecified Greeks dropped their weapons, and the episode known to have appeared in a poem of Ibycus in which Menelaus drops or throws away his sword when confronted by the dazzling beauty of Helen (PMG 296)³¹. If we accept that the Tabula Iliaca Capitolina bears at least an indirect relationship to the Sack of Troy of Stesichorus, the scene depicted there of a half-naked Helen fleeing from the sword brandished by a pursuing warrior suggests that Stesichorus too included a scene in his poem in which Menelaus initially pursued Helen, probably to the temple of Aphrodite, with the intention of punishing her for her conduct, but was soon persuaded either by her beauty or by her prayers to abandon his original intentions. The location of the temple of Aphrodite would be equally significant in Stesichorus' poem in view of his making Aphrodite directly responsible for the curse laid upon the children of Tyndareus on account of the omitted sacrifice (PMG 223). Helen would be thought of as under the protection of Aphrodite; she could therefore appeal to that goddess, who would in turn influence the heart of Menelaus .

There may, however, be more to gain from considering one of the later literary versions of the encounter between Helen and Menelaus. In Euripides' Troïades 860 ff. Menelaus approaches the group of Trojan captives, among whom is Helen, with the intention of killing her, or at least of escorting her back to Greece to punish her there. His intentions are encouraged by Hecuba, who also reminds him of Helen's seductiveness and her κηλήματα: ὁρᾷν δὲ τήνδε φεῦγε, μή σ' ἔλη κούρω (891 ff.). Helen begs to defend her actions, but turns her defence

into an attack on Hecuba, claiming that she is guilty of or responsible for the war because she gave birth to Paris. The scene in which Helen pleads for her life may reflect a scene in Stesichorus in which Helen is depicted as overturning Menelaus' resolve to kill her, by appealing to his love for her and for their child Hermione. Among the fragments of P.Oxy 2619 there are two that might belong to such a scene.

Fr. 19 can be identified as belonging to a conversation between a man and a woman. Line 2 gives the formal introduction to the speech of the woman who calls herself δυσώνημος³² (line 4) and who is described in line 1 as possessing something ὑπερτόν in appearance, perhaps κόμα (Sappho PLF 144 4) or πρόσωπον (Sappho, PLF 112 3; Archilochus SLG 478 (b) 3). Barrett and West interpret the lines as representing Helen's shame for her actions, offering a reconstruction "...how can you love me who ..." for πῶς ἀγαπᾷς³³. The scanty remains of the fragment might as easily be interpreted as a prayer in answer to recriminations, fortified by the declaration of the strength of her love, ὅπως ἀγαπᾶζω The word τεκ[hints at a reference to the child that she bore Menelaus, and this theme was certainly pursued in the argument of fr. 16 (see below). If line 7 represents the reply of Menelaus, no indication of his reaction is apparent, favourable or otherwise. If, as I suspect, fr. 16 belongs to an expansion of the theme of Helen's love for Hermione, then one might suppose that Menelaus was not immediately won by Helen's prayers.

In fragment 16 Ἑρμιόναν is unlikely to refer to anyone other than the daughter of Menelaus and Helen in the context of a speaker, presumably Helen, expressing constant longing for her:

]λον Ἑρμιόναν τε[
]ων ποθέω νύκτι[ας τε καὶ ἄμαρ	
ἀ[γλόποδαν [lines 10-12.

The daughter of Helen and Menelaus makes few entrances on the epic stage.

Her birth is recorded in the Catalogue of Women fr. 175 (M. & W.) and more especially in fr. 204 94,95: ἡ τέκεν Ἑρμιόνην καλλιόσφυρον ἐν μεγάρουσιν | δελπτον. The Hesiodic text does not elucidate the use of the epithet δελπτος. Perhaps the epithet was intended to have a significance similar to that when used of a later-born child, as in the Hymn to Demeter 219, τὸν ὀψύγονον καὶ δελπτον. But in the Odyssey and in this context Hermione was born before the Trojan war, not later in the life of Helen, and therefore we are left to surmise that the child was unexpected and unwanted. In the Odyssey Hermione is mentioned briefly as the bride-to-be of Neoptolemus, compared to Aphrodite in appearance: παῖδ' ἐρατεινήν, Ἑρμιόνην, ἣ εἶδος ἔχε χρυσείης Ἀφροδίτης (Odyssey IV 13,14). The exceptional beauty of Hermione, though not surpassing that of her mother, was used by Sappho in a poem to emphasise the beauty of a girl she praises (PLF 23). Thus in fr. 16 the comparison of Hermione with the gods (goddesses) in appearance, ἀθανάτοισιν εἵκελον (lines 9,10) follows epic and also probably non-epic traditions, while the use of the unprecedented epithet αἰγλοπόδαν³⁴ breaks away from some of the more conventional descriptions of beauty in the epic tradition.

Both Sappho and Alcaeus employed the motif of Helen's desertion of her child by way of a mythological exemplum. The early lyric poets were conscious of a tradition critical of Helen's elopement³⁵. For Alcaeus the tradition of Helen's infidelity acts as an excellent foil for his praises of Thetis (PLF 42) and her desertion of child and husband demonstrates the evil influence of Eros:

παῖδά τ' ἐν δόμοισι λύκοισ' [ἐρήμαν
κ' ἄνδρος εὐστρωτον λέχος
πεῖθ' ἔρωι θυμὸς [

PLF 283 7-9

Sappho, however, alludes to the legend of the desertion as an example of the lengths to which one under the power of love, to which she too is

subjected will go:

... ἃ γὰρ πολλὰ περσκέθοισα
 κάλλος ἀνθρώπων Ἑλένα τὸν ἄνδρα
 τὸν πανάριστον
 καλλίποισ' ἔβα 'ς Τροίαν πλέοισα
 κωῦδὲ παῖδος οὐδὲ φύλων τοκῆων
 κάμπαν ἐμνάσθη, ...

PLF 16 6-11

Sappho cannot entirely censure one under the influence of Eros, but it is still implicit that in the eyes of some the action was reprehensible. Stesichorus, just as Sappho, appears to have adapted the motif for his own particular purpose. Helen's speech includes a defence against the accusations, potential or actual, that she wilfully abandoned her child. We cannot tell, however, if this defence in the mouth of Helen was in any way intended as a partial rehabilitation of Helen. Assuming that the Sack of Troy was written before the poet felt obliged, under whatever circumstances, to revoke his portrayal of Helen λυπεσάνω at Troy, I feel that the depiction of Helen pleading for Menelaus' compassion on the grounds of her love for their daughter may have been intended as an indication of Helen's willingness to change her tune according to the situation. Indeed it may have been in part the poet's representation of a Helen unscrupulous and inconstant that he felt obliged to recant³⁶.

Helen's defence in the Troiades begins with a formal rhetorical introduction:

ἔσως μέ κ' ἂν εὖ κ' ἂν κακῶς δόξω λέγειν
 οὐκ ἀνταμείψει πολεμίαν ἡγούμενος.
 ἐγὼ δ' ἄ σ' οἶμαι διὰ λόγων ἰόντ' ἐμοῦ
 κατηγορήσειν, ἀντιθεῖσ' ἀμείψομαι
 τεῦς σοῖσι τ' ἀμὰ καὶ τὰ σ' αἰτιάσματα.
 πρῶτον μὲν ...

lines 914-919

One would not expect such a highly structured organisation in the speech of Helen in Stesichorus' poem, and yet it would appear that the introduction to Helen's argument of her love for Hermione began at lines 2,3 of fr. 16, where the speaker seems to be underscoring the truth of

what is about to be said: ἐναργές and ἐτύμως (lines 2 and 3 (cf. ἐγὼν λέγω line 8)). The argument of Helen in Stesichorus' poem does not include the castigation of Hecuba, or at least not in the surviving fragments. The allusion to Aphrodite in the epithet κυπρογενής connected with something that is ἀλκιόρροπον suggests that Helen has recourse to mentioning Aphrodite, and the reason may well have been to place the entire blame for her misdeeds on that goddess (cf. PMG 223). In the lines that follow Helen appears to compare her loneliness without her daughter Hermione and the longing for her to the loneliness of Demeter. The word ὑφαρπάγνιον (line 13) could describe the child who was snatched away from earth and carried to the Underworld by Hades (cf. Hymn to Demeter 19,20). The masculine παῖδα φύλον (line 18), however, cannot refer to either Persephone or to Hermione, but may be explained if the poet, after a direct comparison between Helen and Demeter as mothers bereft of their only children, quickly passes to an allusion to Demeter's wanderings in a semi-relevant digression. One might compare κορυφαῖσι νόκτασιν (line 16) with a reference to the cries of Persephone in the Hymn to Demeter 38,39 :

ἤχησαν δ' ὀρέων κορυφαὶ καὶ βένθεα πόντου
φωνῆσι ὑπ' ἀθανάτῃσι τῆς δ' ἔκλυε πότνια μήτηρ .

The wanderings of the goddess finally brought her to Eleusis, where she became nurse of the new-born child of Metaneira (160 ff.). Her plans to make the boy immortal by immersing him in fire each night (239 ff.) were thwarted by the mother's accidental discovery and mistaken belief that her child was being harmed (243 ff.). Thus it may be that Stesichorus chose to include some reference to Demeter's attempts to rescue the boy, παῖδα φύλον, from hateful old age, or death, στυγερὸν (line 16)³⁷. Compare with the words of Demeter in the Hymn 259-261:

ἴστω γὰρ θεῶν ὄρκος, ἀμείλικτον Στυγὸς ὕδωρ,
 ἀθάνατόν κέν τοι καὶ ἀγήραον ἦματα πάντα
 παῖδα φίλον ποίησα καὶ ἄφθιτον ὥπασα τιμὴν.

The allusion to the story of Demeter is brief and is probably drawn to a close in line 19 where ὁ λέγω recapitulates ἐγὼν λέγω in line 8.

Why should Helen make a comparison between herself and Demeter, between Hermione and Persephone?³⁸ Page notes the information given by Hesychius that Persephone was sometimes called Hermione, as was Demeter herself, in Syracuse, and suggests that the words ποθέω... in line 11 were uttered by Demeter herself, in which case one would have to agree with him that the context of the fragment is beyond explanation as part of the Sack of Troy³⁹. Page's doubts are perhaps too extreme. The poet's creation of a comparison between Helen and Demeter, both longing for the child from which they have been forcibly separated, is plausible within a context of Helen attempting to effect a reconciliation with Menelaus. The comparison with Demeter would not only direct Menelaus' attention away from the undeniable guilt of Helen, but would even enhance her image as a devoted mother. Apart from creating a subtle argument through which Helen might redeem herself, Stesichorus may also have intended the comparison with Demeter to have significance to his audience in its allusion to the Sicilian cult, for which Hesychius gives testimony, that associated Hermione and Persephone. However, the full significance of the allusion cannot be estimated.

I assume, although it cannot be substantiated fully, that Menelaus' intentions of punishing Helen were stalled by her persuasive speech, and that Menelaus, as in other versions such as that of Ibycus, threw away his sword and escorted her back to the ships. In Aristophanes' Lysistrata, the Spartan delegate remarks on the story that Menelaus cast away his sword at the sight of Helen's naked breast,

ὁ γῶν Μενέλαος τᾷς Ἑλένας τὰ μᾶλ' πα
 γυμνᾷς παραυῖδὼν ἐξέβαλ', οἷῳ, τὸ εὔφος. lines 155,156.

Two sets of scholia attribute this scene to Ibycus and Euripides, while one of them, the codex Beidensis-Vossianus, includes Lesches' Little Iliad as a third source for such a scene. Another Aristophanic scholion refers to the weakening of Menelaus' resolve at the sight of Helen as treated by Ibycus (on μαλθακός , Wasps 714). Thus it would appear that in a poem of Ibycus there occurred a confrontation between Helen and Menelaus that began with a hostile pursuit (cf. the scholion on Euripides' Andromache 630) but ended in reconciliation, Menelaus dropping his sword at the sight of Helen's beauty as she bared her breasts. Ghali-Kahil is disinclined to believe that such a scene was described in Ibycus on the grounds that it was too modern for Ibycus, and certainly for Lesches⁴⁰. One should recall, however, that in the Geryoneis Stesichorus depicted the mother of Geryon pleading with her son and making an appeal to him similar to that made by Hecuba to Hector in book XXII of the Iliad , namely by the breasts that nurtured him⁴¹. Helen's prayer to Menelaus in Stesichorus' Sack of Troy appears to have included an appeal to remember the daughter, Hermione. It is not inconceivable, therefore, that the poet again employed the Hecuba-motif with a slightly different slant. Helen's token display of motherhood was probably intended to arouse desire as much as pity in Menelaus. Unfortunately there is neither scholiastic or iconographical evidence to support the theory that such a scene occurred in early lyric , and specifically in this poem of Stesichorus. This reconstruction must therefore remain hypothetical⁴².

Thus the major part of the evidence for the Sack of Troy

seems to indicate that the poet did not diverge from the principal events associated with the Sack in the earlier epic tradition of Lesches and Arctinus. There are, however, grounds for supposing that within the structure of these standard episodes the poet did introduce innovative material. The story of Demophon and Agamas finding their grandmother Aethra, included in Proclus' summary of Arctinus' Sack of Troy, is listed together with a number of Stesichorean innovations by the commentator of P.Oxy. 2506 fr. 26. It was not the event in itself, but some of the finer details, such as the parentage of the two and Demophon's sojourn in Egypt, that must have caught the commentator's attention as original in Stesichorus. Similarly, in the development of the character of Epeius and possibly that of Sinon, the poet must have introduced material of his own invention, expanding upon traditional tales in a style that imitated and modified Homeric diction. The encounter-scene between Helen and Menelaus appears to have been treated extensively, as was the debate before the walls, showing the poet's predilection for direct speech within his narrative. One of the more disappointing silences of the new fragments is on the subject of Aeneas. The tantalising evidence of the Tabula Iliaca Capitolina, together with the fact that by Hellenistic time a positive tradition existed of Aeneas' travels in Sicily and Italy, suggests that Stesichorus in the Sack of Troy, as in other poems, was able to incorporate legends relevant to his western audience. Some indication from the papyri confirming or refuting this hypothesis would be very welcome, but as yet nothing has emerged. As in the case of the Geryoneis and other poems, the poet appears to have expanded upon pre-existing versions from the epic corpus, whether for artistic reasons, or because of his desire to create myths relevant to his western audience and to complement existing traditions hitherto without adequate literary form.

Footnotes to chapter X.

- 1 Dio Chrysostomus, Orationes II 33. Cf. II 28, where Alexander according to Dio puts forward the suggestion, not dissimilar to the view of Plato, that poetry of Stesichorus or Pindar would be suitable material for kings to sing, if they must, whereas the poetry of Sappho or Anacreon was definitely unsuitable.
- 2 On 2619 fr. 1, see pages 170-194, chapter VI. In chapter III, on direct imitation of Homeric phrases, we discovered that in sections a), b), c) and e), of the 29 examples considered, only 6 derived from the fragments of the Sack of Troy, as opposed to 17 from the Geryoneis. In section d), in which were listed Homeric epithets that appeared without their accompanying nouns through lacunae in the papyri, of the 16 there were 10 from the Sack of Troy, and 3 from the Geryoneis. The possibility of at least 5 of the 10 belonging to unprecedented noun-epithet phrases was not remote. In the chapter of modified "formulae" we find that 6 out of 17 instances come from the Sack of Troy in the first category, namely noun+epithet groups whose elements are both found in epic. In the other categories there were far fewer examples. The tendency of these figures shows that the poet in the Sack of Troy retained more of the vocabulary found in the Iliad (not unexpected, in view of the subject-matter), but strove to break away from employing known "formulae".
- 3 Haslam, art.cit., pp. 24 ff.
- 4 Page, "Stesichorus: the Sack of Troy and the Wooden Horse," PCPhS 19 (1973) pp. 51-58.
- 5 West, in ZPE 4 (1969) pp. 141 ff. and Haslam, art.cit., p. 26 and footnote 31.
- 6 Eustathius mentions Aphrodite in this regard (on the Iliad, 1325 55), but Athena as patronness of craftsmen seems more appropriate.
- 7 On Stesichorus' use of Catalogues, see pages 223 ff., chapter VI.
- 8 On the role of Sinon, cf. pages 186, 187 of chapter VI.
- 9 For Barrett's supplement, see SLG S 133, p. 37. On the reverse of P.Oxy. 2803 fr. 1 are the letters ΙΙΙΙ, from which it is generally supposed by scholars that the papyrus contained not the entire Sack of Troy, but a portion of the same poem dealing with the Wooden Horse. The notation A on fr. 1 ii indicates the hundredth line of the poem as occupied on the papyrus. Thus the appearance of Cassandra is unlikely to be in the context of the episode in which she is dragged from the temple of Athena by Ajax, but could more plausibly be an occasion on which she prophesied the doom of Troy.
- 10 I accept the proposed joining of 2619 fr. 18 and 2803 fr. 11, suggested by West and Barrett, ZPE 7 (1971) p. 262 and Führer ZPE 5 (1970) p. 11.
- 11 For example, there are scenes from the legend of the Sack described by Pausanias as appearing on the chest of Cypselus, which is dated to

the early 6th century (Pausanias III 17), for a reconstruction of which see Schefold, Myth and Legend in Early Greek Art (London, 1966) pp. 72-73). Shield-reliefs from Olympia from the early part of the 6th century also contain motifs from the legend of the Sack (cf. Schefold, op.cit., p. 93, figs. 40-42). Well-known Black-figure vases include an amphora by Lydos (ABV 109 24) depicting the death of Priam and the meeting between Helen and Menelaus; an amphora by the "group of C" painters (ABV 136 54) depicting the rape of Cassandra; an amphora from a private collection by the Amasis painter (Boardman, ABFV, fig. 90) depicting the recovery of Helen. Of the Red-figure vases from the beginning of the 5th century, a hydria by the Kleophrades painter (ARV 189 74) represents the destruction of Troy and may have owed its inspiration to some single monumental painting according to Beazley The Kleophrades Painter (Berlin, 1933) p. 7. Polygnotus, a 5th century artist, is known to have painted a mural in the Stoa Poikile at Athens and one at Delphi on the theme of the Sack of Troy (Pausanias I 15 2 and X 25 1). For the iconography of the death of Priam see M.I. Wiencke, "An epic theme in Greek art," AJA 58 (1954) pp. 285-306; for Aeneas, see K. Schauenburg, "Aeneas und Rom," Gymnasium 67 (1960) pp. 176-190; on Helen and Menelaus, see L. Ghali-Kahil, Les enlèvements et le retour d'Hélène (Paris, 1955) and P. Clement, "The recovery of Helen," Hesperia 27 (1958) pp. 47-73.

- 12 Wiencke, art.cit., pp. 288 f., while discussing the evolution of the death of Astyanax becoming incorporated into the same scene as the death of Priam, on Black-figure vases.
- 13 See Boardman ABFV, p. 229.
- 14 The 19 Tabulae Iliacae are most recently discussed by A. Sadurska Les Tables Iliques (Warsaw, 1964).
- 15 The first of the tabulae dealt with by Sadurska is I.G. 14 1284, which was found near Bovillae, but is now in the Capitoline Museum in Rome and hence the title. The anonymous sculptor of the tabula refers to one Theodorus, a Greek, as his model for the scenes from the Iliad etc. .
- 16 See discussion in Vürtheim, op.cit., pp. 34 ff.; J. Perret, Les origines de la légende troyenne de Rome (Paris, 1942) pp. 87 ff.; C.M. Bowra GLP pp. 105 ff.; A. Sadurska, op.cit., pp. 32 ff.; K. Galinsky Aeneas, Sicily and Rome (Princeton, 1969) pp. 107 ff. . The principal argument against the validity of the sculptor's statement is the introduction of the Aeneas-legend. Bowra is wrong in thinking the best evidence against the trustworthiness of the statement on the tabula lies in the detail of Menelaus averting his head as he pursues Helen. The texts are silent as to Stesichorus' use of this scene, but its occurrence in Ibycus (if the scholiasts on Euripides' Andromache and Aristophanes' Wasps are correct (PMG 296)) does not preclude its appearance in Stesichorus' poem also. Stesichorus may well have described two separate scenes in which Helen's beauty stalled her would-be killers. On the other hand the inclusion in the scene on the tabula of Misenus does hint at the sculptor having drawn on more than one source. Cf. J. Hubaux, "Misène," AC 2 (1933) pp. 169-172, who argues that the depiction of Misenus

- was influenced by the Aeneid of Virgil. The reasons why Varro and Dionysius of Halicarnassus fail to mention Stesichorus among those who bring Aeneas to Italy may be that there was nothing in his version that could have been interpreted as referring to Rome. Sicily, or at most Etruria, may have been the end of his journey as far as Stesichorus portrayed the legend. Cf. Vallet, *op.cit.*, p. 272.
- 17 Galinsky, *op.cit.*, pp. 107 ff. .
- 18 See pages 254-255, chapter VII and pages 293-295, chapter VIII.
- 19 Vallet, *op.cit.*, p. 272.
- 20 On the depiction of the Aeneas-theme on Athenian Black-figure vases found in Etruria from the last quarter of the 6th century, see Schauenburg, *art.cit.*, pp. 176 ff. ; also Boardman, ABFV, p. 231 and Galinsky, *op.cit.*, pp. 122 ff. . Galinsky points out that the popularity of the theme need not stem from the circulation of Stesichorus' poem, since there are almost as many depictions of Aeneas the fighter as Aeneas in flight. However, the popularity of Aeneas on imported Athenian vases and locally made terracottas in the 6th century testifies to the awareness of the legend that Aeneas came west and substantiates the hypothesis that Stesichorus was incorporating local versions (in this case an Etruscan one?) into his poems for his western audience. On the terracottas, see F. Bömer, Rom und Troia (Leiden, 1951) pp.14 f., who dates them to the 6th century. More scholars prefer the 5th century, as for example, Galinsky, *op.cit.*, p. 133; cf. Vallet, *op.cit.*, p. 271.
- 21 Jacoby, FGH 4 fr. 31 = Dionysius of Halicarnassus AR I 45 4f.
- 22 Dionysius' words are: ὁ μὲν οὖν πιστότατος τῶν λόγων, ἣ κέχρηται τῶν παλαιῶν συγγραφέων Ἑλλάνικος ἐν τοῖς Τρωϊκοῖς AR I 48 1.
- 23 In Dionysius AR I 22 3 we find reference to Hellanicus' accounts of the Sicels leaving their homeland in Italy to cross to Sicily. Other historians, such as Philistus of Syracuse, or Antiochus of Syracuse give different accounts. There were apparently differing versions that had reached the Greek mainland and the Ionian east that would have been available to Hellanicus.
- 24 Galinsky, *op.cit.*, p. 112.
- 25 Cf. footnote 33, page 297, chapter VIII.
- 26 Vürtheim, *op.cit.*, pp. 39 f. .
- 27 Cf. the inclusion of the portent-scene from Odyssey XV in what is assumed to be the Nostoi, P.Oxy. 2360.
- 28 Cf. Lobel, in The Oxyrhynchus Papyri vol. 37 (1971) p. 4 and West in ZPE 7 (1971) p. 264.
- 29 Neither West ZPE 4(1969) nor Page, PCPhS 19 (1973) makes any suggestion as to the context.

- 30 See Ghali-Kahil, op.cit., p. 78 ff. and Clement, art.cit., pp. 52 ff. .
- 31 Whether the scene in Ibycus was part of an epic narrative, or an exemplum from myth in a totally unepic context we cannot tell. Three separate allusions to Ibycus' treatment of the scene (in the scholia to Euripides' Andromache and to Aristophanes' Wasps and Lysistrata) tend to vouch for the truth of the statement that Ibycus did depict the scene in some form, and that he is not here being confused with Stesichorus .
- 32 The theme of Helen's notoriety is repeated in the Helen of Euripides: e.g. πρῶτον μὲν οὐκ οὕς' ἄδικος, εἰμι δυσκλεῆς line 270 ,
or ὥς, εἰ καθ' Ἑλλάδ' ὄνομα δυσκλεῆς φέρω line 66,
or οὐ πού νυν Ἑλένης αἰσχρὸν ὤλεσεν κλέος; line 135.
Cf. lines 926,927. In line 43 Helen speaks of her ὄνομα being at Troy. δυσώνυμος is associated with Moira in the epic tradition, as for example in Iliad XII 116 in which it is implied that Μοῖρα is an evil-bearing name.
- 33 West, ZPE 4 (1969) p. 141.
- 34 So Diggle, "Notes on Greek Lyric poets," CR 20 (1970) pp. 5,6.
Cf. the suggestion of Page, ἀελλοπόδον , PCPhS 19 (1973) p. 55.
Both are foreign to the epic tradition, though the elements of the compound are found in other compounds in Homer.
- 35 Cf. Lindsay, Helen of Troy (London, 1974) pp. 112 ff. . On Alcaeus' criticism, see Page, Sappho and Alcaeus (Oxford, 1955) pp. 280,281, and the likelihood of the sentiment being traditional. Stesichorus' accusations that he later recanted are of course part of this hostile tradition.
- 36 Cf. pages 323-324, chapter IX. One wonders how far the poet was expected or felt under obligation to maintain a consistent attitude to a particular point in different poems. The difference in approach to Helen in the Iliad and the Odyssey perhaps indicates that such a consideration was not of primary importance to the epic poet. On the other hand, the very nature of the recantation, as seen not only in Stesichorus, but also in Pindar, implies that a radical change in attitude on the part of the poet required explanation or justification. I assume, therefore, that if the Palinode were composed later rather than earlier in Stesichorus' literary career, the Sack of Troy would reveal the poet's critical attitude towards Helen. However, it is worth noting that the Nostoi-fragment , obviously borrowed from the Odyssey, appears to represent Helen , as in the Odyssey, as the dutiful wife and hostess, aware of the worries afflicting Penelope abandoned by her son as well as her husband. Do we attribute this representation of Helen as the poet's development of what is inherent in the Odyssey, or as being composed after his formal recantation? Unless we had some independent criteria for creating some sort of chronological order of composition of the poems this question remains unanswerable.
- 37 See chapter III, pages 73,74 on στυγερὸς.

- 38 Cf. Euripides' Helen 1301 ff. and Colluthos 349ff. .
- 39 Page, PCPhS 19 (1973) p. 54.
- 40 Ghali-Kahil, op.cit., p. 31 and 42; cf. Clement, art.cit., p.50.
- 41 See page 282, chapter VIII.
- 42 Clement, art.cit., pp. 72 ff. concludes his article on the depiction of the recovery of Helen with words of caution on assuming connections between literary and pictorial records of mythical themes.

Chapter XI Conclusion

The sands of Egypt have finally yielded among their treasures enough fragments of the poems of Stesichorus to give a far clearer perspective of the poet's position in the history of Greek literature than could be gleaned from the handful of citations that have survived in other authors. In an age when the Iliad and the Odyssey were still recited throughout Greece and her colonies, but when attempts to imitate the monumental epics failed to produce much of literary merit, Stesichorus created an alternative poetic form to replace the degenerating epic. Retaining the heroic theme, he amalgamated traditional and original material in narrative poems of about 1500 lines in length to be performed to the accompaniment of the lyre, either by solo voice or by chorus, or even both. Held within the bounds of this structure the poems were far more narrowly defined as far as content was concerned and less digressive than epic. The musical accompaniment in itself, the nomos which was traditionally divided into seven parts (Pollux 4 66), imposed a finite structure on the theme.

Stesichorus' diction may be described as essentially similar to that of the epic poems, with a superimposition at the level of phonology of a "Doric" pronunciation. The latter feature may be explained as a result of the pronunciation of the epic poems in the primarily "Doric" dialect-areas of the western colonies. Although such "Doric" colouring did later become one of the conventional features of choral lyric as composed by Pindar and Bacchylides, or in the choral odes of tragedy, its origins are obscure and it is impossible to determine whether Stesichorus employed the pronunciation naturally or as an element of a convention already established. His consistent use of

"Doric" features, however, was undoubtedly influential in the preservation of "Doric" elements in the choral odes of tragedy.

My examination of Stesichorus' treatment of "formulaic" expressions of epic derivation revealed that although the poet employed noun+epithet groups reminiscent of epic, in two out of every three cases the individual elements, derived as they were from epic, appeared in associations that were unprecedented in extant epic poems. Thus, what on first encounter gives the impression of being "Homeric" is seen under greater scrutiny to be deliberate remoulding of elements from more than one "Homeric formula". The poet thereby succeeded in retaining the tone of epic, but by breaking the expected word-associations and creating novel phrases also succeeded in restoring vitality into the epic style. An examination of the ways in which the poet adapted his linguistic inheritance from epic to a new structural entity has demonstrated his awareness of both the degeneration of the traditional medium and the poetic potential to be realised by shattering associations embedded in the minds of his audience.

The content of the poems still belonged to the heroic age, be it traditional tales from the mainland of Greece carried by colonists to their new land, or tales created by and for those living in the Greek west. Stesichorus may well have begun his career as a reciter of the traditional epics, but he was either disillusioned in the obsolescent verse-form of the hexameter, or was inspired to revive the waning popularity of poetry on heroic themes by creating a revitalised form, which we could call lyrico-epic. The breadth of his repertoire is indicated by the surviving titles; he was obviously well-versed in the corpus of traditional tales constituting the cultural inheritance of the Greeks.

The innovations for which he gained a distinctive reputation were incorporated into this heroic milieu.

Evidence for the occasions on which Stesichorus' poems were performed is slight, and in this area the new fragments have revealed little. Anecdotes such as that related by Aristotle (Rhetoric II 1393b) or by Philodemus (de Musica I 30,31) suggest that the poet may have used his privilege as a public figure to voice opinions, whether his own or those prompted by interested parties employing him, in situations of political significance. In the context of an example of Terpander's successful attempt at musical psychotherapy, Philodemus tells of Stesichorus' success in restoring peace between two warring factions through the recitation of a poem he calls a paracleticon. Aristotle tells us that Stesichorus warned the people of Himera against allowing too much power to the tyrant Phalaris through a fable of the Horse and the Stag. Whether, as in the case of another fable quoted by Aelian (Nat. Anim. XVII 37), the fable against Phalaris was incorporated within the framework of a long poem or not, we cannot tell. It seems unlikely that a lengthy poem such as the Geryoneis, Sack of Troy or Oresteia would have been performed impromptu in an official assembly or on a battlefield. The reconstructed invocation of the Oresteia (PMG 210) in which wars are dismissed may be understood as a reference to a contemporary situation and thus would suggest the performance of the poem was part of a city-state's festival celebrating the conclusion of a successful campaign. Other than as popular entertainment, the poems may have been designed for performance at a religious festival in honour of a particular cult-figure, perhaps Heracles or Apollo. The new fragments, however, give no indication of specific occasion. If the myths related in the poems were designed to convey social or political comment through their narrative,

again we have no direct evidence from within the structure of the poems. The poet may have easily spoken in his own persona in the introduction and conclusion of his poems, as in the case of the Palinode, but there is no evidence of his intrusion within the framework of the narrative itself. It appears, therefore, that Stesichorus' poems were primarily narratives intended for public entertainment, possibly carried from city to city, as the epic poems were, by transient rhapsodes.

That the poet enjoyed some success in his attempt to revitalise epic narrative poetry is substantiated by the preservation of his poems into the 5th century, when we find references to specific lines made in Aristophanes and Plato, and we discover the foremost Attic tragedians borrowing motifs from his work. Whether or not the poet himself ever travelled to mainland Greece, his poems certainly did. In the case of mythical themes common to Stesichorus' poems and to both vase-painting and sculpture in the mid-6th century, it is seldom possible to trace direct influence in either direction. The increased popularity of representations of the exploits of Heracles in art may have been promoted by the circulation of Stesichorus' poems. Alternatively, both the poems and the vase-paintings may have been produced in response to the popularity of the hero in the Archaic period, especially in the Greek west.

No other poet of the Archaic or Classical period in Greek literature is known to have composed poems of the type created by Stesichorus. The narrative sections of poems composed by Alcman, Pindar or Bacchylides are not constructed on the same monumental scale as his narrative poems. Furthermore, in the works of later lyric poets, and in particular Pindar, the poet's persona assumes a dominant position it never achieves in Stesichorus, as choral poetry more and more becomes a

medium for conveying the reflections of the poet. Stesichorus' "genre" of poetry was not imitated therefore, partly because there was little demand for such purely narrative tales, but also because of the backward-looking nature of his poems. As far as we can tell, his poems continued to reflect the attitudes and mores to be found in the epic tradition. It is impossible to tell to what extent, if at all, Stesichorus directed his efforts to making the Homeric values relevant to his contemporary audience. Moreover, by the end of the 6th century just as the metrical and musical forms that Stesichorus had used were being refined, so the myths that he had narrated in full were reduced to exempla or allusions ancillary to the poet's search for the ultimate truth.

Stesichorus falls as an intermediary in the line of the literary development of the traditional myths from the orally transmitted version of the epic bards to the dramatic realisations of the 5th century tragic poets. As the popularity of epic as an art-form embodying the traditional inheritance of Greek culture diminished, Stesichorus can be seen as one who endeavoured to rekindle the dying embers by his adaptations of inherited and innovative material to a new poetic form, reviving epic modes of expression, amalgamating traditional with original, Homeric with non-Homeric. His poetic creation was given due recognition, but, being essentially retrospective in atmosphere, did not inspire a continuing tradition. The tragic poets of the age that followed, in their presentation of the traditional legends rendered pertinent to contemporary society, succeeded where Stesichorus did not, in creating a monumentum aere perennius. Nevertheless, Stesichorus' influence on the dramatists may be seen, not only in their

adoption of some of his innovative motifs , but also in structure.

The composite unity of his poems, achieved by the limitations of thematic material and of length, which was approximately the same as that of the tragic play, must have acted as a precedent for the structure of a 5th century tragedy. In spite of being designed to perpetuate the obsolescent form and content of the epic tradition, the poems of Stesichorus not only offered the Greek west its own heroic tradition, but also provided a proto-type for the Attic tragedians.

Bibliography.

- Adkins, A.W.H. Moral Values and Political Behaviour in Ancient Greece. London: Chatto and Windus, 1972.
- Allen, T.W. "Miscellanea." CQ 22 (1928) pp. 73-75.
- _____. (editor). Homeri Opera vol. V. Oxford: Clarendon, 1961.
- _____. (editor). Homeri Opera vols. III and IV. Oxford: Clarendon, 2nd edition, 1965.
- Alsina Clota, J. "La Helena y la Palinodia de Estesicoro." Eclás 4 (1957) pp. 157-175.
- Armstrong, J.I. "The Arming Motif in the Iliad." AJPh 79 (1958) pp. 337-354.
- Barrett, A.A. "P.Oxy. 2359 and Stesichorus' Συοθήραι." CPh 67 (1972) pp. 117-119.
- Bartoněk, A. "Greek dialects in the 2nd millenium B.C." Eirene 9 (1971) pp. 49-69.
- Beazley, J.D. The Kleophrades Painter. Berlin: Heinrich Keller, 1933.
- _____. Attic Black Figure Vase Painters. Oxford: Clarendon, 1956.
- _____. Attic Red Figure Vase Painters. Oxford: Clarendon, 2nd edition, 1963.
- Bechtel, F. Die griechischen Dialekte vols. I-III. Berlin: Weidmann, 1921-1924.
- Bérard, J. La colonisation grecque. Paris: de Boccard, 1941.
- Bergk, T. (editor). Poetae Lyrici Graeci vol. III. Leipzig: Teubner, 1882.
- Bertini, F. "L'eidolon di Elena," in Mythos: Scripta in honorem Marri Untersteiner, ed. G.Lanata. Genoa: Fratelli Pagano, 1970.
- Bicknell, P.J. "The Date of the Battle of the Sagra River." Phoenix 20 (1966) pp. 294-301.
- Boardman, J. Athenian Black Figure Vases. London: Thames and Hudson, 1974.
- Bömer, F. Rom und Troia. Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1951.
- Bonnard, A. Archiloque. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1958.

- Bowra, C.M. "Stesichorus in the Peloponnese." CQ 28 (1934) pp. 115-119.
- _____. Pindari Carmina. Oxford: Clarendon, 2nd edition, 1955.
- _____. Greek Lyric Poetry. Oxford: Clarendon, 2nd edition, 1961.
- _____. "The two Palinodes of Stesichorus." CR 13 (1963) pp. 245-252.
- _____. Pindar. Oxford: Clarendon, 1964.
- Brommer, F. Herakles. Munster: Bohlau, 1953.
- Buck, C.D. Greek Dialects. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2nd edition, 1955.
- Burn, A.R. The Lyric Age of Greece. London: Edward Arnold, 1967.
- Calvo Martinez, J.L. "Estesicoro de Himera." Durius 2 (1974) pp. 311-342.
- Cataudella, Q. "Lyrica Greca in Sicilia: Stesicoro." ASSO 64 (1968) pp. 93-109.
- Chadwick, J. Greek Dialects and Greek Prehistory. Greece and Rome, series III, (1956) pp. 38-50.
- _____. "Who were the Dorians?" PP 31 (1976) pp. 103-117.
- Chantraine, P. Grammaire homérique I and II. Paris: Klincksieck, 1948 and 1953.
- _____. Morphologie historique du Grec. Paris: Klincksieck, 2nd edition, 1967.
- Clement, P. "The Recovery of Helen." Hesperia 27 (1958) pp. 47-73.
- Coleman, R. "The dialect geography of Ancient Greece." TPhS (1963) pp. 58-126.
- Collinge, N.R. "Mycenaean di-pa and δέπας." BICS 4 (1954) pp. 55-59.
- Compernelle, R. Étude de chronologie et d' historiographie Siciliotes. Bruxelles: Palais des Académies, 1959.
- Cook, R.M. "The Date of the Hesiodic Shield." CQ 31 (1937) pp. 204-214.
- Couvreur, P. (editor). Hermeias Alexandrii: In Platonis Phaedrum Scholia. Paris: Bouillon, 1901.
- Dale, A.M. (editor). Euripides : Helen. Oxford: Clarendon, 1966.

- Davison, J.A. "Quotations and allusions in early Greek literature." Eranos 53 (1955) pp. 125-140.
- _____. "Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 2506." Atti dell' xi Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia (Milan, 1965) pp. 96-106.
- _____. "De Helena Stesicori." QUCC 1 (1966) pp. 80-90.
- Dawe, R.D. "Stesichorus' fr. 207 P." PCPhS 18 (1972) pp. 28-30.
- Detienne, M. "La légende pythagoricienne d'Hélène." RHR 152 (1957) pp. 129-152.
- Devereux, G. "Stesichorus' Palinodes: two further testimonia and some comments." RhM 116 (1973) pp. 208-209.
- _____. Dreams in Greek Tragedy. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1976.
- Diels, H. and W. Kranz. Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker. Berlin: Weidmann, 1952.
- Dietrich, B. The Origins of Greek Religion. New York: de Gruyter, 1974.
- Diggle, J. "Notes on Greek Lyric Poets." CR 20 (1970) pp. 5-6.
- Dodds, E.R. The Greeks and the Irrational. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968.
- Donlan, W. "Simonides, fr. 4 D and P. Oxy. 2432." TAPhA 100 (1969) pp. 71-95.
- Doria, M. "Le due Palinodie de Stesicoro." PP 18 (1963) pp. 81-93.
- Dunbabin, T. The Western Greeks. Oxford: Clarendon, 1948.
- Düring, I. "Klutaimestra, νηλὴς γυνὴ : a study in the development of a literary motif." Eranos 41 (1943) pp. 91-123.
- Erbse, H. "Betrachtungen über das 5 Buch der Ilias." RhM 104 (1961) pp. 156-189.
- Farina, A. Studi Stesicori : il mito di Helena. Naples : Coll. di Studi Greci, 1968.
- Fenik, B. Typical Battle Scenes in the Iliad. Hermes Einzelschriften 21. Wiesbaden: F. Steiner, 1968.
- Ferrari, W. "Stesicoro Imerese e Stesicoro Locrese." Athenaeum 15 (1937) pp. 229-251.
- _____. "L'Oresteia de Stesicoro." Athenaeum 16 (1938) pp. 1-38.

- Finley, M.I. Ancient Sicily. London: Chatto and Windus, 1968.
- Fleming, T.J. "The Musical Nomos in Aeschylus' Oresteia." CJ 72 (1977) pp. 222-233.
- Fränkel, H. Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy. (Translated by M. Hadas and J. Willis) Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1975.
- Führer, R. Formproblem-Untersuchungen zu den Reden in der frühgriechischen Lyrik. Zetemata 44. Munich: C.H. Beck, 1967.
- _____. "Die metrische Struktur von Stesichoros' Γερουονής, P.Oxy. 2617." Hermes 96 (1968-1969) pp. 675-684.
- _____. "Zur metrische Struktur von Stesichoros' Εὐοθήρα." Hermes 97 (1969) pp. 115-116.
- _____. "Zum Stesichorus redivivus." ZPE 5 (1970) pp. 11-16.
- _____. "Zu P.Oxy. 2803." ZPE 7 (1971) pp. 265-266.
- _____. "Nächtrage zu P.Oxy. 2803." ZPE 8 (1971) pp. 251-254.
- Galinsky, G.K. Aeneas, Sicily and Rome. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969.
- _____. The Heracles Theme. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1972.
- Garzya, A. "La poesia lirica greca nella Magna Graecia." P.&I. 10 (1968) pp. 237-248.
- Gentili, B. "Review of PMG, LSG, SLG." Gnomon 48 (1976) pp. 740-751.
- Ghali-Kahil, L.B. Les enlèvements et le retour d'Hélène. Paris: de Boccard, 1956.
- Graham, A.J. Colony and Mother-city in Ancient Greece. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1964.
- Grégoire H. Euripide vol. 5. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1950.
- Hainsworth, J.B. "Structure and content in epic formulae: the question of unique expression." CQ 14 (1964) pp. 155-164.
- _____. "Greek views of Greek Dialectology." TPhS (1967) pp. 62-76.
- _____. The Flexibility of the Homeric Formula. Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.
- _____. Homer. Greece and Rome, Surveys no. III. Oxford: Clarendon, 1969.
- Hamm, E.-M. Grammatik zu Sappho und Alkaios. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 2nd edition, 1952.

- Harris, H.A. Greek Athletes and Athletics. London: Hutchinson, 1964.
- Haslam, M.W. "Stesichorean Metre." QUCC 17 (1974) pp. 5-57.
- Holsten, R. De Stesicori et Ibyci dialecto et copia verborum. Stralsund: Bremer, 1884.
- Huxley, G.L. Greek Epic Poetry. London: Faber and Faber, 1969.
- Jacoby, F. Apollodors Chronik. Berlin: Weidmann, 1902.
- _____. Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker. Erster Teil. Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1957.
- Jeffery, L.H. The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece. Oxford: Clarendon, 1961.
- Kakridis, T. Homeric Researches. Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1949.
- Kinkel, G. (editor). Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta I. Leipzig: Teubner, 1877.
- Kirk, G.S. Myth: its meaning and functions in ancient and other cultures. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970.
- _____. The Nature of Greek Myth. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1974.
- Kleine, O.F. Stesichori Himerensis Fragmenta. Berlin: Reimer, 1828.
- Krafft, F. Vergleichende Untersuchungen zu Homer und Hesiod. Hypomnemata 6. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963.
- Lattimore, R. "The first elegy of Solon." AJPh 68 (1947) pp. 161-179.
- Lejeune, M. Traité de phonétique grecque. Paris: Klincksieck, 2nd edition, 1955.
- Leone, P. "La Palinodia di Stesicoro." AFIN 11 (1964-1968) pp. 5-28.
- Lesky, A. A History of Greek Literature. (Translated by J. Willis and C. de Heer) London: Methuen, 1966.
- Lindsay, J. Helen of Troy. London: Constable, 1974.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. "Review of P. Oxy. XXIII." CR 8 (1958) pp. 16-22.
- Lobel, E. The Oxyrhynchus Papyri vols. XXIII, XXXII, XXXV, XXXVII. Publications of the Egypt Exploration Society. London, 1956, 1967, 1968, 1971.
- Lobel, E. and D. Page (editors). Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta. Oxford: Clarendon, 1955.

- M^CKay, K.J. "Hesiod's rejuvenation." CQ 9 (1959) pp. 1-5.
- Mazon, P. Introduction à l'Illiade. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1948.
- Meillet, A. Aperçu d'une histoire de la langue grecque. Paris: Klincksieck, 6th edition, 1948.
- Merkelbach, R. "Zwei metrische Beiträge." Maia 15 (1963) pp. 165-167.
- Merkelbach, R. and M.L. West (editors). Fragmenta Hesiodica. Oxford: Clarendon, 1967.
- Monro, D.B. and T.W. Allen (editors). Homeri Opera vols. I and II. Oxford: Clarendon, 3rd edition, 1962.
- Morpurgo-Davies, A. "'Doric' features in the language of Hesiod." Glotta 42 (1964) pp. 138-165.
- Myres, J.L. "Hesiod's Shield of Heracles." JHS 61 (1941) pp. 17-40.
- Nagler, M.N. "Towards a generative view of the oral formula." TAPhA 98 (1967) pp. 269-311.
- _____. Spontaneity and Tradition: a study in the oral art of Homer. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974.
- Nöthiger, M. Die Sprache des Stesichoros und Ibykos. Zurich: Juris, 1971.
- Notopoulos, J.A. "Studies in early Greek oral poetry." HSCPh 68 (1964) pp. 1-77.
- O'Neill, E.G. Jr. "The localisation of metrical word-types in the Greek hexameter." YClS 8 (1942) pp. 103-178.
- Page, D. (editor). Alcman: the Partheneion. Oxford: Clarendon, 1951.
- _____. Sappho and Alcaeus. Oxford: Clarendon, 1955.
- _____. Poetae Melici Graeci. Oxford: Clarendon, 1962.
- _____. The Oxyrynchus Papyri vol. XXIX. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1963.
- _____. Lyrice Graeca Selecta. Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.
- _____. Aeschyli septem quae supersunt tragoediae. Oxford: Clarendon, 1972.
- _____. Supplementum Lyricis Graecis. Oxford: Clarendon, 1974.

- Page, D. "Ibycus' poem in honour of Polycrates." Aegyptus 31 (1951) pp. 158-172.
- _____. "P.Oxy. 2331 and others." CR 7 (1957) pp. 189-192.
- _____. "Stesichorus: P.Oxy. 2617." PCPhS 13 (1967) p.70.
- _____. "Stesichorus: P.Oxy. 2735 fr.1, 2618 fr.1, 2619 fr.1." PCPhS 15 (1969) pp. 69-74.
- _____. "Ibycus, Stesichorus, Alcman." PCPhS 17 (1971) pp. 89-98.
- _____. "Stesichorus: the Geryoneis." JHS 93 (1973) pp. 138-154.
- _____. "Stesichorus: The Sack of Troy and The Wooden Horse (P.Oxy. 2619 and 2803)." PCPhS 19 (1973) pp. 47-65.
- Palmer, L.R. "The language of Homer" in A Companion to Homer, ed. A.J.B. Wace and F.H. Stubbings. London: Macmillan, 1967.
- Pavese, C.O. Tradizione e generi poetici della Grecia Archaica. Rome: Ateneo, 1972.
- Peek, W. "Die Nostoi des Stesichorus." Philologus 102 (1958) pp. 169-177.
- Perret, J. Les origines de la légende troyenne de Rome. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1942.
- Pisani, V. "Elena i l'eidolon." RFC 6 (1928) pp. 476-499.
- Podlecki, A.J. "Stesichorea." Athenaeum 49 (1971) pp. 313-327.
- Porzig, W. "Sprachegeographische Untersuchungen zu den altgriechischen Dialekten." IF 61 (1954) pp. 147-169.
- Preller, L. and C. Robert. Griechische Mythologie II : Die griechische Heldensage. Zurich : Weidmann, 1967.
- Richardson, N.J. The Homeric Hymn to Demeter. Oxford: Clarendon, 1974.
- Richter, G. A Handbook of Greek Art. London: Methuen, 1969.
- Risch, E. "Die Sprache Alkmans." MH 11 (1954) pp. 20-37.
- _____. "Die Gliederung der griechischen Dialekte in neuer Sicht." MH 12 (1955) pp. 61-76.
- Robertson, M. "Geryoneis: Stesichorus and the Vase-painters." CR 19 (1969) pp. 207-221.
- Rose, H.J. "Stesichorus and the Rhadine fragment." CQ 26 (1932) pp. 88-92.

- Rose, H.J. "De Actaeone Stesichoreo." Mnemosyne 59 (1932) pp. 431-432.
- _____. A Handbook of Greek Literature. London: Methuen, 1965.
- Russo, J.A. "The structural formulae in Homeric verse." YCLS 20 (1960) pp. 219-240.
- Sadurska, A. Les Tables Iliques. Warsaw: P.W.N., 1964.
- Santini, C. "Omerismi in Stesicoro." GIF 22 (1970) pp. 71-76.
- Schauenburg, K. "Aeneas und Rom." Gymnasium 67 (1960) pp. 176-190.
- Schefold, K. Myth and Legend in Early Greek Art. London: Thames and Hudson, 1966.
- Scherer, A. "Die Sprache des Archilochos," in Archiloque: Fondation Hardt, Entretiens 10. Geneva: Vandoevres, 1964.
- Schmid, W. and O.Stählin. Geschichte der griechischen Literatur. Erster Teil, erster Band. Munich: C.H.Beck, 1959.
- Schoo, J. Hercules' Labors, Fact or Fiction. Chicago: Argonaut Press, 1969.
- Schwartz, J. Pseudo-Hesiodica. Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1960.
- Schwyzer, E. Griechische Grammatik vols. I and II. Munich : C.H. Beck, 1939 and 1950.
- Scott, W.C. The Oral Nature of the Homeric Simile. Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1974.
- Sisti, F. "Le due Palinodie di Stesicoro." Studi Urbinati 39 (1965) pp. 301-313.
- Sjöqvist, E. "Heracles in Sicily." ORom 4 (1962) pp. 117-123.
- Smotricz, A.P. "Utrum Stesichorus duas Palinodias conscripserit." Meander 20 (1965) pp. 445-450.
- Snell, B. (editor). Pindari Carmina cum fragmentis. Leipzig: Teubner, 2nd edition, 1955.
- Snell, B. "Stesichorus' Σποθηπαύ." Hermes 85 (1957) pp. 249-251.
- _____. "Review of P.Oxy. XXXII." Gnomon 40 (1968) pp. 116-123.
- Solmsen, F. (editor). Hesiodi Theogonia, Opera et Dies, Scutum. Oxford: Clarendon, 1970.
- Thompson, d'A. W. A Glossary of Greek Birds. London: Oxford University Press, 1936.

- Thumb, A. and E. Kieckers. Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte I .
Heidelberg: Winter, 1932.
- _____. and A. Scherer. Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte II .
Heidelberg: Winter, 1958.
- Troxler, H. Sprache und Wortschatz Hesiods . Zürich: Juris, 1964.
- Vallet, G. Rhegion et Zancle. Paris: de Boccard, 1958.
- Vürtheim, J. Stesichoros' Fragmente und Biographie. Leiden: A.W.
Sijthoff's Uitgeversmaatschappij N.V., 1919.
- Webster, T.B.L. "Stesichorus : Geryoneis." Agon 2 (1968) pp. 1-9.
- West, M.L. Hesiod : Theogony. Oxford: Clarendon, 1966.
- _____. "Stesichorus redivivus." ZPE 4 (1969) pp. 135-149.
- _____. "Melica." CQ 20 (1970) pp. 205-215.
- _____. "Stesichorus." CQ 21 (1971) pp. 302-314.
- _____. "Further light on Stesichorus' Iliu Persis." ZPE 7 (1971)
pp. 262-264.
- _____. "Greek poetry 2000 - 700 B.C." CQ 23 (1973) pp. 179-192.
- Wiencke, M. I. "An epic theme in Greek Art." AJA 58 (1954) pp. 285-
306.
- Wilamowitz, U. von. Sappho und Simonides. Berlin: Weidmann, 1913.
- Willcock, M.M. "Mythological Paradeigmata in the Iliad." CQ 14 (1964)
pp. 147-153.
- Woodbury, L. "Helen and the Palinode." Phoenix 21 (1967) pp. 157-176.
- Wyatt, W.F. Jr. "The Aeolic Substrate in the Peloponnese." AJPh 94
(1973) pp. 37-46.
- Zancani Montuoro, P. "Riflessi di una Oresteia anteriore ad Eschilo."
RAAN 26 (1951) pp. 270-279.
- _____. and U. Zanotti Bianco. Heraion alla foce del
Sele. Roma: Libr. dello Stato, 1954.