## 1. Introduction

(boldened numerals in square brackets refer to passages on the handout)

This morning I want to talk about Homer and his lyric (or non-epic) reception, which I think would have pleased our honorand, given that he was a second home to the *Homerou psukha*. My thesis is that Stesikhoros is very important for our histories of early Greek literature, specifically for the vexed question of the influence of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* on subsequent Greek poets. This is because we find in his fragments the first really solid evidence for a sustained, intertextual engagement with Homer's epics.

He may not be the first poet to have known, utilised or alluded to Homer, since the evidence is too slight, too fragmentary for us to be sure. He is, however, the first poet of whom we can say with certainty that he aimed to have his audience recognise the Homeric interaction in his own texts as something more than just a repository of famous episodes, or a generalised appeal to Homer's authority and status, but as an interpreted, entire text. Andrew Ford [**bibliography**] has argued that Herodotos is the first Greek to show such an appreciation of Homer, but I think we should see it, with Walter Burkert [**bibliography**], in Stesikhoros.

## 2. The Problem

The history of Homeric reception in Archaic literature is a vexed matter, usually explored in the context of the Homeric Question(s). Thus it was once very fashionable for scholars to use the evidence of the 7th century lyric poets as a *terminus ante quem* for the composition of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. The realisation that early Greek culture was not literate, however, long ago began to spawn doubts about drawing lines between texts in this way. J. A. Davison wrote a famous article in 1955 in which he argued that generally accepted quotations of and allusions to Homer were not, in fact, evidence of direct textual relationships at all [**bibliography**], and Robert Fowler [**bibliography**] gave a more measured version of the same point in 1987. Their scepticism was influenced by several factors: doubts over the extent of written textualisation, the abundance of other poems or performances with the same material,

the traditional and formular quality not only of epic but also non-epic poetic forms, the fact that Homer was associated with many more poems than the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and so on.

Indeed, all this caution strives to avoid the fallacy which has been called WYSIATI – what you see is all there is – a version of the documentary fallacy which continues to leave its traces all over the histories of early Greek literature. It is, of course, an entirely natural temptation, esp. when most of the evidence is so fragmentary. Yet the process is highly subjective, and much depends on how high or low we set the probative bar.

Let us take the well-known 'men as leaves' theme first found in *Iliad* 6 [**1a**] as our first example. At the end of the 6th century, Simonides F 19W quotes *Iliad* 6.146, and then ascribes it to the blind man from Khios, before in F 20W (recently re-joined to F 19W) identifying him further as 'divine Homer' [**1b**]. This, I don't think anyone would contest, is a rock solid *terminus ante quem* for the emergence of the Homeric poems, and for their use by both poets and audiences.

But the theme itself, even as early as Homer, is a traditional one: he deploys it several times [**1c**] in a manner which shows that he was not the first to express the thought, so that when it recurs in Mimnermos F 2W [**1d**], should we push our *terminus* a little further back? Evidently this is not a quotation of Homer in the same way as Simonides F 19–20W, but it might be – indeed, it has been (by Bowie 2010) [**bibliography**] – considered a direct and recreative quotation of the Homeric passage. Though it remains possible, Robert Fowler and more recently Jonathan Burgess [**bibliography**] are surely right to be sceptical that Mimnermos is doing anything more than using a traditional theme.

Let us, nonetheless, entertain momentarily the conclusion that it is a direct Homeric interaction. What does that add to Mimnermos' poem? We usually ask the question of allusion in order to identify something about the textual history of Homer, but perhaps we should be considering the phenomenon of poetic interaction from a slightly larger perspective, in terms of the use being made of Homer. In this case, as Jonathan Burgess has suggested [**bibliography**], any audience member recognising or recalling

the Homeric passage does not seem to be required to do very much with it, intertextually speaking. Perhaps the interaction adds an heroic nuance to Mimnermos' somewhat pessimistic view of human life, but it does not demand that the 'alert' audience member should activate an understanding or interpretation of that particular Homeric passage, or indeed even Homeric poetry in general, in order to illumine the elegy.

So this case serves as a model in identifying Homeric interactions in the Archaic period: **first**, ensure that the passage is actually interacting with Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, rather than a traditional, non-specific and generically epic background; **second**, assess the interaction in terms of what it asks the audience to invoke about the Homeric poems, and how that invocation affects the target poem. This may all seem rather self-evident, of course, especially when dealing with such a well-known body of evidence. But caution in these matters seems recently to have gone out the window, as we are increasingly being encouraged to conceive of a Homer who apparently knew not only several very fixed Greek epic poems, but one or two non-Greek ones as well, and interacted with them in a very Vergilian manner.

From this newly invigorated perspective, literate culture and dynamics spring forth fully formed in the Archaic period, as though these types of interaction are waiting only for the appearance of written texts in order to flourish in their later-known form. On this model, no-one had to think about it, no conceptions about poetic composition, performance or re-performance had to change or evolve. I find this hard to believe, personally, but it will always be a question of subjectivity. *Quot homines*, and so on. Nonetheless, I hope to show that Stesikhoros will provide us with what we need to move the debate forward, and to throw some much-needed light on the process.

**3. The best case?**

Stesikhoros is not, of course, the first of the lyric poets to have been linked with the Homeric poems, and as a more targeted preliminary I want to examine perhaps the

strongest single candidate for such an allusion – Alkaios F 44 [**2**], whose claim is so strong that even a sceptic like Fowler is prepared to assent.[1]

I want to swim against this tide, not because it will make any particular difference to my basic thesis, but mostly in order to show the subjectivity of any such conclusion or identification, and how readily it can be undermined. Firstly, Akhilleus is deeply embedded in the formula systems of Homeric epic: the *Iliad* was not the only composition ever to have been told about him, or taking him as its centrepiece. Furthermore, given his character, it is hardly unthinkable that several stories about his anger management issues, or what we oralists like to call a 'wrath story pattern', were circulating in the earliest period. The Neoanalysts have suggested that this pattern also structured the *Aithiopis*, but it is an extremely common and variable pattern in Homeric poetry [**3**], deployed to structure the whole of the *Iliad*, or of Meleagros in Phoinix's speech in Book 9, or even over a small section of battle narrative for Aineias in Book 13 etc. So Alkaios' wrathful Akhilleus need not have been derived from our *Iliad*.

Secondly, Thetis' particular role in her son's fortunes are presupposed in other early epic, notably the *Aithiopis* and it forebears, and Laura Slatkin has suggested [**b**] that Homer knows the story in which Thetis was destined to bring forth a child stronger than its father, necessitating her marriage to a mortal. Thus, the nature of the favour which Zeus owes her in *Iliad* Book 1 (saving him from an actual divine rebellion) is an Homeric innovation of another earlier favour, in which she had agreed or simply been forced to marry Peleus.

This original story could have been found in a genealogical narrative, but past favours are very frequently invoked in EGE when they're being recalled in the process of a supplication / request. Thus it is possible that any earlier version of her relationship with Zeus was invoked in the context of a request made of him by Thetis. Even this detail in Alkaios 44, therefore, need not be derived from our *Iliad*. In fact, Thetis was constantly approaching Zeus on her son's behalf: after all, our *Iliad* references a fairly

[1] I have pondered taking *tekeos* as genitive after the verb, to mean something like 'and she grabbed (his) knees and and begged [ . . . ] (from) her child [to abandon *vel sim*.] his anger', somewhat along the lines of Eur. *IA* 1242–3: ἱκέτευσον πατρὸς | τὴν σὴν ἀδελφὴν μὴ θανεῖν, but the relative lateness and isolation of the construction with the genitive is noticeable.

continuous stream of information between them, and the parallels between Akhilleus and Memnon, whose mother Eôs does obtain a special favour of immortality from Zeus, led Wolfgang Schadewaldt [**b**] to propose a specific episode in which Thetis likewise asked Zeus for the immortality she acquires for Akhilleus at the end of the *Aithiopis*. Given how jealously Zeus guards the divine / mortal boundary in early Greek myth, such an episode is surely required to make sense of his eventual fate. Thus Alkaios 44 could be a reference to a story very similar to that later enshrined in the *Aithiopis*.

None of this is really trying to prove that there was such another story or poem for Alkaios to allude to, and in fact I believe that this probably is a reference to the *Iliad*. But the remains of EGE and what we can reasonably hypothesise about what we have lost suggest that, as a matter of argument and evidence, we cannot assume that Homer's *Iliad* was the first or only Greek epic poem in which Akhilleus gets angry and Thetis approaches Zeus on his behalf. Alkaios 44 is not, therefore, conclusive evidence that he knew the *Iliad*.

This may strike every person here as excessive or even mischeivous scepticism, and perhaps it is one, both or all of these things, but it serves an important purpose: if we are to avoid WYSIATI in the process of identifying Homeric interaction, then all the evidence for interaction must be pushed through an absolute wringer. Having done this, we need to ask with each item what the interaction adds to the supposed relationship. The problem with Alkaios 44, of course, is that the beginning of the poem is lost, but we should note that the knowledge of the *Iliad* shown there is basic – two rather momentous, marquee-episodes near the narrative's beginning – involving its major characters and pretext. The audience may be required to know the poem, but we can't tell what they're being asked to do with it in the context of Alkaios' composition. So Alkaios may be doing something rather sophisticated here - we just can't tell.

**4. Lyric Allusions to Homer**

These problems will recur in this section. I exclude here for reasons of space Arkhilokhos and the other elegiac / iambic poets, and refer you to the discussions esp.

of Fowler (1987) and Burgess (2001), against e.g. Adkins (1985) and Bowie (2010) [**bibliography**]. I don't believe there are any compelling cases for interaction in the 7th and 6th century elegists before Simonides, but this morning I concentrate on the lyric poets to the middle of the 6th century – Sappho, Alkaios and Alkman.

Epic interaction in these poets is usually subordinated to the needs of lyric composition, and so restricted in scale, and tied to a place and a time in the author's present. Partially because of these factors, interaction is so sporadic, restricted and allusive that it is extremely difficult to identify an engagement specifically with the Homeric *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. When interactions are suggested, we will see once more that the audience is not being required to do anything much with it: the allusive sophistication of later ages has yet, in my opinion, to appear. This may be less a question of ability than desire, of course, but we must proceed very carefully in retrojecting textual practices from a later period onto an earlier one.

The combination of ellipsis, simplicity of interaction and basic evidentiary difficulty recurs repeatedly. Obviously, epic interaction is more easily visible in lyric compositions in dactylic rhythms, or lyric reworkings of heroic material, but even here, specific interaction with Homer is very difficult to establish.

For instance, in Alkaios 140 V (357 LP) [**4a**] we find a list of armour which looks like a quotation of Homer or 'the Epic' (Page (1955) [**bibliography**]). But which of the four Iliadic arming scenes [**4b**] is invoked? This is, after all, a *formulaic* verse, part of a very typical scene, and so presumably not limited to our *Iliad*. If it is an Homeric reminiscence, is Alkaios asking his audience to think of Paris, Agamemnon, Patroklos or Teukros? Or is there just a generalised connotation of heroic epic endeavour, to be applied to the poet's current circumstance (esp. 8–9)? In either case, there seems to be little sustained or active interaction with the Homeric passage(s).

Typical narrative structures are not the only traditional barriers to identifying a direct Homeric allusion. Take the story of Helen in Alkaios 42 V and 283 V, and Sappho 16 V, a story which was told in the (later attested) *Kypria*. Though the date of this poem is unknown, the material on which it was based was clearly at least as old as Homer,

so its episodes must have been known in some epic form to the Lesbian poets. The same must be said for the 'Cologne Alkaios' (298 V = S 262 *PMG*), which tells the story of Kassandra's rape at greater length than our other lyric compositions, but this time compares the violence of Aias in that scene, apparently, to the behaviour of Pittakos. Both Dirk Meyerhoff and Martin Steinrück [**bibliography**] have recently drawn atttention to the importance of post-Homeric epic influence on the Lesbian poets, and why we should think in these cases of a particular interaction with Homer as opposed to material that we now call 'cyclic' is very unclear. There is, as far as I can see, nothing in these poems which advertises an affiliation or interaction with Homer as opposed to the epic in general (cf. also the story of Akhilleus' birth in Alkaios 42 V, and Aias in Alkaios 387 V).

In this connection, Sappho 44 [**5**] is particularly interesting, since the wedding of Hektor and Andromkahe is not known from another epic poem, though it is not difficult to see it within the narrative scope of the *Kypria* (cf. Apollodoros 3.153). Modern scholars have argued that Sappho recomposes several Iliadic scenes, from Books 6, 22 and 24 – note once more that these are marquee episodes – into a new story (Schrenk 1994; Bowie 2010) [**bibliography**]. Yet neither Hektor nor Andromakhe are Homeric inventions; his traditionality surely needs no argument, and she has a consistent back-story in the poem, while both the Homeric scenes which give most of the requisite information – the prospective lamentation in Book 6, and the formal lamentation in Book 24 – are entirely typical sequences. Homer need not, therefore, have been the first to remind audiences of their marriage in these passages. There is no trigger of interaction in Sappho 44, as it were, in the form of a specific reminiscence or expression which could not simply be a coincidence, the result of a shared thematic / mythological context. I wouldn't deny that Sappho is deliberately recalling epic language here, it's just that we can't safely identify those interactions as specifically Homeric in origin.

A little more promising is Alkaios 395 V [**6a**] as a direct reflection of *Il*. 21.219–20 [**6b**], where Skamandros is narrowed / choked with corpses and not able to flow to the sea. If this is a reference to Xanthos in this situation (after all there is no negative included in the papyrus commentator's note), let us remember that battle on the plain – at the edge of which the river is situated – is surely a typical feature of Trojan War

epic, and Akhilleus' rampage before his death may be a source for the image. Remember that Xanthos / Skamandros has two names and a very developed formular system in the *Iliad* (Richardson (1993) [**bibliography**]) which – just as that for Akhilleus – shows us that Homer was not the first Greek epic poet to give him a prominent place in heroic narrative. The motif itself is also found in the new Telephos elegy of Arkhilokhos, where the Kaikos river is narrowed with corpses (F 1.8–10) [**6c**], and the image recurs throughout history in both Near Eastern and IE contexts. I want to believe that this is an example of Homeric interaction, but I cannot prove it to my own satisfaction. Nor, because of its extremely fragmentary state, can we even speculate on the purpose, extent or type of interaction in this Alkaios fragment.

So there are few very good cases for direct Lesbian interaction with the poetry of Homer. The traditionality of the epic, the existence of other poems detailing Trojan War material, and their loss, all militate against most identifications, leaving aside the further and at times crippling drawbacks of incomplete preservation. But, even if we grant the interaction, the type of engagement being suggested is not particularly demanding, and does not indicate a sustained dynamic with the entire text: some big episodes involving the major characters may be referenced, but nothing that demands abstruse or detailed knowledge of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.

The slightly older Alkman presents the same general picture. The first candidate, from the *Partheneion* [**7a**] has been linked with *Il*. 9.123–4 [**7b**]. Homer's typically etymologising gloss on ἀθλοφόρους suggests a traditional association between horses and epithet seen several times in the *Iliad*, and applied to Polydeukes in a range of other EGE poems [**7b•**]. Alkman's phrasing is, nonetheless, very close to Homer's – only here in Archaic literature do we find the collocation *hippos aethlophoros* qualified by the word *pêgon / pâgon*. That is not quite enough by itself to clear the bar, in my view, but even if it did, it is very hard to see the particular evocation of Agamemnon's offer and its relay by Odysseus in the setting of the *Partheneion*. If it is not coincidental or an underrepresented formula, the interaction does not seem interested in demanding much of the audience's knowledge of that 'source' text, or its invocation within the target poem. Might we even conclude that Alkman was simply struck by the expression, and intended nothing more than to use what seemed to him to be impressive poetry?

A more tantalising case comes in the 1.5 dactylic hexameters of Alkman F 80 [**8a**], if they are by Alkman and not (as Martin West has suggested to me) by the 3rd century figure, Alexander the Aetolian, who wrote a poem entitled *Kirka*. The Homeric Kirke does advise Odysseus to anoint his companions' ears with wax [**8b**] before they reach the Sirens, but she doesn't do it herself. Earlier in their encounter, she does restore their form to them by anointing them with another drug [**8c**]. Alkman's wording seems closer to the former case, the action itself to the latter. We might suspect a clever recombination of two Odyssean episode(s) into one, or even a misremembering, were it not for the fact that Kirke is already known to Hesiod, according to whom she has children with Odysseus (*Theog*. 1011f.) [**8d**]. Though this passage may or may not be authentic Hesiod, the mention of Latinos could have occurred in Greek literature at any point from the 8th or 7th centuries onwards, when Greek contact and trade with Italy began in earnest. This text, therefore, knows another, very likely early, story about her encounter with Odysseus and his men – so Alkman may well have too.

The final case concerns Alkman F 77 [**9a**], linked by a scholiast with *Il*. 3.39 = 13.769 [**9b**]. Like several other negative prefixes, *dus-* is several times appended in EGE to nouns, proper names and otherwise, so as to create a derogatory form of that noun [**9b•**], a common type of kenning with many IE parallels. Hence, and glancing at the obvious traditional importance of this character, I find it hard to believe that Homer was the first or only Greek epic poet to have a character abuse Paris in this way. Again, even if this is an interaction, we cannot go very far into Alkman's poem, or speculate about the intertextual sophistication in the engagement. The name is striking enough that one wonders, once more, if there need have been any further interactive purpose.

In sum, in those very few cases which might get over our evidence bar, the level of engagement – where we can speculate – is distant or superficial. Nothing much about the source text is revealed or apparently deployed, and the audience are not asked to emplot much of that text on the lyric poem. Whatever interaction there is here, it does not suggest a profound redeployment of the Homeric text, that is, a redeployment intended to add a great deal to the interpretation of the target poem. As Andrew Ford

[**b**] has shown, this was Homer's common fate in the Archaic period: to be invoked as a great and authoritative epic poet *without* that invocation requiring detailed or sustained knowledge of his actual texts.

**5. Stesikhoros' distinctiveness**

All this changes, I suggest, with Stesikhoros. He is an anomaly in other ways, most notably in attempting to compose in dactylic lyrics and an epico-Doric dialect the scope and corpus of an epic-stye narrative poet. It's no surprise that the extent of his epicism is more obvious, because previous lyric poets were not trying to write self-contained narrative on this scale, and heroic epic material remains vastly in the minority in their corpora, while for Stesichorus this type of composition is almost all we know and have of his work. Furthermore, his lack of the typical lyric connection with a contemporary circumstance is not merely an accident of transmission, for – as Maarit Kivilo has recently restated [**bibliography**] – the biographical tradition was not really able to make much use of his poetry either.

So there is a real difference between Stesikhoros and the other lyric poets. His approach naturally admits more opportunity for interaction with Homer (and of course other epic poetry as well), most particularly in terms of selection. That is, Stesikhoros moves beyond the details we could observe in Alkman, Sappho or Alkaios, who might be recalling and / or reworking elements which involved the major characters at major moments in the poems: Paris being abused by Hektor, Hektor farewelling his wife or being mourned, Akhilleus fighting with the river, Odysseus and Kirke, etc. Theirs is, in other words, a 'highlights package' approach to Homeric interaction.

But in Stesikhoros, as Walter Burkert first argued in 1987 [**bibliography**], we finally get beyond this. Firstly, in the *Geryoneis*, Herakles shoots an arrow through one of Geryon's three heads (14–16) [**10a**]. The poppy simile, as has long been noted, bears more than a passing resemblance to Homer's description of the death of Gorgythion (*Il*. 8.306–8) [**10b**]. Now the scepticism kicks in: flowers and plants are not uncommonly found in such circumstances in EGE, and the image is different – poppy shedding its leaves, poppy weighed down by fruit and spring water. Moreover, we find the head of the poppy (*kôdeian*) being deployed elsewhere in an Homeric simile

of a decapitated head (*Il*. 14.499) [**10b•**]. In fact, only μήκων is shared between two passages – though we might also point to the repetition (with differences) of βαλοῖσα and βάλεν, and (if the supplement δέμας at line 16 is correct) the once more shifted repetition of δέμας from the biographical mention of Gorgythion's mother in the *Iliad* (8.305) to Geryon himself. Such deliberate recomposition of epic phraseology has been extensively documented by Maingon and Tsitsibakou-Vasalos [**bibliography**], so it would not be out of place here. But μήκων does not occur again in poetry until Aristophanes, and the chances that the same, highly untypical simile image would be applied in two unconnected passages to a figure struck by an *arrow* shot – a distinctly uncommon means of victory in Homer – must be very small.

Unlike the earlier interactions, moreover, this is not at all a prominent episode in the *Iliad*: the victor is Teukros, the victim the otherwise unknown son of Priam Gorgythion (cf. Apollodoros 3.152) – a name surely suggestive for a poet composing about Geryon – but who is himself a minor figure killed by mistake for Hektor, and whose death falls during one of the less important or memorable sequences in the poem. If we accept this interaction, as I think we should, how far then do we push the level of engagement?

We might consider that the story of Gorgythion's mother Kastianeira – her wedding and his childbirth – is mentioned immediately before the simile in the *Iliad*, perhaps recalling the extended scene between Geryon and his mother in Stesikhoros (S 11 and 13). But this is hopeful at best: I would limit the interaction to the fact that, as Homer's simile bestows tremendous *pathos* on an unknown warrior killed by mistake, so this simile seeks to bestow upon the monstrous Geryon a similar level of feeling. The only advance on earlier interactions in lyric would be taking a minor episode rather than a major one, and deploying it for a determinedly non-Homeric story. Perhaps that is advance enough, but luckily this example can also be read in conjunction with the next case, also from the *Geryoneis*.

This is the famous parallel between S 13.5 [**11a**] and *Il*. 22.83 [**11b**]. The theme becomes extremely popular later in the tragic tradition, but is found only in these two

settings in Archaic literature. Of course there is the danger of circularity here, in that the Homeric passage has had an obvious influence on the (universally accepted) Stesikhorean supplement. But even if something should be changed in the supplement, there is still the presentation, or reminiscence of the presentation of the mother's breast to her child as part of a supplication not to go out and fight an overwhelmingly dangerous enemy. That defeats even my scepticism.

Further, and more precise, Homeric interactions in this scene have been proposed: Maingon (1980) [**bibliography**], for instance, suggested that S 13.2–3 combined several expressions from the *Iliad* passage which, if we are right to see the connection in verse 5, must be more than plausible. But the verbal link is not that strong, certainly not as strong as the case in verse 5, and Stesikhoros must have known lamentation scenes – highly stylised features as they are – in other poems or performances. So I would hesitate to place too much emphasis on those similarities, as this would be merely to use the identification of the engagement in verse 5 as an excuse to indulge in WYSIATI.

Leaving these aside, then, the interaction here is surely of a different order from those we have seen hitherto. Though it is once more a marquee-scene in the *Iliad*, in this case both the action, its broader context, and some (crucially) non-formulaic phraseology are mirrored between the passages. Furthermore, when combined with S 15, this passage shows Stesikhoros consistently using imjages from the *Iliad* that are (1) unique to that poem, and (2) applied there to the Trojans, in order to flesh out the characterisation of Geryon and his situation. This is a noticeable increase in the level and sustained nature of the Homeric interaction, and shows Stesikhoros using a continuum of the Trojans' plight in Homer's *Iliad*, most likely to evoke sympathy for the usually monstrous Geryon.

As a second example, we might consider Stes.'s fondness for less significant Homeric episodes in F 209 (tentatively ascribed to the *Nostoi*) [**12a**], which seems to interact very closely with Telemakhos' departure from Sparta in *Od.* 15 [**12b**] – a scene that is, as Steve Reece [**bibliography**] says, "but a minor episode in a subplot of the

*Odyssey*." There are two significant differences between the treatments: Helen interrupts Menelaos to give her interpretation in the *Odyssey*, in Stes. she speaks first; the omen in the *Odyssey* is an eagle holding a crane which causes joy to all who look at it, in Stes. it is a 'cawing crow' which may well have caused some consternation.

Note that Stes. gives Helen much more authority, in offering her interpretation without, apparently, any prior consultation of Menelaos. This may not surprise us in a poet so renowned for a very particular relationship with Helen, but the same program may also be suggested in verse 10 [**12a**], which looks very much like Menelaos' very similar sentiment a little earlier in the Homeric scene [**12b•**]. Of course hospitality is a typical circumstance in EGE, but there is no other 1st person person statement to this end in Homer. With a little trepidation, but only a little, I suggest that this is another case of Stes. explicitly reworking an Homeric passage in line with an interpretation of an entire sequence of Homer's narrative, viz. the relationship between Helen and Menelaos in Sparta. He achieves this by transferring to her directive elements towards the end of the hospitality scene. This is a slightly less radical redeployment than that in the *Geryoneis*, as the same characters and circumstances are involved as in Homer, but the interaction encourages the audience to think in the same way.

Other cases of specific Homeric interaction have of course been proposed, from the level and manipulation of his epic diction to the existence of speech introduction formulae, and even to a thematic parallel between S 11 [**13a**] (also from the *Geryoneis*) and Sarpedon's speech in *Il*. 12.332–8 [**13b**]. I am sceptical, in the former case because formulaic diction may be drawn from other epic poems rather than Homer specifically. In S11, on the other hand, which does look tempting, there is no marked trigger for any specific interaction with Sarpedon's speech, since the single case depends on a restoration and is anyway a formulaic expression ('immortal and ageless' in verses 8–9) which frequently recurs in settings where the contrast between mortal and immortal is being stressed [**13c**]. These cases do not get above the bar.

## 5. Conclusion

Stes. was the most epic of all the Archaic lyric poets. The level of his poetic interaction specifically with the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and not just with 'epic' more generally, seems to be clear in two cases: (i) in the *Geryoneis* he takes two unique episodes from the *Iliad* and combines them as to suggest a consistent reading of the Trojans' fate in that poem; and (ii) in the *Nostoi* he emphasises the determinative power of Helen by giving her two unique actions which were given by Homer to Menelaos.

This suggests that Stesikhoros had access to more than just a general knowledge of the poems, perhaps even to a written text, but also that the nature of interaction is becoming more akin to the intertextuality of a later age: rather than merely showing knowledge of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, or the figure Homer as an authority, or indeed even bits of his poems which could go into a highlights package, Stesikhoros seems to be deploying a larger reading of those poems or broad segments therein (Trojans as sympathetic, Helen as more impressive than Menelaos) in order to enliven the meaning of his own text. For the first time that we can see, the audience is being encouraged to access an entire poem *and* its details, and actively to apply that knowledge to the current song.

Partially, of course, this may simply be a matter of evidence, and subjective bias: Sappho 44 V, for instance, could be claimed as evidence for precisely this kind of interaction, and I would not be too upset by such a claim: after all, they're so close in date that it would be surprising if Stesikhoros and his audiences in the West had access to a complete text of Homer whilst Sappho and Alkaios in the East did not.

But the differences between Stes. and Sappho are still noticeable: she may – I stress may – be taking a range of marquee episodes from the *Iliad* and recombining them into something new, suggesting a reading of several different episodes into a coherent continuum, but her new narrative still has to do with the same characters, and the same events as told in Homer, it's just set at the opposite end of their story. Stes., on the other hand, also takes less familiar episodes and expressions, and applies them to an entirely different story in the *Geryoneis*, as well as to (apparently) the same story in the *Nostoi*. So perhaps it would be more sensible to think of Stes. reaching a more

developed stage in a continuum of interaction, and pushing further the potentialities that were explored by his predecessors.

In any case, my conclusion remains largely the same: Stes.'s interaction with the Homeric poems is something new in our view into the literary history of the Archaic Greek world. We have become recently reacquainted with a highly evolved *arte allusiva* between Homer and his predecessors, Greek and otherwise, let alone between Homer and his successors. But the lack of such a fully developed sophistication in the interactions we have examined this morning speaks against it. Textual interaction in the Archaic period is a story of evolution, not revolution, and Stesikhoros' developments mark an absolutely pivotal stage in that narrative. Thank you.