ABSTRACT

An abstract of a commentary - which must follow the winds and turns of the text it explains - cannot reasonably be expected. The present opportunity may, however, be used to summarise the principles behind my own specimen. Any commentary tries (at least in theory) to examine its subject's work from as many viewpoints - historical, philological, etc. - as are appropriate and possible. When the works, like Stesichorus', only exist in a highly fragmentary state, this impossible ideal seems slightly more capable of fulfilment than usual: there is less text and so more time (and space) to explain it. This approach from a large number of different viewpoints is not only more attainable in Stesichorus' case, it is more necessary: isolated scraps of poetry, whose context is often totally uncertain, require full examination before their secrets can be yielded up. Hence, for instance, the amount of effort devoted by other scholars - and now by me - to the subject of Stesichorus and art. And hence the exceedingly detailed scope of the commentary. For even one word fragments have a philological and, sometimes, a stylistic value. And the speculation of earlier critics must be evaluated and preserved if plausible, or candidly denounced if unlikely, in an attempt to prevent repetition of the error.
This thesis represents a large step towards a full edition of, and commentary on, Stesichorus. The necessary prolegomena, texts of the actual fragments, and commentary on P. Lille 76, are already completed or nearly completed, and are here omitted merely for reasons of space: in particular, the absence of the last-mentioned papyrus find certainly does not imply that I entertain any doubts as to its authorship. The commentary in its present state is largely based on the fragments as edited by Page in Poetae Melici Graeci and Lyricis Graecis Supplementum, and usually presupposes his text: exceptions are noted ad locc.

I have to thank my supervisor Professor Lloyd-Jones and Professor Rudolf Kassel in Cologne for reading and in many places improving earlier drafts of this thesis. I am also indebted to Mr. W. S. Barrett for some very enlightening discussions about many of the problems relating to Stesichorus' papyrus fragments. And Professor Martin Robertson relieved me of much anxiety by checking those sections which deal with Stesichorus and Art. More specific obligations will be registered in the relevant places.

Mrs. Vera Taggart and Mrs. Siva Oke very kindly typed this lengthy thesis. Since the process took longer than any of us originally anticipated I have sometimes (but not
always) been able to insert references to recent publications (for instance, Radt's new edition of Sophocles' fragments). This has made the thesis more up-to-date, but has created one or two minor inconsistencies.
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(1) Editions

Early texts of the lyric poets, including S., are usefully catalogued by Page, P.M.G. p.v. I have consulted nothing earlier than C.I. Blomfield's Stesichori Fragmenta in Museum Criticum VI (1826) 254ff and found little enough of value there. The following contain matter of greater or lesser utility. Of reviews, only those which contribute something to S. are mentioned.

O.F. Kleine, Stesichori Himerensis Fragmenta (Berlin 1828).
(Reviewed by Welcker: see below under (3)).


id. Supplementum Lyricis Graecis (Oxford 1974): contains all the papyrus fragments of S. published since P.M.G. with the exception of P. Lille 76.
(A remarkably long and detailed review by R. Führer, GGA 229 (1977) 1ff) = R.)
(2) Commentaries

(a) devoted to S. alone

Kleine as above (see p.i).

K. Seeliger, Die Überlieferung der griechischen Heldensage bei Stesichoros I (Meissen 1886). No second instalment was produced: see Seeliger's review of Vürtheim.

J. Vürtheim, Stesichoros' Fragmente und Biographie (Leiden 1919).

(Reviewed by Seeliger, Berl. Phil. Woch. 1920 pp 361ff and

J. Sitzler, Bursian (Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft) pp 57ff.)

(b) including some fragments of S. along with the other lyric poets


(3) General Studies

F.G. Welcker, Jahns Jahrbücher 9 (1829) 131ff = Kl. Schr. 1.148ff.

M. Mayer, De Euripidis Mythopoeia capita duo (Diss. Berlin 1883).

Wilamowitz, Textgeschichte der griechischen Lyriker
Wiss. Phil. hist. Kl. N.F. Bd. 4,3 (1900).
Sappho und Simonides (1913).
G.E. Rizzo, Questioni Stesichoree (1895): see p.1193.

F. Raffaele, Indagini sul problema Stesiconero (Catania 1937).


---

This work, like the following two Italian books, is of very little value, but since they are still referred to now and then by later scholars (e.g. Page in P.M.G.) I decided to check their contents: their authors occasionally have the distinction of being the first to stumble upon truth or fall into heresy.

(iv)
Two crucial articles in English have appeared recently:

(4) Works concentrating on specific aspects of S.

R. Führer, Formproblem - Untersuchungen zu den Reden in der frühgriechischen Lyrik (Zetemata 44 (1967)).


M.W. Haslam, "Stesichorean Metre" see above.
J.D. Beazley, Attic Black-Figure Vase-Painters (Oxford 1956).

id. Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters (2nd edition: Oxford 1963).

id. Paralipomena (Additions to the above two volumes) (Oxford 1971).


id. Denkmälerlisten zur griechischen Heldensage 1: Herakles (Marburg 1971).


P. Zancani Montuoro and U. Zanotti Bianco, Heraion alla Foce del Sele: 4 volumes, two of tables, two of text.

J. Boardman, Athenian Black Figure Vases (1974).

id. Athenian Red Figure Vases: the Archaic Period (1975).

These two books contain convenient illustrations of many of the vases mentioned in my work.
"The Funeral Games of Pelias" were a common subject for representation in Greek literature and plastic art. So it is all the more remarkable and regrettable that no early poetic treatment of this topic has come down to us. Simonides (564B) is our witness that the theme was embraced by early epic, as well as in lyric by S. And primitive Attic tragedy did not shun it, if the Suda is to be trusted (Suda 3.711-282 Adl.) = Thespis T. 1.8 = fr. 1 (Sn.): 

Although whatever form Thespis' representation of this particular myth took, his drama must have been quite different from all other extant tragedies, Greek or otherwise. Be that as it may, these references provide the merest whisps of information, and for even the most tentative progress beyond them we must resort to those late authors the mythographers Apollodorus and Hyginus, though they too have depressingly little to say.

It is a fact that nowhere in Greek literature do we find the Funeral Games for Pelias explicitly linked to the familiar tale of Pelias the wicked usurper, the deviser of the expedition to Colchis, who is eventually (and deservingly) chopped to pieces by his daughters thanks to Medea's machinations. Since, as we have seen, there are
so few surviving traces left of the former story, once so popular in early Greek literature, this is hardly surprising, and at first sight it seems perfectly proper to suppose that τὰ δῆλα ἐπὶ Πελλαὶ always provided a fitting conclusion to the saga of the search for the Golden Fleece. Wilamowitz performed a useful service in challenging these complacent assumptions. In Textgeschichte d.gr. Bukoliker pp.196-7 n.2 he pungently asserted that (1) the tradition of a wicked Pelias, which implies the journey to Colchis and the unintentional retribution exacted by the Peliades, is positively incompatible with (2) the Funeral Games held in the dead king's honour, which presuppose a Pelias of a quite different character. For the Argonauts are universally represented as the main contestants in these athletic events: but they would hardly have wished to celebrate the memory of a usurping tyrant who had sought to consign them all to a premature death in the East. Such a monster would surely deserve no commemorative games at all. (This last consideration also gave pause to Vürtheim (see pp. 10-11 of his commentary), Seeliger in his review of Vürtheim (p. 365), Robert, Heldenrage 37). Now the δῆλα ἐπὶ Πελλαὶ was the older story: witness the frequent occurrence of the games in the earliest Greek poetry, coupled with the total absence of Pelias the wicked uncle from literature of the same period. Conclusion: when Simonides refers to Ὀμηρος as having related the exploits of Meleager at Pelias' Funeral Games, he cannot possibly be talking of the composer of the Iliad or the Odyssey (c.f. Wilamowitz, Homer. Unters. p.352) but must have in mind some early epic poet who composed not an Argonautica
which ended with the Games for Pelias but a separate epic entirely given over to an account of these games.

One has only to expand the dogmatism of Wilamowitz's brief note in this way to expose the circularity into which his argument so swiftly falls. For we know next to nothing of the epic which Simonides mentions, and which is the earliest known work to touch upon the Funeral Games of Pelias. We cannot decide whether this epic combined the Games with the expedition to Colchis or not merely by making unprovable assertions about the absence of the bad Pelias from early literature, when it is precisely this presence or absence in the earliest known treatment that is so uncertain!

Besides, the very premises of Wilamowitz's argument have been successfully overthrown by P. Friedländer, in an article that is still useful for a study of the early stages of the Argonaut saga (Rh. Mus. 69(1914) 299ff = Studien zur Antiken Literatur und Kunst pp. 19ff: "Kritische Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Heldensage: I Argonautensage").

After Jason has returned to Iolcus with the fleece, he must succeed Pelias on the throne at once, since he has fulfilled the task that was set him: "Was kann die Sage mit dem überflüssig gewordenen könige besseres tun als ihn im rechten Augenblick sterben zu lassen?" (p. 25). And Wilamowitz's scruples over the Argonauts' participation in the Games that followed the death are shown up for what they are: "Wollte man auch jetzt noch sagen, dem Manne, der den Jason in Gefahren geschickt, gebühre kein feierliches Totenfest, so wäre das viel zu modern moralistisch geurteilt, um für
alte Sage zu gelten. Und ersichtlich ist es ein trefflicher Abschluss, wenn nun die Männer, die so ernste Abenteuer Seite an Seite erlebt haben, noch einmal in friedlichen, glänzendem Kampfspiel mit einander um die Ehre ringen." Friedländer might also have compared the action of Orestes in Od. 3·309f, and have emphasised the exact parallel with Book 23 of the Iliad, where we also find the motif of heroes whom we have seen supporting each other in the face of great danger - in their case war - now presented for the last time in more relaxed circumstances and in friendly competition with each other.

Friedländer has shown that the Argonautic expedition and the Funeral Games of Pelias are not incompatible with each other but can easily have co-existed within the saga and within an epic on the Argonauts. He has not shown that the poem mentioned by Simonides was such an epic. Indeed both he and Wilamowitz are far too eager to narrow down the possibilities for "Homer's" poem to two: an Argonautica which ended with an account of Pelias' Funeral Games, or an epic wholly devoted to these games. Preferable is the uncharacteristically cautious attitude of J.A. Davison ("Quotations and Allusions in Early Greek literature" Eranos 53 (1956) 132-3 = From Archilochus to Pindar pp. 77-78) who observes that "there is almost no limit to the possible speculations" about the poem's identity. As he points out it may have been a Meleagris, or even the Ἀμφιλαοῦ Ἐξελατικ, since the latter hero is so closely associated with Meleager by S. (see below p.55).
Nineteenth century scholarship might have tried to prove one further point about this shadowy epic. The assumptions of that time made it inevitable that certain features in Il·23 would be taken as proof that an epic ἌΘΛα ἔν Πελία was the source of Homer's ἌΘΛα ἔν Πατρόκλωι. (So, for instance Friedländer, Herakles (1907) 64f, and p. 178; Wilamowitz, Die Ilias und Homer p. 69). Of these features two select themselves as especially impressive: (1) The Homeric games for Patroclus and the games for Pelias as depicted on the Chest of Cypselus, are remarkably similar in content and sequence. The Chest shows the chariot-race, boxing, wrestling, the discus and the foot-race in that order. Homer begins with the chariot-race and follows it with boxing, wrestling, and the foot-race. It is true that the Iliad ends with a single-combat, discus, archery and spear contests which for the most part lack any counterpart on the Chest, but the poor quality of the narrative here has for a long time favoured the likelihood that these events constitute a later addition to the main body of the games. (2) The disproportionately significant rôle accorded in the chariot-race to Eumelus, a hero otherwise unknown to Homer (except for Il·2·714), must be explained by the fact that he is son of Admetus, a participant in the chariot contest at Pelias' Funeral Games.

These phenomena cannot be denied, but the mode of interpreting them has changed. The last century spoke of a specific epic, the ἌΘΛα ἔν Πελία, which was pre-Homeric in date and the literary source of most of Il·23. This notion has given way to the more circumspect concept of common
motifs\(^1\) and the more guarded admission that the composer of our \'Αθηλα ἐπὶ Πατρόκλῳ was acquainted with the tale of Pelias' Funeral Games and probably with earlier epic poems which embraced that subject. It would be absurdly rash to fasten upon one single composition as the "source" behind Il.23, and even sillier to equate that composition with the work alluded to by Simonides.

It would be equally rash to assume\(^2\) that the wicked Pelias and his deserved death are relatively late inventions merely because they do not feature in literature before Pindar's Fourth Pythian. That poem's cryptic allusion to the usurper's murder in the sinister phrase Μῆδειαν ... τὰν Πελίαο φονόν (250)\(^3\) clearly presupposes a detailed knowledge of the tradition. Pelias' name is mentioned in Il.2.715 ("Ἀλκηςτις, Πελίαο θυγατρῶν εἶδος ἀριστή") and Od. Il.254ff (part of the Γυναικῶν Κατάλογος which touches on Poseidon's intercourse with Tyro daughter of Salmoineus):

\[\text{ἡ δ’, ὑποκυκαμένη Πελίην τέχε καὶ Νηλῆα,}\]
\[\text{τῷ κρατερῷ θεράποντε Δίδος μεγάλου γενέσθην}\]

---

\(^1\)Funeral Games in general were a popular theme of ancient Greece in both literature and the arts. (c.f.: Dion. Hal. 5.17: ἄγωνας ... ἐπιτάφιους τιθεμένους ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐνθάδεοις ἀνδραῖς γυμνικοὺς τε καὶ ἱππικοὺς δὲ ὑπὸ τε Ἀχιλλέως ἐπὶ Πατρόκλῳ καὶ ἔτι πρότερον.) All the games mentioned in the Iliad are of this type (Il.11.699, 22.162ff, 23.630ff, 679) and the ἄθλα ἐπὶ Ἀχιλλέως were as frequently treated as those ἐπὶ Πατρόκλῳ and ἐπὶ Πελίαί. For a full list of the mythical heroes who were posthumously honoured in this way c.f. L. Malten, "Leichenspiel und Totenkult", Mitteilungen des deutschen archaeologischen Instituts (Römische Abteilung) 38-9 (1923-4) pp.307ff.

\(^2\)With, for instance, V.J. Matthews, Phoenix 31 (1977) p.205 and n.41.

\(^3\)Compare Pherecydes F. Gr. Hist. 3 F 150 (from about the same time): ἡ Μῆδεία τῷ Πελίᾳ κακόν.
No mention here of the fact that Pelias dwelt in Ioclus only after seizing the throne from his half-brother Aeson (Pind. Pyth. 4.106-116) and exiling his brother Neleus to Pylus (Paus. 4.2.5). But this need not surprise us if we bear in mind Homer's reluctance to deal in tales of fraternal strife (seen at its most extreme in his skirting of the hostility between Atreus and Thyestes at Il. 2.10ff).

And of course the narrative here is so curtailed that we will not be amazed when we find "von Aussetzung keine Rede" (Roscher 3.2: 1852) and many other omissions besides.

If, as Wilamowitz suggested, an evil Pelias implies the expedition to Calchis, the reverse also should be true: and this may well be why Hes. Theog. 992-999 and Mimn. fr. 11 (W) which both mention the quest for the fleece, both equip Pelias with the epithet ὑπερήφανος. (West ad Theog. 996 suspects in the adjective an "allusion .. to Pelias' usurpation of power .. as well as to his attempt to get rid of the true prince by sending him in quest of the golden fleece" (p.429)). It is hard to conceive of a version whereby Pelias' sending of Jason to Colchis ever had an innocent motive, and the participants in his Funeral Games, both in art and in the few literary morsels we possess, are regularly gleaned from the Argonauts, as Wilamowitz himself acknowledged (Hell. Dicht. 2 pp.242-3).
and their tale antedates the Odyssey. For, as is now well-known, the wanderings of that poem's hero often presuppose the adventures of those who sailed in

\textquote{Ἀργὼ πᾶς μελουσα} (Od. 12·70)

See especially K. Meuli, 

It thus seems likely that the Argonauts' expedition and the Games for Pelias already co-existed as parts of the saga by the time the epic referred to by Simonides was composed. It would be surprising if some pre-Stesichorean epic, either this or another, had not joined expedition and games together within the compass of a single work.

The exact contents of S's poem must be conjectured by different means. Since its title seems to have approximated to \textquote{Δῆλα ἐπὶ Πελίαι} (so Zenobius = 180P)\textsuperscript{1} or simply Δῆλα (Athenaeus = 179P) it seems prima facie plausible that S. confined himself to a narration of the athletic competitions rather along the lines of Book 23 of the Iliad, and for his source (if any) either concentrated on the closing section of a more general composition about the Argonauts, or followed more closely an epic on the Games alone. Those who open Vürtheim's commentary near the beginning and read pp.9-11 will receive a wholly different impression. There we discover that the poem opened with the return home of

\textsuperscript{1}Compare Ion TGF 1 19 F 1 Sn. Πελίου μὲγ' Δῆλον, Ap. Rhod. 1·1304: \textquote{Αθλων γὰρ Πελίδο δεδουμότος etc.}
the Argonauts, who describe the various sights that met them on their journey, including Prometheus and the vulture. Then came Admetus' wooing of Pelias' fairest daughter Alcestis (see above p. 6), and his winning of her after he had yoked a lion and a boar to his chariot with Apollo's help. A full description of the splendid wedding of the happy pair followed, and next the death of Pelias at the hands of his daughters urged on by Medea, who not surprisingly has to flee the wrath of Pelias' relations. Jason, however, stays behind at Iolcus and participates in Pelias' Funeral Games, for these too receive a place in Vürtheim's generous scheme of things. Thereafter the heroes wend their various ways, Jason, for instance, following Medea to Corinth. The fascinating reconstruction peters out disappointingly over the ultimate fortunes of Pelias' gullible daughters (p. 12). And this is the poem that antiquity, for some inscrutable reason of its own, elected to call by the limited name of "The Funeral Games for Pelias".

To be fair to Vürtheim, the unexpectedly gorgeous and variegated tapestry which is thus unfolded before our unbelieving eyes is not the product of whimsical speculation and fantasy. It is the product of an irresponsibly dogmatic and narrow-minded interpretation of 179(a) and 180P. To suppose that the former refers to a feast at the wedding of Alcestis and Admetus and the latter to Prometheus chained to the Caucasus is not entirely impossible - though it is entirely unattractive - but there are alternative explanations of these fragments. When Vürtheim's interpretations lead to such
disastrous consequences for the supposed structure of the poem, it is light-headed lunacy not to prefer those other explanations, or at the least to state them side by side and leave it open for those capable of rational choice to decide between them. For the implications of the assumption that 179(a)P comes from a description of the marriage-feast of Admetus and Alcestis are - at least in Vürtheim's hands - intolerable. Not only the business with the boar and the lion, but Medea too, with her ram and cauldron, and the Peliades whom she gulls, must needs be dragged into a narrative that has nothing to do with the games that give the poem its name, and be recounted with Stesichorean amplitude. In fact Vürtheim need not have shouldered quite such a burden of irrelevance if he had supposed that S. was using the version mentioned in Diod. Sic. 4·53·2, whereby Alcestis' wedding was postponed until after her father's death and the funeral games in his honour.

But I suppose we must be grateful that he declined the opportunity of placing the marriage before the expedition to Colchis (p. 6). In that case the occurrence of an incident so far removed in time from the actual games, on the wrong side of the quest for the fleece, would create desperate difficulties granted the continuous narrative we have come to expect from S.

We know that S. could be discursive; the Geryoneis included Heracles' reception by Pholus; and we must accept such digressions; but only when there is firm proof for them, not when
they are the fruit of mere guesses about tiny fragments which can be explained more economically in other ways (see below pp. 49ff and pp. 58ff).

THE EVIDENCE OF ART

Vürtheim's bland elevation of his own guesses to the status of facts has misled the Italian scholars Zancani Montuoro and Zanotti-Bianco into supposing that S. "ha certo commemorato nel poema la straziante fine del vecchio sovrano". That misleadingly categorical assertion appears on p. 353 of Heraion alla foce del Sele, during the course of a discussion on two metopes which the authors interpret as reflecting S's ΑΘΛΑ. The exposure of Vürtheim's inadequacy here naturally does much to weaken their case. But, the voice of objection may retort, if the metopes were originally connected with Pelias' death on grounds independent of Vürtheim's approach, is it not possible that they constitute separate evidence for the inclusion of Medea's murder of Pelias within S's poem? Let us study the problem more closely.

The two metopes in question are among the worst preserved of those found at foce del Sele. Of the first (ch. 32 pp. 350-354 Table L (drawing only)) the editors state quite candidly (p. 350) that the surviving fragment has lost practically the whole of the relief's original surface: "di questo non resta che la parte inferiore della mano sinistra dell'unico personaggio superstite con una parte ad essa contigua del listello laterale, inoltre i riccioli e il contorno superiore dell'orecchio sinistro, l'orecchio
e la regione temporale destra, e infine la parte superiore
del sostegno di destra del tripode." Under such conditions
the task of interpreting the scene depicted becomes more
than usually difficult, and the outsider's attempts at
deciding are not rendered easier by the editors' failure to
supply a photograph of the fragment. If one judges from
their drawing alone, then the interpretation they give seems
possible: a figure seen in prospect emerging from a cauldron
set on a tripod and stretching out its arms and raising its
hands. The figure is said to be rising out of the cauldron
rather than standing behind it, because, I presume, there
is no sign of human legs between the tripod's supports: "lo
spazio tra i sostegni di quest'ultimo e così pure quello
tra l'oro del lebete e le braccia aperte non presentano
traccie di scultura, ma l'antico fondo levigato su cui, qua
e là, ma soprattutto lungo la linea ove si distacca il
rilievo, sono ancora evidenti segni del puntino."

This, the Italian scholars tell us, is the death of Pelias
in the cauldron: the unfortunate monarch feels the flames and
cries for help, raising his arms the while in a suppliant
gesture. Several intimidating obstacles stand between this
suggestion and certainty. In the first place there is no
trace of Medea or the Peliades, personages indispensable for
the scene judging from parallel representations in plastic
art, although we are incited to guess at the original presence
of Medea ᾴλάνθρα on the left hand side of the relief because
some figure in that area must have been depicted as holding
one of the male figure's arms.
Secondly it must be conceded that plastic art can show no parallel for a representation of the actual death of Pelias within the cauldron. Vase-paintings portray various other stages of the legend: preparations for the rejuvenation of the ram (with the daughters of Pelias dutifully carrying the requisite magical implements), the ram rejuvenated and emerging from the cauldron, and Pelias himself being invited to draw near. But Pelias actually inside the fatal λεβης is not to be found elsewhere in art, and for obvious reasons unaccountably omitted by Zancani Montuoro and Zanotti-Bianco. Literary treatments of the event make it clear that Pelias must, before he is boiled in the cauldron, be "chopped into messes" as culinary analogies of boiling meat would suggest. That, and not the effects of heat and water, must be the mortiferous part of the process. (See Apollod. 1.9.27; Diod. Sic. 4.50-52; Paus. 8.11). Now to show gobbets of Pelias bobbing about on the water's surface or being placed in the cauldron would be technically difficult as well as aesthetically beastly: hence this particular scene's absence from plastic art. I admit that our Sicilian sculptor alone might have hit upon the novel idea of a Pelias boiled whole as a mode of avoiding the above-mentioned technical difficulties while still representing the dramatic moment.

But even if the Italian's interpretation of the first metope to be correct, it is scarcely solid enough to provide a

---

1For the latest list of vases relating to this topic c.f. Vasenlisten 3 p. 493f. Other representations: Denkmälerlisten 3:368f.
reliable basis for the erection of a second hypothesis, especially when this involves a relief even more fragmentary and controversial in interpretation. Yet this is what the Italian scholars now proceed to do. This other metope (Vol. 2 ch. 33 pp. 355-361; Vol. 2 Plates CI-CII (photographs) and Table L (drawing) = Denkmalerverzeichnisse 3•368•2) depicts two figures clad in long robes apparently in flight and carrying sacred objects in their hands. The figure on the right holds in her left hand "una phiale ombelicata tenuta tra il pollice e la mano rialzata, che resta coperta dall' oggetto sacro" (p. 356) while a fragment of her arm discovered at some distance from the actual metope (see p. 355 fig. 88) contains a dish for sacrificial offerings with above a semi-circular object interpreted by the editors as representing οὐλαί or θυλήματα. The left-hand figure is better preserved (for a description of its anatomical details see p. 358) but even less useful than its companion for those in search of a clue to the identity of the pair.

"Tormentata è stata l'esegesi di questa metope per la mancanza di tutta la parte centrale del rilievo" said the editors with much justification (p. 359), and their original guesses veered with inevitable wildness between Clytemnestra pursuing Cassandra; Apollo doing the same though with a different purpose in mind; Thesus pursuing a young Helen whom he has disturbed while she sacrificed to Artemis (compare Plut Thes. 31•2); Paris after a chaste and virtuous Helen such as the Palinode might have envisaged; or the Pythia and an accolyte fleeing in horror from the arrival of the
Erinyes-tormented Orestes at Delphi. As will have been seen, the χιτών ποδήρης and beardless aspect of the figures was regarded as no guarantee against the masculinity of one of them, and the editors made laudable attempts to explain the presence of the mysterious sacred objects.

The re-discovery of a large part of the lost frieze showed that the whole metope had originally stood to the immediate right of the λέβης scene, which led the editors to assume a direct link with what they took to be the death of Pelias. And indeed did not that scene require completion quite literally, and aesthetically too? Would we not welcome a relevant scene on the right to balance the hypothetical figure of Medea on the left? And what more suitable than the flight of the daughters of Pelias upon recognising the enormity of their deed, still carrying with them the phial and dish which had contained the magic stuff of rejuvenation?

This interpretation does not strike me as very convincing. In particular, the notion (p. 360) that the left-hand figure is drawing up to hip level a garland or fillet that has been knotted (the fillet to adorn a sacrificial victim, the knots to achieve a "virtù magica") seems far-fetched. Such details aside, the very principle behind the identification is questionable. Grant that the earlier metope does present Pelias' death: there is no absolute rule that juxtaposed friezes on this edifice must deal with different stages of the same legend. But the identification of the two figures with two Peliades is far from obvious, and depends totally on the proximity to a metope whose own interpretation is by no means a closed issue.
To sum up: the first metope under consideration may possibly depict the death of Pelias; the contents of the second are quite obscure. We cannot advance from this modest position to the more ambitious stand-point of Zancani Montuoro and Zanotti-Bianco without colliding with at least one daunting obstacle: for there is no good cause to suppose that S. is the sole source of every metope on this building.

If we have to do here with the decease of Pelias, why must we leap to assume that a poem by S. is the sculptor's source? Why assume that poem to be the Ἀδλα ἐπὶ Πελίαι? To do either involves a circular argument. And to support Vürtheim's case with the foce del Sele metopes or vice versa is merely to prop up one broken reed with another.

So far our conclusions have been depressingly negative. Still, there is one area on which works of art might be thought to cast genuine, not supposititious, light: the identities of the heroes who participated in the Funeral Games. Our extant fragments of S's poem name four of these, and it would not be unreasonable to guess that S. somewhere in the original exploited the epic device of a list of heroes as Vürtheim suggested (p. 9). The catalogue in the Συνοδηγοράσι (222ip) would provide a parallel for this. If other literary sources and works of art gave a consistent list of competitors, might not the tradition have been stable enough for us to conclude that S. too must have included the same heroes?
A tabular summary of the evidence provided by literature and art is the most convenient route to the hard facts. The lists on the following pages are based on those presented by L. Malten, Mitteilungen des deutschen archaeologischen Instituts (Römische Abteilung) 38-9 (1923-4) p. 308, but I have introduced considerable changes. In the first place I have omitted those works of art whereon no names of the heroes are preserved. That includes Malten's Amphora showing 7 two-horse chariots engaged in a race and his Attic Amphora with three chariots of the same kind and "sinnlose Namensbeschriften" as well as a tripod for prize and six rows of spectators. In the very nature of things, the contents of these works cannot definitely be equated with the Funeral Games for Pelias. Likewise I exclude the Amyclean throne, since although Pausanias tells us (3.18.16) that καὶ ὁν Ἀκατος ἑσθηκέν ἄγωνα ἐπὶ πατρὶ was engraved upon it, he gives no further details about this particular scene. The throne's probable date c. the end of 6th cent. B.C. is not inconsistent with Stesichorean influence.

On the other hand, I have added competitor's names from vases unknown to Malten when he wrote his article. (For a full list of vases depicting the Funeral Games of Pelias see Vasenlisten 3 p. 496). More controversially, I have also included part of Hyginus' list of victors at these games: late and unreliable though this author is, this part of his catalogue is so full and detailed that it may well reflect, however lamely and inadequately, an early and reliable original.
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Here are my table's sources, together with some comments on them:-

(1) "Epic": the "Ωυμροοε referred to by Simonides 654 P: see pp. Iff. above.

(2) Stesichorus 178 and 179(b) P.

(3) Ibycus S176.

see D.L. Page, P.C.P.S. 17 (1971) 89ff. I am totally in agreement with this scholar's attribution of the fragment to Ibycus. Πηλησυ[ε] at line 11 strongly suggests that the athletic contests mentioned at various points of this poem (2,8,10) belong to the Αθλα ἐπι Πελλαι: there was a foot race (2 κλαδίσοι δρομι), a chariot race (8 γυρώσαον τρέξοι), and a wrestling match (10 ἐσεμαλα ...). In 11-12 Peleus seems to be failing to overcome Atalanta in the wrestling-bout; in 7-10 Iolaus is mentioned as competitor in the chariot-race (less certainly, as Page speculates, he may be acting as charioteer (for Heracles)). At 4-5 Euphemos, who married a sister of Heracles (Paus. 5. 17.9, Ε Πινδ. Πυθ. 4.79 (2.108 Dr.)) may lurk behind 6( Ἡρωκλεόν γαιεν.) in connection with this race. We do not know who wins the foot race of 2, but at 18 Geryon raises one of his ugly heads, preceded at no great distance by the name of his father Chrysaor (17): since this monster's bizarre physical proportions must have disqualified him from any contest, we shall accept Page's conclusion that Ibycus is indulging in "a summary list of numerous matters capable of lengthy exposition" as he does

1 The evidence of "Stesimbrotus" F. Gr. Hist. 107 F 19 is best segregated: see p. 1182 below.
more notoriously in $282P = S\cdot151$ the famous Polycrates Ode.¹

(4) Hyginus fab 273.10

I have omitted from my table, for want of space, those contests mentioned by Hyginus which have absolutely no point of contact with what the rest of our sources tell us. They are: the panmachia, in which Heracles was victor; the bow and arrows competition where Eurytus won; the contest with the sling (winner Cephalus); contests with the lyre, at singing, and at "the flutes of Olympus" where the victors were Orpheus, Linus, and Eumolpus respectively; and single-combat, where Cygnus killed Pilus the son of Diodotus.

Also, in connection with the four-horse chariot race, we are informed that Iolaus son of Iphicles defeated Glauclus son of Sisyphus whose horses tore him apart. The plethora of musical contests may seem suspicious in comparison with other accounts of heroic games. The duelling to the death may also offend; but the practice of single combat is a common feature in the funeral customs of several races, and perhaps originated as a kind of propitiation of the dead individual by an offering of flowing blood; it may even have replaced an earlier practice of real human sacrifice (c.f. Malten sup. cit. p. 328, Willcock, B.I.C.S.20 (1973)2).

¹Against West's notion that this poem has been influenced by S's "Helen" see p.1188). It seems to me likelier (though still far from certain) that in S176 Ibycus is consciously skirting two possible topics for poetical treatment which his illustrious predecessor had in fact embraced. It is at the very least a remarkable coincidence that Ibycus should mention in such close proximity two subjects exploited by S. But those who feel tempted to deduce from S176 that S's ΑΘλα mentioned Peleus and Atalanta, Iolaus, Heracles, and Euphemus, should first remind themselves how very popular were the Funeral Games of Pelias as a subject for poetry (see above pp. 1ff).
The names of Pilus and his father Diodetus are otherwise unknown and Rose ad loc. (p. 164) suggests that the text as it now stands is a crude misunderstanding of some such Greek epic phrasing as Κύκνος δ' αὖ φίλον υἷα μεθ' ὅμοιον ἐξενάριξεν διονεύος ...οἷο. Likewise there are plentiful grounds for suspicion in the statement that Iolaus defeated Glaucus who was torn apart by "equi mordici" (sic). But chariot-crashes are a regular component of heroic games (see e.g. Il. 23.391ff; c.f. Soph. El. 745ff) and some such event as this may be reflected here, albeit in a distorted manner. At any rate, if we were unaware that Hyginus is a particularly unreliable witness, this very chapter would soon have enlightened us, since it proceeds to catalogue the victories at the Funeral Games of Patroclus by summarising the contents of Il. 23 with many omissions, and similarly in the Funeral Games of Anchises introduces many errors into a short resumé of Aeneid 5.

4) The Chest of Cypselus

This work can no longer be automatically accepted as invariable presenting the Stesichorean version of its various myths. Let us take the present case on its own merits. S. has Castor and Polydeuces competing, each in a two-horsed chariot (see p. 38f). The Chest of Cypselus likewise has two-horse chariots (ὁντοθεύνετε δὲ συνὸρδα ...) and Euphemus is the winner in this contest. But Pausanias later remarks that the chest also depicts Iolaus as victor ἵππων ἄρματι. That phrase presumably indicates a four-horse chariot (Hyginus
distinguishes a horse race ("equo") wherein Bellerophon comes first, and a four-horsed chariot ("quadrigis") which ends in Iolaus' victory). Another discrepancy, as easy to solve: the Chest has two-horse chariots, but only Polydeuces competing. Still, "if both the Dioscuri competed, it would be reasonable for artists pressed for space to depict only one of them" (Bowra GLF p. 121) and the same consideration might explain why our Chest can show only five competitors in comparison with the vase's six. Different artists might choose different heroes though their source could be the same. Euphemus features in both this Chest and the Corinthian vase (5): if S. had named him as the victor, cause for surprise will vanish. Admetus is the other common feature: if S. had described his marriage to Alcestis ... ? Believers in this view may well scent victory. But "Schwerlich war [Admetus] zweimal dargestellt, wie bei Pausanias überliefert ist" (Wilamowitz, Hell. Dicht. 2*, p. 242 n. 3), and though that statement is a little too dogmatic, it is distinctly odd that the artist who a few moments ago was too pressed for space to include Castor in the chariot contest should now have room enough to show Admetus engaged in boxing as well as the former competition.

We must always bear in mind the possibility that an error, either in Pausanias' text or in the Chest's actual inscription, has stepped in between us and the hypothetical literary source. But which of the Chest's Admeti should we

---

1 We need not accept, then, the suggestion (see Frazer's commentary ad loc. (3.611)) that Pausanias has displaced Iolaus, who really belongs, as Heracles' helper, to the following scene of the Hydra's slaying.
regard as erroneous? We might attack the chariot-racer with that name and replace him by Castor in order to restore both of the Dioscuri. But such an action would be otiose for reasons we have just seen (p. 21). More plausibly, Friedländer (Herakles p. 63) argued for expunging Admetus from the Chest's boxers and for introducing Polydeuces in this stead. There are two very good reasons for doing this: Polydeuces was the boxer par excellence of heroic myth (c.f. Il.3·237, Od. 11·300; Simon. 509P, Theocr. Id 4·9 etc.) and Admetus belongs to the chariot-race because he was renowned for at least one chariot, that to which he yoked, with the aid of his patron Apollo, a lion and a boar. This suggestion makes excellent sense and explains Admetus' presence in the chariot races of Vase and Chest, without assuming that S. necessarily described his marriage to Alcestis. Many of the heroes, in both art and literature, are linked to certain contests because of an event in a different part of their career (see below p. 54). Mospus, on the other hand, qualifies as a boxer because of the etymologically appropriate name of his father "Αμαθεῖος.

Wilamowitz (Hell. Dicht. Vol. 2 pp. 242-3) cast doubt on the names of several other heroes represented on the chest. Eurybotas' name, for instance, will not fit a hexameter (p. 243 n. 2), and it may well be that the form is a misrepresentation of the Argonaut Eribotes (on whose much-disputed name see Fränkel's app. crit. ad. Ap. Rhod. 1 71 and 73). In view of Melanion's participation in the Funeral Games on at least one other artefact (Dinos fragments c. 560:
I doubt Wilamowitz's plea that his name here is a slip for Ancaeus or Meleager: Melanion is a suitable contender in the foot-race on the principle enunciated above. Nor is it safe to regard Neotheus as an error on the part of Pausanias or the Chest's maker simply because this name does not recur elsewhere. Several vases which have come to light since Wilamowitz wrote appear to contribute equally idiosyncratic names to the list of participants. Such examples of the invention of heroes' names make attempts to recover a Stesichorean catalogue of heroes from artefacts impossible. And the evidence of the Chest, whose close links with S. are so often asserted, may be distorted by tendencies personal to itself. To take an example from the chariot-races: Friedländer (Herakles p. 63) supposed that the name of Hippasus on the Vase accurately reflected the original source, while the Chest's Pisus, the eponymous hero of Pisa, who had no place in the Thessalian Funeral Games for Pelias, was included by the artist because the piece was destined for Olympia.

Does this same consideration explain why the Chest makes Heracles the judge of the Games? Has the artist substituted this hero for another judge because of his importance as founder of the Olympic Games? That is not the only possible explanation. Heracles might have been hit upon

---

1 Page (P.C.P.S. 17(1971) p. 92 n. 1) citing Paus. 5.17.11 ('Ιόλαος ... ἐκεῖνος μετείχεν Ἡρακλὲς τῶν ἔργων) claims that "it sounds as though Heracles did something more than sit in his chair", à propos of Ibycus S 176-10ff, where Ἡρακλῆς may have his chariot driven by Iolaus at the Αἴαλα ἐπὶ Πελίαν.
because his overall fame made him suitable for such a post of honour (Wilamowitz Hell. Dicht. Vol. 2. 242). S. probably included some such βορσευτής (on analogy with Achilles in Iliad 23), in his poem. Some vases name as judges the otherwise unknown Argeius, together with Pheres the father of Admetus and Acastus the Argonaut and son of the deceased Pelias. If one had to choose, Acastus would surely emerge as the most natural occupant of this position, and Heracles as an idiosyncracy of the Chest inspired by either of the motives mentioned above.

Finally, our Chest depicts the Peliades as spectators of the Games. This detail places in a quandary those who believe (1) that this artefact closely followed S's poem; (2) that S's poem described Pelias' death at his daughters' hands. If (2) be true, it is almost inconceivable that any great length of time should have elapsed between this death and the daughters' consequent flight. Certainly not enough time for these daughters calmly to look on at their father's obsequies before dashing off into exile. Vürtheim squirms over this paradox and then tries to wriggle out (p.12) by excogitating a drab compromise in which only some of the Peliades flee into exile, while the rest stay at Iolcus. There is no support whatsoever in ancient literature for this impromptu autoschediasm. Paus. 8.11.3 merely informs us that Micon the painter called the exiled daughters of Pelias Asteropeia and Antinoe: this is clearly quite a separate tradition from that preserved in Hyg. fab. 24 (reflecting Euripides' Peliades?)\(^1\) where four daughters

\(^1\) C.f. G. Zuntz, The Political Plays of Euripides (1953) P.136.
besides Alcestis are named as having chopped up their father. The difference in number is no more significant than the difference in names, and must not be tortured into yielding confirmation of Vürtheim's theory. This fragile growth receives further rough treatment from one of the few facts we do possess about Euripides' Peliades. The play placed Alcestis among the daughters who fled (fr. 600 N\(^2\)); the only daughter at the Games whom the Chest labelled was Alcestis. And observe a further point: before mentioning Micon, Pausanias says of the Peliades ὄνοματα δὲ αὐταῖς ποιητὴς μὲν ἔθετο οὐδέίς, ὅσα γε ἐπελεξάθεσα ἡμεῖς: If S. had described the death of Pelias, had devised the novel idea of placing his daughters among the spectators at his Funeral Games, could he have failed to give them names, he who was so generous at providing nomenclature for Orestes' nurse (218P) or Critolaus' wife (208P)?

Vürtheim's floundering subterfuges are the offspring of a dogmatic belief that S. must have mentioned the death of Pelias and that the Chest of Cypselus must reflect S's account in every detail. Abandon both liabilities and all becomes easy. The presence of the Peliades on the Chest is probably the free invention of its maker: they reappear nowhere else in this context in literature or plastic art. The unknown craftsman gave his imagination full play here at least, and since the actual death of Pelias will have been far from his mind, the oddness of the daughters' presence need never have occurred to him.
5) Late Corinthian column crater (575-500): Berlin F 1655: Payne NC No. 1471 = Vasenlisten 476.Cl. Found in Italy (1872) and destroyed in an air-raid on Berlin during the Second World War, this vase, like the Chest of Cypselus, portrayed both the Funeral Games of Pelias and Amphiaras' fateful departure from his wife Eriphyle. This coincidence of subject-matter, especially close in the case of the latter myth (see below p.480) drove Payne to conclude that "the two designs are roughly contemporary and go back to a common origin", which he tentatively identified as a wall-painting in Corinth. "The stories of Amphiaras and the Funeral Games of Pelias", Bowra adds (GLP^ p. 122), "have little connection with one another, and a natural reason for associating them would be that a single poet had told of both".

But this vase is not alone in its linking of these two events: an Attic amphora (Florence 3773 + Berlin 1711: ABV 95.8 = Vasenlisten^3 476.A2 ) and a Pontic amphora (Munich 838: Vasenlisten^3 476.C2 ) juxtapose them too. And as fine a scholar as Karl Schefold (Frühgr. Sagenbilder (Munich 1964) p. 76 = Myth and Legend in Early Greek Art (London 1966) p. 81) finds nothing surprising in this, or in need of other explanation than that the Funeral Games are meant as a relief to the Eriphyle saga (compare the apposite remarks of H. Brunn, Kl. Schr. 3.91ff quoted by Schefold on p. 100 = p. 189).
These considerations are more damaging to the notion of Stesichorean influence than the trivial discrepancies between the vase and the Chest of Cypselus which many scholars have noted. The divergences in the number and names of the participants in the chariot-race can be explained to our satisfaction as the natural outcome of two different selections from a common source made by two different artists pressed for space (see above p.21). And for those puzzled by the vase's insistence on placing its heroes in four-horse chariots, in arrant contradiction of the two-horse chariots found in S (178P) and the Chest, Bowra again offers the most convincing explanation (GLP$^2$ p. 121f): "if four-horsed chariots were usual in the vase-painter's day he might well depict them in defiance of legend". In other words, this will be an innovation on the artist's part like the Peliades on the Chest of Cypselus.

Nevertheless, of both these artefacts we can truly say that the likelihood of their dependence on S. has shrunk from originally impressive proportions. It cannot be disproved, but there is not nearly as much evidence in its favour as at first appeared.


The vase shows, besides the competitors whom I have tabulated, three further figures (Asterion, Atalanta? Acastus?) who
carry spears. There is also a group of three standing male spectators who are filled out by the new fragment of the vase, which likewise adds a new group of three seated male figures with spears over their shoulders: these are probably spectators rather than judges. Also added are part of Atalanta's legs and most of the body of the foremost spectator who is labelled as the otherwise unknown Damas.

More problematical is the fact that the figure on the right of the vase is now supplied with the name KEVAAΣ. This is clearly not Celaeneus, the obscure son of Electryon (Apollod. 2.4.5). Should he be identified with Pelops' charioteer, who is variously named by our ancient authors as Cillas (Paus. 5.10.7) or Cillus (Strabo 13.6.13 63, Ε Eur. Or. 990 (1.196 Schwartz) with v.l.ΚΟΛΑΝ). There would be no other evidence for Pelops' presence at Pelias' Funeral Games, but his link with the Olympic tradition may be relevant (see Leaf, Strabo on the Troad p. 312).

The apparent absence of Meleager from the vase's spear-throwers does not suggest any very intimate connection between this work of art and S's poem.

7) Acropolis vase 2209: Graef-Langlotz Text 1 p.215:
Plate 93 (NO. 2209) = Brommer Vasenlisten 3 496·Al.C.f.

This fragment contains part of a foot race: a man with curly hair running last, in front of him a youth also
running, and in front of him the hair of a third figure. To the right of the man's head a horizontal inscription of which only ΦA ... now remains. Comparison with the Cypselus Chest suggests Phalareus as a plausible supplement. To the right of the man's arm is part of an inscription written downward: ... ΙΝΕΝΟΣ[... which probably refers not to the runners but to the lost scene on their right. Beazley supplies [S ὉΕ] - ΝΕΝΟΣ a name which occurs on a Corinthian plaque and a Chalcidian neck-amphora. If this is right and the name belongs to a competitor in the Games, the painter or his source is guilty of an anachronism, since of the two Stheneli available, one is too young - he belongs properly to the generation after the Argonauts - and the other, father of Eurystheus, belongs to the generation before, and would ordinarily be too old to compete (though he might be a judge). It would be tempting to suppose the artist was influenced here by Stesichorean ἡαννονοῦα, but the evidence is inadequate. For all we know the vase might have had more than one subject and the name of Sthenelus might be quite irrelevant to the ΑΘΛΑ implied by the running figures.

8) Volute-crater Ferrara T 404: ARV² 1039,9 = Brommer Vasenlisten³ 496 B1 (440-430)

I reproduce Beazley's description: "on A, before the contests (... + ΟΕ, ΚΑΕΟΜΟΛΠΟΣ; Atalanta and Peleus - misnamed ΙΠΙΟΜΕΝΗ -; boxer misnamed ΑΜΥΚΟΣ - on B, after the contests (victorious athlete - bearded, Heracles? - decking a
tripod, Acastus seated as judge, crowning ἸΟΛΥΔΕΥ[ΚΗΣ]; seated beside Acastus his fellow-judge Pheres; standing beside them [ΙΔ]ΑΣ." On A the artist has clearly conflated the boxing fight at the Games with the famous fight between Polydeuces and Amycus (for which c.f. Ap. Rhod. 2-1-97; Theocr. Id. 22-27-134).

The wrestling match between Peleus and Atalanta¹ is particularly interesting because it was so popular a subject for depiction on Greek vases: a recent catalogue in Vasenlisten³ 316f. That the couple wrestled together at the Purera Games of Pelias is vouchsafed by Apollod. 3-106 and 164 (and Tzetz.12-937: c.f. Ibyc. S 176-11ff)². At least one vase shows Meleager's uncle Clytius, an Argonaut (c.f. Ap. Rhod. 1-86 etc.) and therefore a possible competitor in the games, as a spectator of the event: Vulci Hydria (c.540) Munich Antikensamml. 596: Vasenlisten³ 317-Cl.

It is a futile task to sift through the above artefacts in search of a Stesichorean origin. Even if it were proved that S. was here part of a fairly fixed tradition, artistic factors such as shortage of space and freedom of selection conspire to make this tradition seem more fluid than it really is (compare the evidence for the spear or javelin contest). If we would like an idea of how S's list of competitors extended beyond the Dioscuri, Meleager, and

¹Another anticipation of a hero's more famous exploit: see below p. 54.
²Compare Callimachus' solitary and not unambiguous testimony (Hymn 3-206ff) that the similarly disposed Cyrene took part in Pelias' Funeral Games.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JUDGE</td>
<td>ACASTUS, HERACLES</td>
<td>ACASTUS, ARGEIUS, PHERES, PERIPHAS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIZE</td>
<td>TRIPods</td>
<td>AEBHΣ, PELIADES (ALCESTIS NAMED), DAMAS, PHOCUS, STEHENELUS, IDAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECTATORS</td>
<td>TRIPods</td>
<td>EUPHEMUS?, CASTOR, POLYDEUCES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNPLACED NAMES</td>
<td></td>
<td>MELEAGER*, MELEAGER*, MELEAGER*, EUPHEMUS?, EUPHEMUS*, EUPHEMUS*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IPHITUS, MELANION, AMPHIARUS, ANON, CAPANAEUS, PERIPHAS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AMPHIAURUS*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EUPHEMUS?, EUPHEMUS*, EUPHEMUS*, CASTOR, POLYDEUCES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse Race</td>
<td>Foot Race</td>
<td>Boxing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYGINUS</td>
<td>IBYcus</td>
<td>BOXING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEST OF CYPSELUS</td>
<td></td>
<td>POLYDEUCES*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORINTHIAN CRATER</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADMETUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBYcus</td>
<td>HYGINUS</td>
<td>+AMYCUS+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYPSELUS</td>
<td></td>
<td>MOPSUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACROPOLIS VASE (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOLUTE CRATER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEMUS F.GR.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST. 369 F 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(see p.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMETUS</td>
<td>IOLAEUS*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTERION</td>
<td>IOLAEUS?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PISUS</td>
<td>GLAUCUS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPPASUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALASTOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMPHITHEUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(IO[LA]US IOLAEUS*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOLAUS?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BORREAS* HERACLES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORSE RACE</td>
<td>BELLEROPHON*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOOT RACE</td>
<td>IPHICLlus*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARGEIUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHALAREUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEOTHEUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MELANION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STADION</td>
<td>CASTOR*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOUBLE COURSE</td>
<td>CALAIS*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONG RACE</td>
<td>ZETES*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOXING</td>
<td>POLYDEUCES*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMETUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMYCUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBYCUS</td>
<td>HYGINUS</td>
<td>CHEST OF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CYPSELUSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRESTLING</td>
<td>PELEUS*</td>
<td>PELEUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PELEUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATALANTA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Amphiaraus, it would be least dangerous to keep our eyes on the Chest of Cypselus and the Corinthian Crater, where the hypothesis of S. as an original source obscured by different selections made by the different artists cannot be disproved. But neither can it be proved; the Olympic destination of the chest may well explain its choice of judge and at least one competitor; and the free invention of the artist may be responsible for the presence of the Peliades. Nor is it certain, assuming we are right to talk in terms of a literary source, whether that Ἄθλος ἐπὶ Πελίδια is S's or an epic of the same name and nature.

METRE
Dactylo-anapaestic
178 P

179 A

179 B

178 P

A compassionate veil will be drawn over earlier attempts by Bernhardy (ad Sud. 3.209 Adler) and Bergk to hammer a Stesichorean line out of the last nine words of the Et. Gud's entry. Bergk in his final edition came to his senses and realised that these words represent the
relics of two consecutive entries which have been accidentally run together and then abbreviated (p. 205f). Thus originally the lexicographer must have intended Κύλλαρος Ὑπος Ὀατ... "Ἡραν δὲ ἡνθον καὶ Κύλλαρον. Κυλινδόμενος περὶ χαλκών ἡ κυλινδόμενος περὶ τῶν σιδήρων τῶν ἐπισσώτηρων, ὅ ἐστι τῶν καυθῶν. This supposition is confirmed by the parallel afforded in Et. Florent. ap. E. Miller, Mélanges de littérat. grecque, 1 9 9 where we read the following entries one after the other: Κύλλαρ ὡς...Κυλινδόθε...Κυλινδόθε...Κυλ汶川...Κυλινδόμενος περὶ χαλκών...κυλινδόμενος κτλ. In both cases the gloss derives from II. 8. 86.

This innocuous-looking fragment conceals beneath its placid surface several surprisingly tough problems. First and foremost is the question of the exact extent of the quotation: where does paraphrase leave off and the actual words of S. begin? Let us take the whole entry of the Et. Mag. s.v. Κύλλαρος from Ὑπ. Κάστ. to ἡνθ. καὶ Κύλλ. The following options are them open to us: (1) we can accept the MS readings in toto, in which case only ὕλος... Ποδάργας are the ipsissima verba of S. himself, while τὸν μὲν Ἐρμ. κτλ and Ἡραν δὲ κτλ. represent a mere paraphrase of S's original words. (2) We can accept Hemsterhuys' emendation of Ἡραν to Ὡρα because (1) we believe that the lexicographer originally continued his quotation up to Κύλλαρον and wrote Ὡρα which was easily corrupted to the accusative by assimilation with the two accusatives.
which follow it or with the φησί construction which
governs 'Ερμηνii (ii) because we believe that the lexicog-
grapher wrote "Ηραν and intended a paraphrase, but
paraphrased so closely that S's original can be recov-
ered simply by removing "Ηραν from the accusative plus
infinitive construction and making it nominative.
(3) We can expand the boundaries of our quotation still
further by trying to reconstruct the actual syllables
that lurk behind the undoubted paraphrase τὸν μὲν
'Ερμην δεδωκέναι φησί'.

To take these points in reverse order: (3) is easily
the hardest and most questionable process. There can
be no certainty in the reconstitution as the differing
attempts of scholars only go to show. Blomfield (p. 270)
proposed

'Ερμεῖας Φλόγεου μὲν ἐδωκε καὶ "Αρπ.
Hiller and Crusius try (p. LV)

'Ερμεῖας μὲν ἐδωκεν
Φλόγεου τε καὶ "Αρπ.
Edmonds' predictably facile

'Ερμᾶς μὲν Φλόγεου <σφίν> ἐδωκε καὶ "Αρσαγ. ὥς. τεκν.
Ποδ.

"Ηρα δὲ κτλ. (Lyra Graeca 2·30)
is out of the question because Hermes did not give his
two horses to both Dioscuri (see below p. 38).
Several of our sources add the phrase τοῖς Διοςκοῦροις
after δεδωκέναι φης (see app. crit.) and the testimony

For a similar process see my note on 221 P (p. 1024).
of Tertullian de Spect 9, and Servius in Verg. Georg. 3.89 supports them. If we try to turn τὸν μὲν Ἑρμ. δεδωκ. into poetry, why refrain from applying the same remedy to Διοσκοῦροις? For this suggests that the dative of Polydeuces (see below) occurred in the original poem after the words now represented by τὸν μὲν νεκρ. In other words, the introductory paraphrase is too remote for us to squeeze any poetry from it.

(2) seems at first sight a more hopeful case. The two justifications for reading Ἡρα cited above may be thought to offer odds of two to one against the line's being a mere paraphrase; and we might add that it would be distinctly strange if, wishing to illustrate the word Κόλλαρος from S., the lexicographer had directly quoted an irrelevant line and then failed to cite verbatim the very next line containing the word in question. Yet so it was. For against these unexceptionable arguments must be set a metrical consideration that outweighs them all. This will emerge as soon as the line (incorporating Hemsteuys' conjecture) is scanned:

That melancholy succession of longs would be unparalleled in S., especially when compared with the previous line and, indeed, all other (admittedly sparse) fragments of this poem. We must conclude that here too we are in the territory of paraphrase, with Ἡραν δὲ' corresponding to the lexicographer's earlier
(1) however is safe, - or is it? Almost, but not as handed down by Et. Mag. etc. and printed by Page. Again, scansion reveals all: \( \sim \sim \sim \sim \sim \sim \sim \sim \sim \sim \sim \)

The paradosis, by itself and in comparison with the other fragments, screams out for the insertion of a short element after \( \Phi \lambda \gamma \). The \( \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \) of Hiller-Crusius is inevitable (however unacceptable the rest of their text) and gives us a paradigm of those tiny words, inessential for the meaning, which so often steal out of the quotes provided by secondary transmission (see p.330).

Now we can learn more about our fragment's context simply by combining two pieces of information: most of our sources tell us that Hermes gave two horses to both the Dioscuri. Et. Mag. 544·54 tells us that of the two horses contributed by Hera, Cyllarus belonged to Castor. It does not require much exercise of the intellect to deduce that Hera gave Xanthus to Polydeuces and that Hermes likewise gave one horse to each of the twins. Such an arrangement tells against the notion that the twins competed together in a four-horse chariot. That type of chariot is implied by an episode in Homer where

---

Hector addresses four horses who bear names similar to some in our fragment:

Σάνθε τε καὶ σῦ, Πόδαργε, καὶ Αἴθων Λάμπε τε διε

(II.8.185)

and

τεσσάρες θελωνόροι ἵπποι αὐτοῖς ὀξέαν

are mentioned in II.11.699, while an Odyssean simile

knows of τετράόροι ἀρεινες ἱπποί (Od.13.81').

But these are the only Homeric allusions to four-horse chariots

(see Leaf ad II.8.185 (1.345)): elsewhere the two-horse chariot reigns supreme, and Homer's practice seems to

have fixed this as the heroic norm, even though S. himself may have been familiar with the four-horse variety.

(Pausanias claims that a race for the latter was introduced into the Olympic Games as early as 680 (5.8.7))).

This conclusion is confirmed by the failure of any pictorial representation to place the Dioscuri together in one car.

According to Probus on Vergil's Georgics (see app. crit.) Hera had received Xanthus and Cyllarus from Poseidon before she in turn handed them to the Dioscuri. Poseidon is an obvious source for such a gift (compare his gift of horses to Peleus (II.23.276-8 and Rhesus 187)). Whether S. is to be included among the "poetae graeculi" whom Probus cites as his sources, we cannot tell.¹ The motif of a gift passed from one hand to

¹But see below p.45.
another occurs as early as Il.2.101ff (Agamemnon's 
σκήπτρον): see my note on 234 P.

A nicely-balanced problem in assessing the evidence of 
literature and art arises over the identity of the 
victor(s) in S's chariot-race. If 178 P were all we 
have to go on in deciding this question, we should doubt-
less conclude that with horses of divine provenence 
the Dioscuri were assured of a cert.: one of them could 
hardly avoid winning. But the Chest of Cypselus and the 
Corinthian Crater depict Euphemus as victor. Wilamowitz 
reacted indignantly (Textg. d. gr. Bukoliker p. 197 n.2):
"es ist widersinning, dass sie (viz. the Dioscuri) nicht 
siegen", and detected in the apparent contradiction proof 
that "unsere mythographische Tradition ist kümmerlich 
und schlecht." Vürtheim on the contrary thought the two 
details could be reconciled and that Euphemus did fea-
ture in S's ἈΘΛΑ ἐπὶ ΠΕΛΛΑΙ as winner of the chariot-
race (p. 3). After all, would it be so very astounding 
if Poseidon's own son defeated the Dioscuri, even if the 
latter were driving horses which ultimately derived from 
Poseidon? Apollonius says of Euphemus 

κείνος ἄνηρ καὶ πόντου ἐπὶ γλαυκοῦ ὄφεκεν
οἶδοματος, οὐδὲ θοῦτοι βαίττεν ποδας, ἅλλ' ὄσον ἄμοις
ἐχνει τεγγομένος διερῆ τεφόρητο κελεύθω

(Ap.Rhod. 1.182-4)

and Vürtheim takes this as warrant for assuming that 
Euphemus' horses must have possessed the same powers as
their master, powers similar to those of the foals of Erichthonius, offspring of the North Wind (11.20.226-229):

\[
\alpha \iota \delta' \delta \tau \varepsilon \mu \varepsilon \nu \epsilon \chi \iota \rho \iota \tau \omega \iota \iota \epsilon \varepsilon \nu \iota \pi \varepsilon \theta \iota \iota \iota \omega \rho \omicron \omicron \nu \alpha \rho \omicron \nu \alpha \nu.
\]

There is no positive proof that Euphemus possessed horses like these and at first sight the tradition preserved in the Argonautica would seem a better explanation of a win in the foot-race than in the competition for chariots. Indeed Vürtheim's efforts to justify Euphemus' victory paradoxically undermine his main thesis. If there were obvious reasons why Euphemus should win, these reasons might easily have been hit upon by the artists of the Cypselus Chest and the Corinthian vase, rather than S. or his epic source. But if, as I accept, there is no particularly convincing motive for Euphemus' win, then equally there is no reason why workers in the plastic arts should arbitrarily have selected him for the place of honour in contradiction of the literary tradition. We should not be unduly impressed by the apparently unassailable excellence of the Dioscuri's pairs as revealed in our fragment. Eumelus is the favourite in Il.23's chariot race (c.f. Il.23.536) but the gods decide otherwise, and such a defeat of deliberately raised expectations is a most exciting device.
Bergk (p.206) suggested we read Φλόγιόν, on the basis of
the description of Ares' horses in Quint. Sm. 8.241f:

φόρεσον δέ μιν ἐς μύδον ἵπποι ᾧ Αἴών καὶ Φλόγιος,
Κόναβος ὀ' ἐπὶ τοῖς Φόβοι τε. Compare Phlegon, the
horse of the Sun in Ov. Met. 2.154, Hyg.fab.182.

αἴών and φλόγι are both rather ambiguous epithets: should
they be taken as colour adjectives ("red-brown, tawny,
the colour of flame") or as meaning "sleek, shining,
fiery, as bright as fire" as in the only Homeric instan-
ces of φλόγιος (ὀχύρα φλόγια in Il.5.745=8.389 of the
chariot used by Hera and Athena)? Either possibility
would be appropriate for the name of a horse. C.f.
Πυρόεις in Ov. Met. 2.153 etc.

"Αρπαγοῦ

Another suitable name for a horse, given the connota-
tions of speed present in ἄρπαξ and ἄρπως: it would
be especially appropriate for the offspring of the mare
who is called "Ἀρπωῦα Ποδόφηγη at Il.16.150 and bears
the immortal steeds of Achilles, Xanthus and Balius,
to Zephyrus. That connection between the storm-gust
77) and mares is paralleled in Il. 20.223ff (quoted
above p. 41) where Boreas begets a race of fleet horses

¹Pace LSJ s.v. ποδόφηγος, Il.16's Ποδόφηγη is not the
"Name of a Harpy": see Leaf ad loc. (2.157). Harpies
do not graze in meadows or give birth to horses.

τέκνα Ποδάργας

exactly the same two words at line-end in Il.19.400.

Ποδάργας:

Yet another good name for a horse (see Hesych. s.v. Ποδάργης, λευκόσους, ταχύς. Roscher s.v. Podarge (32. 259ff)). If this is the same mare as that mentioned in Il.16, then Phlogeus and Harpagus are the brothers of Xanthus and Balius whom Poseidon gave to Peleus and he in turn to Achilles (Il.23·276f). Did Peleus too compete with his team at Pelias' Funeral Games? According to Nonnus, Dionys. 37·155 however, the offspring of Aquilo and Aellopous Harpyia were called Xanthus and Podarge. Hector (Il.8·185) had another pair with the same name, and Diomedes of Thrace a third (Hyg. fab. 30) who ate human flesh.

Σάνθων:

Hemsterhuys (Lucian 2·338) realised, thanks to Probus on Vergil's Georgics (see app. crit.), that S's original ΔΕΣΑΝΘΩΝ had been corrupted to ΔΕΣΑΙΔΩΝ in the lexicographers. The word is clearly a colour adjective, again suitable for a horse: see Roscher s.v. Xanthos (14) (6·520), M.L. West, C.Q. 15 (1965) p.195 n.4.
Here, attempts to discover an appropriate etymology break down, since of the available adjectives χυλλός means "ass-coloured" or "grey", (c.f. Hesych. s.v. (2·478 Latte), Photius s.v., Eust 1057·56, Eubulus 103 K) and the more familiar χυλλός signifies "clubfooted" or "bandy-legged", (not 'equus .. cuius spina est inflexa", as Jeschonnek, de nominibus quae Graeci pecudibus domesticis indiderunt (1885) p. 48). Neither seems exquisitely appropriate to a racing horse, especially the steed of one of the Dioscuri, and the second is regrettably reminiscent of the lame smith of the gods (χυλλοποδίων, Il. 18·371 etc.). The use of χυλλαρος to refer to the hermit-crab (Arist. H.A. 530A 12) is in no way reassuring. Perhaps S. himself would have accepted the lexicon's derivation from χύλης.

This objectionably-named steed presents us with a further problem, since S. borrowed him from Alcman, if Schol. Bern ad Verg. Georg. 3·89 (ed. Hagen, Fleckeisen's Jahrb. Suppl. 4 (1861-7) 930 = Alcman fr. 25 P) is to be believed. Here are the commentator's actual words:

"Amycla urbs in Peloponneso: equos autem a Neptuno lunoni datos Alcman lyricus dicit Cyllarum et Xanthum, quorum Polluci Cyllarum, Xanthum fratri eius concessum esse dictum est; Cyllarus enim equus fuit Pollucis et magni currus Achillis." Vürtheim (p.4f) disliked this testimony and supposed it to be a mere excogitation
from the Vergilian passage it comments upon. The last four words certainly seem to have been introduced erroneously from that source:

\[
\text{tal} \text{i} \text{s Amyclaei domitus Pollucis habenis}
\]

\[
\text{Cyllarus et, quor} \text{um Graei meminere poetae, }
\]

\[
\text{Martis equi biiuges et magni currus Achilli.}
\]

But Vergil's lines alone would not have given the commentator his information about Juno and Neptune, and an independent source is likewise suggested by Serv. Daniel ibid. (Thilo-Hagen 3'1'283): "Xanthum autem \text{\textless}dicit\text{\textgreater} et Cyllarum equos, quos Neptunus Iunoni dono dedit, illa Castori et Polluci, ut poetae Graeci fabulantur." Both of the annotations may derive from Alcman, since references in such scholia as these to "Greek poets" in the plural do not necessarily imply more than one. (C.f. Ed. Fraenkel, J.R.S. 39 (1949) 151 = Kl. Beitr. 2'382 citing Serv. Daniel. 2'277'6 where "Graeci poeti" is probably limited to Lycophr. Alex. 1133).

There is obviously a discrepancy between S., who makes Cyllarus the horse of Castor, and Vergil and the Schol. Bern., who give the steed to Polydeuces. The evidence can be restored, however, if we suppose that these two latter reflect Alcman's version, which S. deliberately changed varietatis causa. Of the two Dioscuri, Castor is traditionally the ἰμποσδύμος (c.f. Il'3'237 = Od. 11'300 = H.H. 33'3; Ibycus S166'17; Theocr. Id. 22' 34, 136
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etc.) S. was followed not only by Et. Mag. but by Statius Theb. 6.328ff (tua furto lapsa propago, | Cyllare, dum Scythici diversus ad ostia ponti | Castor Amyclaeas remo permutat habernas c.f. Silv. 1.1.54) Valerius Flaccus Argon. 1.425f (Castor.... | passus Amyclaea pinquescere Cyllaron herba) Martial 8.21.5-6 (Ledae poteras abducere Cyllaron astro ; | ipse suo cedit nunc tibi Castor equo: c.f. id. 4.25.6, 8.28.8) and Claudian Consul. Honor. Quart. 556-7 (serviretque tuis contempto Castore frenis | Cyllarus). Note also that on Exekias' black-figure amphora (Rome Vat. 344: ABV 145.13 = Brommer Vasenlisten3 510 A4) depicting the return of the Dioscuri, the steed labelled Cyllarus stands next to Castor rather than his brother.

At present we cannot hope to know more of the context in which Alcman mentioned Cyllarus, but given his predilection for local Spartan legends and deities, it would be outrageously arbitrary to deny that he can have given names to at least two of the steeds of these favourite Lacedaemonian heroes. Nor should we forget that Alcman is credited with the composition of a hymn to the Dioscuri(2P).

1Admittedly, both twins feature as horse-riders in Alcman 2 P, Theocr. Id. 22.24, and Callim. fr. 227.8 Pf. (c.f. Maas, Maia 9 (1957) 157 = Kl. Schr. 85).

2And Ovid in Met. 12.393ff mentions a centaur called Cyllaros, and remarks that he is worthy to be ridden by Castor. The name was in fact quite common for horses: see Jeschonnek, de nominibus quae Graeci pecudibus domesticis indiderunt (1885) p. 48.
On the fragment of Panyassis see Matthew's commentary pp. 126ff. He suggests that Seleucus may have discussed it in his glossary περὶ Ἑλληνικοῦ (on which see Jacoby, F. Gr. Hist. 3B (Text) p. 92ff and p. 124ff).

It is quite arbitrary of Kleine (p. 57) and others to change φερεσθαί - which is clearly a part of Athenaeus' introductory remarks - to φερεςθε and treat it as part of S's fragment. Even more arbitrary of Kleine to read παρθένου, or παρθένων, or even παρθενοθωρα, insert it within the quotation and treat it as a reference to the Peliades or mere "ancillae".

The middle voice of φέρεσθαί is puzzling.

The little we know of this poem's metre (see p. 34) encourages me to print Athenaeus' quotation in one period, as Bergk (p. 206) suggested. That done, we must ask whether there is any means of determining the identity of the παρθένος who is the recipient of the sesame-cakes, groats, sweet-oil cakes, and the rest of the mouth-watering menu. Vürtheim (p. 6), with undeniable ingenuity, identified her with Alcestis, on the grounds that sesame-cakes imply weddings, and that only the wedding of Admetus and Alcestis can be fitted into the Ἀθλα's framework. Bowra is duly impressed (GLP 2 p.102), and the connection between sesame and marriage-feasts cannot be denied (see ad loc). But Vürtheim's theory does have wide-ranging repercussions for the structure and
content of the ἈΘλα (see above pp. 9 ff) which some
may find unattractive. Is there any alternative explana-
tion of the young girl's identity?¹

F. Raffaele (p. 22) and H. Fränkel (Dicht. und Philos.
p. 321 = Poetry and Philosophy p. 282 n. 5) have suggested
that the παρθένος may be Atalanta. As we have seen, her
participation in the Games' wrestling-match is guaranteed
by the evidence of vase-paintings and Apollodorus 3.106
and 164. Why should she be offered food appropriate for
a wedding? Numerous heroes wished to marry her and this
fact may underlie the offer here. Of perhaps if we
remember the indifference of ancient authors to the con-
text of their quotations² we might suppose our line was
set in the mouth of one such hero giving expression to
his wish to marry Atalanta.³

But, as ever, I am more concerned to prevent one hypo-
thesis from attaining the status of accepted dogma than
to peddle my own nostrum. I am also eager to prevent the
drawing of significant and almost metaphysical

¹The early guess that it was Persephone (e.g. E. von Leutsch
in Ersch and Gruber's Allgemeine Encyklopädie d. Wiss. u.
Kunste 62 (1856) 212) still maintained in Mancuso p.266 n.2
is scarcely less risible than Sitzler's misprint (or mis-
understanding) which attributes to Würtheim identifica-
tion of the παρθένος with Athene (Bursian 191 (1922) p.51)
²See p. 232 n.1.
³Note that in the description of Pelias' Funeral Games at
Ibycus S176.1, line 13 could be supplemented γέρσυ
("Peleus, defeated in the wrestling-match, could not
marry Atalanta") an interpretation rejected by Page (P.C.
P.S. 17 (1971) p. 91) because "we have no reason to
believe ... that Peleus wished to marry Atalanta, and
that the fulfilment of his wish depended on the result of
the wrestling-match with her at the Funeral Games."
conclusions from isolated one-line fragments. And here I must object to the deductions to which Frankel is led (sup. cit.) by our fragment's list of foods and other similar lists in 187, 197 and 222 P. For him they signify that "in one respect S. was possessed by the spirit of the new age. He has a penchant towards factual accuracy, completeness and objectivity." Bowra, on the other hand, thinks the fragment proves that "S., like Alcman, enjoyed to retail (sic) tasty foods" (G.L.P. 2 p. 102). The motives of the quoters of all these fragments are far more relevant if we would explain these features.

cacamaδακ

See Photius s.v. κήσαμον· πρῶτον μὲν παρὰ τῶν νυμφῶν τὸ παλαιὸν ἔδιδοσαν τοῖς ἀπαντῶσι περιοίηες τῶν ἑντίμων, ἐπιλέγοντες δὲ παρὰ τοῦ γαμοῦντος ἔτειν ἢ τῆς γαμουμένης. The rest of the copious ancient evidence connecting these with weddings is fully assembled and sifted by H. Blümner in K.F. Hermann's Lehrbuch der gr. Antiquitätäten (third edition 1882) Vol. 4 Privatalterthumer, pp.220ff and 270ff. It may be that "the multitude of its seeds was a symbol of prolific union" (Merry on Ar. Pax 869).

χόνδρον

See Blümner, Technologie und Terminologie der Gewerbe und Künste bei Gr. und Rom. Vol. 1. (1875) pp.55ff and 84ff on the nature of these dainties.
The character of these is well defined by Athenaeus. But the etymology of the word is quite obscure. As Chantraine observes s.v. in his Dictionnaire Etymologique (p.310), R. Strömberg's derivation from ἐγκρίνειν (Gr. Wortstudien (1944) p.15) well fits the substantive's form but hardly suffices to justify its meaning, while the reverse defect mars the explanation of Frisk, G.E.W. s.v. who suggests it is a "back-formation" from ἐγκρεόνυμι : see O. Szemerényi, Syncope in Greek and Indo-European (1964) p.143 n.1. Chantraine himself toys with the notion of a "formation deverbale" like τευκλίς, and Nöthiger (p.188 n.2) observes that all of S's nouns in -ιδας (cακαυιδας above, κορωνιδας in 187·3 P, the present example) occur in what may be marital contexts and speculates that they originate from the "Volkssprache".

See Blümner op.cit. [above ad cακαυιδας] p.220 and n.4. The word occurs also in Panyassis fr. 26K, Solon fr. 38·3W, and Hdt. 1·160·5 (where Powell's lexicon renders it "cookie"). See too Valckenear's conjecture τεύματι for τσεύματι ib. 132. The word is not so rare then in early Greek that Matthews (ad Panyass. sup. cit. (p. 128)) should speak of "borrowing" by Panyassis from S.
καὶ μὲλι χλωρόν

Exactly the same phrase at the end of lines in Od. 10.234, and (minus the καὶ) in H.H. Herm. 560.
(See too Il. 11.631 which opens with ἥδε μὲλι χλωρόν).

179 B P

On the frequent confusion in antiquity between S. and Ibycus which Athenaeus in this particular case tries to resolve, see my note on 251 P. But what is the relationship between the two poems quoted by Athenaeus? The Stesichorean line is cited as confirmation of Simonides' fragment in a way that only makes sense if both poets are referring to the same achievement of Meleager.¹ This would suggest that the difference between δουπὶ and ἄκοντι is purely superficial. Bowra, to be sure, deduced that in S. "Meleager who won the spear-cast, also won the javelin-cast" (GLF² p.101). But it is grotesquely improbable that any poem would court ennui so inevitably as to include both of these almost identical contests and then make the same hero victor in each. And Athenaeus has bungled badly if, with the whole poem in front of him, he thought S's line the closest parallel to Simonides' fragment, when S. in the same poem had actually mentioned a spear-contest. In fact, this passage provides the strongest possible proof that spear or javelin were interchangeable in this part of the tradition.

¹Otherwise Athenaeus would be guilty of the non-sequitur with which he is charged by J.P. Barron, B.I.C.S. 16 (1969) p.47 n.51.
Athenaeus also implies that S's poem mentioned Iolcus and the Anaurus, which by itself would establish for sure that S. did not exhaust all he had to say about Meleager in the one line Athenaeus gives us. (See further below). But the exact extent of the hero's achievement is uncertain. Strabo 9 p.436 tells us that the city of Iolcus is situated at a distance of seven stadia from Demetrias, the region near which the River Anaurus flows. That would be an heroic throw indeed. But Strabo adds that the territory bordering on the Anaurus is also called Iolcus, (πλησίον δὲ τῆς Δημητρίδος ὁ Ἀναυρος ῥεῖ, καλεῖται δὲ καὶ ὁ συνεχῆς ἀγωλὸς Ἰωλκός), which would present us with an easier, though still admirable, feat.

We know nothing about the nature of the Simonidean poem quoted by Athenaeus: the mention of Meleager may have been part of a longer mythical narrative embracing this hero's various exploits, or, for instance, a mythical paradeigma from οἱ ἑπιμικτοὺς (c.f. Simonides 509 P and Pindar's victory odes passim).

The chronological conclusions drawn by Wilamowitz from the juxtaposition of "Homer" and S. have already been exploded, but we might note that the phenomenon gives valuable confirmation to the notion that S. like Homer sang his own songs and accompanied himself on the lyre.

On early epic treatments of the ἄλα ἐπὶ ἂναλίαν see further pp.1ff above.
Turning next to S's actual fragment, I would first observe that Kleine's emendation of the MSS' γΔ is essential to the metre (see p.34). Next, a comment on the line's (admittedly limited) scope. Bowra (GLP² p.101) takes this as evidence that the jumping- and javelin-contests were related in a very cursory manner analogous to Pindar's cramming of five athletic events into eight lines in Ol. 10.64ff. The same assumption seems to underlie Davison's belief (Eranos 53(1956)13 = From Archilochus to Pindar p.78) that "'Homer' may have described the contests more fully than S. seems to have done."¹ But the Stesichorean fragments published since both these scholars wrote have established fairly firmly that S's style of narrative was far closer to Homer's than Pindar's. It would be odd if Pelias' Funeral Games were not treated with the epic fulness lavished upon the adventures of Heracles against Geryon or the sack of Troy. And indeed fragments 178 and 179Bp both suggest very detailed handling: it would be quite disproportionate for the javelin-competition in general and the success of an important hero like Meleager in particular to be thrown away in four words! This is not what the analogy of the ἀθλον ἐπὶ Πατρόκλωι has led us to expect.

It makes far better sense to suppose that the eight words which comprise 179Bp either represent some sort of resumptive summary of a far more detailed preceding narrative,

¹So too Page, P.C.P.S. 17(1971)p.90: "S. seems to have disposed of two of the events briskly enough", though he is aware that the example of the Geryoneis suggests a far more detailed poem
or, alternatively, comprise the answer to an epic-type question anticipating a no less descriptive account. For instance: "tell me Muse, which heroes won the jumping- and javelin-contests?" Then the present fragment, and then the more leisurely treatment for which our appetites have been whetted.

As for the actual victors, it has long been realised that Meleager's javelin-win is to be explained by his later and more famous win in the Calydonian boar-hunt, where he lays the brute low with the self-same weapon (Ov. Met. 8·414ff). In seeking to allot different victories to different heroes it would be natural for poet or artist to be influenced by the most familiar event in the heroes' careers. Some such principle of selection can be seen at work in the Chest of Cypselus: Iphiclus wins the foot-race because his transcendent powers of speed had been proved on other occasions (c.f. Il. 23·636; Hes. fr. 62 and 64·9 MW and observe the significant name of his son Podarces (Hes. fr. 199·5 MW). Melanion takes part in the foot-race because of his later encounter with Atalanta in that event. Peleus competes in the wrestling-match and is often given Atalanta as his opponent because of that other time in his life when he wrestled with a female - the immortal Thetis whom he wished to marry.¹

¹A similar consideration affects the choice of contestants in Il. 23's funeral games: Ajax and Odysseus wrestle together (700ff) in anticipation of their strife over Achilles' armour. Oelian Ajax's defeat in the foot-race because of Athene foreshadows his more fatal worsting at her hands off the Capherian Rocks.
S., who may be the source for some of these representations, chose his victors in the same way, to judge from the scanty fragments at our disposal. Amphiaraus vanquishes all others in the jump because shortly before his death he was to repeat this achievement at the first Nemean Games (c.f. Apollod. 3.6.4 where ἀλματι καὶ δίκω τ' Αμφιάραος (scil. ἐνίκησεν) is Valckenaer's certain emendation of the MSS 'ἀγωνίτ.'). Meleager is an Argonaut like most of the competitors at Pelias' Funeral Games (c.f. Ap. Rhod. 1.191 etc.) and Amphiaraus although he is not a part of Apollonius' list, is included by Ε. Ἀρ. Rhod. 1.139 (p.19 Wendel) = Deiochus F. Gr. Hist. 471 F2, and Apollodorus 1.9.16 in that happy band.

'Αμφιάραος:

On the orthography of this name see P. Kretschmer, Die gr. Vaseninschriften (1894) p. 32 and 122f; Lexikon d. frühgr. epos s.v.

Desperately hard. The absolute minimum that can be agreed is that Zenobius ventures two explanations of the epithet Χειροβρώς, the second of which contains a serious corruption. Most scholars seem agreed on the meaning of the first explanation. I am a good deal less sure, but let us start with it.

1Though elsewhere Amphiaraus is famed for his prowess with the chariot: see Paus. 1.34.2, 2.23.2, 5.17.4, 10.10.2.
"With a bond that gnaws the hand: of thongs used in boxing: because they cut through and wear the flesh."

Whose flesh? We are not told, but scholars may be right in supposing an ambiguity over "the harm which such bonds did both to the boxer himself and to his adversary" (Schneidewin (1) p.328; Bowra GLP2 p.101). The reference is to a practice known as early as Homer, whereby boxers bound their hands with

ιμάντας εὔμητους βοδὸς ἀγραύλοιο (Il. 23·684)

(For an excellent note on thongs in boxing see A.S.F. Gow on Theocr. Id. 22·80f (Vol. 2. pp.394-5)). This gives admirable sense to χιτοροβρωτι δεσμῳ and the only objections to it are (i) that Zenobius at once proceeds to prefer an alternative explanation; (ii) that the phrase is said to be used at the start of the poem. Neither cavil is insurmountable. The latter is really no problem at all: we would do well to be surprised if we were asked to believe that the poem opened by plunging in medias res with a description of the boxing match, the first words of which were χιτοροβρωτι δεσμῳ. Fortunately no-one is asking us to accept any such thing. The match itself probably did not occur ἐν ἀρχῇ τῶν ἐπὶ Πελίαι "Ἀθλῶν, but two words relating to it could easily have done so, and it is not hard to think of a suitable context in which they might have stood. (To mention just one of many possibilities: the poem probably began with an appeal to the Muse: S. might have asked her to sing of the victors in the chariot-race and jump, and those successful with the javelin and the thong that gnaws the hand.)
To objection (i) we may answer with Bowra (explicitly GLP$^1$ p.101, implicitly GLP$^2$ p.101) that Zenobius may simply have been wrong to prefer his second explanation. Besides, even if he were not so mistaken, there is little we can do in the face of the hopeless corruption that disfigures the latter half of Zenobius' entry.

But scholars have been wonderfully reluctant to resign themselves to this. I presume the proposers of the following emendations would accept something like Edmonds' translation of the second explanation in order to explain the γάρ of the succeeding sentence: "The bonds [or the bondage] that eat away the arms [or hands]." (Lyra Graeca 2 p.33). Now let us brace ourselves. Hermann's ἔσενοςγὰρ ἐν τινὶ σπείραι was the ἀρχὶ κακῶν. Then Bergk abused the Latin language by referring (p. 207) to "locus corruptus hand dubie sic emendandus: ἔσενη γὰρ ἐν τινὶ πέτραι (sive σπείραι cum Hermannc malis) ἦν Τυρώ." The corruption probably lies so deep that ambitious re-writing is inevitable. But the imprisonment of Pelias' mother by the wicked stepmother Sidero is not a subject I would gladly inject into an account of Pelias' Funeral Games unless I had better evidence than this. Of course once such goings-on as these have been crammed into our poem we will be profoundly grateful for the extra room provided by Bergk's change of ἐν ἀρχῇ to ἐν ἀ. Not that a "Funeral Games for Pelias" unadorned by this scholar's "improvements" would need the plurality of books afforded to the more extensive subject-matter of the Oresteia or the Helen. And while we are trying
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to decide between ἁπείρωμα and πέτραι let us remember that the meaning "fetter" for ἁπείρωμα is quite without parallel.¹ Not that a version wherein Tyro's sorrows included being bound to a rock is exactly weighed down by corroborative evidence.

Vürtheim (p.9) approached the problem from a different angle. Ἐν τινὶ πέτρᾳ reminded him of another mythological character associated with a rock. Apollonius' Argonauts had seen him:

...τοθι γυῖα περὶ στυφελοῖς πάγωσιν

Ἰλλόμενος χαλκήσις ἄλυκτοπεθήσις προμήθεως

αἰετὸν ἤματι φέρβε ... (2.1248-50)

"und wer sollte nicht den schweren Verlust dieser stesichoreischen Episode bedauern dem der Wortlaut der mächtigen apollonischen Beschreibung in die Ohren klingt?" asks Vürtheim at his most pathetic, and would mend the Zenobian extract as follows: βέλτιον ἐξ τοῦ ἀποβιβάσκοντα τῷ χείρε, ἔδεθη γὰρ...

The Argonauts can only have mentioned Prometheus' plight when recounting their adventures upon returning home. That detail can only have occurred right at the start of a poem called Ἀθλα ἐπὶ Πελίκαι and to that extent Vürtheim has explained the phrase beginning ἐν ἀρχή. But he need not

¹Bergk backs up Hermann's conjecture by rewriting A.P. 3.9.1-2: μητέρα τροπείησιν ἐπὶ ἁπείρομα σιδηρωφ/Σαλμωνεῖ γενέται τῶλσ' ὑποτασσόμενωι. In his hands this becomes μητέρα τροπείησιν ἐνι ἁπείρομείς σιδηρωθ/Σαλμωνεῖ γενέται δ' ὑποτασσόμενου. The lines are too corrupt to provide any firm basis for speculations about the Stesichorean fragment.
have gone such a long way about to achieve that task (see pp. 8ff). And I must make it plain that for all his sufferings the Titan will not squeeze his way past me into the poem unless he can produce better credentials than Vürtheim has given him.¹ Even though we now know that S. did have cause to name Prometheus in one of his poems, I still doubt whether the Ἄθλα was the relevant work.

All above attempts at emendation are vitiated by their assumption that some sort of sense can be squeezed out of πεταμ - or a word like it. But it is highly probably that this word has been adversely affected by the first two letters of Πελαι below. If this is so, we may bid farewell to the much-cherished rock - and to Hermann's palaeographically similar κπαμ - and accept that the original word was probably completely dissimilar in appearance. Once we have taken this step we will not need to travel far before recognising the impossibility of recovering the reading. But after so much bungling from my predecessors it would be pusillanimous of me not to reveal a nostrum of my own. To do so I would return to Zenobius' first explanation and repeat the question "whose flesh?" κάρκας in the plural often means "body" (see LSJ s.v.) and διακοπέω has decidedly hostile overtones. (It is used of breaking through the enemy line several times in Xenophon: e.g. Anab. 1·8·10; Hell. 7·5·23; Cyr. 3·3; of a weapon's effect

¹This polemic against Vürtheim was written before I learned from Professor Henrichs that S. is said by Philodemus to have mentioned Prometheus' binding. The news does not make me unduly penitent; see p.1173.
in Luc. Nigr. 37; and it means "gash" in Menand. Georg. 48). I therefore believe that this first explanation is not as ambiguous as Bowra thought: it refers to the interpretation of χειροβ. δεμ. as a thong which bites the arms (body?) of the wearer's opponent. Implausible but intelligible: one does, after all, expect the ἵμαντες to injure first and foremost the person on the receiving end of the boxer's blows. The paradoxical but preferable interpretation then follows: what get bitten are the hands (not arms) of the very boxer who wears the ἵμαντες. How then emend the crux in a way consonant with this understanding of the text? Nothing can be certain, but the required sense would be completed if we suppose slightly wider corruption and then read ἑσεθη γὰρ (scil. ὅ δεκμος) ἐπὶ τῷ καρπωί. (c.f. Paus. 8.40.3: ἵμας ὅξυς ἐπὶ τῷ καρπῷ τῆς χειρὸς ἐκατέρωσ). The thong, attached to the boxer's wrist, was bound round his hand so tightly that it cut into his flesh.

In this way we circumvent the rock and its prisoners, make Zenobius give two relatively similar explanations of S.'s words, and have him prefer the likelier of the two. In any case, there is only the tiniest of differences between this solution and Bowra's alternative, which accepts Zenobius' first explanation ambiguously interpreted, and rejects the second as unintelligible.
The most useful survey of the Geryon myth as a whole is J.H. Croon's brief monograph "The Herdsman of the Dead" (1952), which well observes the remarkable analogies between the ogre of the West and the god of the Underworld (for which see below p.139f). It has too a good bibliography of previous treatments of the subject. See also J. Fontenrose, Python (1959) pp.334ff, Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. Odes 2.14.8 (p.229f). Of S's composition we have long possessed several quotations. Extensive papyrus fragments of a lyric poem identifiable with the Geryoneis were first published by Lobel in Oxyrhynchus Papyri 32 (1967) pp.1-29 (P. Oxy. 2617). He tentatively assigned the new finds to this work and this author on the grounds of subject-matter, dialect, metre, and the occurrence of the name Παρονυκας (see below p.106). His initial diagnosis has been confirmed and its basis amplified by the labours of two scholars in particular: D.L. Page and W.S. Barrett. The former set out some preliminary thoughts on the poem in Lyrica Graeca Selecta (1968) pp.263-8. A fuller and reconsidered account

1The relevant passages are all competently assembled; the discussion of them is rather less competent. See the review by Herter, Gnomon 26 (1954) 158-161. On the wider significance of the myth, its antecedents and parallels, see now W. Burkert, "Le myth de Géryon: perspectives préhistoriques et tradition rituelle", in Il mito greco (Atti del convegno internazionale, Urbino 7-12 maggio 1973) pp. 273ff. Also B. Gentili, ib. pp 299ff.
appeared in J.H.S. 93(1973)138-154. No less valuable because unpublished is the paper "S. and the story of Geryon" which Mr. Barrett read to a meeting of the Greek and Roman Societies in Oxford on the tenth of September 1968. Professor Page does not exaggerate when he says "Its contribution to the interpretation of the Geryoneis is very great, and to the understanding of S. more generally is unrivalled" (p.138 n.1). My debt to the work of these scholars is ubiquitous and profound, even greater than the frequent occurrence of their names on the following pages would suggest.

Page is right to claim (p.138) that "More light is thrown on the poetic art of S. by the papyrus-text of his Geryoneis than by all his other fragments together." We have a relatively large amount of it for once, and quantity and quality march harmoniously in step, in strongest possible contrast to its only rival as regards extent, P. Lille 76. Not the least agreeable of the surprises which the new finds bring concerns the characterisation of Geryon: who would have guessed that the three-headed and six-legged ogre would enjoy so sympathetic a presentation, or emerge as a figure of such noble dignity? The sensitive and subtle adaptation of Homeric passages to achieve this end provides us with a fine manifestation of one aspect of S's "Homeric" qualities as widely recognised in antiquity. When Pindar says cè δ' ἔγῳ παρὰ μιν | αἰνῶ μὲν, γηρωῦνα, τὸ δὲ μὴ Δ' | φιλτερον σιγῶμι πάμπαν (fr.81 Sn. = Dith. 2) we may get some pleasure from considering whether the rather surprising first half of the remark was at all influenced by S's characterisation of Geryon.
It is sad that we know so little of S's date, since the three passages which echoe the Iliad (S11, S13, S15 ii 15ff) are the earliest large-scale allusions to the poem which we possess (compare the like relevance of 209 P for the Odyssey). We should note that according to the evidence of vase-paintings (as analysed by K. Friis Johansen, The Iliad in Early Greek Art (1967)) this epic was not known west of the Aegean before c. 625.

Cattle-rustling may not seem a particularly heroic or admirable exploit to twentieth century eyes: the ancient Greeks regarded it differently. Look at the questions Odysseus puts to Agamemnon when the two meet in the Underworld (Od. 11.398ff):

τίς νῦς κηρ ἐδαμασσε ταυνηεγέος σανατοιο;  
ἡς κηρ γ' ἐν νήεις ποσειδάων ἐδαμασσεν  
δραςα δραγελων ἀνεϊν ψεμγαρτου ἀϋμπήν,  
ἡς κηρ ἀνάφελοι ἀνδρες ἐδηλησαντ' ἐπι χερσον  
βοῦς περιταμνομενον ἦς ολων πῶεα καλά,  
ἡς περὶ πτολίους μαχευμενον ἤδε γυναικῶν

As if cattle-stealing were all in an epic day's work, the most natural thing in the world for an heroic king of Mycenae. The sole word of disapprobation is reserved for those hypothetical kill-joys in 401 who would presume to interfere with Agamemnon's innocent pleasures. The same sense of values is revealed by Nestor in his enthusiastic recollections of the Pylian Βοηλαςιη (Il. 11.670ff):
Likewise, Neleus would give his daughter's hand in marriage only to him who drove off his cattle from Iphiclus (c.f. Frazer's Loeb Apollodorus 2·Appendix 4 pp.350ff) and the Theban War arose, according to Hesiod, μηλων ένεκ'Ολίνοθαο (Op.163). See too one of the scenes on the shield of Achilles (Il. 18·525ff) and c.f. Il. 6·424, Od. 15·386, Aspis 12ff, 82ff; Pind. Is. 6·32 (on which see Croon p.54f) etc. Nor is the cow-raid as manly exploit a phenomenon limited to ancient Greece, as witness the Irish epic entitled "The Cattle-raid of Cuailgne". And the Welsh wizard Gwydion was not averse to stealing by magic the herd of swine which belonged to Pryderi son of Pwyll (see the Fourth Branch of the Mabinogion). It has been alleged that later Greeks came to entertain doubts as to the morality of this particular manifestation of heroic prowess. For instance the epic Cypria unashamedly explained the conflict between the Dioscuri and the Apharidae by having the former steal the cattle of the latter (Allen p. 103 (Procl.))

Some suppose that Pindar in his retelling of the story nervously bustles aside this αἰτιον with a brief and inexplicit phrase: Ιδας was ἄψωθι βουκίν πως χολωθείς (Nem. 10·60). Anything less vague might discredit the brothers of Helen.

1Apollod.3·11·2 gives a slightly different version wherein the quarrel arises after a joint cattle-raider into Arcadia.
(But compare Asp. 12: χωρίςενον περὶ Βουατ') And Theocr. Id. 22.137ff employs a completely different motivation involving the Dioscuri's abduction of the Apharidae's brides. Pindar seems to display a similar embarrassment over the unprovokedly aggressive element in Heracles' operations against Geryon (frr. 169A1-8 and 81 (=Dith. 2)(Sn.) on both of which c.f. Lloyd-Jones, HSCP 76(1972)55-6). But no such reservations occur in our earliest treatments of the story. In the Theogony and S. (as far as we know) the exploit is wholly glorious, not only for the reason mentioned above, but also because this particular herd of cattle was situated in formidable occidental isolation - merely to reach it constituted a great achievement - and was owned and guarded by an especially monstrous crew.

It is slightly surprising to find so few works of literature totally given over to the tale of Geryon. The matter would be difficult to accommodate in an Attic drama, but it is odd that no epic on this topic is heard of. Not that we should make too much of this: such works may have existed. The legend was clearly well-known by the time Hesiod included in the Theogony that brief summary which is our earliest account (287-294):

Χρυσάωρ δ' ἔτεκε τρικέφαλον Γηρυνήια
μιχθεὶς Καλλιρότη κούρην κλυτοῦ Ὀκεανοῦ.
τὸν μὲν ἄρ' ἔξενάριε βίη Ἡρακλῆειν
βουεῖ παρ' ἐλιπόδεεκεν περιμερέωι εἶν 'Ερυθεινη

1Though see Pearson, the Fragments of Sophocles 1.197, Nicomachus Alex. T.G.F.1.127 F3 Snell, Diod. Sic. 4'8'4.
Note particularly how the poet expected his audience to know that Orthus was the dog who guarded the cattle of Geryon. An even more abbreviated account has been added by someone at Theog. 979-983. The fame of the story grew, to judge from such one-line allusions as Aesch. Ag. 870 and Arist. Ach. 1082 (see my commentary on 186 P = S87 (below p. )), or Eur. Her. 422ff: βέλεσι τ’άμφεβαλ’ (τον Wecklein) ι τ’ον τρισώματον οίς είν κα βοτηρ’ ἔρυμείας. ¹ A reference to it has been swallowed up in a lacuna at the end of a new Ibycus fragment (S176.18ff: see my commentary on S’s ἀθλα επὶ Πελία (p 18f).

But S's poem remains the only example of a work exclusively devoted to this theme. Panyassis included it in his epic Heracleia (fr. 5 K). ² For speculation on the extent of this poem and its books and the sequence of events within it see V.J. Matthews pp.21ff and also pp.131ff on fr. 28. And previously, Pisander of Rhodes had touched on it (fr.5 K.) in his epic of the same title, the earliest identifiable Heracleia of which we know (c.f. G.L. Huxley, Greek Epic Poetry pp.100-105). In both poems however, the labour can only have formed one of a large number of heroic episodes.

¹For a full list of such "proverbial" uses of the Geryon myth see Croon p.17 n.18.
²On this and Pisander's epic of the same name see below p.206.
Heracles' exploits against Geryon also fell within the scope of Hecataeus' Πενηλογία (F.Gr.Hist. 1 F 26: see Jacoby's commentary ad loc. pp.325-6) Pherecydes' Ίστορίαι (F.Gr. Hist. 3 F 18 and p.397) and one of Hellanicus' numerous works (F.Gr.Hist. 4 F 110-111 and p.462). The broad scope of these all-inclusive prose histories does not encourage us to suppose that these adventures were accorded very detailed treatment.

The evidence so far considered suggests that S's version was the longest and fullest original handling of this theme in antiquity. In this way the very scarcity of other such treatments seems to promise us an advantage which we are rarely able to enjoy: for there is a very strong presupposition that the longest and most detailed account preserved in those secondary sources, the mythographers, derives - through who knows what intermediaries - from S's copious narrative. The presupposition is very strong, but not decisive. The hypothesis needs stronger props. And in fact it has had them ever since Kleine (p.62). And Mr. Barrett reminded us of them in 1968. Most treatments\(^1\) must have fallen within the same basic framework, with Heracles crossing the sea to Erytheia, killing Orthos and Eurytion and then their master when he tried to intervene, and transporting the cattle to the mainland and then finally to the Cyclopean portal of Eurystheus at Tiryns. But in several details the fragments

\(^{1}\)Though for a completely different settling of the tale (in N.W. Greece) see below p.110f.
of S's Geryoneis coincide with or are illuminated by the corresponding stages of our longest mythographic resumé. This occurs in Apollod. 2.5.10. Here it is:

δέκατον ἐπετάγη δῶλον τὰς Γηρυόνιον βόας ἐξ Ἑρυθρίας κομίζειν. Ἑρύθρηα δὲ ἦν ὧμειον πλησίον κειμενή νῆσος, ἓ νῦν Γάδειρα καλείται. ταύτην κατώτερες Γηρυόνιος Χρυσάφος καὶ Καλλιπρόντες τῆς ὧμειος, τριῶν ἔχων ἀνδρῶν συμφώνεις σῶμα, συνημένου μὲν Bekker εἰς ἑν κατὰ τὴν γαστῆρα, ἐσχισμένου δὲ εἰς τρεῖς ἀπὸ λαγῶν τε καὶ μηρῶν. εἰς δὲ φοινικὰς βόας, ὃν ἦν βουκόλος Εὔρυτέων, φύλαξ δὲ ὁ Ὀρθος ὃ τῶν δικέφαλος ἐξ Ἐξίλνης καὶ Τυφώνος γεγενημένος. πορευόμενος οὖν ἐπὶ τὰς Γηρυόνιον βόας διὰ τῆς Εὐρώπης, ἀγρία πόλλα παρελθὼν (codd.: Κοίλα ἀνελθὼν Wagner. Against the emendation c.f. Robert, Heldensage p.472 n.3) Λιβύνη ἐπέβαινε, καὶ παρελθὼν Ταρτήσσον ἔστησε σημεία τῆς πορείας ἐπὶ τῶν ὄρων Εὐρώπης καὶ Λιβύνης ἀντίστοιχους δύο εἴκοσι. θερόμενος δὲ ὑπὸ Ἡλίου κατὰ τὴν πορείαν, τὸ τόξον ἐπὶ τὸν θέον ἐνέτειλεν· δὲ τῇ ἀντρείαν αὐτοῦ θαιμάσας χρύσου εἴδωκε δέπας, ἐν δὲ τὸν ὧμειον διέπεραν. καὶ παραγενόμενος εἰς Ἑρύθρηαν ἐν δρεῖ Ἀβαντὶ αὐλλίζεται. ἀλεθόμενος δὲ ὃ τῶν δικέφαλος ἄρμα· δὲ καὶ τοῦτον τῷ ὅπαλῳ πάλει, καὶ τὸν βουκόλον Εὔρυτέωνα τοῦ κυνὸ βοηθώντα ἀπειτείνε. Μενοίτης δὲ ἐκεῖ τὰς Ἀἴδου βόας βόσκων Γηρυόνης τῷ γεγονός ἀπήγγειλεν, δὲ καταλαβὼν Ἡρακλέα παρὰ ποταμὸν Ἀνθεμύντα τὰς βόας ἀπάγωντα, συντηθάμενος μάχην τοξευθεὶς ἀπεθανεν. Ἡρακλῆς δὲ ἐνεθεμένος τὰς βόας εἰς τὸ δέπας καὶ διαπλέεσσας εἰς Ταρτήσσον Ἡλίων πάλιν ἀπέδωκε τὸ δέπας.

1 On the orthography of this name c.f. West on Hes. Theog. 293 (pp.248-9). For the various authors who name him c.f. Croon p. 13 n.2.
The significant correspondences between this account and S's poetical treatment are as follows:

(1) The physical constitution of Geryon - both give him three bodies (see my commentary on 186 P = S 87).

(2) Heracles' killing of Orthos and Eurytion - in both this precedes the death of Geryon by a considerable interval (see my commentary on S 11.27: Geryon has clearly had time to reflect on events περὶ θουκίν ἵνα ἔμοικ). This leads us to the most impressive correlation of all:

(3) Menoetes, the herdsman of Hades, informs Geryon of Heracles' theft of his cattle (see my note on ὃ φίλατ at S11.16 (p.138 infra.): the addressee can hardly be the dead Eurytion and is unlikely to be Chrysaor). The presence of this character, will, so far as we know, be unique to these two accounts. In Apollodorus' curt narrative, Menoetes is a rather puzzling figure whose business on Geryon's island together with the kine of Hades is unexplained. A prose treatment might more economically have Geryon learn of Heracles' onset either by being on the spot or by arriving a little later to find his possessions gone. But suppose that, in S's original unhurried handling of the theme, Menoetes was introduced to facilitate a long series of speeches and retorts on the Homeric pattern between this messenger figure and the herd's owner, who being at home needs to be informed of what has befallen his distant cattle. The oddity then dissolves.

Less certain, but still worth mentioning, are:

(4) Apollodorus has the Sun lend Heracles his cup in
admiration, after the hero has threatened him for making him too hot. Then, on landing at Erytheia, Heracles bivouacs on Mt. Abas. Both details suggest an evening journey (see p.202) and that would be totally consistent with one possible interpretation of 185 P = S17. On the other hand, Apollodorus also relates how Heracles returned the Sun his bowl after regaining Tartessus, and this may well be the subject of the Stesichorean fragment.

(5) Apollodorus makes our hero club Orthos the dog to death and this may be what lies behind S16, but again certainty is not to be had (see the commentary ad loc. (p.181)). For a possible point of conflict between the Apollodoran narrative and S's Geryoneis see below on fr.addendum (p.182f).

The recognition of the relationship between Apollodorus and S. makes it possible for us to reconstruct the general contents and sequence of events in the Geryoneis to an extent we cannot enjoy with his other poems. Combining the two we find that Heracles made his way to Tartessus, obtained from the Sun his golden bowl (185 P = S17) wherein he crossed to Erytheia. There he bivouacked on Mt. Abas (Apollod.). The following day he killed Orthos, the dog that guarded Geryon's herd, and Eurytion the herdsman (Apollod. c.f. S7/8 (pp.116ff and 126ff)). Menoetes observed all this and reported it to Geryon (Apollod., S10-11 and c.f. 9 (pp.131ff)) whom he tried to dissuade from attacking Heracles. His mother Callirhoa did likewise (S12-13 (pp.157ff)) in vain. The gods met in council and Athena supported the claims of her protegé
Heracles in the presence of Geryon's grandfather Poseidon (S14 (pp.160ff)). Heracles killed Geryon beside the river Anthemus (Apollod., S15 (pp.164ff)) and then embarked the cattle in the Sun's bowl, returned to Tartessus, and restored the bowl to the Sun (Apollod. see my remarks on 185 P = S17 (p.186ff)). He drove the cattle back to Tiryns, encountering various adventures on the way.¹

But this is not all: Providence has for once been kind. The papyrus fragments which preserve parts of our poem also convey further valuable information about the structure and extent of the whole. As usual, the poem was written out in perpendicular columns, and in three instances (S15, S20, S27) a single fragment preserves parts of two adjacent columns. In each case we can identify the metre of both columns. Since we know the metrical structure of the whole (see below pp. 78ff) we can deduce for each of the three fragments the number of lines in a column, and each time that number turns out to be thirty. For instance, to return to S15 col.ii where we possess the lower margin, we are able to tell that it began with the first line of an epode and we see that it ended with the fourth line of another epode: 8 (ep.) + 9 (str.) = 9 (ant.) + 4 (ep.) = 30. The very regularity of our scribe's hand makes it most plausible that thirty was consistently the number of lines in a column.

¹We know nothing about S's account of these adventures unless Heracles' entertainment by Pholus (181 P = S19) occurred among them. However it is just about worth while reminding ourselves that according to one tradition, the hot springs at Himera were created for Heracles as he passed by there with Geryon's cattle (c.f. Σ Pind. Ol. 12.27 by (Dr. 1.355) Diod.4.23, 5.3). A poet from Himera might well include this local legend in his account, as was suggested by Friedländer, Herakles (Berlin, 1907) p.22, Mancuso p.221.
throughout the roll: only if the column-length varied irrationally, or one line or more was accidentally omitted would this hypothesis be misleading.

Suppose then there are 26 lines in a triad, 30 lines in a column: the inexorable laws of arithmetic demand that every column must begin at a point four lines later in the triad than its immediate predecessor. And it follows no less inevitably that after 13 columns containing exactly 15 triads, the pattern will come full circle: the fourteenth column will begin at the same point in the triad as the first and will reproduce its metrical content. And so on regularly, after every thirteenth column: this is a most important consideration, to be borne in mind throughout. Moreover, whenever the upper or lower margin of the papyrus is preserved on a fragment, and the place of this fragment within the triad can be determined, we are able to identify the column within the sequence of 13 to which it belongs. This is because the start and end of each column inside that sequence is always different from those of the other columns.

Here is a diagram summing up our state of knowledge so far:

---

1 Provisions rightly stressed by Page p.147 and Führer p.684 n.1, R. p.4 n.21. The assumption that no such omissions or variations occur underpins the whole argument that follows.
Armed with this information, we may proceed to the positioning of various fragments in their proper order. But first a reminder of an old fact and an introduction to a new one. Since columns with identical metrical sequences will recur at intervals of 13, two columns with consecutive column numbers need not themselves be consecutive, but may have originally been a considerable distance apart. Secondly, the stichometric $\overline{N}$ opposite S27 ii 6 (ep. 8) tells us that the poem's thirteen-hundredth line must have occurred in its forty-fourth column (viz. the fifth column of the fourth thirteen column sequence). There are various reasons why we should not be surprised at this. One is that at least four thirteen column sequences will be required anyway, if we are to fit in all the assignable fragments:

(1) S11 appears to portray Geryon conversing with Menoetes:  

---

See my note ad loc.
whatever the identity of the ogre's interlocutor the fragment clearly precedes S15 in which Geryon is being killed. But both passages come from col.XI: therefore there must intervene at least one thirteen-column between the two. S10, which is probably from Geryon's dialogue with Menoetes, must therefore stand fairly close to S11, but its column cannot be identified.

(2) S12, Callirrhoa's appeal to her son must likewise have occurred before his death in S15. Now S12 and S9 both come from a col.VI, but not the same col.VI (VI = E3-E6: S9=E3-8; S12=S7-E6). For they overlap metrically. Therefore at least one thirteen-column sequence stands between the two episodes. If Barrett is right to ascribe S9 to a speech by Menoetes to Geryon, it will stand in the same sequence as S11, and S12 must be consigned to a later - probably the immediately following - sequence. S12, his mother's appeal to Geryon, ought to come after S11, part of the scene in which Geryon first hears from Menoetes about the theft of his cattle.

(3) S14, the Council of the gods, comes from col.VIII. This column cannot stand in the same thirteen-column sequence as Callirrhoa's appeal (S12) and the killing of Geryon (S15: col.XI-XII). This is because S12 contains the very beginning of the mother's address (1.3) and therefore precedes S13, an extract from a later stage of her speech. But S13's metrical pattern does not occur in col.VII which follows S12's col.VI. S13 must therefore come from col. VIII or later, wherefore S14 also from a col.VIII must belong to a different sequence for it overlaps metrically (VIII =

^1See my note on S12 (p.154f).
S3-S6; S13= A9-S4; S14= A8-S8). It is impossible to place the Council of the gods precisely but Barrett's idea that it very shortly antedates the final combat of Heracles and Geryon is attractive.\(^1\) Perhaps S14 (the Council of the gods) comes from the next sequence to S13's. Certainly its sequel (S15 Heracles' attack on Geryon) must come after it. At how great a distance? If within the same sequence, only 73 lines will separate the two episodes. Stesichorean amplitude would perhaps favour the positioning of S15 in a later sequence.

(4) S8 may conceivably have formed part of a digression during Heracles' killing of Eurytion and his dog.\(^2\) If so, it would closely cohere with S7 (= 184P) and the col.X to which it belongs will come from a thirteen-column sequence preceding (probably immediately) the sequence whose col. XI contains Menoetes' report to Geryon (S11).

The further Table overpage sets out the four thirteen-column sequences so far identified, as well as the fragments placed in their proper order within them. But the positioning is rarely free from problems as my commentary ad locc. will show.

\(^1\) But for possible objections to this placing see my remarks on S12.
\(^2\) See ad loc. (p.126f).
(1) S8 (? col.X) may be the earliest in position of our definitely placeable fragments. S7 probably came before it. If so, sequence A cannot possibly be the first of the poem. The nine columns which would precede S8 do not allow nearly enough space for all the events which we must suppose to have preambled that part of Eurytion's introduction.

(2) Observe how, if Barrett's identification of S9 is correct, a vast extent of lines was occupied by the dialogue between Menoetes and Geryon. (At least 200, probably more).

(3) The long gap between Sequence C's col.VIII and Sequence D's col.VIII, which covers 360 lines in all, must have been filled partly by the continuation of the dialogue between Geryon and his mother, mainly by the council of the gods: 250 lines would not be too much for this.

(4) If Sequence D's col. VIII comes, as seems likely (see ad loc.) from near the end of the Council of the Gods we have only 73 lines between S14 and S151: what are the likely contents of this interval? Page (p.149) suggests the sending of Iris by Athene with a message to Heracles, the delivery of that message, and the beginning of Heracles' attack upon Geryon. If we feel that such events would have had to be recounted with an unStesichorean brevity, we may remind ourselves that the rôle credited above to Iris is by no means certain (see p.103 inf.)
The table is basically Page's (p.145). Snell's earlier effort (p.118) is too deeply infected by the errors pointed out by Führer (p.684 n.1) to be reliable.
Thanks to the generous extent of its fragments\(^1\) we are able to restore the Geryoneis' metrical scheme with greater accuracy than for any other Stesichorean poem save the very latest find. It can be recovered by observing the following indications in the papyrus:

1. The presence of relatively shorter lines detectable by the indentation of their ends in the right-hand margin of columns.
2. The varying relation between word- and line-end.
3. The alternation of the str's "rising" dactyls and the ep's "falling".\(^1\)
4. The occurrence of παραγωγικα between str. and ant. (S11·21/22, S12·3/4, S41·2/3) and ant. and ep. (S11·4/5, S12·12/13, S15·ii 13/14, S32·5/6) and coronis between ep. and str. (S11·12/13).

As a result of these criteria, the str. can be established

---

\(^{1}\) Wilamowitz's initial diagnosis (Hermes 18 (1883)p.400 n.1= Kl. Schr. 1·114-115 n.1 c.f. SS p.125 n.1) of the book-text fragments as "rising dactyls" is confirmed by the papyrus finds.
with absolute, and the less often attested ep. with near, certainty (only its final two lines are problematical). In the metrical scheme which I print below, I have, for convenience's sake, added references to the papyrus lines which can definitely be used in the task of reconstitution. This scheme allows us to see that several of the fragments preserved in the tests of ancient authors are corrupt or incomplete. See my commentary on 184P = S7 and 185P = S17.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>str.</th>
<th>BREVIS IN LONGO 8.4†, 10.2, 11.26*</th>
<th>BREVIS IN LONGO 8.4†, 10.2, 11.26*</th>
<th>BREVIS IN LONGO 8.4†, 10.2, 11.26*</th>
<th>BREVIS IN LONGO 8.4†, 10.2, 11.26*</th>
<th>BREVIS IN LONGO 8.4†, 10.2, 11.26*</th>
<th>BREVIS IN LONGO 8.4†, 10.2, 11.26*</th>
<th>BREVIS IN LONGO 8.4†, 10.2, 11.26*</th>
<th>BREVIS IN LONGO 8.4†, 10.2, 11.26*</th>
<th>BREVIS IN LONGO 8.4†, 10.2, 11.26*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ep. 1</td>
<td>HIATUS 15 ii 5/6</td>
<td>HIATUS 15 ii 5/6</td>
<td>HIATUS 15 ii 5/6</td>
<td>HIATUS 15 ii 5/6</td>
<td>HIATUS 15 ii 5/6</td>
<td>HIATUS 15 ii 5/6</td>
<td>HIATUS 15 ii 5/6</td>
<td>HIATUS 15 ii 5/6</td>
<td>HIATUS 15 ii 5/6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**This is used where — for " is presumed admissible but not exemplified in the fragments.**

*But in these three cases the lengthening may be due to two or more (lost) consonants at the start of the next word.

†A supplement (albeit a very plausible one) provides the vowel at the end of this line.
Uncertainties:

(1) The end of the epode (ep. 8)

Barrett and Page give this as printed above: Führer (p. 684) produced ...uv — — by interpreting S13·9  ὥκυαῖς as ὥκυαῖς[iv. In fact, it could just as easily be ὥκυαῖς.

And there is further evidence, both positive and negative, against the longer version. As for the latter, West claims (ZPE 4 (1969) p. 135 n. 1) that at S 14·2, where the left-hand side of the column is missing, there would not be enough room to supplement ep. 8 -βασιλῆς θεῶν —. He is almost certainly right, and the probable sense as restored by Barrett leaves no space for the extra syllable either. Our guesses about the room available depend partly on the other supplements proposed for the lines of this fragment, partly on the sense needed in this particular place. Barrett’s -βασιλῆς θεῶν] conforms with both requirements: the other supplements are all fairly secure and are mostly 11 or 12 letters long. Nor is it easy to add a further syllable which will improve the sense, even if we forget for a moment about the demands of length. Positively, S9 2b B now seems to show us that the epode ended υ — (see pp. 131 ff) and the general metrical pattern of the poem (see below p. 86 f) also somewhat favours the Barrett-Page solution, since the strophe and antistrophe end υυ — in strongest contrast to the internal periods which finish with υυ — —. One would expect a like contrast in the epode, although such an argument from preconceptions can carry little weight, especially when the question of the presence or absence of period-ends is not
itself resolved. But in view of S9b2 the balance of probability rests decisively against Führer, and it is no surprise that his maturer thoughts have led him to abandon this idea (R p.6).

(2) The content of ep.7

Due to the lack of evidence from the papyrus, it is hard to say for sure whether this was  or . Barrett and Page prefer the former which is supported by Barrett's plausible supplements of the beginnings of 313·8 (παραματρὶ) φίλαι γανυθε[-] and 14·1 (οὐ γὰρ τις ἔμι] ἡμε παραὶ Δία παμ[-]) where both space and sense tell against the extra long syllable at the start. Elsewhere, the testimony of the papyrus is deficient (27 ii 5:του, [, 20 ii 7) or ambiguous (11·11: κρέσσον[]), but says nothing in favour of the alternative interpretation preferred by Führer and Haslam. Admittedly, it is possible to make sense of the final line of S7 as transmitted by

1Hence his interpretation of 184p (=S7) as ep.5 - str.1 (p.675) is most unlikely.

2Führer's claim (R p.5 and n.34) that the nine letters required in the lacuna at 13·8 favour the longer version of ep.7 shows that failure to devise a supplement (however provisional) in such cases can occasionally be a disadvantage. Likewise, he could hardly have cited the need for at least 10 letters at the start of 14·1 as an argument for his longer alternative (R p.5 and n.36) had he known of Barrett's supplementation of that line.

3Führer (R p.5 and n. 35) states that S9B tells against the Barrett-Page conclusion accepted by me. This is not so (see p.135f inf.).
accepting this latter form, but S7 is a book-text, whose opening is certainly faulty, and whose close may likewise be deficient and unreliable for filling out the details of the metrical scheme. And there is an alternative remedy for its problems (see ad loc.).

On this interpretation, the change from rising to falling beginnings at ep.3 can be followed by the reverse process here.

(3) The division of ep.5-6 and 7-8

The papyrus colometry divides 5-6 as printed above in the metrical scheme, though in view of the ends of ep.3-4 and the beginnings of 3-5 we would expect the division to be made one syllable earlier. Likewise with ep.7-8, those self-same factors lead us to look for — as ep.7's end and — as ep. 8's beginning (so the papyrus colometry at S 11.11-12 and also at 27 ii 5-6\(^1\)) rather than — and — (as the papyrus arranged S14·1-2). But we have just seen above (2) the strong arguments against this division of 6-7, and the papyrus' disposition of S14·1-2 has some support from the beginnings of str. 2, 4, 6, 8, 9 and ep.1. Besides, owing to the total lack of any other fragments containing exactly that part of the epode, it is impossible to say what the scribe's usual practice here was. But that is of little importance anyway, in comparison with the actual periods of the Geryoneis.

\(^1\)The second instance is overlooked by Page (p.146; SLG p.5 n.1) detected by Führer R p.5.
(4) Period-ends

The metrical scheme shows those period-ends whose existence is definitely attestable by hiatus and/or brevis in longo. Most scholars\(^1\) also presume period-end at str. 3 and 7 and ep. 6, where only diaeresis (regular word-end), a necessary concomitant, but no inevitable proof, of period-end, is attested. In most cases these presumed period-ends take the form of \(\sim \sim \sim \), where double biceps is not contractable so that the basic metrical sequence is thereby interrupted. In these respects they agree with definite internal period ends and thus gain in credibility.\(^2\) The only exception is the period-end posited for str. 7, whose unique\(^3\) \(\sim \sim \) fails to interrupt the metrical sequence. If we do away with it following Haslam (p. 18) we will produce an unbroken run of 14 "anapaests" (str. 6-9) comparable with the 14 dactyls of ep. 3-6 and the 14 dactyls in the strophe of the Suotherae (1-4: (see p. 1021). The diaeresis at str. 7 will then have a parallel structural function to that at the end of ep. 3 (and at Suotherae str. 2) as an important intra-period division but not a period-end in itself.

Given this metrical construction, we may make the following

---

\(^1\) Page, for instance (p. 146 of his article, S.L.G. p. 5)

\(^2\) Also, at S7 4-5 (=184P) the need to avoid five consecutive longa within a period, together with the hiatus created by an emendation of Wilamowitz which is compelling on other grounds might suggest period-end at ep. 6. But the evidence of a provenly corrupt quotation-fragment is worth little, and there is a preferable solution to the difficulty: see p. 115.

\(^3\) Except for period-ends which bring a stanza to an end: see below p. 85f.
generalisations.1 The Geryoneis was composed in runs of various length which began (~) —~ and ended ~—(—). Of the metra's biceps the double-short form is more usual, but the contraction of ~ to a longuin is always permissible except when there is period-end. A longun however cannot be resolved. Now when contraction occurs, the bicipitia on either side retain their double-short form; and the contracted element is not allowed to coincide with word-end; instead there is "bridge" between it and the following longun.2 (The former phenomenon, the ban on consecutive bicipitia, was first noticed by the watchful eye of Mr. Lobel in his ed. pr. (p.2 §4). See too West, ZPE 4 (1969) 144). The effect of these prohibitions and licences is to increase the lines' ease of movement. A series of more than three longa within a single period would create a feeling of heaviness and mask the pattern of alternating — and ~, while the bridge is needed to prevent the verse faltering at one clausula after another.

More can be said about the opening and end of these periods. The Geryoneis generally refrains from intermingling rising and falling beginnings: these are carefully partitioned between strophe and epode, and a transition to dactylic from anapaestic occurs only twice (ep.3 and 7). As for the

---

1Which will also apply generally to what we know of the metre of the Συνώνησις (the strophe) and the Θῆλα ἐπί Πελαιά.  
2The only exception is τιν at Sl3.5 which counts as a monosyllabic postpositive: see my note ad loc. (p.158).
ends, every certain period except the final one of str. and ep. is pendant. This clausula is avoided within the period itself, and is most usually followed by a strongly anapaestic take-off to the next verse (\ldots \texttt{\texttt{-}-\texttt{-}\texttt{-}\texttt{-}\texttt{-}\texttt{-}\texttt{-}\ldots}) which creates a very decisive break in the metre. The break is re-enforced by the corresponding pause in the accompanying sense-unit.

We have just said that \texttt{\texttt{-}-\texttt{-}\texttt{-}\texttt{-}} is avoided within the actual period, and the same is true of its conjunction with \texttt{\texttt{-}-\texttt{-}} and of the following sequences: \texttt{\texttt{-}-\texttt{-}\texttt{-}\texttt{-}} (ep.2/3 and 6/7) and \texttt{\texttt{-}-\texttt{-}\texttt{-}} and \texttt{\texttt{-}-\texttt{-}\texttt{-}} (junctions between str. and ant. or ant. and ep. or ep. and str.) This fact is a further valuable clue to the difference between the effects S. aimed at within periods and at the meeting points of periods and stanzas. There is a variation too in the approach to period- and stanza-ends: all definitely attested cases of the first are pendant, while the latter are blunt, providing a rather abrupt impression, which is brought into greater relief by its very uniqueness. For all the other Stesichorean stanza-clausulae that we can check (including those of the very latest find) are decidedly pendant, the Suotherae alone excepted.

If our earlier remarks about the number and extent of the Geryoneis' periods were correct (see above p.84f) then the structure of the poem stands revealed as follows: the
strophe and antistrophe have four periods, all with rising openings and pendant or "dragged" endings except the last.

Period (1) which is very short, establishes the basic rhythm: the following periods will expand it by introducing elements between its opening \( \sim \) — — — and its close — — —. This period as a whole is in fact the second half of an epic hexameter.

Period (2) is twice the length of (1).

Period (3) is of an intermediate length between periods (1) and (2).

Period (4), a very long run of fourteen anapaests, echoes periods (2) and (3): its first part, 6 anapaests extending to diaeresis at str. 7/8, is an acatalectic version of period (3), while its second part, a closing run of 8 anapaests, is an acatalectic version of period (2).

And here is a similar account of the somewhat shorter epode which has three periods:

Period (1) which is the same as period (2) of the str. is more usefully conceived of as a catalectic version of ant. 9, the clausula of the second half of period (4) of the antistrophe.

Period (3) commences with the first change from rising to falling movement (see above p.83) which is reinforced by diaeresis after four double-shorts (at the end of ep.3). Then follows a long run of exactly the same extent as the whole closing period of the other two stanzas, but with a
contrary movement and a dragged ending: the fourteen dactyls here form "a metrical mirror-image" of the fourteen anapaests in the strophe. (For a precisely similar phenomenon in the Suotherae see my metrical analysis there).

Period (3) as defined above (p.84) reverses the falling rhythm of (2) and comes to a rather abrupt end comparable to that of the strophe and antistrophe.

Thanks to the labours of Führer and Haslam we are now in a position to make even more sophisticated comments on the internal patternings imposed on the periods by preferences for or against word end at given points in a verse. I choose the word "preference" with care since all too often the evidence is lacunose and even in the best-attested case bridge is not invariably shunned. But certain shapes are clearly favoured. Führer pp.678-84 prints a very full set of schemes which allow the reader to detect at a glance the patterns of word-end. But, I repeat, the evidence is often dangerously deficient, and we must take care not to include the supplements made by modern scholars within our findings, at least until a decisive tendency one way or the other has been established.¹

The most copious evidence exists for str. 2-3 and 4-5 and I intend to restrict myself to this area.¹ [The statistics are

¹The exact text and supplements presupposed by my statistics can easily be ascertained: see the metrical scheme above and my commentary on the passages there listed.
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based on Haslam pp.20ff to whose treatment I am heavily indebted]. Only unambiguous cases are included:

(1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>str. 2/3</th>
<th>(2 \text{---} )</th>
<th>(3 \text{---} )</th>
<th>(3 \text{---} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incidence of word-end</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of attestations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>str. 4/5</th>
<th>(4 \text{---} )</th>
<th>(5 \text{---} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At Si4 5, Page's supplement ηάτροω bridges the cut of 2/3 but is impossible to avoid (see ad loc.). If we also bear in mind our above reservations, and note that (1) is the most extreme case extant, we will conclude that the word "rule" is too strong to use in the circumstances: not so "preference" or "tendency" for a defined though not inevitable pattern. (In future choices between alternative supplements in the relevant positions, those conforming to these tendencies must prevail). Perhaps, as Haslam (p. 21) suggests, this was established as soon as possible in the first stanza, and underlined by the melodic accompaniment.

Monosyllabic biceps can be used to reinforce the patterns thus obtained by producing a heavier recommencement after word-end, especially since in our extant examples, it is totally avoided in other positions.¹

¹Pace West, ZPE 4 (1969) p.144 (c.f. id.CQ21 (1971) 311f) who must be mentioned honoris causa nonetheless, for having first noticed that the incidence of monosyllabic biceps was carefully planned by the poet.
An even more sophisticated mode of patterning has been noted by Haslam (p.22). As we are reminded by the above tables, all of str. 2/3 after the first instance of word end (that is, minus the initial two anapaests) is metrically equivalent to str. 4/5 (six anapaests catalectic). But compare the middle section of each:

\[
\begin{array}{c|cccc|c}
\text{str. 2/3} & \underbrace{2\cdots\cdots}_2 & \underbrace{3\cdots\cdots}_3 & \underbrace{4\cdots\cdots}_4 & \underbrace{5\cdots\cdots}_5 & \| \\
\text{No. of contractions} & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 0 \\
\text{No. of attestations} & 5 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 7 & 5 & 9 \\
\text{str. 4/5} & \underbrace{4\cdots\cdots}_4 & \underbrace{5\cdots\cdots}_5 & \underbrace{6\cdots\cdots}_6 & \underbrace{7\cdots\cdots}_7 & \| \\
3 & 0 & 4 & 0 & 0 \\
7 & 6 & 11 & 10 & 8 \\
\end{array}
\]

The exact explanation of these facts is uncertain. Particularly problematic is the generous allowance of word-end after the third longum of str. 2/3, the almost total ban on it after the third longum of str. 4/5. Most plausibly, as Haslam assays, the second period of the strophe has been so patterned as to prevent its latter part echoing the immediately preceding opening period. The closing phrase of the third period can safely afford to echo that sequence which is now more distant, but must itself avoid repeating the
close of the second period which stands relatively nearer to it. Thus is monotony avoided.
THE EVIDENCE OF ART

Professor Martin Robertson (CQ 19 (1969) 207ff) has produced a full discussion of this topic, in an important article which traverses more ground than its title alone - "Geryoneis: - S. and the vase-painters" - would suggest. See also Brommer, Herakles, Die 12 Taten des Helden in antiker Kunst und Lit. 2 (1972) pp. 39ff. The story of Geryon was exceedingly popular in plastic art in general (see Robertson pp. 207-8, Brommer Vasenlisten 3 pp. 58ff, Denkmälerlisten 1·49ff) and a few representations, on vases and elsewhere, must pre-date S.: the earliest is seventh-century, and some come from the first quarter of the sixth. But from the middle of the sixth century onwards there is a vast increase in the number of vases portraying this topic: between then and the end of that century we find almost seventy such depictions and it would be highly tempting to see S's poem as the main force behind this redoubled interest in the subject.

Of the various facets of the Geryon myth, the one about which vase-paintings can tell us most is the actual combat between monster and hero. And four vases in particular seem likely, by reason of their date and contents, to reflect S's narrative. The details on each can most clearly be assembled and compared in tabular form, as I have arranged them over the page. The relevant artefacts are:-
(1) A Chalcidian neck-amphora (middle sixth century).

Cabinet des Medailles, 202: Rumpf. Chalkidische Vasen, 8 and 46, no. 3, 65f., pls. 6-9 = Brommer Vasenlisten^3 63·Cl.


(3) An Attic red-figure cup (the end of the sixth century): painter Euphronius, potter Cachrylion.\(^1\) Munich 2620: ARV\(^2\) 16f. and 1619·17 = Brommer Vasenlisten\(^3\) 62·B1 = ARFV 26·2.

(4) An Attic red-figure cup of about the same date from Vulci: painter Oltus. The original is now lost, but we know it from a drawing careful enough to allow the above attribution. ARV\(^2\) 62·84 = Brommer Vasenlisten\(^3\) 62·B2.

The various figures are given names on all the vases except (4), but Orthus is never labelled.

\(^1\) Vase (3) is probably related to vase (4): the two painters Euphronius and Oltus can be shown to have influenced each other elsewhere: see Robertson pp.210-211. I have concentrated on the four cases which seem most relevant and approximate most closely to the events brought to light by the papyrus fragments. Robertson gives a good account of numerous other artefacts which illustrate the story, and there is a list of all the vases which portray the combat of Heracles and Geryon (together with notes on the weapons of Heracles and the constitution of Geryon on each) in Croon Appendix B (pp.93ff). This is a most useful book; as a compendium of information it is too little known (I find no reference to it in Robertson for instance). For a more up-to-date list c.f. Brommer Vasenlisten\(^3\) pp.58ff.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HERACLES</th>
<th>GERYON</th>
<th>ATHENA</th>
<th>EURYTION</th>
<th>ORTHOS</th>
<th>DISTRESSED WOMAN</th>
<th>CATTLE</th>
<th>UNIQUE FEATURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Lion-skinned,</td>
<td>3 bodies erect by 3 shields;</td>
<td>Behind</td>
<td>Dead on ground;</td>
<td>Dead on ground;</td>
<td>Behind</td>
<td>Behind</td>
<td>Chariot (on back of vase).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 spear brandished. 3 heads and</td>
<td>Heracles.</td>
<td>with arrow in</td>
<td>no arrow visible</td>
<td>Athena</td>
<td>Athena.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>arrow near bottom of a throat.</td>
<td></td>
<td>back.</td>
<td>(clubbed to death?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-armed;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c.f. Apollod. 2·5·1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>winged; single pair of legs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Single head.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 No lion skin,</td>
<td>3 bodies visible; no bow; quiver</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>worn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grips a head of Geryon by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>helmet and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 spears, at least 2 broken.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>drives sword through</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 armed; winged; single pair of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>legs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Lion-skinned,</td>
<td>3 bodies, 1 concealed by shield;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Collapsed on</td>
<td>Dead on ground on back,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attacks 2</td>
<td>1 falls backwards</td>
<td></td>
<td>ground alive, but</td>
<td>with arrow in chest.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bodies of Geryon with</td>
<td>with arrow in eye from above.</td>
<td></td>
<td>but bleeding from</td>
<td>Two-headed and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>club holding bow and pair</td>
<td>No wings, 6 legs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>thigh wound (i.e.</td>
<td>snake-tailed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of arrows in left hand.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>inflicted by sword</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>or spear).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On other side of vase.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iolaus (behind Athena) 3 armed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>men with cattle beneath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>spreading tree (other side of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vase).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERACLES</td>
<td>GERYON</td>
<td>ATHENA</td>
<td>EURYTION</td>
<td>ORTHOS</td>
<td>DISTRESSED WOMAN</td>
<td>CATTLE</td>
<td>UNIQUE FEATURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lion-skinned, attacks 2 bodies with bow.</td>
<td>3 bodies, 1 falls backwards with arrow in eye from above. No wings, 6 legs.</td>
<td>Behind Heracles.</td>
<td>Collapsed on ground alive, but bleeding from breast wound (i.e. inflicted by sword or spear).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Iris (unwinged).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total agreement over the relationship between each of these details and S's actual poem would be hard if not impossible to obtain. Let us start at a point where there is least uncertainty and work outwards in the direction of the doubtful and the ambiguous.

First, then, the physical appearance of Geryon. We know (186 P = S87) that S. fitted him out with wings and six legs. But those of our vases (1 and 2) which show him winged give him only two legs, while those that provide him with six of the latter (3 and 4) display nothing in the way of wings. At first sight this seems to exclude the dependence of any of these vases upon S. This is not the whole truth however. The two Chalcidian amphorae are quite unique in their depiction of Heracles' adversary: all earlier representations, all later vases, give him six legs and no wings. One can see immediately the probable reasons why the wings were not enthusiastically taken up by later artists: they occupy too much space, complicate the picture, and perhaps make Geryon too monstrous. It therefore becomes questionable whether the vase-painter concerned would ever have adopted a motif that was in itself a positive artistic liability, had not S. perhaps invented, and certainly incorporated in the Geryoneis, the same detail shortly before the making of the two vases.

As for the discrepancy over the legs, Professor Robertson (p.209) has probably hit on the right solution: a six-legged Geryon seen from the side is hardly distinguishable from
three separate and normal men side by side. (This point can be most vividly appreciated if we compare Euphronius' six-legged figure (3) with one body collapsing, and the same artist's portrayal of Heracles' fight against a number of armoured Amazons (Arezzo, Museo Civico 1465: ARV² 15.6 = Brommer V³ 23B.3). To do this we may now simply look at pl. 26.2 on p.39 of John Boardman's "Athenian Red Figure Vases: the Archaic Period" (1975) and then turn the page and glance at pl. 29.). The Chalcidian painter chose to bring out the nature of Geryon's monstrousness as clearly as possible by reducing his number of legs to two.

The sceptic will doubtless wish to detect here the all-controlling hand of coincidence. Winged monsters are no strangers to Greek art of this period (c.f. Croon p.47 and n.63, who explains the isolated instances of a winged Geryon as reflections of the usually expurgated concept of him as a winged death-demon). But why the device should be limited to these vases and this date our sceptic cannot say. Nor should we omit to note that S. is closely connected with Himera, the colony founded by Chalcis, though where exactly our Chalcidian vases were made is uncertain: c.f. Croon p.47 n.62.

It will be as well here to repeat Mr. Barrett's warning against the misleading impression caused by the vase-painters' short-hand in depicting the combat of Heracles and Geryon. When Eurytion, with or without Orthus, is displayed lying dead or dying at the feet of the adversaries,
we may easily be enticed into seeing a reflection of a version wherein Geryon clashed with his opponent over the newly-slain corpses of his servants. Not so. The telescoping of events both in time and space is characteristic of the mind of a painter, eager to cover his vase's surface with all the persons and incidents of the legend. Our artefacts are not offering us a literal statement about the time and place of the encounter, which in S. considerably post-dates Heracles' killing of the herd's guardians.

The papyrus finds appear to cast new and welcome light upon the name of the distressed female figure who graces vases 3 and 4. Earlier scholars identified her, not unreasonably, as Erytheia, nymph of the island where Geryon lived. (So Klein, Euphronios 52; Furtwängler, Griech. Vasenmalerei 1.102; Croon p. 26). Now, in view of S12 and S13, it is hard not to see her as Callirhoe, the anxious mother of Heracles' adversary. Still, sceptics can say yes to this without accepting with it the notion of influence by the Geryoneis. The motif of the Grieving Mother has a separate and independent existence in archaic art, as Robertson himself observes (pp. 217-218): compare the presence of Eos in several vases' depictions of the combat between Memnon and Achilles, and see my remarks on the Κυνωναχία in art. It might be reckoned an implausible coincidence that practitioners of literary and plastic art should separately hit upon the same device, and the former not influence the latter. But in the present case, the coincidence would only assume intolerable proportions if vases 3 and 4 displayed other features
which could be proved incontrovertibly to derive from S. And this, sadly, is not the case.

Each of the four vases we are considering—and numerous others besides—show Athena standing behind her mortal protegé. We now know that this very goddess participated in a divine council reported in the Geryoneis (S14). Should we conclude that S. made her fly down to earth consequently and aid Heracles in his fight with Geryon as she helps Achilles against Hector in 11.22? That would be a rash deduction for several good reasons. In the first place even if we decided all the vases were reflecting S. in this detail, the physical presence of Athena there need not imply a like presence in the original poem: the vase-painters might be using this mode of symbolising her defence of Heracles during the assembly of the gods on Olympus (so Robertson p.214). But in fact she is so constantly represented as this hero's ally by plastic artists, in this exploit¹ and countless others besides (see again my remarks on her participation in the Kuxvovaxia) that the notion of Stesichorean influence becomes meaningless. Too many artists will have added her almost without thinking, as an automatic adjunct of Heracles. (For this aspect of Athena in art c.f. G. Beckel, Götterbeistand i.d. Bildüberlieferung gr. Heldensagen (1901) passim (esp. p.17f)).

¹But not every vase-painting includes her. She is missing for instance from Lydos' black-figure hydria (Villa Giulia M 340: ABV 108.14 and 685 = Brommer Vasenlisten61.18) which is roughly contemporary with our Chalcidian vases (1 and 2).
Several interesting points of principle offer themselves when we come to consider the unique feature or features present on three out of our four vases. I doubt if anyone will wish to attach much significance to the chariot that occupies the back of vase 1, standing centrally between the handles which surmount the depictions of Geryon on the one side and of his cattle on the other. This is quite obviously a separate picture drawn to fill up the space. (For examples of this device see Robertson's Greek Painting (1959) p.77). Once more it is the Κυκνομαχία which provides the closest parallels: compare the chariots which often stand on the edges of vase-scenes showing the combat of Heracles and Cycnus (see p.701). And the frontal chariot is a common decorative device on Chalcidian pottery: see Robertson p.218 n.7 and pp.219f). We must never forget the simple fact that the contents of these vase-paintings are often determined by non-literary considerations, in particular the physical constitution of the vase itself. Thus vase (2) shows fewer figures since its painting decorates a panel not a frieze, while Euphronius' cup (3) has the fullest detail because its picture runs right round the outside. Likewise vase (4)'s plethora of figures is to be explained by noting that the composition stretches along the extensive space between the handles on one side of the cylix. (On the late 6th century's fashion for large cyclices with complicated and elaborate crowded compositions see Robertson p.219 n. 10).

It is a nice question whether the unique features on vases
3 and 4 are to be explained in this way. Certainly Iolaus and the three armed men on (3) are very susceptible to the treatment: neither detail looks individual enough to be an isolated reflection of S's handling of the story. Iolaus is about as ubiquitous a companion for Heracles on vases as Athena (the τρόπος as usual confirms the statement: see my remarks on p. 701f) and he would spring readily to mind as a space-filler. The three anonymous warriors are also appropriate decorative devices for the cup's elongated field.

One is all the more inclined to accept this explanation because with a few exceptions (the operations against Troy and the Amazons) Heracles' labours and the incidental adventures that cluster about them were solitary affairs.² There is no good cause to suppose that his expedition to Geryon's island was any more generously supplied with helpful friends, relatives, and obliging έπαίρον than the average. The surviving fragments of S's Geryoneis do nothing to disrupt this general picture: incomplete though they are, they convey an overwhelming impression that Heracles was unaccompanied in his voyage to Erytheia and in his battle against the ogre of that island.

¹Klein (Euphronios 57) suggested they were otherwise unknown helpers of Heracles.
²The eu-hemeristic account of Diod. 4.17-18 whereby Heracles and an army fight against the three sons of Chrysaor (Geryon rationalised?) is well disposed of by Robertson p.219.
Professor Robertson inclines towards this solution, although he also has ingenious suggestions for linking the figures with S's poem. Iolaus, for instance, need not have been present at the actual combat of Heracles and Geryon. As with Athena, his position on the vase may have a symbolic significance, and the goddess may have summoned him to help his uncle at a later stage of the labour, perhaps when he had arrived, with the cattle, back in the Peloponnese. Why Heracles should need aid then would be revealed by Robertson's second hypothesis: the cattle were stolen from our hero by Neleus and his sons (with the exception of Nestor) a rare tale for which Robertson cites only Philostr. Heroicus 4.2. (But it is found elsewhere: c.f. ΕΤ ad Il. 11.690 (3.261 Erbse): Ἀγιάς δὲ ἐν ἀργολικῷ (F. Gr. Hist. 305f) φησὶ τῶν θηρυόνου βοῶν ἀφελεύσαι Νηλέα, ὅτεν Ἰακωβεῖα Νέστορι παραδοθέν τῇν ἀρχήν and Isocr. Archid. 19: συληθεῖσα γὰρ Ἰακωβεῖα τὰς βους τὰς ἐκ τῆς Ἐρυθείας ὑπὸ Νηλέας καὶ τῶν πιέων πλῆν ὑπὸ Νέστορος, λαβὼν αὐτὴν (scil. τῆν Μεσσήνην) αἰχμάλωτον, τοὺς μὲν ἀδικήσαντας ἀπέκτεινεν, Νέστορι δὲ παρακατατίθεται τῇν πόλιν. This second passage will be the source for Philostr. Vita Soph. p.505 as well as Heroicus 4.2). I would rather agree with Croon

1Interestingly enough, Professor Robertson's suggestion that the three warriors on Euphronius' cup (3) represent Neleus and his sons, was anticipated over half a century before by E. Romagnoli, Riv. di fil. class.30(1902) "L'impresa d'Eraclie contra Gerione su la coppa d'Eufronio" p.253. But he conjectured that the story derived from Pisander's Heracleia and said nothing of the other possible sources (see below pp.204ff). The potential relevance of the identification to S's Geryoneis was first pointed out by J. Sitzler, Bursian 133(1907)185.
(p.19 n. 28) that this whole tradition is likely to be a late confusion with the old tale of Heracles' expedition against Pylus (c.f. Il. 11.690ff, Hes.fr.35 MW etc.). See further p.185 inf.

And vase (4)'s Iris? Is she to be explained in the same way? Perhaps. But she does seem to occupy a different level from the three warriors or Iolaus. She is a more individual and specific figure than the former, less obvious a make-weight than the latter. It is not usual to find her adorning this type of scene, but literature frequently makes her the messenger of the Olympians. And since we know S's poem contained a divine assembly (see S14) it is very tempting to follow Robertson's idea that S. had Athena dispatch Iris to advise Heracles as soon as the council of the gods was terminated (p.214). Still, it must be granted that there is no tangible evidence for any such mission; and those sceptics who refuse to detect any connection between identical motifs (such as the distressed mother, or Geryon's wings) when they patently appear in both S. and vase-paintings, are unlikely to be impressed by the link that is tentatively forged between one isolated and unique figure and a totally hypothetical sequel to the attested "concilium deorum". And attempts to fit Iris into the structure of the Geryoneis are not without problems of their own (see p.76 supr.).
On the whole topic Professor Robertson concludes (p.212): "The first Chalcidian vase and the Attic series do make a strong general impression of being based, with considerable freedom, on one current accepted version of the story. I doubt if vase-painting often comes closer than that to illustration of a text, but that is close enough to be useful." He adds on p.218 that all the figures except Iris occur on more than one vase and on vases of different character and composition and so it looks as if they reflect something outside the purely artistic tradition. That is an eminently reasonable generalisation, though even its moderation over-estimates the "usefulness" of the vases' evidence. As regards the individual figures they tell us nothing which we can not learn more clearly from Apollo-dorus, with the sole exception of Iris, who becomes all the more suspect by virtue of her very isolation. They give unhelpfully conflicting accounts of how Eurytion and Orthus were actually done to death, for instance. The freedom which the artists allow themselves in such details makes it highly dangerous to reconstruct the poem from the vases alone: least dangerous perhaps from the Chalcidian paintings (1 and 2) because of their provenance, their date, and their winged Geryon; most dangerous, probably, from Iris' presence on vase 4. I would not advise anyone to follow Page (p.146) in deducing the position of the council of the gods within the poem from Iris' appearance at the combat on one vase.
There are a few vases which show Heracles riding in the cup of the Sun. A black-figure oenochoe Leagros Group no. 252: Boston 03.783 (S. It.) ABV378 = Haspels ABF p.17.3 = ABFH pl.232 = Brommer Vasenlisten3193.Al. Of the same date as a red-figure cup in the Vatican Museum (Manner of Douris no. 2) from Vulci: ARV2 449 = Brommer Vasenlisten3193B2 = ARFH pl.300.

The static nature of the subject-matter here means that we can learn far less from it than from depictions of the combat of Heracles and Geryon with their wide range of characters and incidents. And how do we prove dependence on S. rather than the other poets who associated Heracles and the Sun’s cup (see pp.204ff)? The vases merely drive home an acknowledged fact: the solitariness of Heracles’ expedition. No ξταῖροι share the bowl with him. There are also a few late black-figure paintings of Heracles and the Sun (for the latest list c.f. Brommer Vasenlisten3 p.68). But in view of the probability that S. made Nereus an intermediary between the two (see below p.182f) we should not attempt the task — impossible anyway — of disentangling a specifically Stesichorean version from this last group of vases.1

1There is, then, no value in Bowra’s deduction from these vases (GLP2 p.125) “It is noteworthy that S’s Πηυουμής was appreciated in Athens almost in his own life-time”.
The title: as West has observed (CQ 20 (1970) p. 277 n. 3) ancient authors refer to it in this form¹ (Paus. 8.3.2 = 182 P = S85: Σ Αρ. Ρηδ. 1.211 = 183 P = S186) although the poem itself has Ραυονακ throughout (S13-13, 14-8, 15 11 14, 70-4) and S. presumably talked of his Ραυονακ, if he gave it a name. But dialect poems do not seem to have born dialect titles in the texts of antiquity: apart from S. note Theocr. Id. 28, a poem in the Lesbian dialect whose title is given as ἀλακδα from fifteenth century MSS. but as ηλα[ in an Oxyrhynchus papyrus cited by Gow (Theocr. vol. 1 p. 257; O.C.T. p. 115). The only discernible exceptions to this rule are provided by a few authors to whom the epithet "recherché" might justly be applied. The papyrus fragments of several Boeotian poems (by Corinna?) reveal titles in Boeotian dialect. (690 P: 'Ορέπταις 692 fr. 36·3 P: Θωμαχια[c.f. 694 fr. 13-2P. Contrast the titles in the book-texts of Corinna: 656 P: Κτεροηων for Κεροηων (see Κεροη in the papyrus at 655 fr. 1-2 P) 660 P: Ευωνυμής for Εωνυμή 661P: 'Ιολάω for Φιολ-. But the corruption that is endemic to all quotations of Corinna may explain these). Likewise some of the titles of Epicharmus' comedies and the mimes of Sophron are given in the appropriate Sicilian Doric by their quoters. (In the case of the former see e.g. Γα' καὶ δάλαςα fr. 24 Kaibel, "Ηβας Γάμος fr. 48-70 Kaibel, Πύρος καὶ Προμέθες fr. 114 and 116 Kaibel; for the latter Ὁλεύς τὸν ἄγρεταν fr. 43-4 Kaibel, ταῖ γυναίκες αἱ τὰς θέαν φαντὶ ἐξελαν fr. 3 Kaibel).¹

¹Just as they talk of S's Ερωτόλην(194P) rather than his Ερωτόλη and his Ελεύν not his Ἐλένα, etc.
As for the form of the ogre's name, modern consent, following Aesch. Ag. 870, gives it as Ἰπποῦν. But Ἰπποῦν is what most Greek authors outside of epic call him, from Hecataeus and Pindar to Eustathius, and Ἰπποῦνας is merely S's Doric spelling of this. Ἰπποῦν also crops up on sixth century vases (e.g. Ἰπποῦνας on vase 1, Ἰπποῦνας on 3). Ἰπποῦνας is a third Hesiodic version (c.f. Theog. 287, 982 and West on the second locus (p.425)). For a list of the ancient grammarians who comment upon the three forms of the name see Croon p.13 n.1. For the forms in Greek poets see B. Forssman, Untersuchungen zur Sprache Pindars (1966) 119f, and for the forms in Latin, Housman, J. Ph. 31 (1910) 253f = Collected Papers 2·829f.
Geographical Background:

On Tartessus and its environment in S. Spain, A. Schulten, Tartessos: ein Beitrag zur ältesten Geschichte des Westens (second, revised, edition (1950) published in Universität Hamburg Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiet der Auslandskunde Vol. 53) still provides the fullest collection of ancient sources (see especially ch. 12 ("Wo lag Tartessos?") pp.155ff and Map 3). But his evaluation of the evidence is less reliable: see e.g. the critique by K. von Fritz, Die griech. Geschichtenschreibung 1 (Notes) p.4f.

Considerable difficulties surround its exact location. Most worrying - though not relevant to our present purpose - is the nagging uncertainty whether the name was used of an extremely vital city on the estuary of the middle and lower R. Baetis (the modern Guadalquivir) or merely of the region to the north of this hypothetical town. Schulten favours the first alternative, but no archeological traces of any such wealthy settlement survive. Still, Herodotus' references to Ταρτεσσός (1·163, 4·152) seem to imply a city.

Opportunities for confusion are not reduced by the frequent use of this same word for the R. Baetis itself (so oli παλαιολ cited here by Strabo, including S., and possibly Ephorus (see Jacoby, F. Gr. Hist. Vol. 4 p. 73) and the problematic source of Avienus' Ora Maritima (c.f. Schulten Avienus (1922) passim and von Fritz sup. cit. pp. 11ff) or by geographical writers' contamination of Tartessus with
the city of Gades (Gadeira: modern Cadiz) to the south. This latter confusion possibly post-dates the destruction of Tartessus by the Carthaginians c.500 (c.f. Croon p.18 n.25). Before that time only Tartessus is mentioned in connection with Geryon's homestead. Ephorus F. Gr. Hist. 70 F 129B carefully distinguishes it from Gades (F 129B = ps - Scymn. orb. descr. 152ff: ταύτης ἑνεγγυς δ' ἐστιν ἢ τῆς τάτης μεγίστα γίνεσθαι γόγος καθ' ἡμερῶν δ' ἐστὶν ἡμερῶν δοῦν τελέσαντι πλοῦν ἐμπόροιν εὐτυχέστατον η λεγομένη Ταρτησσός, ἐπίφανής πόλις). So too Hdt. 4.8 inf. cit. For the confusion see e.g. Pliny N.H. 4.120 = Timaeus F.Gr.Hist. 566 F 67: (Gades) nostri Tarteson appelant, Poeni Gadir.1

As for Erytheia,2 this would seem to be an island between both mouths of the Baetis, lying off Gades (C.f. Hdt. 4.8: "Ελληνες λέγουσι 'Ερυθείαν νῆσον, τὴν πρὸς Γηθείρωσι ἐξω Ἰμακλέφων τηλεοι ἐπὶ τῷ ὦκεανῷ. c.f. Ephorus F. Gr. Hist. 70 F 129A and Philistides F. Gr. Hist. 11 F3 (= Pliny N.H. 4.119: in ipso vero capite mox Baeticae ... Gadis (scil. insula) est M longa passus, M lata, in qua prius oppidum Gadium fuit. vocatur ab Ephoro et Philistide Erythea). It is called Cartare by Avienus' source (Or.

1Strabo also informs us that the country occupied in his day by the Tardulians was known as Tartessis, which instance of confusion worse confounded I hereby confine to the present foot-note.

2Pliny (N.H. 4.120) gives the form Erythea, Solinus (23.12) Erythrea, Mela (3.47) Erythria.

Macrobius Sat. 5.21.19 calls Erytheia "Hispaniae insula".

Unfortunately, just as some confused Tartessus with Gades, so others confounded Erythea with that town: Pherecydes for instance (F. Gr. Hist. 3 F 18B = Strabo 3.5.4:

'Ερυθειαν δὲ τὰ Γάδειρα έσοικε λέγειν ὁ Φερεκύδης ἐν ἢ τὰ περὶ τὸν Γηρούνην μυθεύουσι. ἄλλοι δὲ (Eph. F 129A sup. cit.) τὴν παραβεβλημένην ταύτην τῇ πόλει νῆσον πορδύων σταδίοις δεινογομένην, τὸ εἴδοσον δρούντες). This error was perpetuated by Apollod. 2.5.10 ('Ερυθεια δὲ ἢν Οκεανός πλησίον κειμένη νήσος, ἢ νῦν Γάδειρα καλεῖται) and Sil. It. 16.194 (Herculeas Erythia ad litora Gades). Ephorus again draws a careful distinction between the two (F129B = ps.-Scymn.orb.descr. 152ff έιτ' ἐξομευη 'ετι νῆςος ἢ καλομένη 'Ερυθεια, μεγέθει μὲν βραχεία παντελῶς, βοῶν δ' ἀγέλας ἔχουσα καὶ βοσκημάτων .... ταύτης σύνεγγυς δ' έστιν (ἐπιφανῆς) πόλις λαβοῦσα Τυρ(ῶν ἑμπόρων ἀποκινάν Γάδειρ', δπού μέγιστα γύνεσαί λόγος κήτη). Where Hellenicus (F. Gr. Hist. 4 Fl10f) thought Geryon lived is unsure.

For a totally different location of Geryon which places him in N.W. Greece (Epirus in Ambracia) c.f. Hecataeus 1 F 26 and Croon's remarks (pp.49-52). The same environment is implied by the six lines from an ancient pillar found near Hypate in Aenis quoted by ps.-Aristotle περὶ ἰσωματίων ἀκουσμάτων 133.843B 15-844A5 = Preger 95 on which see most recently G. Huxley, GRBS 8 (1967) 88ff. And this coincidence
shows that Hecataeus was not rationalising the more familiar form of the legend: indeed he may even have been returning to the earliest and least extravagant version. Other locations are late: Tricarenia on the Pontus (Palaephath. 24) and Lydia (Paus. 1.35.7).

Hesiod of course knows of "sea-girt Erytheia" but merely places it πέρην κλυτοῦ Ἐρυθείας (Theog.294). Scholars have long remarked upon the difference between this vague phrase and S's more precise picture in 184P = S7, and have invariably sought the explanation in the growth of geographical knowledge during the interval between the two poets. It is just conceivable that the earlier author was acquainted with an Iberian locale but preferred the more resounding and impressive wording quoted above. Orthodoxy is probably right however to connect the appearance of Tartessus in the story with the spread of Greek travellers and merchants to the West. The first Greeks to establish trade-contacts with Gades and Tartessus were Phocaean colonists (c.f. Hdt.1.163 and the literature cited by Croon p.35 n.27. For a more recent resumé of the evidence c.f. J. Boardman, The Greeks Overseas2 (1973) pp.205ff). These Phocaean colonists, who moved westwards from Massalia (Marseilles), had established commercial links with the Chalcidians, and the Chalcidians themselves played an important part in the founding of Himera, a city whose name will be found recurring time and again wherever S. is mentioned. Here, then, is one possible way whereby a story familiar to S. and the Chalcidians might spread on board Phocaean vessels to Tartessus and Gades where a fresh residence awaited it. But this commerce
could flow both ways, and friendly merchants might bring back eye-witness accounts of the tale's new setting, might describe, for instance, the silver mines in whose region the river of Tartessus rose.

Thus, in general, how a Greek myth could speed from the mainland or Magna Graecia to Iberia, suitably remote κλαυτοῦ Ὀμεανοῦ. But why localise it at Tartessus or Gades in particular? More specific causes must be adduced, and Schulten has ingeniously produced them (pp.56ff).

Geryon is frequently associated with the Underworld (see below p.139) and Tartessus and Tartarus are like in name: c.f. Strabo 3.149: εἰκάζοι ἀν τις (scil. Ὀμεανοῦ) ἀκούοντα περὶ Ταρτησσοῦ τῶν Τάρταρον ἐκείθεν παρονομάκαι. Suda s.v. Ταρτησσός. (4.506 Adl.) Ἰβηρικὴ πόλις, πρὸς τῶν Ὀμεανῶν... παρὰ τὴν Ἀορνον ἄμυνην. Ἐρ. Ῥαν. 475: ἦ δὲ Ταρτησσός Ἰβηρικὴ πόλις περὶ τὴν Ἀορνον ἄμυνην. Besides, Geryon may have become assimilated to the homoeonymous king of Tartessus, Geron: c.f. Avienus Ora Mar. 263f: Gerontis arx est eminus namque ex ea | Geryona quondam nuncupatum accepirimus.

Such an explanation presupposes that the Sicilian poet was the first to place Geryon and his herd off Tartessus. This notion¹ is perfectly consistent with our sadly limited sphere of knowledge. But Huxley (Greek Epic Poetry p.101) and Matthews (Panyassisi p.59) have put forward a suggestion that Pisander of Rhodes was the first to locate the

¹Assumed without argument by Wilamowitz, Hermes 14 (1879) 169 = Kl. Schr. 4·7.
adventures with Geryon in the far West, under the influence of early Rhodian explorations in the Western Mediterranean (c.f. Strabo 14.654 who dates the earliest of them before the first Olympiad). These scholars would presumably claim that Pisander was older than Hesiod. They might be right, but we know so appallingly little about the Rhodian epic poet or his date that the hypothesis is hardly worth making. And the only piece of information we possess about the story of Geryon within Pisander's Heracleia is that the hero borrowed the Sun's cup from Oceanus (fr. 5K). For a brief résumé of our few scraps of knowledge about Pisander c.f. Jacoby, F. Gr. Hist. 1 p.544. Wilamowitz (Herakles Vol. 1. p.66 n.121) dated him "not older than the 6th century" i.e. younger than S. For an earlier date c.f. Huxley l.c. 100.
Metre and structure

Thanks to the papyrus finds, we can at last recover the metre and diagnose the sickness of the fragment which earlier scholars (e.g. Bergk p.208; Wilamowitz, Hermes 14 (1879) 169 = Kl. Schr. 4 p.7) desperately rewrote and rearranged in various ways. Page in his LGS (p.264) mentioned two possible solutions: a lacuna after 'Ερυθείας or Barrett's (τίκτευ) after παγάς. In fact only one of these approaches is legitimate, although Page unfortunately adopts the wrong one in SLG p.6. We can see what ails Barrett's ingenious reconstruction simply by scanning it:

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{Tartessou potamou para pagas tiktou exeipnovac cxpyupouc} & \text{ ev} \\
\text{mevymovn petrac}. 
\end{align*} \]

Nowhere else in this poem does S. allow anything like that heavy sequence of five consecutive longa within a period. Indeed he positively avoids a series of more than three such longa by prohibiting the contraction of consecutive liceps and the coincidence of contracted element and word-end. (See above p.85). The proposal approved by Barrett and Page breaks both rules and must therefore go.

Unless the corruption of the fragment goes far deeper than we can tell — in which case no remedy will avail — our only alternative is to posit a lacuna after 'Ερυθείας. The phrase \( \text{cxevov ... 'Eruth.} \) can be fitted into the scheme at

\[ \text{A third (Führer p.675) which interprets our fragment as ep. 5-str. 1 is ruled out by the implausible reconstruction of ep.8 as } \text{— — } \text{— —}(\text{see above p.81f}) \text{which it entails. It also necessitates the deletion of } \text{ev at the start of 1.5, an emendation now renounced by Führer (R p.7 n.46).} \]

\[ \text{And his article p.138.} \]
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virtually any point (— — — — — — — —). Then the gap; and then (1) \( \tau \alpha r \tau \eta c \) ηού ποτάμων κτλ. can occupy the last two elements of ep. 4 and proceed as far as the middle of ep. 7. We will still get five consecutive longa in ep.6-7, but this is obviated by pause and period-end at that place. This reconstruction presupposes that the metrical content of ep. 7 is — — — — — — — —. If we dislike this (as I do) we can read (2) \( \tau \alpha r \tau \eta c c o u \) κτλ. as ep.1-3 minus the initial — — and concluding — — — —. Again period-end breaks up the longa. Lacunae are just what we should expect in the often careless book-texts and quotations of S's poetry; and Strabo may merely have extracted from this part of the Geryoneis those lines relevant to his geographical purpose.
Certain scholars have wanted this phrase to refer to Geryon himself. Not surprisingly, they either have to misinterpret the παράδοσις (so Schulten p.60 n.6) or arbitrarily change it to περὶ Γηρυόνος τοῦ βουκόλου (so Voigt in Roscher Myth. Lex. 1’1634). Their motives are no more respectable than their methods: they apparently find their credulity stretched beyond breaking point by the notion that any character other than Geryon himself should be named in connection with this story. It is in fact true that we possess a few odd strands of a tradition whereby the ogre was his own herdsman: ps - Scylax Peripl. 26: ἐνταῦθα (scil. Ἐρώτεια) ὁ Γηρυόνης λέγεται θηρειν, καὶ τοῦς βοῦς βουκολεῖν. c.f. Et. Mag. s.v. Γηρυόν. παρὰ το γηρύω, δ ἐστι φθέγγομαι, πρόπολο δυόμα βουκόλωι. The form preserved by these late authors may be the original version of the tale. But as early as Hes. Theog. 293, Geryon has a herdsman called Eurytion in his service, and this character plays a significant part in the myth as related in literature and depicted on vases (see above pp.69ff and pp.92ff). His name does not occur in any of the Geryoneis' fragments old or new, but his existence is strongly implied by those fragments which have a distant Geryon informed of the theft of his cattle (see above pp.9f) and that tiny scrap of papyrus which is S29 mentions a ἥρμη[ that must be he. See too my note on S8 (p.126f). In the diffuse narrative of S. there would have been ample opportunity for such a digression on the birth-place of this minor but important character. It would be absurd not to see him as the subject of the...
This said, it follows that we have no concrete evidence as to where exactly S. placed Geryon's own residence: we only know his herdsman's birth-place. But in view of the statement that Tartessus stands near Erytheia, it would be very surprising if this were a merely decorative piece of information, and S. had not placed Geryon on that island as did Hdt. 4.8 (sup.cit.p.109) and later writers. I do not know why Vürtheim (p.20) should suppose that Eurytion was killed at Tartessus by Heracles.

Who gives birth to Eurytion in this place? According to Σ Theog. 293 = Hellanicus F.Gr.Hist. 4 F110 τὸν Εὐρυτίωνα φησιν 'Ελλανικός γεγενηθεὶς ἀπὸ Ἄρεος καὶ Ἐρυθέας. c.f. Serv. ad Verg.Aen. 8.300:

Eurytiona pasto:emm Martis filium. This is the only known tradition about Eurytion's parentage. It may well have been followed or even initiated by S. himself.
On the geography of this island see above (pp. 108ff). Presumably it received its name from words like ἐρυθρός, the land far away to the west being dyed red by the sinking sun: for the same reason, Apollodorus says (2.10.6), Geryon's cattle there were called φῶτινωάς βοῦς. Ancient writers, however, gave different explanations (e.g. Pliny N.H. 4.119: Erythea dicta est quoniam Tyri aborigines earum orti ab Erythro mari ferebantur). Several of them maintain that the island was named after the Hesperid Erytheia (c.f. Σ Διαλ. Ροδ. 4.1399 (p. 316 Wendel) Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἐρυθρία). For her see my note 8 S (p. 126ff). For κλεινάς used of an island (Cyprus) c.f. Solon fr. 19.3W: κλεινής ἀπὸ νῆσου. Compare Antimachus fr. 66 W (see p. 205f below).

2 Ταρτησσοῦ ποταμοῦ
See above p. 108f.

3 παρὰ πατᾶς

"Chalcidensis poeta accusativum plurativum primae declinationis corripere nequit" declared Wilamowitz (sup. cit. on p. 114) and he rearranged the fragment to get πατᾶς at the end of a line.1 Barrett's supplement2 would likewise produce the more normal -άς. But neither approach is acceptable (see p. 114) and we must simply acquiesce in the short fem. acc.pl. demanded by the metre and draw confidence from the occurrence of the same phenomenon in the new fragment

1 A proposal withdrawn Textg. p. 46 n. 2, SS p. 240.
2 Wrongly accepted by Lobel, Oxy Pap. 45 (1977) p. 16.
(P. Lille 76-303). On accusative plurals in -άς see H. Troxler, Sprache und Wortschatz Hesiods (1964) pp.74-6 for the fullest list of examples (to which add the new lyric instance) and G.P. Edwards, The Language of Hesiod (1971) pp.141-165 for the latest discussion with a full critique of previous important treatments (see p.141 n.2). Edward's remark on p.142 - (such accusatives) "are found also in several poets who were either West Greek speakers themselves or came to have close association with places where West Greek dialects were spoken" - amply explains the Stesichorean passages. (See now P. Oxy. 3213·3).

So much for metre; what of the word's meaning? To translate nαγάς as "springs" (with e.g. Bowra GLP² p.90) is absurd. Even if we reject the hypothesis that S. had detailed second-hand information about the locale (see above p.112) we must grant that he knew Erythea was an island - as even Hesiod knew (Theog.290)! - and that islands lie off coasts. And we cannot deny him an awareness that rivers' sources lie inland. How then can Eurytion have been born simultaneously near an island and by a river's spring? No tradition known to me describes him as a giant.

Which cannot be said for W.F. Wyatt's notion (TAPA 97 (1966) p.636 n.32) that nαγάς in the present case is a "reminiscence of Hesiod, for the incident described draws its inspiration from Theog. 287-94." That rather mistates the facts, and now fails to account for P. Lille's instance.
Bergk tried to obviate the difficulty by tampering with the word-order so as to have him born (p. 208)

(1) Ταρτησσοῦ ποταμοῦ σχέδον (2) ἀντιπέρας κλειναὶς Ἑρωδεῖας (3) ἐν κευθμονὶ πέτρας (4) παρὰ παγὰς ἀπείρονας ἄργυροφιζους, that is, "near the river in a cave by the silver mines." Good Greek (c.f. Aesch. Pers. 240: ἄργυρου πηγῆ τις αὐτῶς ἐστὶ, δησαυρὸς χάδωνὸς and Broadhead ad loc. (p.92)) but, we now see, impossible metre.¹

Vürtheim appreciates all this (p.14) but can only retain the meaning "springs" for παγὰς and place an impossible stress upon σχέδον - "nearly over against ἀλ.'Εο" - which is ludicrous. Attempts to keep the springs by foisting the unparalleled meaning "at the other end" upon ἀντιπέρας (so Schulten p.132, Nöthiger p.141) are likewise to be rejected.

The simplest way to restore sense to the passage is to follow Page and Barrett in interpreting παγὰς as "streams" or "waters" (c.f. P.M.G. p.100). Coherence at once floods back: Eurytion was born by the mouth of the river on the coast of Spain off which lies the island of Erytheia.

That "waters" is the usual meaning of πηγαῖ in the plural has been recognised since Wilamowitz's note on Eur. Her. 390 (2II 94) but since the truth seems to be slow in

¹And geography, since the mines were not near the shore (see Strabo 3.148 inf.cit.) and so may hardly be denoted as ἀντιπέρας ἀλ.'Εο. But this consideration is not decisive: see p.123f.
spreading abroad, I append a fairly extensive list of instances, beginning with the Homeric πηγαί ποταμῶν (Il. 20·9 = Od. 6·124 = H.H. Aphr. 99) and continuing with Il. 23·148, Hes. Theog. 282, Pind. fr. 30·2 (Sn.), Aesch. Pers. 202, 311, 613, S.C.T. 273, P.V. 89, 434; Eur. Med. 410, Her. 390, 1297, El. 56, I.T. 1039, fr. 773·33 N² = Phaethon 77 (Diggle), Rhes. 827; Call. Hymn 5·10.

For παρά + ACC. used of rivers c.f. Hes. Theog. 282:
'Ωκεανοῦ παρὰ πηγας (γένσ) fr.13 MW: (ὠικες) ποτάμων παρ' ὄχθας ἑώρειος Πειραίου, Eur.Her. 390: 'Ἀναυρωῦ παρὰ πηγάς (Ὡλεθεν), 1163: παρ' Ἀσωποῦ ρόας (μένουσιν), Hel. 491: (ἔστι) Νείλου παρ' ὄχθας. c.f. Mimn.11Λ3 W: 'Ωκεανοῦ παρὰ χεῖλος.¹ (A little different is Pind. fr. 30·2 (Sn.):
'Ωκεανοῦ παρὰ παγαν ("from beside").) One might expect παρὰ to take the dative (as in Eur. Ion. 1075: παρὰ καλλιχόροις παγαίς etc.) but as Wilamowitz (sup.cit.) explains: "Der Fluss ist eine Linie, und wenn wir eine Handlung an ihm localisieren wollen, so können wir uns ebensogut einen Punkt dieser Linie wie diezle als ganzes denken, indem der einzelne Punkt unbestimmt bleibt." For the bearing of children by rivers in myth see below pp.123ff.

¹See too the passages quoted below p.125.
The epithet is used in epic of the sea and the earth (that is, of flat surfaces stretching away endlessly to the horizon), of the Hellespont (Il. 24.545: that is of a stage intermediate between land and sea), and of a δῆμος (Il. 24.776: that is of a vast mass of people). Also of the νόσμως (in P. Oxy. 2816). Nöthiger (p.141) conceives ἄν. παγάς here to mean "unfathomably deep springs," but we have already seen that the river's sources are not in question here. His alternative translation of the adjective, "endlessly far away", is, as he himself admits, quite without parallel. The phrase ὄνως ἄνεπρον (Od. 7.286) is too abstract to help us in the present place, so I conclude that S. has transferred the epithet from the sea to a river, whose waters might be envisaged as extending into the remote distance in much the same way.

Wilamowitz (Hermes 14 (1879) = Kl. Schr. 4.7) assailed the paradoxos (ἄγους) on two grounds: (1) "probus poeta adjectiva non cumulat sed inter substantiva distribuit" and (2) "montium non fluvii radices argentaeae sunt". The first has very little to recommend it.

The second, however, seems to me to constitute an unanswerable objection, and Wilamowitz's simple remedy deserved better than to be forgotten or ignored by most later commentators (including the great man himself.

1And of its βάσις in Empedocles B39 D-K.
2A late cosmogony in hexameters: compare the use of the word in Empedocles B28 D-K of the σφαιρὸς κυκλοτερῆς μονίμη περιήγει γαλῶν.
3Compare its use in the Empedoclean fragment cited in n.1.
ad Eur. Her. 386-7 (p.93))¹. None of the previous attempts to explain how a river has roots convinces me. Certainly not LSJ's "with silver root...i.e. having silver in the soil": in what sense can a river be said to put down roots into the soil beneath it? Nöthiger's discussion (p.149) is the least unsatisfactory so far, but leaves my basic question unanswered.

A mountain, on the other hand, does have roots: c.f. Aesch. P.V. 365: ὑζητῶν Ἀἰτναίας. And so, by analogy, can a rock on a mountain. For mountains as a common locale for the exposure (and, occasionally, birth) of children in the myths of the Greeks and other races c.f. G. Binder, Die Aussetzung des Königskindes Kyros und Romulus (Beiträge zur klass. Philol. (10 (1964))) pp.129, 134, 137, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 147, etc. But if we read ἄγυροφιξού... πέτρας we must bear in mind two points. Firstly, whether the epithet is possessive ("having" or "with silver roots") or locative ("having roots in silver, rooted in silver")² its reference must be to the silver mountains at Castulo where was mined the metal for which Tartessus became famous: c.f. Strabo 3.148 who observes that the Baetis was given a further name on account of this: οὐ πολύ δ' ἄπωθεν Κασταλωνὸς ἔστι καὶ τὸ δρος ἐξ οὐ δεῖν φασὶ τὸν Βαϊτῖν, ὡ καλὸςιν ἀφυρόθιν διὰ τὰ δροβεία τὰ ἐν αὐτῶι. See

¹That is, in 1895. His later complaint (Sitzb. der Preuss. Akad. der Wiss. 1926 p.139 n.1 = Kl.Schr.52p.146 n.1) about the conspiracy of silence concerning his emendation therefore reads a little oddly, fully justified though it is.

²For other - φιξο compounds see the list in Buck-Petersen, A Reverse Index of Greek Nouns and Adjectives p.744f.
further Schulten's Index s.v. "Silber" (p.179). But since, as Strabo says, the mines were not near the shore (where Eurytion was born: see p. 120) S. must either have received misleading information from his Phocaean merchants, or misunderstood it, or considered geographical accuracy irrelevant to an heroic poem. Secondly, the hiatus ἄργυροποιήσατο ἐν conforms with the period-end entailed on metrical grounds: but elsewhere in our admittedly scanty remains of S. period-end coincides with a fairly decisive break in sense: see p. 86.

The sort of error presupposed by Wilamowitz is common enough at all stages and levels (see e.g. West's Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique (1973), Index s.v. "assimilative corruption") especially so when a multitude of epithets with varying subjects is involved. Compare Pind. Is.2.7ff: οὔτε ἐπέρνατο γλυκεῖα μελιφθόγγας (Heyne: -φόγγοι codd.) οὔτε Τερψιχόρας ἄργυροποιήσατο πρόχειρα μαλακικάφωνοι ἄοιδαί. Further instances in E. Rickmann, In cumulandis epithetis quas leges sibi scripserint poetae Graeci maxime lyrici (Diss. Rostock 1884) pp.34ff.

ἐν κευθμόνι πέτρας

numerous births and exposures of babies in the myths (and real life) of Greece and other countries: see Binder (sup. cit.) pp.125, 127, 133, 135, etc. For reasons given in my commentary on S8 (p.128f) the present fragment may have occurred in a digression linked with the killing of Eurytion. It is therefore of interest to compare two such digressions in the Iliad which hark back to the births of minor warriors slain at Troy: II. 4'473ff: ἐνθ' Ἐβαλ' Ἀνδριάνον υἱὸν Τελαμώνιος Αἴας, ἣδειαν δαλωδόν Σιμωείσιον, δὲ ποτε μήτηρ Ἰδηθεὶν κατισούσα παρ' ὑδηγήσει εἰμώεντος γείνατ', ἐπεὶ δὲ τοιεύουσιν ἀν' ἔπετο μήλα Ἰδηθεὶν· τοῦθεν ἀμν αὐλής Σιμωείσιον. 1 II. 14.443ff: Αἴας Ἐντνιον οὕτασε ... Ἡυπολίθην, δὲ δρᾶ νύμφῃ τελέ ἐν εἰς ἀμύμῳν Ἡυπολίθην βουκολέουσι παρ' ὑδηγήσει Σιμωείσιον. The etymologising of the names of these two warriors born beside rivers makes me wonder whether a similar point is not intended in S's passage about Eurytion: c.f. Eur. I.A. 420f: εὕρητον παρὰ κρήσην for a possibly relevant adjective. Note too the mentions of herds of cattle in the Homeric lines.

Eurytion's birth in a cave beside a river can be paralleled by that of Abraham in Jewish tradition: see Binder (sup. cit.) p.167.

1 On this passage see S.L. Schein, Eranos 74 (1976) 1ff.
If the fragment is describing the adventures of Heracles, two questions immediately raise their repellent heads: why is this verb plural, and how does the visit to the isle of the Hesperides fit in with the expedition against Geryon? We have already seen that the unanimous voice of antiquity proclaims the single-handedness of Heracles' endeavours in this (and most other) labours (see above p.101). It is unlikely that the hero shares the verb with Iolaus or some less famous companions. Mr. Barrett has suggested two possible explanations: the Sun's magic self-propelling cup may have been credited with an independent personality and thus included with Heracles in "they." Or the lines may be from Heracles' homeward journey and the plural may refer to the cattle as well as their captor. Neither approach, as Mr. Barrett was the first to admit, is at all attractive. One would not gladly suppose that the poet put the lion-hearted champion on the same footing as the cows he had driven off or the inanimate object in which he was conveyed.

But the second question posed above constitutes a far more important objection. The Garden of the Hesperides may have been located fairly near Tartessus and Erytheia in the far West (as a passage like Minn.fr.12.8 W taken together with Antimachus fr.66 W suggests: see below p.237 n.1), but there is no precedent or parallel whatsoever for the combination of one large-scale labour (the quest for the
apples of the Hesperides) with another (the rustling of Geryon's cattle). Major labours may have attracted a cluster of lesser παιδρυς about them (such as the visit to Pholus: see p.209ff) but this would be a totally different phenomenon. The two labours do share a few common motifs (such as Heracles' exploitation of the ἀλιος γέρων) and they were perhaps originally two different perspectives of the same story, Heracles' conquest of death (see p.61). As we have them now however, they seem irremediably discrete.¹ S. had a reputation for ψαλιωτικα, it may be argued, and the introduction of Pholus implies a certain diffuseness; yet to cram in a whole new labour would surely burst the loosest frame.

Heracles may have indulged in a motiveless trip to the Hesperides in a search for light relief during his expedition against Geryon. But before we are driven to that refuge we should examine an explanation which also promises to solve the riddle of 1's plural verb. We are in the land of the Hesperides, and one of these divine creatures is closely linked with the story of Geryon. As we saw above (on S7:p.117) Eurytion's mother was named by Hellanicus F.Gr.Hist.1 F 110 as Erytheia, who may have given her name to the ogre's island. And it is precisely she who is listed among the Hesperids by Apollod. 2.5.11 and Hes. fr. 360 MW.

¹Pherecydes F.Gr.Hist. 3 F 17 seems to have made Heracles use the Sun's bowl for his journey to the Isle of the Hesperides as well as to Erytheia. But this does not amount to an amalgamation of the two labours and the reduplication of the motif is itself a very thorny problem: see Jacoby's commentary ad loc. (p.395).

knows a Hesperid called Erythreis. Paus. 10.17.5 says that Erytheia was the daughter of Geryon himself (in this he is followed by Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἐρυθρεία and Myth. Vat. 1.68) and proceeds to relate how she bore to Hermes Norax, the eponymous hero of Nora in Sardinia which he founded together with the Iberians. This looks like late embroidery (so Jacoby ad Hell. F. Gr. Hist. 4 F 110 1A p. 462), and there is no reason to suppose that a word of it appeared in S's narrative. And if Erytheia did feature in his poem she can have had nothing to do with the lady of the same name who is mentioned on the stone pillar found near Hypate as having passed through Epirus with Heracles and the cattle of Geryon and having born him a son. For this story belongs to a totally divergent form of the myth, which would place Geryon not in the far West but in N.W. Greece. (See above p. 110f).

Now it is Professor Robertson's ingenious contention (pp. 215ff) that Erytheia did in fact feature in the Geryoneis, and as Eurytion's mother. It is she who gave birth to Geryon's future herdsman in S7 and she who consequently took the baby to the island where she and her sisters usually dwelt. The arrival of the pair is described in the present fragment, hence the plural verb ἀφίκοντο. The likeliest home for both fragments would be in the context of a digression on the early life of Eurytion - no unthinkable phenomenon in the work of a poet as discursive as S. -, and the likeliest place for such a digression to appear would also be the latest place, at the time when the herds-
man is killed. The Iliad's narrative abounds with such παρεκβάδεςις, adorning the death of some minor warrior and rendering it more individual and pathetic by some colourful detail from his earlier life (see e.g. Il. 4.473ff, 11.221ff, 14.443ff).

And so here too, Professor Robertson suggests, frs 7 and 8 might have been conjoined in some such way as this:

"(Heracles killed Orthus). Then came the herdsman Eurytion, Eurytion whom Erytheia the Hesperid bore to Ares. Ares loved her, and when she was with child by him she left her sisters and wandered over the earth. At last, in a hollow of the rocks by the boundless silver-rooted waters of Tartessus, over against famous Erytheia, she bore her child. She raised him in the cave, but when he was a boy she took boat with him and they came over the waves of the deep sea to the beautiful island of the gods where the Hesperides have their golden homes. There she dwelt with her sisters, but when Eurytion was a man he took service with Geryon, keeping his herds on Erytheia. (But him too Heracles killed)."

2f: Ἔδων περικαλλέα νήσου

As Snell pointed out (p.119 n.2) Pherencydes Fr. Gr. Hist. 3 F 16C refers to the Garden of the Hesperides as τὸν τῶν Ἐδών κῆπον, δεν η' παρ' τῶν "Ατλαντι', but κῆπον is certainly not the reading of the papyrus here. Compare Theogn. 1277: περικαλλέα νήσου. Homer uses the adjective of man-made objects (δομος, δίφρος, τεύχεα) in which connection

1Against this, the traditional reading, see above p.122f.
II. 3·421 Ἀλεξάνδρου δόμον περικαλλές ἔχωντο (scil. Helen and Aphrodite) is formally close to our passage. But he also uses it of natural objects (τεμένος, λίμνη, βόσκ, ἄγροι) though not of a νησος.

3: τ]όθι

This reading is necessary for the space (όθι would be too short) but we must then remember that τ]όθι as relative does not feature in Homer, except for the quotation of Od. 4·229 in Theophr. H.P. 10·15·1. The earliest examples of the usage apart from the present passage are H.H. Pan 25(?)
Mimn. fr.11A·1 W, Pind. Pyth. 9·6, Nem. 4·52, Pa. 6·15.

3-4: π[αγχρ]όςεα δό[μα]τ', ἔχωντι

The gods' houses are regularly depicted as golden: see the list of passages cited by Diggle on Eur. Phaeth. 238 (p.153), to which add Pind. Pyth. 9·56, and now P.Oxy, 2816·3. (C.f. Sappho 1·8 and 127 LP). And the Hesperides also have παγχρόςεα μῆλα (Hes. Theog. 335).

6: κ]αλ[δ]κ[ω][ν]

Read by Barrett who interprets it as an allusion to the buds on the Hesperides' apple-tree; c.f. LSJ s.v. I 2.

---

1The date of this hymn is, of course, strongly disputed.
I had already decided to use this fragment as a paradigmatic illustration of how even small particles of text can be identified metrically and sometimes located within the structure of columns in this poem, when Mr. Barrett kindly put at my disposal his own demonstration of the correct placing of the present lines. I reproduce the substance of this below virtually intact. To those who suspect that much labour has been expended here to little effect, I would point out the gain in our knowledge about the exact end of the epode.

(1)

Firstly, Lobel's "assumption that opposite sides of one and the same column are represented" (p.22) can be shown to be wrong. For line 2 of (b) must be jōwā: the alternative jōwā is to be excluded because no line of our poem ending in - is followed by three lines of equal length as here. jōwā then, of which two possible interpretations exist: (i) it is a long line in --- this, with a long line preceding and three long lines succeeding, will be either str./ant. 9 or ep. 1. (ii) it is a short line in --- this, given the same surrounding line-lengths, will be str./ant. 7 or ep. 8.

1It had already been rejected by Führer (p.677), but his idea that (b)1ff=str.6ff fails to take into account the consequences for this identification of the relationship between column and lines which entails that (a) 1ff = str. 1ff. But the scansion θμθ for (a)2 is most implausible as Führer himself now accepts (R p.6).
On either alternative we must expect paragraphoi at various positions in the papyrus text of (a), and the total absence of such marks proves that (a) and (b) are not from the same column.¹ For if they were, either (a) 1 = (b) 1 or (a) 1 is a short line and (a) 2 = (b) 1.

Thus,

(i)  
(ii)  

if (b) 2 is str./ant.9 ep.1 str./ant.7 ep.8
then if (a) 1 = (b) 1 these will be a paragraphos under
(a) 2 (a) 1 (a) 4 (a) 2
and if (a) 2 = (b) 1 there will be a paragraphos under
(a) 3 *² (a) 5 (a) 3

There are no such paragraphoi. Therefore (a) are from different columns. Q.E.D.³

¹Barrett notes that the discrepancy between fibres and lines of writing in (a) and (b) seems too great to have been resolved in the width of a single column. This bears out the conclusion reached on independent grounds.

²This instance is impossible: (a) would be a long line.

³Barrett makes assurance double sure by showing that even if a low paragraphos under (a) 5 could have disappeared without trace, (a) 1's τη could not be identified with str./ant.5 ("---") since long biceps is impossible here. Also (a) 2's ἀνω could not be str./ant.6: that line is not in synaphea with str./ant.5 and what word (the relative apart: but the papyrus has no breathing) begins thus?
(2) Metre of (a)

2's ἀπὸ is likely to be a noun or adj. in -α plus an enclitic. If so, there appear to be four possibilities (Barrett's supplements are merely meant to show how the metre could be matched to real words).

(1)

(2)

(3)

Of these, (1) is easily the most plausible:

(a) ἀ ποῦκα (numerous possibilities: e.g. ἐκχαριά, στερεά, γενεά, θεά, ἰοδ) seems more promising and metrically more attractive than ἀ ποῦ in (3) and (4).

(b) ἡ ταύπι may well be a correction of faulty

---

1Compare ἀ τε in S 15 ii 16 (ep.3).
line-division; if so, it is likelier at the beginning of a line in synaphea with the preceding one, which tells against (3) and (4) again.

(c) (2) is possible only if a paragraphos is lost under 5: unlikely.

(d) (4) gives an implausible str.5.

(3) Metre of (b)
We saw in (1) above that 2's δόξα is str./ant.9 or ep.1 if a long line, str./ant.7 or ep.8 if a short.
Now (i) if 2 is str.9 or ep.1, 3 (λό ρο ποκαρ) will be ant.1 or ep.2 and we shall have

```
... δόξα
...
```

where the disparity between the lengths of the lacunae on the left is highly objectionable.

(ii) if 2 is ant.9, 4 (λανης' ουττ) will be ep.2 and we get

```
... δόξα
...
```

again an improbable disparity, and, to boot, two equally unattractive alternative endings to ep.2.
Therefore

---

Page, who in his article (p.139) left the interpretation of this letter open, now prints it as δ (S.L.G. p.6)—an uncharacteristic piece of rashness.
is a short line, which gives an acceptable situation on the left in two possible ways:

(1)  

\[
\text{str./ant.6 } \text{φόναλαν τ]}} \text{φόναλαν τ]
\]

(2)  

\[
\text{ep.7 } \text{φόναλαν τ]}} \text{φόναλαν τ]
\]

str./ant.6 "...κεφόλαλαν τ]}

8 ("...κεφόλαλαν τ]

Führer (R p.6 n.40 c.f. p.5 n.35) offers a criterion for choice between (1) and (2) with his observation that the punctuation Ἰανηρ' οὖτι would be strange in Str.9 with the strophe end so near ("...κεφόλαλαν τ]}

while it would be perfectly in place, indeed paralleled, in str.2 (c.f. S 15 ii 6: οὐναίτιν Ἄρας' ζήτω δ' ὑπ᾽ Ἐπι-). More important, we have seen above p.133f) that the likeliest metrical interpretation of (a) has it beginning with ep.3. If so, (b) in the next column would begin with ep.7.

We may then accept (2), and with it decisive proof that ep.8 ran "... not "... (see above p. 83f). But it will be clear from the evidence analysed above (pp.81ff) that the extra longum at the start of ep.7 and ep.8 is by no means essential.

Thus (in spite of Führer R p.5) this identification of

\[\text{In each case, the column could have begun one line earlier, with the short line str./ant.5 or ep.6 (both...).} \]

- 135 -
S9b tells us nothing about the papyrus' division of ep. 7/8 here, nor does it tell in favour of the longer version of ep.7 (see p.82f).

Contents of (b)

Barrett tentatively suggests the lines come from Menoetes' description of Heracles. The position would be suitable given the following sequence: (1) Menoetes describes Heracles and tells of his abduction of Geryon's cattle (S9(b): col.VII). (2) Geryon says "then I shall fight him". (3) Menoetes seeks to dissuade him (S10). (4) Geryon replies that he is not afraid to die (S11: col.XI). 105 lines do not seem too long for such a sequence of contents.

Also 3's πωξα may point to a speech since Homeric πωξα occurs mainly in speeches.

And if Barrett is right to supplement 2's ιδόω as ιοιδόω or ιοιετοίδόω (space suggests the latter) "quiver" in the nominative would not be out of place in an account of Heracles' appearance (see my note on 229P).

Tentative speculation then, but intelligent enough to be recorded.
As Lobel remarks (p.19) ἀλγυνόθεντος ("painful": un-Homeric but in Hes. Theog. 214-226, Mimn. 11·2 W etc.) seems likelier than ἄργυνόθεντος (an epithet of cities etc.)

3f

Ὄ φιλάε reminds Barrett of the dialogue between Geryon and Menoetes (see the same phrase at S11·16), and he raises the possibility that the latter is here appealing to the former to consider his mother and father before he fights. It is indeed hard to see who else could make a speech with this content and this form of address.

A comparison of Lobel's original transcript of this fragment (p.12) with the text given here will remind us how much we depend on the large-scale supplements offered by various scholars for an understanding of the passage as a whole. But such an observation is seriously misleading: for by an unusually good turn of fortune, the actual words or parts of words preserved on the papyrus make the general sense and sometimes the very phrasing of the suggestions enclosed within square brackets quite inevitable, as will become clearer from my comments on each individual line.

This is perhaps the finest of all Stesichorean fragments recovered from the sands of Egypt. Its impressive and moving adaptation of an epic passage and the interesting characterisation of Geryon that ensues give us an insight into what Quintilian means by "reddit enim personis in agendo simul loquendoque debitam dignitatem, ac si tenuisset modum videtur aemulari proximus Homerus potuisse" (10.1.62).

I have outlined above (p.69) the identities of the two characters in this passage. The speaker of 5ff must be Geryon reacting to Heracles' theft of his distant cattle. The phrase περὶ θουρίν ἐμαυτός (27) alone would show us that. He is talking to a male personage (whose sex is guaranteed by the metrically necessary supplement ὣ φιλακε at 16). Every analogy provided by versions of this incident in literature and art implies that Eurytion must already be
dead, killed together with his dog while attempting to protect his master's herd. Geryon's father Chrysaor is a candidate who springs readily to mind - until one reflects that ο̣ φιλε is an eccentric mode of addressing one's father, and "the son of immortal Chrysaor" - unavoidable as a supplement in 3-4 - an even more inept soubriquet for someone speaking to Chrysaor. We would gladly have a different character, and Mr. Barrett supplies as interlocutor Menoetes, whose presence here will simultaneously explain an anomaly in the Apollodoran narrative of these events. As we saw previously, the presence of Menoetes on the island of Erytheia τὰς Ἀιδού βοῦς Βόσκων is quite mysterious unless we suppose S. wanted to develop a long series of epic speeches between Geryon and him.¹ Such Homeric devices were dear to his heart, and a large proportion of his papyrus fragments are given over to direct oration.

Perhaps S. also selected Menoetes in particular to be the second herdsman in the story because he was dimly aware that Erytheia, the redland in the West where the Sun dies daily, was originally a synonym for the Underworld: that Geryon was really Hades himself, Orthus a duplicate of Cerberus (in the myth as we have it the dogs are brothers, and Orthus often has two heads and a snake-tail) and

¹Vürtheim (p.21) was the first to guess that the mythographer's Menoetes derived from S., (criticised by Seeliger in his review (p.365)) but he confused him with Menoetius and produced a fantastic motivation for his presence near Eurytion.
Menoetes as herdsman of the king of the Dead no more than another name for Eurytion. In terms of the legend's pre-history, Menoetes is rather at home here after all. See further Croon pp.31ff.

1: *χηρσίν* δὲ

noting δεδίκειται at 6, Lobel (p.13) quotes Il.15.196 *χερσί* δὲ μὴ τί με πάγχυ κακόν δ'ς δεδίκεισθω as a conceivable way of explaining *χηρσί* here. In the Homeric passage of course the noun has the rather specialised sense of "violent measures" (LSJ s.v. IV). Want of a context in our fragment makes it impossible to tell whether this or the more usual signification was employed here. *χερσί* phrases are very common in Homer (Schmidt, Parallel-Homer p.233f) but since we are hampered by ignorance of the preceding line's content, we cannot choose between the two meanings. The form given by the papyrus would seem to be a hyperdorism, the supposed equivalent of a nonexistent *χερσί*: contrast 12.18, 54.1 below.

τὸν δ' ἀμειβόμενος ποτέφα.

the phrase is clearly modelled on such Homeric line-end formulae as ἀμειβόμενος δὲ προσεύθα ἐπέεσιν προσεύπευν or τὸν δ' αὖ(τ')..., ἀμειβόμενος προσεύπευν/ἀμείβετο φώνησέν τε. In view of the verb at the start of 6, we should pay particular attention to Il.20.199f (200f = 431 f): τὸν δ' αὖτ' Ἀνευος ἀμείβετο φώνησέν τε | Πηλείδη, μὴ δ' ὑπεέσει γε νηπίτουν δὲ | ἐλπεύ δεδίκεισθαι, and

22.329: δῆφα τὸ μὴ προτειέστω ἀμειβόμενος ἐπέεσι.

1So Nöthiger p.77 who compares *χερσί*/*χελσί* (> *χηρσί*) with *χέρπ/χετπ*, where however there are obvious metrical advantages in the alternative form.
Apart from S's own δικενμειν ... (S25 below) and τὸν δ' ὄδ' ᾀμειβόμενος ποτέ ἔδω (S 148·6-7) the nearest lyric parallel is Bacch. 5·519: καὶ νῦν ᾀμειβόμενος τάδε ἑφα. For more remote analogies c.f. Führer, Form-problem etc. pp.45-6. A speech begins here with the epode just as a speech begins in Sl2·4 at the antistrophe.

4: θανάτωο
the ending might be -οῖο or -οῖc, but when we realise that the word is part of a designation of the replying Geryon, θανάτωο becomes inevitable (see below p. 144). And genealogy, guided by metre, leads us to Mr. Barrett's supplements. This will be the only genealogy which talks of Chrysaor as immortal, but that is a fact explicable by noting that the number of authors who say anything at all about him is minute. And his credentials are good: father Poseidon, mother Medusa (admittedly the one mortal Gorgon of the three) and his full brother Pegasus, definitely an eternal being: c.f. Pind. Οἰ. 13·92: τὸν δ' ἔν οὐλόμωτι φάτναι ζηνός ἀρχαίᾳ δέκονται (note the present tense).

5: μὴ μοι θαλ
μοι: θαλ must be the beginning of "death", ἵτα the end of an adj. agreeing with it, and then there is a snug space between the two words for a participle governing them and clarifying their relation to the main verb of the next line. χρυσίςεις, used of Ἰωκή in II·5·740, φόβος in 9·2, πόλεμος in Hes. Th. 936 and Τάρταρος in Scut. 255 would be an appropriate epithet for θανατος here.

6: δεδίσκεξ'

7: μηδεμελ

various articulations present themselves: μηδ' ἐμε λ', μηδ' ἐμ' ἐλι, μηδὲ μελι, μηδὲ με λι. Because of ἔλεγχεα at 11-12 Barrett preferred to avoid Lobel's very tentative μηδὲ μ' ἐλεγχ- in favour of something beginning λι. S. is not very sensitive to such repetition: note within this passage alone φ[λε (16) ... φ[λ[λον (25), θ[ε[ὼν μακάρων (19) ... μακά[ρε]ζει [θε[ο[ίς (25-6) ἄ]θανατοι (3-4) ... ἄ]θανατος (8) and compare the latest papyrus find passim. At any rate Page has suggested μηδὲ με λίσσεο, while Mr. Barrett creates a supplement for the whole line with μηδὲ με λίθεοι κέλε' ἀλοιόις.

8 : αί μὲν γάρ ... αί δ' 

The two "if" clauses help constitute a passage which is based on an Homeric episode that has always (and deservedly) enjoyed a high reputation, both in antiquity and in more recent times. (For the former see e.g. Pind. Nem. 10.83ff quoted below, Cic. Phil. 10.20, Verg. Aen.
10.467ff: for the latter see the famous anecdote concerning Lord Granville first mentioned by Robert Wood, Essays on the Original Genius and Writings of Homer (London, 1775) p.vii). In 11.12 Sarpedon urges on Glaucus to join in the onslaught upon the Achaean Wall. For why else, he asks, do they both enjoy wealth and honour in Lycia unless to match these privileges by their prowess in war? And then these noble lines (322-8):

δὲ πέπον, εἰ μὲν γὰρ πόλεμον περὶ τόσδε φυγόντε
aιεὶ δὴ μέλλοιμεν ἀγνῆρ τ’ ἀθανάτω τε
ἐκκεκά’, οὕτε κεν αὐτὸς ἐνι πρώτοις μαχοίμην
οὕτε κε σὲ στέλλοιμι μάχην ἐς κυβιάνειραν'

υὸν δ’ ἐξιπὲς γὰρ κήρες ἐφεστάειν θανάτοιο
μυρία, ὥς οὖκ ἔστι φυγεῖν βροτῶν οὐδ’ ὑπαλάβαι,

ἔομεν, ἥ τωι εὐχὸς δρέξομεν, ἥ τις ἡμῖν.

Much of the pathos behind these words resides in the tragic impossibility of the first alternative: hence the optative mood. If only we could gain immortality on surviving this war, then of course it would be folly to court death by continuing to fight. But since we must, like all mortals, die sooner or later, let us fight and if we die—die with honour. Sarpedon himself does of course perish later on in the narrative as does Geryon.

S. Puts this great model to different use. The verb in Geryon’s first alternative, supply it how we may, terminates in ημα (19). It is indicative not optative, and the prospect it expresses is not unreal but perfectly
serious. Not surprisingly; the grandson of Poseidon and son of Chrysaor and an Oceanid has more reason than most to hope for inherited immortality. And if he is not immortal, then (somewhat like Sarpedon) he will fight Heracles and prefer honourable death to an old age of disgrace. That this last must be the general meaning which lurks behind the second alternative none deny (for details see below ad locc.). The first if-clause is more problematic: logic and Geryon's characterisation as a noble being demand something along the lines of "If I am going to be immortal, I will fight this hero and run no risk since he will be incapable of killing me." A neat and coherent sentiment which Page (pp.149-150) Barrett, and, I imagine, most other scholars, would dearly like to have occurred to S. as well as to us. But Mr. Barrett seriously doubts whether this meaning can be reconciled with the (admittedly exiguous) remains of the text at llf: χρέσσον ... καταγέεα rather suggests to him "If I am going to be immortal, it is better to endure disgrace and to allow Heracles to make away with my cattle." This indeed is what a direct transposition of Sarpedon's optatives into the indicative would entail, and since Page's article appeared Barrett has produced an ex gratia supplement that proves this sense could have been expressed here by S.

For another pair of if-clauses, indebted to the Homeric passage, or to S's, or perhaps both, c.f. Pind. Nem. 10.83ff: ει μεν θάνατον τε φυγών και γηρας ἀπεξόμενον

\[1\] For later poetry's tendency to convert to reality the mere wishes of Homeric epic see J. Griffin, J.H.S. 97 (1977) 42.
αὐτὸς ὁδηγηθεὶς τελείς ἦν εὐμὴν μειον. Βοεκής ἦσσεν τ’ Ὀδηγηθεὶς κελαίνει σχέτω τ’ ἀρεί ἢ ἐστὶ τοι τοῦτων λάθος ἐς δὲ κασιγυήτου πέρι ὑμᾶς, πάντων δὲ νοεῖς ἀποδάκτασο τοῦ ἴσον, ἡμικ μὲν κε πνεόμενε γαλαξ ὑπένερθεν ἐὼς, ἡμικ δ’ οὐρανοῦ ἐν χρυσέοις δόμοις. The similarity of thought is obvious.

8ff: both Page and Barrett provide neat supplements here, the former with ἂν μὲν γὰρ γένος ἄδανατος πέλοι μαί καὶ ἀγήγραοι δὴτε βλού πεδέχειν] ἐν Ὀλυμπῶι, the latter with ἂν μὲν γὰρ πέπον ἄδανατος ἔκοι μαί καὶ ἀγήγρως πᾶρ μακάρεσσι θεοῖς] ἐν Ὀλ.

If I find Barrett’s less attractive (in spite of the parallel between his πέπον (8) and ὑ πέπον (II.12-322) at the beginning of the Homeric passage here imitated) it is not because of the proximity of his πᾶρ μακάρεσσι θεοῖς (9) to similar phrases in 19 and 25 (see my note on 7 supr.) nor because of the mild illogicality of ἀγήγρως ἔσομαι (this sort of oddity is really unavoidable given the context). It is rather that the contracted form ἀγήγρως is alien to S. who regularly uses the uncontracted.

Mr. Barrett has now offered a fresh supplement which avoids this difficulty though it incurs another. See below p. 146.

Certainly ἄδανατος in the position proposed by both scholars seems inevitable. The epithets ἀγήγρως (τ’) ἄδανατος occur in juxtaposition at II.2.447, 17.444 and (most relevantly) in the speech of Sarpedon quoted above (II.12.323). For further instances of the collocation
of the two adjectives see the list given by West ad Hes. Theog. 277 (p.246). For their tragic significance in epic c.f. J. Griffin, J.H.S. 97 (1977) p.42 n.27.


11f: κρέσσον[ | ἔ]λέγχεα

Both Page and Barrett believe that these two words offer prima facie support for the thought-sequence: "if immortal, better to avoid disgrace." The former envisages the possibility of supplying "better to fight and avoid disgrace" but rejects that sentiment by itself as too similar to the apodosis of the second alternative below (22-4). But (1) S. notoriously "reundat atque effunditur" and the repetition might not be intolerable especially in comparison with the contents of the latest papyrus find. (2) There ought to be enough space after ἔλέγχεα to have contained ample matter to differentiate the two passages. But it is an awkward fact that none of us has actually managed to prove that S. could have said "if immortal, better to avoid disgrace" by producing a supplement, however tentative, to that effect. Mr. Barrett on the other hand has shown that the less noble and logical alternative can be conveyed in a series of supplements which he very kindly permits me to reproduce: αἰ μὲν γὰρ πέπον ἄθανατος τ’έκοι | μαί καὶ ἀγήρας ἀνέρα τόνδε φυγών | ἐν Ὄλυμπῳ, κρέσσον [με] καθήμενον ἐνθάδ’έ] | λέγχεα δέκαι [ἐπέα] | καὶ τ[ο]δ’ὑπαλεύμενον ἂλκαν] κερακο-μένας ἐπὶ δὴν βόας ἄ[ | μετέρωγν ἄπονοσοφιν ἐπαύλων]. For the feminine βόας c.f.1.27 below. Neither Mr. Barrett nor
myself is pleased with the position of the phrase ἀνέρα τόνδε ψυγῶν proposed for line 9 where it very clumsily interrupts the natural sequence ἀθάνατος ... καὶ ἀγήραος .... ἐν Ὁλόμπωι. But these three words are by no means essential to the rest of the supplements which could, for instance, be combined with Page's version of 8-10. Some more serious objections can be raised against this reconstruction (they have already been marshalled to maximum effect by Professor Page p.150):

(1) Geryon's reasoning is bad: as Page puts it with epigrammatic clarity "The man who says that, if mortal, he prefers death to disgrace, is not likely to say that, if immortal, he prefers disgrace to death" (p.150). Cannot Geryon see that he is proposing quite the worst of both worlds for himself? "If I am immortal I will sit by, though Heracles cannot hurt me, and endure the loss of my cattle. If on the other hand I am mortal I will risk death and destruction in trying to recover them."

(2) Geryon's reasoning is poltroonish: after the apparent bold defiance of μὴ μοι θάνατον προφέρων κρυόνεντα δεδίκε· ἀγάνορα θυμόν, the sequel "do not try to frighten me with talk of death - for if I am immortal I shall simply not sally forth" comes as a lame anticlimax, a crushing piece of bathos. That, after all, must have been the end which Menoetes was previously urging upon his friend. And yet Geryon is represented by S. as a noble and sympathetic figure. If he really did continue thus "it would be almost a travesty of Homer" to quote Page again.
(3) Geryon's reasoning is impractical: "If I am immortal, I will not fight; if I am mortal, I will fight." And how, pray, is Geryon to find out whether he is immortal or not? Anyone who thinks he can answer that question had better remember that for the interpretation to work Geryon must be able to learn the truth with all the speed of greased lightning. Otherwise his new-gained knowledge will come too late for him to stop Heracles, who has already killed the herd's guardian, from sailing off with the cattle.

In other words, although the transference of the Iliadic motif from the mortal Sarpedon to the potentially immortal son of Chrysaor caused some difficulties, one would like to think S. managed it in a less cack-handed manner than this, and did more than blithely change optatives to indicatives and hope for the best. No-one, I think, will deny for a moment the validity of these charges. But no more can anyone deny they are ultimately what Mr. Barrett has called "potential criticisms of S." rather than decisive proofs that S. could not and did not produce such a sentiment. Indeed Barrett's supplements for 11·11ff show that it is perfectly possible to devise Greek words of the right proportions which will express it. This has not yet been done for the more logical and dignified statement which we would all prefer to put in Geryon's mouth. Apart from this there is little hope at present of deciding between the alternatives. Merely to hope
that S. employed the more pleasing of them comes
dangerously near to circularity of argument. It is sad
that at the heart of one of S's finest passages we cannot.
say for certain just how effectively the transposition of
a great Homeric model was accomplished. But the notion
that he must have done so very competently indeed is a
preconception unsupported by our text as it stands.

κρέευν

"Neither Homeric nor Doric, so far as is known" says Lobel
(p.13) but as West observes (C.Q. 21 (1971) p.304 n.3) its
Mus. Helv. 24 (1967) 64) suggests an Ionic origin
(for Homeric κρείευν as a possible Atticism see Chantraine,

εἰςλεγχέα

as Lobel notes (p.13) the papyrus' accentuation here
implies the adj. ελεγχής ("contemptible") as in Il.4.242,
24.239 (the abusive vocative pl. ελεγχέεις) Nonnus 40.35
(μόθον ελεγχέα) Hesych. s.v. ελεγχέεις αίσχρον (2.63 Latte).
An unattested -ελεγχής compound seems an unlikely alter-
native. Lobel nevertheless prefers to take the word as a
substantive ("disgraces" as in Od. 21.329, Pind. Nem. 3.15
etc.) but Barrett's supplementation of this line shows how
the adj. would fit.

14: κέρα

possibly some part of κέραςεν rather than a reference to
the horns of Geryon's cattle.
15: αἵ δὲτι: far distant from its accompanying αἵ μέν (8): compare the Homeric and Pindaric passages cited above.

16:

a noun ending in -ρας can only be γῆρας or πείρας.
Page's άτυχέρον μ' ἐπὶ γῆρας would cut a bridge that is maintained in all other attestable places (see p.90) and one might think of χρή μ' ἐπὶ λόγον γῆρας: c.f. 11·19.

336: γῆρας τέ ετυχέρων Ἀρ. Ῥόδ. 4·872:ετυχέρον χρονί γῆρας
Posidippus GLP 114·4; Od. 24·249f: γῆρας λύγρων Πινδ.
Nem. 10·83: γῆρας ἀπεθάνομενον, Lloyd-Jones, J.H.S. 83 (1963) 84. Both epithets are paralleled then; against the latter it must be said that there is as yet no proof of Stesichorean variation in the treatment of mute + liquid within one poem, especially at such close quarters.

18: ἐν ἐφαμερίοις

19: -suffix
a preposition + gen. meaning "apart from the gods" is required: ἄνευς or ἀπάνευς. Either can be reconciled with the metre: ἐν ἐφαμερίοις ἄνευς or ἐν ἐφαμερίοις ἀπάνευς. Alternatively -οις ἄτερες or -οις ἀπάτερες may be considered.

20: νῦν μοι πολύ καλλιόν ἔστι παῦν
for the language of Page's supplement c.f. Hor. Od. 1.11·3: ut melius quidquid est pati, with N-H ad loc. (p.139). As an alternative Barrett suggests exempli gratia νῦν μοι πολύ καλλιόν ἀμφιέπεν

- 150 -
20ff: the general sense here must be something like: "It is far more καλόν for me to endure whatever is fated, so that shame and disgrace may not attend on me and all my family from the lips of those who tell hereafter of the son of Chrysaor; may not that be the will of the blessed gods." And so ex. gr.: δτι μόρσιμου ἢ, μὴ ἐλεγχεῖα! καὶ δνείδετ' ἐμοὶ τε γένηταί! καὶ παντὶ γένει, παιρ' ἄεικομένων] ὅπλων Χρυσάολροις υἱὸν κτλ. The supplements in lines 21-22 are due to Barrett, that in 23 to West.

Führer (R p. 8) now reminds us that these by no means exhaust the possibilities: δτι μόρσιμον ἢ θάνατον προφυγήν] καὶ δνείδει a (Snell p. 119 n. 1) παιεὶ φιλοις καὶ παντὶ γένει καταχειμεύειν εξὶ ὁπίς. Compare for 21 Il. 2.401: εὐχόμενος θάνατον τε φυγεῖν Pind. Nem. 10.83: θάνατον τε φυγὼν (note too the whole context quoted above) Bacch. fr. 60-29 Sn. προφυγεῖν θᾶ[νατον] S27:2 φυγῆν: for 22 παλάς τε φίλοις in this very poem (S17.7) and my note on 22 below and for 23 Od. 22.463f: αἱ δὴ θυμὶ κεφαλῆι κατ' ὄνειδεα ἵππαν μητέρι ἑ' ἡμετέρηι. The phrasing here seems less natural to my ears at least, but the supplement for 23 preserves a synapheia with 24 that is maintained in all other places (see p. 90).

21: δτι μόρσιμον

C.f. μόρσιμον ἐστὶ in P. Lille 76.212, το μόρσιμον ἐστὶ γενέθαι vel γενέθαι ib. 274.
καὶ παντὶ γένει


if we take this word in isolation, Führer's ἡξοπίσσω (p.678) is preferable to Page's ὀπίσσω because the latter articulation would contravene the ban on word-end between lines 2 and 3 of str./ant. which is respected in every one of the six attested instances (see above p.90). It might be thought that Geryon's reference to himself in the third person should be the object of some such verb as West supplies, and there is not really enough room for that participle and ἡξο- too. But Führer's supplement (above
p. 151) shows how ἐξοπίσω can be fitted in. The word now occurs in P. Lille 76-202.

Xρυσίδονας ὑπόν

for this sort of proud reference to oneself in the third person see West on Hes. Theog. 22 (p. 161).

25f: μὴ τοῦτο φιλον μακάρεσσι δεέοις | ἔνιοιτο

C.f. Od. 1.82: εἰ μὲν δὴ ύνων τοῦτο φιλον μακάρεσσι δεέοις

7.316: μὴ τοῦτο φιλον Δίι πατρὶ γένοιτο.

26: περὶ θουεῖν ἐμαῖς


28. Ἰκλεός ἢ

As Lobel says (p. 14) ‘Ἡρακλέος must be considered. But in the context of the preceding lines, κλέος would be just as likely.
The two words which alone survive from 1·7 strongly suggest that a parent is addressing a son: we think at once of Callirhoa's appeal to Geryon in S13. But how relate the two fragments? S12 is from the foot of col. VI; S13 (which undeniably represents the pathetic appeal of mother to son) is from an unknown column, but not from VI or VII, and if from VIII not from the same VIII as S14, the council of the gods. These considerations would suggest that if S13 is closely connected with S12 it comes before it, in one of cols. I-V. But the third line of our fragment renders this conclusion problematical.

Barrett remarks that his interpretation of the traces of the papyrus ([[δοῖμα]]) suggests the introduction to a speech: perhaps δοῖμα τε νικήμενον ποτέφα - she saw him coming and she addressed him." ποτέφα introduces a speech beginning with the epode in S11·3. Even without this supposition we must grant that the phrase is a most unlikely means of introducing Callirhoa's second speech to Geryon, especially when it would come so soon after the first. One would far rather conclude that if the two fragments in question belong together, S13 came before 12. But consider the consequences of such an hypothesis.

Either Barrett's attractive placing of 14's council of the
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gods must be abandoned - for 13 cannot come a mere two columns before 14: that would not leave adequate space for fr.12 - or a whole sequence of 13 columns must be inserted between S13 and 14, and the interview between mother and son must have continued for over 15 triads (= 73 ll + 463 ll).

According to the hypothesis outlined above, a direct speech will begin with the antistrophe. Since ambiguous forms such as νικαί or νικαν would have been interpreted by accentuation in the papyrus there is little room for manoeuvre in the restoration of the speech's first line: νικα[τ c τι] κράτος or νικα [τ c δὲ] κράτος. The latter would be a very odd way to begin a speech. Bacch. fr.4-21ff (Sn.) δὲ τ' ἔφα' | ἀυτήματοι δ'' авгαδων〈ἐς〉 δαίτας ἐνδήθουσε ἐπέρχονται δικαίοι | ἡμέτερος is the only (very eccentric) parallel, νικαίτι κράτος offers even less promising sense. Führer (R p.9 n.79) suggests νικαί τὸν κράτος comparing the Homeric τὰ χερσινῖα νικάι (Il.1.576 = Od. 18.404). There are parallels for a gnomic commencement of this sort in lyric speeches (Formprobl. p.143 and n.43) but apart from the obstacle in the absence of any accent on the papyrus for νικαί, the definite article is an unstesichorean feature. Page was quite justified then in abandoning the νικαί of J.H.S. 93 (1973) 140 in favour of the νικαί of S.L.G. p.8.

7: πείθευ

Although the initial π survives only in the form of a speck on the line, no other letter gives any sense. We must, then, follow Barrett in emending the Attic πείθου with which the papyrus presents us to the form we expect of S.

9f: αἵλοχος-

a very common epithet of Zeus (c.f. Bruchmann, Epitheta Deorum p.123).

Compare S56.2: τῇερπικερα[υν]̣.
The distressed woman who speaks here must be identified with Geryon's mother Callirhoë, as Lobel first realised (p.10) on the basis of 11.22-82ff inf. cit. Her appearance at this stage can only serve to increase the audience's sympathy for her son. (Vase-depictions of her are discussed above p.98). For the number of letters missing at the start of 6ff, Barrett's supplements at 3, 5 and 8 provide a fairly close index. A further guide is afforded by statistics assembled for another purpose (see below p.586) which show that 9's \( \text{\textcircled{v}} \) requires (out of a sample of 100) an average of 9, a maximum of 11 letters, and 10's \( \text{\textcircled{w}} \) (out of a sample of 75) an average of 12 or 13 (only twice sinking to 10 as the very lowest minimum).

The papyrus' accentuation \( \alpha\alpha\varepsilon \) tells us that by the modern system of accentuation, a syllable subsequent to these vowels must bear the accent. (On the papyrus' word-division here see my note on 515.12). This excludes \( \alpha\lambda\alpha\gamma\rho\omicron\nu\omicron\omicron \) but not of course a derivative or compound of that word, and Barrett's supplement, though not in the lexica, is linguistically possible. It is also of the right dimensions (an eight-letter supplement matching well the seven-letter supplement in 5) and produces a highly effective piece of rhetoric that elegantly circumvents what at first sight seemed a clumsy repetition. The lines may then be intended to recall another Homeric passage where mother reproaches son: 11.1.414: \( \delta \mu\omicron\omicron \).
τέκνον ἐμῶν, τί νῦ c’έτρεψον αἶνα τεκνίας; (Thetis to Achilles).

άλας]τα παθοῖσα


4: Barrett avows that νῦν δὲ σε is too long a supplement, and ἀλλὰ σε too short. The first statement is true; I am less certain about the second which one would like to be wrong, since a phrase of intermediate length is hard to devise. Note the striking correction γονάζομαι αἱ— which here accompanies the rhetorical pause at the cut.

According to L.S.J. s.v., γονάζομαι is a verb confined to epic.

αἱ ποικίλον τίν μαζ[ον] ἐπέσχ—
c.f. 11.22.82ff (Hecuba appeals to Hector not to confront Achilles): εἰ ποτὲ τοι λαθυκηδέα μαζὼν ἐπέσχον. The self-same verbal form (or Pages’s -χεον) must have ended our line. The humanisation of Geryon is complete, and amid the pathos we forget to ask exactly how a three-headed infant was breast-fed.¹

ἐμῶν τίν provides the only extant instance in the poem of word-end after single-syllable biceps (see above p.85).

¹Professor Kassel mischievously compares Plut. amic. mult. 95ε: δύσπερ οὖν ὁ Βροιάρεως ἐκατόν χερσίν εἶλε πεντήκοντα φορὸν γαστερὰς οὖδέν ἦμῶν πλέον εἰκε τῶν ἀπὸ δυεῖν χεροῖν μιᾶν κοιλίαν διοικοῦντον ...
Führer (Hermes 97 (1969) p.115 n.2) must be right to explain this anomaly in terms of the exceptional treatment allowed to monosyllabic postpositives: c.f. Archilochus 2·1 W: μοι | μᾶλα, Callim- Hymn. 3·7: μοι | Φοῖβος, Maas GM §137.

8: γανωθ’
-είς or -έντα? In either case the aorist tense is odd if Callirhoa is inviting her son to delight in good cheer (εὐφροσύνη). Neither is attested but c.f. ἡγανώθην from γανώω in Arist. Ach. 7.

Ἰέα πέπλον
Perhaps, as Barrett suggests, Callirhoa has by now finished speaking and is unfastening her robe to expose her breast as does Hecuba (Il·22·80: κόλπων ἀνεμένη, ἐτέρησε δε μαζων ἀνέσχε). The robe may have been fragrant (Barrett's ἦφώδεα) and Il·22·81 (καὶ μιν δάκρυ χέους, ἐπεα πτερόεντα προσηόδα) suggests one way of completing the line: Führer’s ὥς φαίνα (R p.9). Compare ὥς φάτο in a similar position at the start of the triad in S88 ii 15, 107·7, 148·6, P. Lille 76·232.
The Council of the Gods: Athena is addressing her uncle Poseidon. The details will be clarified ad locc. Here we may ask ourselves about the placing of the fragment: Barrett rightly draws a comparison with the killing of Hector in Iliad 22.22ff, a region of the Homeric epic on which S. has already drawn (see p.158). After Achilles has caused Hector's flight, Zeus questions all the gods who are engrossedly observing the mortal scene: shall they save Hector or let him die? Athena indignantly objects to the first idea, and Zeus, despite his personal sympathies, gives way. And Athena flies down to earth to encourage the commencement of the combat by her own intervention. This pattern will have been followed here: our fragment comes from the foot of col. VIII, and S15 begins in the middle of col.XI with Heracles planning to attack Geryon. If the two columns come from the same sequence, 73 lines will intervene between 14 and S15. And that would give us a concilium deorum in much the same position as in Iliad 22. After rejecting the entreaties of S13, Geryon must have gone in search of Heracles and his cattle and before he found them the gods will have met and provided an interlude: Athena spoke to Poseidon, Poseidon probably replied, and then presumably the audience's attention was shifted back to Geryon as he came upon Heracles. All this would easily fit into 73 lines. Problems only arise if we try to introduce Iris because of her presence on vase 4 (see p.103 supr.). If she has to receive
instructions from Athena and repeat them to Heracles, our 73 lines become dangerously crowded. A more economic solution would have Athena contact Heracles directly, as the Iliadic parallel and vase depictions suggest.

1: μὴ μνε

Since it is hard to see why one single deity should be described as having stayed with Zeus, there is much to be said in favour of Barrett’s οὐ γὰρ τις μὴ μνε παραὶ Δία παυμ. Θεῶν. So interested are the deities in the impending battle that they desert Olympus in order to watch at close quarters: none of the gods stays with Zeus.


μακασιλῆ

c.f. Alcaeus 308 (2b 3-4): (τὸν) Μαῖα γέννατο Κρονίδα μὲ; εἰς Orph. Hymn. 73.3 (Quandt): ἥνα μέγαν ... μακασιλῆ. For the feminine noun c.f. Aristoph. Nub. 357: ὁ παμβασιλεῖα 1150: ὁ παμβασιλεία Ἀπαίδη (both parodies of hymnic formulae) and eight instances in the Orphic Hymns.¹ The phrase Ζεὺς βασιλεὺς is of course very common: see Fraenkel on Aesch. Ag. 355 (2.186f).

3: γλαυκῶπις Ἀθάνα

Homer passim, and regularly at verse-end (c.f. Schmidt, Parallel-Homer p.44).

The two epithets are both Homeric, though Homer applies neither to Poseidon. He uses the first of Odysseus (Od. 4.333), Heracles (Il.14.324), and the Dioscuri (Od. 11.299), the second of Patroclus in the Iliad (16.126, 584, 839). According to LSJ, ἵπποκ. recurs only in A.P. 9.210.9 (Θοῦ ἐπ ... γένος Οὐνων). But the former adjective is elsewhere used of Athene (Ibyc. 298.3.Ρ, I.G.1² (ed. min.) 503 ), and of Poseidon again in Quint. Sm. 8.394.

Haslam observes (p.20 n.22) that πάτρω (Page's supplement) straddles an area where word-end occurs regularly in all five attested cases: see above p.89. But the word here is so unavoidable that doubt is cast upon the inevitability of diaeresis. Line 4 cannot end with κρατερόν since the left-hand upper angle of the nu would be visible: κρατερόν then, demanded by the traces and by its application elsewhere to Poseidon. This leaves room for no more than ἐν before ἵπποκ. and πάτρω is required by the space on the papyrus and the preceding ἔν. It is also a word we know S. to have used elsewhere (228 P).

6f: "ἄγ’ ὑποσχέσθης μεμνημένος ἐν περ ὑπέστας.

C.f. Il.2.286: ὑποσχέσθη ἦν περ ὑπέσταν, Od. 10.483: ὑποσχέσθη ἦν περ ὑπέστης.

At first sight the sequence ὑποσχέσθης μεμνημένος ... Γαρουνάν Ἐνατέου implies the general supplement "remember your promise [and save] Geryon from death." Poseidon as
Geryon's paternal grand-father would be only too glad to do that, but Heracles' perennial patroness (see above p. 99) can hardly be urging him to do so! Page (in LGS p. 265) tried to obviate that difficulty by putting a defiant gloss on the goddess' words: "Remembering your former promise to Geryon, try to save him if you can; I will help Heracles and make sure he kills his opponent nevertheless."

but that first phrase coheres ill with the rest of the sentence. In the heroic world—as in most others—the demand "remember your promise" inevitably precedes a request for the fulfilment rather than the non-fulfilment of the original promise. So it is in the two Homeric passages cited above.

It is therefore more convenient to accept (as Page now does (p.150)) Mr. Barrett's solution: "remember your promise to me and do not try to save Geryon from death".

So e.g. μὴ βοήθεο γαρ νόμαν θεονάτου ἵνα σωθητί (for which c.f. Alc. 344.7 ἔκακος θεονάτῳ δοκεῖ.)

We have no proof as to how Athena managed to extract such a promise from her uncle, but the supposition places no strain on our credulity.
First of all, I will reproduce Lobel's remarks (p.5) about the traces here: "of ο only the base, of ω only the base of the left-hand part and a trace of the adjoining base of the right-hand part; between ο and ω the foot of an upright. [two dots, one on, one just below the line; perhaps two letters." To begin with the letter betwixt ο and ω, it can hardly be anything other than iota as Fuhrer has seen (p.679). All vowels except this would create an unthinkable sequence of vowels, any consonant would produce a short syllable, and — would be illicit at any point of the poem's metrical scheme. Iota is also a satisfying interpretation of the mark on the papyrus and offers a wide number of possible articulations.

5-11: Heracles must have caught sight of the approaching Geryon, and he here debates, at characteristically Stesichorean length, what tactics to use against him.

5: νόωι δίελε

1 As has been appreciated by O. Musso, Aegyptus 49 (1969) 73. But he overlooks the possibility that omicron was followed by another vowel, and arrives at a reading contrary to the papyrus' traces, as does B. Gentili, Gnomon 48 (1976) p.747 n.13, who accepts the improbable notion of the correption δδλων.
Page and Barrett both interpret this as διέλεινυ: the former translates "Hercules distinguished between different courses of action", the latter "Hercules decided", which he characterises as "a rather odd use." This would indeed be the verb's earliest appearance with these senses (LSJ s.v. διαιρέω III 1 and 2). One wonders if νῶλ διέλεινυ ἐξήμων was intended: c.f. Hes. Op.499: κακά προελέξατο ἔμωι and now West's note ad loc. (p.284).

7: ἐδοάκατο ὦ (or γάρ;) suggested by Diggle (C.R. 20 (1970) p.5 n.1) as supplement on analogy with the very common Homeric formula δοσε δε ὦ φρονίωντι δοάκατο κέρδιον ἐναι. (Il.13.458, 14.23, 16.652; Od. 15.204, 18.93, 22.238, 24.239 c.f. Od. 10.153: δοσε δε μοι κτλ.).

Euboean Ionic according to Bechtel, Die Griechische Dialekte 3.180, citing inscriptional instances from Olynthus (Dittenberger 135.3.13.15) Eretria (I.G. 12.9, 220.8) and Oropus (Ditt. 2585.7 c.f. Ib. 1004.30). See further Thumb-Scherer, Handbuch der gr. Dialekte 2 (Heidelberg (1959)) pp.280f. There is no way of avoiding this dialect (no parallel for εἶναι with elision before a vowel for instance: apparent cases of elided infinitive endings in -αι at Theogn. 104, 286, 565 are illusory: see West's text) and no real need to avoid it. The Euboean εἶναι might well reflect the influence of those Euboean Chalcidians who helped found Himera, upon the town's spoken dialect. So Nöthiger (p.17) and West,


Unelided εἶναι is excluded of course by the rules of word-division between lines, which enjoin a syllable's division after its vowel: see p.167.
8: λάθραί πολέμετίν
"Gegensatz zum offenen Kampf" says Ebeling's Lexicon Homericum I (Lips. 1885) p. 965 s.v. and it must be some such open confrontation with Geryon that Heracles rejected here as the worse course. The line may well have commenced ἁπάνευθε κὸνοντά, as Mr. Barrett surmises: Heracles decides to keep at a distance and make war covertly against the powerful Geryon.

9: κραταῖοι
Presumably Geryon himself, so supply perhaps ἀνδρὶ or φωτὶ κραταῖοι with Page (p.150).

10: εὕριξ (Barrett) is a more likely reading of the papyrus than εἴριξ (Page LGS p. 268). It is an Homeric word (II.11.251, 15.541) glossed by Σ 11.251 as ἐκ τοῦ πλαγίου (3.171 Erbse: c.f. 4.118 Erbse) "on one side". Both Iliadic lines begin κτῇ δ' εὕριξ κῦν δορὶ λαθὼν. Compare λάθραί above. We need a participle before the word and Page's βεβαώς δ' (LGS p. 268) or more vivid πτάξας δ' (p.151) gives the general sense. We need a participle because κατέφραζετ[ό] is the main verb of the sentence. Fr. 5 of P. Oxy. 2617 (Joi) fits nicely at the end of the line, and we must then prefer Lobel's κατέφραζετ[ό] οί to his κατέφραζε τ[ό]ι because this latter is metrically impossible. For κατέφραζε - c.f. Od. 15.444: ἐπιφράσσετ' (note that δλεόρον is the object of both verbs), and my note on the next line.

11: πιλερόν
not Homeric. Homer only has αἰπός, λυγρός, of δλεὸρον. But λύγρον δλεὸρον at line-end (Schmidt Parallel-Homer 135) is a close enough parallel.


12: πρός is not a form to be looked for in S. where we expect the Doric ποτί (though c.f. S88 ii 6) and four passages from Homer show us what to make of these four letters: 11-12-294: ἄσπιδα μὲν πρός ἔσχετο 20-162-3: ἄσπιδα δομιν πρόσδεν ἔχε στέρνοντο 22-313: πρόσδεν δὲ σάμος στέρνοντο 7-224: (σάμος) πρόσδε στέρνον ψέρων. The combat as depicted on vases suggests that the shield is being held by Geryon not Heracles, perhaps in front of his chests rather than chest. Page's supplements give what must have been the general sense.

A small but interesting point of principle may be raised concerning the presentation of this line. In LGS p.267 and JHS 93 (1973) p.142 its final four letters are printed as πρός, in SLG p.11 πρός and the app. crit. in all three records the supplement πρός... But in ancient texts, the elided syllable, together with the consonants belonging to it, are invariably placed in the same line as the vowel before which it is elided (c.f. E.G. Turner, Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World (Oxford 1971) pp.19-20 with the literature cited at p.19 n.3). Compare e.g. the printing of Eur. Hipp. 221-2 in W.S. Barrett's text: ἐπιλογχον ἔχου c: c.f. Lloyd-Jones,
Why not προσεκαθαρίζων here too? Turner notes exceptions, especially (p.20) "between doubled consonants or two consonants, the first of which was a liquid or a hard or a sibilant." Compare ἀλαξάτοροικος in this very papyrus (S13.2-3: note that the sigma has been added as an afterthought). If we wish to be correct, then, we should print πρὸς τῆς ἀδὸς ἀπὸ κτλ. in the app. crit. And more than pedantry is at stake since the scribe's word-division can sometimes make or break a supplement proposed for a papyrus text.¹

¹See e.g. Bacch. 13.153f where Page's μελαινθεῖς' Ἐκτροπλέας (C.R. 13 (1963) 109) can be ruled out because (by the rules mentioned above) the first word would have been divided μελαινθεῖ- | Α' Ἐκτροπλέας which is one letter too long for 1.154's lacuna. I owe this observation to Mr. Barrett.
14ff: "Then from Geryon's head ... the horse-plumed helmet ... on the ground". This is all we know certainly: but it is possible to conjecture what stood once in the lost parts of the papyrus. First of all, what is "on the ground"? "One of Geryon's bodies", seems the least likely of answers. It does not cohere with the other two extant phrases, and I cannot see how one or even two wounded bodies could come to rest on the ground while at least one was able to struggle on uninjured. This will be especially true if the upper parts of Geryon met together in the abdomen, as Apollodorus pictures them (see p.235). The slain portions will merely slump downwards without bringing down the rest of the elaborate structure with which nature has endowed Geryon. Besides, if Geryon's first body were being disposed of here, the poet must needs have sped on at an uncharacteristic gallop to the slaying of the second body in col.ii lff. And the mere thirteen lines that separate the two stages of the narrative cannot have enjoyed the detailed treatment which he bestows so freely everywhere else in the surviving fragments.

Far more plausible proposals are that Heracles has shot an arrow at Geryon's head, but the helmet he bears wards it off so that the missile falls to the ground (the hypothesis favoured by Mr. Barrett) or that Heracles has lobbed a stone at Geryon's head and thus succeeds in knocking off the helmet which itself tumbles onto the ground (so Professor Page). Each interpretation has
something to be said in its favour; each likewise faces some obstacles. Mr. Barrett's would neatly explain the stop in the papyrus after τριφίλας by positing a change of subject from helmet to arrow. Nor am I much deterred from it by Page's observation (p.151) that we must then accept that a brief description of an unsuccessful shot preceded a longer account of a successful one. How is this objectionable? S. "redundat atque effunditur" as Page is well aware, and Homeric heroes provide numerous precedents for detailed narrations of initial misses. Admittedly these stray shots are often given additional point by virtue of their hitting someone else. But this is not always so (see especially 11.21.164ff)

and S. might well have adopted the motif even though in the combat limited to Heracles and Geryon there could be no incidental and ill-starred person to intercept a misdirected weapon. I am more impressed by Page's citation of ii 7ff: for there an arrow passes through Geryon's forehead. A helmet is not easily pierced by an arrow: Heracles shoots at his helmeted opponent's eyes on vases 3 and 4 and at his throat on vase 1, (see above p.93) but the language of S's passage gives no grounds for supposing a helmet worn by Geryon is being circumvented in this way. Indeed there is no mention of the helmet referred to in i 16, though if S. did believe an arrow might penetrate a helmet he would surely have described its passage through the enclosing metal in imitation of such Iliadic episodes as 3.357ff 4.135ff etc.
Geryon is probably bare-headed by ii 7ff then, and furthermore the very full description of the arrow's progress here (together with the mention of its poisoned head at ii 3-4) implies that this weapon is only now being employed for the first time. It is therefore likelier that our lines depict Geryon's loss of his helmet. 8 enjoins that the attack be covert: Heracles squeezes every benefit he can from his advantageous position by exposing his adversary's head with a stone from a distance (as opposed to his club at close quarters) and then shoots the surprised Geryon through the head with an arrow before he can regain his helmet. A thoroughly cogent and coherent plan. The tactic is not displayed on any vases, but that is hardly an insuperable objection.

16: ἵπποκόμως τρυφάλετι

c.f. ἵπποκόμων τρυφαλείδων in Il.12 (not 13 pace LSJ sv ἵπποκομ.) 339. The Iliad also uses it of a κόρυς (13.132 15.216 etc.) and a πῆληξ (16.797).

17: ἐπὶ ζαπέδωι

on the form (secondary to ζάπεδον) see Richardson on H.H. Dem. 283 (pp.254-5), West on Xenophon, fr.1.1 W (Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus p.188f).
1: ίών
perhaps φέρων (Führer p.679 and Barrett).

2: τέ[λος]
κεφαλὰ used of an arrow's head: c.f. Bacch. 5.74: χαλκεό-κρανον...[ῶν.
[πότυμον]; the frequent association of π. and θάνατος in Homer (c.f. LSJ sv.π.) supports Barrett's supplement.

3: πεφορυ[γ]μένος αἵματι
c.f. Od. 9.397: πεφυμένον αἵματι (both phrases are in practically the same metrical position).
The word is divided here before -γ-M- as at S12.5/6 and 32.2/3 in this papyrus. See my note on i 12 above.
4: χολαί: the word hints at the story presupposed by Sophocles in Tr. 574 and 831ff. For Heracles' use of the Hydra's gall as a poison c.f. Apollod 2.5.2 (τὸ δὲ σῶμα τῆς Ἡδόρας ἀνασχίσας (scil. ὃ Ἡρακλῆς) τῇ χολῇ τούς οἴκτοὺς ἐβασίσευ) Paus. 2.37, Hyg. Fab. 30.3, Diod. 4.11.38. Its mention here seems superfluous (in a very Stesichorean way) since the arrow by itself deals a sufficiently mortal wound not to need such expedients. But perhaps S. is thinking ahead (or back) to the Pholus story, where a poisoned arrow may have played an important part. (See p. 209 below). 

5: ὀλειδώρος

Previously only known as an epithet of ὀρκοὶ (Theogn. 399, Nonnus Dion. 28.273) with an allusion to the effects of perjury. Musso (Aegyptus 49 (1969) 72) would now supplement Hes. fr.23A·30 as κτείνε δὲ μητέρα ἥν ὀλευς("",ορὰ κτλ. which seems to me superior to all other suggestions so far. For the form compare the Stesichorean λιπεσδώρος (223.5 P) which is also similar in sense and metre. There are Homeric analogies for the present adjective, but we may well find the differences more striking than the similarities. Od. 10.510 has ἄτατ ὀλευσιφόροι at line-end, but that epithet has the peculiar ὀ(λ--) (which is itself an unusual instance of metrical lengthening) and refers to trees. φθεικήωρο as an epithet of πώλεμος five times in the Iliad brings us nearer home, and

1 The use of poisoned arrows is unhomeric (see Murray, The Rise of the Greek Epic4 (1934) p.129f). In the Iliad and Odyssey a hero's wound is automatically mortal, though Σ Od. 1.260, ignorant of this convention, explains Odysseus' visit to Ephyra in search of poison thus: προκατεκεύασεν ἣνα μὴ ζητόμεν πῶς ἀπὸ μιᾶς πληγῆς ἀναιροῦνται οἱ μυητήρες.
μάχη φθιείμβορος (II. 13·339) should not be overlooked.

At this point, Nöthiger (p. 15·7) following in the wake of Th. Knecht (see my note on λιπεσάνωρας (p.326)) tentatively postulates a now lost *"Αρης ὀλεσήνωρ as the "missing link" between the epic formula πόλεμος φθείμβορο and the Stesichorean ὀλεσάνωρ Ἴδρα.

The form of our adjective displays the same puzzling feature as its relative in 223 P, with the additional difficulty that the feminine construction is the same as the masculine. There is no epic precedent for this:- Homer changes his masc. ἰωρό to fem. ἰνειρό whether its prefix be ἀντι- βοτι- or καθι- . But it must be said that later poets abandon this practice and, like S., use ἰνωρ as a feminine ending: Bacchylides' φιλάνωρ, Pindar's ἀγ- εό- μεγαλ- φιλ-ἀνωρ, and Aeschylus' ἀστεργάνωρ and φιλάνωρ all tell the same tale.

Since ὀλεσάνωρ as a form is easier to deduce than λιπεσάνωρ there may be something to Nöthiger's suggestion that it came first and created an analogy for the construction of its partner.

αιολοδείρων

αιολόδειροι πανέλοπες (Ibyc. 317A) can no longer be cited as the first example of the word. It is interesting to note that Ibycus uses the adjective of unexceptionable creatures, as do late poets (e.g. Opp. C. 2·317 (περδίκες) Nonn. D. 12·76 (χελιδών) 47·31 (Ἀδηδών)).
Not so S. here. αἴόλος occurs in Soph. Tr. 1.1 of a snake and at 834 in the same play of the Hydra itself. Does it refer to the speckled skin of a snake or its sheeny scales?

In apposition, remarkably, to χολαί. "Agonies from the man-slaying Hydra" must mean "agony provided by the Hydra's gall". Page does well (p.152) to draw attention to the "almost Pindaric boldness" of the whole phrase in contrast to S's usual "simple and conventional" phraseology. The dat. pl. δούνασιν is common in Homer (Il.5.397, 399, Od. 9.415 etc.) but there is no parallel for its position in this verse.

cιγάι

Immediately intelligible but ultimately illogical, since no bowman would wish to alert his victim by shouting at this stage, while not even Heracles could silence the twang of the bow-string.

For another usefully dactylic adverb of like formation c. f. κλαροπαληδόν in P. Lille 76.223. Both are ἀπαξ. We are also reminded of Homeric words like ἐπιτροχάδην, ἐπιστροφάδην, προτροπάδην etc. See Schwyzer, Gr. Gr. 1.626. ἐπικλοπός may mean "deceitful" or "clever" and so too here.

(1) What is the subject? "Heracles" says Lobel (p.6) and so does Barrett; "the arrow" thinks Page (p.152). Neither solution is free from difficulties: if Page is right we...
are faced with an isolated and unique instance of
intransitive ἔπειδω or ἔνεπειδω with the dative (Ar. Nub.
558: ἔπειδων εἰς Ὑπέρβολον is no real parallel) and an
otiose οἰ(c)τός in 10 which looks as if it should be
marking a change of subject from 7-8. But the alterna-
tive entails an awkward modification of subject from the
long preceding sentence, and also from the immediately
following sentence according to Barrett and Lobel, though
I would not absolutely exclude the possibility that
ἐξεχίσει too is an activity of Heracles. Much may depend
on the force of 6's ὅ γ'. Can it, under its emphatic
guise (GP pp.115ff) carry our attention back over at
least 5½ lines to an hypothetical passage before the
present line 1 where Heracles was subject? Or does the
γε merely stress that the arrow still persists as subject,
now as before? It is impossible to say. The argument
that the arrow is now out of Heracles' control so that it,
rather than Heracles, must be described as cutting and
piercing here (Page p.152) strikes me as over-nice.
We should at any rate note (a phenomenon interesting in
itself) that the parallel openings of the sentences at
8-9 and 10-11 are no guarantee of identity of subject
throughout.
Their διᾶ δ'..... διᾶ δ' is at once succeeded by a further
pair of sentences with a symmetrical structure ἐμίαυε
δ'ἄρ' .... ἀπέκλινε δ'ἄρ', but the subjects of the latter
pair are indubitably different.
(2) Our choice between the available alternatives may perhaps be influenced by the odd sense that transitive \( \epsilon \nu \rho \varepsilon \iota \delta \omega \) produces here. As both its sponsors appreciate, the meaning implies a thrusting blow dealt by a sword or spear held in the hand (c.f. Od. 9.33: \( \delta \phi \delta \alpha \lambda \mu \nu \iota \ \epsilon \nu \rho \varepsilon \iota \kappa \alpha \nu \) (scil. \( \mu \omega \chi \lambda \nu \)). But the picture of Heracles stabbing Geryon with an arrow, apart from being ludicrous in itself, is openly contradicted by three adverbial phrases: \( \iota \gamma \alpha \iota \ldots \epsilon \pi \kappa \lambda \omicron \alpha \delta \alpha \nu \) and \( \delta \alpha \imath \mu \omicron \nu \omicron \omicron \ \alpha \iota \gamma \alpha \). Still the language in this region of the poem is highly-coloured to an unusual degree (see p.175). If Pindar used the transitive \( \epsilon \nu \rho \varepsilon \iota \delta \omega \) of an arrow shot I doubt we would give the metaphor a moment's notice.

7: \( \mu \epsilon \tau \omicron \rho \omicron \omicron \omicron \)

c.f. II.4.460f: \( \epsilon \nu \ \delta \epsilon \ \mu \epsilon \tau \omicron \rho \omicron \omicron \omicron \ \pi \eta \xi \epsilon \epsilon , \ \pi \epsilon \rho \nu \epsilon \zeta \epsilon \ \delta ^{ \prime } \alpha ^{ \prime } \delta \epsilon \tau \iota \epsilon \omicron \)
\( \epsilon \iota \xi \omicron \omega \) \( \alpha \iota \chi \nu \mu \iota \ \chi \alpha \lambda \kappa \epsilon \iota \eta \).

8: \( \delta \iota \lambda \delta ^{ \prime } \epsilon \xi \chi \iota \epsilon \omicron \)

c.f. Od. 4.507: \( \alpha \pi \delta ^{ \prime } \epsilon \xi \chi \iota \epsilon \nu \ \alpha \upiota \iota \iota \iota \iota \) \( 9.71: \ \delta \iota \epsilon \chi \iota \iota \epsilon \nu \) \( \iota \) \( \epsilon \) \( \delta \alpha \nu \mu \iota \omicron \omicron \omicron \).

8f: \( \epsilon \alpha \rho \) \( \kappa \alpha \) \( \kappa \alpha \) \( \delta \iota \) \( \zeta \) \( \gamma \alpha \): Haslam (p.21 n.23) explains the breach of the usual rule for word-end (see above p.89f) as inspired by the wish not to impede the line's movement.

c.f. Od. 9.293, 11.219: \( \epsilon \alpha \rho \kappa \alpha \) \( \tau \epsilon \) \( \kappa \alpha \) \( \delta \iota \) \( \epsilon \alpha \) \( \gamma \alpha \) \( 5 \sim \) \( 6 \)
(in the same metrical position viz à viz line-end).

\( \delta \alpha \imath \mu \omicron \nu \omicron \omicron \ \alpha \iota \gamma \alpha \)

c.f. H.H. Dem. 300 (δ. \( \alpha \iota \gamma \alpha \)) and Richardson ad loc. (p.257). \( \delta \alpha \imath \mu \omicron \nu \omicron \omicron \ \alpha \iota \gamma \alpha \) in Od. 11.61; the more specific (and
more usual) Διὸς αἱκα in Il.9.608, 17.321, H.H. Apoll. 433.

10: διὰ δ' ἀντικρὺ σχέθεν οἰκτός
c.f. Il.5.99f: διὰ δ' ἐπτατο πικρὸς οἰκτός | ἀντικρὺ δὲ διέςχε, and of spears ἀντικρὺ δὲ δι' ὀψιν χάλκεον ἔγχος | ἔλθεν (Il.4.481) ἀντικρὺ δὲ διέςχε φαείνοι δουρὸς ἀκμὴ (Il.11.253) ἀντικρὺ δὲ διέςχε παρ' ὀμφαλῶν ἔγχος αἰχμή (Il.20.416).

10f: ἐπ' ἀκροτάταιν κορυφήν
c.f. Il.8.83: ἄκρην κὰ κορυφὴν (of a horse); κορυφή elsewhere in Homer of mountain-tops (as in such formally similar phrases as Il.13.12: ἐπ' ἀκροτάτης κορυφῆς: c.f. Il.14.157, Hes. Theog. 62 etc.) but c.f. H.H. Apoll. 308-309: ἥνικ' ἄρα Κρονίδῆς ἐρίωδεα γελνατ' Ἀθήνην | ἐν κορυφῆι, Hes. fr.443.10ff M-W: Ἀθήνην... τὴν μὲν ἑτικτε παθὸ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε πάρ κορυφήν. Ibyc. 298.3-4: [τὰ] ἔτικτετ<ν> αὐτός (scil. ζεῦς) | κορυφᾶς δὲ οἱ ἔξανταίτοσ<

Pind. Ol.7.36: κορυφᾶν κατ' ἄμφαν Eur. Ion. 456-7: κατ' ἀκροτάτας κορυφᾶς. In all these cases the reference is to Zeus' head.

The arrow then comes out at the top of Geryon's head: but at 7 it entered by the forehead. Is Heracles crouching at a very low level in his ambush and shooting upwards, or has S. simply failed to visualise the shot consistently?
12: ἐμίλαινε δ’ ἀφ’ αἰματὶ ποροφ[υρέωι] | θώρακα

c.f. Il.5.100: παλάσσετο δ’ αἰματι θώρηξ Il.17.360 : αἰματι δ’ χθὸν | δεξετο ποροφυρέωι. μιανω in Homer only in the passive.

13: βροτάεως

usually of ἔναρα in Homer (c.f. Schmidt, Parallel-Homer p. 72) which would be an impossible supplement here metri et sensus causa.

14ff: the model is obviously the simile in Il.8.306ff, on the death of the Trojan warrior and son of Priam named Gorgythion. (Be it noted that he is killed by an arrow in the chest).

μῆκων δ’ ὅς ἐπέρωσε κάρη βάλειν, ὣς τ’ ἐνι κηπωλι,
καρπωὶ βραδουμένη νοτιησι τε ἐλαινησιν,
ὡς ἐπέρωσε’ ἡμως κάρη πήλλη καρυνθέν.

S. like Vergil (Aen. 9.436ff) takes his inspiration from this striking simile, but he adds several details all his own: the spoiling of the poppy’s delicate shape for instance, and its shedding of its petals. The ἄμαλον [δέμας] is probably limited to the flower but I do not see how Page knows that the phrase ἀπὸ φύλλα βαλοῖσα "is wholly irrelevant to the wounded man (sic)" (p.153) especially after he has argued most vigorously and convincingly for the thesis that Geryon has just lost his helmet. And how can we tell whether in the lines that follow the close of our fragment the
wounded Geryon did not drop a shield or a weapon?

ἀπέκλινε ... αὐχένα ... ἐπικάρσιον

c.f. II.23.879: αὐχέν' ἀπεκρέμασεν (of a shot dove) Od. 9·371: κεῖτ' ἀποδοχώσας παχῦν αὐχένα (of the sleeping Cyclops) II.13.543: ἐκλύνθη δ' ἐτέρωσε κάρη Od. 22·17: ἐκλύνθη δ' ἐτέρωσε (of mortally wounded men) Od. 19·470: ἀψ δ' ἐτέρωσε' ἐκλύθη (of the bronze vessel dropped by Eurycleia.

For ἀπέκλινε c.f. Od. 21·138 = 165: προσεκλίνε.

15: ὡς δικα

for this phrase used without finite verb to introduce a simile c.f. Il.4·462: ἥρπε δ', ὡς δτε πύργος,Od. 5·281: εἴκατο δ', ὡς δτε ὅλων, Pind. P. 11·39: μὲ τις ἀνεμος ἔξω πλόου ἔβαλεν, ὡς δτ' ἄκατον ἐνναλίαν; Ibyc. 317B P (?) aieι μ' θίλε γυμνὲ ταυύπτερος ὡς δικα πορφυρίς. Sappho 106 L-P: πέρροχος, ὡς δτ' ἄοιδος δ λέεβιος ἀλλοδάποις.

On the superfluous δτε/δικα in such similes see LSJ s.v., Schwyzer, Gr. Gramm. 2 p.648 n.2.

καταισχύνοικα:

'spoil' as in II.18.23f: (scil. Ἀχιλλεὺς) ἐλὼν κόριν αἰθαλδεσσαν | χεῖτο κάι κεφαλῆς, χαριέν δ' ἕτεχυνε πρόκωπον 24·418: οὖδὲ μιν αἰσχύνει.

ἀψ'

otiose.
Barrett tentatively suggested that this tiny fragment might come from the same context as S15 and form a sequel to its contents: there Heracles disposes of Geryon's first body with an arrow-wound, here perhaps he moves against the second body with a club. Vase 3 shows him employing precisely that sequence of weapons against precisely that sequence of bodies, and one would expect a large-scale narrative poem like the Geryoneis to exploit such a variety in order to avoid monotony in the modes of killing all three parts. And we might adduce the description of Geryon's corpse in Quint. Smyrn. 6.250f: κάρη δ' ε' ον τν κονίτιςιν | αίματόηνα κέχυντο βίη βοσάλοιο δεμένα.

But one may point out that if S16 does follow 15 ii, there must be an interval of at least 27 lines between the two, since the former seems to be the bottom of a column, and the latter certainly is. And the fragment may after all come from a different region of the poem. I mention one possibility that seems just as likely as the Barrett-Page hypothesis: remember Apollod. 2.5.10: φύλαξ δε (scil. θόν) ὁ κύων δικεφαλος ... αἰσθήμενος δε δ' κυων ἐπ'αυτον (scil. Ἡρακλῆ) ὅρμα δε και τουτου τω δοσάλωι μαετ κτλ. If Orthus' second head were being referred to here it would imply that both had to be dealt with separately. But "like master like dog."

---

1 A club is also employed by Heracles against Geryon on the metopes of the Temple of Zeus discovered at Olympia. See further Croon's list of vases pp.94ff.
FRAGMENTUM ADDENDUM

Paradox. Vat. 33 p.110 Keller (Rerum Naturalium Scriptores Graeci Minores): παρ’ Ὄμηρῳ Πρωτεῦς εἶς πάντα μετεμορφοῦ-
το (Od. 4.455 seqq.), καθὰ Θέτις (Rohde, καθάτις codd.)
pαρὰ Πυνδάρωι καὶ Νηρεῦς παρὰ Στησίχορῳ καὶ Μήστρα.
"S. did not name any intermediary" says V.J. Matthews
(Panyassis (Leiden 1974) p.58) contrasting the Geryoneis
with the epic poet's Heracleia, where Πανώας.... παρὰ
Νηρέως φησὶ τῆν τοῦ Ἡλίου φιλὴν κοιλισασθαι fr.7K). The
present fragment casts considerable doubt on Matthews'
statement. Not that one can blame him for ignorance of
a passage that escaped the capacious nets cast successively
by Bergk, Diehl, and Page. It is rather strange, though,
that it has eluded capture for so long when it was known
to Wilamowitz (Heracles² (1895) Vol.1 p.23 n.45) who
rightly attributed it to the Geryoneis. Kunze also
mentioned it (Ol. Forsch. 2 (Arch. Schildb.) p.109 n.1)
as did Friedländer, Herakles (Berlin 1907)p.37 n.1; and
Professor Kassel has recently earned our gratitude by
bringing it to the notice of an inattentive world once
again (Rh. Mus. 116 (1973) p.100 n.14).

The only other author to connect Nereus with the story of
Geryon is Panyasssis in the fragment cited above. But
Pisander fr.5 K tells exactly the same tale as Panyasssis,
with the name of Oceanus substituted for Nereus. The
most straightforward hypothesis would be to suppose that
the Geryoneis too made Heracles obtain the cup indirectly, through the agency of the Old Man of the Sea. The trouble here is that Apollodorus' narrative, which we have seen good reason to drive from S's poem, follows a completely different tradition. Like Pherecydes F. Gr. Hist. 3 F 18A it has Helios hand over the cup after Heracles threatens him with a bow. No room for a marine intermediary there. Pherecydes does proceed to mention Oceanus as being bullied into inactivity by Heracles after rocking his boat, and Bowra (GLP2 p.91) thought that the historian's version reflected S's. But before we identify this Oceanus with the Stesichorean Nereus let us remark that such an encounter between Heracles and the sea-god would offer no scope for the required metamorphoses. Besides, Apollodorus himself, though supposedly dependent on S., does not include the sequel with Oceanus.

It seems safest to conclude that while preserving many features from S's poem, the Apollodoran account is not to be trusted for every single detail. Not surprisingly, given the summary nature of its narrative, it omits various incidents, and in at least one respect it has been contaminated by a non-Stesichorean source. Bowra's hypothesis that S. used the same version as Pherecydes (rather than Panyassis or Pisander) was anyway perfectly arbitrary.

We are more familiar with the motif of Heracles' struggle against the wily ἀλιος γέρων in connection with his search for the apples of the Hesperides: see especially Pherecydes
F. Gr. Hist. 3 F 16A (= Schol. Apoll. Rhod. 4:1396) aι νύμφας Διός και Θέμιδος οἰκούσαι ἐν ἐπηλαίων περὶ τὸν Ἡράδανδην ὑπέθεντο Ἡραικείς ἀποροῦντι μαθεῖν παρὰ Νηρέως που ἔλη τὰ χρόνεα μῆλα· καὶ λαβέειν αὐτὸν βίαι, πρῶτον μὲν μεταμορφούμενονεἰς ὄνομα καὶ πῦρ, εἶτα εἰς τὴν παλαιὰν δῆμιν καταστάντα καὶ δηλώσαντα φησιν (sequitur F 17).

But we need not deduce from such passages that the Geryoneis did after all describe this labour, or else that our fragment comes from a different and hitherto unknown work within whose compass that story fell. Panyassis confirms the possibility of such motif-transference. And Nereus may have been introduced into the story for the same reason as Menoetes, because he was originally a figure parallel with the herdsman of the dead. Nereus in particular - and old men of the sea in general - keeps herds of seals which, like the herds of cattle tended by Geryon and Menoetes, symbolise the dead. The sea in Greek myth is often regarded as a boundary between the lifeless and the quick. And Heracles often has to wrestle with a ἀλικός γέρων just as he wrestles with Menoetes in

1 The μεταμορφούμενον of Jacoby's text is a mere slip, as a glance at Wendel's text of the Apollodoran scholia (not available to the great historian writing in 1923 twelve years before its appearance) will show: p.315 records no variants or conjecture, and the Corrigendum on * p.24 of the 1957 reprint of Jacoby's volume reverts to μεταμορφούμενον. It is unfortunate that Jacoby's error was taken over by LSJ s.v. μεταμορφούμενον, since the only other two instances of that verb are active (Hdt. 1.64.2; 2.125.4) and are used of the physical transfer of objects from one place to another.

2 See above p.126f.
Hades (Apollod. 2.5.12) and fights Geryon on Erytheia. See further Croon pp.57ff and more generally on the phenomenon of "Meergreise" A. Lesky, Thalatta pp.107ff. For depictions in art c.f. Kunze l.c., Brommer Vasenlisten³ pp.143ff, Boardman, BICS.5 (1958) 6ff.

Nonnus (Narrat. ad Greg. Invect. 1, 2 p.128: Myth. Gr. ed. Westermann p.383) includes the sons of Proteus among those who robbed Heracles of Geryon's cattle. This is a late and unreliable source at the best of times: and one should not hurry to associate this particular remark with the tradition used by S. Admittedly, Proteus, Nereus, and Oceanus are often regarded as equivalent to one another. But I suspect that the present notice is the end-product of the following sequence of error: Neleus → Nereus → Proteus. In other words we have here a garbled version of the story of Neleus and his sons touched on above p.102.
S17 = 185 P

Metre and structure

Again, the metrical scheme which emerges from the papyrus fragments allows us to detect corruption at the start of the present book-text. We can now see that the scheme of the quotation printed on p.38 of D.A. Campbell's Greek Lyric Poetry (1967) is inaccurate. More seriously, Page's latest emended version of 1-2 is no more acceptable, because it gives us δέημας ἐκκατέβαινεν | Χρυσοσόν δορὰ while by the bridge principle observed everywhere else throughout the Geryoneis, single-syllable biceps does not coincide with word-end (see p.85 above). Large-scale corruption - the fruit of Athenaeus' acknowledged carelessness as a quoter - hovers over the opening of our fragment, and is not to be limited to the omission of a single syllable after the MSS' ὑμεριονίδας. Its exact limits are indeed problematical: one might extend the latter crux to the end of 3 and thus explain the failure to observe the customary rules of word-end at δι᾽'Ω|κέα-βοῦ. But there are two other places (15:8, 26:3: see ad locc.) which display a like failure, and there is an alternative explanation for the present anomaly (see below ad loc.).

1-2: certainty is impossible, but given we have here the start of a str./ant. the most convincing method of
restoring metrical sense to the beginning of our fragment
is to take over from Führer (p.675) the following
reconstruction: ἔπαυς ἐκκατέβανεν εἰς Ἡμέρην Πάντως ἡμερήσιον δ'—κτλ. Sadly, this entails the jettisoning of West’s brilliant Ἡμέρησιον δ’ which can no longer be accommodated in the first line: nor must it be given a new life as the first words of 1.2, for it would contravene the rule restated above that the contracted element must not coincide with word-end, but must be bridged to the following longum. We might retain it by further shuffling of the opening words: ἔμοι δ' Ἡμέρησιον δ’—κτλ. (West ap. Führer R p.7). But this brings us to a second problem: Kaibel’s even more brilliant correction of the MSS’ reading, ΑΜΟΣ for ΑΛΙΟΣ at the start of 1, is metrically acceptable. And it wins our hearts by its virtues palaeographical and psychological (διήλως arising from ἔμοι under the influence of the near-by Ἡμέρησιον δ’). But it must be ruled out on other grounds. Pre-eminent among these is the total lack of parallels for the sequence ἔμοι δ’ ... δ’ δ’ (8). Apodotic δ’ is a familiar phenomenon (c.f. Denniston, G. P. 2 pp.177ff) but instances of it after ημος are not to be had. Besides, as W.S. Barrett points out to me, subordinate ημος clauses in Homer and Hesiod invariably define the time of day at which a given event occurs, by means of some natural phenomenon (or, more rarely, some item of human behaviour) which recurs regularly at a
constant time. I take all the following exemplifications of this statement from Mr. Barrett. (A) Homer: (1) celestial phenomena expressed in aorist, imperfect or pluperfect, with apodosis in aorist or imperfect: (a) ἡμος δ' ἄριστηνα ϕάνη ροδοδάκτυλος ἢς (Il.1.477, 24.788; Od. 2.1, 3.403, 491, 4.306, 431, 5.576, 5.228, 7.347, 8.2, 9.152, 170, 307, 437, 560, 10.187, 12.8, 316, 13.18, 15.189, 16.481, 19.427.) (b) ἡμος δ' ἤλλος κατέδυ και ἐπὶ πνεύμας ἦλθε (Il.1.475, Od. 9.168, 558, 10.185, 19.426 ). (c) ἡμος δ' ἤλλος μετενίκσετο βουλιτόνδε (Il.16.779, Od. 9.58) (d) ἡμος δ' ἤλλος μέσον οὐρανόν ἀμφιβεβήκει (Il.8.68). (e) ἡμος δ' ἄγαν νυκτὸς ἐν μετὰ δ' ἄστρα βεβήκει (Od. 12.312) ἡμος δ' ὀστ' ἄπω ἢς, ἐτι δ' ἀμφιλύκη νύξ (Il.7.433). (2) celestial phenomena expressed in habitual present, apodosis in aor. or impf.: ἡμος δ' ἐκεφόρος εἴς ϕῶς ἐρέων ἐπὶ γαῖαν (Il.23.226). (3) the same expressed in the subjunctive mood, with the apodosis in habitual present: ἡμος δ' ἤλλος μέσον οὐρανόν ἀμφιβεβήκε (Od. 4.400). (4) Human behaviour expressed in the aorist, and the apodosis likewise in the aorist: (a) ἡμος δὲ δρυτόμος περ ἄνηρ ὀπλισσατο δόρπον (Il.11.86). (b) ἡμος δ' ἐπὶ δόρπον ἄνηρ ἀγορηθεν ἀνέστη (Od. 12.439). (B) Hesiod: (1) the time of year is defined by some natural phenomenon (the apodosis giving, in various ways, advice about actions appropriate to the season) (a) ἡμος δὴ λήγει μένος δέος ἤλλοιο κτλ. (Op. 414). (b) ἡμος κόκκυξ κοινύζει κτλ. (Op. 486). (c) ἡμος δὲ σκόλυμος τ' ἄνθετε κτλ. (Op. 582). (d) ἡμος δὴ τὸ πρῶτον ...πέταλ' ἄνθοι φανήη (Op. 679f).
(2) the time of year defined in exactly the same way, with the apodosis (in the imperfect\(^1\)) giving the event in the narrative which is being so dated:

\[ \eta \mu ος \delta' \ldots \tau \acute{ε}ττις \ldots \delta' \delta'ειν \deltaοχεται \ (Scut. 393f). \]

These passages make it certain that Kaibel's conjecture would have S. defining the time of day at which Heracles entered the δαλοκ, by reference to the Sun's regular and recurrent setting. Lines one to seven would then be nothing more than an exceedingly ample and redundant version of the epic formula \( \eta \mu ος \delta ' \acute{ε}λιος \κατέδυ \nu \ σε κι \nu \ \eta λθε \) mentioned above. But the allusions to our passage in Athen. 781\(^D\) and Eust. Od. 1632.23 suggest that on the contrary S. is making a special, indeed a unique, point: "when the Sun had re-entered the bowl which he had formerly lent to Heracles..." Perhaps S. saw no difference between this and the more obvious epic formula, but this difficulty, coupled with the total eccentricity of apodotic \( \delta ' \) after \( \eta \mu ος \), rules out Kaibel's proposal. We might instead adopt Barrett's ταμος (though not his \( ταμος \) \( \delta ' \nu \eta \nu \) mentioned on p.32 of L.G.S. which can now be recognised as unmetrical: see above p.186). This is hardly inferior to \( \eta \mu ος \delta ' \) as an economic explanation of the MSS' δαλοκ, and on grounds of grammar it is positively better: see especially H.H. Herm. 101 (after a description of the time of day) and Hes. Op. 585 (after a description of the time of year introduced by \( \eta \mu ος \delta ' \) for \( ταμος \)

\(^1\)Lines 398-400 of the apodosis, with verbs in the present, are rightly expunged by Kuenneth: see Russo ad loc.
without δέ. But the opening of this fragment is so deeply corrupt that only obeli belong in the text.

2: δέμας

The same word for the Sun's bowl is to be found in Aesch. frr. 69.4 and 74.5 N², Antimachus fr. 66.1 W, Pherecydes F. Gr. Hist. 3 F 18¹, possibly Pisander fr. 5 K, Apollod. 2.107, Eustath. Od. 9.361 p. 1632.23. The author of the Titanomachia calls it a λέβης (fr. 7 Allen p. 111) as does Theolytus F. Gr. Hist. 478 F 1 and Eur. ad Dion. Perieg. 558. Panyassis fr. 7 K may have called it a φιάλη. It is a κύλις in Iul. Or. 7.219D, a ποτήριον in Athen. 470A and 781D, a poculum in Macrob. Sat. 5.21.19. For the precise meaning of δέμας see my note on S19.1. Vase depictions of that belonging to Helios (see above p. 105) show it as a mixing bowl with narrow mouth and beaker shape. Euphorion (fr. 52 Powell) speaks more prosaically of a journey χαλκεύτη αὐτάων.

ἐκματέβαινε

For this verb at line-end c.f. Od. 24.222: οὖδ' ἐξερευν
dolion, μέγαν δραχμαν ἐκματαβαίνων (the only epic instance of the word) and the oracle ap. Hdt. 5.92.ε: δλβιος οὔτος ἀνήρ ὡς ἐμὸν δόμον ἐκματαβαίνει. The verb is altogether very rare, though not quite as rare as LSJ implies s.v., citing Od. 24 and Hdt. 5 but not the present passage. Its combination of prefixes is particularly apposite: εἰσβαίνω means "go on board a ship", καταβαίνω is used of the Sun's setting in Hes. Theog. 761.
An epithet of the Sun in Od. 12.176 and Hes. Theog. 1011 ('Ἡλίου ... Ὑπεριονίδας) a synonym for him at H.H. Dem. 74 and here (though our passage is again missing from LSJ). Sometimes Ὑπερίων is the father of Helios, sometimes it is a synonym for Helios, and sometimes Helios has a male child called Ὑπεριονίδης. See West on Hes. Theog. 134 (p. 202), Richardson on H.H. Dem. 26 (p. 158).

〈παγ〉 χρόσσεων

For Führer's proposed form c.f. 58.3 from this very poem. The Sun's cup is golden in Antimachus fr. 66.1 W, Aesch. fr. 74 N2.3, Mimn. fr. 12.7 W, Pherec. FGH 3 F 18A. With an equal appropriateness his rays lie in a golden chamber in Mimn. fr. 11A.2 W. Eust. ad Dion. Perieg. 558 mentions a bronze λέβης in his paraphrase of Euphorion fr. 52 (Powell) which runs χαλκεῖν διάκωπι βουηλθέος ἐξ Ἑρυ-θεῖν.

3ff: for a bibliography and critique of previous interpretations of these lines c.f. Lesky, "Aia", Wien. Stud. 63 (1948) 31-35 = Gesamm. Schr. 33-36. In which direction is Helios supposed to be travelling? The Sun rises in the east and sets in the west, and the Greeks envisaged him as travelling from former to latter by horse-drawn chariot. Mimnermus fr. 12 W very lucidly combines this picture with the idea of the Sun's cup by supposing that the winged and golden vessel transports Helios from the land of the Hesperides (i.e. the West: see p. 193) to the
region inhabited by the Aethiopians (i.e. the East). This clearly occurs at night, and Helios sensibly sleeps during the voyage. Now Erytheia lies in the West, and Helios' chariot must reach the occident at day's end. On this basis one would expect Heracles to have sailed to Geryon's island in the normally empty cup which daily travels east to west under its own propulsion. It is impossible to say whether our fragment depicts Heracles landing at Erytheia — after the journey over from Tartessus and the mainland — or at the Spanish mainland by the reverse route. On either interpretation one might suppose that Helios, having regained his vessel, sailed off in it back to the East, where Mimnermus places his palace: he must return there with his horses in order to set off as usual in his chariot on the following day. But against this reconstruction stand two objections. That most frequently raised rests on the phrase ποτέ βένθεα νυκτός έρεμνάς.

But it is ambiguous (see below ad loc.). Much more daunting is Athenaeus' explicit testimony δέ ποτέ καὶ δ "Ηλιος ἐπὶ ποτηρίου διεκομίζετο ἐπὶ τὴν δύσιν Στηνίχορος μὲν οὕτως φησίν ...

That makes nonsense of the traditional Greek view of the Sun, his locale, and his diurnal activities. For the Sun

1See Diggle on Eur. Phaeth. 1 (p. 78).
2According to Pherocydes F. Gr. Hist. 3 F 18A: Mimnermus 12-5 has the Sun travel alone.
sets in the West and reaches that destination by traveling through the sky in his chariot. And Erytheia is in the West. How does a journey ἐπὶ ποτηρίου ... ἐπὶ τὴν δύσην fit in with that? Western stables are credited to Helios by Eur. Alc. 593f: 'Αελλίου κυνεφαίαν ἱππόστασιν ἀλθέα τὰν Μολοκκῶν and western palaces by Ov. Her. 9.16: Solis utramque domum (c.f. Sen. Herc. Oet. 2: utraeque Phoebi ... domus). But these passages are late or obscure, and the natural eastern palace occurs as early as Mimnermus fr.11A (Ἀίτησαι πόλιν, τόθε τ’ ὥκεος Ἡελλίον ἀντίνες χρυσῆς κείσαι τον θαλάμων | Ὀμεανοῦ παρὰ χεῖλος) on which see Lesky, "Aia", Wien Stud. 63 (1948) 24-8 = Gesamm. Schr. 28-31.

This major incoherence is clearly not the casual product of carelessness or corruption. The phrasing and context of Athenaeus' remark make it quite clear that he knows (and means) what he is saying. He has just finished talking about Panyassiss' picture of Heracles sailing to Erytheia in the Sun's cup. And he subjoins the statement "That Helios too travelled to the West in the cup is said by S. in the following words." But he must already be in the West and has no need to travel to it (διεκομιζότως here like διαμελείν τὸν Ὀμεανόν in Ath. 781\textsuperscript{D} implies a fairly lengthy sea voyage).

And how ever is he to get back to the East in time to start the new day? I can only conclude that like

\textsuperscript{1}"Erst in der Morgenfrühe, so haben wir anzunehmen, kehrt er auf dem Okeanos nach Osten zurück", says Seeliger in
several modern scholars, Athenaeus misinterpreted the phrase ποτὶ βένθεα νυκτὸς and supposed it to mean "towards the West" rather than "towards the East."

δοφρα: Homeric and Hesiodic: see Chantraine, Gramm. Hom. 2. p.266 n.2 and 270ff.

3: δι′ ὥσανοίο περάσαις

δι′ (or ἀπ′, ἕπ′, παρ′) ὥσανοίο occurs frequently in Homer in this metrical position. See especially Od. 10·508 (a line-end as is the present phrase): δι′ ὥσανοίο περήσης. The phrase's breach of S's usual rule for word-end in this line (δι′ ὥσανοίο: see p. 89 above) may be explained after Haslam p. 21 n. 23 by noting that ὥσ. is one of H. Fränkel's "heavy words" capable of postponing or suppressing caesurae in the Homeric hexameter (Wege und Formen fruhgr. D. 2 p. 111). The meaning of the verb must be the same as in Od. 10·508: ἀλλ᾽ ὃποτ' ἂν δὴ νητί δι′ ὥσα- 


4ff: ἱαράς ποτὶ βένθεα νυκτὸς ἔρεμνας

(contd...)

1This review of Vürtheim (p. 366). Similarly Sitzler p. 58. I wish I could believe them.
"To the depths of holy, dark night": for some reason these words have irresistibly suggested to most scholars a journey towards the West. They then either accept this impossibility or more usually try to reinterpret or emend the phrase. I can see no logic in their attitude: once the Sun has set in the West, surely all places are equally dark, and we are free to apply the words to the only route that makes sense, the route from West to East.

Or if we think that the phrase implies an especially inky blackness (βενθεν) so much the better: when the Sun has set in the West, it is as far as possible in time and space from the East which must therefore be at its darkest ("Cum sol occidit profundissima est in oriente caligo" Page PMG p.101).

We may therefore reject the following devices as unnecessary:

(1) Vürtheim's emendation (p.18) of the MSS' ποτὶ β. to διὰ β. which is to mean "passing through the darkness of the West to come to his family in the East". Good sense (c.f. Pind. Is. 3·70: ἐπὶ χθόνα καὶ διὰ πόντον βεβακεν), a plausible corruption (under the influence of 6's ποτὶ) and a by no means intolerable repetition of διὰ at close quarters (and with different cases). For once a suggestion by this scholar is not by itself implausible: it is simply not required.
(2) F. Gisinger's statement (RE Suppl. Bd. 4 (1924) sv "Geographie" 536) that the words refer to a journey in the North Ocean. He is presumably thinking of dark nights in the Cimmerian North. But the parallelism of ποτὶ ... ποτὶ makes it clear that both allude to the same thing: there can be no artificial dichotomy between Helios' route and his goal. The Sun must be travelling to where his family live, and no ancient author places them "auf dem nördlichen Okeanos."

(3) Wilamowitz's highly ingenious suggestion that ποτὶ βένθα Νυκτὸς ἐρευνά is to be taken in close conjunction with ποτὶ ματέρα as a genealogical rather than a geographical statement (Hermes 18 (1883) p.397 n.1 = Kl. Schr. 1 p.111 n.1, adopted by Lesky sup. cit. p.36). On this reading, the Sun returns to the depths of the Night, his mother, and she and the rest of his family may be safely located where we expect his destination to lie, in the East. No Greek author specifically names Helios as the son of the Night but c.f. Soph. Tr. 94ff: ὃν αἴόλα νῦν ἐναριζομένα τιπτει κατευνάζει τε φλογιζόμενον, ἀλιον and similarly Aesch. Ag. 278: τῆς νῦν τευχύσες φῶς τὸδ' εὕφωρόνης λέγω. Very closely akin is the notion of Night as the mother of Day (c.f. Hes. Theog. 124, Aesch. Ag. 264 and Fraenkel ad loc (2.149)). If Day or the Sun come forth out of (the preceding) Night it would be reasonable to suppose she lived in the East, and perhaps some Greeks did place her there. Unfortunately Hes. Theog. 760 declares that the Sun never shines upon at least two of
Night's children (Sleep and Death) and ib. 214f reminds us that Night gave birth to the Hesperides who dwell πέρην κυτοῦ 'Ωκεανοῦ, that is near Erytheia and in the West!

This brings us back dangerously near to square one. Besides, as Wilamowitz himself points out, S. deliberately refrains from naming Helios' wife and children: why should he make an exception for his mother?

4: ίαράς ... νυκτός

Meleager A.P. 5.8 = Gow and Page 69.1 (4348) νυξ ίερή.

For a recent discussion of the connotations of the Homeric phrases, see P. Wülfung-v. Martitz, Glotta 38 (1960) 292f.

βένθεα νυκτός

β. of the sea (δόλος, θαλάσσης, λίμνης) in Homer, and once (Od. 17.316) of a wood. Only here of the night (another usage unknown to LSJ for whom this fine fragment does not seem to exist). A more ambitious attempt to analyse the phrase's impact in M.S. Silk, Interaction in Poetic Imagery (Cambridge 1974) p.24f. Compare κεύθεα νυκτός quoted below (p.198).

5: έρευνάς

apart from unnecessarily redistributing the epithets with greater equity among the available nouns, Wilamowitz's
is presumably intended to facilitate the personification of θεώς. In either case it is undesirable. The Greeks did not distinguish as clearly between the abstract and the personified as we do. See especially Hes. Theog. 758: Νυκτὸς παϊδεσε ἔρεμνής (and in a parallel vein Solon.

36· 4ff W: μήτηρ μεγίστη δαμάσων Ὀλυμπίων ἡ ἁριστά, ἠὴ μέλλαναι, τῇ ἔγώ ποτε ἐρεύνην πολλάχια πεπηγότας.

If Mother Earth can be black, so can Mother Night. Not that she is needed here). For the phrase νυκτὸς ἔρεμνάς c.f. (apart from the Hesiodic line just quoted) Od. 11· 606: ἔρεμνή νυκτὶ ἐσθαρᾶ, and οἶδεσα νυκτὸς ἔρεμνής at 1. 29 of the "Orphic Kataβασις" most recently edited by Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, Keydell Festschrift (1978) p.91.

6: ποτὲ ματέρα κουριδίαιν τ' ἄλοχον παῖδας τε φίλους

The mother is Theia according to Hes. Theog. 371 and Pind. Is. 5·1, Euryphaessa according to H.H. 31·2; the wife Perseis and the children Circe and Aeetes according to Hes. Theog. 956·7. (The union between Helios and Clymene which according to later writers produced Phaethon (see Diggle's Phaethon (1970) pp.4ff esp. p.7 n.1) was a much more transitory affair). But as Wilamowitz (sup. cit.) most sensitively observes, S's failure to produce specific names looks like a deliberate device: the Sun himself, like any weary mortal, returns from his day's work to "Weib und Kind." The universality of the experience is well conveyed.

κουριδίη τ' ἄλοχος is another Homeric phrase: c.f. Il·7· 392, 13·626, 19·298 (acc.), Il·1·114, Od. 15·356 (gen.), Od. 14·245 (dat.), παῖδες φίλου occurs in Od. 19·455,
παιδε ϕιλω in Il.7.279. For further instances of children and wife as the goal of the returning traveller see Eur. Phaeth. 85 and Diggle ad loc. (p.108).

8: δ' δ':

It would be a nice touch if S. here turned from the picture of Helios returning to peaceful home and beloved wife and children, to Heracles about to set off in search of Geryon's cattle and the laborious adventures that attend on them. But that in itself is no argument in favour of this interpretation of our fragment's context.

8-9:

The metre demands κατασκυ- (τι) ποιήσαι. Page in LGS p.32 proposed κατασκυίδον (or -σκάρυν). The former of course is a singular present participle active agreeing with ἄλλως, and as such reads a little unnaturally. We expect an adjective, and somewhat preferable to Page's alternative is Barrett's κατασκυῖδον (ε)ν. But as Mr. Barrett himself observes the form is unattested, and eccentric for several other reasons beside: denominative adjectives in -ε τικ are usually formed from the uncompounded noun: χιλώς, ¹ σεματό, πετρήις, άλλεις and the like. However, in support of κατασκυῖδεις = κατάσκυλις Mr. Barrett is able to cite as more (or less) remote analogies the following:

(1) a few Homeric adjectives with -ε τικ terminations which seem to be metrically convenient extensions of other adjectives: e.g. δευδείς = δευτερ or φαλεμός = φαλόμοις

(2) βαδυδινής in Il.21.15 as a contamination of δυνής and βαδυδίνης, and βαδυχαίτης in Aeschylus' epitaph (Page epigr. 457) which is contaminated from βαδυχαίτης and χαίτης, offer conceivable parallels for the creation of κατάκλιτος from σκλής and κατάκλις. (3) the only Homeric instance of an -εις adjective with prepositional first element is ποτυφωνής (Od. 9.456) which is not very close to the present coinage. ὑποσκλίτος for ὑπόσκλις in Nicander Ther. 96 is an excellent analogy, but Nicander's personal predilection for adjectives in -εις considerably reduces its value. In view of all this, and the extreme rareness of such adjectival forms throughout Greek literature² we may prefer simply to read κατάκλιον (ἐν) ποκί which has the additional advantage of meeting Nöthiger's objection (p.145 n.2) that ποκί looks suspiciously superfluous and isolated. But there are other solutions: Führer's ἦς ποκί (R p.8) would presuppose Page's interpretation of our lines (see p.203). By now it will be clear why I have invoked the obeli at the end as well as the beginning of this fragment.

ἄλος ... κατακλ.

"overshadowed by". For the thought c.f. Od. 12.435f: δξοι | ... κατεκλιαν ... χάρυβδών, 9.182f: σπέος ... .

¹ He uses 110 of them, of which 58 are ἄμαξ: see Buck-Petersen, A reverse Index of Greek Nouns and Adjs., pp. 46ff.

² In early poetry only περιτυμής (H.H. Ap. 65) and ξαρυβδής (Alc. 34-8 LP; c.f. id. 48-12, 61-14). Later on ἐποχρίδης (A.P. 7.401 = Page 5215) ὑπογής (Nic. Ther. 663, but see n.1).
In the middle passage, as in Hes. Op. 513: τὸν καὶ ἄχυρτα δέρμα κατάσκυλον, the word meaning "covered or shaded" is in the same metrical position as the present phrase.

This is usually said to stress the return to dry land after the sea voyage (so e.g. Campbell p.257). But for Ποσί with a verb of motion (compare ἔβα here) as a normal phrase c.f. Il.5.745: (= 8.389) ἤσκαλέσετο: Il.476f: πόδεσσι φεύγων 21.557f: Ποσίν ... φεύγω H.H. Dem. 317: διέβαμεν ... πόδεσσι H.H. Ap. 520: προσέβαν Ποσί Theogn. 331: ἔρχεσαι Ποσίν Panyassis fr.5 K: Θόρε Ποσί Bacch. 18.17: (ἁμείρας) ... Ποσίν ... κέλευθον Pind. Nem. 1.50: Ποσίν ... ὁσοῦκας' [Theocr.] 8.47: βάλνει Ποσίν. Mnasalces A.P. 6.268.3 = 2603 (G-P) = 2584 Page: Ποσί ... βάλνεις

[Ἡρακλῆς] is a very tempting supplement, though other possibilities (e.g. an adjective) cannot be excluded.

The pattern of periphrasis followed directly by proper name which the first presupposes is quite unobjectionable: see Diog. Laert. 6.50 = Kaibel Epigr. 1138: ὁ τοῦ Διὸς παῖς καλλίνικος Ἡρακλῆς etc. The device became very common in Latin poetry: c.f. Housman, J. Ph. 34 (1918) 227 = Classical Papers 3.973.

As Apollodorus' summary reminds us, Heracles would need to use the Sun's cup twice, once to cross over from
Tartessus on the mainland to Geryon's island of Erytheia, once to return in the opposite direction this time with the stolen cattle. We would dearly like to know whether he kept the vessel for the whole period or borrowed it twice on the two separate occasions. If we could be certain that the former was true, then we might securely assign our fragment to the return passage from Erytheia, as does Page (p.149). But we cannot be so certain: we can only weigh the alternatives. The repetition of the motif of the borrowed cup might be thought offensive and tedious: but who is to deny that the phenomenon of "reundat atque effunditur" applied even here? Mr. Barrett observes that Apollodorus' narrative contains two reasons for supposing that Heracles' arrival at Erytheia occurred at late evening: the Sun lends Heracles his cup after the hero has threatened him for making him too hot. That must happen towards sunset when the sinking Sun comes very close to Heracles in the far West. Then Heracles on reaching Erytheia bivouacs on Mt. Abas for the night. If Helios does not regain his bowl, how is he to return from West to East to begin the next day? The argument is not absolutely overwhelming, since Apollodorus' account of the transference of the cup may well not derive from S. (see p.183). And there is much in Barrett's remark that "in this world of fantasy such practical

---

1The picture of Heracles sharing the cup with the cattle he has just pilfered, may derive from the similar notion of Helios voyaging with his own steeds, provided that is not just a private fantasy of Pherecydes: see p.206f.
details might be overlooked", though S's customary amplitude might surely have included them. Page is certainly right to refute Barrett's further contention that the cattle of Geryon ought to have been mentioned if Heracles were here returning from Erytheia: the present stanza may say nothing of them; the following stanza might easily have done so: "the son of Zeus went into the grove - driving the cattle before him ". It is, sadly, impossible to decide either way. Bowra (GLP^2) pp.91-2 and Campbell (p.256) are wrong to state dogmatically that Heracles is landing at Erytheia. Page (p.149) errs by regarding the alternative interpretation as certain. What we can say is that Huxley (Greek Epic Poetry p.27) and Gerber (p.148) have no grounds for supposing that Heracles has arrived at the Isle of the Hesperids: despite its proximity to Geryon's island, there is no proof whatsoever that its magic apples and Heracles' search for them ever featured in our poem (see above p.126).
Excursus on the bowl of the Sun in Greek Literature

The motif of the Sun's vessel appears in the folk-lore of many peoples (c.f. Rapp in Roscher 1:2014 and Stith Thompson, Motif-Index of Folk-Literature A 7:723 and 724:2). But despite its later popularity in Greek literature, there is no trace of it in Homer or Hesiod. Of course both poets may have known about the golden cup, and its absence from their works may be pure concidence. But the whole notion seems inconsistent with several Homeric passages (see Kirk and Raven, The Presocratic Philosophers (1957) p.15) and Homer's avoidance of features redolent of the folk-tale is notorious. He likewise says nothing of the Sun's chariot. For Homeric and Hesiodic views of the motions of Night and Day c.f. Page, Folktales in Homer's Odyssey (1973) p.40f.

The first mention of the cup in literature would seem to have occurred in the epic poem known as the Titanomachia. Athenaeus 470C tells us θεόλυτος δ' ἔν δευτέρω Ἄρων (F. Gr. Hist. 478 F 1) ἐπὶ λέβητος φησιν αὐτῶν (scil. Ὁλίου) διαπλέοια, τοῦτο πρῶτο εἰπόντος τοῦ τὴν Τιτανομαχίαν ποιήσαντος (Allen fr.7 p.111). (See Huxley, Greek Epic Poetry pp.26-7 on this fragment). Then comes Mimnermus' full and circumstantial account. Ath. 469F-70B: Μίμνερμος δὲ Ναννοῖ ἐν εὐνήλῃ ψηλῇ χρυσῇ κατεσκευασμένη πρὸς τὴν χρέιαν ταύτην ὑπὸ Ἡφαιστοῦ τὸν Ὁλίου καθεύδοντα περαιοθεῖαι πρὸς τὰς ἀνατολὰς, αἰνιγομένος τὸ κοίλου τοῦ ποτηρίου. λέγει δὲ οὕτως' (fr.12 W)
For a brief explanation c.f. West, Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus (1974) 175-6. Note that Mimnermus says nothing of the Sun's horses sharing the vessel with their master. That detail only comes in Pherecydes (inf. cit.). The Sun's cup itself clearly existed before S. But for all we know, this master of mythical καλλιτέχνα may have been the first to introduce it into the story of Geryon as Heracles' means of conveyance to Erytheia.¹ The cup is mentioned for its own sake in Aeschylus fr.69 N² (from his Heliades): ἔνθ’ ἐπὶ δυσμαίες ἔκου (δυσμαίες τεοδ Ηέρμαν) πατρός ἡφαιστοτεκνε| δέπας ἐν ταῖ διαβάλλει| πολύν οἴδιματέντα| τ’ φέρει ὄραμον πόρον οὐδείς (περίδρομον Sidgwick, εὖθελε Schmidt) μελανίππου προφυγόν | ἱεράς νυκτὸς ἀμολγόν. Antimachus fr.66 W (τότε δὴ χρυσέωι ἐν

¹Unless Pisander is to be placed earlier in time than S. See above p.113.
δέπαι | Ἡλιον πόμπευεν ἀγαλματεν Ἠρώθεια) pictures the
Sun sailing off from the island of Erytheia (or its
eponymous nymph: the distinction is meaningless). As
West observes (l.c. p.169) "The fragment may mean simply,
"the sun had just set!" On Euphorion's bronze vessel see
above p.191.

Aeschylus likewise had cause to mention Heracles' borrow-
ing of the Sun's cup, in words which seem to reflect the
Stesichorean passage: ἐνείδεν | δρμενος θραδυνως βοῦς ἡλας' (Wilamowitz: ἡλαςεν codd.) ἀπ' ἑκάτων | γαῖας, Ὡκεανὸν
περάσας ἐν δέπαι (Wilam.: διηλῆ codd.) χυσηλάτων (fr.74.
fff N² from the Heraclidae). But if we wish to learn
exactly how Heracles managed to borrow his vessel from the
Sun we must turn to three authors in particular. (1)
Pisander fr. 5 K = Athen. 469D: Πεισανδρός ἐν δευτέρω
Ἡρακλεάς τὸ δέπας ἐν δὲ διέπλευσεν ὁ Ἡρακλῆς τὸν
Ὠκεανὸν εἶλας μὲν φησὶν Ἡλίου, λαβεῖν δ᾿ αὐτὸ παρ᾿ Ὡκεανὸν τὸν Ἡρακλέα. (2) Panyassis fr. 7 K = Athen.
469D: Πανύσις δ᾿ ἐν πρῶτῳ Ἡρακλεάς παρὰ Νηρέως φησὶ τὴν
tοῦ Ἡλίου φιάλην κοιμᾶσθαι τὸν Ἡρακλέα καὶ διαπλεύσαι
eἰς Ἐρώθειαν. (3) Pherecydes F. Gr. Hist. 3 F 18A = Athen. 470C: Φερεκύδης δ᾿ ἐν τρίτῃ τῶν Ἰστοριῶν προειπόν
περὶ τοῦ Ὡκεανοῦ ἐπιφέρει·
ὅ δ᾿ Ἡρακλῆς ἔλεκται ἐπ᾿ αὐτὸν τὸ τόξον ὡς βαλῶν, καὶ ὡς Ἡλίος πάυσασθαι κελεύει, ὁ δὲ δελαῖς παυεῖ. Ἡλιος δὲ ἀντὶ τούτου διέωσιν αὐτῶν τὸ δέπας τὸ χρύσεον δ αὐτόν
ἐφόρει εὖν ταῖς ἱπποῖς, ἐπὶν δύνη, διὰ τοῦ Ὤκεανοῦ τὴν
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νύκτα πρὸς ἐώςν ἐν ἀνίσχει ὁ ἥλιος. Ἑπεὶτα πορεύεται Ἡρακλῆς ἐν τῷ δέπα τοῦτω ἐς τὴν Ἑρώθειαν. καὶ ὁτὲ δὲ ἦν ἐν τῷ πελάγει, ὁμειῶνος πειρόμενος αὐτὸν κυμαίνει τὸ δέπας ψανταζόμενος. ὁ δὲ τοξεύειν αὐτὸν μέλλει, καὶ αὐτὸν δείκαν ὁμειῶνος παύσας οἰκεύει.¹

For later philosopher's elaborations of the Sun's bowl c.f. Kirk and Raven l.c. pp.14f, 156, 203. It is interesting to note that no vase-painting depicts the Sun himself in his bowl: we only have depictions of Heracles sitting in the vessel (see above p.105).

¹Wilamowitz's correction of the first sentence of narrative (καὶ ὁ ἥλιος δείκαν παύσας οἰκεύει, ὁ δὲ παύσας in Gesch. d. gr. Sprache (1909) p.24f) is sufficiently plausible to make Bowra's generalisations (GLP² p.91) about the significance behind Heracles' different treatment of Helios ("an Olympian who could not be treated too violently") and Oceanus ("the son of Uranus and Gaea and the brother of the Giants could perhaps be defied with less risk") highly dubious. And the existence of fr.add. renders Bowra's transference of these motives to S. and his deductions about a remodeling of the story by "later poets" (viz. Pisander and Panyassis) "to avoid any implications of impiety" quite unacceptable.
In view of the probable vocative Κρο[νίδα βα[ζιλε] at 11 and the probable ἄ[δυξοι] in the previous line Barrett very tentatively identifies the fragment as a speech (that much is indubitable) by Geryon to Zeus expressing indignation at Heracles' robbery.

Because of the bridge regularly maintained directly before this region of the line, it is best to follow Haslam (p.20 n.22) in supplementing something like ἐπιέρανται rather than Führer's π[πέρανται] (p.678).
This has long been the locus classicus for the discursiveness and ἡποτομία of S's narratives. Who would have guessed without this fragment that the tale of Heracles' entertainment by Pholus was somehow grafted on to the totally separate story of the theft of Geryon's cattle? The news is certainly surprising. And, predictably, at least one scholar has noticed that only one of the passages by Athenaeus explicitly mentions the Geryoneis (and, we might add, this says nothing of Pholus) and has sought to expel the phrase ἐν Γηρουνηΐς as a late gloss (G. Cajati, Il mito di Ercole in Stesicoro (Rome 1941) p.42). The reaction is absurd: we must simply steel ourselves to accept that S. united these two episodes, though we do not know why, how, or at what stage of the narrative. The usual account of the visit to Pholus, as preserved in fullest detail by Apollod. 2.5.4 and Diod. 4.12, connects it with Heracles' search for the Erymanthian boar. This creature lived and worked in Arcadia, and it was while passing through this region of Greece that Heracles came to Pholoe and was there entertained by Silenus' son the centaur Pholus. On opening a special jar of wine presented to him by Dionysus for just this occasion, Pholus brought ruin upon himself: other centaurs, attracted by

1Who elsewhere (2.5.10: see pp.67ff above) but not, apparently, here, seems to preserve the sequence of events followed by S. in the Geryoneis.

2On whose usual location see further my commentary on S85.
its remarkable bouquet, arrived armed with rocks and firs, and a full-scale battle with Heracles ensued. Blazing brands and copious use of Heracles' bow drove them off, but during the pursuit the totally innocent Chiron was wounded with an arrow-shaft dipped in the gore of the Hydra, and precisely the same fatal combination killed Pholus: he drew an arrow from the corpse of a centaur, and while inspecting it, accidentally dropped it on his foot. Heracles buried him upon returning to Pholoe and then proceeded to hunt down the boar.

As noted above, we cannot say in what way S. re-cast this material to fit its new environment, nor whether he located it before or after the main episode of Geryon and his cattle. To our way of thinking, its position after the central events of the poem's narrative would incur the charge of anticlimax and dissipation of interest. But it would be rash to assume that S. must have shared our views on narrative structure. We cannot even deduce from the tiny fragment in our possession, how detailed a treatment S. accorded to what was a subordinate incident, though we have no good reason to suppose he was any less generous than usual.

The story was known to other poets: Panyassis may have handled it in his epic on Heracles (see Matthews on fr.4 K (p.48f)), Epicharmus composed a Ἡρακλῆς παρὰ Φῶλοι, and see Theocr. Id. 7.149f ἄρα γέ πατοῦνε Φῶλο κατὰ λαΐνον ἄντρον ἡμανθής Ἡρακλῆς γέρων ἐστάσατο Χίρων; with Gow ad
The theme was popular in works of art too (c.f. Lucian, Conv. 14: ἡμίγυμνος ... πήξας τὸν ἀγκώνα ὀρθὸν, ἐξων ἀμα τὸν σκύφον ἐν τῇ δεξιά, οἶος ο παρὰ φόλωι Ἡρακλής ὑπὸ τῶν γραφέων δείκνυται, Brommer Vasenlisten 3 78ff, Denkmälerlisten 1-140)

but one plastic depiction has been thought particularly relevant to S's treatment. This is the well-preserved slab discovered to the south-west of the thesaurum at Foce del Sele (see Zancani Montuoro and Zanotti-Bianco, Heraion & c pp. 111ff and Tables XXVI and LII). It presents a totally nude figure, male and bearded, facing right in profile: his head is markedly doliocephalic and he is extending his arms, which are crooked up at the elbows: the palm of his right hand is held open. The slab is broken off at the left, but the way in which the small of this figure's back is elongated in that direction strongly implies that he is intended to represent a centaur. This presumption is in no way thwarted by the appearance of a normal human left leg advancing forward beneath the figure's torso, or by the automatic inference that this feature was originally matched by a no less normal right leg: centaurs were often represented thus in art, especially on our oldest representations: see P. Baur, Centaurs in Ancient Art (1912), pp. 78ff. Furthermore,

1Gow protests that this passage is unique in directly involving Chiron in Heracles' entertainment, but as Dover observes (again ad loc. (p. 165)) "Theocritus seems to envisage a more harmonious occasion than that described by Apollodorus."
the position of this find relative to other fragments of a frieze depicting Heracles in combat with numerous centaurs variously portrayed as fighting, galloping, wounded, or dying, leaves us in no doubt that we have before us the first scene of a Centauromachy: the remaining scenes are fully described and analysed in Heraion &c pp.118ff. Our figure's gesture with his open palm now becomes meaningful: he is Pholus beseeching his fellow centaurs to depart in peace.

I think it unreasonable to claim that these scenes can have taken their inspiration in any way from S's Geryoneis. It would be extraordinarily perverse for any artist influenced by that poem to have devoted so much space and energy to the representation of an episode that must have been entirely peripheral, no matter how detailed its treatment, while totally excluding the central incidents involving the removal of Geryon's cattle and the killing of their master. Only if we could assert with confidence that most of the other friezes which adorn this thesaurum bear the unmistakeable impress of S's poetry, might we begin to wonder whether so minor a motif likewise followed his mythopoeia. But that is precisely what we cannot prove.

At first sight this fragment is straightforward. On further inspection it becomes fantastically opaque. The meaning of the first half of the quotation is clouded by
two difficulties which resolve themselves into the question of the relationships between ἀχύρον and δέμας, εὐμετρὸν and τρυλάγυνον. I begin with the first pair.

(1) Both words are ambiguous, but let us start with what is securely transmitted. δέμας has a long pre-history, being represented on the Linear B Tablets by its ancestor di-pa (c.f. Ventris and Chadwick, Documents in Mycenaean Greek (1973) p.540). This is symbolised there by vessels which either have no handles at all or bear free-standing ring handles (numbering anything from two to four) set upright on the rim. These latter look as if they were used for hook-slinging or similar transport, and both types of vessel are shaped quite differently from cups and goblets of contemporary or later date. It is clear that Mycenaean di-pa was some sort of vat or storage-jar intended to hold liquid for a considerable time: it was most certainly not a drinking-cup to be held with ease in the hand. Likewise in Il.11.632ff, Nestor's famous δέμας is not used for drinking from; δέμας περικαλλές ... χρυσείους ἱλοίς πεπαμένον· οὐδατὰ δ' αὐτοῦ τέσσαρ' ἔσαν, δοιαὶ δὲ πελειάδες ἀμφίεκαστον χρύσειαι νεμέθοντο, δόω δ' ὑπὸ πυθμένες ἤσαν. Rather, his slave-woman mixes a potion in it (638ff): ἐν τῷ δ' αὐτὶ κυκῆς γυνῇ ... οἰνωὶ Πραμνείῳ, ἐπὶ δ' αἴγειον κυὴ τυρῶν κυήστι χαλκείῃ, ἐπὶ δ' ἀλφίτα λευκὰ πάλυνε, just as Circe uses her δέμας to concoct a more sinister brew in Od. 10.316f.

But in the other 54 instances of the word's occurrence in Homer, δέμας does refer to a drinking-cup (and so also in
the Homeric Hymns' two instances, H.H. Ap. 10, Dem. 206). Most usually it has the product of a κρητήρ poured into it. It is hand-held (e.g. Od. 18.152), it is drunk from directly (e.g. Od. 19.62), and on two occasions it is usefully glossed as a κυκέλλον (Il.1.584 596) and as an ἄλσικον (Od. 22.17 9).

This second meaning might seem obviously appropriate in the present passage. But N.R. Collinge, B.I.C.S. 4 (1957) 55ff, ingeniously suggests that δέημα here is most nearly equivalent to that of Nestor or Circe in Homer: the enormous appetites of Heracles demand a mixing-bowl (if not the liquid-container of Mycenaean homes) from which to drink wine that lesser mortals would sample from mere cups. That δέημα here does not in itself mean "goblet, beaker" is deduced from the addition of σκύφωσιον (Casaubon's conjecture) which might be taken as emphatic of the unusual rôle here allotted to the noun. On the usual relationship between δέημα and σκύφος see A.M. Dale, C.R. 2 (1952) 129ff = Collected Papers pp 99ff: σκύφος is there shown to refer regularly to a deep cup.

The σκύφος of the MSS is a rare word, used at Athen. 11.477f, which occurrence might well provoke a slip on the part of a copyist - or of Athenaeus himself - in the present citation. The diminutive of σκύφος sits oddly in such close proximity to τριλάγυνον, and with one certain substantive in the middle of the line and a further
possibility at the end (see below) the prospect of yet another noun in clumsy apposition is not attractive. Casaubon's \( κυνόν \) would either serve the purpose Collinge's above interpretation assigns to it or complete a grandiloquent periphrasis (\( κυνόν \) \( θέποις \) equivalent to \( κυκωκος \) in much the same way as \( κυκωκος \) \( κιςσοβ \) at Eur. Cycl. 390 and \( κιςσοβ \) \( κυκωκος \) at id. fr.146 N\(^2\) represent \( κιςσοβ \) that conveyed some new information (a \( κυκωκος \) is not only large but rustic: see Od. 14.112, Alcm. 56.3 P, Eur. Cycl. 390, Theocr. Id. 1.143 etc.). Metre demands that the line thus emended remove from str./ant.4 to ep.5 (which new position also entails the harmless transformation of \( πι\'\) \( επικυκωκος \) to \( πι\langle υεν \rangle επικυκ \) after Friedmann).

For \( κυνόν \) c.f. Hes. frr.271 and 272 P, Panyassis fr. 4.2 K, Anaximand. F. Gr. Hist. 9 F 1. But again, our fragment allows us so restricted a view that we cannot then confidently acquit ourselves of the charge of rewriting S. (2) \( εμε\τρον \) \( ω κ τριλάγυνον \): does this mean (i) "measuring as much as three flasks, bottles", with \( τριλάγυ \) a neuter singular noun? Or is it (ii) "of goodly size, approximately containing three flasks", with \( τριλάγ \) as adj.? (i) corresponds with LSJ's rendering of the phrase s.v. \( εμε\τρος \) II ("measuring, containing"): but S's is the only passage to be found under that particular subdivision of a not especially rare word: besides, \( τριλάγ \) 's other appearance is as an adj. (see below), though its existence as substantive would be amply paralleled by forms like
πετράδραχμον and others assembled by E. Risch, Mus. Helv. 2 (1945) 15f, and Page clearly takes it this way since he renders ὰς by "quantum" in P.M.G.'s Index Verborum (p.263). (ii) is implied by LSJ's translation s.v. τριλάδυ."(holding three bottles") and fits in with that word's only other occurrence in a second century A.D. list of miscellaneous articles (P. Oxy. 741-12) where it is an adjective qualifying κελλάριον. It also allows εὔμετρος to bear the common meaning it later enjoys ("in measure, proportioned": LSJ s.v. I 1) a meaning possibly favoured by such analogous poetic forms as περίμετρος ("very large": the Odyssey and later) ἐμετρός ("immense": Simonid. 543. 22 P and later) ἐμετρός ("measureless": Soph.T G F 4 F 353 Radt) ὑπερμέτρος etc. τριλάδυ. will then follow this as a further attribute of δένας explanatory of ἐμετρ. ὰς is thereby given a meaning unparalleled in early or indeed any Greek poetry, but its use in connection "with words compounded with numerals" to signify "about" or "nearly" is well attested in prose authors: see LSJ s.v. ὰς E where our passage is placed, rightly I believe. The only slight obstacle to this overall interpretation is the rather clumsy word-order, which would fit (i) far more smoothly. But it is difficult to hew any coherent and grammatical meaning out of these irritating lines without entailing some such minor infelicity, and on all other counts (ii) provides an infinitely superior rendering of the phrase. On either interpretation, of course, ὰς τριλάγυνον clings together as a word-group (Maas, Gr.
Metr. 135) which maintains the bridge that we expect at this part of the line (see p.89).

This part of the fragment has evoked strange reactions from some scholars: thus Hermann Fränkel (Dicht. und Phil. p. = Early Gk. Poet. and Philos. p. 282) sees S's readiness to allow "a prosaic measurement" like τριλάγυνον into his verses as one manifestation of his "penchant towards factual accuracy."

Mancuso p.220 and Bowra (GLP p.93) speculate that the size of Heracles' draught here "may have helped to start on its career the conception of Heracles as a man of prodigious appetites", a conception whose comic effects are exploited in Euripides' Alcestis and elsewhere (see Dale's edition of that play p.xx). But that seems too undignified for S's usual level and one thinks rather of the heroic implications of Il.11.636f (Nestor's cup):

διλλος μὲν μογέων ἀποκινήσας τραπέζης | πλεῖον έδον,
Νέστωρ δ' ο γέρων ἀμογητί ἀειρεν, itself very closely related to Il.24.452ff.

cf. δε λαβών δέπα ... τό ὅτα οἱ παρέθηκε Φόλος

c.f. Od. 4.66 (scil. νῶτα ... διπτα) έν χερσίν ἐλών, τά δά
οἱ γέρα πάρθεκαν αὐτῶι.
"fortasse ad Pholi historiam spectat (δῶξε ... οἶνον...)", says Page (SLG p.13), which is a mite misleading, since that verb and that object clearly do not construe together. They are kept apart by ένοθευ (5), four letters offering a wide range of articulations (ένοθευ, ένοθ'έν, ένοθ'έν οτε, ένοθ'έν, ένοθ'έν έν. ένοθένι- seems less likely). The hypothesis might be maintained and the phenomena saved by supposing that in this passage [someone] gave (δῶξε) [to someone else a jar or cup] from which (ένοθευ) [he drank or drew off] the wine (οἶνον). But Heracles' drinking seems to be pre-empted by S19, as is Pholus' mixing.

5: οἶνον (Führer p.683 ("the left-hand arc of a circle" ed. pr. p.24): c.f. Schmidt's Parallel-Homer s.v. (p.160), Archilochnus fr. 4·8W.

6: the final letter here is represented by an arc "above the general level" (Lobel p.24). Its unusual height and curved shape make alpha an unlikely interpretation. This tells against Lobel's Πεύξι[καλλιμαν], which also leaves the final syllable of ep.6 awkwardly unfilled. Barrett's Πεύξι[καλλιμοσιωτίν on the other hand is metrically convenient, its raised omicron is paralleled by the papyrus'
rendering of that letter in S22.6, and its concluding
-τυμοίς is implied by the papyrus' accentuation κάλιμολ.
"One substantial fragment which awaits an ingenious inter­preter", is Page's description of this scrap (p.154). I am sorry to say that this is still the case, and that, as so often, our increased knowledge of S's metrical practi­ces makes it harder, not easier, to reach the answer. As Page observes, the first line is the start of an epode and the top of a column, and the top of col.XII begins with an epode. Could our fragment belong between S15: (= col. XI) and ii (= col.XII), directly following on the former, providing the upper part of the latter? καὶ τὰ ἅν μὲν (scil. τρυφάλειαν) is promising immediately after S15: 16-17, and ἐπὶ χθόνα and κεφαλά fit that context, but I have been no more successful than Page in identifying the "swift-flying" female subjects, ending in -povec or -pevec and perhaps governing 1·2's ἔχοιςα, which Lobel's completion of the end of line one implies.

 Granted such failure we should perhaps entertain more readily than Page the possibility that S21 belongs to a col.XII in a later or earlier thirteen-column sequence (at least 390 lines away). But here again difficulties abound: suppose a totally different context, Heracles' combat with the Centaurs (presupposed by Pholus' cup in S19 = 181 P): ἐπὶ χθόνα and κεφαλά are hardly less appropriate and κενταλύρον ἐς ὁμοταξίαν would provide excellent sense (especially in view of the adj.'s usual
application: see below). But the ban on more than three consecutive longa rules this out.

1: The distance of (a) from (b) cannot be decided by examining the fibres of the back, but note that ςιυ ξενι near the start of the line will only allow ["""" ] to be missing in the lacuna, since this is ep.1.

ὁμοιότητα: usually of horses or birds.

5: Δας Barrett.
Page's presentation of the text here (on p.153 of his article, p.14 of SLG) is slightly askew in its reproduction of the spatial relationships required by papyrus and metre. I give the corrected version as approved implicitly by Haslam p.20 n.22, explicitly by Führer R p.7 n.65.

φατά] κωδ φατά first suggested in print by Führer p.678. c.f. [Hes.] Scut. 230: Γοργόνες διπλητοί τε και οὐ φατάι. κωδ φατά of course is treated as a word-group (Maas, Gr. Metr. §135) and does not violate the bridge usual in this position (see p.89).

Ηκάματος
Lobel's tentative ἦκάματος (p.15) is best avoided, since word-end before this part of the line seems to be regular (see p.89).

Πφυλοπις δραγαλέας
C.f. Il.11.278: φύλοπιν δραγαλέννυ. Elsewhere in Homer and Hesiod φύλοπιν is followed by αἴνην to complete the formula.

6f: Ἰμάχαι τ' ἀνδροκτασίαι τε
c.f. Il.24.548 (different metrical position) μάχαι τ' ἀνδροκτασίαι τε. So too II.7.237: -ας τ' ...-ας τε], and τ' ἀνδροκτασίαι/-ας τε as line-ending in Od. 11.612, Hes.
Theog. 228.

διαμπροχίου

in H.H. Aphr. 19 of sounds. Otherwise in Homer only the
adv. διαμπρόχιον.
Someone denounces someone else to the gods? The χα (.)γ. written over μαντις is explained by Page (p.153) as a variant (κατα)καρόςς for καταμανύ-. But note that καταμανύω in the passive is used of a god giving a sign in Xen. Hell. 3.3.2.
As Lobel says (p.9) "ει, which interprets the form as infinitive, is placed in an unusual position, below instead of above that to which it applies."

Although we can glean very little in the way of knowledge about the fragment's contents, we have in this stichometric letter a glittering gem of information. Such marginal signs stand not so much opposite as slightly below the relevant line, between every hundredth and hundred and first, signifying that there have been 100 lines up to the point they mark. Compare $\overline{A}$ in S133 ii 9 and $\overline{F}$ in P. Lille 76. For the principle c.f. K. Ohly, Stichometrische Untersuchungen, Zentralblatt für Bibliothekwesen 61 (1928) passim, E.G. Turner, Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World (Oxford 1971) p.19 (with recent examples in n.2).

The present sign tells us we have reached 1.1300 of the Geryoneis. It is true that the pathetic scraps which huddle about it do not allow us to decide what stage the narrative has reached by now. But we must be grateful for what Fate has granted us. We can now draw the appropriate conclusions for the scale of S's composition.
which bears out preliminary deductions from the narrative scale of the fragments. We know that Book 1 of Sappho contained 1,320 lines (c.f. Page S & A p.114 n.2). Pindar's Nemeans have 1,261 lines, his Pythians 1,983. Nor must we forget that the Oresteia definitely (213 P) and the Helen very probably (189 P) occupied more than one book, covered more than one roll.
S31

There is no trace of any writing on 1.2, which must therefore represent one of the two shortest verses in the metrical scheme (str.5 or ep.6). And this entails that our fragment is either str./ant.4-8\(^1\) or ep.5-str.1.

We can decide between these alternatives by recalling Lobel's assertion (p.12) "I do not think there is any doubt that [S31] stood on the right of [Sll]\(^2\), but they have no vertical fibres in common and the interval between them cannot be fixed by external evidence." We now see that the first half of this statement disproves the second, since the external evidence of the thirty-line column, wedded to our reconstituted metrical scheme, will locate our fragment in col.XIII as ant.4-8 starting one line lower within that column than S 11.16ff (ep.3ff) in XI.

S32
Possibly the bottom of Col.VI whose upper part is S9\(^A\).

4: χουτε -
First suggested in print by Führer p.681.

8: αφα ζ
On the form suggested by Barrett's and Führer's (p.682) 'Αφαίτε - (c.f. S 55.2) see B. Forssman, Untersuchungen zur Sprache Pindars (1966) pp 20ff.

\(^1\)This was the interpretation of Führer (pp.676 and 679f) while under the misapprehension (now rectified: see R p.9) that S31 came from the same column as S11.

\(^2\)Misprinted as S13(a) by Page ad loc. (S.L.G. p.16).
Line 2 establishes this fragment as str./ant.4-8 or ep.5-str.1, for the same reasons as rehearsed in my commentary on S31.

Once again the second line of the fragment points the way to its metrical identification. A short verse preceded by one and succeeded by two longer lines (1, 3, 4) which are at the least four letters further to the right, can only be str./ant.7. Decision between str./ant.3¹ and ant.6-ep.3 is not aided by the stop after 1·7, since that can be paralleled both in str./ant.3 (S13·12, 15 ii 7) and ep.3 (S21·3, 27·5). But considerations of relative line-length exclude the second alternative: ep.1 is always longer than ep.2 (S 13 2/3, 15 ii 14/15, 21 1/2, 27 i 3/4) whereas here line 6 clearly protruded beyond line 5. str./ant.1 is always shorter than str./ant.2 (S14·314, 15 i 9/10, 15 ii 5/6) however, and that fits the phenomena here. That ant.2 (36·6) should be shorter than ant.3 (36·7) is on the contrary very unusual, and only one

¹Rightly preferred by Führer R p.9 (c.f. p.677 of his earlier article).
analogy can be found: S15 ii 5/6 on the papyrus have just that relationship.

S39

If Lobel's supplement for 4 (εύροςυχρο[[-]) is correct, the relative position of the line-ends proclaim this fragment as str./ant.4-7 or ep.5-8.

S71

Lobel plausibly interprets the traces of 2 as έρεαστήλοκαμ- (p.27: the first extant letter "the lower part of a stroke descending from left"). Another example (see p.1129) of a word shared by S. and Ibycus? See 303A P2 and c.f. B.K. Braswell, Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft 36 (1977) 9ff.
Page ad loc. (SLG p.23) mentions two possible metrical interpretations of this morsel: str./ant.2-8\(^1\) and ep.3-str.1. Führer (R p.10) observes that the former is the likelier since it allows for 1-2 (str.3) the expected sequence "\[\]". The bridge principle in ep.4 however will only allow ιαίνηται.

καὶ φυλα[πα]

with Führer's supplement c.f. this poem S22.4 and 24.3 and Iliupersis 89.10.

\(^1\)Misprinted as str.3-8.
182 P = S85

Pausanias here tells us that Pallantium was mentioned in the Geryoneis. Paus. 5.1.8 and 8.43.1 and 5 make it quite clear that this was the name of a town in Arcadia (situated in fact S.W. of Tripolis by Lake Taka) and that offers the likeliest link between Pallantium and our poem. For Heracles' visit to Pholus is always set in Arcadia (Pholus lived in Pholoe described by Steph. Byz. s.v. as an Arcadian city) and so S85 may be from roughly the same context as S19 (= 181 P). So first K.O. Müller, Die Dorier (1844) Beilagen II 8. Admittedly that location must be due to the usual association of the Pholus tale with the Peloponnesian Labours especially the Erymanthian boar (c.f. Apollod. 2.5.3f) an association which the Geryoneis clearly did not follow.

A different approach notes that the Arcadian hero Evander is reputed to have left his native town of Pallantium and to have founded a city of similar name in Italy. Relatively late authors have Heracles entertained there by Evander as he returns through Italy with Geryon's cattle (c.f. Paus. 8.43.2, Dion. Hal. Ant. 1.40, etc.). Usener Jahrb. für Philol. 139 (1889) 369 = Kl. Schr. 1.330 ingeniously supposed that some such scene occurred in the Geryoneis and that Evander's account to his guest of his original home town was the source not only of our present fragment but of the Suda's notice s.v. Στησίχορος ὁ δὲ ἀπὸ Παλαντίου τῆς Ἀρκαδίας φυγόντα αὐτὸν ἔλθεῖν φασίν εἶτε...
Kατάλυμα. Of course the isolated statement "S. made Evander say 'I left Pallantium and went into exile" could quite easily be abbreviated by accident into "S. said 'I left Pallantium and went into exile.'" And although we know nothing of S's treatment of Heracles' return journey, it is still true that a poet so closely connected with Magna Graecia might well let his hero take this particular route. On the other hand we must bear in mind that a close interest in and embroidery of Heracles' adventures in Italy (for instance the fight with Cacus) was a characteristic of Roman writers (see Croon pp.22ff) eager to glorify their own land.

---

1 For a common Greek attitude to quotations which would make such an abbreviation very easy see K.J. Dover, "Greek Popular Morality in the Time of Aristotle" (1974) p.15 and n.1.

2 See above p.71 n.1.
Hes. Theog. 287 runs Χρυσάωρ ἢτεκε τρικέφαλον Γηρυνῆα and the scholion ad loc. makes the present comment. We now know from the papyrus fragments that S. portrayed Geryon as the offspring of Callirhoa and Chrysaor (the former name an inevitable supplement at 10.3 and 11.45, the latter a lacunose but inevitable reading at 10.5 and 11.24 and an inevitable supplement 11.3). Not that the scholion is attributing this genealogy to S. here. The first ἦδι of the second sentence is only relevant to the description of Geryon's physical conformation.

Hesiod called Geryon τρικέφαλος, S. gave him six arms, six legs and wings, Aeschylus (Ag. 870) and Euripides (Her. 423) know him as τρικώματος. In theory, the two earlier poets might have followed a different tradition from the Attic tragedians, and might have visualised a monster with three heads (and in S's case a swarm of limbs almost rivalling those of a particularly well-endowed Indian god) upon a single body. In fact such a tricephalus being is not without parallel in plastic art.

But it is precisely the evidence of art that disqualifies this interpretation of the evidence of literature. Representations on vases and the like invariably give us a three-bodied Geryon, right from the start. The earliest examples are the Protocorinthian pyxis from Phalerum.

\[1\text{For the evidence of Latin authors see Nisbet and Hubbard on Horace Odes 2.14.8 (p.229).}\]
(easily the oldest specimen: c. mid. 7th cent.) in the British Museum (65.7-20: Payne NC 130 = Vasenlisten 3 63. Cl); and the bronze relief from Delphi dateable to the first quarter of the 6th cent. (Kunze, Arch. Schildbänder (Ol. Forsch. 2 (1950) 106ff pls. 30, 50.2, 63, 65 = Denkmälerlisten 1.49.6). See further Robertson p.209 n.4. See too Paus. 5.19.1 on the Chest of Cypselus (τρεῖς ἄνδρες ... ἀλλήλοις προσεχόμενοι) and Lucian Toxaris 62 (506) ὅποιον τον Γηρυόνην οἱ γραφεῖς ἑνδεικνύονται ἀνθρώπου εἴδεσθαι καὶ τρικέφαλον. In the face of these parallels, it would be as perverse to maintain that S's Geryon (or Hesiod's) had one body as to argue that the Attic dramatists had a one-headed Geryon in mind. The failure of our present fragment to make this more explicit is easily explained by observing its context: the scholion is commenting on Hesiod's τρικέφαλον and restricts its remarks to the features which the Hesiodic epithet necessarily passes over.

\[\text{The singular should not mislead us: Lucian is comparing Geryon to the union of two or three friends. (τοιοῦτον τι γὰρ ἐστὶ συνελθόντες δόο ἢ τρεῖς φίλοι ὅποιον κτλ.)}\]
The few ipsissima verba of S. which have cause to mention Geryon's physique, refer to a head (or a part of it) in the singular (15 i 14-15; ii.7, 11, 14). But that is because Heracles must dispose of each of his enemy's heads and bodies in turn. The most detailed account of Geryon's appearance is to be found in Apollodorus, whose narrative of the labour in question is the ampest we have. Since this general resumé probably derives from S. (see above pp.67ff) it is highly plausible that this detail too should be traced back to the self-same source:

Γηρυόνης ... τριῶν ἐξων ἄνδρῶν συμφυές σώμα, συνηγμένον ἕκεν ἐν κατὰ τὴν γαστέρα, ἐσχισμένον δὲ εἰς τρεῖς ἀπὸ λαγόνων τε καὶ μησόν.

ὑπόπτερον: how many wings? Plastic art has only two examples to show from vase-paintings. Vase 1 gives him two, that is the near wing on his outermost left shoulder, and the further wing whose source cannot be seen. Vase 2 likewise provides a single pair, though the general collapse of Geryon here makes it difficult to locate them so precisely. At any rate, Bowra (GLP² p.124) is quite wrong to maintain that these vases "show Geryon not only with three bodies but with three pairs of great curved wings" (my italics).
The Geryoneis is here credited with a mention of an Atlantic island known as Sarpedonia. This is the same place as the Cypria (fr. 24 Allen (p. 125) = Herodianus peri monhrouc lexewc c. 9 Lehns, 2·914·15 Lentz) calls Sarpedon: Σαρπηδόων -όνος, είτε ή ἤρως είτε ή πέτρα είτε ή νήςος είτε ή ἄκτη. καὶ ή νήςος λίδως ἐν ἦμεανωι Γοργύνων οἰκητήριον ὀδα, ὥς δὲ τὰ Κύρια φησι.

τοι δ' ὑποκυσαμένη τέκε Γοργύνας αἶνα πέλωρα,

ἀλ Σαρπηδόνα ναὸν ἐπ’ ἦμεανωι βαθυδίνηη,

νῆςον πυτρήεσσαν.

(This passage is inexplicably absent from LSJ's article s.v. Σαρπηδόν. Likewise missing is any entry s.v. Σαρπηδόνα. Contrast Pape-Benseler Wörterbuch der gr. Eigennamen s.v.). Hes. Theog. 274f must be alluding, albeit more vaguely, to the same territory:

Γοργύος θ’ αἱ ναḯονμεν πέρην ξλντοῦ ἦμεανοῖο

ἐκχατηὴ πρός νυκτός, ἐν ἦμ’ Ἐπερίδες λιγύφωνοι.

Indeed all three authors may well have the same island in mind. But I find it hard to explain why the first two give it a name so reminiscent of the Lycian hero of the Iliad. It is not as if he were at all closely connected with the Gorgons (or Geryon for that matter). The Isle of the Blessed is sometimes placed in the far West, but Sarpedon was carried to Lycia after his death (Il. 16·666 ff). Admittedly, the regions which derive their names from his are widely spread, and this suggests that his worship is old and deep-rooted (see Immisch in Roscher
4.393ff). Maybe a real island where the hero had a cult-
centre was picked on by our poets for the Gorgons' home.
But I find no value in the unverifiable speculation of
Vürtheim (p.20) or Schulten (p.58) on this topic.
Hesiod places the Gorgons πέρην κλυτοῦ, ᾌκεανοῖο in the
same area as Erytheia which he goes on to mention. If
he is thinking of the island named after Sarpedon it must.
be fairly near Geryon's homeland\(^1\) and that would lend
support to Mr. Barrett's suggestion (anticipated by
Kleine p.66) that our fragment's isle, like that of the
Hesperides (S8), was visited by Heracles on his travels to
or from Erytheia. The two fragments might then come from
the same context. But we have already seen reasons to
doubt the application to S8 of this particular explanation
(see p.127). And it seems a pity to waste the few scraps
of information vouchsafed us by Cypria fr.24: the Gorgons
lived on Sarpedon we are told, and the Gorgons have a
marginal part to play in the story of Geryon. His father
was Chrysaor, and he, together with Pegasus, sprang from
the severed head of Medusa (see Hes. Theog. 270ff and West
ad loc. (pp.243ff)). Robertson has guessed (p.216) that
the present fragment originated in a digression touching
on the ancestry of Geryon, just as S8 is from an excursus
on Eurytion's genealogy.

\(^1\) The nearness of the two places also emerges if we juxta-
pose Mimn. fr.12-8 (the Sun's cup bears him away χώρου
ἄφ' Ἐκπερεΐςων) with Antimachus fr.66 W (τότε δὲ χρυσέωι
ἐν δέπαι Ἡέλιον πόμπευεν ἀγαλματίνη Ἐρύθεια) and S's
fr.17.
Bowra (GLP<sup>2</sup> p.90) draws a rather tortured contrast between our fragment, which he sees as an acceptance of tradition as enshrined in the Cypria, and S7 (= 184 P) where geographical discoveries have "extended [S's] horizon." But what he says of the latter is also true of the former: S's placing of his island ἐν τῷ Ἀτλαντικῷ πελάγει is more geographically specific than the Cypria's ἐπὶ Ὀκεανῶι βασθέηνη and marks as much of an "advance" over the vague language of Hes. Theog. 274f as his mention of Tartessus and Erytheia does over Theog. 288ff.
EAENA

THE MYTH

The scholarly production on this topic is predictably immense. Under the perennial spell which Helen has cast ever since Homer's time, a vast amount of secondary literature has arisen. Among recent works which are themselves rich in bibliography one might mention the general survey included by R. Kannicht in the Introduction to his great commentary on Euripides' Helen (Vol.1 (1969) pp.21ff) J. Th. Kakridis on "Problems of the Homeric Helen" ("Homer Revisited" (Lund 1971) ch. 1 pp.25-53); T.C.W. Stinton, "Euripides and the Judgement of Paris" (J.H.S. Supplementary Papers No.11 (1965)).

On Helen in religion, "Immortal Helen" An Inaugural Lecture by M.L. West, Bedford College (University of London) 1975 contains within a short space much that is as stimulating and provocative as its authorship would lead us to expect. Lilly B. Ghali-Kahil, "Les enlèvements et le retour d'Hélène dans les textes et les documents figurés" (Paris 1955) 2 vols.) is good on the latter, less good on the former. F. Jouan, Euripide et les légendes des chants cypriens (Paris 1966) ch.11 Euripide et ses sources 4: les lyriques (pp.41fff) contains usually rash attempts to recover S's Helen from Euripidean dramas and to determine how S's version differed from the Cypria's: see too pp. 158ff on "les Noces d'Hélène".

- 239 -
I have no wish to repeat what these and other scholars have written about the history of the myth of Helen. But I may, with advantage, emphasise one or two of its aspects which seem particularly relevant to S's poem. The sympathetic quality of Homer's treatment has long been remarked: ὁ ποιητὴς ὑπεραπολογεῖται Ἐλένης ἀει says Σ Od. 4.145. Almost the only person in Homer to blame Helen is Helen herself: she is strongly aware of her responsibility as an ἀδόχη κακῶν to both Greeks and Trojans alike.

For her wish that she had died rather than cause the Trojan War c.f. Il.3.173ff, 6.345ff, 24.763f. This detail is missing in the more tranquil environment of the Odyssey: the war is done and such passion would be less appropriate. But the detrimental self-characterisation as κακῶν or κυνωπίς runs over into the later poem: c.f. Il. 3.181, 6.344; Od. 4.145. And so does her unique sense of her own destiny: she appreciates that she and her lover are "a theme for songs" (Il.6.357-8). She weaves a web depicting herself as the object of the struggles of Achaeans and Trojans (Il.3.125ff). In a manner quite unlike other Homeric wives she gives a special gift of her own to the departing guest Telemachus (Od. 15.120ff) and it is a πέπλος which will serve as μνημ' Ἐλένης χειρῶν.  

1 Even those who have greatest reason to curse her refrain from so doing: Priam in the Iliad (3.164-5), Penelope in the Odyssey (23.218-24). The only exceptions are Achilles (Il.19.325: εἴνεκε ἡγεσάνθις Ἐλένης) and Eumaeus (Od. 14.68-9).

2 Note how here, as elsewhere, Helen thinks of herself in the third person. The combination of surpassing beauty which leads to catastrophe with a strong sense of personal
There can be little doubt that this Helen is Homer's invention, and that just as the Iliad presents us with a very human Achilles purged of the primitive supernatural traits such as invulnerability or preternatural fleetness of foot which he possessed afterwards, and almost certainly possessed before Homer, so both epics display to us an unusually sympathetic Helen who stands in the sharpest possible contrast to the picture drawn by the poets of the epic cycle. It is reasonable to guess that this more hostile picture - which received its most striking embodiment of all in S's poem - was that of the pre-Homeric tradition wherein much of the criticism Homer puts in Helen's own mouth actually came, less objectively, from the poets themselves.

Often we seem to detect Homer in the act of expurgating the tradition for the sake of Helen's name. One may cite (contd...)

1destiny and bitter self-reproach, occurs in heroines in the myths of several cultures. In Celtic legend for instance, Deidre, the daughter of a bard at the court of Ulster, fulfils prophecy by growing up to be the loveliest woman in the world and causing the death of Naoise and his two brothers with whom she runs away from her intended husband the King of Ulster. She herself perishes of grief a few hours after their end. Likewise, Branwen in the Welsh legend related in "the Second Branch of the Mabinogi" is the cause of war between her husband the king of Ireland, and her brother Brân ruler of Britain. Upon landing on the coast of Britain after the battle that has almost totally destroyed the inhabitants of both countries, she declares that two good islands have been laid waste because of her, and then she too dies of a broken heart. One might see Helen's frequently voiced wishes that she were dead as a diluted version of this. A fragment of Anacreon (347 fr.1.1ff P) may be an adaptation of Helen's self-defamation at 11.6.342ff: see Führer, Formprob1. pp 99 and 130 (c.f. C.R. 21 (1971) 169).
in corroboration a passage that will concern us again later (p. 379). We learn from I1·3·445 that the πρώτη μῆξις of Helen and Paris took place on the island of Cranae. The various authors who mention this area locate it at no great distance from Sparta. But Σ I1·3·445 (1·437 Erbse) notes that Cranae has been introduced διὰ ότι ἐν Σπαρτῆ η ἡμίγη τῆς Ἐλένης (scil. Ἀλεξάνδρως) ᾲνα μὴ περιφανῆς γενήται. This implies the existence of a version where the guilty pair were shameless enough to do just that, and Proclus informs us that this was the variant adopted by the Cypria: ἐν τοῖσι δὲ Ἀφροδίτη συνάγα τὴν Ἐλένη τῷ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ. καὶ μετὰ τὴν μῆξιν τὰ πλέοντα κτήματα ἐνθέμενοι νυκτὸς ἀποπλέουσι.

What at first sight seemed to be a merely hedonistic recollection on Paris' part transpires on closer enquiry to be an element in the exculpation of Homer's Helen: Zeus Xenios is less offended and the erring couple less sexually voracious in the Iliad than in the Cypria.

This is one of the reasons why it can be so hard to divine whether Homer is acquainted with a given part of the

---

1For ancient guesses about the identity of this island c.f. Jacoby ad Hecataeus F. Gr. Hist. 1 F 128 (p. 343) and Kannicht ad Eur. Hel. 1670-5 (2·434-5). Strabo's source in 9·1·22, an Athenodographer, saw the Homeric passage as referring to the Attic island of Helene: c.f. Strabo 10·5·3, Σ I1·3·445 (1·437 Erbse), Eust. Dion. Per. 524 (Muller GGM 2·317), Scyl. 58. Eust. Dion. and Hecataeus know a version connecting the αἰτίου of the island's name with the vocot of the Greek heroes. Eur. Hel. 1670ff likewise puts the island μὴρ Ἀκτῆν, but has to devise a new αἰτίου for its name to protect his virtuous heroine. For traditions connecting Cranae with Sparta and Aphrodite's Cythera c.f. Paus. 3·22·1, and Σ I1·3·445.
tradition. He adopts or remoulds myths for a variety of motives. Scholars are now far less ready to follow Σ II. 24-28 in concluding τὴν τε περὶ τοῦ κάλλους κρίσεων οὐκ οἶδεν πολλαχῇ γὰρ ἀν ἐμνήσθη. He does seem to allude to the Judgement of Paris in II.3.40lf and 5.421ff, and the evidence of art (c.f. R.M. Dawkins, Sanctuary of Artemis Orthia (London 1929) p.223 fig.127) suggests it was known by c. 700-600 B.C. The failure of this tale to play a more blatantly obvious part in the poem may be explained along the lines suggested by K. Reinhardt, Das Parisurteil (1938) = Tradition und Geist (1960) pp.16ff. It thus makes better sense to see in the post-Homeric progress of the myth a gradual recrudescence of those grosser and more obvious traits in the picture of Helen which Homer suppressed in his sympathetic and humanised portrait. This is more plausible than the notion that succeeding generations of poets grew - for no easily explicable reason - more and more resentful against this figure of mythology and devised increasingly wilder calumnies against her. Indeed many of their details seem too obviously primitive to be relatively late inventions. This is true of the cause for the Trojan War given by the Cypria fr.1 Allen (p.117f) where Zeus is easily deflected by Momus from his original plan to destroy mankind by natural disaster to the more congenial task of begetting a beautiful woman for whose sake a war will break out between Greeks and barbarians which will effectively lighten the burden of the earth. (For
ancient Mesopotamian analogies to the motif of universal destruction c.f. G.S. Kirk, Myth, its meanings and functions (1971) p.116f). Similarly archaic in appearance is Zeus' next step, his pursuit of the reluctant goddess Nemesis who adopts numerous animal guises in the vain attempt to escape him (Cypria fr.7 Allen (p.120)). We can guess the sequel, which was probably the version alluded to by Apollod. 3.10.7: Nemesis finally took the form of a goose to which Zeus responded by changing into a swan and so enjoyed her. A shepherd later found an egg which he brought to Leda, and when Helen was hatched, Leda brought her up as her own child. Such divine transmogrifications are rigorously shunned by Homer (note their absence from Il.14.313ff). The tendency towards normalisation will explain why, in spite of her common epithet Διός ἔγγαυξια (Il.3.199, 418, Od. 4.184, 219 c.f. ἡ γοῦρη Διός αἰγόκοιο in Il.3.426) Helen still speaks regretfully of Leda and Tyndareus as her τοξής (Il.3.140). There is no word of the fantastic egg from Helen, and her brothers Castor and Polydeuces are of course strictly mortal. Equally epic is the refusal to allow Helen a plethora of offspring. Her daughter Hermione is her only child (Il.3.175, Od. 4.10ff) according to Homer, but by the time of the Cypria (fr.9 Allen (p.121)) and Hesiod

1 Sappho (fr.166 L-P) has Leda herself find the egg, but the most familiar version of the story, whereby Leda herself, and not Nemesis, enjoys Zeus' feathery advances, occurs first, to our knowledge, in Euripides (Hel. 16ff, I.A. 793ff). Whether S. originated it, as Jouan (p.155) suggests, we have absolutely no means of knowing.
fr. 175 MW a son named Nicostratus has been added, and later authors supply even more (c.f. Σ. II. 3. 175, Σ. Od. 4. 11, Σ. Lykophr. Alex. 851). It is interesting to note how the second passage seeks to explain Homer's apparent parsimony: διότι τὸ πολλάς τεκείν ἄλλοιοι τὸ κάλλος τῆς γυναικός. μελλοῦσι τὸ αὐτῆς μεσολαβήσαι εἰς τὸν πόλεμον Τρώων καὶ τῶν Ἐλλήνων, οὐκέτι ἔδιδον αὐτῇ τέκνον οἶ θεοί, ἦν τὸ κάλλος γυναικεία, δι’ Ἁλέξανδρος ἱδυνθηκαὶ ἔμελλε. τὸ δὲ παντελῶς εἶναι ἄτεκνον ἢν ὑδάταιμον καὶ μακάμον, τὸ δὲ τεκείν ἐθάλαμον καὶ μακάριον. We might rank this reluctance to give Helen any offspring by her guilty marriage with Paris alongside the absence of children in the union of Oedipus and Epicaste (Od. 11. 271ff on which c.f. Paus. 9. 5. 11). Likewise, in later literature Helen is notoriously πολυάνωρ (see my note on 223. 4 P (pp. 318ff)) But Homer's Helen studiously omits to mention her early abduction by Theseus and rescue by the Dioscuri when noting her brother's absence from the Achaean forces (11. 3. 236ff). That myth first appears in the Cypria (see p. 286). Homer's Helen is portrayed as the wife, not the mistress, of Paris. In the Iliupersis (Procl. (Allen p. 106)) Helen was married to Deiphobus after Paris' death:

1 On this problem and the exact significance of τῆλυγετός in 11. 3. 176 and δελτρος in Hes. fr. 204. 95 MW (both used of Hermione) c.f. Kakridis pp. 49-53.
2 For another instance of economic avoidance of surplus children compare the Odyssean Telemachus' status as a single offspring with his position in the Telegony where he has four half-brothers (fr. 1 Allen (p. 143) and Procl. (Allen p. 109)) to which number Hes. Theog. 1011 adds a further pair.
Menelaus, who mentions the former hero (in Od: 4.276) does not call him Helen's husband. According to Proclus' summary (Allen p.105) the Cypria related how μετὰ ταῦτα Ἀχιλλεὺς Ἑλένην ἐπιθυμεῖ θεάσασθαι, καὶ συνήγαγεν αὕτως εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ Ἀφροδίτη καὶ Θετις. The union referred to is surely sexual since the goddess of love is involved, and the phraseology recalls Proclus' earlier description of Paris and Helen's congress (ἐν τούτῳ δὲ Ἀφροδίτη συνάγει τὴν Ἑλένην τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρωτι). For the significance of Achilles' encounter c.f. Wilamowitz, B.K.T. 5.1.39 who refers to "Die anmutigen Erfindungen, dass der Held einmal die schöne Frau zu Gesicht bekommt (oder auch geniessen darf), für die er sterben soll," and Kannicht ad Eur. Hel. 99 (2.45). The scene is perhaps the inspiration of the later tale (first found in Paus. 3.19.3) that Helen became Achilles' wife on Leuce after their deaths.

This, then, is the Helen of the epic cycle, a creature deliberately brought into the world to cause men's deaths, entangled with a continuous series of lovers from earliest youth onwards, Theseus, Paris, Achilles and Deiphobus. With this background we are not surprised to learn that Menelaus in the Iliupersis would have killed his newly-regained wife (Procl. (Allen p.134)) had not love disarmed him.

But there is no cause to suppose that this contrast
between Homer and the ἔπικος κῦκλος, however familiar to us, can have impressed itself upon S. and the other early lyric poets. On the contrary, before Herodotus, Homer was generally regarded as the author of the Cypria, the Iliupersis, and the other cyclic poems which will have mentioned Helen. It is Herodotus (2.117) who first questions this notion as applied to the Cypria.

But the Eoeae's passing denunciation of her (fr.176.7 MW)

ως δ’ Ἕλενη ἠλεξυνε λέος Ἐανδοῦ Μενελάου

seems to us voiced in the tone of the Cycle rather than Homer. As early as Semonides, Helen appears to be a stock paradeigma (Sem. 7.117-118 W: ἔξ οὗ τοις μὲν Ἀἰδην χεῖσατο γυναικὸς εἶνεκ ἀμφιδησμένους echoing Il.2.161f (= 177f) and Hes. Op. 165) and is cited as a mythological exemplum¹ by Alcaeus in two notable poems (42 and 283 L-P). Alcaeus is perhaps being more

¹There is no lack of tendentiousness in the role to which Helen is consigned in both poems, especially 42 L-P: Helen brought ruin upon Troy we are told, but Thetis was happy in her marriage and her glorious son. If we are meant to remember that "this son ... was the instrument of the doom which Helen brought on Troy" (Page sup. cit. p.280) we are just as surely meant to forget that he was her only son and met an early death (c.f. Pind. Pyth. 3.100f) - a pathetic fact artfully omitted by Alcaeus. Likewise Sappho in her sympathetic treatment of Helen who is to her an illustration of the claim that τὸ κάλλιτον is what you love (16.6ff L-P). It is hard for us to recognise Menelaus at lines 7-8 under the soubriquet Ἰὸν ἄνδρα τοῦ πανάριτον (or ιμηγ'ἄριτον or the like), but in order to emphasise the power of love Sappho has to stress the impressive qualities of Helen's husband. The epithet probably derives from Helen's description of her husband in Od. 4.264 as ὅς τε ἐνεύμενον οὔτ' ἄρ φρένας οὔτε τὶ ἡλιος, but that reflects more upon the eloquent tact of Helen than the genuine capacities of Menelaus.
conventional and less personally indignant than is allowed by Page for instance (S & A p.278: "The story of Helen and Paris in 283 is portrayed as a great misfortune to the world, an illustration of the power of love for evil, of disaster as the wages of sin." The mood of these poems is indeed sombre and bitter, but that may be explained, as Page (ib. pp.280-1) observes, by the influence of S's Helen: "It is certain that Alcaeus was familiar with some Western cults and legends; it is likely that he visited the mainland of Hellas." Here, of course, we are on wretchedly frail ground: we can hardly speak with much profit about the hypothetical influence exerted by an almost non-existent work upon poems that are only relatively less fragmentary. But just because we are in no position to trace this process in detail, we have no reason to deny that that poem which the ancient evidence variously indicates to have been a βλασφημία, a κακηγορία, a vituperatio, has certainly left a heavy print upon tradition. S's Helen may or may not be reflected in such glancing allusions in the lyric poets as Ibycus' (282-6ff P: [Εα]γθάς Ελένας περὶ ἐξέπει ἀδικοῦν πολύμυνον ἔχοιντας· πόλεμον κατὰ δόκιμαν φόνητα, ἑπεράταμον δ' ἀνέβαν ταλαπερίον ἄτα | [Χρυ]σόσελεραν ἔκλεις Κύπριδα) or Pind. Pyth. 11·33ff: (ἐπει δμφ' Ἐλέναι πυρωθέντας· Ἡρώων ἔλυε δόμους ἀβρότατος) and Paean 6·95ff (περὶ δ' οὐποκόμων [Ἐ]λέναι· [χρήν ἄρα Περγαμοῦ εὐρήδε] ἀπετώσαι σέλας αἰθωμένου· πυρός). But the information preserved in 217 P has reminded us how heavily indebted were Aeschylus and
Euripides to S., and it is highly probable that this debt extended to the unfavourable picture of Helen contained in the works of those two dramatists. As Alcaeus may have exploited S's ὑπηγορία to introduce an impressive strain of moralising into Lesbian poetry, so the Attic dramatists probably drew on the poem as a source for the more subjective and partial attitude to Helen which, appropriately in an enacted representation, replaces Homer's relatively detached narrative.

Although Helen does not appear in the Agamemnon as a character on stage, the impression left upon an audience by the frequent references to her is almost as strong as if we had actually seen her with our own eyes. The chorus' repeated mentions of Helen operate as a leit-motif, and the demonic creature becomes as real a figure as any on stage (c.f. Ag. 62, 800; 681ff, 1455f). Euripides' creation, a character in the Troades and Orestes, mentioned abundantly (and disparagingly) in the Andromache, Hecuba, Electra and I.T. and I.A., is a meaner creature.

The air of paradox which pervades Gorgias' defence of Helen makes it clear that the master-sophist has set himself a task no less formidable than Polycrates' and Isocrates' praise of Busiris or Alcidamas' Praise of Death. The question of S's influence upon Gorgias' work and also Isocrates will be dealt with below in connection with P. And indeed it is high time to turn to what we know of S's compositions upon Helen.
METRE

187 P: e | vD-D | D* | D* | D
The dactylo-epitrite scansion of this fragment has long been appreciated: c.f. Wilamowitz, Gr. Versk. 431, A.M. Dale, C.Q. 44 (1950) 14 = Collected Papers (1969) p.57 etc.

188 P: (...) D- ...?

223 P: D-D | vD- | e- | e v e | vDv | dv-- | 2da (reading τιθοντι with MSS)
| vDv | D | 2da (reading ητηθει with West: see p.323)

"The cadences have a very epic feel about them" (Haslam p.43) which is only what we should expect given S's reputation as Ομηρωκαταγο and the very epic nature of a poem about Helen. Even poets like Anacreon or Sappho who normally compose in their own vernaculars naturally drop into epic metre and dialect when dealing with epic subject-matter (c.f. Sappho fr.44 LP and Page S S A pp 65-6 and pp.72ff). A.E. Harvey, C.Q. 7 (1957) 209ff).¹

¹Note now, however, the thesis of G. Nagy (Comparative Studies in Greek and Indic meter (1974) ch.5 (ppl18ff) c.f. M.L. West, C.Q. 23 (1973) 179ff) that Sappho's metre and phraseology here may be inherited independently of Homer.
THE CONTENTS OF THE HELEN

It is a sobering thought that there are only three explicit references to S's Helen in our ancient authorities (187-9 P), and that the sum total of knowledge certainly guaranteed by these sources is the hardly astounding news that the poem described the wedding of Helen and Menelaus! The more significant and vivid details which build up our mental picture of the poem, come from fragments which are not definitely attachable to it: 190 and 191 P, and - most important for moulding our impressions of the Helen but least certain of all - 223 P. Whether these last three passages are rightly attributed to this poem, and whether the three fragments which specifically emanate from the Helen can have a few more drops of information squeezed from them than my first sentence implies, must be left for the readers of my commentary on each to decide. Supposing for the moment that the answers to these questions are "yes", we may tabulate the contents of the Helen as follows:-

1 Tyndareus' omission of Aphrodite from sacrifice and her consequent anger and revenge (223 P).
2 Helen's abduction by Theseus and her rescue by the Dioscuri (191 P).
3 The birth of Iphigenia to Helen and Clytemnestra's adoption of her (191 P).
4 The wooing of Helen (190 P).
5 The oath of the suitors (190 P).
6 The marriage of Helen and Menelaus (187-9 P).
7 Helen's elopement with Paris.

(7) is deduced from 223.4 P: one of Helen's three husbands must have been Paris. (See below pp.319ff). But to avoid circular argument we may remind ourselves that even if 223 is not from the Helen, we should still expect Paris' abduction of Helen to form an important part of any poem called after her. And no-one can possibly be surprised at (1) to (6). They are essential ingredients of any work with this title.

But it would be gratifying to know at what point this poem ended. We know that S. also composed a poem called 'Ιλίου Πέρσες (explicitly mentioned by the citers of 196-9 P) and J.A. Davison (p.201) makes the suggestion that S's poems did not overlap in subject-matter. If this were so, we could expect the Helen to end somewhere before the sack of Troy. But it is hard to check the accuracy of a guess like this, because we lack comparative material. There are no other large-scale narratives of this period extant, so we cannot inspect them to see if their matter overlapped from poem to poem. The works which make up

---

1 It is a suggestion and no more: when Davison asserts that "there is some evidence" that S's Heracles poems (Geryoneis, Cycnus, Cerberus) formed a connected cycle, and that there may have been a similar "Trojan Cycle" (Iliupersis, Nostoi, Oresteia) he is indulging in fantasies: there is no such evidence. Again, an unfortunate suggestion by Kleine (p.60) seems to lie at the root of the modern delusion.
The epic cycle as it now stands have been specially doctored in the interests of producing a continuous narrative, but it is a notorious fact that the Iliad and the Odyssey do not impinge on each others' material. And the sheer scope and detail of a typical Stesichorean poem make two works on the same topic an unlikely proposition. That Pindar narrated the birth of Heracles in detail on two different occasions but in very similar language (Nem. 1.35ff, Paean 20.8ff) is nothing to the point: his compositions were far shorter. See my remarks on Page's theory that S. composed two poems on the sack and fall of Troy (pp.658f) and my remarks on the prospect of Agamemnon's nostos in the Oresteia (( p.862f)). In the present case there is a further consideration: as soon as Helen had arrived at Troy, there was little more that could be done in the way of the continuous narrative which S. seems to have habitually practised.

A diary of the day to day doings of Helen at Troy would hardly be in his - or any other ancient author's - style. There is a positive vacuum in narrative material until the events of the Iliad (whose poet has clearly gone out of his way to make Helen an important figure in his story: the contexts in which she appears are clearly invented for her sake: see above p 239f ) and then the sack of Troy. This emerges clearly from Proclus' epitome of the epic cycle which very rarely mentions Helen after the Cypria until the Wooden Horse appears in the Ilias Parva. It seems unlikely that S. will have allowed such a lacuna
to flourish in the middle of his poem.

If the Helen ended before the sack of Troy, one can with easy conscience assign S's only other mention of Helen (201 P where the Greeks, about to stone Helen, are overcome by her beauty) to the Iliupersis. I would rather have the poem conclude with the arrival of Paris and her at Troy, than, as Davison, with the approach of the Achaeans, since that would be to raise too many fresh issues, especially the siege of Troy, only to leave them hanging. But it would be wrong to end without repeating that these views on the poem's terminus are totally speculative. The Helen might quite well have continued its review of Helen's career after the sack of Troy right down to the day of her death and indeed 209 P — to be provocative — could be from a late stage of the poem.

THE EQUIVALENCE OF THE HELEN AND THE OFFENDING POEM

Κακηγορία, βλασφημία, ψόγος Ἔλλης, vituperatio — these are the terms which antiquity attaches to the poem which lost S. his eyesight and necessitated the palinodes.¹

Well, in fact none of our sources gives it any name. Hence resort to our native wits becomes a sad necessity. So far as we know, there are only three Stesichorean poems which could have contained the original offence: Oresteia, Iliupersis, Helen. Of these the first is easily the

¹For a full survey of the relevant passages see below pp. 347 ff.
most unsuitable: S. must have been far too busy rehearsing the mischievous acts of Clytemnestra to spare time to libel her sister properly, unless Aeschylus' use of Helen as leitmotif in the Agamemnon owes far more to S's Oresteia than we have ever had cause to believe. The Iliupersis is a much more promising candidate, favoured by Welcker (KL. Schr. 1:173), and at the time of Bergk's fourth edition of Poetae Melici (1884) still the favourite (c.f. p.214: "plerique ad Ilii excidium revocant.") Certainly the desolation of the towers of Troy must rank as the summit of Helen's crimes, and, more to the point, is treated as such by Alcaeus and the other lyric poets whom we quoted earlier (pp247ff above). But again, the Iliupersis seems, from its surviving fragments, to have had the usual wide range, and one wonders whether there would have been much room for the dispraise of Helen. There might have been. Certainty, as so often, is impossible. But surely it is absurdly perverse, when we know that S. composed a poem called the Helen, not to allow it a pride of place in our list of candidates for the offending poem. We must not be so blinded by the fact that a ψόγος Ἑλένης could possibly have constituted part of the Oresteia or Iliupersis, that we fail to perceive

1 I will say nothing here of one consideration which some may find decisive: it will be seen later (pp.410ff) that the Palinodes' favourable picture of Helen is probably due to Spartan influence. S's Oresteia displays different signs of a like influence. It seems unlikely that the Lacedaemonians who objected to the βλασφημία would have allowed it in the Oresteia. See further below p.299f.
the radiant truth that a poem given over to the subject of Helen is infinitely more likely to have contained the required abuse. In a conflict between possibilities and probabilities, the latter must always prevail. Let us not confuse an open and an empty mind.

Our conclusion also provides a simple answer to the problem why no ancient author ever names the Helen as the offending poem: it was too obvious. Granted that the titles at least of S's poems were familiar in antiquity and that the name of Helen is always mentioned (how could it not be?) in the context of the blinding, our sources' failure to be explicit becomes the most natural thing in the world. To take only the two earliest and most reliable testimonia: Isocrates (Hel. 64) says ἐνεδείξατο δὲ (scil. Ἑλένη) καὶ Στηνειχόρωι τῷ ποιητῇ τὴν έαυτὴς δύναμιν. δὲ οὔ ζορδομενός τῆς ὡφθής ἐβλασφήμησε τι περὶ οὕτης ἱτλ. Admittedly Isocrates has not mentioned the name Ἑλένη since § 61, but she is the subject of all that supervenes and stays in the reader's mind throughout. When, therefore, we hear that she showed her power by blinding the poet after he had begun the poem (τῆς ὡφθῆς - as if it were familiar) what song can possibly be meant but the Helen? τῆς ὡφθῆς is not at all the natural way to allude to the Oresteia or the Iliupersis for neither they nor their subject-matter are anywhere near the surface of the reader's mind. Likewise when Plato (Phaedr. 243A) refers to S's blindness διὰ τὴν Ἑλένης κακηγορίαν, he has no need to add the otiose gloss "ἐν
'Ελένης" - it is already clear that this is the poem meant.

The argument used above is essentially that of Bergk (p.214) who compares Pausanias' reference to the Iliupersis (Paus. 10.26.9 = 204 P): ἐν δὲ ταῖς Πριάμου θυγατράσιν ἄριστηκαί τις ἀν καὶ ταύτην κατὰ τοῦ Ἱμηραίου τῆν ὀιδήν. This shows that our assumption that the titles of S's poems were well-known in antiquity was right. The reference to the daughters of Priam makes further specification of the poem they appeared in superfluous. In fact this parallel actually presupposes greater knowledge on the reader's part, since Priam's daughters, unlike Helen, did not give their name to the poem, but were merely a subsidiary part of it.
The lines are explicitly attributed to the Helen by Athenaeus - which is a luxury; but most unhelpfully he gives no further details about the excerpt or the poem, since his mind, as usual, is on food, and his only interest in the present passage its mention of Κυδώνια μῆλα. For reasons given below, the lines suggest a marriage, and since we know from 189 P that the Helen included a description of Helen's wedding with Menelaus, it is reasonable to suppose that our fragment describes their wedding cortège. The perversely-inclined might like to argue that it is Helen and Paris who are getting married, since the Iliad represents the couple as man and wife (above p.245) and the Cypria seems to have touched upon the nuptial celebrations of the guilty pair: Paris ἀποπλεόσας εἰς "Ἰλιον γ吸毒 τῆς Ἐλένης ἐπετέλεσεν (Allen p.103 (Proclus)). But perhaps too much faith should not be placed in Proclus' phrasing. And the Iliadic portrait of Helen as a married woman is part of Homer's favourable and sympathetic picture of his heroine and would thus be out of place in S's critical handling. Besides, a full-scale treatment of two marriages within a single poem (however great its length) would surely be too much.

On marriage hymns in literature see first and foremost P. Maas' excellent article s.v. ὄμενατος in RE 9 130-4. More recent discussions include Ed. Fraenkel, "Vesper Adest" JRS 45 (1955) 1-8 = Kl. Beitr. (1964) 2·87-101 and J. Diggle's commentary on Phaethon p.149 (with

The two earliest of the numerous descriptions of wedding ceremonies in Greek literature both provide vivid accounts of the events just listed. "The Shield of Achilles" (Il·18·491ff):

εν τῇ μέν ἀρ γάμοι τ' ἔσαν εἰλαπίναι τε νύμφας δ' ἐκ θαλάμων δαίδων ὑπὸ λαμπομενάων ἡγίνεστεν ἀνά ἀκτι, πολὺς δ' ὑμέναιος ὤρφει· κοῷβῳ δ' ὀρχηστηρεῖς ἔδένεσεν, ἐν δ' ἄρα τοῖς ἀυλοὶ φόρμιγγες τε βοήν ἔχον· αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες ἱστάμεναι δαύμαζεν ἐπὶ προθύροις εἰκάστη.

And the Hesiodic Aspis (273ff):

tοῖς μὲν γὰρ εὐσεβτρού ἐπ' ἀπήνης ἡγοντ' ἀνδρὶ γυναῖκα, πολὺς δ' ὑμέναιος ὤρφει· τῇς δ' ἄπτ' αἰθομένων δαίδων σέλας εἰλύφαζε χερεῖν εὐὶ δμωίδων· ταῖ δ' ἀγαλαῖς τεβαλυῖα πρόος θ' ἐξισιᾳ τῇς ἔχοις. ταῖς δὲ χοροὶ παίζοντες ἐποντο· τοῖς μὲν ὑπὸ λιγυρῶν συρίγγων ἔσαν αὐθὴν ἔξ ἀπαλῶν στομάτων, περὶ δὲ εὐφειτιν ἄγνυτο ἡχώ· αἱ δ' ὑπὸ φορμίγγων ἄναγον χορὸν ἰμερόντη κτλ.
Reading these colourful vignettes, one is tempted to wonder whether S. was in any way influenced by them in his portrayal of the wedding of Helen (especially in view of his recognised indebtedness to Homer and Hesiod in other poems: see Our verdict will be the same as Page's on the idea of such a source for the epically-coloured "Marriage of Hector and Andromache" (Sappho fr.44 L-P:c.f.Page S & A p.71 n.1): that the epic passages cited above are too short to be "models" for S. (or Sappho) in any meaningful sense of the word. It is probably impossible for us to tell whether Page's second conclusion about Sappho's poem would also apply to S.: the "portrait is drawn not from tradition or from imagination but from contemporary life." But see my note below on Κυδώνια μάλα.

1ff: πολλά μὲν... πολλὰ δὲ

Schneidewin, Ἰβυκτὶ Ρηγενίνα Καρντίνα Ρελικτίαε (1883) p.121 compared Pind. Pyth. 9.123ff: πολλὰ μὲν κεῖνοι δόκουν[φυλλα' ἐπὶ καὶ στεφάνους'] πολλὰ δὲ πρόσθεν πτερὰ δέξατο νικᾶν.

1: Κυδώνια μάλα

mentioned also by Alcman (99 P) and Ἰβυκτὶς (286.1-2 P).

For a full description of them c.f. Pliny the Elder N.H. 15.10.37 ("mala quae vocamus cotonea et Graeci Cydonia e Creta insula advecta" etc.) and the agricultural writers listed by Lewis and Short s.v. Cydonia. The Latin "cotonea" is clearly a perversion of the Greek name. On μάλα see B.O. Foster's useful article "The Symbolism of the Apple in Classical Antiquity", HSCP 10 (1899) 39ff, whose discussion is to be supplemented by the fuller lists of relevant passages in A.R. Littlewood, "The Symbolism of the Apple in Greek and Roman Literature", HSCP 72 (1968)
147ff. μηλον itself is a generic name for any apple-like fruit that grows on trees. Greater specificity is achieved by adding an adjective: Κυδωνια μηλα = quinces, Ἀρμενιαδ μηλα = apricots etc. (see Littlewood pp 148-9).

I know of no exact parallel for the pelting of bride and bridegroom with quinces at any stage of the marriage ceremony. The use of μηλα as love tokens to be thrown at the object of one's affections is familiar (Littlewood pp.154-5 (xi)) but not quite the same. However, it seems to be the case that this fruit was connected with marriage (Littlewood p.155 (xii)) and fertility. In mythology μηλα feature as wedding-gifts from Gaea at the nuptials of Zeus and Hera (Littlewood p.148 (i)) and perhaps the motif arose from some such custom as is referred to in three passages of Plutarch (Sol. 20.3; mor. 138 D (coniug. praec.); mor. 279 F (aetia Rom.)) conveniently collected as frr. 127 A-C on p.120 of E. Ruschenbusch's Εδωκωνος νόμοι (1966)) which attribute to Solon a law whereby a newly-married bride must chew on a μηλον Κυδωνιον before going to bed with her husband. Plutarch himself seems to have regarded this as a device to ensure that the young woman should have sweet-breath on the all-important first night, but sadly this charming notion is probably quite inaccurate. As many scholars have realised the nibbled μηλον Κυδωνιον is likely to be a fertility token meant to guarantee its eater as many children as it has.

---

seeds. And it is more than plausible that a similar sympathetic magic underlies the use of the identical fruit in our present passage. Littlewood argues that the throwing of μῆλα as love-tokens represents a weak vestige of the original pelting for purposes of fecundity, a vestige that was all that survived when the primitive belief was obliterated in the course of religious evolution. Hardly: the two processes seem to co-exist and are totally dissimilar in purpose. But Foster must be right (p.45) in supposing that S. reflects a real-life practice in the picture of the heroic world he conveys here.

δὲ λαοβον: the word can mean "chariot" or "throne", and some scholars actually interpret it in the second way here: Davison (p.197 n.1) translates "their lord's chair" and states that the quinces imply a wedding-feast - presumably one where the guests throw left-overs at the unfortunate bridegroom! Bowra takes a positively schizophrenic line: in his chapter on S. (p.108) he renders the phrase "they cast on the chariot of the prince", but on p.261 of the self-same volume we read that the fragment depicts individuals casting quinces "before the bridegroom's throne"!

Needless to say, no parallel can be adduced for this latter extraordinary picture. If a chariot is the target of the φυλλοβολία the scene may be equally anomalous: but the symbolic value of the Cydonian quinces (see above) requires the presence of the bride, and, it is impossible to fit
Helen into Menelaus' "chair" literally or metaphorically. However, if this fruit is appropriate to a wedding, so is a δίφρος in the sense of a car or chariot, since it was on this that bride and groom were conveyed to the latter's house: c.f. Photius p.52·22: ζεύγος ἡμιονικόν ή βοεικὸν ζεύχαντες τὴν λεγομένην κλίνίδα, ἢ ἐστὶν δημολο διέδροι, τὴν τῆς νύμφης μέθοδον ποιοῦνται. παραλαβόντες δὲ αὐτὴν ἐκ τῆς πατρῴας ἐξεῖλας ἐπὶ τὴν ἀμαξαν ἄγουειν ἐλε τὰ τοῦ γαμοῦντος ἐσπέρας ἱκανῆς κάθηνται δὲ τρεῖς ἐπὶ τῆς ἀμάξης, μέση μὲν ἡ νύμφη, ἐκατεροῦ δὲ τε ὁ νυμφίος καὶ ὁ παροχός, οὔτος δὲ ἐστὶ φίλος ὡς συγγενῆς ὁ μᾶλλα τιμώμενος καὶ ἀγαπώμενος καὶ ἀπὸ ταῦτας τῆς συνθείας, κἂν πεζοὶ μετίωσι τινες κόρην, ὁ τρίτος συμπαρὼν παροχὸς λέγεται. Hesych. s.v. κλίνις (Latte 2·489): ἐπὶ τῆς ἀμάξης νυμφικὴ καθέδρα. See the other passages cited in Blümner sup. cit. p.273 n.1, and JHS 1 (1880) 206ff ("An Archaic Vase with Representation of a Marriage Procession"). That such is the scene intended here is clinched by Eur. Hel. 722ff which may even be an echo of our fragment: the old servant addresses Helen: νῦν ἄνανεοῦμαι τὸν σὺν ύμέναιον πάλιν καὶ λαμπάζων μεμνήμεθ’, δὲ τετράχροις ἱπποῖς τροχάζων παρέφερον, εὖ δ’ἐν δίφροις ἤξυν τῶνες νύμφη δύμ’ ἐλξετες δῆμιον. On the religious ritual underlying this part of the Helen myth see A. Klinz, ΙΕΡΩΣ ΓΑΜΟΣ: Questiones Selectae ad sacras nuptias Graecorum religionis et poeseos pertinentes (Diss. Halle 1933) pp.14ff. ἀνακτὶ:

Menelaus according to the above interpretation.
2: μύρρινα φύλλα:


The μύρρινα of CE is a further instance of the usual Atticisation of Stesichorean fragments preserved in the indirect tradition.

3: καὶ θρίστοι τετεφάνους ὅν τε κορωνίδας οὖλας 

apart from the Cypria fr. 4.4f (Allen p. 119: ἕν τε ἦν 

θαλέστοντι | ἄθροι τ' ἐνὶ ἀνθέε' καλώι) the two flowers are mentioned together again in Ibyc. 315P. μύρτα τε καὶ λα 

καὶ ἐλλυρικοῖς μᾶλα τε καὶ ὀξὺ καὶ τέρεινα δάφνα and Pind. fr. 75.16f (Sn.) τότε βάλλεται, τότε ἐπ' ἀμβρόταν χρόν' ἐραται | 

ὁν φόβαι, ὀξὺ τε κόμαει μείγνυται, which Kleine (p. 94) rashly supposed to be an echo of our line. See too Sappho fr. 94.12ff LP: πόλλοις γὰρ τετεφάνους ὅν | καὶ βρο[δών] ... 

... ὃκι πόλλοις ὑπα] θύμιδας, carm. pop. 852 P and H.H. Dem.

6. For the characteristics and connotations of the two flowers see Richardson on the last passage (p. 142f).

θρίστοι τετεφάνους:

with the phrase compare Anacreon 434 P: τετεφάνους δ' ἀνή 

τρεῖς ἐκατός εἶχεν, | τοὺς μὲν θρίστοις κτλ.

κορωνίδας οὖλας:

"twined garlands": this meaning for κορωνίς is elicited from Hesych. (2.516 Latte) s.v. κορωνίδες' ... οἱ ἐκ τῶν ὅν πεπλεγμένοι τετεφάνου (c.f. id. sv. κορωνίς' ... 

tετεφάνις (2.517 Latte)) and Et. Mag. s.v. κορωνίς' 

εἶδος τετεφάνης πεπλεγμένης ἐξ ὕου. Since this

1"Similia verba, ubi similis res" as Schneidewin, Ibyci Rhegini Carminum Reliquiae (1833) p. 121 remarks.
signification for the word is confined to these three passages the citations in the lexica may well stem from this very line. Elsewhere in early Greek our word is either a proper name (for its associations as which c.f. Wilamowitz, Isyllos von Epidauros pp.18-19) or an Homeric epithet for ships ("beaked").

Nöthiger (p.188 n.2) observes that S's two other -ιδ- nouns (σασαμίδας and ἕγκριδας in 179A P) may also occur in the context of a wedding: see my note ad loc. And he suggests a derivation at the level of "Volkssprache" from κορωνος ("curved, crooked" c.f. Archil. 35.2 W). I prefer Wilamowitz's notion (l.c.) that we have here an "Italische lehnwort" (compare Latin corona) not at all out of place in the work of a poet from Himera.
This fragment is cited by Athenaeus à propos of poets' riddling allusions - riddling is the word. It is surely fit companion for the δοῦβαλλος of the Cerberus (206 P) as the most impenetrable Stesichorean fragment, especially when Athenaeus is so disobligingly foggy as to the context of his tiny quotation. However, Vürtheim (p.63) with his usual propensity for pulling something out of nothing, divined that the foot-bath was an instance of what Pollux (3.39 Bethe) calls τὰ διδόμενα δῶρα τῇ νύμφῃ. Evidence for this assertion there is none, nor could there be. But perhaps Vürtheim imagined, in his simple-minded way, that because the two other fragments explicitly assigned to the Helen refer to her marriage, so must the third. Others might conclude that the degree of coincidence required for such an eventuality consigns it to the very end of any potential list of explanations of the riddle. It would by no means be difficult, were it worth while, to conjure out of thin air an alternative context for our two words, as plausible as Vürtheim's or more so. One thinks of the foot-bath used by Helen to wash the feet of Odysseus when he slipped into Troy disguised as a beggar (Od. 4.243ff especially 252-3) or of the gifts Helen brought back from Egypt (Od. 4.126ff etc.). But such roving thoughts are soon brought back home and injured to the ars nesciendi by the recollection of Housman's strictures upon Marx's Lucilius (C.Q. 1 (1907) 73-4 = Collected Papers 2.683-4).
The process of mining for silver in the mountains usually produces a mixture of lead and silver which is then subjected to smelting. In the first smelting the mixture of lead and silver is extracted (1) from the ore, in the second silver is smelted out and lead monoxide (2) is left, from which pure lead may be extracted. It is difficult to say whether S's λιθαργύρεον corresponds to (1) or (2). Athenaeus does go on to quote a fragment of Achaeus Eretriensis (450D = T.G.F. 20 F 19 Sn.) λιθαργύρος ὀξύλπη μαριωρεῖτο χρώματος πλέα and adds the gloss τὸν γὰρ λευκὸν ἰμάντα βουληθέντες εἰπεῖν ἐξ οὗ ἡ ἀργυρὰ λήκυθος εξήρητο but that need not imply that he thought S's object too was silver. S's compound has been created from λίθος and ἄργυρος (for similar compounds c.f. E. Risch, I.F. 59 (1949) 288. Compare the substantive λιθαργύρος). The variety of endings between S's λιθαργύρεος, Achaeus' λιθαργυρος, and λιθαργυρινος in Arist. S.E. 164B 23ff shows that ἄργυρος is not the determining element.

ποδανιπτήρα
For the epic spelling (c.f. ποδάνιπτρον in Od. 19.343,
504) as opposed to prose's ποδονυπτήρο see Lobeck, Parerga in Phryn. p.689.

189 P

The Argument's statements are infuriatingly vague. Certain details in Theocritus' Eighteenth Idyll (we are told) were taken from S's Helen; and since Theocritus' poem takes the form of an evening epithalamium sung outside the bridal chamber (see especially Id. 18.3) we would not be embarking on too disparate a sea of speculation if we guessed that S. too described such a scene. This would fit what we expect of the Helen's contents, and forms a suitable sequel to the wedding-procession of 187 P.

We shall look in vain for more specific traces of S. in Idyll 18. As Gow observes (Theocritus 2.348f) "Whatever details Theocritus may have borrowed from S. ... he owes a larger general debt to Sappho." Attempts to dig up further information from this barren field merely result in unprovable hypotheses. (The curious may be referred to Kaibel, Hermes 27 (1892) 258-9, Wilamowitz, Textg. d. gr. lyr. p.92, Würtheim p.6). Id. 18.17 reminds Menelaus how all the heroes of Greece had come to Sparta to woo Helen, and Wilamowitz (Sitzb. Akad. Berl. Phil. Hist. Kl. 1900 (2) p.845 n.1) ingeniously compared the contents
of 190 P, which he took to be the object of the Argument's vague allusion. But S. was not the sole poet of antiquity to touch upon this or most of the other details which fall within Idyll 18's scope, so that it is hard to see why he in particular should be singled out as source for such contents.

Kannicht (1-40) makes a more sinister attempt to add to our meagre store. I quote: "Der Wert dieser Nachricht ist nicht leicht zu überschätzen: denn Theokrits Gedicht ist ein deutlicher Reflex der Bedeutung, die die Hochzeit dieser beiden in Sparta ηθος κτερυφτην Heroen als das mythische, sich sozusagen immer wiederholende Urbild aller spartanischen Hochzeiten gehabt hat (s dazu Merkelbach Philologus 101 (1957) 19-23). Hat aber Theokrit auch diesen Zug von S. übernommen (und allgemeine historische Erwägungen sprechen eher für als gegen diese Annahme)...."

Here we must stop, since I can detect no justification for the last assumption - or the final parenthesis - in the Argument to the Idyll, which is, after all, our only solid ground here. The Idyll says nothing explicit about Helen and Menelaus as gods who receive worship, however much it may reflect such a practice, and it is in the poem itself, not any hypothetical cult underlying it, that the Argument professes to find "some" (unspecified) borrowings from S! Kannicht's argumentation here is uncharacteristically shoddy, and it is not hard to see
why: his customary scepticism about sources has been sapped by his wish to prove a pre-conceived theory. Already, he claims, as early as S's description of the wedding, the divinity of Helen and her husband is foreshadowed, and this proves the unity of the Helen and the Palinodes: they were parts of a single poem. How this mysterious foreshadowing was achieved Kannicht somehow omits to tell us. But that in itself is a trivial point. What matters is that we note here that no proof is to be found in 189 P (or any other passage of ancient literature) for Kannicht's theory. It must stand or fall on its own merits.

Finally, how explain the phrase ἐκ τοῦ πρώτου Στησιχόρου 'Ελένης? In theory we are at liberty to take it (with Schmidt, G.G.L.I.1 pp.469-70 n.3) as the only recognition by an ancient source of the existence of two Stesichori, the earlier lyric poet, and the individual who flourished 3 centuries later and whose name occurs in 841 P and the Parian Marble. (see p.120). The distinction drawn between this "first S." and his later name-sake by an Alexandrian student of bucolic poetry, would have important repercussions for those theories which identify the composer of the Daphnis, the Calyce, the Rhadine, with

---

1There is certainly no reason to emend τοῦ πρώτου 'Ελένης to τῆς πρώτης 'Ελένης in order to bring the phrase into line with such allusions to S's dispraise of Helen as ὁ πρότερος λόγος (Philostr. Vit. Apoll. 6.11) or ἡ ὀστερον σῖλη (Dio Chrys. Or. 11.40) whatever they mean: see pp.457ff below.
S. the second (see pp.120ff inf.).

On the other hand there is no other trace at all of this distinction in Alexandrian scholarship or later. For this reason I would prefer to follow such scholars as Bergk (p.217), Wilamowitz (SS p.239), and even Vürtheim (pp.63-4) in translating the phrase as "the first Book of S's Helen",¹ and supposing that the Argument here preserves the important information that the Helen, like the Oresteia (213 and 214 P), spread over two Books at the least. This is what we should expect from a poem with this scope (see above p.251f). Wilamowitz's earlier notion (see the reference to "die beiden Helenen" in Textg. p.35 n.1) of two separate poems each called "Helen" is no likelier here than for 213 P (see ad loc.).

¹None of these scholars acknowledges that the credit for being first to suggest this belongs to F. Bücheler, Jhb. f. Phil. 81 (1860) 368 = Kl. Schr. 1·282f.
Homer, the author of the Cypria, Hesiod and S.¹: each poet has been credited with a mention of the oath over Helen by various scholars, ancient and modern. A different combination of the same forces has sought to dispute the attribution for each of the poets named. And reasoned discussion of the use of this famous motif in the earliest Greek literature becomes unexpectedly complicated. That Homer knew of the story would seem to follow from numerous passages: Il.1.152ff [Achilles is speaking]: οὗ γὰρ ἔγρα Τρῶν ἔνεκ’ Ἡλυθον αἰχμητάων δεῦρο μαχητόμενος, ἐπεὶ οὗ τι μοι αἰτιοὶ εἰςιν.2.286ff (Odysseus speaking): οὐδὲ τοι ἐκτελέσωσιν (scil. Ἀχαίοι) ὑπόθεσιν ἦν περ ὑπέσταν ἔνθαδ’ ἔτι στείχοντες ἀπ’ Ἀργεος ἵπποβότοιο.¹

"Ἰλίου ἐκπέρσαντ’ ἐκτείχον ἵπποβότοιο, ἀπονέεσθαι 339 (Nestor): πῇ δὴ συνθεσία τε καὶ ὀρκία βῆσται ἡμῖν.4.267 (Idomeneus): Ἀτρέιδη, μάλα μὲν τοι ἔγρα ἔριηρος ἑταίρος ἐξευαί, ὡς τὸ πρῶτον ὑπέστην καὶ κατένευσα. It is indeed true that one could conceivably take each one of these passages to be referring to an oath of loyalty to the Atreidae which has been invented by Homer ad hoc. It is also true that Σ βΤ ad Il.2.286-7 reveals Aristarchus' belief that οὖν οἶδε δὲ τοὺς πρὸς τοὺς Τυνδαῖδας² ὀρκους ὁ ποιήσε

¹The Helen is easily the likeliest home for our fragment, as first seen by Heyne on Apollod. 3.10.8f (2.288) and Blomfield p. 262.

²This is the MSS reading retained by Erbse. A. Roemer (Die Homerexegese Aristarchs in ihren Grundzügen (1924)
(1.247 Erbse). But since Aristarchus' note on 11.2.339 seems to have disappeared (so A. Severyns, Le Cyclique épique dans l'école d'Aristarque (1928) p.275) we are unable to tell how he explained away a line which is prima facie most convincingly interpreted as a casual allusion to the oath of the Suitors. Since there is no reason why Homer should not have known this story, and modern scholars have produced no adequate objection¹ to this obvious interpretation of the verses quoted above, I conclude that the Iliad does contain a sizeable number of references to the myth.

Clearly though, these references are too fleeting to be used as a "source" by a later poet such as H. Could Hesiod or δὲ Κύμηα ποιήσαν have provided him with a quarry? We really must discipline ourselves into accepting that we know far too little of the latter poem to answer with certainty whether it contained a full-length Catalogue of the Suitors and mention of their oath. ²

(_CONTD..)

²p.161) conjectured τὸν Τυνώδρεων, and the king himself usually does take the lead in organising the oath. Corruption into the plural under the influence of the enfold-ing τὸς ... ὅρκους would be all too easy. But as we shall see (p.280 n.2) the Dioscuri feature as arrangers of the oath in the Hesiodic account, so that the scholion's version is no impromptu autoschediasm.

¹Robert, Heldensage 1067, Seeliger pp.6-7, Bethe, RE 7.2832.

²One may here dispose of the argument advanced by M. Mayer, p.20f and Severyns, Cycl. Ep. p.275 : S. must have invented the oath because the Greeks would never have risked life and limb for the despicable creature of S's poem unless they were formally bound so to do. As I have argued above (p.240) Homer's treatment of the heroine presupposes a hostile tradition, and the Cypria's view of her was not exactly flattering (pp.242ff supr.). The oath would not be inconsistent with either epic account.
Proclus' silence on each is inauspicious for theories
that it did, though not fatal in view of his other
omissions. Bethe (Homerische Dichtung und Sage 2·234-5)
and Schmid (Gesch. Gr. Lit. I·1 pp.208-9) are the most
vigorous exponents of the view that the Cypria contained
Catalogue and oath. Indeed they go further and suggest
that Odysseus' rôlé in suggesting the oath to Tyndareus
occurred in the epic. That detail can be found in
Apollodorus 3·132, and scholarly surmise avows that the
list of suitors provided by this author may well have
derived from the Cypria. A full and careful discussion
of the relationship between the mythographers' Catalogues
of Suitors and earlier accounts is afforded by W. Kullmann
(Die Quellen der Ilias (Troischer Sagenkreis) Hermes

Perversely enough, there is no easier access to certainty
about S's sources when we more on to the Κατάλογος Γυναι-
κῶν, although we have long known that the work included a
list of Helen's wooers (Paus. 3·24·10 and fr.202 M-W) and
we have actually possessed, since the turn of the century,
what would seem to be extensive fragments of just such a
list (frr. 196-204 M-W) ending with an oath (204·78ff M-
W). S's use of Hesiod is well-documented
so the problem seems solved. But "dass der Katalog der
Helenafreier nicht von Hesiod stammen kann, ist allerdings
sicher" (Merkelbach, Gnomon 32 (1962) p. 459). "Non-Hesiodic" does not always mean "post-Stesichorean": still, priority between S. and this part of the Catalogue of Women has provided, and still is providing, rich fuel for controversy. ¹

Scope for confusion in an already complicated area is not reduced when one of the two scholars who have most fully argued for the late dating of the fragments thinks S. may well have utilised them, while the other finds this totally impossible. In his earlier treatment (Sitzungsberichte Akad. Berlin Phil. Hist. Kl. 1900 (2) pp. 845ff) Wilamowitz ruled out genuine Hesiodic authorship and made the implausible suggestion that what seemed to him the satirical picture of an absurdly over-confident Menestheus (fr. 200 M-W 8–9) was intended as a hit at Athens. A connection between the poem and the marriage of Agariste and Megacles was cautiously suggested (p. 844) but "es ist sehr glaublich dass S. wie anderes auch dies aus unserem hesiodischen Gedichte nahm" (p. 845 n. 1) and this influence upon S. was even contemplated as a terminus ante quem (p. 848). When he returned to the topic (Berlin Klassiker Texte V (1907) 1, pp 37ff) he attached much importance to the absence of Athens from the list of places neighbouring on Salamis, which Ajax promises to pillage to secure Helen's dowry (fr. 204 M-W 44ff). This, Wilamowitz supposed, must date the poem (together with 11·2·557–8

¹ A bibliography may be found in F. Jouan, Euripide et les légendes des chants cypriens (1966) p. 158 n. 6.
from the Catalogue of Ships) to the period after Athens' annexation of Salamis and its national hero: "Dieser Hesiod ist jünger als die Fassung des homerischen Kata-
loges, die erst unter Peisistratos fallen kann, ist also frühestens ein Zeitgenosse des Anakreon. Diese Braut-
werbung um Helene ist beträchtlich jünger als die um Agariste" (p.37f).

The notion that our Catalogue of Suitors was inspired by and composed in honour of the marriage of Cleisthenes' daughter Agariste (in c. 580-570?) and has in turn influenced Herodotus' account of that historical event is enthusiastically adopted by J. Schwartz (Pseudo-Hesiodeia (1960) pp.420ff and pp.487ff). He adds various modific­ations, but his highly complex conclusions are open to serious objections nonetheless. I leave aside his naive assertion that to be anti-Homer in Cleisthenes' Sicyon was to be pro-Hesiod. Would the Argive-hating heart of Cleisthenes be so very gladdened to hear that two of Helen's suitors, the sons of Amphiaraus, Εξε Ἀργειος ἐνωντο μάλιστα γυνη (197-7 M-W) and to be reminded, with such grating insistence, that the heroine herself, (his own daughter's counterpart!) was Ἀργείη (200-2, 204-43, 55)? Wilamowitz supposed that Ajax's promise (204-45ff) to provide Helen with a dowry of rustled cattle was intended to present a disparaging picture of that hero which would be impossibly unflattering for the successful wooer Megacles if his native city had by then adopted Ajax
as its own. This is a misinterpretation: the ancient world saw no dishonour in such activity: see my introduction to the Geryoneis (p.63f). Schwartz compounds the error by trying to twist the passage into an obscure and hidden attack on the Pisistratids, the rivals and enemies of the Alcmeonids. Even then the hypothesis has not explained all the phenomena, and the lines on Menestheus (200-3ff) must be interpreted as an eulogy of Athens, itself interpolated into the original Agariste poem years later, at the time when Cleisthenes son of Megacles was at his zenith.

If one genuinely finds the problems raised by Wilamowitz in connection with Ajax and Menestheus insoluble given a pre-Stesichorean date, there is still no need to place the entire episode of the wooing of Helen later than S. M. Treu (Rh. Mus. 100 (1957) p.154 and n.32), by treating the suspect passages as an Attic interpolation, was able to re-integrate the list of Suitors within the Catalogue as a whole. This he dated to the first half of the sixth century at the latest, using as termini ad quos apparent echoes in the lyric poets, especially, of course, S. But I am encouraged in my belief that the wooing-tradition was known to Homer, Hesiod and early epic by M.L. West's reminder (pp.11ff) of the primitive origins of the story, which has clear analogies with Indo-European tales of suitors for the hand of the daughter of the Sun.

At any rate, to argue that S. cannot have drawn on the Hesiodic Catalogue of Suitors and the oath which concludes
it because he lived before its composition, is not to argue that S. cannot have known of the tradition therein described because he lived before it was created. And yet this is precisely what J. Schwartz proceeds to maintain (Pseudo-Hesiodeia pp.552ff): "Il n'y a même aucun motif d'admettre que S. a parlé du serment des prétendants d'Hélène." This extreme assertion professes to rest on the labours of Ed. Schwartz (in Jahrb. für cl. Phil. Supplmtbd. 12 (1881) pp.405-463), and the unprejudiced reader of the later Schwartz's summary of his earlier namesake's views is left with the distinct impression that the German scholar has cast conclusive doubt on the authorship notes which conclude the mythical Ιτροπίαι of most Homeric scholia including that which constitutes 190 P. Far from it. Not every instance of such concluding formulae is damned, and the alleged fragment of S. is never mentioned throughout the lengthy article. Mere homoeonomy is no justification for treating a predecessor's work so cavalierly. Nor should preconceived notions on the date of the Hesiodic list of Suitors induce us to reject a perfectly good piece of evidence on S's Helen.

Not even when we have vindicated the right of the last sentence to maintain its place at the end of the scholion is our task finished. We must explain what the sentence means. There are some for whom the simplest Greek bristles with difficulties unsuspected by the rest of us. Seeliger (p.6) discovers an intolerable redundancy in the
import of the two statements ὅς τινες φασί and Ἡ ἱστορία ἦν. Therefore the first phrase is to be taken as referring to the form of the tale as summarised by 190 P and τινες as a paraphrase for Euripides¹ (i.e. I.A.51ff).
And the final sentence, so carefully rendered unintelligible by this process, is to be given meaning by the arbitrary expedient of a lacuna after ὅρκους which has swallowed up some such words as ὅς ὄρκος συμβουλεύοντος. Not the whole of the general summary before our eyes, but the single motif conjured up out of thin air and Apollo-dorus, belongs to S's treatment. Absurd! S. is clearly one of the τινες mentioned earlier on, and he is specifically singled out and named at the end because his poem on Helen was particularly famous, indeed notorious (so Van der Valk, Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad Part 1 p.356 and n.182).
Once we have swept away the débris of scholarly misinterpretation that has littered this scholion there is little we can do except sit back and stare glumly at its inadequate contents, since its summary of S's poem is too stark to yield any information about his detailed treatment. Scholarly surmise is not inactive, but it can never attain to certainty.²

¹ A totally legitimate idiom (see Fraenkel, JRS 39 (1949) 151 = KL. Beitr. 2•382) but inapplicable here.
² For instance, M. Mayer (p.19) was impressed by the close similarity between the Π's outline and the trimeter prologue of Eur. I.A.51ff and concluded that the latter was derived from the fragment behind the former. This supposition would not help us very much since the account of Helen's wooing given in the prologue is hardly more
ample than what we have in 190 P. We would merely know that S. invented the figure of Phoebe (II. 50) a shadowy personage found elsewhere in literature only in Ov. Her. 8.77 (see my note on 223.4 P) and that Helen herself had chosen Menelaus as her husband (so Hygin. fab. 78 on which c.f. West p. 13). Against the former assumption we might quote Σ Eur. Hec. 3: πολλάκις ὁ Εὐριπίδης αὐτοκεχείδαξε ἐν ταῖς γενεαλογίαις, ὥσι καὶ ταυτῷ ἐνιότε ἐναντία λέγειν (1.12 Schw.). Against the latter, note the conflict with our scholion which claims that Μενελάω καὶ Θυτήν ἱκδιάων Τυνδαρέως. Seeliger's retort (p. 6) that the scholion's summary may be very free and loose as well as drastically curtailed is no answer at all. Since the scholion is our only source for S's handling of the wooing of Helen, it is irresponsible to make far-reaching assumptions about how accurately its author summarised the original material simply to bring it into line with our own guesses. Tyndareus' rôle seems to be the principal one and we would do well to respect it and disregard it not in favour of wild surmise about the rôles of Helen or Odysseus. For by indulging in such speculation we may risk overlooking one of the few points of contrast with previous treatments that it is possible to detect: Hesiod's Catalogue made the Dioscuri important figures and the real organisers of Helen's wooing: c.f. 197.3f, 198.8, 199.1 MW. A more respectable conjecture from Mayer (p. 20) is that S. provided Euripides with the novel and surprising information that Achilles was one of Helen's suitors, in flagrant contradiction to the voice of earlier tradition which protests that he was too young. So the Hesiodic Catalogue explicitly (fr. 204 MW 87-93) and Apollod. 3.129-31 and Hygin. fab. 81 implicitly. See Kannicht ad Eur. Hel. 99 (2.45)). That has the ring of a genuine piece of Stesichorean μαντοτομία, but the kingdom of speculation knows no certainty, and the counter-suggestion which places responsibility for the innovation at Euripides' door, (so Wilamowitz BKT 5.1 p. 39, Kannicht p. 45) cannot be refuted.
Again the attribution to the Helen is not specifically guaranteed by the author who cites our fragment, and we must make sure that we can defend it against those who would wrench it from that poem, or even from S. himself. Of the alternatives usually open to those who wish to deny an event in the life of Helen to the poem of that name, one would appear to be closed: for Philodemus tells us (de piet. p.24 Gomperz = 215 P) that in the Oresteia Iphigenia was the daughter of Agamemnon not of Theseus:

εἰς Ὀρεστείαν κατακολουθήσας Ἡλέκτρω τὴν Ἀγαμέμνονος Ἰφιγένειαν εἶναι τὴν Ἐκάτην νῦν ἔνωσεν ἰσομαζόμενη.

Scholars have made incredibly heavy weather of this piece of information. To me the difference between the contents of 191 P and 215 P is a sure sign that since this former tale of Helen's adolescent misdemeanours could only awkwardly be fitted into the Iliupersis, we must accept the Helen as its natural resting-place (see p.255 above). And that is a scrap of news for which we should be profoundly grateful. But gratitude is not the predominant emotion which I detect in most scholars' reactions to the texts before us. Here, for instance, is what Kannicht says (pp.39-40 n.2): "Die seit Bergk [p.216] herrschende Annahme, Helenas Theseusabenteur (d.h. die 'argivische' Version der Abkunft Iphigenies) sei von S. in der Helena behandelt worden (191 P) ist sehr unsicher fundiert; denn sie hat als einziges Argument für sich,
dass die 'arkadische' Version (Paus. 1.43.1 = ix.23A 21-6 MW) für die Orestie gesichert ist (215 P) involviert also die fragwürdige Annahme, S. habe die beiden Versionen auf die beiden Dichtungen verteilt (dagegen richtig auch Herter [Rh. Mus. 88 (1939) p.248 n.16])."

Wilamowitz too discerned an intolerable contradiction between the two Stesichorean fragments which made it impossible for him to accept both of them as accurate reports of S's original poems. Clearly we must examine the arguments of such distinguished experts with the greatest care. Their assertions seem to fall into three main groups:— (1) that it is wrong to accept Philodemus' statement; (2) that it is wrong to accept Pausanias' statement; (3) that it is improbable that S. used different traditions about Iphigenia's birth in different poems.

(1) manifests itself in various forms, but generally assumes that there is a direct conflict between the testimony of Philodemus and Pausanias and that the former is unlikely to be right. Thus Herter (l.c.) opines that when Pausanias says Στησίχορος ὁ Ἰμεραῖος is one of those who claim θεσσαλῶς ἔναλθεν ἰόνια ἰφιγένειαν he is referring to both the Helen and the Oresteia, and Philodemus is simply in error. But there is no need at all to make the first assumption: Pausanias may fondly have supposed that the mention of Helen in the neighbouring lines made it obvious that he was talking about the Ἐλένη poem; if he had meant to attribute the event to the Oresteia, he would surely have done so more plainly (see p. 256f.). The
second assumption, that it is inherently probable Philodemus made a mistake, occurs in Herter (who does not argue the case) and likewise in Bowra C.R. 13 (1963) 251-2 = On Greek Margins (1970) 97. (For the context of Bowra's argument see below p.464). Bowra suggests that, in concentrating on the relevant and crucial detail of Iphigenia's transformation into Hecate, Philodemus forgot that Hesiod and S. had made her a daughter of Helen, and thoughtlessly referred to her in her much more customary rôle as daughter of Agamemnon. Against this unproved, unprovable, and totally arbitrary claim, I trust I need bring no objections. Merely to state it is to refute it. (2) Wilamowitz likewise assumed that the different versions of Pausanias and Philodemus entail a real contradiction, but he chose to fasten the blame upon the former. (Hermes 18 (1883) 252 = Kl. Schr. 6·198, stubbornly maintained in Sitzb. der Preuss. Akad. der Wiss. (1925) p.236 n.3=Kl. Schr. 1 (2) p.117 n.1). Philodemus is a good boy (pp.251-2: "Philodem, der zwar keineswegs dem Apollodoros ἡπὶ Ἑσίον, aber einem sehr guten Gewährsmann folgt") Pausanias the bone-headed bungler, here as elsewhere: "soll sie (Clytemnestra) etwa ihren Gatten aus Rache für ihre Nichte erschlagen haben? Nein, schon als geringerer Zeuge müsste Pausanias weichen. Es ist ja aber auch sein Versehen ganz deutlich. Wieder einmal, wie schon so oft, hat er eine Notiz, die er Überkam, in zwei Stücke zerschnitten, und dabei ist es ihm passirt, dass er den S. statt zu Hesiod, wo er bei Philodem
erscheint, zu den alexandrinischen Dichten stellte; ich wünschte, er hatte nicht schlimmere flüchtigkeiten auf dem Gewissen." (my italics). It was the contemptuous attitude towards Pausanias that underlies this argument which kindled the ire of J.G. Frazer (c.f. GRBS 15 (1974), 348ff). Against it see also A. Kalkmann, Pausanias der Perieget (1886) pp.252ff (especially p.254 n.2) and Seeliger pp 12ff. Both point out that the apparently anomalous conjunction of an archaic lyric poet (S.) and two far later Hellenistic writers (Euphorion, Alexander Aetolus) which Pausanias makes, can be exactly matched by Ibycus 295 P ( = Σ 11·3·314 (Erbse 1·415): Πορφύριος ἐν τοῖς παραλειμμασιν αἰτεί ν ὑπὶ τὸν Ἔκτορα Ἀπόλλωνος ὑλὸν παραπλῆσεν "Ἰβύκος Ἀλέξανδρος Εὐφορίων Δυνάμων). Nor is the juxtaposition of S. with Euphorion quite unparallelled: c.f. S's fr.224 P ( = Σ Lycophr. 265 (Scheer 2·115) Στησίχορος δὲ καὶ Εὐφορίων (fr. 56 Powell) τὸν Ἔκτορά φασμὶν ἐξαιρεὶ ὑλὸν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος) καὶ fr.225 P ( = Σ Lycophr. 658 (Scheer 2·219) Στησίχορός φασιν Ἄδεισσα ἐπὶ τῆς ἀπώλους φέρειν διελπίνος τύπων καὶ Εὐφορίων (fr.67 Powell) δὲ τοῦτον συμφεύγεται). And for Apollodorus' περὶ θεῶν as the regular source of Philodemus see above p.

But the blow that will shatter the arguments under review is yet to come. All the scholars named above, and several others besides, are agreed on (3) the improbability of S's using different versions of Iphigenia's birth in two different poems. This is a ruinous concord of
error. To me the view that S. (no less than Euripides or Pindar) could vary the versions of the myths he told from poem to poem is so staggeringly obvious a truism that it requires no justification. However, I will offer even this: the Oresteia may well have been composed at the same time as or after S. had decided to rehabilitate the heroine of the Helen. Granted the palinodes and their attendant causes, it would be essential, when Iphigenia came to be mentioned in the Oresteia, to suppress the idea of Helen as her mother. That this is no idle fancy on my part is shown by the Spartan elements which have been detected in both Palinodes and the Oresteia. (See below pp. 410 ff). They would date the latter poem to some time after that contact with Sparta which likewise seems to have inspired S. to compose his recantations.

Of course it is also true that the internal coherence of the Oresteia would be destroyed if Iphigenia were merely Clytemnestra’s niece, as Wilamowitz (l.c.) realised. (See my note ad 215 P).

But the essential step is to realise the possibility of differing versions of myths in different poems. Grant this, and the need to impugn the credit of Philodemus or Pausanias fades into thin air.

But perhaps the strongest argument for attributing 191 P to the Helen, is that it would furnish, at last, a specimen of that χαβγορία which we have seen good reason to suppose occurred in the Helen. No matter what Helen’s exact rôle in the affair according to S., the fragment
is hardly a flattering reminder of her teenage days.¹

Pausanias marks the tale as an Argive version, and

observes that it was also related by Euphorion of Chalcis

(fr. 90 of Powell's Collectanea Alexandrina:² Et. Gud. 285·

45: οὐνεξα δὴ μὴν Ἰφι βησκαμένων ἑλένη ὑπεγείνατο θησεί.

Et. Mag. 480·17: Ἰφις Ἡφιγένεια* Ἐὐφόριων αὕτην ἐτυμο-

λογεῖ, ἄγνωστον αὐτὴν Ἀγαμέμνονος, οἰκεῖει δ᾽αὕτην ἑλένης·

καὶ θησεώς, ὑποθελήτην δὲ δοθήναι κλειταιμήστραι, οὐνεξα

κτλ.) and Alexander Aetolus (fr. 12 Powell = Paus. 2·22·7).

But the tale's context was apparently included in the

Cypria (Allen fr. 10 (p. 121)) as part of that epic's
denigration of her character: ΣΑ II·3·242 Ἑλένη ἀρπασθεῖ-

σα ὑπὸ Ἀλεξάνδρου, ἄγνωστο τὸ συμβεβηκὸς μεταξὺ τοῖς

ἀδελφοῖς Διὸςκῷροις κακόν, ὑπολαμβάνει δι᾽αἰσχύνης αὕτης

μὴ πεπορεύεσθαι τούτους εἰς Ἰλιὸν, ἐπιεῖδη προτέρως ὑπὸ

θησέως ἡπάσσῃ, καθὼς προείρηται. διὰ γάρ τὴν τότε γενο-

μένην ἀρπαγὴν "Ἀφιδνἄ πόλις Ἀττικῆς πορθεῖται, καὶ

tιτρώσκεται Κάστωρ ὑπὸ Ἀφιδνοῦ τοῦ τότε βασιλέως κατὰ τὸν

dεξιόν μηρόν. οἱ δὲ διὸςκῷροις θησέως μὴ τυχόντες λαμφα-

γωνοῦτο τάς Ἀφιδνὰς (Ἀθῆνας σοι .). ἡ ἱστορία παρὰ τοῖς

Πολεμωνίοις ἢ τοῖς Κυκλικοῖς καὶ ἀπὸ μέρους παρὰ Ἀλκι-

μάνι

tῶι λυρικῷ (21 P).

For further proof that the outline of the myth was known

as early as Alcman see Paus. 1·41·4 (21 P): ταῦτα μὲν ὁπτω

¹Perhaps we should not be in too great a hurry to assume

that the Greeks of S's time would automatically blame

Helen for what Theseus did to her Ἰφι βησκαμένων. But

I am sure they would have done so after a little

prompting from S.

²F. Scheidweiler, Euphorionis Fragmenta (Bonn Diss 1908)
p. 68 has a fuller list of testimonia on this fragment.
And an additional testimony to the story's great antiquity is provided by the Protocorinthian lecythos illustrated by K. Schefold, Frühriechische Sagenbilder (Munich 1964) p. 39 = Myth and Legend in early Greek art (London 1966) p. 42 fig.9 which shows the Dioscuri rescuing Helen from Theseus and Pirithous (Brommer Vasenlisten\(^3\) 222 Cl). See too the lecythos illustrated in fig.10 of the same book and the bronze cuirass from Olympia (c. 670-660) depicting the same scene of rescue (Schefold pl.26 = Denkmälerlisten 87.1). The Chest of Cypselus (Paus. 5. 19.2-3) portrayed the Dioscuri: Τυνδαρίδα Ἐλέναν φέρετον, Αἴθραν δ' ἐλκείτον | Αἴθάναθεν.

But there is no reason to suppose that the particular detail of Helen's precocious motherhood featured in any of these accounts. S. may well have invented that,
inserting the disreputable vignette into a very old tradition.

The tale was also embraced in poetry by Nicander fr.58 Schneider, Gow-Scholfield (= Ant. Lib. 27): 'Ιφιγένεια ἱστορεῖ Νίκανδρος: 'Ετερολοίμην βας 'Ἑλένης τῆς Δίὸς ἔγενετο θυγάτηρ Ιφιγένεια καὶ αὐτὴν ἔξετρεφεν ἢ τῆς Ἑλένης ἅδελφη κλυταιμήστρα πρὸς δὲ τὸν Ἀγαμέμνονα εἶπεν αὐτῷ τεκεῖν. Ἑλένη γὰρ πυθανομένων τῶν ἅδελφῶν ἔφη κόρη παρὰ θησέως ἀπελθεῖν) and in prose by Hellanicus of Lesbos F. Gr. Hist. 4 F 134 = Σ A II•3•144: Αἰθρὴ Πιτῆδος θυγάτηρ· ἐτέρα τῆς θησέως μητρός ἔστιν αὐτὴ ἢ Αἴθρα· αἷσχρον γὰρ ὑπάρχει θεραπαίνη τρόπω ἀκολουθεῖν τῇ· Ἑλένη τὴν Αἴθραν ἐκυρᾶν νομίσθεισαν. ὡς γὰρ ἱστορεῖ 'Ελλάνικος, Πειρίδους καὶ θησέως, δὲ μὲν Δίὸς ὄν, δὲ δὲ Ποσειδώνος, συνέθεντο γαμήσαι Δίὸς θυγατέρας καὶ ἀρπά- σαντες τὴν Ἑλένην κομιδὴ νέαν παρατίθενται εἰς "Ἀφίδναν τῆς Ἀττικῆς Αἴθρη τῇ Πιτῆδος μὲν θυγατρὶ, μητρὶ δὲ θησέως. οὕτως εἰς Αἴδου παραγίνονται ἐπὶ τὴν Περσεφόνην. οἱ δὲ Δίοκχουροι, μὴ ἀπολαμβάνοντες τὴν ἅδελφην, τὴν Ἀττικῆν πορθοῦσιν, Αἴθραν δὲ αἰχμαλωτίζουσιν. (For the works of Hellanicus from which this extract may come see Wilamowitz, Sitzb. der Preuss. Ak. der Wiss. 1925 p.54 n.3 = Kl. Schr. 5² p.73 n.3, Jacoby ad loc. 1 A p.466).

Hellanicus (F. Gr. Hist. 4 F 168) is likewise cited as source in the fullest treatment we have, that of Plut. Thes. 31.1-3, which bears the traces of a tradition that sought to exculpate the venerable Athenian hero from the charge of child-molesting: ἢδη δὲ πεντήκοντα ἐπὶ γεγονός,
Various writers in antiquity taxed their brains in assessing Helen's exact age at the time of her encounter with Theseus. According to Hellanicus (F 168B = Σ Lycophr. 513) she was seven; Diod. 4.63.2 gave her ten years; Apollod. Ep. 1.23 thought she was twelve. As Jacoby remarks in his commentary on that Hellanicus fragment 1A p.471: "die sieben jahre waren unmöglich, wenn man die tochter von Theseus anerkannte." But the differences in age have less to do with the onset of Helen's
puberty than with the difficulty of creating an artificial mythological chronology (see below p.296).

The tradition exploited by S. was, then, of great antiquity: its familiarity may be judged by the way in which Euripides alludes to it in a single word: τον λυπονταρα λυπόγαμον (Or. 1305). But among the numerous authors listed above as having made Iphigenia the daughter of Helen, Homer and Hesiod are conspicuous by their absence. Did they know of the tale? Certain people in antiquity thought that 11.3.144 (δια τη γε και δυσιπολοι δο δεποτο, Αθρη, Πυθηος θυγατη κτλ) presupposed the idea that Aethra was kidnapped by the Dioscuri in revenge for her son's abduction of Helen, and rescued by the sons of Theseus at the sack of Troy. (The latter event is to be

1Printed in Aristophanes fr.338 Κ with a reference to Meineke's 'Αριστοτελης for 'Αριστοτελης.
found in the epic cycle: c.f. II. Pers(Allen p.108 (Procl.)) and fr.4 (Allen p.139)). The ancient critic Aristonicus would have none of it: εἶ μὲν τὴν θησέως λέγει μητέρα ἀδετιτέον ἀπίδανον γάρ ἔστιν Ἐλένης ἀμφίπολον εἶναι τὴν οὖτως ὑπεραρχαίαν, ἢν οὐκ ἤκποιεῖ δὴν διὰ τὸ μήκος τοῦ χρόνου. εἰ δὲ διμωνυμία ἔστι, καθάπερ καὶ ἐπὶ πλείδων, δύναται μένειν. (Σ Α in II.3.144 (1.384 Erbse)). His point of view has left its imprint on several of the Iliadic scholia (e.g. Σ in II.3.140 (1.383 Erbse)) ἰγνοεῖ τὴν θησέως ἄρπαγήν ὁ ποιητής. At II.13.626-7 οὐ μὲν κουριδίγην ἄλοχον ...[μᾶς οἴχεςθ' ἀνάγοντες we find the comment κουριδίγην: πρὸς τὴν κουριδίαν ὡς εἰς παρθενίας αὐτὴν ἔσχεν ὁ Μενέλαος, καὶ οὐκ οἶδεν τὰ περὶ τῆς θησέως ἄρπαγής (3.519 Erbse). And Aristonicus has found numerous present-day followers, including Sir Denys Page (History and the Homeric Iliad p.172: "The mother of Theseus was never a maidservant of Helen at Troy ... The sons of Theseus are unknown to the Iliad"). See contra W. Kullmann, Die Quellen der Ilias (Troischer Sagenkreis) Hermes Einzelschr. 14 (1960) pp.77ff. It seems at any rate unlikely that Homer was acquainted with that modification of the tale which made Iphigenia Helen's daughter.

There is no firm evidence that Hesiod ever treated the story either, though he is often a source for S. Sir Maurice Bowra, to be sure, has tried to argue that the Boeotian poet is S's inspiration here (CR 13 (1963) pp 251-2 = On Greek Margins pp 97-8) but the attempt is
hardly happy, and one cannot imagine he would have made it at all had he not possessed the ulterior motive of seeking to explain the second palinode directed against Hesiod (for which more plausible explanations have been forthcoming: see pp.464ff). The backbone of his argument is Philodemus' remark (215 P) about Iphigenia's transformation into Hecate as described in the Oresteia. Both Philodemus and Pausanias (1.43.1) confirm that Hesiod had earlier said that Iphigenia was saved from sacrifice by Artemis and became Hecate. Now, Bowra proceeds, if S. dealt with this tale in the Oresteia, his treatment there might well have been meant to supplement what he said in the Helen: the joint story would then be that Helen bore to Theseus Iphigenia who was later changed into Hecate. The reasoning behind this conclusion? "If S. got the latter part of the story from Hesiod it is quite likely that he also got the first" (p.97). Its author admits with characteristic frankness that "this is very far from being a solid case", but unfortunately it is even more flimsy than this statement implies. Not to put too fine a point on it, the thesis is contradicted at every point by what we know of the treatment of Iphigenia in the Eoeae (fr.23A.17ff MW). There Agamemnon, not Theseus, is the father of the daughter at Aulis, this daughter is called Iphimede not Iphigenia, and she is transformed into "Αρτέμις ελυσίη - a divinity by no means identical with Hecate.

It might reasonably be alleged that the second and third
instances of divergence are trivial. Not so the first. The whole interval coherence of the story is shattered if Agamemnon merely sacrifices his niece at Aulis: there are numerous parallels in world folk-lore for a father's enforced killing of his own child (see e.g. Frazer's Loeb Apollodorus Vol.2. Appendix 12 (pp.394ff)) no analogies at all for the alternative.

Since I have only just argued (p.285 above) that early Greek poets freely used different versions of a given myth in different poems, I have no right to claim that the contradictions to which I have drawn attention entirely rule out the possibility that Hesiod was S's source here. Those of us who believe that it was Hesiod who invented the idea of an εὐδωλον for Helen (fr.358 MW) must then accept that this is prima facie evidence of internal variations on a single myth within the Hesiodic school, since elsewhere Hesiod accepted that Helen had gone to Troy and "shamed the bed of Menelaus" (Op. 165 and fr. 176.7 MW). If this is allowed in that case and in S's handling of the Iphigenia tale, why not in Hesiod's treatment of the same topic? I merely remark that I use the argument to defend existing evidence, not as a substitute for such proof. Even if we agree with Sisti (Stud. Urb. 39 (1965) p.301) that Hesiod's usual anti-feminism and "l'intonazione moralistica della sua poesia" are signs that he might have branded Helen with the infamy of Iphigenia as her "love-child", we must surely
confess that there is no tangible proof whatsoever that he did so.

The myth of Theseus' rape of Helen clearly came into being as a doublet of the more familiar rape by Paris, and both reflect her status as one of the few genuine "faded" goddesses, whose original concerns were vegetation and fertility. On the appropriateness for such a divinity of the legends of her abduction by various young heroes see, for example, Nilsson, "The Mycenean Origins of Greek Mythology" p.75 and pp 170-1 from the latter of which I quote: "Helen is a pre-Greek goddess of vegetation whose peculiarity it is to be carried off, just as Kore was carried off by Pluto. Thus we have a pre-Greek hieratic myth, the rape of the goddess of vegetation by a god, which was made a heroic myth in various ways. The myth was secularised by the Greek invaders and transferred to an Asiatic prince by epic poetry .... in the two other myths, those of Ariadne and Persephone, Theseus appears as the abductor of a goddess of vegetation. He may originally have been the chief male personage of the old hieratic myth." (See further on Helen as a goddess S. Wide, Lakon. Kulte pp 340ff, and Nilsson, Minoan Myc. Rel. 528-31, Gr. Geste 426ff, Gesch. d. gr. Rel. 1.315, West pp 5-6). The abduction of a nature goddess associated with seasonal growth must correspond in some way both with a hypothetical temporary absence of the goddess in the Spartan religious calender (c.f. Nilsson, Origins p.73,
Usener, Sitz-Ber Wien Ak. 137 (3) 1897 p.12 =Kl. Schr. 4.209f) and with the natural phenomenon of the death of vegetation during the winter season symbolised by that absence. For West’s attempt to interpret Helen’s sojourn in Egypt as a further symbol of this see below p. 453f. The same scholar has convincingly argued (pp.10-11) from Indo-European analogies that the Dioscuri originally featured in our version of the myth as rival bridegrooms for Helen against Theseus (compare their rôles as stealers of the Apharidae’s brides in Theocr. Id. 22 and elsewhere) and were only later transformed into their now familiar rôles as her protective brothers.

The legend of Theseus’ abduction of Helen is inextricably connected in our sources with the town of Aphidna (so Nilsson, Origins p.74 and n.15). Situated in North Attica, not very far to the north west from the plain of Marathon, this town has a site with an acropolis that was inhabited in Mycenean times, and thus links the original Helen most closely to Attica and the Mycenean period.¹

¹Wilamowitz (Hermes 18 (1883) 257ff = Kl. Schr. 6.20ff) claimed that the pictures of Iphigenia as Helen’s daughter and as a sacrificial victim at Brauron rather than Aulis were twin branches of the same Attic tradition. He based his argument upon testimonia relating to two Alexandrian poets who seem to have retailed both forks of the tradition, Euphorion and Nicander:

Such were the origins of the myth of Helen's abduction. When this was split up into the numerous variations on the same theme that Nilsson mentions, it became necessary to fit the version concerning Theseus, who was less integral to the epic tale of Helen, into some stage of Helen's many-faceted career. And since it was already established that Theseus had lived too early to take part in the Trojan War, this particular doublet must needs be inserted at a correspondingly early part of Helen's life, when she was still at prepubescent stage. (See Jacoby on Hellanicus F. Gr. Hist. 4 F 168 Vol.1A p 471: "die genauen altersangaben und der grosse altersunterschied beruhren auf der schwierigkeit, die die erste vortroische heroengeneration genauer chronologischer fixierung machte"). These purely "chronological" considerations

(contd.)

APTEY-TETEVTACPOV EAAPOV. KACTA DE FAVATOUL (F. Gr. Hist. 325 F 14) AKTOV (scil. EN BRAVONI) KATA DE NIKANP0V (fr. 58 Gow-Schofield) TAPOV. See contra Jacoby's commentary on the fragment of Phanodemus (p. 187): "Even more uncertain is the inference from Euphorion that Ph. regarded Theseus and Helen as the parents of Iphigenia." Certainly there is no indication that the connection of the two branches existed in pre-Alexandrian times, or that S. envisaged Helen's daughter as being sacrificed at Brauron.

The whole problem of Iphigenia at Brauron and her connection with Artemis Brauronia is a horribly difficult one: see most recently W. Sale, Rh. Mus. 118 (1975) 265 ff ("The temple-legends of the Arkeia") with the bibliography on p. 265 n.1 to which add Sourvinou-Inwood, C.Q. 21 (1971) 339ff, T.C.W. Stinton, ib. 26 (1976) 11ff.

The geographical locality of the legend of Helen's abduction is rather confused: we have seen its link with Attic Aphidna, but Pausanias associates it with the Argives, and the yearly absence of the Spartan vegetation goddess gives it a third residence. Did the Argives adopt the version with Iphigenia's birth as a means of discrediting an important Laconian deity?
were artfully exploited by those poets - like S. - who wished to expatiate on the promiscuity of Helen's earlier years. But they were no less cunningly adapted by the authors of the pious protestations preserved in Plutarch, who claimed that the national hero of Attica had merely received Helen at Tyndareus' hands to protect her from the violence of others since she was still but a child.

S's whole version presupposes that Agamemnon had already been married to Clytemnestra for a considerable time before Menelaus married Helen. That would be quite compatible with the wooing of Helen as it is represented in the Hesiodic Catalogue which S. may have followed (see above pp.274ff). See especially fr.197.5-6 M-W:

\[\text{Δ\,λλ' \text{Αγαμέμνων}}\]
\[\gammaαμβρός \, ϵ\,\omega\, \epsilonυ\,\nu\,\alpha\,\varsigmaι\,\gammaνή\,\tauω\, \text{Μενελάω}}\]

It could also be compatible with the idea that Clytemnestra had first been married to Tantalus (see below p.315ff).
This is an absolutely fascinating fragment, though it has more than its share of the usual cruces. First among these of course is its attribution. And here the familiar trio of titles comes into play once more. A bibliography of early treatments of this problem will be useful: I have arranged it under the names of the relevant Stesichorean poems to which the various scholars have assigned our piece.

1) Iliupersis

C.I. Blomfield, Stesichori Fragments: Museum Criticum 6 (1816) p.261 places this fragment under the rubric 'Ελένη but argues "palinodiam eiusdem carminis ac vituperium partem fuisse; et nescio an utrumque ad 'Ιλίου Πέρσιν pertinuerit."


2) Oresteia

J. Geel, "de Stesichori Palinodia" Rh. Mus. 6 (1839) 7

F.W. Schneidewin, Beiträge zur Kritik der "Poetae Lyrici Graeci edidit Theodorus Bergk" von F.W.S. nebst einem vorworte (Göttingen 1844) 121

3) Helen

Blomfield (see above).
None of the scholars who subscribed to (1) managed to produce any convincing argument to support his preference. Thus Welcker explained that he chose to place the piece in the Iliupersis rather than the Oresteia because the figure of Tyndareus is more relevant to the story of Helen than to that of the House of Atreus. I doubt if that remark is true anyway, but supposing it were, it surely points away from the Sack of Troy (with which Tyndareus and those of his daughters who are not Helen have only the slenderest of connections) to the Helen itself, which, strangely enough, was not yet considered as a candidate.\(^1\)

Geel is far more persuasive in arguing for the Oresteia as the home of our extract. For, he observes, Schol. Eur. Or. gives, in all, three references to an unspecified poem of S, and of these, two (Σ Eur. Or. 46 = 216 Π and Σ Eur. Or. 268 = 217 Π) though not explicitly drawn from the Oresteia, can hardly derive from any other work by S. Is it not likely that the third unattributed citation must be traced back to the same source as the two others? This is the strongest argument we shall encounter in our investigation of this topic,\(^2\) but it falls some distance short of certainty. And one factor makes me reluctant to accept it: the Oresteia displays definite traces of Spartan

\(^1\)Kleine (p.25) who cannot decide between the Oresteia and the Iliu Persis ("Clytemnestram enim non leviter culpat") categorically excludes the Helen.

\(^2\)It was also used by Wilamowitz, Aisch. Orest .... Das Opfer am Grabe (1896) p.248 n.1.
influence (see pp. 866ff below) the very same Spartan influence which shaped S's favourable presentation of Helen in the Palinodes. And yet if we allowed ourselves to be swayed by the case which Geel and others present, we would be obliged to accept into the Oresteia a most derogatory implication concerning the heroine whom the Spartans honoured as a goddess (see below pp. 410ff). Geel cannot have appreciated this incoherence, but it is a real one nevertheless.

And so we arrive at that identification to which Bergk finally gave his authority. Kleine (p. 125) pithily (if unwittingly) summed up the advantages of this attribution: "habes ipsius Helenae vituperii partem et fere summam."

Of course Kleine himself supposed that the Ψόγος 'Ελένης was to be identified with the Iliupersis, but I have already given good reasons for rejecting that view (pp. 254ff above). The ωαχηγορία and the 'Ελένα are almost certainly to be identified, and 223 P is a more convincing instance of the required vituperation than anything else we have.

Kannicht has recently reassessed the case for attributing our piece to the Helen, and has ingeniously devised some fresh arguments in favour of that poem (1.39). These are (in ascending order of persuasiveness) (1) The climax produced by the sequence διγάμους, τριγάμους, λυπεσάνωρας, necessarily points to a poem exclusively concerned with Helen, since she, of all Tyndareus' daughters, is the most decisively stained with μαχλοκύνη and the μαχλοκύνη-motif
is most suited to a poem about her. (But if, as I argue below (p.315f), neither τρίγαμος nor λυπεένορας refer exclusively to Helen, the effect of the climax is considerably reduced). (2) The Second Palinode with its attack on Hesiod presupposes that that poet had somehow slighted Helen, and Hesiod's μαχλοσύνη-motif would be a very good αὔτον and starting-point for a κακηγορία of Helen and very good grounds for a later recantation. (Again this is very true and just, but most scholars have sought a different reason for S's criticism of Hesiod in the Second Palinode, one which will provide a contrast with his criticism of Homer (see below p.464.f). (3) A most important metrical fact: surviving fragments of the Oresteia suggest it was exclusively dactylic (see p.873). 223.3P however takes the form E ὀ e which is incompatible with anything that remains of that poem. It will fit in with what is left of the Helen though. Note especially how the famous three lines of the Palinode as emendea by Kannicht and Haslam produce a sequence (192 P: | xDx | exexe| xDx |) which is perfectly echoed in 223 P (see p. 250). And one would naturally expect S's recantation to be in the same metre as the offending poem. Clearly, not one of these arguments taken in isolation is overwhelmingly compelling. But taken together they have a great cumulative force. Bowra (p.111) exaggerates when he says that the lines "must come from" the Helen (my italics). that poem remains the likeliest source nevertheless.
The Scholion on Euripides' Orestes proceeds to quote a very similar fragment of Hesiod (176 MW):

The Scholion on Euripides' Orestes proceeds to quote a very similar fragment of Hesiod (176 MW):

τῇς εἰν δὲ φιλομειδὴς Ἄφροδίτη

ηγάθη προσιδούσα, κακὴ δὲ σφ' ἐμβαλε φήμην.

Τιμάνδρον μὲν ἔπειτ' ἢχεμον προλιποῦς ἐβεβήκει,

ἐκεῖ δὲ Φυλῆα φίλον μακάρεσσι θεοὶς

ὅς ὑπὲρ θυταμιὴστη <προλιποῦς.'Ἀγαμέμνονα δὲν

Ἀγησθών παρέλεικτο καὶ εἴλετο χείρον ἄκοιτην'

ὅς δὲ Ἐλένη ἔιχυνε λέχος ξανθοῦ Μενελάου.

What is the relationship between these hexameters and the Stesichorean fragment? Most scholars have assumed that the latter is imitating and adapting the former, and some have even taken S's lines to be a valuable terminus ad quem for dating the Hesiodic Catalogue (so e.g. Wilamowitz, Sitzb. Ak. Phil. Hist. Kl. 1900 (2) p.848 or M. Treu, Rh. Mus. 100 (1957) p.154 n.32). Kannicht thinks they are nothing of the sort: "Beweisende Kriterien für die Bestimmung der Priorität oder auch nur die tatsächliche Abhängigkeit der beiden Zeugnisse voneinander liegen nicht vor" (1.p.39 n.23). The second half of that statement is absurdly extreme, since the similarities between the two passages have long been recognised, by the ancient scholar who quotes both fragments as well as by modern critics. But this in its turn is a fact that can be overstressed. Schneidewin (sup. cit.) and Seeliger (p.5) seem to imply that S's motif of the neglected sacrifice could have occurred in Hesiod's account just before the passage.
quoted above: τῇςίν ὅτι might originally have contrasted with a preceding reference to the father of the Tyndarids (so Schneidewin) and Seeliger points out that ἦγάςῃ ἦν ἀν ὅτι can refer to anger as well as jealousy (he compares Od. 8.565f: ὃς ἔωσε Ποκειδῶν ἄγας ἐσθατῇ ἦμίν). The verb would then be closely comparable in effect to S's χολωσαμένα. But the interpretation fails to explain the emphatic προσιδοεὶς and attributes an implausible amount of stupidity to the quoter of the two fragments: since he is actually comparing the versions of S. and Hesiod it is rather unmannerly to suppose he was so doltish that he failed to quote that part of the latter's work which would make the parallel even closer. From the small amount of poetry which we actually possess we must conclude that Hesiod explained Aphrodite's action as stemming from a fit of pique occasioned by the beauty of the daughters of Tyndareus. The obvious parallel for such petty spite on the part of immortals is provided by the Judgement of Paris (formerly regarded as a frivolous post-Homeric invention, but see K. Reinhardt, Das Parisurteil (1938) = Tradition und Geist (1960) 16ff) and Greek mythology abounds with other instances of divine but all-too feminine jealousy of a mortal woman's superiority in a given area. (Compare Athene's treatment of Arachne in Ov. Met. 6.5ff or Hera's attitude to the numerous conquests of Zeus). Aphrodite in particular seems to have acquired a reputation as a deity eager to punish slights to her godhead. (Kannicht 1 p.39 n.23 compares Ε Eur. Hipp. 47 (Schwartz 2.11): τὸ ὅτι...
S. may well have replaced this discreditable motive with an epic explanation of divine wrath: the omission of the offended deity from a general sacrifice. It was a familiar idea that a mortal, by frequent sacrifices to a particular god, could qualify for especially favourable treatment from that deity (c.f. Il. 22.170ff, Od. 1.60ff, 19.396ff). The converse was grimly true: several parallels can be adduced from the Iliad. For the principle see Achille's question to Calchas concerning the plague in Il. 1.64ff: δε κείμενοι δε τόσον ἔχοσατο θοῖμος Ἀπόλλων, εἰς ἄδρο γὰρ ἔχωλες ἐπιμείχθηται ἐπὶ ἐκατόμβης. Diomedes can easily be checked, declares Pandarus in Il. 5.177f, εἰ μὴ τίς θέος ἐστὶ κοτεσσάμενος Τραύεσσαι | ἵ σον μηνίς | ἕκαλε ὃ τε θεοῦ ἐπὶ μῆνις. And a concrete instance of such an omission leading to divine anger is presented by Artemis, who sent the Calydonian boar (Il. 9.534ff) ὁ τελείως | ὡς οὐκ ὡς τά νοῦ θάλως | ὁ μὲν δὲ θεοὶ | δὲ θεοὶ | διότι | ἐκατομβας | οἴη | ὅ ὄ | ἔρρεξε

1 Compare the folk-tale versions of this motif, whose most familiar manifestations will doubtless be the neglected Fairy in the story of Sleeping Beauty, and the omission of Eris from the wedding of Peleus and Thetis.
Διὸς κοῦρης μεγάλοιο. Ἡ λάθετ' ἡ οὐκ ἐνόησεν', ἀλὰ ἀκοῦ ἡ μέγα δυμῶλ. (On this passage c.f. A.W.H. Adkins, J.H.S. 92 (1972) 6: "there was nothing deliberate in the slight, but Artemis was none the less ἀτυμότερος, for she had not received the sacrifices which are themselves the τιμή"). The motif continued to be popular after S's time and occurs in tragedy: when a character is suffering and the chorus speculate why, this answer rises readily to their minds. That Ares or Artemis may have been so neglected is considered in the parodos of Sophocles' Ajax (172ff): ἢ ράς εἰς Ταυροπόλα Διὸς Ἀρτέμις... ἄφρα εἰς πονὸς πανδάμους ἐπὶ βοὸς ἄγελας, ἢ ποῦ τίνος νῖκας ἀνάρπωτον χάριν, ἢ ράς κλυτῶν ἐνάρων | ψευσθείς, ἀδώροις εἰς ἔλαφοβολλαίες; ἢ χαλκοθάραξ εἰ τίν' ἑνώπιος μουμφάν ἔχων ἔνυσσ' δορός ἐνυχλοίς | υπαναίες ἐτείκατο λόβαν; Likewise for Phaedra in Eur. Hipp. 147ff: ἢ δὲ ἀμφί τὰν πολύθηρον Δίκτυνναν ἄμπλακεν ἀνιέρος ἀθώτων πελανῶν τρόχην; And the motif stretches down to Alexandrian times and beyond: Pelias omits to sacrifice to Hera, thereby incurring her wrath, in Ap. Rhod. 1.13 and 3.65; the same hero makes the same mistake concerning Artemis (with equally unfortunate results) in Apollod. 1.9.15; see too the reason for Protesilaus' early death invented in Cat. 68.74ff: domum | inceptam frustra, nonum cum sanguine sacro | hostia caelestis pacificasset eros|.... | quam ieiuna pium desideret ara cruorem | docta est amisso Laodamia viro: c.f. Ov. Met. 8.580ff (Naiads overlook Achelous); Apollod. 1.9.17 (women of Lemnos ignore Aphrodite); Bade, Scriptores rerum mythic. Latini
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1.162 (Pirithous neglects Ares). For real-life formulae intended to avoid such errors see Fraenkel, Ag. 2·p.262 and nn.2-3 and W.M. Calder III, G.R.B.S. Monograph 4 (1963) p.32f. The idea then is very common, but no extant author has followed S. in applying it to Tyndareus and his daughters. Its failure to appear in the numerous versions of the three Attic tragedians is particularly striking. If, as seems likely, we have here an example of Stesichorean καυνοτομία, we cannot help asking why the lyric poet has replaced the Hesiodic motif of divine jealousy. And the most probable answer is not that S. is anticipating Pindar's reluctance to speak ill of the gods, but rather that he is trying to win sympathy for the goddess¹ and away from the daughters of Tyndareus, especially Helen. The daughters are being punished not out of pique but because Aphrodite has been genuinely offended. Consequently those who accept the conventional Greek doctrine about the sins of the father will be less inclined to feel sorry for the Tyndarids.

Apart from the usual commentaries, we must turn to Schneidewin's rather acrimonious review of Bergk's first edition (see above p.298) pp 120-121 for several important emendations and clarifications of our passage (and several over-subtle alterations of the text which can safely be ignored).

¹I cannot understand T.C.W. Stinton's remark (p.14) that "S. is concerned to bring out the malice of Aphrodite as the potent factor." On any interpretation of fr.223 P, the responsibility is being laid fairly and squarely upon Tyndareus' shoulders (see p.305 supr.). If the contrast with Hesiod's version drawn above is correct, S. is revealed as deliberately rejecting a motivation which shows the goddess in a bad light.
It would be absurd to pretend that we can know exactly what preceded our fragment, but since S. definitely employs the epic motif of omission from sacrifice, and since our lines so supply a typically Homeric αἰτίον of human behaviour on the divine level of causation, we might wonder whether οὖνεξα was not the reply to the type of question which opens an epic by starting the chain of cause and effect with the gods. Something along the lines of Il.1.8-9: τίς τ' ἄρα σφώς δεῦων ἐρίδι ἐυνέηκε μᾶχεσθαι; Δητοῦς καὶ Δίως ὦλος κτλ. For instance, "which of the gods punished Helen and her sisters by making them sex-mad? It was Aphrodite: she was offended because Tyndareus had forgotten" . . . Such an αἰτίον would be in place at the beginning of the poem. But this is the merest speculation.

Τυνδρεος

The Ionic-Attic form of the MSS, so alien amid the surrounding Doricisms, was expelled by Schneidewin who rightly restored (here and at 3) the epic form (c.f. Od. 11.298-9, 24.199; Hes. frr. 23A [7] and 14, 196-7, 199-8, 204-61 MW; see C.O. Pavese, Omaggio a Ed. Fraenkel per i suoi ottant'anni (Rome 1968) p.171 = Tradizioni e Generi Poetici della Grecia Arcaica (Rome 1972) p.50).

2 δέξων

The same absolute use as in Il.9.535, which may well have suggested the motif to S. (see below).
As did Oeneus (Il. 9.537). For the reason why such an involuntary omission is a punishable offence c.f. A.W.H. Adkins, Merit and Responsibility p.62, J.H.S. 92 (1972) p.6. (There is no need to adduce the odd tale preserved in Paus. 3.15.11, wherein Tyndareus is said to have fettered Aphrodite's statue in anger at what she had done to his daughters. That looks like a primitive tale, but it has no connection with the present version).

2-3: μόνας λάθετ' ἕπιοδόφοι | Κύμπιδος

Haslam (p.23 r.27) notes that S's "dactylo-epitrite, in which the colon usurps from the period some of its structural importance, tends to be less consistently paratactic - sometimes to very good effect" and he cites the present passage as a "splendid example." We might add that the emphatic device of delaying an important proper name until the end of a sentence occurs again and again in the choral lyrics of a poet whom S. influenced considerably - Aeschylus. (See especially Ag. 681ff τίς ποτ' ὄνωμαζεν .... Ἐλένα; with Fraenkel's notes ad loc. and on 687, 877ff and 1436). Κύμπιδος is an Homeric name for the goddess: Il 5.458 etc.

1: ἕπιοδόφοι:

only used once by Homer, of Hecuba (Il. 6.251) when she comes to comfort Hector. Its meaning, "having (i.e. dispensing) gentle gifts" is, as Nöthiger (p.139) points
out, most singular: the adjectives oftenest used of gifts in epic onwards are ἀγλωδ, κλυτά and the like, and the resulting epithets ἀγλωδώρος (H.H. Dem. 54) etc. The gifts dispensed by Aphrodite and Hecuba are, needless to say, quite dissimilar. Our unusual word does not appear again in literature until Oppian (Hal. 4-7). The prefix ἡπιο- is likewise rare in later compounds: Bacch. 13.78 (ἡπιόφρων), Pind. Pa. 7.7 (ἀπιωμήδης).

3: Τυνδαρέου κόμρας
κόμρας as object of the verb at the end of 4, or κόμρας dependent on χολωσάμενα? Schneidewin¹ observed that the latter alternative is illogical in sense: Aphrodite is only angry with Tyndareus for omitting her from sacrifice. She can have no rational grounds for wrath against his daughters, whom she afflicts with μαχλοσύνη merely to punish their father. Divine resentment at the Tyndarids themselves would be perfectly in place in Hesiod's version, but seems inconsistent with S's sacrifice-motif (see above p.302f). Therefore I choose the accusative plural. By a simple correction to each word of the phrase, we remove Wilamowitz's grounds for deleting it (Aisch. Orestie ... Das Opfer am Grabe (1896) p.248 n.1), a deletion rashly approved by Merkelbach and West in their app. crit. to Hes. fr.176. As Wilamowitz himself was aware (Comm. gramm. 4 (1889) 11 = Kl. Schr. 4.672) the line is metrically

¹The same arguments are put forward, independently it seems, by Sitzler on p.60 of his review of Vürtheim.
blameless, and his objection to the repetition of Tyndareus' name will find few supporters.

For the phrase c.f. Od. 24·199: Τυνδάρεως κόορη. Is there any further significance in the phrase? Jouan (p. 155) combines it with the questionable assumption that Helen is the θεός of 193·10 Π (see my discussion ad loc. p. 341f) and deduces that S. made Helen a daughter of Tyndareus in the defamatory Helen, a daughter of Zeus in the exculpatory palinodes. That would certainly make sense, but it is rather a far-reaching assumption to base upon two words. As we saw above (p. 244) Homer's Helen can simultaneously be daughter of Zeus (11·3·199, 418, 426) and regret Leda and Tyndareus as her τοκῆς (11·3·140). Still, Seeliger (p. 5) has ingeniously observed that while the extant portions of Aeschylus and Sophocles never refer to any of the relevant heroines as "daughter of Tyndareus" (with the solitary exception of Aesch. Ag. 83), Euripides frequently employs this term and, what is more important, employs it as a mode of abuse for Helen or Clytemnestra. (See in general Or. 249f: ἐπίσημον ἔτεκε Τυνδάρεως εἰς τὸν ψόγον | γένος δυσατέρων δυσκλέεις τ' ἄν' Ἐλλάδα, El. 1063f: δύο δ' ἔφυτε συγγόνων | ἅμως ματαιώ. (Of Helen: Hec. 269f: ἡ Τυνδάρις γὰρ ἔλθεν ἐκπρεπεστάτη, | ἀδικοῦσα δ' ἄμοιν οὐδὲν ἤκουσεν ηὐρέθη, Tr. 766: ἤ Τυνδάρεων ἔρνος, ὅπωτε' εἰ Δίὸς. Of Clytemnestra: Hec. 1278: μὴ πω μανεῖν Τυνδάρις τοσόνδε παῖς, El. 60: ἡ γὰρ πανάλης Τυνδαρίς μὴ περ ἐμῇ 480: Τυνδαρίς ... κακόφρονον κοῦρα (c.f. El. 8 and 806). Or. 374: τῆς Τυνδαρείας παῖδος ἁνόσιον ψόνον).
It may well be the case that in these passages Euripides is following in the footsteps of Hesiod and S. Certainly Tyndareus' lamentable reputation in this respect was widely-broadcast: ἡ γὰρ δὲ τάλλα μακάριος πέφυκ' ἀνήρ, πλὴν ἐς θυγατέρας τούτο δ' οὖν εὐδαιμονῶ as he himself admits with admirable restraint in Eur. Or. 540-1, and so well-known that Orestes in the same play can be sure the audience will appreciate the bitter irony of his description of his grandfather as δ' τας ἄριστας θυγατέρας εὐεργεῖς πατήρ (750).


4-5: διγάμους τε καὶ τριγάμους .. καὶ λιπεσάνορας

"How many daughters had King Tyndareus"? Only Helen and Clytemnestra are regularly named, but Hesiod knew of a third, Timandra (cf. frr. 23A-31ff, 176.3ff MW) and if we search hard enough we can come up with two more, Phoebe and Phylonoë. These last two are rather obscure characters. The only literary reference to the latter is Hes. fr.23A 7ff MW from the Γυναικῶν Κατάλογος:

This is clearly the source of the notice in Apollod.
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For what services rendered she received this honour we cannot say, for no other details of her existence are preserved. But it seems safe to conclude, since she was made immortal and has ties with the virgin goddess Artemis, that she was probably a young girl, and certainly led too pure a life to be included among the daughters criticised by S. (so Seeliger p.6). Phoebe's grip on existence is more tenuous yet. She appears in Eur. I.A. 49ff (at the start of the trimeter prologue) but as one of the three daughters of Tyndareus:

εγένοντο Λήδαι Θεστιάδει τρεῖς παρθένοι,
Φοίβη Κλυταμήστρα τ', ἐμὴ Ξυνόρος
'Ελένη τε ...

She is also mentioned in Ov. Her. 8.77, and depicted together with her sister Helen and her brothers the Dioscuri on a hydria (Brommer Vasenlisten 3 542.A·1) described by D. von Bothmer, Antike Kunst 12 (1969) 26.

We might at first assume that Euripides means to name the three best-known daughters, in which case Phoebe would be an alternative name for Timandra, perhaps adopted because the etymology of her original name seemed ludicrously inappropriate for any daughter of Tyndareus. Or there might be confusion (deliberate or otherwise) with one of the two daughters of Tyndareus' brother Leucippus who are mentioned e.g. in the Cypria (Allen fr.8 (p.120)). But to this latter suggestion, the sharp-witted will retort
that deliberate confusion would be pointless, accidental confusion unthinkable in Euripides. Hence it is better to follow Mayer's identification of Phoebe with Phylonoë (p.33), especially in view of the epithet Phoebe which Artemis occasionally bears: minor goddesses often assume the names of major ones, and Phoebe's niece Iphigenia was also made immortal by Artemis and was called after her "Ἀρτεμίς ἑίρωδής." (Hes. fr.23A-24ff MW: see my note ad S's fr.215 P (pp.910ff).

Whatever the truth about that, it is clear that Hesiod and S. knew only three daughters of Tyndareus, or more probably suppressed the daughter or daughters who would spoil their picture of unmitigated promiscuity. This means that on a purely arithmetical basis, one of the first two adjectives in 223·4 P must be a case of plural for singular - perhaps the device is intended to make the daughters seem worse than they were.

It is surprisingly difficult to decide which of the errant sisters are meant to fit into which of S's categories of polygamy. But the worst that can be said of Timandra is

---

1 Artemis Phoebe is mentioned rarely and late by Greek authors (c.f. Paul. Sil., Anth. Pal. 5·254·10; Opp. Cyn. 2·1) more frequently by the Romans (c.f. Verg. Georg. 1·431 and W. Richter ad loc. (p.174)). She was especially associated with young maidens. For connections between Apollo and Artemis see Parnell's Cults of the Greek States 2·465ff. These connections explain such epithets as Φολβή or 'Εκαέρυη.

2 For a different explanation whereby all of the adjectives in 4-5 are plural for singular, see below p.321f).
that she had two husbands. So Hesiod fr. 176 3-4 MW:

Τιμάνδρη μὲν ἐπειτ' Ἔχεσον προλипοῦσ' ἐβεβήκει,
κεκτο δ' ἐς Φυλὴν φίλον μακάρεσσι θεοῦς.

For the first marriage see also Hesiod fr. 23 A 31ff (MW):

Τιμάνδρην δ' Ἔχεσον δαλαρῆν, ποιήσατ' ἀχλοτόν,
δὲ πάσης Τεγάνες ἡδ' Ἀρκάδης πολυηλόν
ἀφείος ἤνασις, φίλος μακάρεσσι ἐπιστής νῦν.
ἡ οἱ λαδόδοκοι μεγαλητορια ποιήσαν αὐτοῖς λαῶν
γι' εἰναὶ ὑπόθυμοθεῖται διὰ] χρυσῆν Ἀφροδίτην.

The tale is repeated in Apollod. 3. 10.

We learn something more about Echemus from Σ Pind. 01. 10. 80 (Drachmann 331) who tells us τὴν δὲ πάλην ἐνικήσεν

"Εχεσος Ἀρκάς το γένος, ὑφ' οὗ χαί τὸν Ἰλλον τελευτήσαι
eis Πελοπόννησον κατίντα (on this see Wilamowitz (Glaube

der Hell. 1 (1931) 71), Mayer pp. 22) and proceeds to quote
the first line of the above fragment of Hesiod. Paus. 8. 5. 1 fleshes out this sketch of the Arcadian prince with a
more detailed genealogy and further background information
on the death of Hyllus: Δυνωργοῦ δὲ ἀποδανόντος "Εχεμος
ὁ Ἀπρόπου τοῦ Κηφέως τοῦ Ἀλέου τὴν Ἀρκάδων ἔσχεν ἄρχην.
ἐπὶ τοῦτον Δωρίσας κατίντας ἐς Πελοπόννησον ὑπὸ ἡγεμόνι
"Ιλλων τοῖς Ἱρακλέοις Ἀχαιοὶ περὶ ἑσθοὺ τὸν Κορινθίων
κρατοῦσι μάχη, καὶ "Εχεμος ἀποκτίννυσιν "Ιλλων μυο-
μαχήσαντα οἱ κατὰ πρόκλησιν. The Laodicus mentioned
(Hes. fr. 23 A 34) as the offspring of this marriage cannot
be equated, as A. S. Hunt realised (Oxy. Pap. 17 (1927)
26) either with the son of Apollo and Phthia mentioned in
Apollod. 1. 7. 6, or the more famous Argonaut and son of
Bias and Pero (Ap. Rhod. 1:119). But he may be the Laodiceus mentioned in Apollod. 3:6:4:4 (so Lobel, Oxy. Pap. 28 (1962) 11). Servius ad Aen. 8:130 knows of a tradition whereby the Evander of Roman myth was the son of Timandra and Echemus, but clearly distinguishes this from the Hesiodic version.

The demise of the marriage is touched upon by Eustathius. II.305:17 (1:472 Van der Valk) in connection with the mention of a son of Timandra's second husband (Μέγης ...) φυλείδης in II.2:627: ιστορεῖται οἰκεῖώσις τοῦ Μέγητος πρός τοὺς βασιλείς. φυλεύς γάρ, φασὶ, μοιχεύσας Τιμάνδραν ἀδελφὴν 'Ελένης καὶ Κλυταιμέντρας ἀπῆγαγεν εἰς τὸ δούλη-χίον ὀστε καὶ εὐλόγως, φασὶ, διὰ τὴν ἐπίγαμλαν συμμαχεῖ καὶ ὁ Μέγας.

Clytemnestra is well-known as the wife both of Agamemnon and Aegisthus, and one's automatic impulse is to enter her name under the heading δίγαμος. But there existed in antiquity a definite tradition that she married three times, and that her first husband was called Tantalus and was put to death (together with his child) by Agamemnon who then married her himself. This variant first appears - to our knowledge - in Eur. I.A. 1148ff, where Clytemnestra is subjecting Agamemnon to a vigorous harangue:

πρῶτον μὲν, ἵνα σοὶ πρῶτα τοῦτ' ὄνειδίσω,
ἐγήμας ἁκουσάν με καλαβές βλαί,
τὸν πρὸς θεῦν ἄνδρα Τάνταλον κατακτάνων'
βρέφος τε τούῦν σοὶ προσοδίσας πάλωι,
μαστῶν βιαλως τῶν ἐμῶν ἀποσπάσας.

The tale recurs in Apollod. ep.2.15; also in Σ Od. 11.430 (ἐνιοί ¹ γὰρ γεγαμῆςαι τὴν Κλυταιμήστραν Ταντάλων, ὥσ· Εὐριπίδης εἰςάγει αὐτὴν λέγουσαν πρῶτον μὲν κτλ.). Tantalus, an unfortunate but otherwise anaemic and unmemorable figure in Greek mythology, is given some infusion of colour by Paus. 2.18.2 and 2.22.2. Here are the relevant remarks in both passages: ὅστερον δὲ οὐκ ἔχω σαφές εἴπεῖν πότερον ἄδικας ἢ ἡγειτος ἢ προούπηρξεν 'Ἀγαμέμνονι φόνος Ταντάλου τοῦ θεότου' συνοικεῖν δὲ φασιν αὐτὸν Κλυταιμήστραι παρθένωι παρὰ Τυνδάρεω λαβόντα ... (Then, in connection with a tomb of women at Corinth who died in a battle against the Argives under Perseus,) πέραν δὲ τοῦ τάφου χαλκετόν ἔστι οὗ μέγα, ἀνέχει δὲ αὕτῳ ἀγάλματα ἀρχαῖα Ἀρτέμιδος καὶ Δίος καὶ Ἀθηνᾶς. Δυσέστες μὲν οὖν ἐν τοῖς ἐπεσείν ἐποίησε Μηναχέως τὸ ἀγαλμα εἶναι Δίος, καὶ Ἀρχαῖοι ἔφη τοὺς ἐπὶ Ἰιλιον εκπαλαγμαντας ἐνταῦθα δυσεΐς παραμενειν πολεμουντας, ἔστ' ἄν ἢ τῷ Ἰιλιον ἐλωσιν ἢ μαχομένους τελευτῇ σφάς ἐπιλάβης. ἐτέροις δὲ ἐστὶν εἰρημένον δητὰ ἐν τῷ χαλκεω τείχεδαι Τανταλοῖ. τὸν μὲν ὑπὸ θεότου παῖδα ἢ Βροτέοι - λέγεται γὰρ ἄμφοτερα - δὲ Κλυταιμήστραι πρότερον ἢ Ἀγαμέμνονι συνωίκηςα, τοῦτον μὲν τὸν Τάνταλον οὗ διοίσκομαι ταφῆναι ταύτης.

The casual way in which this apparently rare variant is introduced in the I.A. suggests that the audience must have known it well. But there is no room for it in Hes.

¹ For the idiom see p.373 inf.
fr.176 MW. Did S. know of it? Kannicht (1, pp 39-40 n.24, partly anticipated by Mancuso p.193 n.3) thinks not, because abduction is involved (the Euripidean passage alone makes it quite clear that Agamemnon took Clytemnestra by force) and this can hardly justify the charge of μοιχλοκόνι which S. levelled against the Tyndarids. No doubt this is true strictly speaking, but juridical fairness to Clytemnestra - any more than to Helen as regards Theseus - may not quite have been S's aim here. Davison (p.200) claims, quite rightly, that there is no evidence that S. was acquainted with the story, and poses two alternatives: either Pausanias borrowed the story from S., or it was invented by someone who wanted to explain τριγύμους (possibly a plural for singular: see above p. 313) as including Clytemnestra as well as Helen. The first possibility ignores Euripides' mention of the tale (and indeed, true to form, Davison is unaware of this earliest treatment). The second may be right, and one can balance various likelihoods against each other: S. might want to blacken Clytemnestra's reputation to the darkest conceivable hue (especially if the fragment were from the Oresteia) so as to drag down the woman to the same level as Helen. Conversely (and this is particularly probable if the lines are part of the Helen) he may have wished to represent Clytemnestra in a more favourable perspective so as to render her and Timandra foils against which Helen's mischief would appear in an even more lurid light.
A possible argument in favour of Clytemnestra as τρίγυμος is the passage from the I.A. In dealing with the House of Atreus, Euripides often seems to fall back on S. for an unusual but dramatic detail. Leaving aside for the time being his Helen, we find the abrupt and unexpected mention of the εἷδωλον at El. 1280-3, the numerous uses of "daughter of Tyndareus" as an insult (see above p.310), the single word λυποπάτωρ at Or. 1305 - and now, perhaps the allusion to Clytemnestra's first marriage at I.A. 1150. Mayer (p.33) suggested this was so, and he may have been right. On the other hand, such inventions are very common both in this part of this particular play and in Euripidean ἀγαθοεις in general. Clytemnestra's lot is clearly being assimilated to that of her sisters Timandra and Helen, but this source for the innovation hardly helps us decide whether the younger or older poet was responsible. Outside of Homer, (see p.245) Helen, at any rate, is notoriously the woman of many husbands. Aeschylus' phrase πολυάνορος ἰμφό γυναικός (Ag. 62) springs instantly to mind. See too Eur. Cycl. 181: ἐπεί γε πολλοίς ἦδεται γαμουμένη. But how many husbands exactly? In Lyco- phron's Alexandra 143 the number has reached a prodigious level: τῆς πενταλέκτρου θυάδος: ib. 146: νυμφεία πεντά- γαμβρα ... γάμων. Tzetzes ad 143 (Scheer 2.67) dutifully explains the number five: Theseus, Menelaus, Paris,

1 But ϕιλανθρίς at Eur. Andr. 229 is not relevant (pace Herter, Rh. Mus. 88 (1939) p.248 n.16 and Seeliger p.5). See P.T. Steven's note ad loc. (p.122).

2 The tradition of Helen as a woman of many husbands is probably the inspiration of Andromache's paradoxical adapt- ation at Eur. Tro. 767ff: πολλόν δὲ πατέρων φημί σ᾽ ἐκπε- φυκέναι κτλ.
Deiphobus, Achilles, the last obscurely in a dream. There is no need however to assume that the number five here is canonical. Lycophron's work is justly epitomised by A.M. Dale (Introduction to A Commentary on Euripides' Helen p.xix) as a "preposterously obscure Hellenistic poem", and the whole point of calling Helen "five-times wed" is to be perversely and contortedly obscure. By giving Helen the largest possible number of husbands that can conceivably be squeezed out of the tradition, Lycophron hopes to set his readers cudgelling their brains in an attempt to identify the five. But later in the poem he refers to Helen as τῆς ... τριάνωρος κόρης1 (851) and comparison with S. would suggest this as the more regular number.

Whom then are we to drop from Lycophron's artificially inflated team? Menelaus and Paris must be integral to any account. Achilles, on the contrary, can easily be spared. If the reference is to the sexual union perhaps presupposed by the Cypria (see p.246) and the mysterious dream, then this "episodische Verbindung" (Kannicht on Eur. Hel. 99 (2.45)) occurred while Helen was still married to Paris, and it hardly qualifies as a separate γάμος, however discreditable it may have been. If the reference is to Helen's marriage to Achilles on the Isle of Leuce after their deaths, then this variant first appears in Paus. 3.19.3 and I would agree with Seeliger

1 Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἀἰγυς explains the epithet by describing Helen as τῇ Μενελάῳ, Ἀλεξάνδρῳ καὶ Δηνόφῳ γαμηθείς.
(p.5) that there is no proof S. knew it.

To bring the number down to three, Theseus or Deiphobus must be sacrificed. If we wipe from our memories all our previous assumptions about S's Helen and decide this new question de novo, we will probably retain Deiphobus. His union with Helen has more right to be called a marriage than Theseus' arbitrary abduction of the young girl, and it is described as such in Proclus' summary of the Ilias Parva (Allen p.106: μετὰ δὲ ταύτα Δηίφοβος Ἐλένην γαμεῖ). Compare Apollod. Ep.5.9.22 ("clearly from the Ilias Parva" according to Kannicht l·p.39 n.24):

εἰς ἑρυτᾶ ἦρχονται Ἐλευνς καὶ Δηίφοβος ὑπὲρ τῶν Ἐλεύνης γάμων' προκατέθνος δὲ τοῦ Δηίφοβου κτλ. c.f. Ibycus 297 P = Simonides 561 P = ΣΤ Ι1·13·516 (3·500 Erbse):


However, we have seen good reason to believe that S's Helen described Theseus' adventures with the young heroine (see above pp 281ff). Provided that 223P is from the same poem, it would have been eccentric of S. not to include that sexual escapade in his characterisation of Helen within the present αἶτιν-passage. And if the poem ended with the arrival of Paris and Helen at Troy (see above
the marriage to Deiphobus as well as all possible opportunities for a liaison (of whatever nature) with Achilles will have been excluded from its scope. That factor would have made it easier to eject the unmentioned Deiphobus from his normal position as the last of Helen's three consorts, and replace him with Theseus as the first to occupy that unenviable position.

Those who remain unconvinced by the above explanation, and those in particular who feel that even as early as S. Helen may have enjoyed five husbands, may prefer Kannicht's ingenious and at first sight attractive suggestion (pp 39f n.24) that διγγόμισε refers to Timandra, τριγγόμισε to Clytemnestra, and λίπεσάνοισε to Helen (with each adjective plural for singular). This will allow Helen to have had as many husbands as one can find for her. Kannicht himself objects to this interpretation (1) that Clytemnestra's Agamemnon and Helen's Theseus abducted them forcibly so that these respective unions can hardly rank as proper marriages or provide adequate grounds for S's charge of μαχαλοκούνη. (2) that Helen's fleeting encounter with Achilles does not merit inclusion in the list of liaisons. I have already given my own answers to these objections (see above p 317f). What seems to me a more serious obstacle concerns the rhetorical structure of these lines: after the two epithets describing Timandra and Clytemnestra, we expect something more bold and vivid for the notorious Helen herself, so much more voraciously
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πολυδύωρο than her sisters. Instead, on Kannicht's interpretation, we would have: Timandra had two husbands, Clytemnestra had three husbands, and Helen - Helen left her husbands. After the factual information conveyed in the first two epithets, the vagueness and conventionality of the last falls flat and seems quite the antithesis of the climax we would anticipate if Helen came last after a gradual build-up achieved by the mention of her other sisters.

Hence I prefer to follow the traditional interpretation of λιπεράνωρος as resuming the sense of the first two adjectives which together embrace all three sisters.

ηπιγήμους

The epithet occurs here for the first time; it crops up again in Theocr. Id. 12.5. Its models are probably the Homeric negative compound διγμος (Il.3.40) and the Odyssean epithet for the suitors πικρόγμως (Od. 1.266 = 4.346 = 17.137). These epic words feature in a curse, as does our own example, but S. produces a piquant surprise by giving us not the expected negative but a recherché superpositive. Other -γμος compounds occur in Aeschylus, Sophocles, and (especially) Euripides. Number words of course are very easily combined with the suffix of a compound, and Homeric διπλαζ, διπτυχ, τρίπος, τρίγλυνος and the like may be further distant models for the two very effective compounds here.

έτεθει

The MSS’s τιθέντι in which so many scholars have supinely
acquiesced, is impossible on grounds of dialect, tense, and metre. Nöthiger (p.58) in 1971 objected to the non-Doric ending in -ct, at a time when M.L. West (Philol. 110 (1966) 152, one of his forty-six conjectures on Greek poets) had already attacked the form for other reasons and had supplied a satisfactory replacement.¹ As West reminds us, we cannot interpret τίθηντι as an historic present (so, e.g., N.R. Collinge, BICS 4 (1954) p.58) since that phenomenon is completely absent from early Greek epic and likewise missing in all lyric narrative to judge from the (admittedly scanty) remains. (The extensive fragments of S. which have appeared since West wrote have not produced a single example to refute him). This absence was first noted for both Homer and Pindar by J. Wackernagel, Vorlesungen Über Syntax ¹² (Basel 1926) p.163). Other literature commenting on the fact is listed by Führer pp 93-4, who rightly deplores scholars' attempts to introduce the praesens historicum by supplementation or interpretation in verbs which form his own special concern (including φωναῖ at 209.2 P: see my note ad loc. ). It will be as well to draw attention here to one example of each misguided attempt in a wider field, since the repute of the Cambridge Professors who make them is such as to mislead the unwary.

¹I presume that at least some of the following considerations influenced R. Holsten's emendation of τίθηντι to ἔποιησεν (see his 1884 dissertation "De Stesichori et Ibyci dialecto et copia verborum p.80) an unacceptable change which deserves mention as an anticipation of West's remedy.
Interpretation: Jebb on Bacch. 5.48 (p.275 of his commentary, followed e.g. by Campbell (p.428): ἔτεκε (scil. ὑπευκλακος). "The historic present here is unusual but intelligible ... [it] gives a touch of animation." No: the verb here refers not to what Pherenicus did on a past occasion, but what this horse usually does ("speeds on") i.e. it is a normal present. Supplementation: in LGS 138.14 (Alcaeus' "Cologne Ode") Page illicitly introduced the historic present ὑπευκλακε, an unwelcome addition reproved by Lloyd-Jones (CR 19 (1969) 21; GRBS 9 (1968) 132 (see now Führer R. p.28)) but mysteriously retained in SLG p.81, persistently present in more senses than one.¹ The historic present in lyric in fact makes its debut in Aesch. Suppl. 540ff, and late Euripides (e.g. Hel. 1325ff). τῆς ἑλει cannot therefore be an historic present, and is unlikely to be a normal present unless it occurs in a speech (a possibility wisely conceded by West in ZPE 4 (1969) p.144 n.7 since a remarkably large proportion of S's fragments does in fact consist of direct speeches in the Homeric manner). But what sort of speech is envisaged here? Who would be announcing to whom that the goddess Aphrodite "is in the process of making" the daughters of Tyndareus διγαμοι and the rest? The present still seems awkward in sense.

West's ἔτεκει, apart from mending the sense also improves

¹A simple present at Pind. Pyth. 2.31 is misinterpreted as historic by Lloyd-Jones, J.H.S. 93 (1973) 120, fourth line from the bottom.
the metre. (N.R. Collinge's remark "presumably the metre secures the form" of τίδηςι (sup. cit. p. 59 n.20) was particularly inept). The MSS' odd "D' d" for this line is now converted into the more familiar "D D". When dialect syntax metre and sense are so economically ameliorated, and when quoted fragments are notoriously the prey of inaccuracy, it is absurdly timid not to accept emendation. The present of our texts is far likelier to be that simple slip a misquotation of the past.¹

5: λιπεσάνωρας

The word λιπεσάνωρα appears only here.² On its formation c.f. Nöthiger pp.156-7 who observes the anomalous nature of the first part of the compound, where λιπες- is not extended to λιπεςι- though ἄφεςι-μολπος (250 P) might lead us to expect that second prefix. There is no parallel for λιπες- and compounds with initial λιπο- (compare φυγο- compounds) are a later feature appearing first in Aesch., Pind., Hdt. etc. Nöthiger concludes that this first element of our compound should be regarded as a strong aorist stem to which the sound-group -εσι has been added as an independent suffix on the analogy of

¹West's correction has won acceptance from Kannicht p.39 n.22, Webster (The Greek Chorus p.78 n.1), and Snell, Frühgr. Lyriker, Teil 4: Die Chorlyriker (Berlin 1976) p.36. When Gerber (p.153) claims that "it is hard to account for the error", I presume he is thinking of transmissional corruption, though even then he is wrong, as the corruption of ποτήσις to ἐποίησεν just before the direct quotation shows.

²Lobel cautiously suggested λιπεσάνωρα as a supplement in Hes. fr.23 30 (Oxy. Pap. 28(1962) p.11) where Musso's ὀλεσάνωρα (Aegypt. 49 (1969) 72) seems the most plausible attempt so far: see my note on S 15 ii 5.
Homeric ταμεί-χως from ταμεῖν, φαεί-μβροτος from
φαεῖν, ἄλφεσίβοιος etc. More speculatively, Th. Knecht,
Geschichte der gr. Komposita vom Typ ῥεψίμβροτος (Zurich
Diss. Biel 1946) p. 39, hypothesises an original now lost
* ἄλφεσάνωρ as model for λιπεσάνωρ on the basis of the
antithesis ἄλφεῖν ("bring in, fetch")/λιπεῖν ("abandon").

The second part of the compound is far easier to under­
stand: Homeric ἰγαπ- ἰγκε- φηιε- ἰνωρ etc. are obvious
analogues, though in their case the suffix signifies
"man" or "hero", not "husband" as in the Stesichorean
epithet. For that meaning we must compare πολυάνωρ, also
an epithet of Helen (Aesch. Ag. 62: see Fraenkel ad loc
(2.40)) though there the prefix is not verbal, so that
the Geryoneis' ἄλεσάνωρ (S 15 11 5) is an even closer
parallel. This corroboration, together with the decisive
MSS evidence in favour of λιπεσάνωρας, tells firmly
against Schneidewin's λιπεσάνωρας excogitated from M's
λιπεσίόρας and bolstered up by appeals to Hesychius (Latte
1.194) s.v. Ἀμεσε γυναῖκες and συνάρωτε εὐναλα δαμαρ,
γυνη, ἀλοχος etc.

Our epithet's application to Timandra and Clytemnestra is
amply explained by Hes. fr. 176.3ff MW:

Τιμάνδρη μὲν ἐπειτ' ἔχειν προλίποις' ἐβεβήκει
ἴκετο δ' ἐς θυλὴ καὶ φίλον μακάρεσσεν θεότειν'
ὡς δὲ κλειστήμεστρή προλίποις' (sic Cobet: άτιος'
[West]) 'Ἀγαμέμνονα δῖον

Ἀλυκίωι παρέλεκτο καὶ εἰλετο χείρον' ἀκολούθην.
As applied to Helen, of course, the epithet requires no documentation, and she was not only λιπόγαμος but also λιποπάτωρ (Eur. Or. 1305). See too Eur. I.A. 783: πόσιν προλιποῦσα.

On the metre c.f. Haslam p.38: "The last phrase presumably went on to become D (x) (though the sense is complete and we could make a verse - - - - - ||| if we felt like it), but ... S's habit of having word-end before the ancesp suggests that it does not belong with what precedes but is to be given the status of an independent period."
These have always been the most famous of S's poems, both in antiquity and in more recent times. No other of our poet's compositions has gathered about itself so well-populated an array of secondary literature, much of it of very dubious value. There is a very full (though by no means complete) bibliography of earlier treatments of the problem provided by M. Doria, P.P. 18 (1963) pp.82-3 n.8 (about the only item of any utility in an otherwise totally inane article). Not the least of the services rendered by the publication of 193 P is that it renders otiose or obsolete most of the discussions of the previous century and a half. Of the works that have emerged since the momentous discovery that S. composed two palinodes, the most significant are:-

C.M. Bowra, CR 13 (1963) 245-252 = On Greek Margins (1970) 87-98\(^1\)
L. Woodbury, Phoenix 21 (1967) 157-176
J.A. Davison, From Archilochus to Pindar (1968) ch.8

\(^1\)Distinguished from Bowra's earlier treatment (GLP\(^2\) (1961) 107-112) as Bowra (2).
Appendix pp 222ff.¹


A Podlecki, Athenaeum 49 (1971) 313-327

G. Devereux, Rh. Mus. 116 (1973) 206-208

Only articles which (for good or ill) require frequent citation have been included in this brief list. It will, I hope, become clear from the following pages, which of these treatments serve a useful purpose, which not. I need hardly add in which category I would place H. Grégoire's theory that the Palinode was a forgery put together by "pseudo-Stesichore" at some date after the Peloponnesian War (Budé edition of Euripides' Helen p.36).

For a brief but delightful account of how the Greek word παλινωδία came to furnish the English (and Latin)tongue with the new verb "recant" c.f. Fraenkel, Horace p.209.

¹Much the same contents may be found, less coherently and persuasively presented, in this scholar's contributions to Quad. Urb. 2. (1966) 80ff("de Helena Stesichori") and "Atti del XImo Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia" (Milan 1965) 96-107.
METRE

192 P

The paradosis of Plato's MSS offers us | x~w | w | x~w | w |, that is | x D x | e-e- | x D x |.

Several scholars have been affronted by the eccentric "spondee" of the second line, which is now seen to be metrically without parallel in S.\(^1\) Various solutions have been offered, of which the latest is also the least acceptable: Snell's \(\epsilon\delta\epsilon\lambda\mu\omega\iota\varsigma\iota\nu\), proposed in Frühgr. Lyriker, Teil 4: Die Chorlyriker (Berlin 1976) p.34, would replace one anomaly with another, a run of four longa within a period (against which see p. 85). Better is the suggestion of Kannicht (p.40 n.25) and Haslam (p.44): \(\epsilon\delta\epsilon\lambda\mu\omega\iota\varsigma\iota\nu\)\(\iota\nu\).\(^2\) This supplement provides exactly the sort of word, "inessential to the sense" as Haslam observes, which Plato, a notoriously careless quoter, would be likely to have omitted. Transmissional error is a less plausible explanation. Note that the emended sequence here (|xDx| exexe |xDx|) is perfectly mirrored in 223 P, very probably from the Helen (see above p.301) and this would confirm presuppositions that both offending poem and apologies should be in the same metre. Simplest

---

\(^1\)As Haslam (p.44) notes, there are similar things in Simonides (581.4 P) and Pindar (Pyth. 9 str.2).

\(^2\)\(\iota\nu\) Kannicht, perhaps misled by the illicit \(\delta\tau\epsilon\) and \(\pi\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\) in 211 and 223.2 P; Haslam does not mention Kannicht.
of all remedies however is Blomfield's ἔφυεκέλμοι (now accepted by Page, S.L.G. p.157) with single syllable biceps in 2 das: |-----|(|e-D|). There is no exact parallel but --- is found in the Iliupersis (S 89·5, 103·9, 107·1); the Eriphyle (S 148·3) and P. Lille 76 (ep.7) has ---.

Though we now know that these three lines are not the actual opening of the poem, it still seems likely that they mark the beginning of a strophic whole.¹

193 P

The two opening lines quoted show that the Palinodes' initial period was ∆D -. At least, word-end in both cases suggests this is an independent period, and one identical with the opening period of the Geryones, except that the initial element is (presumed) anceps not biceps.

¹So first Davison p.223; Kannicht p.31, Haslam p.44.
Are these famous lines from the First or Second Palinode? Almost everyone would argue for the first (the attack on Homer) but we cannot be sure until we arrive at a proper understanding of the meaning of the last two lines. Wilamowitz (SS p.241 n.1) Page (p.36) and Dale (p.xxii) are all in favour of taking them closely together. So am I, as long as we then translate them correctly. And a correct translation will hardly allow of Wilamowitz's deduction "Wenn Helene überhaupt nicht Sparta verliess, kam sie auch nicht nach Aegypten", especially since this has been disproved by the appearance of 193 P. The clearest explanation of the three lines' construction is Haslam's (p.44 n.80): the last two lines "are a strong way of saying "you didn't sail to Troy" (other means of transport "[scil. to Troy]" not being in question - any more than other kinds of ship than well-benched ones are in question): it is only one λόγος, but it is expressed in hendiadystic λέξεις εἴρημένη\(^1\) matching the short periods."

I agree, with the following proviso: S. is only talking about Troy: and while other means of transport to it are not in question, other destinations (i.e. Egypt) and modes of reaching them are left open. We must reject Davison's thesis that 1.2 is to be taken separately as an answer to Hesiod ("you didn't go anywhere by ship, not even to

---

\(^1\)Mancuso p.202 had already spoken of the Palinode's "endiadi di pensiero".
Egypt as Hesiod would have it") with 3 as a reposte to Homer alone. We now know that S. did have Helen reside in the land of the Nile (193 P) during the Trojan War: she must have reached this territory by aerial transport not because 1.2 of the present passage entails that she never went anywhere by ship, but because she can only have sailed to Egypt in Paris' company, and such an event can never have been related in a poem claiming to be a recantation (see below p. 379f). The famous three lines are not specifically designed to hint at air-borne conveyance to Egypt by excluding any other form of travel to any other place, but they are perfectly consistent with such an idea.

Granted this, the three lines must emanate from the First Palinode, the onslaught upon Homer: the mention of Homer in the Platonic context (see p. 353f) shows this.

Besides, S. probably knew of the Hesiodic use of the ἐπὶδωλον which entails that Helen was never at the wide-wayed city, and, even if he did not, it was Homer who most notoriously brought Helen to Troy. For Sisti's antithetical viewpoint see below pp.465ff.

οὐκ ἐκ"τοιμος λόγος οὗτος

Diehl (p.51) compares Penelope's words at Od. 23·62:

ὅλλ'οὖκ ἐκθ'Ωδε μῦθος ἐτήτυμος, ὥς ἄγορευες·

λόγος οὗτος

There seems to be general agreement among present-day scholars that "in terms of style οὗτος must refer forward
to the following words" (Dale p.xvi n.2: so το α e.g. 
Bowra (2) p.94 n.6; Davison p.224; Haslam sup. cit.).
This is probably right, though we must, of course, bear
in mind the effect of the double-negative: οὐκ ἐστι' ἔτυμος
... οὐδέ' οὐδέ', i.e. "the following story is true: you
did not go to Troy" or "the following story is not true:
you went to Troy."
Kannicht's explanation (p.32) λόγος οὗτος (scil. ὃτι ἐς
Τροιαν ἡλθε) revives the older view that ὅτιος refers
backwards to some immediately preceding statement. This
interpretation was adopted by those scholars (e.g. See-
liger p.7) who, like Kannicht, believed the Palinode to
be merely the concluding section of the Helen. According
to them, the hostile account of Helen's adventures was
brusquely cut short by the recantation: "the tale I have
just been telling is not true ..." This is highly
implausible (see below pp.456 ff). Still, there is no
indissoluble link between that theory and the backward-
looking οὗτος. Those who envisage a plurality of poems
can freely suppose that this Palinode contained a fresh
resumée of the Helen's contents followed by the famous
three lines: "this tale (which I recounted at length in
the Helen) is not true ..." Or both concepts of forward
and backward reference may be irrelevant, and οὗτος may
merely signify "the λόγος I have in mind at present."

οὐδὲ ἐβας
Doria's much-vaunted "emendation" οὐδὲ, βας' paraded with
an irrelevant display of parallels (pp.89-92) is of course nothing of the sort, but merely a reinterpretation of the παράδοσις, and an especially harsh and awkward one at that. MSS have no authority for accents or word-divisions, so that Doria's appeal to two MSS with the "reading" ὄδε ἄν is particularly pointless. His interpretation of what S. must originally have written as ΟΥΔΕΒΑΣΕΝΝΕΥΣΙΝ is apparently meant to signify "The tale is not true: no indeed, although you sailed in the ships" (c.f. Denniston GP² 196ff) and purports to have two advantages over the orthodox understandings of these lines: it brings the poem itself into line with those sources which say S. made Helen go only as far as Egypt (see pp.378ff) and it avoids the "stridenti contrasti" between the Doric ᾲδαί and the Ionic νυκτί. In fact our indirect tradition is full of such "contrasts" (c.f. Wilamowitz, Textg. d. gr. Lyr. p.44) and papyri finds show that α for η is quite normal in S. And those sources which say S. made his heroine go by ship to Egypt are not to be trusted (see below pp.377ff).

ἐν νυκτί εὔσσελμος

It comes as a surprise to learn that though the Homeric poems have numerous instances of this very common epithet for ships in the other cases, they can show only one instance of the dat. pl.: Od. 4.409: παρὰ νυκτί εὔσσελμος εὔσσελμοςιν. Otherwise there are εὔσσελμος ἐπὶ νῆξ (Od. 12.358, 17.160, 19.243), εὔσσελμοι ἐπὶ/ἐνὶ νῆ (Od. -- 335 --
2-414, 14-345), ἐὖσσελμῶν ἐπὶ/ἀπὸ νηῶν (Il. 7.419, Od. 8.500, 24.117).

οὗδ᾽ ὄντος πέργαμα Τρολάς

Mancuso p.199 n.5, followed without acknowledgement by A. Farina, Studi Stesicorei (parte prima: il mito di Elena) Collana di Studi Greci 45 (1968) p.28 n.14, assembles passages from Euripides' Helen which he sees as verbal reminiscences of S's phrase: ἐς Ἰλιὸν οὔκ ἥλθον (58f), οὔκ ἥλθον ἐς γῆν Τρωϊάδ' (582), γὰν | οὔκ ἐλθούσαν οὐτ' Ἰλιῶν, Φοιβείους ἐπὶ πύργους (1509ff) are the likeliest instances produced.

ΣΑ Il.4.508 comments: "Οὐμηρος μόνην τήν τῆς Ἰλιόου ὀκρό-πολιν Πέργαμον καλεῖ, οὶ δὲ νεότεροι πάσας τὰς ὀκροπόλεις (c.f. Hesych. s.v. Πέργαμα' ἡ ὀκρόπολις τῆς Ἰλιόου).

With this meaning the noun is feminine: Il.5.460: Περγάμων ἄκρη, 6.512: κατὰ Περγάμου ἄκρης, Pind. Ol. 8.42: Πέργαμος ... ἀλίσχεται. S. provides the earliest example of an intermediate "the towers of Troy", with a shift to neuter, and we now see that he was followed by Ibycus (S 224.7-8: τῶν περγάμων | ξυποςθεὶς Ἰλιόου): c.f. Soph. Phil. 353 = 611: τάπί Τρολαὶ πέργαμ', Eur. Andr. 292: περγάμων τε Τρολάς. From here the word spreads to embrace any city's towers (L.S.J. sv I 2). See further Usener, Rh. Mus. 23 (1868) 349ff = Kl. Schr. 4.53ff.
We are told that two poems begin with an invocation to a female deity: who is she? "A Muse", I imagine most people would reply, and "a Muse" remains the likeliest answer for both our lines when all qualifications and alternatives have been displayed: καλεῖ δὲ Στηνίχορος μὲν τὴν Μοῦσαν ἄρχεσίμωλπον (250 P).

Our papyrus fragment tells us that S. blamed Homer in one Palinode and Hesiod in the other, and then continues ἐκτίν ἦν <ε>`μὲν ἄρχη ... τῆς δὲ ... It is thus reasonable to suppose that τῆς μὲν introduces the opening line of the poem attacking Homer, τῆς δὲ that attacking Hesiod. Davison (p.223) accepted this, but then perversely argued that αδτε in the first line of the attack on Homer proved that S. placed the palinode criticising Hesiod before that on Homer, and that Chamaeleon for some mysterious reason had taken them in the reverse order. But αδτε does not necessarily imply "come goddess again to my second Palinode as you did to my first." Nor need it even suggest that S. is singing a very different song from his last one (the Helen) which might be used as an argument in favour of Helen as the θεά here (so Bowra (2) p.88). The word occurs elsewhere at the start of a poem: c.f. Sappho fr.127 L-P: δεῦρο δηδτι Μοῖσαί χρύσιον λίμοισαν κτλ. There it merely implies that this is
...on which the scholion comments δῆλον καὶ ἐκ τοῦ
ἀφεὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ πάλιν᾿ ἄπερ γὰρ ἀναλαμβανόν πρῶς τὸ ἄνω
λέγει. We know further that a poem by Terpander began
something like ἄμφι μοι ἀφεὶ ἀνασκ’ ἑκατηβόλου (697 P).
It is unlikely to be purely coincidental that the deities
invoked by the words δεόρο and ἀφεὶ at the start of the
Sapphic fragment are the Muses. One or other of the
words often features in such poetic appeals to the
cλειουσι, ἄειτε Δι’ ἐννέπετε η η η σε ποιεῖ τὸν ἔπος κόραι,
Allen (p.115): νῦν ἄφθονοπλοτέρων ἀνδρῶν ἀρχόμεθα Μοῦσαι.
Sappho fr.53 LP:βραδοπαξες ἀγναί χάριτες ἄειτε Διὸς κόραι,
fr.128 LP:δεότε νυν ἀδραί χάριτες καλλικομοί τε Μοῦσαι.
Empedocl. B 131-3 D-Κεδυκομένωι νῦν ἀφεὶ περίστασε, Καλλι-
όπεια. Ar. Arch.665 : δεόρο Μοῦσε ἔλθε, Lysistr.1296f :
Ταύγετον αἰτε ἐραννον εκλιποῖα ἡ σιλ α μόλε Δάκαινα. Επι
instance from S. himself is worth the rest:δεόρο αἰγε Καλλι-
όπεια ἡ γεία (240 P). Invocations of the Muses are, of
course, closely related to the cletic hymn, where such words
as δεόρο and ἐνδοσε are totally characteristic: instances in
West on Op.1f (p.138). These two particles, then, are by
themselves redolent of Muses or Graces. Nor is the word
"goddess" any obstacle. There are numerous examples of the
singular Θεα as a soubriquet for the Muse: they extend from
the earliest times onward:II.1.1 (c.f. Orph. Fr.48 Kern): μὴν ἄν
δειδε Θεα, Od. 1.10: τῶν ἀμοδεν γε, Θεα, Θυγατερ Διὸς,
Further examples, from both Greek and Latin literature, are given by Wackernagel, "Über einige antike Anredeformen", Kl. Schr. 2·98ff. This vocative too is a feature of κλητικοῦ ὄνομα: c.f. Fraenkel (sup. cit.) For the plural used of the Muses, c.f. II·2·484f : ἐσπετε νῦν νοι, Μοῦσαι, ... τοιεὶς γὰρ ἑαυτὲς ἐστε, Hes. Theog. 24: θεαὶ ... Μοῦσαι Ὀλυμπίαδες, Scut. 205f: θεαὶ ... Μοῦσαι Πιερίδες, Theocr. Id. 16·3: Μοῦσαι μὲν θεαὶ ἑνὶ, Pind. Is. 8·60, Ap. Rhod.4·552,Callim. fr.7·19 Pf.,Cat.68·41, Verg. Aen. 7·61ff, Stat. Theb.1·4 etc. Furthermore, the adjective φιλόμουλπος strongly favours the Muse. Nöthiger (p.151) appositely compares the names of the Muses Μελπομένη and Τερψιχόρη, and we remember that ἄναξιμολπος is an epithet applied to Οὐρανία by Bacchylides (6·10) and ἄρχεσι μολπος to the Muse by S. (250P). The adjective φιλόμουλπος, applied by Pindar to Aegina because of its love of song and dances (Nem. 7·8) is obviously appropriate to a goddess of dance and song. It is likewise applied to the island of Asteria by Φιλο-epithets (φιλομειδής, φιλοπαίγμων, φιλόδαινος etc.) are very common in epic: c.f. E. Risch, Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache (Berlin 1973) § 71B. The other earliest instance of a μολπος compound may be lurking behind H.H. Herm. 478, if the verb εὐμολπέω presupposes εὐμολπος (first attested as an adjective in A.P. 9·396 = Paul.Sil., but c.f. Richardson on H.H. Dem. 154 (p.197)). See too ἄντιμολπον ... ἄνως in Aesch. Ag. 17, ἐρασίμοιλπος in Pind. Ol.14·16, and the other passages from Pindar and Bacchylides cited in the text above.
Callimachus (Hymn 4.197) while Pindar uses the related epithet ϕιλησίμολος of the deified abstraction Εὐφροσύνα (Ol.14.14). A new fragment of Alcman (S 1) has recently been disinterred from a papyrus commentary on Aristophanes (Com. gr. fr.56-52 Austin) which informs us that the phrase χρυσοκόμα ϕιλήμολπε is 'Αλκμάνος ἦ ἄρρη. Mr. Lobel (Oxy. Pap. 35 (1968) p.44) suggested that the addressee was Apollo, and in view of poets' frequent allusions to the colour of that god's hair (collected by Gelzer, Mus. Helv. 29 (1972) 143 to which list add at least Pind. Pyth. 2.16, Is. 7.49) and S's fr.232·2 P (παιγμο-
cύνας <τε> ϕιλεῖ μολύντα τ' Ἀπόλλων) it is hard to blame him. On the other hand, A. Griffiths (QUCC 14 (1972) 27) thinks the golden locks may be those of Helen: for her love of song see p.341 inf. and for her gold hair my note on S 103·5. But neither deity has a monopoly over tresses of this colour: c.f. Pind. fr.215B8: χρυσομι-
λόκοις ... Μοίσαις. And a Muse would be the most appropriate divinity to invoke at the start of a poem with the title ϕιλήμολπος.\footnote{Lobel is right to interpret the fragment as "a quotation of the first words of Alcman's first poem" (l.c. p.39). and corroboration for this is provided by Gelzer l.c. pp.142ff. Page's (PCPS (1971) 98) mistakenly translates 'Αλκμάνος ἦ ἄρρη as "the beginning" (scil. of the Aristophanic strophe) "belongs to Alcman" (c.f. S 2), out of devotion to his own theory that the Louvre Parthenoeion was the first poem of Alcman's first book (see p.30 of his Alcman, The Parthenoeion).}

Another place where ϕιλήμολπος may be used of a Muse is 692 fr.2 (a) P (one of the Boeotica Incerti Auctoris).
Unfortunately the lack of context makes interpretation quite uncertain: οὐ παρεθένυ κόρης ἡδένδρόν μὲν ωὲν οὖν ὁμοφας κούφος ἢ λυγοῦ δὲ μέλψων[θ.] ἢ γυν φιλόμολπον.

Still, it is interesting to note that elements from the poems of both Palinodes (φιλόμολπος, παρεθνος) are juxtaposed in this passage and that singing is mentioned (4). Lobel (Oxy. Pap. 23 (1956) p.68) thought he detected a possible reference to the Graces and compared the opening of Pindar's Fourteenth Olympian. As we saw above (p.338) a Muse or the Muses are no strangers to the company of the Graces: see further West on Hes. Theog. 64 (p.177). For λιγεία used of a Muse see my note on 240 P.

Who are the other candidates? Helen, since the Palinodes were apologies to her, and she was most certainly apostrophised in the Palinode against Homer (192 P). S. may have described her deification in the Palinode(s) (see pp.394ff below) and she is called θεά in Eur. Hel. 1667 (θεός κεκλησι) c.f. Ar. Lysistr. 1308-15: ταὶ εἰς θέαν χοροὶ μέλοντι ... ἀγαπά τι δ' Ἀλέας παῖς. Nor is the epithet φιλόμολπος totally inappropriate for the deity in whose honour dances by the waters of the Eurotas take place (Eur. Hel. 1465-7, Ar. Lysistr. 1308-15) and whose particular affection for μολὴν is noted by Theocr. Id. 18·35-7 (οὐ μὰν οὐδὲ λύραν τις ἔπισταιτι δὲς κροτήσαι | Ἀρτέμιν ἀείδασα καὶ εὐρύστερνον Ἀδάναν | ὡς Ἑλένα) and Plut. Thes. 31·2 where Theseus and his crony abduct the young Helen ἐν ἱερῷ Ἀρτέμιδος ὧρας χορεύουσαν. Even δεδοσ would be suitable if we supposed that this poem was
performed at a festival where Helen was believed present. For such ὑπὸξένια see the opening of Pind. 01.3: Τυνθα-ρίδας τε φιλοξένοις ἀδείν καλλιπλοκάμων Ἄλεναι ... εὐχῶς. But there is no evidence for any such festival here, and the Muse remains the likeliest candidate.

The Muse is also the most probable addressee in the second passage, although now, when only two words are extant, we should shun dogmatism even more than usual: no solution can be regarded as final. But notice how handsomely the singular παρθένος of a Muse can be paralleled by the plurals in the following passages: Bacch. 1.1-2: κλωτο-φόρμιγγες ... παρθένοι ... Πιερίδες, Pind. Isth. 8.67: Ἰλικώνια ... παρθένοι, Ar. Ran. 875-6: ὁ Διὸς ἐννέα παρθένοι, ἄγαλ Μοῦσαι, Pind. Pa. 6.54: παρθένοι ... Μοῖσαι, Euphorion (Bartolletti, Pap. della Soc. It. 14 (1957) 1390 c ii 29): γαῖης παρθένει ἔμπλα Αἰτρήσῳδῦς, Cat. 65.2: a doctis ... virginibus, Prop. 2.30.33: nec tu virginibus reverentia moveris ora.

For the singular c.f. Cat. 1.9: ὁ patrona virgo, and, most striking of all, Emp. 3.3B D-K: λευκόλενε παρθένε Μοῦσα. Words synonymous with παρθένοι are also used of the Muses: Sappho fr.53 LP: Διὸς κόραι (c.f. P. Oxy. 2816.1, or Theocr. Id. 16.1) Verg. ecl. 7.21: nympheae Libethrides; c.f. Pap. Tebt. 3.1 etc. or Prop. 3.33 (puellae) etc. In view of this it would be pleasant if we could find a parallel for the accompanying epithet. No actual passage in early Greek poetry calls the Muses
"golden-winged" but compare Bacch. 20 B 3-4: ὁμοιόω τι πέμπειν] χρύσεον Μοίσαν Ἀλεξάνδρων πτερόν. And Page is able to cite most appositely (p. 36) the late orator Himerius, who often borrows his images and vocabulary from the lyric poets: οἱ λόγοι παῖδες, ἵπτε, ὑπε, Μοῖσαι χρυσοπτέρυγοι. (Himer. 
Or. 14·37=48·37 Colonna.) Also see Pind. Is. 8·5: ἀνετῶς χρυσαί παλέσαν Μοῖσαν, ¹ Pyth. 1·12: χρυσαμπύκων ... Μοῖσαν, fr. 
215 B 8: χρυσοπτέρως χρυσαί ... Μοῖσας, Sappho fr. 26 B: ὁ χρυσόθρονε Μοῖς. A search for alternative candidates will take us first to those deities to whom the epithet χρυσοπτέρως is elsewhere applied. Eros (Ar. Av. 697, 1737-8) is not a παρθένος. Neither is the Sun (Orph. fr. 62·3 Kern) or Phanes (ib. fr. 78). What of Iris, who is really the only divinity to be called "golden-winged" with any regularity in early poetry (Il. 8·398, 11·185; H. H. Dem. 314; c.f. Nonnus Dionys. 31·110)? Podlecki (pp 322ff) has recently urged her case with great vehemence.² But how could she be relevant to S's poem? She is the messenger of the gods in the Iliad (the Odyssey sees this rôle usurped by Hermes) and might therefore be envisaged as bringing S. a message from Olympus. But Bowra found the concept of the gods as men's messengers "offensive" and "unprecedented", and the latter adjective is certainly true of the picture of Iris as a poet's ἄγγελος. Podlecki counters with a new argument:

¹χρυσαί ... Μοῖς is to Μοῖς χρυσοπτέρυγοι in Himerius as χρυσαί ... Νίκας (Pind. Is. 2·25) is to Νίκῃ χρυσοπτέρυγε in Himerius or. 65·29.= Colonna.
²Podlecki is unnecessarily agitated about his protegée's
and Menelaus, and in the Cypria (Allen p.109 c.f. Apollod. ep.3.6) it is she who brings Menelaus the unwelcome news of the departure of Helen and Paris, "a detail which may have found a place in S's version." Podlecki suggests that Iris was invoked at the start of the Palinode and later appeared in it: is not Iris Hermes' double, and does not Hermes transport Helen to Egypt in Euripides' play about this heroine? In S's treatment may not Iris have carried out this task?

I find this theory wanting. Admittedly in Eur. Hel. 31 ff it is Hera who fashions the τῆς ᾠδοῦ of Helen, and in later literature and vases Hera's handmaiden is "almost exclusively" none other than Iris (see especially Call. Hymn 4.232). But a moment ago we were being impressed by Iris' Homeric rôle as divine messenger, and her Homeric epithet χρυσώπτερος: now we are expected to read back into S's treatment the far later idea of Iris as Hera's devoted attendant.

(contd..)

2 good name, and hopes that S. will not have heard about the scandalous liaison related by Alcaeus (fr.327 LP): .. δεινότατον θεών | <τῶν> γένναντ' εὐπέδιλλος Ἰρίς | χρυσώπτεροι Ζεφύρωι μίγεται. He seems to be unaware of a basic fact of the Greek language, namely that παρθενος does not have to mean "virgin" sensu technico: c.f. Wilamowitz on Eur. Her. 834 (2.p.182), Diggle on Eur. Phaeth. (p.76 n.1). A glance at Soph. Tr. 1219ff would have convinced him of this. So the applicability of the term to Helen must be decided not by worrying about Menelaus' sexual relations with Helen, or by swallowing Davison's fantastic idea of a tactful oxymoron stressing her virginity in contrast to the story told in the Helen (p.223), but by considering her age.
I dislike such inconsistency, and I am at a loss to see why Euripides' Helen is supposed to have followed S. so closely in all other details, but to have arbitrarily changed the sex and identity of the deity who bore Helen through the sky. No: the whole thesis stems from an over-reaction to Homer's use of the epithet χρυσόπτερος (in three places) of Iris. S's reputation as Ομηρουκώτατος can be a useful key to his technique, but it becomes a strait-jacket as soon as it prevents us from supposing that S. can have applied an adjective to a different deity from Homer's.

Eur. Bacch. 370ff refers to ὤςια πότα νυθδων, ὤςια δ' ανα ματά γαν | χρυσέαν πτέρυγα φέρεις, but that deified abstraction does not seem an especially appropriate addressee in this place. Nor can I see any substance behind Davison's claim (p. 223 n. 1) that the two words suggest a Siren. All in all, a Muse is probably meant: indeed it would be metrically possible (though not absolutely essential) to supply χρυσόπτερος παρθένες Mois, with West, ZPE 4 (1969) 137: c.f. Emp. 3.3 sup. cit. (p. 342).

Why she, or any other goddess, should be decked out with golden wings I am not at all clear: but "objects belonging to the gods are often called golden from Homer on" - c.f. Lloyd-Jones, JHS 83 (1963) pp 81 and 85 (for golden possessions of the Muses see above p. 343) Nor can I say where she wears her wings: Iris has hers on her heels (see
Richardson ad H.H Dem. 314 (p.262) \(^1\) but c.f. Euripides fr.911 N \(^2\): χρύσεις δὴ μοι πτέρυγες περὶ νῶτων | καὶ τὰ Σειρήνων πτερόντα πέδιλ’ ἀρμόζεται, | βάσκου εἰς αἰθέριον πόλον ἄρθεις | θυσὶ προσμείξων. There too the wings seem to be connected with divinity: c.f. Wilamowitz, Kl. Schr. 1.204 p.450 n.1; Fraenkel, Horace p.301 n.1.

---

\(^1\) This tells against W.H. Lorimer's notion ("Gold and Ivory in Greek Mythology" in Greek Poetry and Life p.24) that the phrase χρυσόπτερα Ἰοίτις "betrays a knowledge of winged Oriental demons".
"Obscura sunt omnia et in quamcunque te partem versaveris, obstant molestissimae difficultates": J. Geel, "de Stesichori Palinodia", Rh. Mus. 6 (1839) 7

"Jede Ansicht über den Bau der Dichtung durch die Ausführung einer Hypothesis gestützt wird": Seeliger p.7.

The best thread to guide us through the convoluted turns of that labyrinth which is present-day opinion about the Palinodes and save us from "inextricabilis error", is first and foremost a re-assessment of the testimonia which bear upon this vexed question. Only after we have discovered what these say (as opposed to what scholars would like them to say) can we turn to the more general questions of the technical relation between the Helen and the Palinodes, or the actual contents of S's recantations.

As will be seen below, I have been generous in my interpretation of the word "testimonium", including in my discussion not only those notices which specifically attribute a Palinode or Palinodes to S. but also such passages as Paraphr. Lyc. 822, or Eur. El. 1280-3, Hel. 44-6, which seemed to throw valuable light on our problem.

In the face of such unremitting darkness, almost any candle is welcome at first, though some of them may have to be rejected later. Thus it seems appropriate to explain right at the start why I am inclined to be far from generous in my attitude to one particular set of notices which though rejected long ago by Kleine (p.97)
have been graced with the name of testimonia. I am referring to the anecdotes recorded by Paus. 3.19.11-13 and Conon F. Gr. Hist. 26 F 1 (XVIII) which link S's Palinode and curing from blindness to the Battle of the River Sagra. This material has been used to fabricate a phantom far more insubstantial than any clasped by the unsuspecting Paris - the spectre of the Palinode as a political poem. This modern fantasy rests on sources which are quite unreliable;

). S is only very loosely connected with the yarns, dragged in by the scruff of his neck at the very end of a fable where he originally had no place. Furthermore, it cannot be emphasised too strongly that the idea of an intermediary who comes from an island to tell S. the cause of his blindness is totally incompatible with the evidence of all the other testimonia (see below pp 355ff).

And how are we to suppose that these anecdotes stem from S's poem when they disagree about a detail as fundamental as the intermediary's name?

Despite all this, the wretched Sagra tradition has been taken up by those who are determined to include every scrap of information in their solution, no matter how ill-shaped the patchwork that results. Thus Pais (Ataka: 1

1I have not immediately forgotten that S. composed two Palinodes. When I use the singular here and on succeeding pages, it will usually be found that I am paraphrasing or alluding to the remarks of writers, ancient and modern, who were ignorant of the existence of a second recantation.
Quest. di stor. (1846) p.37), A. Holm (Gesch. d. Siciliens 1 (1870) p.167), and E. Rizzo, Questioni Stesichoree 1 (1895) 3ff and Mancuso p.206, were led by Pausanias and his confederates in delusion to connect the Palinode with the Battle of the Sagra, and concluded that S., having received a commission from the Locrians to celebrate their victory as well as the Dioscuri and Helen, did so in the Palinode no less. Their view was demolished with ease by Sitzler, Bursian 104 (1900) pp.120ff (in the course of his review of Rizzo). As he points out, neither Pausanias, nor Conon, nor Hermias, actually name the Battle of Sagra, and Plato's Phaedrus and Isocrates' Encomium of Helen, our earliest and most reliable sources, give not a hint that the poem in which S. made his retraction had such political and encomiastic contents. More important, so notable a development in the history of lyric as is presupposed by this hypothetical "Siegeslied" would surely have been mentioned in at least one of our sources. But again, who would ever dream of combining a victory ode and a personal apology within a single work - an inconceivable fusion of the public and the private - or who would give any such combination the name of Palinode?

Vürtheim (pp.67ff) was aware of these objections and accepted them, but he still tried to suggest that during the Trojan War Helen had gone not to Egypt but to the Isle of Leuce. And yet even in his own time, when the papyrus which was to shatter this theory was still lying undeciphered, he should have realised that the detail of
Leuce is based exclusively on Pausanias' anecdote, and that there is no proof this derives from S. at all. And if we are going to borrow Helen's presence on Leuce from Pausanias, there is no justification for failing to borrow from the same source the closely related fact that Helen is there as Achilles' wife. But what sort of recantation would our poem become on that theory?

The statement that S. composed two Palinodes, one criticising Homer, the other Hesiod, should, by the heavy weight of its silence, have crushed all life out of the theory of the Palinode as political poem. Not so. Hear the words of Podlecki (p.317): "Is it not possible that the Crotoniates had called upon S. (whose family was said to have come from Locri's own colony of Metaurus) to produce poetic propaganda which would counteract the assistance - moral if not material - which the Locrians claimed was being rendered to them by Sparta's national heroes, the Dioscuri?... In dwelling on stories of Sparta's "First family", S. may have been challenging the exclusive claims to these stories made by the Locrians."

Less obviously the product of an over-heated imagination, but ultimately no more convincing, is the statement of Peter Levi (Penguin translation of Pausanias, 2. p.72 n. 184): "We only know that... [S's] recovery was connected with the cults on the island of Leuke. Evidently around the year 600 there were confusions and conflicts over the relation of these cult-heroes with the Homeric poems."
This at least has the merit of variety. But what end to variety can there be, when the method is to add as many ingredients as possible to an increasingly unsavoury stew? Surely methodology enjoins that we accept Bowra's comment (p.100) "The stories of the blindness smack too much of folk-lore to suggest that [S.] told them himself ... The story... remains outside the scope of the actual poem."

It is good news that two of the most distinguished of recent editors of Euripides have dismissed the tradition in a foot-note (Kannicht 1. p.27 n.2 "für die Dichtung selbst irrelevant"; Barrett Hipp. pp.437-8 n.1: "purely fabulous") which is where it belongs: vile damnum. [See too P. Von der Mühll,"Der grosse Aias"(1930) p.14f = Kl. Schr. 445f: he calls the connection with S. "secondary".]

Plato Phaedr. 243A

Socrates declares that he intends to sing a palinode for having blasphemed the power of ἔρως, just as S. did when he had offended Helen. I leave aside for the moment the consideration whether the quotation of the famous three lines proves that Plato knew the whole of the original poem from which they are extracted. Can the passage tell us anything more about this original poem? The context from which our few lines are plucked has a great deal more delicate wit and humour than scholars who plod along trying to reconstitute S's poem usually allow, and we must always be prepared to accept the possibility that Socrates is playfully distorting the meaning of S. to fit his own situation, just as he waywardly perverts Simonides
542 P in Protag. 339\textsuperscript{A}-346\textsuperscript{D}. Were it not for the generous citations he gives from that latter lyric poem, we might mistakenly take Socrates' jeux d'esprit there far too seriously. If this should be the case with the Phaedrus too, and if it transpired that all other references to the poem in later authors were dependent upon Plato's passage, we might well abandon hope of achieving anything. However, since it will be seen that Isocrates at least possesses independent knowledge of the poem which confirms Plato's account, we may press ahead with some degree of optimism.

Plato's mention of Homer presupposes the familiar tradition that he was blind, a tradition which stems, as everyone realises, from the passage in H.H. Apollo 172. His blindness is compared to S's, to the younger poet's advantage: S. was cured because he knew of a καθαρμὸς ἄρχανος, a παλινωδία, of which the epic poet was ignorant and therefore remained blind. Hence both poets had committed an offence which merited blindness. One would naturally assume that the offence in Homer's case was a poem, and the inference is converted to certainty by the news that S. realised the grounds for his blinding ἄρε μουσικὸς δὲν, and the opening statement that both poets had made a mistake περὶ μυθολογίαν. That Homer's poetical blunder concerned Helen is likewise strongly implied by the parallelism of the two poets' fates.

It might once have been argued that Plato himself had playfully introduced the comparison with Homer, (compare
his habitual antagonism to that poet as expressed in the
Republic and elsewhere.
Otherwise it must have been S's original poem that made
such antithesis between Homer's permanent blindness and
his own enlightenment and curing. I once thought that
this case could be made even more watertight by the
following consideration: it is strongly implied that
Homer was responsible for a κατηγορία Ἐλένης. Yet no­
one who was familiar with the humane and sympathetic
treatment of her in the Iliad and Odyssey could ever
bring this charge, except someone arguing with the fanat­
tical zeal of a convert against the very notion that Helen
had so much as gone to Troy. Therefore S. must be the
source of the idea. But such an argument overlooks the
important fact (see above p.247) that at S's time Homer
was commonly regarded as the author of the Cypria and
those other epic poems which painted Helen in far blacker
colours than appear in Iliad or Odyssey. Nevertheless,
even without this illicit deduction, it now seems highly
probable – because of the new papyrus evidence, especially
the phrase μεμωρέται τοῦ Ομηροῦ—that S. did refer to the
blindness of Homer, and this supposition is important to
the whole tradition of S's blindness. It would indeed
be a mightily odd coincidence if a joke of Plato's own
making converged so closely with what S. actually said.
Davison (p.207) argues in favour of S's reference to
Homer on the grounds that "We have some evidence that S.
did refer to certain of his predecessors by name (this is
explicit for Hesiod and the otherwise unknown Xanthus" (c.f. 269 P and 699 P). One could strengthen this case by recalling that it was traditional for a poet to claim that other poets tell lies while he himself tells the truth: c.f. Hes. Theog. 24-9 and Pind. Nem. 7.20f (correctly explained by Lloyd-Jones, J.H.S. 93 (1973) p. 110 n.9). It is significant that this particular poem of Pindar is often compared to S's Palinodes¹ (so e.g. Mayer p.17, Lloyd-Jones sup. cit. p.137). Mehmel, Homer und die Griechen, Antike und Abenland 4 (1954) 16-41 is also relevant. But the passage which throws most light on the hypothetical reference to Homer as άμουκος is Pind. Paean 7B 18-20 (Sn.)² cited by Kannicht p.29: ἱστοληπτικόν ἄνδρον φρένες, ἐλευθερίας ἔλαφον ἑμπατίαν ἐμθητέων (Sn.) ἐρευνάς σοφίας δῶν. Here the charge of blindness and Muselessness is combined and made to form an anti­thesis to Pindar's own state of inspiration (see further below pp. 409 ff).

Such microscopic scrutiny of this text as we have made and will make would no doubt have had Plato staring in gape-mouthed wonderment at the spending of more time on this one passage than he had required to write the whole dialogue. But the loss of most of S's poetry makes it

¹The parallel is denied by Seeliger (p.8) on inadequate grounds.

²Paul Friedländer, Cl. Phil. 36 (1941) 51-2 = Studien 210-11, pointed out that pl. Phaedr. 245A looks like a quota­tion of Pind. Paean 7B.13ff. But in view of the context of the former passage, is it possible that Pindar and Plato were both echoing the relevant Palinode?
necessary, especially as some very far-reaching deductions have been drawn from quite innocent individual words. Plato says S. realised the cause of his blindness ἀπὸ μουσικός ὦν. The meaning of the adjective need not detain us long - "inspired by the Muses" or some such translation surely. (Again the detail may be an addition by Plato or, more likely, a reflection of an original claim by S.). But is this phrase a contradiction of the explanations other authors give for S's enlightenment? It is most certainly inconsistent with the versions of Pausanias et al. which require an intermediary to inform a clueless S. of the cause: but we have already decided to pay no attention to these, and this incompatibility will merely confirm us in our attitude. It need not be inconsistent with the Suda's claim (s.v. Στηνίχωρος (Adler 4.433)) that S. learned the truth as the result of a dream: the Muses may have appeared to the poet in a dream and warned him of the cause of his blindness. Hesiod's vision of the Muses in Hes. Theog. 22-34 was sometimes interpreted in antiquity as a dream (although the direct evidence for this is, in the main, late: c.f. West ad loc. (pp.158-9)). On the other hand, the Suda's passage could be a later rationalisation or a contamination with the innumerable instances of the motif of enlightenment through dreams which occur in various folk-tales and myths.

A third account of S's mode of enlightenment has come down to us from antiquity, though recent scholars have
usually ignored it or failed to discuss it. Davison includes it in his catalogue of testimonia (p.211) but without comment. Page omits it from his collection (P.M.G. pp.104f). Pseudo-Acro on Horace Odes 1.16 tells us that the Roman poet is here imitating S. "qui vituperationem Helenae scribens caecatus est et postea responsa Apollinis laudem eis scripsit et oculorum aspectus recipit, cuius rei et in epodo poeta idem meminit." c.f. "oraculo admonitum" in Porph. epod. 17.42. Nisbet and Hubbard have pointed out (A Commentary on Horace Odes 1 p.1 n.1) that the pseudo-Acro scholia could not have inferred the detail about the Delphic oracle from either of Horace's poems. (Nor for that matter could Porphyrio: contrast Cruquius' schol. ad epod. 17.42 cited on p.395 inf.). For the valuable streams of information tapped by ps-Acro and Porphyrio c.f. Nisbet-Hubbard pp.xlvii-li. This third tradition may be wrong; again it may reflect a later rationalisation or contamination with other tales about more famous consulters of the Delphic Oracle. Nevertheless, I think it has a stronger claim on our attention than the Suda's version or Plato's, because it is so specific. The Delphic Oracle was a powerful political influence with Sparta at this time (see my discussion of the Oresteia) and I would not rule out the chance that S. mentioned it as part of his homage to Sparta. It is of course just about possible to combine

1Kleine (p.96f) was aware of it.
the accounts of all our sources into one precarious whole: S. ποιμενός Ὕν (Plato) had a dream-vision of the Muses (the Suda) telling him to consult the Delphic Oracle (ps-Acro and Porphyrio) which directed him to the Dioscuri (Horace; see p.393). The trouble about this ramshackle construction is that the Suda and the Horatian scholia talk as if they were giving the sole and simple explanation of S's healing. But what really matters is that the pseudo-Acro "scholia's assertion ... should not be ignored by S's editors" (N-H p.1 n.1).

To return to the Phaedrus itself: as soon as he realised the grounds for his punishment, S. composed the palinode at once (ευθώς). Of course: it is hardly surprising that S. was reluctant to stay blind a moment longer than necessary. Then he was given his eye-sight back immediately (παρασχόμενα). As we would have expected. Kannicht (p.29) is surely wrong to argue that these two innocuous temporal adverbs imply that S. recited the insult of Helen, at once composed the palinode, and immediately saw again, all during the course of the single song which was the Helen. The immediacy in both cases is relative to the preceding action: S. learns the truth and at once writes the Palinode and at once sees again. Both adverbs stand a long way off from the statement that S. was ὀμμάτων επειθεὶς διὰ τὴν Ἐλένης καπηγορίαν and have no connection with it. Plato could easily have said, had he wished to, that when S. had been blinded because of his dispraise he at once wrote his Palinode. He has not said
this; and even if he had, it would not be the same thing as saying that S. insulted Helen, was blinded, recanted, and regained his sight, all in the course of one single (and eventful) poem. Yet this is the unexpected meaning Kannicht wrings out of εὐθὺς and πασαχρῆμα. They are surely inadequate props for so wide-reaching a theory. The same scholar gives a similarly idiosyncratic interpretation of the final phrase we must consider: τὴν καλομένην Παλίνωδίαν. What is the exact nuance of καλομένος? Kannicht has no doubts (p.29). It shows that Παλίνωδία was not the genuine name of the poem, but rather one which it acquired in the course of the evolution of the blindness legend.¹ And this conclusion again facilitates the assumption that the revocation was part of the single poem known as Ἶλένη, an assumption which we can now freely adopt without fear of contradiction from the most famous testimony to the separate existence of a poem called the Palinode.

But is this really so? Must καλομένος mean "so-called" in the pejorative sense, with a strong implication that the noun described should not be so called? Of course

¹Kannicht (p.29 n.7) bolsters up this theory by claiming that early choral lyric poetry on myth originally bore no titles (compare Bacch. 23 (Sn.) which only received the name ΚΑΣΣΑΝΑΠΑ from Aristarchus: c.f. P. Oxy. 2368 col.i = p.128 Snell-Maehler). Apart from the uncertainty as to whether S's lyric is choral, objections still flourish: and pre-eminent among them is the sheer improbability that none of the other authors who have cause to mention the Palinode should think it worth while to state the important fact that it was only a part of that poem which was called Ἶλένη in the Alexandrian edition.
not. I suppress the copious passages I had assembled to re-
enforce the obvious, for a single exact parallel from
nearer home is worth them all: Athenaeus 12.513A (= Xanthus 699 P) has cause to mention S's Oresteia, and
thus he names it: πολλὰ δὲ τῶν έξώντων παραπομπῶν ὁ
Στηπίχορος, ἡσπερ καὶ τὴν Ὀρεστείαν καλομένην. Further
evidence, if required, may be found in G. Langbein, de
Platonis Ratione Poetas Laudandi (diss. Phil. Jena 1911)
pp.59-60.

Unnecessary controversy over the precise nuance of
καλομένην veils a more significant detail which few
scholars have noted. Only H. Fränkel (Dichtung und
Philosophie des Frühen Griechentums p.322 n.7 = Early
Greek Poetry and Philosophy p.283 n.7) and Sisti (p.303)
have pointed out the oddness of what the former prints as
πάσαν (!) τὴν καλομένην Πολινώδιαν. This has seemed
to them to provide a much-needed clue to explain the
blatant contradiction between Plato's reference to one
Palinode and Chamaeleon's categorical mention of two
separate Palinodes. Fränkel notes that apparently πάσαν
"deutet vielleicht auf eine bestimmte stelle mit der das
Lied schloss." Plato seems to be alluding in this
awkward and elliptical manner to a specific passage near
the end of the poem, without which the palinode was not
complete, not, in fact, a true Palinode. This might
suggest, as Sisti (p.301) realises, that the total
rehabilitation of Helen only occurred in the latter half
of the poem: presumably, then, the former half contained
only a partial rehabilitation? The repercussions of this hypothesis are stated with all due caution by the Italian scholar: "solo il passo del Fedro Platonico poteva generare un sospetto, ma non più, per via dell' aggettivo μάκαιν non assolutamente necessario in riferimento ad un solo carme." Kannicht (p.31) agrees that Plato's μάκαιν may refer to the same phenomenon as does Chamaeleon's mention of two different works. Still, others may think it likelier that Plato is simply recording the fact that S. was cured not half-way through his composition, but only after his change of heart had been signalized as fully as possible by an entire poem.

Wilamowitz was the first scholar to stress adequately that the famous three lines (which may quite well be synonymous with the Suda's τοια τά Ετησιχόρου. ) enshrined in the Phaedrus passage owe their notoriety in later times almost entirely to Plato's citation of them: c.f. Textg. p.35: "Selbst das Gedicht das ihn am bekanntesten macht, die Palinodie, kennt das ganze Altertum nur durch Platon"; SS p.242: "populär ist auch hier nicht das Gedicht geblieben, sondern die durch Platon erhaltene Geschichte des Widerrufes." References to the Palinode soon reached proverbial status: c.f. A. Otto, Die Sprichwörter und Sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer (1962) p.262. But as we shall see, it would be an exaggeration to claim that antiquity knew nothing of the Palinodes save what Plato told it.
In this passage from the ἔγχωμιον Ἠλένης, the phrase ὄρχημενος τῆς ὤδης ἐβλασφήμησέ τι is the main source of controversy. Let us divide the problem in two, and start by examining its first three words. What is their exact significance? Again Kannicht (pp 28f) is ready with an answer: "Wenn Isokrates sagt ὄρχημενος τῆς ὤδης habe S. über Helena einige "blasphemische" Äusserungen getan, so ist darin offenbar die Vorstellung mitgegeben, dass er παυόμενος τῆς ὤδης die sogenannte Palinodie gedichtet habe. Isokrates meint also in τῆς ὤδης ersichtlich eine ὤδη, in der "Schmähgedicht" und "Widerruf" vereint waren."

Woodbury comes to much the same conclusion (p.169): "It is not at all clear why it is relevant for Isocrates to say that the blasphemy occurred at the beginning of the poem, unless he meant to prepare a contrast with what happened later in it." If true, this would have important consequences for our understanding of the relationship between Helen and the Palinode. One of our earliest and most reliable of sources would have given testimony to the peaceful co-existence of those entities within one single poem, a crucial fact which, we must then suppose, the derivative sources of a later date inadvertently abandoned to oblivion. And our examination of Plato's Phaedrus passage has led us to suppose the end of what Plato calls...

---

1 In fact he was anticipated by Vürtheim (p.59) who in turn is following R.C. Bakhuizen van den Brink (Symbolae litterariae 5 (1843)pp. 119 ff).
But is the interpretation true? If Isocrates meant to imply something about the end of the song, why did he not explicitly say ἄρχόμενος μὲν τῆς ὀλίθης ... παυόμενος δὲ τῆς ὀλίθης instead of resorting to a mysterious inexplicitness which has confused the majority of readers ever since? The dependent sources which derive from the accounts of Plato and Isocrates, and often expand them (see below pp 371ff) might have been expected to enlarge this hint about the end of the poem by making it a good deal more explicit. But they never do. We might at least have been given an anticipatory μὲν after ἄρχόμενος to let us know what is happening. But in fact we already have a perfectly coherent contrast of μὲν and δὲ clauses, between what Isocrates did at the start of his poem (δὲ μὲν γὰρ ἄρχόμενος...) and what he did when he recognised the cause of his mishap (ἐπειδὴ δὲ γνωὸς κτλ). And the natural inference from this contrast is that the two processes occurred at different times, the first when he was reciting his poem, the second later, when he was not. ἡ ὀλίθη ("the famous poem" see above p.257) seems to be clearly distinguished from the Palinode (so Bergk p.218). Nor is Woodbury right to suppose that only his (and Kannicht's) explanation will answer "why it is relevant for Isocrates to say that the blasphemy occurred at the beginning of the poem." If we accept that ἄρχόμενος τῆς ὀλίθης is equivalent to ἐν τῇ ἄρχῃ τῆς ὀλίθης then there is, I suggest, a quite reasonable explanation. No-one
would be surprised to learn that the beginning of the Helen dealt with the early part of her life. Now two fragments which we have seen every reason to attribute to the Helen (223 and 191 P) would, from their subject-matter, naturally stand \( \epsilon \nu \tau \eta \iota \delta \rho \chi \eta \iota \tau \acute{h} \iota \theta \varsigma \omega \iota \delta \varsigma \varsigma \varsigma : \) they embrace the \( \alpha \iota \tau \iota \iota \nu \nu \nu \) of the Tyndarids' promiscuity and Helen's precocious affair with Theseus respectively. They are clearly the sort of things that Isocrates includes under the heading "\( \epsilon \beta \lambda \alpha \sigma \varphi \mu \mu \mu \varsigma \)ce". All this is patently obvious, and was seen by Bergk long ago (p.214: "facile autem apparent haec verba, quae gravi approbrio abruunt Helenam (\( \tau \acute{r} \iota \- \gamma \alpha \mu \nu \) et \( \lambda \iota \pi \varepsilon \delta \alpha \nu \omicron \omicron \alpha \) dixerat poeta), ad carminis primordium pertinere itaque plane convenit, quod Isocrates scripsit \( \delta \rho \chi \omicron \omicron \epsilon \iota \omicron \varsigma \tau \acute{h} \iota \omega \iota \delta \varsigma \epsilon \beta \lambda \alpha \sigma \varphi \mu \mu \mu \epsilon \tau \iota \iota \iota \iota \varsigma \tau i e r i a \alpha \omicron \upsilon \tau \mathrm{c}\uhom").

Of course, as Davison observed (p.205), the \( \beta \lambda \alpha \sigma \varphi \mu \mu \mu \varsigma \) will not have been confined to the opening of the poem: the most notoriously discreditable detail, Helen's abduction by Paris, will have occurred nearer the end. But the sexual scandal of her early years will surely have attracted the attention of the majority of the first audience (a glance at today's popular Sunday newspapers will tell us why) together with the generalised condemnation of 223 P. And the beginning of a poem is its most conspicuous place.

\( \epsilon \beta \lambda \alpha \sigma \varphi \mu \mu \mu \varsigma \tau i e r i a \alpha \omicron \upsilon \tau \mathrm{c}\uhom \) may seem to minimise S's

---

1 This seems a better explanation than to suppose, quite arbitrarily, that Isocrates had only read or heard of the beginning of the poem.
offence in an unnatural way, and to be unnecessarily vague in view of the theory I have just outlined above.

But the vagueness is deliberate and derives from Isocrates not S. (So e.g. J. Schwartz, Pseudo-Hesiodeia (1960) p. 552).

In his ἔγκωμιον Ἑλένης Isocrates would have been inept if he had not studiously omitted everything that detracted from his subject's glory. Thus Davison's objection that τι suggests a relatively short poem at odds with everything we know about the Helen (p.205) falls, where it belongs, to the ground.

This leaves us with the problem of ἄνακτη and its meaning. Davison (pp 206-7) who is the only recent scholar to have given any serious thought¹ to the matter, suggested three possible meanings. (1) S. was blinded while composing the Helen and realised as much when he "rose from his writing desk." This has several serious disadvantages.

¹I repeat "serious thought". But Woodbury (p.170) has given it some thought. Here are its fruits: he reads ἄνακτη - a lection which he has plucked from the apology for an apparatus criticus that litters the Budé edition of Isocrates. The infinitely more reliable apparatus of Drerup (p.80) says nothing about the existence of this "reading", which Woodbury would translate "stand aloof, recoil" as at Il.3.33, Pind. Pyth. 4.145, 01.1.52. In the last of these passages, Pindar uses the verb of his refusal to impute γαστρομαγγά to the gods. May not - Woodbury is inspired to ask - may not S. have used the word in the same sense, and may he not have covered his head for shame with his cloak as does Socrates in Phaedr. 237A, the very dialogue which later quotes the Palinode? 237A, the very dialogue which later quotes the Palinode? S., it appears, "spoke of recoiling, with his head covered ... in shame and horror, from his blasphemy after being struck blind." Shame and horror must be the uppermost emotions experienced by the author of those words if he ever re-reads them.
In the first place, on the linguistic level, it demands that we take ἀρχόμενος as implying that the poem was never finished, a totally unacceptable conclusion for which the correct Greek anyway would be ἀρχόμενος ὡς ἔτι τίνος (as Davison himself appreciates p.205). Then again, it visualises "S. composing with pen in hand. No lyric poet of the great period speaks of himself thus, and we should require direct evidence to support any suggestion that Isocrates thought of S. composing in this way" (Woodbury p.170). Besides, if S. was struck blind while composing the poem, it would have taken a remarkable combination of devotion to poetry and sheer insensitivity to events to recite the poem publicly after this unpromising start, rather than tear it up at once. Yet that the poem was recited publicly is implied by its survival into later times and by the whole idea of a Palinode - presumably a public retraction to atone for the earlier public offence. (2) S. realised he was blind when he "stood up to sing". This is exposed to most of the objections levelled against (1). If S. proceeded to deliver his song after he had been blinded (for, as Davison argues, loss of sight cannot have prevented him from singing what he had learnt by heart) it argues great presence of mind allied to astounding hebeteude of intellect. But that he did recite the Helen is suggested by all our evidence. And would the poor blinded man have had the strength to stand throughout what was probably a very lengthy poem? Would he have stood to
sing anyway?
This brings us to (3), Davison's likeliest suggestion (though he himself prefers (2)). S. sang sitting and realised he was blind when he "rose to leave the hall."
This has the great merit of bringing S's performing habits into line with those revealed in the Homeric poems. When the embassy visits Achilles in Il. 9.182ff they find him - ϕρένα τερπόμενον φόρμιγγι λυγείαi while δειδε δ' ἀρα κλέα ἀνδρòν. When Achilles sees them he is amazed and leaps up λιπὼν ἔδοξα ἔνθα Ὀδάκτεν. Achilles is alone among mortals of the Iliad in practising and enjoying the charms of music. The situation is different in the Odyssey, where the bards Phemius and Demodocus fulfill an important function in society and are rewarded for it. In Od. 8.62ff, the Phaeacians see to it that the blind Demodocus at the feast sits on a Ὑφόνος ἄργυρος and knows where to reach for the peg that holds his lyre. Since we are not told that the δούσος stands to deliver his song of κλέα ἀνδρòν, it is to be presumed that he reaches for the lyre from his chair, and sings in that position. It seems most probable, then, that in Isocrates' account, S. sang and played sitting down, like Achilles or Demodocus, and was blinded after he had finished reciting his ill-starred poem and rose to leave.
That the passage of Plato and Isocrates are not immediately interdependent is suggested by several significant divergences between the two: Isocrates gives a detail about the context of S's blinding (ἀνέκτη τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ἐκτερημένος) missing in Plato who, conversely, quotes the famous three lines whereas Isocrates does not. Furthermore, Plato, unlike Isocrates, makes it clear that S. had to compose "the whole of the Palinode" before he regained his sight. Nevertheless, the two writers have some verbal similarities such as to imply a common source:

PLATO
τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ἐκτερημένος
ἐγνώ τὴν αἰτίαν
(πᾶσαν) τὴν καλουμένην

ISOCRATES
τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ἐκτερημένος
γνως τὴν αἰτίαν

Палиноидіяν

And both use the blinding of S. as a παράδειγμα, though because of the contexts of their references - to different ends. (For Plato, S. shows the χορφαί of the ἄνήπ μουφί-κός, in Isocrates he illustrates the δύναμις of Helen).

These considerations led Kannicht (p.27) and Davison (p. 204) to arrive independently at the idea of a common

source. They differ only in their definition of this source with the English scholar deciding for S's actual poem, while the German thinks it was a different work of which we can know nothing more. The reasoning behind both these verdicts is a little opaque. Davison sets out by noticing that Plato has the poetic ὑμίτων as against Isocrates' ἀφθαλιμῶν. But this need not prove his source to be in verse, since the poetical element plays an important rôle in Plato's style, and he uses this particular word on several other occasions (e.g. Timaeus 45C). Next he claims that the blindness tradition is so firmly rooted in antiquity that it must originate from a poem, but again the logic of the argument eludes me. Finally, he suggests that since Plato proceeds to quote S., his Palinode is the direct source here of Plato (and, for some reason, of Isocrates too, even though he most definitely does not cite S's words). Since the whole aim of the investigation is to decide whether the three lines of verse are drawn directly or indirectly from S., Davison's argument ends in premature circularity.

Kannicht though rejecting the idea of such a poetic source for the Phaedrus, believes that Plato can be shown to have been acquainted with S's original composition from Rep. 11.586C. But even in the Phaedrus passage, Plato must have known more about S's poem than the three lines he quotes, because the contrast he draws between Homer and S. approximates so closely to what S. himself said in the relevant Palinode as revealed in P. Oxy. 2506 fr.26 (See
above p353). This correspondence cannot be attributed to the random play of coincidence. As for Isocrates, those who are reluctant to take the story of S's blinding at its face value (see below pp.404 ff) will have to argue that Isocrates' apparently circumstantial detail about the poet's discovery of his blindness on rising does not derive from S's actual poem but some unknown (and very detailed) source.
Unreal pleasures, says the Platonic Socrates, are mere εἴδωλα of true pleasures; and as an analogy he uses the εἴδωλον of Helen. So far our testimonia have told us that S. was blinded for his dispraise of Helen, but upon composing a Recantation, his eyes were healed. The three lines cited in the Phaedrus contained the remarkable assertion that Helen never went to Troy. Why then was the Trojan War ever fought? The present passage provides the answer: it was fought over Helen's image. That statement is now confirmed by 193 P which first says that S. blamed Homer for making Helen rather than her phantom go to Ilium, and then states clearly what we could anyway have deduced from this fact (193·12ff P): αὐτὸν τὸν Ἰππίαν Φησίζον δὲ Στηρίχορον τὸ μὲν εἴδωλον ἔλθεῖν ἐκ τῶν Ἱλίων. If we confine ourselves at present to Plato's mention of the εἴδωλον we can still learn several things of value. The casual and brief allusion which Plato makes to the εἴδωλον surely suggests that the story was well-known, at least in his time. Also the passage is proof that Plato knew S's Palinode independently of the common source – if it is not S. himself – hypothesised (see above p.367) for the Phaedrus and Isocrates passages, neither of which explain that S's retraction utilised the εἴδωλον. Furthermore, the adjective περιμάχητον used of the εἴδωλον that is the analogy for the ἢδονας περιμάχητοι which Plato despises as εἴδωλα τῆς ἄληθος ἢδονῆς strongly
suggests that Plato is here paraphrasing S. And that in turn would suggest that S's concept of the phantom Helen was inspired by some such passage as Il.5.451ff: ἀμφὶ δ᾽ ἀρ’ eἰδῶλωι (scil. Ἀλεξάνδρου) Τρῶς καὶ δὴ καὶ Ἀχαῖοι δηλοῦν κτλ.

For further speculation on the relevance of the Iliadic lines to S's eἰδῶλον see below pp.415ff.

Plato clearly uses S's eἰδῶλον merely in passing, as a suitable analogy for the eἰδῶλα τῆς ἀληθοῦς ἡδονῆς which are his real subject. He is not concerned to give a disquisition on S's poetic aims, and he therefore omits from his casual reference the detail of Helen's total exculpation which he gave in the Phaedrus - naturally, since in that dialogue Helen's rehabilitation was relevant to Plato's parallel as it is not here. Nothing could be more innocent or easily explained; but Sisti (p.305) pounces zestfully on this omission, and pummels it into a proof that Plato is here referring to the First Palinode which, Sisti believes, only partially exculpated Helen; the Phaedrus which implies total rehabilitation must therefore be talking of the Second Palinode. Once one has grasped the different purposes behind the different references in each dialogue, one easily sees through this claim, and has no difficulty in relating both Platonic passages to the same Palinode - that which blamed Homer for sending Helen, and not her eἰδῶλον, to Troy.

Two German scholars have attempted to establish general principles for our use of the later testimonia on S's Palinode, and for this would-be doxography we must be
very grateful, even if we disagree with it. Seeliger in 1886 was quite categorical: "die in der Rhetorenschule beliebte Anekdote pflanze sich unter Schriftstellern fort, die vielleicht die Werke des Dichters nie gesehen geschweige denn gelesen hatten ... Ich sage dies, damit man auf Dio Chrys. Philostr., und Maximus Tyrius keine Hypothesen gründe" (p.7). And further: "Dass die Kühnheit der Palinodie die Fabel von seiner Erblindung und späteren Heilung veranlassen konnte, ist leicht zu begreifen" (p.8). More recently Kannicht has been less sweeping and more precise. He finds (p.26 n.1) that previous attempts at reconstructing the poem have been vitiated by their excessively uncritical attitude to the sources (Page's treatment in Oxy. Pap. 29 pp 35-36 is singled out for particular dispraise here). He then proceeds to enunciate his own guiding principle (p.28): we can only use Isocrates and Plato properly as evidence if we do not supplement them with the aid of later sources, for all such secondary testimonia consistently derive (directly or indirectly) from Plato's twin references and from these alone, and apparently new details in them about the Palinode really refer to Plato's citation and his summary of the legend: "Erst die Eliminierung dieser Scheinzeugnisse macht deshalb den Blick für das frei, was die beiden authentischen Fassungen der Legende wirklich für die Dichtung des S. bezeugen können."

This vigorously astringent hypothesis has much to commend it, apart from the prospect of time saved from labour on
such uncongenial ground as the scholia on Aristides. We have already reviewed Wilamowitz's remarks on the apparent phenomenon that Plato's citation in the Phaedrus, rather than the original lines themselves, was the fount-head of the poem's fame in antiquity. Plato must indeed have been a more popular author than S. And observe: the hypothesis unravels a further problem. The almost total failure of our sources to mention the two Palinodes which Chamaeleon knew becomes immediately explicable if they all derive from Plato who in the Phaedrus certainly gives the impression (however ambiguous: see above p.359) that there was a single poem of revocation. Some independent inquirers would surely have stumbled upon the second poem known to Chamaeleon.

On these lines we can certainly ignore as derivative from Plato Rep. 586C the two testimonia of Aristides Or. 13·31 and 45·54. (The former mentions τῶν ποιητῶν τινες as sources for the εἰδωλον story, but this phrase will just be an elliptical periphrasis for S. Compare the idiom whereby in Latin scholia "Graeci poetae" or the like need not imply more than one poet (c.f. Fraenkel, J.R.S. 39 (1949) 151 = Kl. Beitr. 2·382)).

But if we expect a succession of easy cases such as these, we are in for a rude shock. Kannicht has done nothing to prepare us for the situation which prevails in the majority of the testimonia, where apparently novel details are introduced whose derivation from Plato's two passages is problematical to say the least. Let us
begin with those testimonia which appear to distinguish the Helen and the Palinode as two separate poems. They are Dio Chrys. Or. 11.40-1, Philostr. Vit. Apoll. 6.11, Maximus of Tyre 21.1. Kannicht (p.28 n.5) believes that they all derive from Plato Phaedr. 243A. The earlier part of Dio, with its explicit statement that S. used Homer as his model for his original dispraise of Helen could be deduced from the remarks Plato prefaced to his three-line citation from S. After all, we ourselves made exactly the same deduction earlier on. (see p.352). Maximus of Tyre's distinction between ἐπανον and ψόγος might likewise originate from Plato's statement that the cause of blinding was a κακηγορία healed by a revocation - which obviously will have contained the opposite ingredient. No need to presuppose access to independent information so far. But do the famous allusions to an earlier poem (ὁ πρότερος λόγος (Philost.), ἡ εἰμπροσθεν ὑσθή, ὃ εἰμπροσθεν ψόγος (Max.) and a later sequel (ἡ ὅστερον υσθή (Dio)) also derive from the apparent sequence conveyed in Plato's "unequivocal narrative" by the move from κακηγορία to ποιεῖ;? I find Kannicht's attitude here appallingly incoherent. Let us pose him two simple questions. Does he think later evidence stating that the Helen and the Palinode were two separate poems is obviously inferred from the narrative of Plato? Kannicht says yes. Does he think - and does Plato say - that the Helen and the Palinode were two separate poems? Kannicht says no. But we must not
let him get away with this. If these testimonia are based on Plato, they provide priceless evidence that our own interpretation of Plato's Phaedrus passage was found perfectly natural by persons who still spoke and wrote Greek. And that is bad news for the believers in a single poem. If, on the other hand, the testimonia are independent of Plato, then their source may have been S. or derived from S.

I append some further remarks confined to Dio's passage. It is clear that the repeated negatives here (οὐδὲν Ἐλένη ὁδομὸς) derive from the triple negatives (οὐκ.. οὐδこともあります) of the famous three lines quoted by Plato. (So e.g. Sisti pp 302 and 309 or Kannicht p.28 n.5). In fact these lines give Dio's interpretation of S., and it says little for our knowledge of Greek that before 1963 both passages were taken as meaning Helen never went anywhere at all. (So e.g. Wilamowitz, S3 p.241 n.1: "Denn so kann man οὐκ Τροί-ης auffassen, man muss es aber nicht, da neben ἐν mit dem Dativ ξύναc sehr wohl das Ziel einschliessen kann. Wenn Helene überhaupt nicht Sparta verliess, kam sie auch nicht nach Aegypten," Bowra p.109: "In the Παλινωδία S. said emphatically that Helen neither embarked on a ship nor went to Troy, but presumably stayed at home at Sparta. This is plain both from Plato's quotation and from the statement of Dio Chrysostom that, according to S., Helen never went anywhere .... It is clear that S's reformed Helen went neither to Troy nor indeed to Egypt.")
after 1963, Page continued to apply this interpretation to Dio, although the new fragment he himself published showed that S. had, in fact, depicted Helen as going to Egypt and staying with Proteus. Either our understanding of Dio's words is at fault or Dio himself is. Page took the latter view and subjected the unfortunate man's testimony to a blistering attack: "It was, no doubt, a risky inference from S's words ... that Helen did not sail with Paris at all; we now learn that it was a false inference ... oδδ'εβ'αν εν νηυκίνν is to be taken closely with the next line, oδδ'ϊκεφο Πέργαμα Τροις. But the fact remains that Dio of Prusa states explicitly that the Stesichorean Helen 'never sailed anywhere at all', and that the story of her arrival in Egypt was to be found in 'certain others'. This is now seen to be a falsehood, a remarkably careless and misleading blunder." (p.36). This, with all due respect, is now seen to be fantastically unfair to Dio, and a perverse misunderstanding of his words. Their true drift was first realised by A. von Premerstein (Philol. 55 (1876) 641), and Davison too (p.212) before 1963, could see that Dio's πλεύεσσε (equivalent to S's oδδ'εβ'αν νηυκίνν) by no means covers all forms of transport, but only those compatible with Paris' abduction.1 It is

1Bowra was rightly converted to this view after the publication of 193 P: c.f. Bowra (2) p.94. Woodbury (p.164) objects to this later position on the grounds that Dio's "rhetorical skill might have made much play with antitheses instead of putting it in this blunt and elliptical way." This characteristically picayune complaint will not get a serious hearing until its author enlightens us as to how a mode of expression can be simultaneously blunt and elliptical.
unlikely that Dio misunderstood S's words, although, I suppose, this would be marginally more probable if he was only working from the fragment enshrined in Plato's text and did not have the whole poem before him.

S., then, said that Helen never went with Paris aboard any ship. Who are the ἄλλοι των with whose version Dio contrasts (Στ. μὲν ... ἄλλοι ἔδε) S's? The only other version which we categorically know to have brought Helen to Egypt with Paris, is the tale which Herodotus attributes to the priests of Ἱπτήσ (see below pp.442ff). Now since Dio represents an Egyptian priest as speaking the present passage, is it likely that he would make that man refer to other priests of his own country as ἄλλοι when a few words later he calls his fellow natives ἑυμάς? There is a clear contrast between the Greeks who tell the first tales and the Egyptians who are involved in the second story. Either Dio's priest is distinguishing Herodotus from his avowed informants, or he is talking about a different Greek version, which may well be Hesiod's (see below 383ff). We will later examine a theory which seeks to explain Chamaeleon's reference to two Palinodes by supposing that in the First S. made Helen go with Paris as far as Egypt (pp.466ff). Whatever the other merits of this thesis, it must be conceded that it gets no support, but rather the contrary, from Dio, who openly contrasts that version with S's treatment! Proponents of the thesis must argue (as does Sisti p.309) that Dio first
talks of the Second Palinode quoted by Plato and then absent-mindedly attributes to ἄλλοι the very version which S. himself had also used, but in the earlier Palinode: the fame of this was soon eclipsed by the second, so rendering Dio's forgetfulness venial. This is a conceivable process (just), but if we cannot trust Dio in the second part of his remark, why should we trust him in the first?

Tzetzes ad Lycophr. 113; Σ ad Aristid. Or. 1·212 (AC and BD)

It is by now clear that these testimonia are (pace Kantschicht) independent of Plato's two references, since they contain at the very least a mention of Proteus for whom we shall seek in vain in Plato. Furthermore, as Sisti (p.302) remarks of them: "è evidente che la versione degli scholiasti non poteva in alcun modo conciliarsi con la citazione del Fedro Platonico, secondo la quale Elena non salì affatto sulle navi." They clearly imply that Helen sailed with Paris as far as Egypt, where she was taken from him by Proteus, while the famous three lines assert that Helen never set foot on a ship. Either these testimonia are talking about a different Palinode from the Phaedrus (so Sisti: see below pp 466 ff), or they are simply wrong.

Now our new papyrus discovery has shown that Proteus did have an important part to play in S's scheme. Is it not therefore conceivable that at least in their references
to Proteus these testimonia had separate access to S? Page (who, it will be remembered, takes the unnatural interpretation of S's second and third lines) was sanguine in his commentary on the new find (p.36): "The fact stated here, that the Stesichorean Helen stayed with Proteus in Egypt, while her phantom went to Troy, was already familiar to us from the scholia on Aristides and from Tzetzes. Most modern accounts have rejected their testimony; wrongly as we now see, but not unreasonably." Almost all other scholars to touch upon this matter have disagreed\(^1\): surely by the time Helen reached Egypt with Paris, her reputation had already been shattered to smithereens. She had been seduced by her Trojan guest and their πρὼτη μετέχεια had taken place on an island at no great distance from Sparta, if not at Sparta itself as the Cypria told. (Allen p.105 (Proclus): see above p.242). What sort of palinode would this be, that allowed Helen to be τρίγυμος still, that even left her with the will to follow Πάρις to Troy, and merely bereft her of her goal, and conceivably of the solemnisation of her illicit union?\(^2\)

There are two ways of eliminating the contradictions between Tzetzes' statement and S's words, and between all the testimonia considered in this section and our expectations of any palinode worth its name. The first

---

1Page is followed by Jouan (p.192 n.1) who believes that Proteus, "maître dans l'art des métamorphoses", creates a substitute (in S's poem) for the Helen who is brought to Egypt by Paris.

2And of her marriage to Deiphobus if that was related in the Helen - which is doubtful (see above  p.253).
way is to suppose that Tzetzes and the Aristides scholia are simply wrong. We must note that Aristides himself makes no such reference to S. as his scholia, and we thus depend on witnesses of very uncertain worth. If we decide that they are wrong, we must explain their error, and Bowra (2) pp 95-6, Dale (p xxii) and Kannicht (p 32 n.12) concur in supposing that they are referring not to S's uncontaminated account but to some sort of conflation of various non-Stesichorean sources. Over the exact identity of these sources they diverge, as is natural, and we would be being unrealistic to expect a precise answer. Dale and Kannicht agree that Tzetzes and Σ Arist. used as source Lycophron's version (Alex. 110-138) on which Tzetzes is commenting. This is itself probably a conflation of Herodotus' rationalised tale (see below pp 444 ff) and the εἵσωλον-motif derived from S. himself (as Kannicht thinks) or from Euripides (so Dale). More contortedly, Bowra hypothesises the following contamination: (1) an expansion of the details in 11.6·291-2 that Helen and Paris sailed to Troy via Sidon into the statement that they put in at Egypt; (2) an exploitation of S's version that Helen stayed with Proteus during the war, with the εἵσωλον ignored by Herodotus now reinstated not in Sparta (where it must have made its

---

1This had already occurred to Kleine (p.94): "liquet autem ex fragmentorum collatione finxisse poetam in Palinodia imaginem Helenae a Paride inscio Troiam Lacedaemone fuisse abductam. Confudit haec Aristidis scholiasta cum Herodoti de Proteo narratione et male sic mixta Stesichoro tribuit."
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first appearance to spare Helen any infamy) but in Egypt, as a creation of Proteus. Bowra suggests that the version would be the work of Greek poets in Egypt who picked up a story connecting Helen with their own country, combined the two versions, and added new details to make it interesting.

It is hard to choose between these hypotheses, although Bowra's seems less plausible because so much more devious. But I like his suggestion that Tzetzes and the Σ Aristid. need not have known the actual text of S., but rather derived the story from handbooks of mythology where the confusion already existed. For this reminds us of the all-important fact that these testimonia are so very late, and wrote at a time when it was depressingly easy for those of dull wits to confuse S's treatment of Helen with half a dozen others, or have a handbook do the confusing for them.¹

I prefer this general mode of explaining the contradictions of our testimonia to the second type of approach, favoured by Sisti (pp 306ff) who argues that Tzetzes and the Σ Arist. are right, but refer to the other Palinode. In this case their inconsistency with Plato's Phaedrus and their failure to exculpate Helen's reputation become positive assets: the Phaedrus is referring to the Second Palinode which did finally and irrevocably absolve Helen.

¹It must not be forgotten in the following pages that this generalisation has often been applied to the particular case of Hes. fr.358 MW.
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And the inadequacy of the First Palinode in this respect provides an excellent explanation of why a Second Palinode became necessary, and why the earlier effort, being superseded, soon fell victim to oblivion and is so rarely mentioned in our testimonia. But in my view it beggars belief to suppose that of those testimonia which refer to only one Palinode and its contents, some happen to be referring to the First, some to the Second. If most of our sources refer to one Palinode, surely there is a very strong implication that they are talking about the same poem. It is fantastic to suppose that Tzetzes and Aristid. of all people knew the far less familiar version, yet when they mentioned it, kept quiet about its infinitely more notorious companion.

It should at least be easy to agree that the reference in Σ ad Ar. Or. 1.212 AC to an εἴδωλον "ἐν πίνακι" can be dismissed as an insignificant aberration or an "Euhemeristic interpretation" (Davison p.212). The only individuals to have tried to take the remark seriously are those devotees of the implausible Podlecki (p.327) and Doria (pp 88-9). The former's tortured line of reasoning culminates in the triumphant suggestion that the δψις of Helen which caused the Greeks to drop their stones in 201 P was not Helen herself but her portrait, "like Menelaus' colossi of Helen in the Agamemnon"! We can safely leave the scholiast and his modern followers to their own devices. But before leaving the problem, we should first
turn to Kannicht's note on Helen 31-6 (2.27) where he illustrates well that the additional adjective in the phrase εἰδωλον εὐμυνουν (Hel. 34) shows how already in the fifth century εἰδωλον per se meant a portrait (c.f. Aesch. fr.17.6 Mette) or a statue (c.f. Hdt. 6.58). On this topic c.f. H. Schäfer,Charites ((Langlotz Festschrift) Bonn 1957) pp.230-3 cited by Kannicht. Thus it would be relatively easy for the gloss ἐν πίνακι to be half-consciously intruded at some stage of the legend's existence.

Hesiod fr.358 MW

This particular testimonium wears a rather battered look nowadays, after the drubbing it has received from recent scholars, especially Dale (p.xxiii), Sisti (p.308), and Kannicht (p.24 n.5). I think a somewhat stronger case can be made on its behalf than these scholars allow, although I would be the last to claim that it should recover that automatic and unthinking acceptance it once had (from e.g. Murray, The Rise of the Greek Epic4 p.205 n.3, Page (p.35), or Davison (p.224)). And first let us have the sequel to the attribution to Hesiod, denied us by Merkelbach and West, so that we may assess the value of this evidence more accurately. In fact the full context of the passage brings woeful tidings to those who would like to have Hesiod as the inventor of Helen's εἰδωλον; for it seems at first sight to give every justification for Miss Dale's remark "It is difficult to understand why this obiter dictum should so often be taken as unarguable
fact, in view of the nonsense about Herodotus in the next line", and for her conclusion that Marckscheffel\textsuperscript{1} was right to suppose the name of Hesiod "a mere blunder"\textsuperscript{2} for S.

The mention of Hesiod and Herodotus in connection with the phantom of Helen, the total omission of S. and Euripides, seem at first sight eccentric, if not positive deterrents to credulity. But if we take the view that the blunder over Herodotus casts aspersions on the remark about Hesiod, we must first define the blunder more clearly, and here scholars are divided. V. Pisani, Riv. Fil. 6 (1928) 477 quotes Hoff, de Helenae mytho euripideo (1843) p. 79 to the effect that Herodotus seems to have been confused with Euripides, Hesiod with S., which would neatly explain the baffling absence of those names more usually associated with the ειδωλον. On the

\textsuperscript{1}G. Marckscheffel's correction (made in "Hesiodi, Eumeli, Cinaethonis, Asii et carminis Naupactii fragmenta" Leipzig (1840) p. 393) has been accepted by F. von Duhn ("De Menelai itinere Aegyptio" Diss. Bonn (1874) p. 38\textsuperscript{E}) Mayer (p. 6) and Merkelbach and West (Fragmenta Hesiodea p. 176: "haec potius de Stesichoro accipienda ") as well as the scholars mentioned above in the text. It was rejected by Seeliger (p. 8 n. 2), A. von Premerstein (Philol. 55 (1896) p. 638), Wilamowitz (SS p. 241 n. 1: "lässt sich das Zeugnis des Paraphrasten zu Lycophron 822... nicht leicht beseitigen, da er Herodot selbst davon unterscheidet") and Ghali-Kahil (p. 286).

\textsuperscript{2}Kannicht parts company from Miss Dale in the explanation of the Paraphraser's statement which he prefers: this is not so much a silly mistake (p. 25 n. 1) as a reflection of a serious tradition, derived from a post-Stesichorean "Rhapsodeninterpolation" inserted into some Hesiodic poem. This reference to an ειδωλον was later supposed to be a valid Hesiodic variant, and since Hesiod was the older poet, he was thought to have invented it. Could anything be more complicated or less likely? In fact, as Mayer (p. 6) has stressed, the corruption of ΠΡΩΤΟΣ-ΣΤΗΣΙΧΟΡΟΣ to ΠΡΩΤΟΣΗΣΙΟΔΟΣ is not all that difficult, palaeographically speaking.
other hand, Woodbury (p.160) remarks that "We have here a case in which the version that became standard later in antiquity has been read back into Herodotus. We are left to wonder whether Hesiod has been treated similarly."

This was not the view taken by Seeliger, the most stalwart defender of Hesiod's name here: "Man sollte das Gewicht dieser glaubhaften Notiz nicht durch die Kritik des nachfolgendes Satzes erschüttern wollen" (p.8 n.2). His dismissal of the reference to Herodotus as a venial slip is all the more impressive because he plucks out a similar instance from the work of a modern scholar: "Die S. Fassung ist von Herodot adoptiert" (Bild und Lied p.25).

If Carl Robert could commit such a trivial error or clumsiness of phrasing, then, clearly, it must not be taken as a glaring proof of monumental incompetence. We shall see below that Herodotus' account of Helen in Egypt has numerous similarities with the myth: indeed it is in all probability a rationalisation of the εἴδωλον-story. Granted this, is it not plausible that our man - like Robert - temporarily misremembered Herodotus' treatment and presumed that Egypt entailed the εἴδωλον, that he in fact carelessly reversed the historian's rationalisation? And is not this very far from saying that anything else this man has to tell us about earlier literature is worthless?^1

^1 Of course this is not the only way of obviating the present difficulty. As Seeliger realised, the emendation of Ἴρόδοτος to Ἰκλοδος (or Στηςίχος) would constitute no more drastic a remedy than Marckscheffel's
I hope that I have shown that our testimonium's information has every right to be considered on its own merits, without being prejudiced by its later reference to Herodotus. But has it any merits? Our uphill struggle here becomes positively precipitous, and we see three weighty arguments marshalled against us. The information is, we are told, inconsistent with Chamaeleon's remarks about the Second Palinode which criticised Hesiod; it is at odds with several extant Hesiodic fragments about Helen which exclude the use of the εἰδωλος; and it is unsupported by any surviving word in Hesiod. Strong statements. Let us examine their foundations one by one.

(1) Dale, Sisti, and Kannicht are united in their insistence that 193 P has finally discredited Lycophron's paraphraser. How, asks Kannicht, could S. have composed a Second Palinode against Hesiod if that poet had anticipated his own εἰδωλος device? The confidence of this rhetorical question is misplaced, for it can be answered. We shall see shortly how Davison has advanced an attractive hypothesis explaining the grounds for criticism while accepting the testimony now under discussion: Hesiod used the εἰδωλος, but not extensively enough — he introduced it at too late a stage, when Helen's reputation was already

(contd..)
lost.¹

(2) Bowra (2) p.110 adds his voice to the above-mentioned trio of scholars in asserting that the ipsissima verba of several Hesiodic fragments are in arrant contradiction to the idea that Hesiod invented the εὔδωλον-motif. Kannicht cites frs. 196-204 from the Eoeae's Catalogue of Helen's Suitors, but I fail to see how they exclude the εὔδωλον. Of course the wooing presupposes Tyndareus' oath, which in turn presupposes Paris' abduction. But not even the most fervent of Helen's apologists could deny that the Trojan War took place, and to this, wooing, oath, and rape, are all necessary preliminaries. The abduction implied in the Eoeae might even have involved the εὔδωλον; more probably its victim was Helen herself who was only replaced by the εὔδωλον in Egypt (see below p. 470.) Thus again Davison's theory can abolish objections against an Hesiodic phantom, - partly at least. Fr.176 MW is of course a different matter:

doch δ’’Ελένη γίνεται λέχος ξανθοῦ Μενελάου (176.7)

So, probably, is the statement that Zeus sent the heroes over the sea to Troy Ἐλένης ξυεχ’ηὐκόμοιο (Op. 165).

But there is no difficulty in supposing that the large quantity of poetry composed by the Hesiodic school contained discrepancies in its treatment of myth both

¹This theory's most persuasive statement, in "From Archilochus to Pindar" pp 222f was published too late for Kannicht to know. But he is aware of (and rejects) the summary of it in Atti del Ximo Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia (Milan 1965) 96ff: see his Introduction p.26 n.1.
between the master's own compositions and the later versions of imitators, and between different sections of the "school".

(3) Miss Dale is particularly insistent in stressing that no original word of Hesiod has survived to confirm the accuracy of Lycophron's paraphraser. Strictly speaking this is true but not especially significant: we must simply accept that the poem or part of a poem, to which our testimonium refers, like so much Hesiodic poetry, has not survived. More generally speaking there are a few fragments which indirectly support our witness: I am thinking in particular of one passage which no-one has used to cast light on Hes. fr. 583, although, significantly, Kannicht takes good care to hide it away in a footnote. This is Hes. fr. 23A 21-22 MW which describes how Artemis saved Agamemnon's daughter Iphimedon from sacrifice by substituting an εἰδωλον in her place. (Later sources talk of a hind or a boar: see my discussion on 215 P).

Hesiod then used the device of an εἰδωλον to rescue one maiden in distress: may he not have helped Helen by the same means?  

1 Of course if one presses this passage too hard, something unpleasant may emerge, viz. the possibility that Lycophron's paraphraser has confused Helen and her niece, and has erroneously transferred Hesiod's εἰδωλον from the latter to the former. But that scarcely strikes me as a mistake it would be easy to make. Helen and her niece are two completely dissimilar personages. And the mind behind the paraphrase says Hesiod was the first to introduce the εἰδωλον. Our scholiast clearly thinks he is talking about the invention of a device.
strongest evidence we have for Hesiod's use of the 
εἰδωλον to protect Helen's reputation, I am well aware that some may take this as the supreme indictment of the whole case, and clearly the argument "Hesiod definitely used the εἰδωλον-motif in x poem, therefore he must have used it in y" has little except daring to commend it. But since we now know that Hesiod used the motif on several occasions besides (see my section below on antecedents of the εἰδωλον motif pp 415ff) it does become marginally more probable that the source which credits him with another such use is talking something other than nonsense.

Miss Dale has a final potent plea in store: the scholiast paraphrasing Lycophron's Alexandra is "one solitary voice" isolated from the rest of antiquity who believed that the εἰδωλον was a bold and very striking invention of S's: clearly it stuck in their minds. Kannicht and Woodbury (p.137) back her up by reminding us that Chamaeleon's reference to the Two Palinodes occurs in a section of the papyrus which is stressing S's ναυνοτουλια: it would hardly be appropriate to place the εἰδωλον under this heading if S. had merely borrowed it from Hesiod! The argument is strong, but again not incontrovertible. One could argue that S's use of the εἰδωλον was so much more (contd..)
conspicuous because it was in so singular a contrast with the abuses he had previously showered upon Helen. (Far worse than Hesiod's: see above p.251f) and because it became associated, rightly or wrongly, with the famous tradition of the poet's blinding. No such spectacular volte-face occurred in Hesiod's case (so Seeliger p.8). In other words, S. was renowned for the Palinode, not the use of the εὐδωλον. His καὶνοτομία lay in the use of the εὐδωλον to purge Helen of all guilt. If Davison is right, Hesiod's use of the device was half-hearted and ineffectual and did little to save Helen's name. S. inherited it and made the crucial and startling innovation which entailed that Helen had not even left Sparta in Paris' company.

We have still not accounted for every possible objection. Why should the Boeotian Hesiod (or his school) wish to defend the Spartan Helen? One might try to retort, along Davisonian lines, that in fact Hesiod did not really defend Helen if he made her go to Egypt. That is, the εὐδωλον was at this stage of its existence merely a colourful and fanciful invention. But a more satisfactory explanation would be to suggest that the εὐδωλον stems from a native Spartan tradition which the Lacedaemonians encouraged S. to use because it was favourable to Helen. This coincides with what we shall learn later of this heroine's divine status in this part of the world (below pp.410ff). And if the theory is true, it would not surprise us if this Spartan tradition had leaked out...
and reached Boeotia in "Hesiod's" time. And if it had leaked out, perhaps the form of it that reached Hesiod's ears was in some way imperfect and incomplete, unlike that which S. encountered directly during his residence in Sparta. Hence the latter's attack on the former in the Second Palinode.

I do not for one moment argue that the case for Hesiod's invention of Helen's εἰδωλον is unassailable. But I do believe that it is far stronger than any of the scholars named above have allowed. And now that we know it would be the third instance of Hesiod's deployment of a female εἰδωλον, there seems to be a good deal of truth in Seeliger's remark (p. 8 n. 2) "Willkür, nicht Methode, wenn der Name Hesiodos in S. verwandelt wird."
"Benutzt hat der Tragiker den S. nicht" claimed Vürtheim (p.71). But then how explain the present passage? The Dioscuri tell Electra, Orestes and Pylades that Helen and Menelaus will bury Clytemnestra, and, not surprisingly, feel keenly aware of the need to explain how Helen of all people is fit reverently to inter her sister. For the traditional bad view of Helen is used earlier in this very play by Clytemnestra herself (c.f. 1027-9: νῦν δ’οὖνεχ’ Ἐλένη μάγος ἡν δτ’αθ λαβὼν ᾗ ἀλοχον κολάζειν προδότιν ὅλυ ἡπίστατο, τοῦτων ἔκατι πατὸς ἐμὴν διώλεσεν). Now suddenly Helen must be exculpated, however much nonsense is made retrospectively of Clytemnestra's previous sufferings and motivation. Vürtheim and Wilamowitz both lived in the darkness before the discovery of 193 P, and thus could not know that S. had preceded Euripides in making Helen reside with Proteus. Now it is almost impossible to avoid the conclusion that by this brief and elliptical reference right at the end of the play, Euripides was harking back to the lyric poet. That interpretation will be absolutely inevitable if G. Zuntz's re-dating of the work (The Political Plays of Euripides pp.64-71) is to be accepted. He argues that the tragedy cannot have been performed in 413, and a date around 420 has been postulated by Ceadel on metrical grounds (C.Q. 35 (1941) 76) and by Newiger on

the basis of external (Hermes 89 (1961) 422-30) and internal (GGA 219 (1967) 184-91) criteria. Previous readings of the passage as an advertisement for the following year's Helen would thus become untenable, and I for one am not sorry to lose what is an unwelcome anachronism that should never have been suggested. Leaving aside such awkward questions as how Euripides knew in advance that the archon was going to accept the Helen for performance, how can we stomach so vulgar a notion as an advertisement for a coming tragedy?

Such considerations necessitate the conclusion that Euripides is here giving a resumé of an earlier account fairly familiar to his audience, the same account which he was later to use as the source of his Helen, namely that of S. We should note that since Helen is said by the Dioscuri to be with Menelaus at Nauplia, and since the sack of Troy is an event in the past (El. 1279), Menelaus must have picked up Helen in Egypt on his way back home. This is quite consistent with the account in Hdt. 2.112ff, which, however, conspicuously omits the ἐνδωδειγματι. We shall later see good cause to suppose that Herodotus drew on S's poems for his account.

At the ends of his Helen and Orestes, Euripides tells us that Helen will end her life by becoming a goddess, in which capacity she will receive libations in company with the Dioscuri, and enthroned in the sky with her brothers she will bring protection to sailors. Davison (p.216) maintains that Euripides does not specifically say that
Helen is going to become a star, but Or. 1685ff (καὶ πρὸς ἄρτων πόλον ἔξανύσας, ἐνδά παρὰ Ἠραῖ τῇ Ἡρακλέους Ἡ ναυπτή πάρεδρος θεός κτλ.) and the stellar position of the Dioscuri seem to make this certain. Seeliger (p. 8) thought Euripides probably derived from S. here, and even Vurtheim (p. 72) had to admit that in the Orestes, 1635-7 fit "vorzüglich zur stesichorischen Apotheose der Helena. Hier knüpft der Tragiker direkt an seinem Vorgänger S. an." Wilamowitz (SS p. 241 n. 1) still held out, and maintained that it was impossible to tell whether Euripides was drawing upon S., Hesiod, or Herodotus. But comparison with Horace epod. 17·40-44 surely settles the matter. There Horace humorously expresses the hope that as S. was pardoned for his insults to Helen, so he himself may likewise be forgiven for his abuse of Canidia. And thus he says it:

\[
\begin{align*}
tu pudica, tu proba & \\
peramǐ·ulabis astra sidus aureum. & \\
 infamis Helenae Castor offensus vice & \\
fraterque magni Castoris, victi prece, & \\
adempta vati reddidere lumina. & \\
\end{align*}
\]

It takes stark insensibility to avoid setting this side by side with the passages in Euripides and drawing the conclusion that when Horace says Canidia will become a star, he is copying S. who said that Helen would (or did?) become a star in the heavens together with her brothers. Horace also seems to say that it was the Dioscuri who
restored S's eyesight after he had recognised Helen's divinity. We should naturally assume that they also blinded the poet in the first place. That is what Cruquius' schol. 1 ad epod. 17·42 says: "S. poeta Graecus scripsit Helenae vituperationem; quare irati Castor et Pollux illi lumina ademerunt. sed posteo monitus S. illius laudem decantavit, quare oculos iterum illi reddiderunt." Unfortunately this does not look like independent testimony: there is nothing in these words which could not have been derived by guess-work from Horace's poem. Still, it seems to be intelligent guess-work, and it coincides with the deductions of most scholars since. 2

The appropriateness of the Dioscuri's rôle as blinders and restorers of sight may extend beyond their kinship with the offended Helen. The passages quoted above connect them with those sources of light the stars, and for parallel Indo-European brothers connected with "the daughter of the Sun" c.f. West pp.8ff.

Bowra (p.110) noticed that Horace's "tu pudica, tu proba" addressed to Canidia, was remarkably reminiscent of the description of Helen in the Spartan chorus of the famous

---

1 On the composition of these scholia, see Nisbet-Hubbard (A Commentary on Horace Odes Book 1) p.11. They represent an amalgam of pseudo-Acro, Porphyrio, and the notes of Renaissance scholars. The commentary thus constituted "does not provide any ancient material to which we have no other access."

passage in Ar. Lysistr. 1314-15 as Αἴας ταῖς ἀγνῶσταις. Since the epode is comparing Canidia to Helen, we might conclude that Horace is translating from the Palinode's Greek some such reverent epithets as Aristophanes was later to apply to Helen. But the case is not so simple. Horace is copying, certainly, but his source for the phrase is considerably nearer in time and place than the poet of Himera. At the close of his splendid "flagitatio" against the young woman in possession of his writing-tablets, Catullus achieves a total total paean by ending on a note of quiet respect: instead of the rabid "moecha putida, redde codicillos, redde, putida moecha, codicillos", the poem's last line is:

pudica et proba, redde codicillos. (Cat. 42·24)

Anyone who is so impressed by the similarity of the Greek and Latin phrases that he still posits a translation, must spin a tenuous thread of argument: Catullus ends his little poem with a mock palinode and borrows from S's real Palinode two adjectives which most specifically signalised his repentance. Later, Horace writing a poem which had a slightly closer relation to S's Palinode than did Catullus', borrows directly from the Latin poet the two adjectives which translate his own model's Greek phrases. This possibility seems to be envisaged by Fraenkel, who writes of Cat. 42·24 (Kl. Beitr. 2·120):

"We are not told with what measure of success this palinode meets" (my italics).

This devious line of reasoning gains support from a remarkably close parallel afforded by two other Latin poems. The tenth poem of Horace Odes Book 1 is said by pseudo-Acro (quoted above p.355) to be an imitation of S's Palinode. Nisbet-Hubbard (p.204) follow F. Ritter in his commentary (Leipsig 1856) in suggesting that the extent of Horace's borrowing is limited to the opening "motto":¹ o matre pulchra filia pulchrior (and to the new coinage "recantare" at 27 which is meant to convey the Greek παλινωδῆς). Such a form of address would be preeminently appropriate for Helen the daughter of Leda, especially if it emanated from a poet seized by the flattering mood. And the case is practically clinched by [Ov.] epist. 16.85f: pulchrae filia Ledae ibit in amplexus, pulchrior illa tuos.²

The relationship between "Ovid" and Horace here is precisely the same as that envisaged above between Horace and Catullus: the earlier Latin poet translates a striking phrase directly from S's Greek but makes only the gentlest of allusions to the original context. The later poet,

¹Horace will often open an ode with some such striking but usually superficial allusion to his model: see Nisbet-Hubbard p.438 s.v. "motto", and Fraenkel, Horace p.159 n.2 and Index (p.457) s.v., J.A. Richmond, Rh. Mus. 113 (1970) 197ff.

²The fact that these lines are not by Ovid (see U. Fischer, Ignotum hoc aliis ille novavit opus (Berlin Diss. printed at Augsburg 1969) pp.132ff) is irrelevant to the argument.
more openly and obviously concerned with a situation relevant to S's original, takes over his Latin predecessor's phrase.

If this is right, we will have the satisfaction of knowing that somewhere in one of his Palinodes S. tried to gain Helen's favour by apostrophising her as the fairer daughter of fair Leda, and by using some epithets roughly equivalent to ἄγνα and εὔπροπής.

Eur. El. 1282-3, Hel. 36ff, Or. 1641-2

Seeliger (pp.9-10) was the first scholar to argue that Euripides in these three passages is re-treading ground once covered by S. The former two in fact link the ἀδώνιστα-motif (definitely taken over from S.) with the over-population motif which makes its earliest appearance in the Cypria (fr.1 Allen (p.118): ἄνδρων ἀνθρώπων παμφότορα γαῖαν | ἡ τάξις ἀδών ἔλεγεν καλ ἐν πυκνώσεις προπολέμονες | διπλάσιοι πολέμου μεγάλην ἐρωτήθη Ἰλιακῷ | διὰ χρώματεν θανάτου βάρος. Is it being too bold to suggest that the second motif also occurred in S's Palinode(s)? The suggestion (to which Dale p.xxiii also subscribes) is rendered all the likelier because in the Helen prologue this motif is a piece of supplementary over-causation: for the purposes of the play the Judgement of Paris is the central cause. Thus the mention of one Stesichorean element may have automatically drawn in another in the Electra and Helen.
On the other hand we must remember the general tendency in Greek Literature to over-motivate the Trojan War: that would explain these passages without recourse to S. In the Helen extract for instance, the wish to make Achilles famous is piled on top of an amply adequate list of causes. (On such over-motivation c.f. Stinton pp 7-8 n.3, and Kannicht ad Hel. 36ff (1·29).
Hel. 44-6

Hera defrauded Paris by giving him an ἑτολογον of Helen while the genuine article was conveyed through the air by Hermes to live in Egypt with the virtuous Proteus until Menelaus should return from Troy. Seeliger (pp 8-9) suggested in 1886 that the same thing happened in S's Palinode. He was followed by A. von Premerstein, Philol. 55 (1896) 646. Since then the publication of 193 P has proved that S. did indeed make Helen stay with Proteus, and since Euripides is following S. in this particular, it is highly probable that he is also following him in the mode of Helen's transport. This last hypothesis is particularly appealing since it bridges the gap between the two statements "S. said Helen never went on board ship to Troy" and "S. said Helen stayed with Proteus in Egypt."¹ It seems to me as certain as anything can be in the study of the Palinodes that S. did have Helen conveyed through the air to Egypt and probably by Hermes. For the significance of the aerial transport of a heroine who was formerly - in her status as daughter of the Sun and vegetation goddess - some kind of celestial being, see West p.14; for the appropriateness of Hermes as the rescuing deity see Nisbet-Hubbard on Horace Odes 2.17.13(p.115f). Having made my own views clear, I now turn to possible objections. Many have been rendered obsolescent by 193 P: thus the claims by Milamowitz (SS p.241 n.1) and

¹And answers Kleine's characteristically shrewd question (p.94) "quo modo enim, si navem non conscendit Helena, Aegyptum potuit visere?"
Vürtheim (p. 65) that "you never went on board ship" is equivalent to "you never left Sparta at all, and you certainly didn't go to Egypt" are now totally and deservedly discredited. But it is admittedly embarrassing for my case that the scholar who first revealed Chamaeleon's remarks on S. to an unsuspecting world must be counted among the opponents. For Sir Denys Page remarked (p. 36) "it is worth noticing that our commentary gives no support (rather the reverse) to the theory, based mainly on Eur. Hel. 44ff that the Stesichorean Helen went to Egypt not by ship with Paris but by air in the arms of Hermes. The account given by the scholia on Aristides and by Tzetzes, being now confirmed in one respect, is quite likely to be reliable in another: that Helen was taken away from Paris by Proteus in Egypt." At this point one begins to understand Kannicht's comment on Page's treatment of the papyrus: "fast Zeile für Zeile eine Provokation zur Widrigerung" (p. 26 n. 1). I hope I have shown elsewhere that Page's trust in the scholia's statements is misplaced, for the version they present, that Helen went with Paris as far as Egypt, is no recantation at all. Besides, do not S. himself and Dio Chrysostom state that Helen did not set foot on a ship? Page sweeps aside this objection with the claim that ὀὄς Ἰβάκ ἐν νησίῳ is to be taken closely with the next line, "ὁὄς Ἰκεο Πέργαμα Τρολνο." Even if this assertion is correct (see my discussion on p. 332 f) I can see no grounds for Page's further contention that P 193 "gives no support (rather
the reverse)" (my italics) to the hypothesis that others (myself included) have found so satisfactory. Miss Dale (p.xxii), who leans towards the Page-Wilamowitz translation of the last two of S's famous lines, suggests that S. may not have raised the problem of how Helen got to Egypt: "we do [not] know nearly enough about his narrative habits to assume that he raised the point at all", she says, and supposes that "like other lyric poets he avoided anything like a straight narrative of events with all the connections filled in, and rather picked out the salient points for decorative elaboration." But S's reputation as Ομηρωγότατος and the papyrus fragments (especially those of the Geryoneis) published since those words were written, show that this verdict is the diametrical opposite of the truth. S's lyric narrative was indeed as full and flowing as Homer's, and it shows no example of abruptly Pindaric transitions. Besides it is unthinkable that having settled on the novel recasting of Homer's tradition, S. should fail to make his own version as detailed as possible.

Having met Page and Dale's strenuous objections to the theory that Euripides is borrowing from S. here, we will not be impressed by what Woodbury (p.168) takes to be obstacles to our view: "The device is characteristic of Euripides", he remarks of Hel. 44-6, "both in form and in purpose. It is an arbitrary [sic] manipulation of the purely mythical, which he regards as conventional, in order to make Helen a heroine ... acceptable to the moral
judgements of his own time." All this may well be true, but it does not prove that Euripides did not gratefully take over from S. that "arbitrary manipulation" of myth which he is so fond of elsewhere. As for the silence maintained by the Hypothesis on Euripides' Helen about S's influence, we can hardly be amazed at this since (so Seeliger p. 8 n. 2; Dale p. xvii) it seems unaware\(^1\) that Euripides had any predecessor in his exploitation of the $\epsilon\lambda\omega\omega\lambda\nu$ device. See Dale loc. cit. for further misleading statements enshrined in the Hypothesis.

\(^1\)Or is indifferent because only concerned with possible indebtedness to other Attic tragedians: see p. 944 inf.
S'S BLINDING AND THE MOTIVE FOR THE PALINODES

Over the tradition of S's blinding which has clearly left so deep an impression on antiquity it is possible to adopt one of two extreme points of view: (1) the tradition is true, S. was blinded and then cured, and he duly recorded the fact in his poem(s) which is (are) the source for the story. (2) the tradition is false, nothing of the sort ever happened (nor of course did S. record it in his poem(s)) and an external legend about blinding has for some reason been grafted on to S. at a later date. A reasonable case could be made for either of these extremes, and also for a third position mid-way between them, reached by combining their terms. I doubt if one could coherently argue that the tradition is true but that S. did not record it in one or both of the Palinodes. One can however easily maintain (3) the tradition is false in the sense that S. was never blinded: but it nevertheless springs from some statement in one of S's poems which was either meant to mislead the reader and listener into believing S. had been miraculously blinded and cured or which has been misinterpreted by later times to the same effect. Let us examine each possibility in turn.

(1) S. really was blinded and said so in a poem. Those who accept that S. was blinded and then cured need not necessarily be gullible believers in the miraculous. Post-Freudians who know about psychosomatic afflictions may find themselves able to acknowledge the likelihood of
the tradition. In 1973 G. Devereux argued with characteristic ingenuity for "a simple medical hypothesis" to explain "the tradition of S's transitory blindness and for his having written two palinodes in order to recover his sight." (pp 207-8). The solution? S. had attacks of hysterical blindness which he attributed to Helen's vengeance and his compositions of the recantations were "ritual attempts at self-healing ... in an archaic society such as Stesichorean Greece, attempts of [sic] ritual self-healing tend to be temporarily successful but usually end in relapses requiring further attempts at self-healing." It is all too easy to make fun of such arguments expressed in such language, and I leave it to the experts to decide on their plausibility. It requires no expert knowledge however to appreciate the superfluity of Devereux's additional hypothesis that S. may have become permanently blind ("for organic reasons") in old age. This is surely implausible: the striking coincidence that after his earlier miraculous cure S. should have again succumbed to darkness in old age is surely too vivid to have sunk without trace from the tradition.¹ And there is no compelling evidence for the theory. The air of venerable antiquity which seems to have haunted S's figure in the famous statue as described by Cicero (Verr. 2.2.35) and reproduced on the Himeraean coin (Head, Hist. Num.² (1911)p.147=Poole, Cat. Brit. Mus. Sic. p.24 nn.9-10)

¹Devereux supposes it was suppressed "by the purveyors of edifying tales" (who?) since "it would have destroyed the hearer's faith in the usefulness of repentance."
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may be a purely conventional adornment of sages and poets: it is no strong reason for supposing he is depicted in the period after the Palinodes. The way in which S. stares blankly ahead into space rather than look at the tome in his hands may well be an allusion to his blindness: Greek sculptors were perfectly capable of depicting their subjects as reading a book (examples in Th. Birt, Die Buchrolle in der Kunst (1907)). On the other hand there are many instances in plastic art of a figure failing to read the roll in his hands without the slightest implication of blindness. Nevertheless, it is far harder now to state with sublime faith in the rationality of the world that if S. did mention his cure in the poem the whole story must have been a fabrication. But sceptics can still make a strong case. Folk-tales the whole world over treat of the blinding of unfortunate mortals by some deity in anger or as a display of power, and miraculous healings frequently ensue. Within Greek literature one immediately thinks of Thamyris (Il.2.597ff), Phineus, Tiresias or Daphnis. Less familiar examples are collected by F. Dornseiff, Die archaische Mythenerzählung (Leipzig 1933) p.33f. Dornseiff

1We must not accept as an argument for the genuineness of S's blinding the anonymous suggestion preserved ap. Davison (p.208) that the famous three lines are characterised by "a deep spiritual revulsion." That seems a very wide deduction to draw from so small a fragment, unless the reference is to S's habitual weight and solemnity ("Stesichori graves Camenae") in which case of course the tone of the lines proves nothing.
himself suggested (pp.33-5) that S. deliberately imitated the folk-lore motifs of blinding and healing and narrated them as an aetiological joke on Homer's blindness. Bergk (Gr. lit. gesch. 2·p.290 n.59) compared the Icelandic tale of the scald Thormod who after thoughtlessly dedicating the same poem to two maidens dreamt that one of them threatened blindness unless he made public amends for the insult. He woke with a sinister smarting in his eyes, paid penance, and was cured. Does the Suda's μελέποι imply a similar dream and similarly painful eyes? The idea seems altogether too euhemeristic.

More recently, the notion of a legend has been eagerly adopted by those who wish, for ulterior motives, to deny the clear implications of an interval between blinding and healing which we find in the Phaedrus and Isocrates. Kannicht, for instance, claims that these passages are relevant only to the legend which has grown up around S's blinding, not to the poem itself.

\[1\text{Against the fanciful portrait of an "old merry Stesichoros" which deprives Dornseiff's book of most of its value, see the reviews by H.J. Rose, J.H.S. 53 (1933) 326f, Pfeiffer, Gnomon 9 (1933) 61ff and (shortest and deadliest) Maas, Deutsche Literaturzeitung 46 (1933) 2168.}\]
The disreputable motives sometimes lurking behind the idea of a legend about S's blinding separable from the actual poems should not alienate us from the idea itself. But when we begin to ask ourselves why the legend was attached to S. in particular, it becomes difficult to answer without sliding into our third category of explanation and maintaining that the poem itself did after all contain some allusion which, whether taken at face-value or misinterpreted, provided a firm anchorage for the legend.

S. may first of all have "lied" about his blinding and recovery. Or if "lie" seems an unnecessarily harsh word we may adopt Davison's subtler and more tactful language, and speak of a "diplomatic invention" to explain the inconsistency between the two successive portraits of Helen; also, perhaps, to advertise himself as under the protection of higher powers. The invention might seem extreme: but so was the idea of a rehabilitation of the Cypria's hateful heroine. Miss Dale sums it up beautifully: "it is perfectly possible that he felt the launching of so revolutionary a notion required a special claim to revealed truth, and made it memorable in this form" (p xxii).

Or there was some misunderstanding of a metaphorical statement. Scholars generally cite as example the adjective ὑπάφλως (so e.g. Bowra p.108) which apart from its literal meaning of "blind" also enjoys the figurative implication "unenlightened". Sophocles plays with the
double meaning to produce a chilling irony in O.T. 371:
twolόc tά τ’ωτα τόν τε νοόν τά τ’διματ’ει and 388-9:
δετις έν τοῖς κέρδεσιν | μόνον δέδομε, τήν τέχνην δ’έφυ

twolόc. Also Parmenides fr. 6·7 DK: κώφοι δύμωç τυφλοί
tε, τεθηπότες, ἀκριτα φύλα. Most significant of all are
two Pindaric passages: Nem. 7·23f: τυφλόν δ’έχει | ἦτορ
δύμως ἄνδρῶν ὁ πλείστος. And, even more relevant,
Paean 7B 18-20 (Sn.): ξυφλός γαρ ἄνδρῶν φρένες | δετις
ἀνευθ’Ελληνιδῶν | βαθεῖαν ἐμ[πα]τῶν (?Sn.) ἐρευναὶ
cοφλας δόδν. These last two parallels are quite
fascinating. We have already seen (p.354) that Nem. 7
is often compared, with good reason, to S's Palinodes.
In Nem. 7 a deprecatory reference to Homer occurs in
close proximity to the metaphorical use of τυφλός (21 and
23): is Pindar imitating S. here? Further we have
already seen reason to guess that S's poem contained some
antithesis between the poet himself and the ἄμουκος (Muse-
less, uninspired) Homer. And we find in the Paean a
similar contrast, though without a reference to Homer.
Hence it is tempting to follow those scholars who note
that Homer was traditionally represented as blind, and
suppose that S. will have held "Homer" responsible for
the disrespectful treatment of Helen in the Cypria and
the later epic cycle. What more natural than that S.
should have drawn a causal link between Homer's dispraise
and his blindness, and then contrasted this blindness with
his own enlightenment? Embarrassingly prosaic para-
phrases of what S. is conjectured to have said inevitably
follow, of which H. Fränkel's is perhaps the most bearable: "Dem blinden Homer folgend, habe ich dich verkannt und bin selbst blind gewesen; nun aber bin ich sehend geworden." (Dichtung und Philosophie des früh. Gr. p.322 n.7 = Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy p.283 n.7).

This explanation of the blindness tradition seems to be the most popular, and if I had to choose between the three possibilities, this is the one I should select as most probable. It is true that in seeking to retain and explain the idea of blindness while rejecting the miraculous, the suggestion "has a disquieting flavour of editorial ingenuity" (K.J. Dover on a quite different problem in Thuc. 6.16.2(Commentary p.247)). One of the extreme solutions may after all be right as against the compromise. But the two striking parallels with Pindar are very attractive arguments in favour of the "metaphorical" explanation. If we accept this, we must still search for an external stimulus almost as potent as genuine blindness, to explain why S. adopted this self-deprecatory metaphor and why he so abruptly decided to sing another tune.

SPARTAN INFLUENCE

Seeliger in 1886 clearly stated the possibility that S's new-found respect for Helen in the Palinode was occasioned by Spartan influence, and mentioned priestly legend (pp
8-9) as a potential source of stimulation. Later, one of the many stimulating suggestions about S. which Wilamowitz threw out in SS concerned the causes of the Palinode: "In diesen Gedichten (Helen, Palinodie, Oresteia) ist das lakonische Element auffällig ... Die Rettung der Helene lag an dem Orte am nächsten, wo sie göttliche Verehrung erfuhr" (p.241). See also pp.866ff below on the Oresteia of S. But it was left to C.M. Bowra to etch in the details of this bold outline (C.Q. 28 (1934) 115-116 repeated almost verbatim in GLP\textsuperscript{2} pp 111ff). For, as he noted, the hypothetical contents of the Palinode gave Helen a particular glory which would be appropriate to Sparta but not to the rest of the Greek world, just as the unflattering picture of the thrice-married adulteress in the Helen must have angered Sparta but no other region.

On the subject of the cult of a Doric Helen in Sparta, see besides Bowra the following: Nilsson, Griechische Feste von religiöser Bedeutung 426-7, Ziehen, RE 3\textsuperscript{A} 1481-2, West pp 5-6 and p.10 with the relevant notes on p.17f.


\footnote{Spartan stimulation was also envisaged by Von Premerstein (Philol. 55 (1896) 634-5 and H. Usener,Kl. Schr. 4.210.}
Ancient testimonia on the worship of Helen and Menelaus as gods is very conveniently collected by S. Wide, Lakonische Kulte (Leipzig 1893) pp.340ff. To these we must now add P. Oxy. 2389 = Alcman 7 P (with notes by Lobel, Oxy. Pap. 24 (1957) p.31) a fragmentary commentary apparently describing the worship of Menelaus and the Dioscuri at Therapnae. Of course we would know a little more about Helen's divine status in Sparta if A. Griffith's ingenious idea (QUCC 14 (1972) 7ff) that Alcman's First Partheneion is a marriage song for the newly-wed Agido and Hagesichora a title of Helen could be proved right. 1

Against this background it is easy to understand the remark of the Spartan chorus in Ar. Lys. 1314-15: \(\delta 4e\gamma T\alpha\, \delta\iota \,\Lambda \eta \delta \alpha \,\pi \alpha \iota \iota | \delta \gamma \nu \,\chi o\rho \alpha \gamma \dot{\alpha} \,\varepsilon \omicron \mu \rho \varepsilon \mu \nu \dot{\iota} \). This "chaste patroness of young girls, throned in the sky and honoured with libations" (Bowra, CQ 28 (1934) 116) is so jarring a contrast with the \(\tau \rho \iota \gamma \alpha \mu \omicron \omega \) of the Cypria and Stesichorean treatment, and even with the sympathetic picture drawn by Homer. When one casts the mind back to the adolescent mistress of Theseus and mother of Iphigenia, it is hard not to agree broadly, at least, with the verdict of Bowra (p.111): "If S. told stories of this kind about her we can understand that he got into trouble in a place where she was held in high regard and found it prudent to

---

1 Compare IP's \(\kappa \lambda \varepsilon \nu \nu \alpha \,\chi o\rho \alpha \gamma \dot{\alpha} \,\) (44), \(\epsilon \mu \pi \rho \varepsilon \mu \nu \dot{\iota} \) (46), and \(\chi o\rho \varepsilon \omicron \chi \tau \alpha \tau \alpha \) (84) used of Hagesichora, with Helen's titles in Ar. Lys. 1314-15 sup. cit. This analogy was already appreciated by Wilamowitz, Textg. d. gr. lyr. 92.
retract." There may also have been in S's mind a wish to dissociate himself from the myths of an "Argive stamp" which he had retailed in the Helen. It is to be noted that Paus. 2.22.6 places the temple of Eilethyaia which Helen dedicated on giving birth to Iphigeneia at Argos, and adds Ἐτησίχορος ὁ Ἰμεραῖος, κατὰ ταύτα φαίνει Ἀργεῖον ὁ θεός ἡς ἑκὼν εἶναι θυγατέρα Ἰφιγένειαν. Further mythical innovations to appease Sparta's hostility towards Argos have been detected in S's Oresteia. (See further my notes ad locc. ). I would merely question the crudeness of the pressures which Bowra envisages as being applied to S. Doubtless like Pindar he chose that version of a myth which most pleased the particular locality and audience he happened to be visiting (c.f. Lloyd-Jones, JHS 93 (1973) 110). Bowra's thesis has won general acceptance, and it is rendered all the more plausible by the further proofs of S's links with Sparta revealed by a study of the Oresteia, where again the epic tradition seems to have been altered to please Lacedaemonian interests.

Indeed it would be very convenient to suppose that the εἰδώλων actually originated as a local Spartan tradition, and that S. was actively encouraged at Sparta to adopt the idea in verse. For then we would be able to explain the appearance of the motif as early as Hesiod: it had spread past the borders of Lacedaemonia and had penetrated Boeotia, though perhaps in a garbled form which later required S's correction.
No other hypothesis seems to me to explain the phenomenon of the Palinodes as satisfactorily as the idea of a sojourn at Sparta. Kannicht (p.38) claims S. may have known of the cult of the Doric Helen from Sicily or South Italy if he lived in the hey-day of Epizephyrian Locri (c.f. Vallet, Rhégnion et Zancle (Paris 1958) 309-312).¹ But, to say nothing of the other evidence that proclaims a visit to Sparta, why should S. have chosen to insult the Doric deity in his Helen and then abruptly changed tack almost immediately after? Surely some external stimulus, such as Spartan pressure, is required to explain the change. The same consideration rules out the idea that the reaction occurred merely because of the influence of Delphi² or of Doric and Achaean piety which now began to oppose the Homeric tendency to reduce figures like Helen to a human status (so Schmid, Gesch. d. gr. Lit. 1.1.471-2). Such a process would have extended slowly over a long period of time (longer than one poet's lifetime, however expansive): it would not have sprung up cataclysmically between the composition of two poems.

¹Kannicht has now withdrawn this suggestion, as I learn from a letter he sent to Professor Kassel in 1969.
²But Delphi may have played a part if the pseudo-Acro scholia on Horace Odes 1.16 are to be believed: see above p.356.
Precedents for S's εἰδωλον-motif

At first sight there are obviously three precedents for the Palinode's notion of an εἰδωλον which can act as substitute for Helen. These are:

(1) Il. 5.449-453

A rather complex series of events is involved here. Diomedes in the course of his ἀφεσία worsts Aeneas who is then rescued by his mother Aphrodite. She had previously (Il.3.374ff) saved her protégé Paris by wrapping him in a cloud and whisking him away. In the present case she merely holds Aeneas in her garment until she is wounded by Diomedes at which point she lets him fall. But he is taken up by Apollo who enfolds him in a dark cloud and transports him to his temple on Pergamus where Leto and Artemis heal him. But while this healing is done, the Achaeans are wasting their time by fighting over a distracting εἰδωλον of Aeneas which Apollo has left as a substitute on the battlefield:

αὐτὰρ ὁ εἰδωλον τεῦξ' ἀφωρότοξος Ἀπόλλων
αὐτῷ τ' Ἀινείαι ἱκελον καὶ τεύχει τοῖον,
ἀμφι δ' ἂρ' εἰδώλωι Τρώως καὶ δίοι 'Αχαιοι
δηλουν κτλ.

Apollo then spurs on Ares who helps the Trojans by spreading a cloud of darkness over the field. At 512-14 Aeneas himself returns to the frey. Of the several awkward issues raised by this re-entry, Homer cleverly avoids the questions we might have expected his Trojan
comrades to ask (516ff): μετάλλησάν γε μὲν οὖ τι. | οὖ γὰρ
ἐὰν πόνος ἄλλος κτλ. But we are not told (and therefore
not supposed to ask) what happened to the έδώλων or, for
that matter, Ares' darkness.

The two other early instances of an έδώλων are more
straightforward:

(2) Od. 11.601ff

At the end of the Nekuia Odysseus relates how he saw
Sisyphus in the Underworld:

τὸν δὲ μετ’ ἐλεενόντα βῆν Ἡρακλείην,  
έδώλων αὐτός δὲ μετ’ ἀθάνατοις θεοῖς

τέρπεται ἐν θαλήνῃ καὶ ἕχει καλλίσφυρον Ἡβην κτλ  

The manner in which the έδώλων is introduced in a sepa-
rate line almost as if by afterthought may remind us of
our final example:

(3) Hes. fr.23^ 17ff MW

'Ιφιμέδην μὲν σφάξαν εὐκυνῆμιλίδες 'Αχαίοι  
βωμῷ ἐπ’ Ἀρτέμιδος χορεηλακήτου κελαδεινής

ηματί τῷ δὲ νυκτὶ ἀνέπλησον "Ιλιον έίθεω

πολυνήν τειχόμενοι καλλίσφυροφ Άργειῶνής,  

έδώλων αὐτὴν δ’ ἐλαφηθόλος λοχαίρα

δεῖα μᾶλ’ ἅββαζόκες, καὶ ἀμβροσίην ἔρηματεινὴν

cτάξε κατὰ κρήθεν ἵνα ὁι χρώς [έμπε[δ][ο][ς] εἰτη

θὴκεν δ’ ἀθάνατοικαὶ ἀγήρασον ἡμᾶς τὰ πάντα
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For a further example of an εἰδώλον in Hesiod c.f. fr. 260 MW mentioned below p.424.

In all the above cases the expedient of the εἰδώλον allows ιχ to be in a different place while his or her normal functions are carried out.¹ These functions differ considerably in each instance of course, and Heracles is certainly an eccentric example. But the three εἰδώλα have enough in common for us to be able to distinguish them from what we might call the non-technical use of an εἰδώλον as apparition: see for instance what Achilles says after Patroclus' ghost has left him (Il. 23.103-4):

\[ \text{οὐ πάποι ἂν δὲ τίς ἔστι καὶ εἰν 'Αἴδαο ὀδύμωσι}
\text{ψυχῆ καὶ εἰδώλον, ἀτὰρ φρένες σόβα ἐνι πάμπαν.} \]

This is not an εἰδώλον in our special sense, for the real Patroclus is not carrying out his usual rôle elsewhere as is the case with the real Heracles (in our Odyssey passage) who is feasting on Olympus. On the other hand, we might note that Patroclus' εἰδώλον is said to be an exact replica of the hero as he was when alive (Il.23.65ff):

\[ \text{ἦλθε δ' ἐπὶ ψυχὴ Πατροκλῆς δειλοῖο}
\text{πάντ' αὐτῶι μέγεθος τέ καὶ δηματα κάλ' ἔτικενα}
\text{καὶ φωνὴν, καὶ τοῖς περὶ χροῖ εἴματα ἔστο.} \]

One cannot help wondering whether the concept of a ghost

¹Compare Od. 11.210ff, where on failing to clasp his mother's ghost (ψυχῆ) Odysseus asks whether Persephone has sent him an εἰδώλον. His mother's spirit replies ὁδ τι ἐν Περσεφόνεια ... ἀπαφίκει. Scholars regularly ignore this passage in discussing S's precedents, perhaps because the possibility Odysseus raises is proved wrong. But the notion of an εἰδώλον sent by a god to deceive a mortal is obviously relevant to our problem.
revealed here (though sedulously repressed elsewhere in Homer) was the inspiration for Aeneas' εἴδωλον in II·5, οὖν τῇ Ἀλεξανδρίας ἔκελον καὶ τεῦχες τοῖς. But the εἴδωλον of Patroclus belongs to a different category from our specialised example, as does that of Achilles in the Nostoi (Allen p.108 (Proclus): τῶν δὲ περὶ τοῦ Ἀχαμέμνονα ἀπολεόντων Ἀχιλλέως εἴδωλον ἐπιφανεὶν περαταὶ διακωλύον). It could be argued that each of the three εἴδωλα we are now considering contributed at least one element to S's eclectic εἴδωλον. Iphigenia is saved from death, and her aunt from a fate worse than death, by their εἴδωλα and, more important, the idea of an εἴδωλον for a mortal woman makes its mark. Heracles' εἴδωλον supplies the concept of a phantom that vicariously represents its original for a very considerable length of time. When G. Devereux wrote "S's eidolon differs from every (italics mine) Homeric εἰδόλον in being not only solid but above all durable and/or in not being a dream apparition" (p. 207), he must either have forgotten the Odyssean passage or discounted it as an interpolation. But I get the impression that Aeneas' phantom too is pretty solid. In

1In Od. 4·796ff Athene manufactures an εἴδωλον in the shape of Penelope's sister Iphime and sends it to comfort the sleeping wife of Odysseus. This then is a female εἴδωλον but it behaves in all respects like a dream, or like the ghost of Patroclus mentioned overpage. It enters the room through the keyhole, stands over Penelope's head (just like a dream vision) and when Penelope wakes up after it has departed, she rejoices ὡς ὃς ἑναργεὶς δυνατὸν ἐπέστησεν νυκτὸς ἀμολύστη. 
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fact this εἶδωλον is potentially the most significant, even if it seems in other respects strikingly dissimilar. Miss Dale has drawn attention (pp.xxiii-xiv) to a remark\(^1\) on Aen. 2.592 preserved in Servius' commentary ad loc. (ed. Harv. p.464): "phantasma in similitudinem Helenae Paridi datum ... quod etiam Homerum volunt tetigisse subtiliter, ubi Aeneas a Neptuno opposita nube liberatur: ἀμφὶ δ᾿ ἀρ’ εἶδωλον Τρῳς καὶ ὅιοι Ἀχαιοὶ [μάχοντο]." Of course this super-subtle allusion is ludicrous and quite out of the question for Homer, but like Dale one wonders whether much mental ponderings on the line taken out of context may not have given rise to the tradition of an εἶδωλον at Troy. The adaptation of that device to protect Helen's good name will have been the "invention" of Hesiod or S., possibly under the influence of Hes. fr. 260 (vid. inf. p.424) where Zeus uses an εἶδωλον to protect his wife from violation. But the case with Helen is considerably different, since not only is her good name being kept clear from sexual scandal, but she herself is released from the charge of having caused the deaths of thousands of innocent Greeks and Trojans (c.f. Alcaeus 42 LP etc.: see my remarks above pp.247ff). However, apparently early passages may be interpolated, or mislead in more devious ways, and ostensibly late passages may preserve a version of a motif, which extends back to pre-literate times. Such are the presuppositions

\(^{1}\) Its relevance to our problem had already been seen by Robert, Heldensage p.1086 n.7.
of Kannicht, who in the chapter of his Introduction entitled "Typologie des Eidolonmotivs" (pp.33-8) offers a radical-if not revolutionary-reinterpretation of the evidence. His method is to cast doubt on the testimonia I have just examined, and to elevate other passages, hitherto neglected, on the grounds that they contain valuable reflections of early myths.

Let us examine this stimulating new approach, and first of all let us see whether it is right in dismissing the worth of our apparently pre-Stesichorean passages. Examples (2) and (3) are of course inherently suspect, since their very shape suggests that the εἰδωλον idea has been tacked on to a narrative which knew nothing of it. (2) is in fact a desperately unsatisfactory piece of work: in the first instance it occurs within a description of the Hades of King Minos which is grotesquely at odds with its immediate context in the poem (see, most severely, Page, The Homeric Odyssey pp.25-6, and pp.48-9) both in detail (Odysseus is no longer standing on the threshold of the Underworld but strolling about inside) and ideas. And the dichotomy between Heracles' phantom and body is very odd - "ludicrous" Page calls it (p.49 n.6 (4)) and Kannicht is no more flattering (p.37 n.20):

"Dass der Autor ... ein Eidolon im Sinn des epischen Seelenglaubens gemeint hat, wird dadurch unwahrscheinlich, dass ja in αύτός die unversehrte Einheit von Leib und Seele des Vergöttlichten mitgegeben ist." But as Rohde pointed out, the very eccentricity of the concept
makes it impossible to date securely: "Whoever wrote this was practising a little theology on his own account. Such a contrast between a fully-animated "self" possessing the original man's body and soul still united, and a counterfeit presentment of himself (which cannot be his psyche) relegated to Hades, is quite strange both to Homer and to Greek thought of later times." (Psyche (English translation) p.39). Hence it is impossible to deny that S. may have known the passage, and equally impossible to deny that he knew Od. 11.210ff (discussed above p.418 n.1) of which Kannicht says nothing.

Passage (3) is nothing like as suspicious as the Odyssean lines on Heracles, and it is hard to see why Kannicht should seek to stifle it in a foot-note (p.37 n.20) where he remarks that "scheint auch syntaktisch das Muster zu repräsentieren, nach dem der Interpolator (scil. of (2)) verfahren ist." The very form of the legend does clearly indicate that the notion of a rescue by ξίδωλον is some sort of later development: so does the syntax. But I see no obstacle to supposing that the development was already made by the time the Hesiodic passage finally took the shape it has now. And no-one, I imagine, will welcome the unsupported assertion that "Hier ist ξίδωλον offenbar nur noch eine Chiffre für den Begriff der Scheinbarkeit."

Kannicht's case against the two later passages is by no means watertight, and his arguments concerning (1) are

---

1Rohde himself (p.53 n. 39) suggests that (2) is modelled on the Stesichorean ξίδωλον.
weaker still. The very long passage to which II.5.449-453 is ineradicably fixed is far more firmly anchored to its context than are (2) and (3). It could only be wrenched away by an analytical argument of an extreme type unacceptable today. Kannicht is therefore reduced to insisting that (1) cannot mark the invention of the εἰδωλον motif because it displays "ironische Deformation, Verdop pelung und Steigerung vorgegebener Motive" (p.33) and "ist offenbar mit der schon Künstlich genug retardierten Rettungsaktion nur als deren ironische Klimax verbunden." In other words its first appearance must have been un-ironic and normal. The idea that (1) is "eine Deformation des heroischen Schemas" derives from Erbse, Rh. Mus. 104 (1961) 156-189 and Reinhardt's "Die Ilias und Ihr Dichter" (1961) pp.124-137. Well, the Neo-Analytiker school has been unjustly neglected in our country (c.f. M. Willcock, BICS 1974 lff) but I doubt whether its interpretation of the present passage is the best possible advertisement of its approach. There are certainly other ways to explain the εἰδωλον's appearance here. The oralist might hold that this unusual method of divine rescue for a worsted hero replaces the more traditional motif of cloud-envelopment here because that device has already been expended on the climax of the duel between Menelaus and Paris in Il.3. After its conspicuous occurrence there, it can hardly be repeated after so meagre an interval, and therefore the poet improvises that modified version whose most prominent feature is the
ειδωλον. An analyst on the other hand would perhaps maintain that our anomalous ειδωλον is a misunderstanding of a traditional motif due to the lateness of Book 5. They could parallel this by pointing to 356ff of the same book, where Ares leans his spear against a cloud - surely a remodelling of the old concept of the cloud as a means of hiding gods and men. What matters is not that either of these explanations must be shown to be unerringly correct, but that they indicate that there are other (and in my opinion better) ways of clarifying the passage than Kannicht's. And I will welcome any interpretation that dispenses with "Ironie", whose magic wand can seldom have been waved to less purpose than here. All in all the possibility remains that the ειδωλον is used in the Iliadic lines for the first time.

Kannicht's negative assault on the relevance of these pre-Stesichorean instances of the ειδωλον seems to me to have failed. What of his equally fundamental, equally bold, insistence that later sources give useful information about the mythical tradition on which S. drew? Kannicht sets out the following generalisations about these ειδωλον myths and their relation to S's poems (p.37): the ειδωλον was originally a device whereby a goddess was preserved from sexual union with a mortal. The creation of this phantom out of cloud and the protection of the relevant goddess was the work of Zeus, the only natural δημιουργός ειδώλων νεφελοποιητών by virtue of his position as νεφεληγερέτης. Each of these features is compatible
with what we know of S's Palinodes and their contents. And the tendency to avoid the blasphemy inherent in the coupling of a mortal and a goddess is revealed in several passages of Greek literature. These statements on the nature and manufacture of the εἴδωλον are founded on the following excerpts:

(1) Ixion


Σ Eur. Phoen. 1185 (1.375 Schwartz)

(scil. 'Ἰξίων) ἱδὼν τὴν Ὑπας ἧρας ήρας ἁρτής. μὴ φέρουσα δὲ ἡ Ὑπας τὴν μανίαν αὐτοῦ φησὶ τῷ Δίλ· ἐφ' ὄι ἀγανακτήσας οἱ λεύκι βουλόμενος τε γνώναι εἰ γε ἄληθὲς ἔστιν, ἀπείκοσα τῇ Ὑπας νεφέλην, ἦν ἱδὼν ὁ Ἰξίων νομίμας τὴν Ὑπας εὑναὶ μὴ γνωταί αὐτής καὶ ποιεῖ παιδά διψήν κτλ.

(2) Endymion

Hes. fr.260 MW = Σ Ap. Rhod. 4·58 (p.264 16 Wendel)

ἐν δὲ ταῖς μεγάλαις Ἡλόας λέγεται τὸν Ἑνδυμίων ἀνενεχθήναι ὑπὸ τοῦ Δίδες εἰς οὐρανόν, ἐρασθέντα δὲ Ὑπας εἰδώλωι παραλογισθήναι νεφέλης, καὶ διὰ τὸν ἔρωτα ἐκβληθέντα κατελθεῖν εἰς ᾿Αἰδοῦ.
(3) Iasion

(i) original form of old fertility myth:

Hes. Theog. 969ff:

Δημήτηρ μὲν Πλοῦτον ἔγεινατο, διὰ θεᾶν, Ἰασίων ἡμιώ
μυγεῖς ἔραττι φιλότητι νεῖσσι ἐν τριπόλοις κτλ.

(ii) early expurgation: punishment of Iasion:

Od. 5.125ff (125-7A to Hes. Theog. 769-71A)

οδὴ δὴν ἦν ἄπυκτος Ζεῦς, δό μὲν κατέπεφε βαλὼν ἄργητι
κεραυνῷ

(iii) later expurgation: introduction of εἰδωλον-motif:

Hellanicus F. Gr. Hist. 4 F 23: Ἰασίων ... φαέλ
κεραυνωθηναι ... ὑβρίζοντα ἄγαλμα Δημητρος.

Conon F. Gr. Hist. 26 F 1 (xxi): ἄλλῳ μὲν Ἰασίων φάσμα
Δημητρος αἰσχύναι βουληθεὶς ἐκεραυνώθη.¹

Now Kannicht first claims that the original function of
the εἰδωλον was to protect a god from sexual intercourse
with a mortal. Only two goddesses are mentioned in the
sources: Hera and Demeter. The first of these, as wife
of Zeus, is obviously a special case, and the assault upon
her εἰδωλον occurred in Olympus - none of this is relevant

¹Kannicht chooses to blur the main outlines of his case
by also citing Pherecydes F. Gr. Hist. 3 F 34 on the
tale of Procris and Cephalus - where the mysterious
Ναεφάλη may be Procris' lover - and by referring to the
multitudinous variants of the Athamas legend which seem
to agree that the natural mother of Phrixus and Helle was
a divine Ναεφάλη (who in Euripides' Second Phrixus flew
down from the sky and saved her children from their
stepmother's attack: c.f. Hypoth. 32.286ff (Austin p.
103)). This is hardly relevant to his main case and I
omit it from consideration here.
to Helen. Demeter's phantom does seem to have appeared on earth, but it is a late development, more plausibly derived from S's εἴδωλον than vice versa. And notice how the sources do not give this familiar name to it, but call it ἄγαλμα or φάσμα. And none of these εἴδωλα have anything like the long life-span of Helen's. Besides, the wish to stop intercourse between mortal and goddess is not very apposite to Helen's case, since she only became a goddess after her death (see p.393f above) before which event she will presumably have had intercourse fairly regularly with at least one mortal, her husband Menelaus. Kannicht's next argument is that in S. as in the original εἴδωλον myths, Zeus\(^1\) will have devised the phantom of Helen out of cloud-material. A double appropriateness, since νεφέλαι, feminine in gender, can only produce female phantoms (whence Homer's silence, when he misused the motif, as to the substance from which Aeneas' εἴδωλον was made) and Zeus is the cloud-gatherer par excellence. None of the testimonia which explicitly refer to S's use of the εἴδωλον say it was made out of cloud: which is odd, and awkward (but not fatal) for Kannicht's thesis. There are several allusions to Helen's εἴδωλον as cloud-composed which may conceivably derive from the Palinodes: latest and least reliable are Apollod. Ep. 3.5: ἐνιοί δὲ φασίν Ἐλένην μὲν ὑπὸ Ἑρμοῦ κατὰ βούλησιν Δίὸς κομίσθηναι

\(^1\)I see that Seeliger suggests (without arguing the point) that "ein von Zeus geschaffenes Scheinbild an ihrer Stelle nach Troja kam" (p.8: my italics).
κλαπείσαν εἰς Ἀλυππόν καὶ δοθείσαν Πρωτεῖ τῷ βασιλεῖ τῶν Ἀλυπτίων φυλάττειν, Ἀλέξανδρον δὲ παραγενέσθαι εἰς Τροίαν πεποιημένον ἐκ νεφῶν ἔδωλου ἔχοντα καὶ Ἑρ. 6·30: κατὰ τινὰς εὐθύςκεται παρὰ Πρωτεῖ τῷ τῶν Ἀλυπτίων βασιλεῖ Ἐλένη, μέχρι τότε ἔδωλον ἐκ νεφῶν ἔσχηκότος τοῦ Μενελάου.¹

If these two passages were the only evidence for a cloud-phantom in S. we could securely dismiss them as contaminated with later treatments (this is possibly suggested by the way they make Proteus "King of Egypt") and different legends of νεφελοποιητα ἔδωλα. But they have on their side a witness who stands head and shoulders above them, whose testimony we ourselves have already accepted as an infallible reflection of S's handling of the story:

Euripides. Observe these extracts from his Helen:

704ff:

Με. οὐχ ἢδε (scil. Ἐλένη), πρὸς Ὀδὴν δ᾽ ἦμεν ἡπατημένοι, νεφέλης ἀγαλμ' ἔχοντες ἐν χυτῶν

750:

νεφέλης ἄρ' ἄλλως ἔχομεν πόνους πέρι;

1219:

Α. von Premerstein (Philol. 55 (1896) 645) seems to have been the first scholar to suggest that the two passages from Apollodorus derive from S. If this is right our poet may be one (or all?) of the ἔνιοι and τινὲς mentioned as sources: for the idiom see p. 373. Of course Apollodorus may here be following Hesiod, as he so often did.

¹A. von Premerstein (Philol. 55 (1896) 645) seems to have been the first scholar to suggest that the two passages from Apollodorus derive from S. If this is right our poet may be one (or all?) of the ἔνιοι and τινὲς mentioned as sources: for the idiom see p. 373. Of course Apollodorus may here be following Hesiod, as he so often did.
The claim that Euripides has conflated a cloud-built phantom from other legends with S’s treatment will ring rather hollow coming from one who has already accepted so much in this play as an unadulterated reflection of the Palinodes. And now as Kannicht’s whole theory is approaching the threshold of probability, and I am standing there ready to welcome it, disaster strikes and it disintegrates at the seams. For closely bound up with his idea of the εἶδωλον as νεφελοποιήτων is the concomitant picture of νεφεληγερέτα Ζεύς as its maker. Euripides preserves the Stesichorean cloud-phantom: who does he say created it?

“Ἡρα δὲ μεμφητικ’ οὖνεκ’ οὖ νικά θεάς,
ἐξηνέμωσε τάµ’ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ λέξην,
διδωτι δ’ οὖν ἔμι’, ἀλλ’ ὅμοιόχας’ ἔμοι
εἶδωλον ἐπινοοῦν οὐρανοῦ ξυνθεῖτ’ ἄπο,
Πριάμου τυράννου παιδί ... (Hel. 31-5)

Which is only what we should expect. It is Hera, queen of the gods, who has been insulted by the Judgement of Paris, and she would naturally seek to thwart the hated son of Priam at every step. In the Cypria she drove the fleeing couple off course (Allen p.103 (Proclus)). In Euripides— and, we presume, S. — she goes one better, and Paris is prevented from so much as placing his greasy oriental hands on the prize promised by Aphrodite. As Menelaus ruefully comments at Eur. Hel. 708: “Ἡρας τάδ’
ξρα καὶ θεόν τρισσών ξρις. Of course the phantom must be Hera's handiwork: Zeus has nothing to do with it. His role in the Ixion and Endymion myths is completely different because there he is concerned to protect his own wife from priapic mortals. But in the case of Helen, it is Hera who has a special interest, as is stressed throughout Euripides' Helen (c.f. 241ff: ἄδει λυκευτὸς θρόνος | Διὸς ὡμαγάλισμα σεμνὸν | Ἡρα τὸν ὕμειον ἔπεμψε Μαλάδος γόνον and 670-82). And let no-one propose that Euripides has followed S. in every other respect but has deserted him in this. What could be the rhyme or reason behind arbitrarily changing this single detail and writing Hera for Zeus?¹

From the débris of Kannicht's brave new theory what emerges? The Stesichorean phantom of Helen was conceivably cloud-built (although it is still odd that none of our testimonia mentions this fact) but if this is the case νεφέλαι were chosen not because of any link between their gender and the requisite sex of the εἰδώλον, as Kannicht fondly imagines,² but because "they suggest what is vain,

¹Kannicht's claim that in S. it was Zeus who fashioned the εἰδώλον is repeated in Vol.2 of his commentary p.30 n.12 with no new arguments in its favour, but on the contrary accompanied by references to those very Euripidean lines which refute it.

²In my above critique of Kannicht I have, of course, been excessively kind. I could have pointed out that p.426f's list of passages which represent the εἰδώλον as made from a νεφέλη is far from impressive. The lines quoted are from Euripides' Helen: 1.34 of the same play says the phantom was manufactured οὐράνος ... ἄντ. 1.584 calls the εἰδώλον's material αἰθήρ (the substance of which the sky is made: c.f. [Ar.] de mundo 392A5: οὐράνος καὶ ἀστρων οὐσίαν αἰθέρα καλοδύμων). This is all very similar to
empty, deceptive, and insubstantial" (Dover, Clouds p. lxviii). And these seem appropriate adjectives with which to conclude my survey of Kannicht's theory.

---

2 the Bacchae's story of a substitute for the new-born Dionysus whom Hera wished to cast out of heaven: ζεύς δ' ἀντειμηνήκας' οία δὴ θεός. ἤ δέ μέρος τι τοῦ χθόν' ἐγκυκλουμένου | αἰθέρος, ἔθηκε τὸν ὁμηρον ἐκδιδόος (291ff: unfortunately a lacuna veils the end of the story: see Dodds ad loc.). If Kannicht wishes to maintain that νεφέλη is not very different from αἰθέρ or οὐρανός he must swallow a bitter pill: the severance of the link between the gender of the cloud and its phantom. For Dionysus, despite certain appearances to the contrary, was male.
The exact nature of the work from which this fragment is extracted need not detain us now. Instead, we can turn to examine the implications of its contents.

1 [μέν] φέτα

this same verb is used of another poetical rebuke, by Corinna 664 P (a): μέμφομαι δέ κη λιγούραν | Μουρίδας

ωνόματι βανά φοσ | c' ἐβα Πινδάροι πὸτ ξειν.

7f διηττάλ γάρ εἰς πα | λινωδις(ται δια)λάττουσαι

The participle seems to me to convey unmistakable overtones of separateness which are confirmed by the later citations of the two opening lines of the two separate poems. Kannicht's interpretation (p.30) that διαλάττων οδιαφέρων (c.f. LSJ sv iv) with a latent antithesis to e.g. ὁμοειδῆς or κοινὸς is tendentiously designed to hide these overtones but certainly does not exclude them.

8f: καὶ ἐκτὸς (τ)ην (c) μὲν(η) ἀφην ... τῆς δὲ

---

1 For speculation c.f. Page p.1; Davison, J.H.S. 85 (1965) 197-8 and "Atti del XImo Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia" (Milan 1965) 96ff. Most weight will probably be attached to the guess of Rudolf Pfeiffer (A History of Classical Scholarship 1.222): "I am pretty confident that it should be regarded as a fresh specimen of that earlier literary form Ἠπεὶ τοῦ δεινα which continued to be used beside the developed ὑπόμνημα. The interweaving of biographical material and problems with the interpretation of selected passages of texts, often starting from long lemmata, is typical of this form: typical also are the references to Peripatetic authorities" etc. So too, independently, E.G. Turner, Greek Papyri: an Introduction (1968) p.114.
The correction suggested by Fraenkel and West (ap. Lloyd-Jones' review of PMG in CR 14 (1964) 18: see too Merkelbach and West's Fragmenta Hesiodea p.176) is palmary: for another proof of the scribe's carelessness see the haplography in 8. On the οὖ (ή) ἄρχῃ formula in general c.f. E. Nachmanson, Der griechische Buchtitel (Göteborg 1941 repr. Darmstadt 1969) 38-49. (Lloyd-Jones reports the correction as τῇ ἰης μὲν ἄρχῃ, Merkelbach and West, and Fraenkel's own copy of P.M.G. (preserved in the Ashmolean Library) have τῇς μὲν η ἄρχῃ. Either formula is possible).

11: The original sequence of letters on the papyrus provides yet further evidence of scribal inattentiveness - simple repetition of the third and fourth letters in - πηρε - and there is no need to follow Lloyd-Jones (C.R. 15 (1965) 71) in supposing that a gold-winged Eros was haunting the scribe's subconscious.

15f: παρὰ τῷ Πρωτείν καταμένειαι
For the meaning of the verb here (not "remained behind" (scil. behind Paris) but "lodged, resided with") c.f. Eubulus fr.21 (Kock): ἐσέλει δένει μεσοῦ παρ' αὐτοῖς καταμένειν ἐπισίτιος (quoted by Dale p.xxii n.3).

It was formerly argued that Proteus must be a post-Stesichorean invention (so e.g. Schmid G.G.L. 2·1·476). Several ingenious reconstructions of Helen's whereabouts during the Trojan War are rendered obsolete by our new
discovery. On the impossibility of defining further the identity of the Stesichorean Proteus (Homer's Old Man of the Sea? Herodotus' King of Egypt?) see below p.454f.

Only those with an axe to grind would disagree with Page in his ed. pr. (pp 35-6): "It looks as though Chamaeleon is the authority not only for the quotations from the two Palinodes, but also for the statement that there were two Palinodes (and presumably for the information about their contents)." Woodbury (p.164) deviously argues that it is not certain that our commentator is drawing directly on Chamaeleon after the mention of his name in 12 and that he may have had no independent copy of S's works, so that the two opening lines may merely be taken from Chamaeleon's citation. Even if this were so, doubt would only be cast on Helen's residence with Proteus (for whose appearance in S. there is much corroborative evidence elsewhere: see above pp.378ff).

It thus follows that we are faced with an apparent contradiction between the vast majority of other writers who speak as if there were only one Palinode, and Chamaeleon who categorically states that there were two, and quotes the opening line of each. Solutions divide themselves

---

1 e.g. Vürtheim (p.86) wanted Helen on the Isle of Leuce during the Trojan War. Welcker placed her on the Isle of the Blessed (Kl. Schr. 1) Schmid G.G.L. I.1 p.476 Mancuso and Ghali-Kahil pp 288-9 wisely maintained an agnostic line. Seeliger (p.9), von Premerstein (Philol. 55 (1896) p.646), Mayer (pp 7-9), and Robert (Bild und Lied p.25, Gr. Heldens. p.1086 n.3) actually anticipated Egypt.
into two main groups: some support Chamaeleon against the rest; others accept the testimony of those earlier and later writers and are sceptical of what Chamaeleon says. As we shall see presently, the problem is not quite so simple as this, but whatever side we choose, we must still find convincing explanations for the extraordinary error of the other.

(1) Our first alternative is to reject Chamaeleon's testimony. Scholars have on the whole taken this papyrus discovery a good deal more calmly than they did that of 1952 (P. Oxy. 2256 fr.3) which revealed to a world reluctant to accept it the news that the Supplices was not Aeschylus' earliest extant play. The frantic rush for improbable hypotheses and extravagant stratagems to avoid the obvious which marred that occasion has not been repeated on a large scale. Nevertheless, at least one scholar has showered upon Chamaeleon that mixture of suspicion and contempt which is usually reserved for those who dare to ripple the surface of classical studies by introducing new and unexpected facts. Since this scholar's treatment has been praised by the normally reliable Gerber (Euterpe p.150) it seems worth while to check again Chamaeleon's credentials.

How much do we know about Chamaeleon's credibility? For the fragments of his work περὶ Ἐτησίχορον see Wehrli, Die Schule des Aristoteles 9 (1957) 55-6, and for a brief biography ib. p.69. Bowra (2) p.87 puts the facts well when he characterises him as "a slightly ambiguous figure"
who seems to have possessed "a taste for gossip about men of letters and to have purveyed it when he did not himself believe it." But it is surely important that in the case of Athenaeus 13.599C (= Anacreon 355 P = Chamaeleon 26 (Wehrli)) our man merely quotes others to the effect that Anacreon wrote a love poem to Sappho, without giving his own authority to that fantastic anecdote, while in Athenaeus 13.599D (= Cham. 26 (Wehrli): c.f. Maas, Sokrates 8 (1920) 23-4 = Kl. Schr. 188) he is rightly sceptical about the attribution of some lines to Sappho: Χαμαελέων δ' ἐν τῷ περὶ Σαπφοῦς καὶ λέγειν τινάς φησιν εἰς αὐτὴν πεποιηθέναι ὑπὸ Ἀνακρέοντος τάδε .... καὶ τὴν Σαπφῶν δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν ταῦτα φησιν εἰπεῖν .... ὅτι δὲ οὐκ ἔστι Σαπφοῦς τοῦτο τὸ ἄλκμα παντὶ που δῆλον.

But it is time to hear the voice of the prosecution: Woodbury (pp 161ff) notes that Chamaeleon is our source for the splendid fragment of the encomium for Xenophon of Corinth (Pindar fr. 122 (Sn) = Cham. 31 (Wehrli)) which makes charming reference to the religious prostitutes of that city. Woodbury concludes that Chamaeleon had "a taste for sensation." But even if he did, does that decrease the authenticity and utility of this particular Pindaric fragment? And what is so lurid about his reference to S's two Palinodes? The counsel for the prosecution then deduces from the two fragments of lyric noted above that Chamaeleon "followed the Peripatetic practice of spinning biographical webs out of the texts.
of his subjects' poems". The most perfunctory glance at the words of Athenaeus quoted above will reveal to the unprejudiced that Woodbury's summary is the perfect antithesis of the truth, and again the relevance of the charge to the non-biographical fragment about S's two Palinodes escapes me. Our learned counsel now proceeds, via the unfounded assertion that Chamaeleon was "interested in literary polemics rather than in bibliography "to some web-spinning of his own. Here is a representative cross-section of the mesh (p.162): "[Chamaeleon] may well be applying this name [Palinode] for some reason, to another poem. Perhaps he was concerned with poems which take the form of a revision, or a retraction, of a well-known myth. He may have known a poem in which S. expressed his horror of a myth that he had begun to tell (e.g. Pind. Ol. 1, Nem. 7). Perhaps he found in "palinode" a polemical or depreciatory connotation which may be found in some uses of πάλιν." A futile show of parallels follows. But what jury in its right mind would prefer such flimsy speculation, with its dreary sequence of "may's" and "perhaps's", to the solid evidence of 193 P? The robust commonsense of Page seems in this respect unassailable (p.36): "We have no particular reason to distrust the new evidence: Chamaeleon wrote a book about S. (Athen. 14 620c), and is not likely to have said that there were two Palinodes, quoting the opening lines of both, unless the fact was manifest enough; we at least are not in a position to discredit or even to dispute his testimony -
he had certain poems in front of him, we have not." Indeed so. When Chamaeleon's antagonist concludes (p. 164) that the peripatetic's "purpose is neither sufficiently bibliographical nor sufficiently scholarly to compel belief", we may decide that his words have a more accurate application nearer home, but we will not find their use for Chamaeleon at all just.¹

Woodbury's argument is a crude exercise in character-assassination, a bellow of rage against the appearance of evidence which upsets lovingly nurtured preconceptions. It is possible to doubt Chamaeleon's testimony in a subtler way. Perhaps because of Alexandrian pedantry, or a desire to claim an advantage in knowledge over his

¹When Chamaeleon is able to quote the opening lines of the two Palinodes, we must needs resort to strange contortions before we can cast doubt on his assertion that there were two poems. This principle will also put paid to Kannicht's extraordinary suggestion (p.29), with which Woodbury would presumably agree (p.171 n.30), that if the two quoted lines are invocations to the Muses (see above pp337ff) they need not be from the opening of their respective songs: S. could have repeated his initial appeal to mark his realisation of his former folly. Of course it is not hard to present parallels for such an internal appeal to the Muses (e.g. Iliad 2.484-93, II.218-20 = 15.508-10 = 16.112-13; Bacch. 5.176ff, Pind. Pyth. 1.58-9, Paean 6.54-8). But, granted our incomplete state of knowledge, why do Chamaeleon the disservice of imputing to him that state of advanced idiocy required to make him mistake such an internal invocation for the beginning of a poem? It is not as if we had any reason to suppose that Chamaeleon was stimulated into this stupendous error by, for instance, an Alexandrian division of a single Palinode into two books, with the dividing-point occurring at an important second invocation to the Muses: the Alexandrian editors did not divide the Iliad into books at any of its numerous internal invocations to the Muses: why should they do so to "the Palinode"? Of course the citing of separate poems by their first lines was a well-established practice: see above p.432.
colleagues, Chamaeleon has exaggerated a trivial division within one Palinode between two parts or at most two books into the statement that there were two Palinodes: one might cite in support the Phaedrus' odd phrase μᾶςων τὴν καλομένην Παλινωδίαν (see above p.359).

Or, inspired by very similar motives, he might have sought to foist an alien title upon a poem that did not merit it, as Miss Dale supposes (p.xxi): "One may reasonably guess that this [the poem of Plato Phaedr. 243A] was the earlier, the grand Recantation, directed full-tilt against Homer and the tradition, and that Chamaeleon was rather proud of his acumen in elevating to the status of a second palinode another poem upholding the same view and objecting to a reference of Hesiod's on the old lines."

All these views have it in common that they attribute the discrepancy between Chamaeleon's account and that of most others to Chamaeleon himself. No longer is anything as vulgar as an error attributed to him, but rather a hypersensitive if not finickity distinction between two closely-related parts. The term "second Palinode" is illicitly extended to a section of the Palinode proper or even a completely different poem. This view does have its advantages: it explains why Chamaeleon's view came as such a shock to us: it was an idiosyncratic distinction or assimilation, soon discarded by everyone else in antiquity as a perverse anomaly from a pedantic scholar.

We must now state that Chamaeleon is not quite the sole
voice crying in the wilderness which he was at first taken
to be. Davison (p.203) noted that Conon talked of two
δυνοτ to Helen, and in 1973 G. Devereux found a reference
to "palinodes" in two interdependent testimonial from the
Christian Fathers which he claimed had been so far "over-
looked." So they had, though not perhaps in the sense
he intended. He himself overlooked the brief allusion to
all three passages on p.219 of Bergk's Poetae Melici.
See too L. Alfonso, Le "palinodie" di Stesicoro nella
tradizione cristiana, τιμητικον αφερωμα Κωνσταντίνω Ι.
Μεσεντητη (Athens 1972) 13ff for these passages (and
others in the Church Fathers mentioning only one Palinode).
Why scholars should have so sedulously ignored these
apparent corroborations of P. Oxy. 2506, why Page, for
instance, should claim (p.35) "The information given here
is new and surprising: there are many allusions to S's
Palinode from Plato onwards, but never an indication of
two Palinodes", or Sisti (p.303) should talk of "L'asso-
luto silenzio della tradizione su un particolare cosi
importante come l'esistenza di due carmi palinodici", I
do not know. But if their silence implies doubt as to
the reliability of the witnesses, then I am sympathetic.
Hippolytus is dependent on Irenaeus, which leaves only
Conon and the latter. And, to be frank, their names do
not inspire us with instant respect.¹ Why should they
of all people have stumbled upon a truth that eluded

¹On Irenaeus' knowledge of Greek literature see R.M.
Grant, Harvard Theological Review 42 (1949) 41ff.
Plato? Is it not likelier that they have misread some of the secondary sources available to us? Dio Chrysostom's ἐν τῇ ὑστεροῦ ὁδη, Philostratus' τῷ προτέρῳ λόγῳ, Maximus of Tyre's τὴν εἰμποροθεν ὁδη, might all have led the unwary into error, to say nothing of the "per carmina" and διὰ τῶν ἔπων wherewith our friends Hippolytus and Irenaeus themselves refer to the single Helen. It would indeed be a coincidence if they together with Conon arrived by mistake at exactly the same conclusion as Chamaeleon deliberately presented as the truth. But it is not a coincidence to stretch our powers of belief. I conclude that Conon et al. provide at the best scarcely needed support for Chamaeleon; at worst they are irrelevant. Chamaeleon's own statement, substantiated as it is by direct quotes from the two relevant poems, is on a quite different level of existence. Once we have accepted that there were two Palinodes, we still have to surmount the problem of why the majority of ancient sources talk merely of one. Few will be convinced by Sisti's ingenious claim that these sources really do refer to two poems, and that the single work mentioned by most authors is sometimes the First, sometimes the Second Palinode, though no-one ever happens to mention the two together. Nor do I find much to recommend in Devereux's casually thrown out suggestion (p.208) that "some of the many relevant texts speak of a retraction (palinode), others - imitating perhaps both Gorgias and Isocrates - speak of an encomium of Helen.
Perhaps S. "cured" his first attack of hysterical blindness by retracting his earlier accusations and his second attack by writing a praise of Helen." As so often in the treatment of testimonia on this subject, an hypothesis is here founded on what is in all likelihood a mere coincidence. Devereux himself notes that Irenaeus clearly considers the hymnising of Helen as part of the Palinodes. Hence we are driven inevitably to the solution offered by Page (p.36): "The fact that post-Alexandrian writers speak as if there were only one Palinode is open to the further possible explanation that only one of the two was extant in the later period: but it seems most reasonable to conclude that two Palinodes were in existence, of which one was more obviously a Recantation of the Slander, more directly related to it, and specially worthy of the name "The Palinode"; whether both Palinodes were still extant at the time of our Commentary, we cannot tell."
HERODOTUS AND HELEN IN EGYPT

Hdt. 2.112-120: the successor of King Pheros, Herodotus relates, was an ἄνηρ Μεμφίτης called Proteus in the Greek tongue, whose splendid τέμενος south of the temple of Ptah-Hephaestus was set in the middle of the Camp of the Tyrians where dwelt Phoenicians from that city. Within the temenos was a temple to Ἑλένη Ἀφροδίτη. And now let Herodotus himself take up the tale for a while: συμβάλλωμαι δὲ τοῦτο τὸ ἱρὸν εἶναι Ἑλένης τῆς Τυνόδαρεω, καὶ τὸν λόγον ἀκηκῶς ὡς διαίτησι Ἑλένη παρὰ Πρωτέι καὶ ἐὰ καὶ διὶ "Ἑλένης" Ἀφροδίτης ἐπώνυμὸν ἔστι. δει γὰρ ἄλλα Ἀφροδίτης ἱρά ἔστι, οὐδ᾿ ἄλλο "Ἑλένης" ἐπικαλέται. ἔλεγον δὲ μοι οἱ ἱρέες ἱστορέουσι τὰ περὶ Ἑλένην γενέσθαι δὲ. Sadly, there is not enough space to reproduce H's account in toto: but its outline is familiar enough. Paris and Helen were driven off course to Egypt as they tried to reach Troy, and they came ashore by a temple οἱ Ἡρακλεῖς whither fled some of Paris' slaves and denounced Paris' crime to the priests and Thonis the keeper of this mouth of the Nile. He sent the guilty couple together with their possessions and suppliant attendants to Proteus at Memphis, and Proteus getting the truth from the suppliant slaves rather than Paris, treated the unfortunate son of

1The literature on this topic is too vast for me to attempt a bibliography. Preliminary bearings in RE 23.951-3, to which add K. Fritz, Die gr.Geschichtsschreibung 1 (1967) Text pp 162ff, in spite of his bizarre silence about 193 Π on p.165.
Priam to a lengthy homily: if it were not for Proteus' moral qualms against killing any stranger forced ashore on Egyptian soil, Paris' sins against hospitality, his theft of wife and possessions, would have received harsher punishment. As it was, Paris and his men were ordered to quit Egypt within three days while Helen was kept behind by Proteus. (At this point H. inserts a reference to Od. 4.227ff, 351-2, which he interprets as proof that Homer too knew of this story). Then H. resumes with the detail that the priests claimed to have received information about the sequel and the sack of Troy from Menelaus himself. Arrived before the walls of Troy, and told by its inhabitants that neither Menelaus' wife nor his possessions were anywhere but in Egypt, the Greeks, not surprisingly, were incredulous. Only when they had sacked the city and discovered the truth did Menelaus hurry off to Proteus who gave him hospitality, his wife unharmed, and all his possessions. But being detained by contrary winds, Menelaus sacrificed two Egyptian children and then eluded escape in the direction of Libya. The priests of Ptah claimed to know for certain everything in the above tale that took place in Egypt, and the rest they had ascertained by enquiry. Or so says H., who concludes by approving the whole story on the grounds of his own special rationalism: for who would have sacrificed Troy and its inhabitants γυναικὸς οἶνες; H. has woven a tangled web here and the numerous later discussions have done nothing to make it easier to unravel.
Others must decide whether this consideration has influenced my choice of a solution that cuts rather than unwinds the knot. The revelation that S. had Helen stay with Proteus in Egypt during the Trojan War has mercifully resigned most earlier disquisitions on H's treatment to a welcome oblivion. No longer are we at liberty to suppose that the whole concept of Helen's residence with the Egyptian Proteus was the fanciful brain-child of Herodotus or the Egyptian priests. Much-merited obsolescence has fallen upon theories such as Mayer's (pp 12ff) or Vürthelm's (pp 67ff) which argued that if S. had deposited Helen in Egypt H. would have mentioned him rather than the Egyptian priests as his source, especially when he is so keen to cite Archilochus, Sappho, Alcaeus, Anacreon, Simonides and Pindar for information, wherefore "Helenas Aufenthalt in Aegypten ist eine nach-stesichorische Erfindung" (Vürtheim p.71). Before we bid these theories farewell however, we should make a rigorous mental note, for methodology's sake, of the principles which led them to the wrong conclusion.

It seems to be the agreed view of modern scholarship, in the light of 193 P, that H's tale represents "Eine pragmatisierte und rationalisierte Neufassung der Eidolonversion des S" (Kannicht p.41). But the exact implications of

---

1Every now and then one stumbles upon a scholar who is naive enough still to maintain that H. cannot be dependent on S. because he omits the εἰδωλον from his account! Jouan (p.192 n.3) is one such innocent; Vürtheim (p.65) another.
this conclusion have not been explored with much vigour. Has H. achieved the rationalisation ἐπ’ ἑωτοῦ and did Memphis priests have no part to play despite categorical statements to the contrary? Miss Dale (and, I suspect, most other scholars) cannot bring herself to omit them: "H. makes no mention of S. That is not surprising, since undoubtedly the most memorable thing in that story was the ἐξωλον, and it is not in H's manner to argue against fantastications of that sort ... but the story as a whole he attributes to the Egyptian priests at Memphis. It is difficult to know just what to make of this, but certainly the circumstantial detail of the account of Paris' adventures in Egypt which led to his appearance before the king at Memphis strongly suggests a local tradition" (pp xviii-xix). I would be surprised if most scholars did not in their heart of hearts agree. But the imponderables raised by this solution are legion. As Miss Dale notes, the priests - according to H.- "spun him a circumstantial tale (one would dearly like to know in what language and in response to what leading questions" (p.xviii). But problems of translation and interpretation between H. and these priests, and the extent to which H. prejudiced their account, are only a few of the awkward issues aroused. Were the Egyptians (or at least their priests at Memphis) really so thoroughly acquainted with a current Greek version about Helen and Proteus as this theory supposes? How did they pick it up? Was it S's version, and if so did they know it directly or at secondhand? And if at
second hand, did the Egyptians suppress the εἰδωλον or did H?¹

One turns with spinning head from these crucial (and unanswerable) questions. Let us try to attain a firm purchase in the actual narrative which H. sets before us. It is often asserted (e.g. Kannicht pp 46ff) that this narrative is definitely pro-Egyptian and anti-Greek in bias, and that consequently it must have an Egyptian origin: H. has (for reasons unknown) retained the colouring the priests injected into the tale though it is irrelevant to his purpose. The fact of the tale's bias must be obvious even to the blind: it contrasts Egyptian kindness to strangers with the ingratitude towards a host displayed first by the Asiatic Paris and then by the Greek Menelaus. Proteus studiously stresses that Egyptians never kill strangers, not even the loathsome Paris: how unlike, we are meant to think, how very unlike, the later behaviour of Menelaus when detained in Egypt by storms: ready to wield the knife upon the first two Egyptian children that lie to hand. None of this can be denied. Nor can the purpose of the pro-Egyptian bias: it is intended to combat

¹Kannicht too realises this problem (p.48): "Wie gross sein Anteil am Zustandekommen der dann vorgelegten Version gewesen ist, d.h. ob er den Ägyptern durch gezielte Fragen bestimmte Antworten insinuert hat, ist nicht zu sagen." He reserves this fundamental remark till the end of his lengthy discussion. Not surprisingly. Since the uncertainty cannot be resolved, his (and everyone else's) belief in the existence of a separate Egyptian tradition on Helen is overshadowed by a gigantic question-mark. If the question were posed at the very beginning of the discussion, it would be impossible to take seriously much of what followed.
tales with the opposite slant which present the Greeks as humane and civilised, the Egyptians as murderous and lustful barbarians. As Kannicht has shown at length, these anti-Egyptian tales divide into two groups:

(1) The Egyptians as murderers: Busiris

c.f. Hdt. 2.45 and more briefly Pherecydes F. Gr. Hist. 3 F 17: (scil. Ἡρακλῆς) ἀφικνεῖται ἐπὶ τὸν Νεῖλον εἰς Μέμφιν παρὰ Βοῦσιρίν τὸν Ποσειδόνος, ὡν κτείνει ... πρὸς τῷ βωμῷ τοῦ Δίου ἐνθα ἐξενοκτόνουν.

With Pherecydes' ἐξενοκτόνουν compare Hdt. 2.115 and 119.

(2) The Egyptians as barbarians: Thonus

c.f. Hellanicus F. Gr. Hist. 4 F 153: ὁ θῶνος βασιλέως ἦν τοῦ Κανώβου καὶ τοῦ Ἡρακλείου στόματος, ὥς πρὶν μὲν ἠδὲν Ἐλένην ἐφιλοτιμεῖτο Μενέλαον, τῶν δὲ αὐτῆς ἐπεχείρη ἑξεκείθη. ὁ γυνὸς Μενέλαος ἀναίρετο αὐτὸν ὃ δεῖν ἐπὶ πόλις θῶνις ὀνόμασε.

Contrast H's insistence that Menelaus was given back to Helen, whom ἀπαθέα κακῶν ἀπέλαμε.

Kannicht and others have assumed that these considerations prove the Egyptian origin of the tale. They are well aware that besides Egyptian elements the story contains a large amount of Greek material, but explain this by retorting that it is after all an "ostentative Antwort" to a biased Greek original. This is hardly convincing: in reality the Greek elements are too widespread and ubiquitous, and leave only a small space for the supposed Egyptian retouching. A crucial argument here involves the detail of Menelaus' sacrifice of two Egyptian children.
to appease the winds: surely this is a doublet of his brother's sacrifice of his own daughter at Aulis when his fleet was penned-up for precisely the same reasons? And would this parallel occur to anyone but a Greek? The significance of the sacrifice-motif is seen by Detlev Fehling, in his fundamental reassessment of this whole episode (Die Quellenangaben bei Herodot (1971) pp 46ff). His explanation is bold, brilliant, and, I think, correct: "eine griechische Parallel auch eine griechische Quelle anzeigt ... es ist also nichts anderes möglich, als dass die ganze Geschichte von Herodot selbst stammt" (pp.48-9). Once we accept this, a whole brood of perplexing problems dissolves. No longer need we puzzle our heads as to whether H. had previously told the priests what he knew of the Egyptian Helen before they unleashed their account, and if so why he treats their tale as quite new. No longer must we vainly speculate on the extent of Egyptian knowledge of Greek literature and traditions. We are liberated from the necessity of explaining why Herodotus, although ostensibly uninterested in Egyptian and Greek polemics and counter-polemics, nevertheless preserved them intact in his retelling. Besides, as Fehling points out (p.49), the whole idea of a tale invented by the Greeks but

1Kannicht disagrees and sees the sacrifice of Egyptian children as a "tendenziöse Umdeutung" of the innocent sacrifice recommended to Menelaus by Proteus in Od. 4. 472-85 (= 576-86). If true, this would merely reformulate the argument in different terms: for what Egyptian could be expected to know the Odyssey so well as to transform this very intimate and minor detail from it?
containing a bias injected by the Egyptians is absurd. Are we to imagine that H. told the Egyptians a pro-Greek tale to which the resourceful orientals immediately replied by retelling it with an opposite slant? And that H. in all innocence repeated this essentially Greek tale as an Egyptian yarn without realising what had happened? We need not be intimidated from accepting Fehling's theory by H's bold mention of the temple to Εὐινή 'Αφοσώτη. This is certainly meant to imply personal autopsy and research, but it need not. It was an easy inference that an area which contained Phoenician residences would also contain a temple to Astarte ("the foreign Hathor"). There needs no travelling Greek come from the East to tell us this. That H. was perfectly capable of inventing the bias of a tale as well as the tale itself has been amply demonstrated by Fehling. That the bias here is pro-Egyptian should surprise no-one. ψιλοπροφορος is what Plutarch calls him (de Herodoti Malignitate (Mor. 857A)) and this attractive sympathy is proved by his writings and partially explained by his birth-place. (See Meiggs and Lewis, A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions 32 (A Halicarnassian Law) and the commentary ad loc. (pp.71-2)).

The notion that H. himself introduced the bias - already accepted in principle by those who supposed that he retained the priests' bias because sympathetic to it - also allows us to dispense with the unattractive picture of a naïve and gullible simpleton so beloved by How and Wells (who quote (1.44) with approval Mure's remark: "it
could hardly fail that a man who believed such stories, would become the butt of humorous or malicious persons.

But so far from being at the mercy of every yarn-spinning Egyptian, H. was, in Fehling's words, "ein gelassener und welterfahrener Skeptiker", and the same scholar rightly says of his invented Proteus-logos: "diese Dinge sind für ihn ein Teil seiner illusionslosen Darstellung menschlichen Verhaltens."

Although H. can be said to have invented the Proteus-logos as it now stands in his text, he will not have fabricated it out of thin air. Now that we possess 193 P and can see that according to both poet and historian Helen was not at Troy but with Proteus in Egypt while war raged round Ilium's towers, it is all but impossible to avoid the conclusion that H. is conveying a rationalised version of the εἴσωλον in S's Palinodes.  

The only strong objection to this idea is Sisti's (p.306 n.1). He believes that H. follows S's First Palinode except for the εἴσωλον and the conversion of Proteus into a king, but he thinks Menelaus' arrival in Egypt after the sack of Troy in order to get back Helen and her κτήματα cannot be from this Palinode because Tzetzes on Lycephron 820 (2.262 Scheer) says that the Hellenistic poet's description of Menelaus' wanderings derives from Herodotus, while on 113 (2.59 Scheer) he attributes to S. Proteus' gift of the εἴσωλον to Paris: if both elements occurred in S. why does Tzetzes not say so? But those of us who have no faith in the value of Tzetzes' testimony on 113 will find no such contradiction: they will conclude that Tzetzes was wrong there but right on 820, although he does not happen to trace the story's treatment back beyond H.

It is of course conceivable that H. simply used the versions of Homer and Hesiod, or even Hesiod alone, since H.'s story amounts to what we presume Hesiod to have told (see above pp.383 ff) minus the εἴσωλον. We could then explain H.'s total silence about S. (even elsewhere e.g. in connection with Tartessus c.f. Hdt. 1.163 etc and 184 P) as due to genuine ignorance.
both hit upon the same \( \kappa \alpha \iota \nu \omicron \tau \omicron \omicron \alpha \) of mythical material independently on two separate occasions is wildly unlikely: it would be mere wanton cruelty upon the arm of coincidence to stretch it thus far. Scholars have in the past unavailingy searched their souls to discover why H. has omitted the name of S. from his account. A cynic would point out that since H. was trying to palm off his own tale as the product of the Egyptian priests, he would hardly want to give the game away by revealing its true source. A more scholarly way of stating this would be to say that H. is conforming to the rules of a genre which though self-consistent is by no means exactly identical with history as it is now conceived. For similar "false" tales in Hecataeus c.f. Fehling pp.59ff. Since H. has rationalised the \( \epsilon \iota \delta \omicron \omega \lambda \omicron \nu \) out of the story he can hardly have Helen arrive in Egypt by the equally miraculous air-transport which we have supposed that S. used. But his more prosaic version of Helen's arrival with Paris may equally have been mentioned by S. if we are right to assume that in his Second Palinode he assailed Hesiod for making Helen follow Paris as far as the land of the Nile. Fehling asserts that Hdt. 2.112-120 rests on a conflation of (1) a pre-Herodotean expansion of Od. 4.227ff and 351ff; (2) a rationalisation of S's \( \epsilon \iota \delta \omicron \omega \lambda \omicron \nu \). This seems quite right in the light of our present state of knowledge, but we must remember that (1) may well be equivalent to S's Palinodes or even Hes. fr.358 MW. In other words, either S. or Hesiod will be H's sole source here. Certainly the
two Odyssean passages must be near the fount of the later
tradition of Helen in Egypt. Od. 4.351ff depicts Menelaus as detained against his will at Pharos by contrary
winds until he tackles Proteus and learns from him that he
must first return to Egypt. According to Fehling (p.46)
Menelaus is here depicted "während der Rückkehr von Troja,
also in Begleitung Helenas", but the deafening silence
about Helen's presence in Menelaus' narrative could be
interpreted as a sign that she was not with him. Od. 4
125ff tells us that Helen stayed with Menelaus at Thebes
in the house of Thon and Polydamna, and in 227ff we hear
that Helen possessed φάρμακα ... ἔσθελα, τὰ οἱ Πολύδαμνα
πόρεν, θῶνος παράκοιτις Ἀγυπτίη ... Helen then, was in
Egypt at the same time as Menelaus, but S., as recovered
from H. and 193 P, goes further and says that the two were
originally not travelling together but met up for the
first time there. He might have invented this detail de
novo. He might have created it by an "imaginative re-
interpretation" of the Odyssean passages (compare the
possible deduction of Helen's εἰδώλιον from 11.5.451 (see
above p.419)). Or Hesiod may have anticipated him in
either course. But Seeliger (p.9) suggested that the
Odyssean passages reflect the Spartan version of the myth,
and now that we know S's Spartan-flavoured treatment had
Helen reside in Egypt during the war, this seems the
likeliest explanation of all. Particularly attractive is
the parallel thus created with Hesiod's anticipation of
the εἰδώλιον-motif. Both Odyssey Book 4 and Hesiod fr.
358 seem to have adopted at random (as far as we can tell) an isolated motif from the larger Spartan legend of Helen, a motif which does not well cohere with the rest of the tale as told by these poets. (Compare the lonely implication of a Spartan residence for Agamemnon in Od. 4.154ff).

For the two traditions of Helen at Troy and Helen in Egypt are desperately difficult to reconcile as West has underlined (pp 6ff) in his important study of the origins of the latter. And this very incompatibility—neatly epitomised by Egypt's position way off course from Troy—strongly implies that the Egyptian Helen antedates her namesake in Troy and has a quite independent existence. West has shown us good reasons for supposing that the two traditions with their two different locales constitute two different answers to the question "where did the Spartan vegetation goddess from whom Helen is descended disappear to in Winter?" The choice of Troy was obvious once the "faded-goddess" had become associated with the cycle of myths centering on its siege. Egypt seems more problematic, but West has rightly re-emphasised the Indo-European parallels for Helen and the Dioscuri. Numerous tales, especially from India and the Baltic, feature those analogous figures the twin sons of the sky-god, who are regularly linked with the divine daughter of the Sun. If Helen was originally such a daughter of the Sun, who went away in Winter as part of the abduction of the vegetation goddess, it would certainly make sense for her to visit the same place as her father. And that the Sun visited
Africa in Winter is avowed by Hes. Op. 527f and Hdt. 2.24-6. Egypt, the southernmost region of the world, the only part of Africa known to Greeks before the seventh century B.C., suddenly emerges as the most natural of havens for Helen, and aerial transport as an exceedingly appropriate mode of conveyance for an erstwhile offspring of the Sun.

We may as well use this opportunity to tie up a few remaining loose ends concerning S's depiction of Helen in Egypt. Firstly, when did the deceptive εἰδωλον disappear? H. of course avoids this trickly little problem. Euripides, who probably follows S. closely, makes the εἰδωλον vanish in Egypt. But as Miss Dale cleverly observed (p.xxiii n.1) Lycophron 822 puts its disappearance immediately after the sack of Troy, thus condemning Menelaus to years of fruitless wandering as he searched for Helen all over the Mediterranean; and this certainly does make a more organic whole of the story than Euripides' tale of seven years' frustrated attempts to get back to Greece with the εἰδωλον awkwardly on board all the while, as it must be if the play's climax, the dramatic Recognition Scene, is to occur. It would thus be highly attractive to suppose that Lycophron has copied S. in this detail, especially since that would bring S's version in line with the Odyssean passages.

Secondly we would dearly like to know whether S's Proteus was the King of Egypt as in Euripides (and, in a different way, H) or the Odyssey's Old Man of the Sea. But it is
impossible to say.  As so often, we suffer uncertainty as a result of S's double reputation.  On the one hand he is the 'Ομηρικότατος of melics who sustains "epici carminis onera" upon his lyre; on the other he is notorious for his παυνοτομία, a trait conspicuously active in the Palinodes.  These opposing considerations cancel each other out in the present case, and leave us baffled and depressed.  We would like S's Proteus to have the virtuous qualities of the mortal king of the tragedian and historian, to render him a suitable custodian of Helen for the length of the Trojan War.  Equally one would willingly dispense with the suspicious powers of shape-shifting which he bears in the Odyssey.  On the other hand we now know that S. depicted one shape-changing Old Man of the Sea, Nereus.  (See the fragment recently exhumed by R. Kassel, Rh. Mus. 116 (1973) p.100 n.4: Paradox. Vat. 33 p. 110 (Keller) παρ' Ομήρων Προτέως εἰς πάντα μετεμφυσώτα, καθά θέτων παρά Πινδάρων καὶ Νηρεύς παρὰ Στησίχωροι καὶ Μήστρα: see above p. 182).  This is probably from the Geryoneis.  Still Nereus is not Proteus, and the appearance of a "Meergreis" in one Stesichorean poem does not guarantee the appearance of a like character in another.  It is impossible to decide at what stage of the story's evolution the γέρων ἄλος νημερτής of Od. 4.384 turned into the King of Egypt.  

\[1\] Fehling p.48 n.10 argues against the view that Proteus is an attempt at the Egyptian word "prouti", and suggests that the rationalisation occurred when the Homeric phrase Πρωτεύς Αἴγύπτιος was interpreted to mean "King Proteus".
Before 1963, several scholars were of the opinion that the Helen and the Palinode formed different sections of a single and continuous poem, with the Helen as the earlier part and the Palinode as an apologetic conclusion. The news that there were two Palinodes seemed to change all this, since if Chamaeleon regarded the two Apologies as discrete compositions, it implies that he looked upon the Helen as a third and separate entity. Therefore Sir Maurice Bowra sang his own recantation, and stated that his earlier view of the Helen and Palinode as one work (p. 112) had been decisively disproved by the new fragment (p. 89 n. 2). And Sisti does likewise: "La sorprendente notizia ... fa cadere definitivamente la supposizione che l' Elena e la Palinodia fossero un solo carme", (p. 305).

The case against a single work seemed unanswerable. Not so. In 1969 Kannich reseated within the Introduction to his massive commentary on Euripides' Helen the arguments in favour of one poem. Since an intelligent scholar can come to this conclusion after the publication of 193 P, and since at least one reviewer of his book can acknowledge "This may be right" (P.T. Stevens, CR 22 (1972) 327) we must obviously re-examine the problem to see whether any fresh light can be cast on it.1

1The idea of a single poem of which the Helen and Palinode were parts was first suggested by Blomfield on p. 261 of his edition. (Welcker, Kl. Schr. 1:173, toyed with the idea that the Helen was "gewöhnlich die Palinode
Confusingly, both sides to the dispute claim the support of the ancient testimonia which I have already re-examined (above pp. 347ff). As I showed, there is no proof of unity to be shaken from the words of our two earliest and most reliable sources, Plato and Isocrates: indeed, quite the opposite, since Isocrates' narrative clearly implies an interval between the poem which cost S. his eyesight and the Recantation. Nor do later sources offer much solace to those who want a single opus, since Dio and Philostratus refer to ἡ ὀστερον ωτῆ and ὁ πρότερος λόγος. This inconvenient fact must be hustled out of the way by mistranslation ("the latter part of the song", "the earlier part of the tale") or by supposing that Dio and

(continues)

1"gennant"). It was restated by R.C. Bakhuizen van den Brink (Disputatio Lit. Inaug. (1842) Thes. 1A) whose concept of "unum atque continuum carmen" was followed by Bergk Gr. Literatur gesch. 2 (1883) p.290 n.56, Seeliger (p.7), Vürtheim (p.59), Bowra in both editions of "Greek Lyric Poetry", and most recently Kannicht (p.29). The opposing view was adopted by Lehrs, Populäre Aufsätze aus dem Alterthum (1856) 28ff, and Bergk in his fourth edition was finally won over to the view "palinodiam peculiare fuisse carmen" (p.215). Davison, even before 1963, took the same attitude (p.221).
Philostratus were merely drawing deductions from Plato and Isocrates, if the thesis of a single poem is to survive intact. But even if Dio and Philostratus have no independent value, they are still important as showing how impartial authors with no preconceived theory to prove, interpreted the Greek (a language they themselves still wrote and spoke) of Plato's account and Isocrates. It is not Kannicht's interpretation they choose.

193 P brings one crumb of comfort to believers in a single poem, since it strengthens the reasons for supposing that Helen and Palinode were written in the same metre (see above p.330). This is a far from conclusive argument however: prima facie one would expect a separate apologia for a poem to be written in the same metre as the original poem. Would-be "unitarians" must simply resign themselves to the fact that our ancient sources provide no evidence for their case, and quite a lot of evidence which seems to point against it. Still, let us suppose that this second category of evidence is not decisive. Can the unitarians produce proof of a different kind to bolster up their view?

It was once customary to manufacture evidence by mistranslating cōtoc: (So, for instance, Seeliger p.7). See my discussion above p.334f. Another device involved appealing to other allegedly analogous poems for help. Epode 17 of Horace, as we have seen (above p.394 f) does owe something to S's Palinode, and, lo and behold, the Latin poem contains abuse of Canidia instantly followed by
recantation, and all within the limits of a single song. The naivety of this reasoning - used by Vürtheim among others - is unlikely to escape reprimand in our more enlightened times. But then today nobody is going to argue that even the immature Horace imitated his sources so closely and crudely, nor will many so determinedly ignore the fact that S's Helen must have far outstripped Horace's epode in length. Now we understand that as early as his first attempts at poetry, Horace practiced "contaminatio" of genres, mixing with elements from Archilochus and Hipponax, details from bucolic, or characteristics of Hellenistic epigram.

Pindar's First Olympian is another poem often hauled in to justify the concept of a single poem, although in fact it bristles with dissimilarities. Bowra (p.112) and Woodbury (p.175)\(^1\) cite the ode as proof that it was not so very unusual for a poet to contradict at point-blank range the story he had just told. As Pindar mentioned the old story of Pelops only to follow it by his own revision, "correcting in stride" (Lattimore's description of the poet's technique), so S. is supposed to have related the familiar version of Helen's misdemeanours and then to have abruptly withdrawn it, a recantation "in the archaic, linear style" to quote Woodbury again. In fact the truth about Pindar's handling of the Pelops-myth is wonderfully different (though Bowra displays the same failure to

\(^1\)See too J.G. Griffith, Fifty Years (and Twelve) of Classical Scholarship p.80 n.59.
recognise this simple fact in his Pindar, pp.57-8). The Theban poet makes it perfectly clear that he is telling his own version of the myth right at the start (26) by calling the λέβης in the story μαθαρός (it was hardly that in the original tradition where it was used to roast the son of Tantalus!) and by introducing Clotho, one of the three Fates. In this way we are given to understand that the λέβης is no longer a cooking-pot but a vessel for washing the baby Pelops, and that Clotho is at hand because the Μοίραι were birth-goddesses present at the birth of each individual to give him his μοίρα. All this is made crystal-clear right at the start of Pindar's retelling of the myth: there is thus no question of Pindar's correcting himself "in his stride ... in the archaic linear style" and equally there is no question of this in S.¹

It must be said that Kannicht does not resort to the arguments criticised above. But what arguments does he have, apart from those interpretations of the ancient sources which we have already demolished? As we saw in connection with 189 P, (p.269f) Kannicht believes he has

¹A closer Pindaric parallel for the hypothetical single poem would be provided by the myth in Pyth. 3.27ff, where the poet begins to tell how Apollo learnt of Coronis' sin, in language that suggests the Hesiodic version of the story (fr.59 MW) and then unexpectedly reveals that the informant was Apollo's own mind. So the audience is misled - for a matter of seconds: the truth is revealed within a mere two lines. The contrast with the situation postulated for S's poem could not be greater, and the length of time for which the audience is deceived is minute compared with what is envisaged for S.
proof that even in the Ἑλένης the divinity of Menelaus and Helen was hinted at and the Ἑλένης anticipated. And on p. 41 of his Introduction he finally reveals what he imagines S's purpose to have been in adopting this extraordinary arrangement of showing Helen in two dimensions and under two lights within one poem: "in der 'παλίντονος ἄρμονίη', also in der dialektischen Beziehung zwischen sogenannter Schmähung und sogenannter Πολινοδίεις wie in einem Diptychon die Ambivalenz Helenas als der Göttin und als der Heroine sinnenfällung zur Erscheinung zu bringen." The discerning reader will not be too intoxicated by the mystic reference to Ἑλένης άρμονίη, or the moving invocation of the sacred name of Diptych, to notice the sheer lack of hard argumentation, for which mere assertion is no substitute.

In less dithyrambic mood, however, Kannicht had earlier delivered a stern rebuke to most scholars for ignoring what is poetically probable in their handling of the testimonia on S's Palinodes. "Poetic probability" seems a reasonable final test to apply to the view which Kannicht holds. We guess that the Helen was a very lengthy poem which treated its events with an Homeric plenitude (see above pp251ff). We back up this guess with another: it may have been divided into at least two books by the Alexandrian editors (see 189 P and my note ad loc (p. 270f)). There is no reason whatsoever for the assumption that the first book was the Helen, the second book the two Palinodes. Even if this were the case however, the
foundation of my argument would scarcely be shaken. For what are we being asked to accept? That the Helen began with an amply-detailed \( \kappa \alpha \nu \gamma \alpha \rho \iota \alpha \) of its eponymous heroine; that during several episodes narrated with epic scope the audience was encouraged to look askance at Helen and view her abduction by Theseus and its sequel with decidedly jaundiced eyes; and that then, after an atmosphere of detestation had been comfortably established, S. had blithely announced that all that had gone before in the same poem was untrue, and that the depraved woman whose dispraise was so liberally sung is in fact an innocent destined for divinity among the stars. This from the scholar who urged us all to seek "was poetisch warscheinlich sein kann!" But what poetic probability, or probability of any kind, can be disinterred from this prodigy of a reconstruction, which carefully builds up the audience's expectations and then blows them sky-high? What remote parallel in ancient Greek literature can be offered for this abrupt volte-face? Even when we postulate two separate poems, the discrepancy between their respective pictures of Helen is so great that we gladly snatch at the explanation that S. claimed the excuse of blindness (real or metaphorical), as well as appealing to Spartan influence. To cram the two pictures successively into the limits of a single poem is to create a monster unique to ancient literature. To cram them in concurrently, as Kannicht at one point essays (see p.461 above) is no less grotesque. With what incomprehension would the poem's
first audience find their attention shunted so bewilderingly from καινορία to ἐπαίνος and back again? Such switches would be acceptable in drama if they corresponded to the adoption of different views by different characters. In lyric narrative they spell not ambivalence but incoherence. When we are finally asked to accept the notion of a single poem by S. containing both the ἐλασφημία and a Palinode - and that in two sections! - then the remoteness of this picture from any statement in our sources, and everything we know about ancient Greek lyric poetry, rightly makes us revolt. And it was for this phantasma that Kannicht bade us throw overboard all testimonia later than Plato, and assured us that this being done we would have a clearer view! Fatally hybristic words, for which his eyes were blinded just as surely as those of the poet he discusses. Dogmatism and its handmaid polemic are especially out of place in the uncertain terrain of early Greek lyric, but this is, I think, one view against which both can be safely unleashed.
THE RELATION OF THE TWO PALINODES AND THEIR CONTENTS

At this late stage of the day I think it is possible to dismiss as non-starters the following explanations:

(1) The two Palinodes are really two sections of one Palinode, which is itself merely the name of the concluding section of the Helen.

So Kannicht, quite perversely in my view: see pp.456ff above.

(2) The two Palinodes are of course two separate poems. The first attacked Homer for sending Helen to Troy, the second attacked Hesiod for making the adolescent Helen the mother, by Theseus, of Iphigenia. So Bowra (2) p.97.

But as I showed in connection with 191 P (pp.291ff) there is not one iota of evidence for supposing that Hesiod ever told this scandalous tale.

(3) The first Palinode was a section of a larger poem such as the Iliupersis. (For the practice of designating parts of a long work by separate titles compare the Δολώνεια or Τηλεμάχεια). The Iliupersis would have included a section on the recovery of Helen, and here S. included a "digression" and "corrected" his earlier account of her elopement, and this section came to be known as a Palinode.

So Podlecki (pp.324-5). I mention this view purely varietatis causa, which is about the only motive I can see for devising it in the first place. I do not refute it in detail, for as with Herodotus (see p.445) it is not in
my manner "to argue against fantastications of that sort."
Deserving of somewhat more detailed analysis are two fuller theories.

(4) Sisti
This scholar has observed that our testimonia on the Palinodes divide into two groups: (a) those that mention a total rehabilitation of Helen (and, incidentally, contain no word of the εἰδώλων) viz. Plato Phaedr., Dio, Philostr., Vit. Apoll., Max. Tyr. (b) those which say that the εἰδώλων went to Troy instead of Helen: Plato Rep., Σ Aristid. Or. Since (a)'s omission of the εἰδώλων must be totally fortuitous, it is hard not to argue that (b)'s omission of the total rehabilitation is also purely coincidental. I have, besides, pointed out the various inadequacies of Sisti's interpretations of the testimonia in my individual commentaries on each. Thus, mighty deductions are drawn from the innocent fact that the Republic passage does not mention Helen's total reprieve, and we are assured that Plato must here be referring to a Palinode which only partly exculpated her. Nonsense: Plato only mentions the εἰδώλων because only that is relevant to his parallel with the εἰδωλα τῆς ἄληθοῦς ἡδονῆς. The supposition that Tzetzes and the Aristides scholium are witnesses to this same Palinode is likewise quite flimsy (see pp.378ff). It falls, and drags with it

It is surely inconceivable that there was any complete exculpation of Helen which did not involve the εἰδώλων.
this centripetal argument: "La polemica con Omero si comprende solo se nel primo carme Stesicoro si preoccupava di scagione Elena della grave accusa di essere stata causa della guerra troiana: l'expediente ινητηκατον non aveva altro scopo che questo" (p.305).

Sisti then explains the need for a second Palinode: the first had still left Helen open to the charge of adultery. A second, more complete exculpation was required. This second Palinode soon surpassed the first in fame and became known as the Palinode (after all, it was the only proper recantation). Hence all references in our sources to the Palinode apply to the second, the attack on Hesiod, while very general allusions (ἐν τῆι ποιήσει ... ὃς ψησι and the like) to the first. After all, this still survived, was referred to by Plato in the Republic, and, of course, Chamaeleon was acquainted with it. This suggestion makes it necessary to suppose that the famous three lines in the Phaedrus are excerpted from the Second Palinode (Sisti p.308) and that Plato's other mention of S., the casual allusion in the Republic, concerns a totally different poem. Like the whole theory, this idea is fiendishly ingenious and desperately unlikely.

Sisti's most eloquent pleading is reserved for his twin theories that the Second Palinode must have been occasioned by some deficiency in the first and that it must have introduced for the first time the striking idea of total innocence which captured antiquity's imagination.
It cannot just have concerned an incidental detail which Hesiod got wrong (this specifically against Bowra) for this would be an anticlimax (pp 308-310): "questo è l'unico motivo valido che possa giustificare un secondo carme: per quale ragione S. sarebbe stato costretto a scrivere una seconda palinodia se non proprio perché la prima era stata giudicata insufficiente ... in tal caso il secondo carme avrebbe ritrattato un particolare secondario del mito, certamente meno noto, e avremmo fra la prima e la seconda Palinodia un climax in senso contrario, inconciliabile con il presupposto che la composizione del secondo carme fu dovuta non ad un lusus erudito, ma alle critiche mosse al poeta, per una grave omissione, dall'ambiente al quale il carme era destinato."

It was unfortunate that Sisti published these words in 1965, too soon for him to know anything of Davison's alternative treatment. That would have shown him how it was possible to conceive of S. as criticising Hesiod in his Second Palinode for a mistake over a detail, without presupposing a poem that was "un lusus erudito". Whether the εἰδωλόν was introduced in Egypt or earlier would be crucial for Helen's reputation and by no means a "particolare secondario". But the whole poem might still be an anti-climax surely? It is possible to embrace this idea with joy and turn Sisti's argument on its head. For what is wrong with supposing the Second Palinode to have been an anti-climax? Such a work would be a bad poem. A bad poem would be little read or talked of. A
little-read poem would be neglected. A neglected poem would soon fade into obscurity: which is precisely what is supposed to have happened to one of the two Palinodes. What I am stressing is not so much that we should accept this last suggestion, but that we should realise there are other ways to explain the emergence of a Second Palinode than Sisti's rather simplistic idea that the first one was not good enough. That is always a possibility; but not the only one. After the striking notion of a revision of Homer's original treatment - which, one would presume, impressed its first audience as much as it did later antiquity - it was very natural that S. should try to repeat the concept, but this time with different criticisms of a different author. The lure of the sequel has always inspired artists of various kinds: but how many such sequels have matched the original?

And so we come at last to the theory which, suitably emended, forms the most plausible explanation of the plurality of Palinodes. Davison's thesis in its original shape was not so very different from Sisti's. The Italian scholar believes in two Palinodes, the first attacking Homer because he had made Helen go to Troy:

\[\text{In fact Davison, like Sisti, believes that the papyrus has reversed the order of the palinodes, and that } \langle \tau \rangle \hat{f} \langle c \rangle \ \mu \nu \text{ introduces the first line of the attack on Hesiod. His reasons for so doing are superficial and unconvincing (see p.337). I have adapted his theory by dropping this feature. The sequence of the commentator's remarks makes it clear that he thinks the First Palinode attacked Homer, the Second Hesiod.}\]
no she didn't says S. she merely went as far as Egypt.
In the second he changed his tack: Hesiod too was in the
wrong, for saying Helen even went as far as Egypt with
Paris. I wish to avoid this notion of a retraction in
two progressive stages, with S. actually sharing Hesiod's
delusion in the first. The purpose of it is to allow
us to suppose that those unreliable authors which bestow
on S. a version wherein Helen does sail with Paris to
Egypt, are referring after all to the First Palinode. As
we have seen (p.382) this is a liability rather than an
advantage. With my adaptation of Davison's thesis, we
may suppose that S. saw the whole truth straight away as
early as the First Palinode.\textsuperscript{1} In this he attacked Homer
for the obvious reasons: because in the Iliad he made
Helen the cause of the deaths of thousands, and also,
perhaps, because he depicted her as making love with Paris
And I would add to Davison's case here the claim that S.
thought of Homer as the composer of the Cypria, and also
attacked him for the sundry immoralities attributed to
Helen in that epic. In the second Palinode, S. turned
his fire on Hesiod and criticised him for not making full
use of the \(\varepsilon\iota\omega\lambda\nu\nu\), and for not introducing it in Sparta
to protect Helen's reputation completely. Hesiod was
preferable to Homer in that he avoided Helen's direct

\textsuperscript{1}This is the only hypothesis which will neatly match the
old tradition of S's blindness and curing and the modern
notion of some sort of Spartan influence.
responsibility for the deaths of so many Greeks and Trojans: S. may have made the point that there is no tradition of his being blind. But he was wrong to allow Helen to leave Menelaus for Paris' sake and go as far as Egypt: admittedly Proteus stopped them there, kept Helen with him, and sent Paris off to Troy with the εἰσωλον. But this was insufficient to save Helen's repute, for reasons we have already rehearsed.

We may as well admit now quite brazenly that nothing which could justly be called proof has ever come into contact with this reconstruction, for I do not subscribe to Davison's idea that in the phrase οδος ἐβασ ἐν νηυς S. is answering both Homer and Hesiod: I doubt if we are meant to take this line separately as a statement that "Helen never went anywhere by ship, not even to Egypt as Hesiod alleged." But I still accept his overall interpretation of the relationship between the two Palinodes, since I cannot conceive of any other hypothesis which will reconcile the following fragments of information: (1) Hesiod introduced the motif of Helen's εἰσωλον; (2) S. made Helen stay with Proteus during the Trojan War; (3) S. criticised Hesiod. I do not think I have encountered any scholar who has argued that S. criticised Hesiod for exactly the same reasons as he criticised Homer, though this is surely the only rational refuge for those who persist in rejecting (1). Embracers of this theory would be responsible for foisting upon S. a singularly pointless and unimpressive poem, a mere duplication of the other
Palinode, only with "Hesiod" substituted for "Homer" throughout. Still, they must be allowed to do so if they wish, and they may console themselves with the reflection that they have probably solved the riddle of why most ancient authors talk of only one Palinode: the flaccid composition they are presupposing would surely have plummeted into the pit of oblivion as soon as it had been composed.

Some may object that there can hardly have been enough material to provide sufficient subject-matter for three different poems, each related in characteristically full and ample detail, on Helen. It does indeed become hard to imagine totally fresh and unused narrative for the second Palinode attacking Hesiod, though this difficulty becomes positively critical only if we cannot accept that the Boeotian poet or his school introduced Helen's εἰδωλον to literature.

Whatever form this second Palinode took, it can hardly have avoided repeating some of the material expended on the Helen and the first Palinode. But the possibility that S. handled the same subjects in different poems must be kept open, given our present state of ignorance. And I have already maintained, with, I hope, no suggestion of frivolity, that we should positively welcome such faults as unoriginal subject-matter or repetitive contents in the Second Palinode, in order to explain how it later failed to retain anyone's interest and so passed into obscurity.
Anyone who after 1963 still believes that firm conclusions about the Palinodes can be reached has no business to be writing about S. But I have given what seems to me the most plausible answer to the questions raised by P. Oxy. 2506. We are faced with two unexpected pieces of information - Hesiod introduced the εἰδωλον of Helen; S. composed two Palinodes - and we then find, with no great feelings of surprise, that both items of knowledge can be reconciled without strain. Those who reject my findings must reject these testimonies from antiquity. This is not an impossible course, but let them remember that my hypothesis forms a coherent whole: Hesiod's use of the εἰδωλον left something to be desired and was criticised in S's second Palinode. If a critic refuses to believe that the Hesiodic school knew of the phantom, he can hardly accept the plurality of the Palinodes. If he is willing to have more than one Recantation, how can he discard the tradition about a pre-Stesichorean εἰδωλον? Complete retention or complete rejection of frs. 358 MW and 193 P are intelligible alternatives: to take up one and discard the other is quite untenable. And although no man would normally feel the slightest qualms over blocking his ears to the evidence of fr. 358 MW, the wise critic will pause twice and then thrice before dismissing the explicit statement made by Chamaeleon. That is why I prefer my explanation.
EPIΦΥΛΗ\(^1\)

THE MYTH

The earliest mention of the myth of Eriphyle occurs in Od. 11.326f where the poet, with characteristic delicacy, swiftly glides over this story of family deceit and murder:

Μαϊράν τε Κλυμένην τε έδον στυγερήν τ’’Εριφύλην, ἡ χρυσὸν φίλοι ανδρὸς ἐξέβατο τιμήντα.

Even more allusive is the reference in Od. 15.247:

άλλ’ οἶνος’’ (scil. Ἀμφιάραος) ἐν Θῆβαις γυναιῶν εἶνεκα δώρων. A far fuller resume is offered by the scholion ad 326 which enshrines Asclepiades of Tragilus F.Gr.Hist.12F29: Ἀμφιάραος ὁ Οἰνείος γῆμας Ἐριφύλην τὴν Ταλαυδι οἱ διενεχθὲς ὑπὲρ τινῶν πρὸς Ἀδραστον καὶ πάλιν διαλυθένσι δυσκολίην ὀμολογησέν ὑπὲρ δυν ὅν διαφερόμεθα πρὸς ἀλλήλους αὐτῶν τε καὶ Ἀδραστος ἐπιτρέπειν Ἐριφύλην\(^2\) κρίνειν καὶ πείθεσθαι αὐτῇ. μετὰ δὲ ταύτα γινομένης τῆς ἐπὶ Θῆβαις στρατεύσεις, ὁ μὲν Ἀμφιάραος ἀπέτρεπε τοὺς Ἀργείους καὶ τὸν ἐκδίκεν ἀδερφὸν προεμπνευότον, Ἄδραστος δὲ ἠθελε μάχην suppl. Jacoby ex Eustathio ἡ λαβοῦσα δὲ ἡ Ἐριφύλη

\(^1\)For the form of the title as cited by ancient authors (listed under 194P) see my note on Πηνυνθη (p.106).

\(^2\)Ἐριφύλη τε θεοῦς Jacoby.
Other authors who treat of this myth are listed by Jacoby ad loc. (1A pp.488-9): add Paus. 8.24.7.

For modern discussions of the story and its appearance in Greek drama see Robert, Heldensage pp.956ff, Pearson, The fragments of Sophocles Vol. 1 pp.68ff and 129ff, and, more recently, H.D. Jocelyn's commentary on Ennius' dramatic fragments (Cambridge 1967) pp.184ff, T.B.L. Webster, The Tragedies of Euripides (1967) pp.39ff and 265ff. The similarity between the legends of Alcmeon and Eriphyle on the one hand and Orestes and Clytemnestra on the other has long been remarked: the common elements include an avenging of a dead father by matricide enjoined by the Delphic Oracle, pursuit by the Erinyes, exile and final purification from guilt. See especially Marie Delcourt, Oreste et Alcmeon: Étude sur la projection légendaire
du matricide en Grèce (Paris 1959). It is of no small interest that S. composed poems which embraced both topics. Note too that the latest papyrus finds indicate the existence of a further Stesichorean poem which dealt with the first attack on Thebes from the viewpoint of the house of Cadmus.

Doubtless, as Vürtheim (p.34) divines, S's Eriphyle had considerable influence upon the numerous Attic tragedies that attacked this theme, but our knowledge of these works is extensive only in comparison with what we can say of S's own poem. Indeed, before the discovery of the latest papyrus finds, it was impossible to be sure which of the two themes associated with Eriphyle fell within the scope of the poetic composition. Did the bribing of Eriphyle(with the necklace of Harmonia in the hands of Polyneices) so that she persuaded her husband Amphiaraus to join the Seven against Thebes - did this form the subject-matter of the work? Or was the stage occupied by Thersander son of Polyneices and his later bribing of Eriphyle with the robe of Harmonia and her consequent cajoling of her son Alcmaeon into leading the second expedition against the Theban citadel? In itself the information that S. had Asclepius resurrect Capaneus and Lycurgus (194P) is not enough to help us decide between the two alternatives. S148 tells us that the second of the two series of events was certainly included in S's work, but for all we know
that work may have been capacious enough to include the first as well, not to mention Eriphyle's death or its sequel. And we are still as far as ever from being able to determine whether Asclepius' miraculous act of resuscitation is to be associated with the Epigoni or their forefathers.
THE EVIDENCE OF ART

Bowra (GLP pp.121-122) has argued that the famous Corinthian crater dating from 575 to 550 (Berlin F 1655: Payne NC No.1471=Brommer Vaselisten 3 476.C1) which depicts the departure of Amphiaraus, is probably based on S's Eriphyle. It is an impressive feature of his hypothesis that this same vase also depicts the Funeral Games of Pelias: "the stories... have little connexion with one another, and a natural reason for associating them would be that a single poet had told of both" (Bowra p.122). It is also important that this same scene of the departure of Amphiaraus was depicted on the Chest of Cypselus, an artefact apparently hospitable to several legends treated by S. And Pausanias' description of it (5.17.7) reveals numerous striking coincidences with the crater (see Payne, Necrocorinthia pp.139-141). Both works of art seen to have shown the house of Amphiaraus, both a nurse (labelled Aerippa on the vase, anonymous, it would appear, on the Chest). On both, Eriphyle is depicted

\[\text{...}\]

1 ἀμφιαράδου τῆς οἰκῆς πεποιηται καὶ ἀμφιλόχου φέρετ ὑπὲρ προεβύτις ἠτίδη. πρὸ δὲ τῆς οἰκῆς ἐριφύλη τὸν ὄμοιν ἔχουσα ἔστηκε, παρὰ δὲ αὐτὴν αἱ θυγατέρες Εὐρυδίκη καὶ Δημώνακα, καὶ Ἀλκμαῖων παῖς γυμνὸς. ἂντος δὲ ἐν τοῖς ἐπεξει καὶ Ἀλκμηνίως ὁποίησε θυγατέρας ἀμφιαράδου καὶ ἐριφύλης εἴναι (Asius fr.4K). Βάτων δὲ ἐν ὅξιοις τοῖς ἀμφιαράδωι, τὰς τῆς οἰκῆς τῶν ἱππῶν καὶ τῆς χειρὶ ἔχει τῇ ἑτέρᾳ λόγχῃ. ἀμφιαράδωι δὲ τῷ μὲν τῶν ποδῶν ἐπιβεβηκέν ὅπῃ τοῦ ἄρματος, ἐὰν δὲ ἔχει γυμνὸν, καὶ εἰς τῇ ἐριφύλην ἐστὶν ἐπεξεκασμένος έξαγομένως τῇ ὑπὸ τοῦ θυμοῦ... έκένες δὲν ὄποιοχόδαι. μετὰ δὲ ἀμφιαράδου τῆς οἰκῆς ἐστὶν ἀγῶν ὁ ἐπὶ Πελλαὶ κτλ.
holding her notorious necklace, and her daughters Demonassa and Eurydice can be seen. Alcmaeon too is present, though nameless, on the vase, and Amphiaraus steps into his chariot with his sword drawn: he looks behind him. His charioteer shown on both depictions is labelled Baton on each. Correspondences of this order and magnitude are not produced by the capricious play of chance and Payne very properly concludes that "the two designs are roughly contemporary and go back to a common origin". He suggests a wall-painting in Corinth as the source for both of these depictions. Was that wall-painting influenced by S.? For a similar problem in S's Oresteia see below p.816. If S. was fond of attaching names to secondary mythical characters such as Amphiaraus' charioteer or Alcmaeon's nurse (compare 208P), so were purely plastic artists. A concrete example of the sort of difficulty we are involved in here is near to hand. The Chest of Cypselus showed not only the boy Alcmaeon but also his young brother Amphilochus who in some versions of the legend helped Alcmaeon in the act of matricide: see Apollod. 3.7.5 etc. Bowra (p.121) claims that "Both boys... were indispensable to the story", speculates that "both may have had a place in S's poem", notes the absence of Amphilochus from the crater, and concludes that he was omitted "for reasons of space or design" because he "was thought relatively unimportant... the Chest was apparently closer than the vase to S." Perhaps. We can certainly
state from experience that such omissions of minor characters from purely aesthetic motives are very common (see p. ). But additions of minor figures "for reasons of space or design" are no less characteristic, and it is impossible to say which of the two processes has operated here. Abandon the indefensible allegation that both brothers are essential to the story (ξυνοι μὲν λέγουσι εὖν ἀμφιλόχωι τὸι ἄντειλοι κητίνα τὴν ἑσιφύλην, ξυνοι δὲ δῖ τι μόνος: Apollod. sup.cit.) and there are no means of divining whether the crater has subtracted a character present in S's poem, or if the Chest's artist added Amphilocharus on his own initiative. Observe - what Bowra keeps quiet about but Payne records - that our vase is not alone in its linking of Amphiaraus' setting out and the Funeral Games of Pelias (e.g. both appear on an Attic amphora Florence 3773 + Berlin 1711:ABV 95.8= Brommer Vase nisten3 476; A2 a Pontic amphora in Munich: 838: Brommer Vase nisten3 476; C2: compare Paus. 5.17.7 sup.cit.p.477 n.1) and one begins to wonder whether the notion of Stesichorean influence has anything to commend it at all. K. Schefold, Frühgr. Sagenbilder (Munich 1964) p.76 = Myth and Legend in Early Greek Art (London 1966) p.81, suggests that the Funeral Games are merely intended as a relief to the Eriphyle saga on vases such as these (see the remarks of H. Brunn, Kl. Schr. 3.91ff which he quotes on p.100 = p.189).
A few preliminary steps towards the reconstitution of this were taken by Snell in his review of Lobel's ed. pr. (Gnomon 40 (1968) p.120). But the most impressive results have been attained by the now familiar team (Page with Barrett's collaboration) in P.C.P.S. 17 (1971) 94-8. Haslam makes some sensible comments on what has now been achieved (pp.35ff).

The metre can easily be recovered. As in the Suotherae (see below p.1014) we should start with the extant marginal sign: a coronis stands opposite ii7, and nothing could be less likely than that this siglum indicates the end of a Stesichorean poem. Perhaps the strongest proof of this is W.S. Barrett's observation that no work by S. is likely to have started in mid-roll without any sign of a fresh title. But we cannot afford to ignore Haslam's remark (p.40 n.70) that in theory (as reported by Hephaestion, π. ημείων, p.73f Consbruch) coronis only marks poem-end for works that are monostrophic, while triadic structures of the type we expect from S. had their poem-end marked by asteriscus, their triad-ends by coronis.¹ We might even ram home the obvious by repeating Page's assertion (p.95) that ii 6's

¹Of course practice tells a somewhat different tale, and the paragraphus very often marks the ends of strophe, antistrophe and triad. This is the case in the Geryoneīs (P.Oxy.2617) and the Iliupersis (2619).
μνακτευομαι μωτηρ seems an unlikely final line of a work and that the subject-matter of ii 8-9 may have affinities with that of ii 1-7.

col. ii 7 then is the end of a triad. And i 5, a line shorter than the others and ending with two long syllables and punctuation, is prima facie the close of a stanza or perhaps of a triad. If we adopt the second alternative and postulate two triad-ends (i 5, ii 7) we are gratified to find that each of them is preceded by lines in synapheia (i 3-4, ii 5-6) and each is likewise succeeded by two lines which over-run (i 617, ii 8-9). And, in a most encouraging manner, correspondence occurs between verses which are, on the above hypothesis, metrically equivalent:

\[
\begin{align*}
    i 3 & = ii 5 \\
    i 4 & = ii 6 \\
    i 5 \text{ [plus c. 8 letters]} & = ii 7 \\
    i 6 \text{ [ " " " " ]} & = ii 8 \\
    i 7 \text{ [ " " 7 " ]} & = ii 9
\end{align*}
\]

Mr. Barrett (ap. Page pp.97-8) records some incisive comments on the metre of S 150, presuming it to be from the same poem as S 148. The regularity of the scribe's hand implies a constancy of column length, and given

\[1\]Given Page's πόσε in i 3, which I see few disputing.
that the metrical scheme worked out above and reproduced below is correct, the lines in col. k will recur two lines lower in col. ii.

Splendid! By combining the beginnings of lines in ii with the ends of the metrically equivalent lines in i we achieve the following:

ii 5 + i 3 [ or C (tav (so Barrett) or tav [-?)

ii 6 + i 4 - - ] (with run-over)

ii 7 + i 5 -

ii 8 + i 6 ? Unfortunately, i 6 has left no traces and ii 8's epuca( is capable of a wide variety of interpretations: [ , [ ] [ ] are all conceivable. As for the rest of the first column, we have:

i 7 [ ] [-

i 8 [ ]

i 9 [x

i 10 [ ]

i 11 [ ]

i 12 [ ]

i 4 may be the first line of its column (if the trace in i 1 signifies the upper margin). Alternatively, i 12 may represent the foot of the column.

Our knowledge of part of the metrical scheme together with the relative lengths of the successive lines shows that the line exemplified in part by ii 6 and i 4 cannot be str./ant. 1, 2, 3, or 4. Nor can it be ep. 5 or any of the other epodic lines from s up to and including z.
And it will be ep. q or r only if that line had monosyllabic biceps at its end.

It is conceivable that col. i originally contained nothing but an epode not less than ten lines long. i 4 cannot be the opening of a new triad, not only for the reason given above, but because there is no paragraphos under the corresponding ii 5. Or again, col. i might consist of the end of an antistrophe and the start of an epode, or the end of a str. and the beginning of an ant.

In other words S150 does nothing to confirm our metrical scheme but is at least not inconsistent with it. And this latter negative point is enough to prevent at least one misconception: see below p. 489n.1.
Periods

str./ant.

2/3: period-end here is as certain as such things can be in view of the strong stop in the papyrus and the beginning of a speech.

4: a less strong stop here (after θυμόν) and one not indicated on the papyrus. But it is tempting to posit period-end here because it ought to occur in the same place in almost the same metrical sequence in ep.x (q.v.).

ep.

There is no absolutely decisive sign of period-end (decisive in the conventional sense of hiatus or brevis in longo) at any stage of what remains of this structure. But we need not take seriously the notion of v - z as one vast period: a very striking feature that soon emerges from a study of Stesichorean metric is this poet's avoidance of a run of more than three longa within a period (see p.85).

This consideration points to period-end at the end of ep.y (which certainly by-steps five consecutive longa). Also to period-end (as suggested by Barrett ap. Page) in the middle of ep.x (--|--∥ --≈ --≈--)

at i 3 (ἤρως "Αλκμαον...) and ii 5 (ἀρηναν ξευ[...]).

Here too, provided we accept the likelier scansion "Αλκμαον in i 3 (see my note ad loc.), there is a
sequence of five long syllables just asking to be avoided. The only features about period-end within ep.x which need give us as much as a moment's pause are: (a) the papyrus colometry. But Barrett compares the arrangement of Pindaric cola by scholars of antiquity which often combines within a single colon the end of one period and the beginning of the next. And Haslam (p.36) suggests that ep.x's incidental status as an iambelegus influenced the papyrus' division here. I add that the usual practice of lyric poets in opening direct speech (see my note on i 3) gives us independent grounds for supposing some sort of erroneous division here. (b) the lack of a very strong stop after ἀπήναω in ii 5 (contrast i 3 where a speech begins after ἔρως'). This is decidedly odd, but I can see no way of avoiding the anomaly.
Difficulties

This partial metrical scheme presents us with several oddities which centre round the use of single-short phrases. Look at str. 1 for instance: 

\[ \text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots} \text{.} \]  

In other words no "anceps interpositum" makes the transition from epitrites to dactyls. Barrett's very simple correction (ap. Page) ---

\[ \ell\hat{o}v \delta'\hat{o}\delta' \ell'\hat{o}m\hat{e}i\beta'\hat{e}m\nuoc \kappa\nu\lambda. \]  

would restore a lengthy dactylic run preceded by a single-short unit with long ancesp link. For the run of dactyls (an octameter catalectic \( \varepsilon\iota\varepsilon \kappa\mu\lambda\alpha\beta'\eta'\nu \)) compare str. 1 of the Iliupersis; for the opening \[ \ldots \] c.f. the start of the first line of 187P (the Helen).

If we accept the text as it stands, we would do well to accept with it Barrett's alternative proposal ( provisionally preferred by Page) which supposes that biceps here occupies "the position of later ancesp at the transition from epitrites to dactyls". Compare now P. Lille str.5. But by positing period-end in the middle of str.4 (after i 9's \( \omega\mu\nu'\) see above p.484) we will annihilate the only instance of ancesp in that position \[ \text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots} \text{.} \]

which will instead link the final single-short phrase to the preceding dactyls.

- 486 -
The anaepe's operation within the Iliupersis might be compared, if we could be sure that the last biceps in str.3 of that poem (\ldots) is replaced by an anaepe in str.4: \ldots. But we cannot so be sure, and the positioning at the point of change from epitrites to dactyls would still be unparalleled.

The first element of str.3 (i 8) must be a single-short since (as we shall see ad loc.) there is no room for \( \text{c\u03c9n\u03ca} \) \( \text{\phi\lambda\epsilon} \). Since such a take-off to a dactylo-anapaestic run has no parallel in S, Haslam (p.39) interprets it as anaepe, which does begin some dactylo-epitrite verse.

A further oddity is provided by the end of the epode (ii 7: \ldots). We need not cavil about its surprising brevity since the close of the Sototherae is just as abrupt: \ldots || 1. But the form is decidedly odd. Still Page rightly concludes that there is no alternative interpretation which does not create

\[1\] Haslam (p.38) also compares 211P and 223P (on which see below p. 488).
even greater anomalies\textsuperscript{1}. Until recently, we could best
make sense of ep.z by reading it (with Haslam p.37)
as a dactylic line with single-short pendant clausula
\[\text{w w w w w} \]
(an aristophaneum: compare str.3 of Bacch.13, str.12
of Pind. Paean 6). Even then the contraction of the
second element that occurs in ii 7 is unexpected: all
those longa make this short line remarkably heavy.
And I am not very happy about the props with which
Haslam supports his version of ep.z. They are all
borrowed from book-text fragments which are notoriously
unreliable as sources for metrical information. And,
as ill-luck would have it, two of them afford us
particularly strong grounds for suspecting corruption.
I mean 211P (from the Oresteia) which Haslam interprets
as a rising version of our line, and 223.4 P's second
part (\(\omega l \tau \rho \gamma y \cdot \kappa l . l \)) which would give us an exact
aristophaneum if we accepted the transmitted text —
which we should not: see my note ad loc. It is
fortunate then that the Lille Papyrus now provides us
with a parallel for \[\text{w w w w w w} \] in its ep.7 (see 11,210,231,294).

\textsuperscript{1}For instance, Barrett's hypothesis of single-value-\(\nu\)-
at the start of ii 7 would allow a marginally more
acceptable metrical sequence, but such a licence would
be unthinkable for these two letters even were there no
period-end directly before ii 7. This latter consider­
ation likewise excludes an interpretation of ii 6-7 as
dactyllo-epitrite with monosyllabic biceps in a hopelessly
anomalous position (\[\text{w w w w w w} \] etc.). Finally
Haslam (p.37) is right to raise only to dismiss the
notion of ep.z as \[\text{w w w w w w} \].
For where is the parallel for anceps in that position
within an independent period?
Our limited knowledge of the Eriphyle's metre allows us to say that the poem seems to have been built up out of dactylo-anapaestic runs combined with epitrite units. There is no discernible pattern in the lengths of the former, which are sometimes joined to the latter by anceps, sometimes not. Again the only analogy for this absence of anceps interpositum resides in a quotation fragment, though admittedly one whose text is considerably more secure than those mentioned above: in the first line of 244 P (ἄτελεστα τά γάρ καὶ ἁμάχανα τοῦ θανόντα) the anapests run directly into the clausula ----. Another interesting feature is the way in which ep. w-x (i 2-3 and ii 5-6) echoes (indeed, as far as we can see, is identical with) str. 3-4 (i 8-9).^1

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{str. 1} \\
\text{2} \\
\text{3} \\
\text{4} \\
\end{array}
\]

^1 Haslam pp.39-40 raises but then rejects the possibility that this apparent identity is caused by the monostrophic nature of the Eriphyle. This notion is rather more unlikely than Haslam realises: the Suda tells us that all of S's work was triadic, and large papyrus finds have produced no refutation of this generalisation. The coronis at ii 7 is prima facie evidence of triad-end. And Haslam's hypothetical six-line, four-period stanza is incompatible with the metre of i 1 and ii 3 (see ad loc). Incompatible also with S 150, which one would automatically assume to be from the same poem as S 148, even if it did not very probably contain a reference to Ὀρέιος (i 8) a name most appropriate to the Eriphyle myth."
On the fragment of Philodemus see A. Henrichs, Cronache Escolanesi 5(1975)8ff, who apart from proving the passage's derivation from Apollodorus' work περὶ Θεῶν also provides the most accurate text so far, and a list and discussion of the variant versions of Asclepius' miraculous feat. See too V.J. Matthews' commentary on Panyassis fr.19K (pp.108ff).

Until recently the five passages assembled above constituted the only fragment of S's Eriphyle which we possessed. Their information is interesting but disappointingly circumscribed. Since the event they refer to is ignored by all other extant authors, we must remain unable to answer some very important questions. Firstly, which of the numerous mythological personages bearing the name of Lycurgus was resurrected by Asclepius? Pausanias' description of the Amyclaean throne (3.18.12) takes us a small way along the route to the truth: Ἀδραστος δὲ καὶ Τυδεὸς Ἀμφιάραον καὶ Δυκοῦργον τὸν Πρώνακτος μάχης καταπαύοντιν. This is likely to be the same Lycurgus, but if we know whose son he was (c.f. Apollod. 1.9.13) we know nothing else of
him. Vürtheim's guess (p.33), confidently appropriated by Bowra (G.L.P. 2 p.101), to the effect that the Lycurgus who persecuted Dionysus in Il.6.130ff would make a suitable companion in resurrection for that impious despiser of the gods Capaneus (c.f. Aesch.S.C.T. 422ff, Soph. Ant. 128ff etc.) strikes me as highly tenuous. And does not Homer explicitly say that his Lycurgus was son of Dryas?

Nor can we be sure just when the magical resuscitation occurred. Capaneus of course was one of the leaders of the first expedition against Thebes. But Heyne in his note on Apollod 3.10.3(2.279) conjectured that the event belongs to the war of the Epigoni who (in spite of Sthenelus' aggressive remarks at Il.4.405) might have welcomed some help from the former generation. And we have seen above that the papyrus finds of this poem show that it embraced at least the second expedition against Thebes. We must therefore request scholars to refrain from the automatic assumption 1 that 194 relates to an event in the first expedition.

And again, whether there is any particular significance in the identity of the heroes S. selected for resurrection (the impiety of the deed stressed by the impious character of at least one figure? c.f. Bowra GLP 2 pp.11-101) we cannot tell.

"Möchte die ägyptische Erde auch von dieser Lyrik etwas gerettet haben!" wrote Vürtheim (p.34). In 1967 his prayer was answered, though not as generously as he may have hoped. The fragments first published by Lobel in that year (Oxy.Pap.32 pp.30ff), of a papyrus which he dates to the first century A.D., proclaim themselves Stesichorean in metre and dialect. This being so, the name of Alcmaon son of Amphiaraus (i 3,7) strongly suggests the Eriphyle.

col.1
A conversation between Adrastus and Alcmaon.
Full details below (p.493).
The gradual increase in the number of letters required for supplements to the left (5 in 1.3,7 in 1.9) suggests a mild case of Maas' Law (on which see below p.1017).

As Führer observes (Review p.24) this is likelier to represent ...\[ \ldots \] μελα ...[compatible with Lobel's μελαγιγ] than ... μελα...", and this consideration is enough to rule out Haslam's speculations about a monostrophic Eriphyle (see above p.489 n.1).
2: δδε ποτήνεπε

for the phrase c.f. Bacch.15·9, Pind. Pyth.4·97,9·29
(προσήνεπε(v)).

Κ

as a continuation, Page (P.C.P.S.15(1969)72) tentatively
suggested κερομέων, which would supply a suitable tone
of hostility for a conversation between the hero who
organised the expedition of the Seven against Thebes
and alone survived, and the man whose father perished
as a result of that expedition. Adrastus had conspired
with Eriphyle against Alcmaon's father before the first
expedition, and probably conspired with that mother
against that son about the time of the second. The
earlier quarrel between Adrastus and Amphiaraus, referred
to by Pind.Nem.9·13ff as δεινῶν ετάσιν is also relevant.
See further on i 8 below.

3: "Αδρας τος Ημως"

the hero is the subject of the verb ποτήνεπε, and metre
and context conspire to suggest the name of Eriphyle's
brother, the uncle of the addressee Alcmaon. And there
is a nice parallel for the soubriquet in Pind.Pyth.8·51:
"Αδραςτος Ημως. See too Ημως 'Αξιλεύει in S 137·3.

This line seems at first sight to provide a serious
difficulty, for it is all but impossible to avoid
supposing that a direct speech begins after Ημως.
And yet the painstaking researches of Führer (Form-
problem etc. pp.66ff especially n.4) indicate that an
address beginning in mid-line has no real parallel in
early lyric. The sole Homeric justification for such a phenomenon would be II.23.855:

\[
\text{τοξεύειν' "δε μέν κε βάλη τρόισινα πέλειαν...}
\]

which comes from a portion of the Iliad that has never been free from suspicion's cloud. There was no Stesichorean instance when Führer wrote, and none has appeared in the copious papyrus finds of his poetry that have been brought to light since (209.3P is certainly no counter-example - see my note ad loc.). Of the other comparably early passages listed in Führer's n.4. Corinna 654.18P and Sappho 1.18 L-P really exhibit different phenomena, the latter illustrating a change from indirect to direct enquiry. Simonides 543.6P emanates from a poem whose metrical structure is notoriously foggy, and Sappho 95 8 and Alcaeus 304.5 are too lacunose to allow of certain reconstruction.

Fortunately there are metrical grounds (the need to

1Corinna 654.18: τε τιμάν' τάδ' ἐμέλψειμεν. Sappho 1.17ff: κῶττι μοι πάλιστα θέλω γένεσθαι μανύλαι θόμωι τίνα δηστε πείσω κτλ. Simon. 543.6: εἰπέν τ' ο' τέκος οἶον ξιω πόνον. Sappho 95.8: εἰπον' εἰ δέσποτ', ἐπικτλ. Alc. 304.5: ἄλαν' αἳ πάρθενος ἐκεκοιμάι

2See most recently Führer, Beiträge zur Metrik und Textkritik der gr. Lyriker (Nachrichten der Akad. der Wiss. in Göttingen (1976)) 1 Text und Kolometrie von Simonides' Danæ (pp.111ff).
posit period-end after ἴπωκ' see above p.484f) for believing in a mild case of mis-lineation on the papyrus here. A fresh line and a new period should begin with the direct speech.

"Ἀλκμᾶον

several epic passages support this scansion: Il.12.394, Od.15.248, Hes.fr.193.1 MW(c.f.Lexicon d. frühgr. Epos s.v.).

"Ἀλκμᾶον would be less well attested (only Alcman's spelling of his own name in 95Bp) though the metrical sequence thus produced ( — _ — — — — — ) has close analogies with the unemended version of str.1.

3f: πόσε δαῖ[τυμῶν]ακ

Page's brilliant remedy for the papyrus crux (P.C.P.S.15 (1969)72) solves several problems at one stroke.

Poseidon has no place in the story of Eriphyle, the form Ποστεῖδα has no place in a poem by S. (where we expect the "Doric" Ποτεῖδα), and the implied termination Ποστεῖδακ has no place anywhere. Suppose then, with Page, that the dot of ink over the middle iota is a cancellation mark (for the principle of such "expunging dots" see E.G. Turner, Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World (Oxford 1971) p.18; for examples see the notes to

\[1\] For the various forms of Poseidon's name in Greek Lyric see Pavese, Tradizioni e Generi Poetici della Grecia Arcaica (Rome 1972) 81, who is ignorant of Page's correction of the present passage.
plates 15, 16, 34, 67 of that work). Both the epic word πόει (for ποιέω) and the reference to feasting fit perfectly.

4: άπριστον δοίδον

for the Odyssean picture of a minstrel at the banquet c.f. that poem 13·7ff: δεκοί εύλι μεγάροις γερούς ονομα οίνον, αιεί πάντες ἵμοισιν, ἄκουσις εσθε δ' ἄοιδοι. More generally Od.8·73ff, 266ff, 500ff.

6: ιεδειατρίβει: for this coincidence of end of speech and triad see the parallels cited by Führer, (Formproblem etc. p.67. Table 1) from Pindar and Bacchylides. Compare S 88 ii 15 ( [δε] ων [τ]ο).

6ff: ιεδειατρίβει: δ' άεια άμειβόμεινος ποσεί πευ for similar formulae used in introducing direct oration see my note on S 11·1ff.

'Αμφιαρητείδας

dis is obviously a patronymic derived from the name of Amphiaraus, and refers to Alcmaon. Lobel in his ed.pr. (p.31) expressed puzzlement at the form, since the only other occurrence of the patronymic in the literature of antiquity is "Amphiareiades" at Ov.Fast.2·43. He claims that none of the various forms of Amphiaraus' own name ('Αμφιάρης or-πος in Pind.Nem.9·13 and 24 and Antimach.?) (P.Oxy. 2519 fr. 1 ii 1), - ρης in Pind. Oi.6·13, Pyth.8·56, - ρας in Pind. Is.8·33, this last the most common c.f. Lex. d. frühgr.Epos s.v.) explains the
intrusive tau. But as Snell observes in his review of Lobel (Gnomon 40(1968)120) there seems to be an adequate analogy in the name Αφαρεδες (that form in 11.9.83 and Theocr. 22.159: Αφαρης-πτυς in Plut. Moral. 315\( ^F \)) and probably Bacch. 5.129 (‘Αφαρηςα) which gives rise to the patronymics Αφαρητίδας (Pind.Nem. 10.65) and Αφαρητιάδας (Ar.Rh.1.151).

8ff: cυ μέν ..|.. αὖτα ἐγών

the sequence μέν...ἄταρ is found in Pind.Pyth.3.98, 4.169, fr.333\(^A\)Sn. Some have introduced it by supplement into 222 i 2ff P (the Suotherae) but see my note ad loc.

cυ μέν φ]λε clearly gives the right sense, but it is slightly too long for the space available. Given the relationship of the two speakers, φ]λε is likely to be ironical (see above p.493).

ἐὐφραίνῳ τυμέν: c.f. Pind. 1s.7.1f: τίνι τῶν πάρος...

..μάλιστα τυμόν τεύχον εὐφρανάς; For θαλλας

ἐδωρ. θυμι. c.f.Od.2.311: δαίνυοις τ’άκεςοντα καὶ εὐφραίνεσθαι ἐκηλον.

ἐπὶ πρά -

πρά - γος - γυμα - ξιν suggests Lobel. I forbear to speculate on "the matter" about which Alcmaon says he will go.
As far as we can tell from the sad remnants of this part of the poem, a mother is described (5ff) as yoking a mule-cart and going matchmaking. The most important mother in the story of Eriphyle, need one say, is Eriphyle. That any woman, especially a mythical queen, should have to yoke her own cart, may occasion surprise. But heroic poetry supplies near enough parallels.

Priam, in the last book of the Iliad, does not yoke his mule-cart, but he orders his sons to do so (Il.24.189ff, c.f.265ff) and that princes of the Trojan royal house should carry out this menial task is no less striking than the case that confronts us here. But then secondary figures like servants are conspicuous in the Homeric poems by their very absence. Priam supplies a further example in Il.3.310 when he himself places the lambs that are required for the truce in his chariot. See too Il.13.34ff where Poseidon performs some very menial tasks: έν όποιον έκτηνος Ποσειδάων ένοικος νεών| λύσας έξ άνέων, παρά ο' άμβροσιον βάλεν ειδαρ | έδυναι | άμφι δ' νοοεÎ πέδας έβαλε χρυσέας κτλ. In Il.8.440ff that deity unharnesses his brother Zeus' horses from his chariot: c.f. Od.3.421ff where Nestor's dispatch of his own sons to fetch the wherewithal of a sacrifice

Lobel's suggestion that a new poem has begun since col.i is no more likely here than it was at 222 iiP.
evokes the splendid comment from the Σ ad loc.:

διὰ τι ὁ Νέκτωρ βασιλέως ὄν, τοῖς αὐτοῦ παισίν
ἐπιτέλει τά τῶν δοῦλων καὶ τῶν ὑπὸ χείρα; φαίνει οὖν
ὅτι ἀπολύει καὶ ἀκεφόδοξος τότε διέκειντο καὶ οὐκ
ἑκοντες ἐκαρσίν. Female divinities harness horses in
11.5.719ff (Hera) and Eur.Hel.1311f: ἡ γάρ ὁτε ζυγίους
ζευδάκα τε κατ' ἄναλς (Demeter).

Given this background it is perfectly natural for the
widowed Eriphyle to go in person to woo on behalf of
son or sons. Whether she was successful or not we
cannot say. In the years of exile that followed his
act of matricide Alcmaeon had a positively embarrassing
plethora of wives, but we know of no tradition of earlier
marriages involving himself or his brother Amphilochoi.

3: ἱνεκατονῦ[

Various articulations and metrical interpretations are
possible (,,,) οὐδὲνάμον, οὐς ἄμωντο τοῖς οὐς ἄμισον).
Führer (Review p.24) prefers the last, but lack of context
renders all uncertain.

5: ἀπῆλαν ζεῦ[

Lobel (p.31) compares Pind. Pyth.10.65 ζεῦξεν ἄρμα the meta-
phorical chariot of poetry),
Timotheus 791.19Off P (Persae) ζεῦγνητε δχήμ.

6: ναδέβα

Lobel shrewdly saw the possibility of -νάδε, and since there
is so little space between this and ζεῦι one expects some such
phrase as Barrett's ζεὖ[ξα[ε(oc(or ζεῦ[ξαμένακ) Σικυών]νάδε(ε)
which is metrically and geographically appropriate.For the
potential relevance of Σικυών(or Σικυών: see RE s.v. Sikyon
2528·30ff) note Paus.2·11·2 on its connections with Eriphyle's brother Adrastus. The city is easily reached from Argos. With the otiose εἰς Σιθίχοδε which Barrett's supplement entails c.f. phrases like εἰς Αδάσε (Od.10·351) and see in general Wackernagel, Vorlesungen über Syntax 2 (1928) 156ff and 222ff. Presumably παίδανδε in opposition to 6's παράκοιτα. The next word is troublesome: it is not recorded either as the name of a mythical personage or as an epithet (which is how Mr. Barrett prefers to take it). On the formal level we might compare παίδε Ἰννολόχοιο at Il·12·309 and 387 and note that in the same epic Ἀλέξανδρος outnumbers Ἀλέξανδρος by 9 to 4.  

γα μέν

The immediate context, with words such as παράκοιταν (6), μνατεύσωσι (7), and ἔγγιον (9) floating about, suggests the interpretations γαμάν (Doric infinitive) or γάμου (Doric third person singular unaugmented aorist of the verb meaning "to marry"). But the metrical context requires two successive shorts here which neither γαμάν nor γάμου (έν for -εῖν) can supply. Barrett's articulation γα μέν is therefore preferable and this entails a new sentence beginning with ὑπερμακάλου. For the collocation γα μέν, characteristic of archaic poetry, c.f. Denniston's G.P. pp.386ff. Compare oδδὲ γα μάν in P.Lille 207. This line should therefore cease to be regarded as the only instance metrically guaranteed -έν for -εῖν (c.f. M.L. West, Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus p.189)

1 It is the name of several historical persons, but the only one early enough for there to be the remotest possibility of his being mentioned by S. is the Spartan king who reigned during the Second Messenian War. (RE 1·20·2080). But what business has he to feature in a mythological narrative?
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col. i

Line 7 (ἐδώ' ἐμοί) indicates that this fragment is part of a direct speech, with which the γνώμη supplied at 4 by Lobel would well cohere. In connection with 7's ἐδώ' and 11's ἄμφω we might remind ourselves that Eriphyle had two sons (Alcmaeon and Amphilochus) and that P. Lille presents us with a mother and queen's speech about her two male offspring. But we have probably gone too far already.

4: ἔναδ' ἐςθλᾶ κακός
Lobel convincingly supplements μεμιγμένα δ' ἐςθλᾶ κακοίς (p. 33) comparing Hes. Op. 1791 (μεμιξεται ἐςθλᾶ κακοίς), Theogn. 192 (κδν γάρ μίσυεται ἐςθλᾶ κακοίς).

8: ἱκανός...
Barrett plausibly restores θερίσκανθρον, the son of Polyneices and Adrastus' daughter Argeia mentioned by Pind. Ol. 2. 76 etc.

col. ii

Führer (Review p. 24) ingeniously suggests we may have here a description of a departure (compare the activity at S148 ii 5ff).

1Misprinted as 197 in Lobel.
5: ταντ
see p. 482 above.

6: καρπαλ[μ]-
Führer (sup.cit.) supplies καρπαλ[μ]ως, noting how often this word occurs of creatures drawing a chariot (11.24.
327, Od.8.122). More relevant still to Führer's interpretation of the fragment as a whole would be
Od.3.478: καρπαλιμως δ᾿ ἔξευξαν ὄφ᾿ ἀρματιν ὡκέας ἵππους.

7: τεσετ[μ·]
φέρων] τεσ τίς[ (servants loading a chariot?) would fit Führer's reconstruction, and Lobel's description of the final letter ("the left-hand arc of a circle" (p.33)).

8: ερύκ[μ·]
ερύκε[γραματες (an epithet used of ἵππου in 11.15.354,
16.370, [Hes.] Scut.369) would again match Führer's reconstruction.
Is the poem's title an alternative spelling of the more familiar Εὐρωπη, or does it mean "the story of Εὐρωπη", just as η 'Οδόσσεια means "the story of Odysseus", η Αιολήδεια "the story of Diomedes"? It is impossible to decide, because Stesichorean poems bear titles of both sorts, although titles consisting of the central figure's name (Ἐλένη, Ἕριφθη, Κερβήρος, Κύκνος, Σκόλλα) predominate over the other type (Γηρυονήτες, Ὀρεστεία). Instances of Εὐρωπεια as a variant form of Εὐρωπη occur in several authors apart from Σ Ευρ.Φων.670 (our source for Σ's poem) and Σ Ευρ.Φων.5 (1.248 Schwartz). We find it in Moschus' Europa passim (but Εὐρωπη in the first verse: see Bühler ad loc. (p.47) and compare the six verses preserved in ps-Aristotle περὶ Σαμαστῶν ἁμουσιάτων 133.843B15-844A5 which deal with a nymph they call both Ἕριφθεια (2) and Ἕρωθη (5)) in Choeroboscus ap Cramer's Anecd. Gr. Oxon. 2 p.206 (not 205 as claimed by Roscher inf.cit.) 15-19; in Et. Mag. s.v., in Nicander ap. Athen.7.296F = fr. 25 (Schneider) and Nicander fr. 26 (Schneider) = Steph. Byz. s.v. "Αθως; in Σ 11.6.131 (2.153 Erbse) = Eumelus fr. 10 (Kinkel) and in Clement of Alexandria Strom. 1.24.164 = Eumelus fr. 11 (Kinkel). Roscher 1412.26ff - from which I take these passages - claims that "Europeia" is a late form; contrast the judicious remarks of Lobeck, Paralipomena Grammaticae Graecae p.321. The above-named authors in whose texts
this spelling occurs are certainly late, but someone should have realised that in at least three of the instances it might have been taken over from poets as early as Eumelus and S. This possibility was confirmed in 1915 with the publication of P.Oxy.1358 fr.1·1 = Hes. fr. 141·8 MW which shows us that in part of the Γυναικῶν Κατάλογος the daughter of glorious Phoenix was called Εὐρωπείη. The spelling then is definitely early,¹ and may well have occurred in the original texts of S. and Eumelus. Compare Καλλιόπεια for the usual Καλλίδου in 240 P. See further Steph. Byz. s.v. 'Ερυθέα (λέγεται δὲ καὶ 'Ερώθη κατὰ συναλοφήν, ὡς τὸ 'Αγάμμελα Ἀγάμη, καὶ Ζέλεια Ζῆλη, Μαντίνεια Μαντίνη), E. Risch, Wortbildung der hom. Sprache² (1974) p.137f, Bühler sup.cit.

Little can be said profitably of the early stages of the Europa myth in Greek literature (see Bühler pp.17-20). The story of this heroine's rape is sufficiently familiar for Zeus to omit her actual name when he briefly alludes to

Φολίνικος μούρης τηλεκειτοῦ

ἡ τέκε μοι Μίνων τε καὶ ἀντίθετον Ῥαδάμανθυν (II·14·321-2).

No word there of the bull, but it is quite in Homer's

¹On the other hand, the form Εὐρωπη occurs in Hes.Theog. 357 and H.H. Apoll.251 and 291, though in all three cases it refers to the continent. And in S.fr.209.11 P we encounter the first use of the short form Πανελόπη for the epic Πηνελόπεια (see my note ad loc.).
manner to omit such undignified transmogrifications. (Contrast Cronus' equine cavortings in the Τιτανωμαχία (Allen fr.8 p.111) or Zeus' own metamorphosis into a swan - all the better to couple with Nemesis - in Apollod. 3.10.7). Likewise, the frequent Homeric use of the epithet Κασυειος clearly presupposes knowledge of Cadmus' journey from Asia to mainland Greece in fruitless search for his sister. The fully developed tradition of the flower-gathering in the meadow, the deceptively docile bull, and the unanticipated journey to Crete, seems to have appeared as early as the Hesiodic Eoeae (frr.140 and 141 M-W). That poem added a third son, Sarpedon, to the two notables mentioned by Homer.1 Exactly the same details are attributed to an unknown work of Bacchylides (fr.10 Sn.) whose uncle likewise recounted the story of Europa and the bull (Simonides 562 P). Most tantalising of all is the news that the early Corinthian poet Eumelus seems to have written an epic with the very same name as S's poem (Paus. 9.5.8 = fr.12 (Kinkel) and frr. 10 and 11 cited on the previous page). As luck would have it, our knowledge of this poem's contents is extensive only in comparison with what we can say of S's (see G.L. Huxley, Greek Epic Poetry (1969) pp.75-76). But if the epic

1The same three sons are mentioned in Aeschylus' Κάρες Ἑὐρυδίκη (fr.99 N.;c.f. Loeb Aesch.Vol.2. pp.599ff; Wilamowitz, Glaube d Hell.1 (1931) p.56 n.3). For a fourth offspring (Καρινειος) c.f. Praxilla 753 P.
called Europeia really described how Hermes taught
Amphion to play the lyre which made the building of
Thebes such an easy and pleasant task (fr.12), and
if it also dealt with the purification and initiation
of Dionysus (fr.10), and other parts of his career
(fr.10), we would have an interesting parallel for the
apparently extensive subject-matter of S's lyric poem.
Not that any such justification is really needed.
The work's title tells us that Europa was involved;
our one piece of information concerns Cadmus' founding
of Thebes. We know that S's style was detailed and
diffuse. Hence there is nothing in the notion that
one compendious poem by S. embraced both the rape of
Europa and the founding of Thebes that need stretch
our credulity: Cadmus' journey to Delphi and the site
of his future city in search of his sister is an adequate
link between the two diverse events.¹ It is only when
scholars insist on adding the grim end of Actaeon
(236 P) to the poem's contents (so Vürtheim p.28, Bowra
GLP² p.99) that I become restless, especially when Bowra
defends his action by the erroneous statement that
"Semele, like Europa, was a daughter of Cadmus" (my
italics). Of course S's poems ranged wide in their
contents, and the fate of the son of Europa's niece

¹As Huxley (l.c.) observes, a further link is supplied
by the necklace which Zeus gave to Europa, and she in
turn to Cadmus when he married Harmonia (c.f. Hes.
fr.141·3ff; Phercydes P.Gr.Hist.3 F 89 etc.)
might have received detailed treatment in a poem with this title. Or Actaeon's end might have been mentioned very briefly in passing, and need thus be only incidental to the poem's main theme. Nevertheless it would be wrong to assign fr.236 P to the Eυκοπεία out of a mistaken desire to lodge every Stesichorean fragment within a poem whose title we know. The very latest papyrus find (P. Lille 76) provides us with a very salutary reminder (1) that S. wrote several works based on the Theban cycle of myths; (2) that he composed some poems of whose title we are ignorant.

S. is the only author known to us who makes Athena sow the dragon's teeth at Thebes. The otherwise unanimous voice of antiquity nomiimates Cadmus for that task. (These later passages are most conveniently collected and discussed by F. Vian in his really useful though rather too speculative book Les origines de Thèbes: Cadmos et les Spartes (Études et commentaires, 48) (1963) pp 21ff, pp 94ff.) But several sources concur in attributing his action to Athene's inspiration. (Eur. Phoen. 666ff: δι' αυτος δυνατος τοις βαθυστους γυς της αθηνας δε δεντοντας θεσ (Wecklein: Παλλάδος codd.) φρασαίται... Απολλοδ.3.4.1:Κάδμος κτείνει τον δράκοντα, και της Αθηνας υποθεμένης τούς δόθησε αυτούς θείοις... Ηγιν. fab. 178: draco Martis filius... a Cadmo lapide est interfectus, dentesque eius Minerva monstrante sparsit et aravit). Pherecydes F.Gr.Hist.
3F.22 has both Athena and Ares give Cadmus the teeth but only Ares advise on the way to use them, and Jacoby in his commentary ad loc (p.399) is surely right to detect here a contamination of the version noted above which involves Athena alone, and a different version featuring only Ares which seems to occur in Euripides Her. 252f (ὅ γῆς λοχεύμαθ', οὖς "Αρης επελεῖ ποτέ\nλάβρον δράκοντος ἔξηρημάκες γένυν) and Hellanicus F.Gr.Hist.4 Fl (κατὰ "Ἀρεῖς ὑπάλητον): for other passages which have been thought to reflect this "Ares-
version" see Jacoby ad Hellan. Fl (pp.431-2) and Vian sup.cit. pp.23ff.

Few scholars have thought it worthwhile to divine the reason for S's apparent autoschediasm.\(^1\) Bowra (GLP\(^2\) p.99) however, turned his hands to the problem and produced the following explanation: "Of course (S.) may have composed the poem for a festival of Athene and thought such a change suitable, but we can see what he gained by it. The whole action becomes more majestic and more mysterious by being transferred from human to divine agency. The curious thing is that it had very little effect on subsequent literature". He goes on to interpret Eur. Phoen. 666ff as an attempt to harmonise S's idiosyncracy with the usual version, and at first

\(^1\)But Robert, Heldensage 106 suggested that S's version represented "die Ursage".
sight "Cadmus sowed the teeth on Athena's advice" does seem a suitable dilution or rationalisation of "Athena sowed the teeth (instead of Cadmus)". By the same token, Hellanicus Fl must be a rationalisation of the tradition preserved in Eur.Her. 252. I am given pause however by Alcman fr.80 P = STI1.16.236 (4·223 Erbse):

καὶ ποι' Ὀδυσσῆος ταλαίφρονος δότ' ἐταλών
Κτρώνα ἑπαλέψατα.

As the quoter of this morsel observes, in Od.12·177 Circe herself does not bung the ears of Odysseus' men with wax, but merely advises the use of this excellent expedient against the Sirens' allurements: Odysseus himself does the anointing when the appropriate moment comes (Od.12·177). So once again we are confronted by two versions of an incident: (a) a divine being advises a hero to do x and he does it; (b) a divine being does x instead of the hero. But in our second example the chronological relation between the versions is reversed and the work containing (a) - the Odyssey - is earlier in time than the lyric poet who uses (b). Thus it becomes difficult to use Bowra's principle and see here too (a) as a rationalised version of the original (b).

In view of this we may reasonably enquire whether S. and Alcman really saw any significant difference between (a) and (b). Did they not simply regard them as equally
viable ways of describing the same phenomenon? Would not S. have been somewhat puzzled by the scholion's statement that he was telling a substantially different version of the tale from Euripides? Several passages in epic seem to me to confirm that the following all say the same thing: a deity alone does x; a mortal does x on that deity's prompting; that mortal alone does x.

For instance, in 11.2.826 we are told that Pandarus had received his bow from Apollo himself. But in 11.4.106ff there is a lengthy description of how Pandarus fashioned the weapon with his own hands. Rather than pounce on the "inconsistency" and cry "multiple authorship" we should try to accept that both passages are telling us that Pandarus was a very successful archer. (So M.M. Willcock, B.I.C.S.17 (1970) pp.3-4; for a more mechanistic explanation see e.g. Page, History and the Homeric Iliad p.140). Interestingly enough, the ostensibly disparate statements that a god did (or made) x and that a mortal did (or made) the identical x, can be modes of saying the same thing. Likewise in Od.19.571ff Penelope announces, seemingly of her own volition, that she has decided to test the suitors with the bow; at the very beginning of Od.21, the goddess Athene prompts Penelope to do the very same thing. But here is no contradiction

\[1\text{Compare 11.9.628f: 'Αχιλλέας | ἄγριον ἐν στήθεσσι θέτο μεγαλήτορα θυμόν | ib.636f: σοὶ ἰδ' ἄλληκτον τε κακόν τε | θυμόν ἐνι στήθεσσι θεοί θέσαν.}\]
caused by a clumsy interweaving of incompatible traditions: the same act can be described at different times, even within the same work, as the product of a human decision or of divine inspiration. Compare the supposedly varying accounts of how Achilles met his death. Sometimes Apollo alone kills him (II.21-277ff; Aesch. fr. 350 N²; Soph. Phil. 334ff; Hor. Od. 4.6.1ff; Qu.Sm. 3.60ff); sometimes Paris alone (Eur. Andr. 655; Hec. 387ff; Plut. Quaest. Conv. 9.13.2, Comp. of Lys. and Sull.4); sometimes the two in consort (II.19.404ff, 22.359ff; Aethiopis Allen p.106 (Procl.) with Apollo guiding Paris’ hand in Verg. Aen. 6.56.8 and Ov. Met. 12.597ff. Finally, note the traditions about the building of the Trojan Horse: Od. 8.493: τὸν (scil. Ἰππον) Ἐπειδὴ ἐποίησεν σὺν Ἀθηνα... II. Parv. (Allen p.107 (Procl.)) Ἐπειδὴ κατ’ Ἀθηνάς προανέφευρεν τὸν δούρειον Ἰππον κατασκευάζει... Eur. Tro. 560f: λόχου δ' ἔξεβαιν ἂρης, κόρας ἔργα Παλλάδος.¹

I therefore conclude that with this fragment we should for once abstain from drawing conclusions about S’s “innovations”, and even from regarding the one detail we know from the Europeia as a change introduced into the normal tradition.

¹Professor Kassel reminds me of the principle "qui facit per alium facit per se" (illustrated by Pearson ad Soph. fr.620 (2.257)) which is very similar to the attitude I have been discussing.
Troy's destruction is not described in the Iliad, for obvious reasons, though it is often foreshadowed, most strikingly by Hector and Andromache in 11.6.407ff, by Agamemnon ib.4.163ff. The Odyssey has cause to mention the Wooden Horse (Od. 4.265ff, 8.492ff, 11.523ff) but we have already examined the context and contents of the first of these three passages in connection with the story of Helen (pp.240ff) and since we shall shortly be inspecting most of the information preserved about these early epics the Ilias Parva and the Iliu Persis during discussion of the all-important Tabula Iliaca, it will be sufficient here to register a few bibliographical references on the relevant portions of the epic cycle. First and foremost of course must come Bethe, Homcr: Dichtung und Sage 2 (Kyklos) pp.241ff. See too W. Kullmann, Die Quellen den Ilias (Hermes Einzelschr. 14 (1960)) Index s.v. "Iliu-persis".

Numerous Attic tragedies embraced the topic, most of them now lost, many by Sophocles: see especially Pearson, The Fragments of Sophocles 1.8ff (on his Αἰας Δόξος) ib. 86ff

---

1 See too my commentary on 198-202 P.

2 But against his notion that the Ilias Parva was no more than a name for the Aethiopis, Iliupersis and Nostoi together see Severyns, Rev. Phil. 49 (1925) 162f.
(on the Antenoridae), 2·38ff on the Laocoon, ib. 161ff (Polyxena) and on his Sinon ib. 181ff. Two tragedies by Euripides, the Hecuba and the Troades, though set at a time immediately after the fall of Troy, contain choral odes which recall with moving impact the sack of the city as experienced by the female chorus. But it is not until Quintus of Smyrna and Triphiodorus in the third or fourth centuries A.D. that we encounter a continuous Greek narrative of these events that is still extant.

Of course the principle that these later poets incorporated into their compositions material taken from earlier epic and S. has long been recognised: see, for instance, the excellent remarks in F. Vian's Recherches sur les Posthomerica de Quintus de Smyrne (Paris 1959) 17ff on that poet's probable sources. And we can now detect specific echoes of the Stesichorean Iliu Persis, certain or possible, in both poets (see e.g. my notes on S 88 ii 13 and following, or 104·9). Doubtless there are many others in these late Greek poets and also in, for instance, Vergil's Aeneid Book 2. But they must remain imprisoned and unrecognised, just like the conceivable derivations from S. in Attic tragedy, unless new evidence accrues.
THE EVIDENCE OF ART

The multifarious events attendant upon the Sack of Troy were always a popular subject in Greek art. For the latest list of vase-paintings see Vasenlisten\textsuperscript{3} 382ff. Other artefacts in Denkmälerlisten 3–174ff. Carl Robert's general consideration of the depictions in chapter 2 of Bild und Lied (pp.52ff) is still well worth reading; see also J. Boardman, Antike Kunst 19 (1976) 7ff. M.I. Wiencke, A.J.A. 58 (1954) 285ff has some useful general remarks before branching off into an investigation of portrayals of the fates of Astyanax and Priam. For that very popular scene Menelaus' recovery of Helen, we must consult Ghali-Kahil, Les enlèvements et le retour d'Hélène (Paris 1955) 31ff, 71ff, 325f and P.A. Clement, Hesperia 27 (1958) 47ff. The best introduction to Polygnotus' Sack of Troy painted in the Cnidian Lesche at Delphi between 458 and 447 and painstakingly described by Pausanius 10.26 is again Robert's: Die Iliupersis des Polygnot (Siebzhentes Hallisches Winckelmanns programm (1893)).

The value of most works of art for S's Iliupersis is largely negative: practically none of them can be shown to derive from the lyric poem. In the particular of Helen's retrieval they can most certainly be proved to have nothing to do with it (see below p.678).
And "dass die Iliupersis von Polygnotos ... benutzt wäre
ist ganz unwahrscheinlich" (Wilamowitz SS p.242). Two metopes from Foice del Sele however, have been thought to reflect S's poem. The first (Zancani Montuoro and Zanotti-Bianco Heraion & c ch.22 pp.260ff, Tables XLIII, LXXXIV-V = Denkmälerlisten 3:175:1) is now broken into six pieces and its whole surface is corroded: furthermore it is unfinished, though work on it had obviously progressed to an advanced stage. These factors achieve a monumental simplicity: two female figures clad in chitons that reach the ankle, with face and bodies shown full on, are displaying unmistakable signs of grief: the left one tears her hair with both hands; the other uses only her right, for the left hand supports a baby. This child marks out the scene as a specific mythological depiction: we soon think of the lamentation in Il:24-710ff involving Hecuba, Helen, and Andromache, and if Astyanax has been added from Il:6:404ff, that will help an onlooker to label and distinguish the characters, as well as deepening the picture's pathos by intimations of the future tragedy. Say, then, that the women represent the final two of the mourners in Il:24. This may help our identification of the second metope (Heraion & c ch.23, pp.266ff, Table LI, 41. This relief has been abandoned at a far earlier stage of work than the preceding, and shattered into more numerous fragments. An exact interpretation of the head facing right in profile and clasped by its owner's right hand in an enfolding gesture suggestive of grief and despair is thereby rendered all the more difficult; but

---

1 This would seem to be an implicit polemic against Bergk, who had argued that Polygnotus was considerably indebted to S. in his Delphic Iliupersis (Gr. Literaturgesch. 2 (1883) 296).
the Italian scholars, connecting it with Helen and Andromache, tentatively suppose it to be Hecuba's, perhaps in the context of the prothesis of Hector (Il. 24.719ff); compare the relief in Dawkins, Artemis Orthia (1929) Table CII.

This latter hypothesis is very speculative. But we would most readily choose the Iliad as the source here, even without the presence on the same site of metopes arguably inspired by the events of Il.16.787ff (see Heraion & c pp.254ff). And in fact this is the conclusion reached by Zancani Montuoro and Zanotti-Bianco. It is only Page (P.M.G. p.95) who ventures "Stesichori ad Ilii Pers. referre possis." It will already be plain how unlikely such a remark is.
THE TABULA ILIACA

205 P = Denkmälerlisten 3·21·12 = 175·10 = 460·8 etc.

The Tabula Iliaca stands on a completely different level from all the other artefacts we have to consider in connection with S. It alone explicitly claims to be reflecting the events contained within a Stesichorean poem. True, few scholars have accepted this claim without first subjecting it to a searching scrutiny, and their attitude is perfectly right. Nevertheless, when all the appropriate reservations and qualifications have been made, what would we not give to find an equivalent to the inscription "Ιλίου Πέρσων κατά Στησίχορον on some of the vases or metopes held to be influenced by the Geryoneis or by the Cresteia! But there are difficulties. Some of these are inherent to this type of investigation and will be familiar to us from our study of other areas of the wide topic "S. and art". Some are new, and are caused by want of satisfactory reproductions - drawings and photographs alike - of the table. The necessarily close analysis of the intricate details of this work of art has long been bedevilled by the drawing of Feodor Iwanovitch¹ (1765-1832) first

¹This is the same man as the Theodor Iwanovitch who produced drawings of sculptures on the Acropolis for Lord Elgin. He had an extremely unusual career: having been born a Tartar and captured by the Cossacks as a child, he later lived at the courts of St. Petersburg and Baden. He was thought by Elgin's private secretary to be perhaps the only man of taste ever produced by his nation. See the references to him in W. St. Clair, Lord Elgin and the Marbles (1967), especially p.61, where after high praise of his Acropolis drawings (now in the British Museum) we
produced in 1821 (in Tischbein, Homer nach Antiken gezeichnet, VII (Stuttg. 1821) Taf. 2). This manages to give a thoroughly misleading impression of our table: in particular it grotesquely exaggerates the sharpness and clarity of outlines, and in places substitutes a totally arbitrary reconstruction for what on the original is blurred and indistinct. The resulting reproduction is a joy to behold but deeply pernicious. And it continues to wreak havoc even at this late date and leads astray the most distinguished scholars. Two relatively trivial examples: Page (P.M.G. p.110) claims that the table labels one of its characters Aìca. Only if you believe Feodor's reproduction (see below p.536 ). Or again, both Bowra (GLP p.105) and Page (sup. cit.) state that a warrior is emerging from the side of the wooden horse and the latter gives him a helmet. The whole notion ultimately derives from Feodor's fanciful elaboration of the scene: on the original, as I can confirm from autopsy, surface wear has obliterated the relevant region of the horse's flank. It is appalling to find Feodor's effort (contd...) 

1 read the sinister words "with astonishing imagination and good judgement, he made lively restorations on paper of how they must have looked in their original condition. Unfortunately, ... [he] was extremely lazy and had an uncommon relish for strong liquor." Apparently he could only be made to work "by a judicious administration of brandy." See further A.H. Smith, J.H.S. 36 (1916) 172ff, where Goethe is quoted as remarking of him "He has hardly sufficient knowledge and accuracy to let one look for the highest standard of accuracy and truthfulness of style."

1 Admittedly the point is pedantic, since an emerging figure probably did occur there originally (see p.532 n.1).
being preserved as the only illustration of the table in K. Weitzmann, Ancient Book Illumination (pl. 24 = fig. 56, and see pls. 17-19) as late as 1959.¹ (In fact his whole treatment of what he calls the "Iliac tablet" is desperately unsatisfactory: he thinks, for instance, that the work is crediting S. with the epic Iliupersis elsewhere attributed to Arctinus or Lesches). Far more accurate, though less ingratiating to the eyes, is the drawing of L. Schulz specially prepared for the Jahn-Michaelis publication (see below) but it is little reproduced and can be very confusing if reduced in size. Photographs too are hard to come by. The best are those of Paulcke (see the bibliography below p. 523) which is approximately life-size, and Mancuso (p. 5) which is larger but not quite so clear.² But these works are rather inaccessible: the only books of any wide circulation known to me which contain a photograph are (1) F. Bömer's Rom und Troia (1951), but it is too small and is set opposite an enlargement of a section of Feodor's unreliable reproduction (Tab. 2 facing p. 17); (2) Galinsky's Aeneas, Sicily, and Rome (1969) pls. 85 and 86¹: better, but still rather too small and juxtaposed with Feodor's drawing. Again, treatises on the Tabula Iliaca are often

¹Weitzmann's fig. 56 is referred to, for all the world as if it were reliable, by e.g. R.C. Austin on Verg. Aen. 2.262. And G.K. Galinsky (see my bibliography) is still reproducing Feodor's reproduction in 1969! (see his plates 29 and 86²).

²Or so it seems to my eyes: but Mancuso (p. 667) calls Paulcke's photograph "mediocre." Sadurska's photograph (pl. 1) is in my opinion inferior to both.
distressingly inaccessible, and sometimes written without knowledge of the original work of art. No useful investigation of our topic has ever been written in English; no full-scale examination has been undertaken in any language during the past fifty years. The list below is not a full bibliography: it aims at setting out the most detailed monographs on the subject. These in turn contain references to less exhaustive (but not always less profitable) treatments. The list, incidentally, constitutes a remarkably broad spectrum of views. A very full bibliography of treatments up to 1897 can be found scattered among the footnotes of Paulcke's dissertation; a similarly full bibliography up to the early 1960's in Sadurska's footnotes (especially pp 6 and 25).

Jahn-Michaelis¹: Griechische Bilderchroniken (Bonn 1873): bearbeitet von Otto Jahn: aus dem Nachlasse des Verfassers herausgegeben und beendet von Adolf Michaelis (Tab. 1 shows Feodor's reproduction, Tab. 1* Schulz's).

C. Robert: Arch. Ztg. (1874/5) [I have not read this]
Bild und Lied (1881) pp.73ff

¹Only a fanatic will wish to penetrate further back in time behind this, in many ways the editio princeps of the tabula. But F.G. Welcker (Jahns Jahrbücher (1829) 9.2.3 = Kl. Schr. 1.181-186, and Annali del Inst. di corrisp. archeol. 1 (1829) 227ff = Alte Denkmäler Vol.2 Bas-reliefe und geschnitene Steine (1850) 185ff) is still well worth reading.
L.G. Konstas: Iliupersis nach Stesichorus (Tübinger Diss. 1876)

A. Brüning: Über die Bildlichen Vorlagen der Ilischen Tafeln: Jahrb. d. Deutsch. Arch. Inst. 9 (1894) 136ff

M. Paulcke: De Tabula Iliaca Quaestiones Stesichoreae (Königsberg Diss. 1897)


Wilamowitz, Kl. Schr. 51.497ff (c.f. Kl. Schr. 52.74): a little-known but stimulating article suggesting that artefacts like the Tabula Iliaca with its summaries of epic narratives presuppose the existence of illustrated "Volksbücher" containing like resumés of early poetry.


A. Sadurska: Les Tables Iliaques (Warsaw 1964) especially pp.24-37: in many ways this is the most useful treatment of the subject: it is very up-to-date and full, not least
in its references to the work of previous scholars. But this utility is very considerably diminished by the author's excessively brisk and dogmatic handling of the numerous problems raised by the Capitoline tablet. Thus, in listing the figurative scenes within the central Sac of Troy, she leaves too many dubious areas I will not say unsolved - that would be asking too much - but unmentioned. Similarly, though she provides a fine resume of earlier discussions of the Stesichorean nature of the artefact, she has nothing to contribute herself that is at all incisive or original.


Konstas and Perret are the most virulent opponents of the notion that the table gives an accurate reflection of our poem's contents: between them they provide almost all the arguments of substance that can be marshalled against its reliability. Jahn and Michaelis contribute what is the most objective and balanced survey of the problem, perhaps because they were writing before the controversy over the table divided the scholarly world into two hostile camps for and against it. Paulcke's dissertation strikes me as being the fullest and most reliable treatment of our subject, but he is too keen to interpret what are often

---

1 Perret's attitude is hardly surprising, since he believes that the legend of Troy and Rome was invented ex nihilo by Pyrrhus of Epirus and propagated and elaborated by his historians, especially Timaeus. See contra, Momigliano sup. cit.
wretchedly uncertain and ambiguous outlines in the light of our few fragments of S. and other authors, and he tries to attach a name to too many uncertain figures. This is all the more regrettable when these interpretations appear to be based on an inspection of his own photograph rather than the original artefact. But I doubt whether the carefullest and lengthiest autopsy would resolve the more enigmatic jumbles of lines, and scholars have been too reluctant to register a verdict of "nescimus". And yet when the figure to the right of the central doors of Troy has been variously identified as Aphrodite, Clymene, Calchas, and Astyanax with a Greek warrior, a cautious agnosticism seems the only sane response. In the description of the relevant section of the table which I shall now proceed to give, labelled figures will be carefully distinguished from those without identifying tags, and vacuous speculation about the latter will be generally relegated to footnotes (to provide concrete proof of the uncertainty that so often assails us). The names of the former will be printed in Greek letters and embellished with an asterisk.

The object now known as the Tabula Iliaca was found not long before 1683 A.D. (the date of its first publication) about ten miles from Rome at Torre Messer Paolo.\footnote{On the early history of the artefact c.f. Jahn-Michaelis pp.2-3, Mancuso pp.666-667, Sadurska pp 24 and 32.} It is kept in a glass case at Rome's Capitoline Museum - the
building which faces Michelangelo's Palazzo de' Conservatori on the top of the Capitoline Hill (c.f. E. Simon in W. Helbig's Führer durch die öffentlichen Sammlungen Klassischer Altertümmer in Rom 2 (1966) pp.116ff) - on the first floor in the Sala delle Colombe as item no.53. It is one of a number of fragmentary reliefs now scattered over Europe whose similar material, contents, technique or style rank them together in one group. (For a full survey of these other reliefs c.f. Jahn-Michaelis pp 4ff and tables II to VI; Denkmälerlisten 3·1ff). Our own fragment is a disappointing 25 centimetres in height, 28 in width, and 1.50 in thickness. It is regularly said to be made out of white "palombino" marble, but solemn scientific research (see Sadurska p.24 and n.1) seems now to have decided that it is constructed from "calcite" (calcium carbonatum: Ca CO₃). One's first impression on seeing it is dismay at the crude vagueness of many of the outlines. for a particularly frustrating instance see the case of the figure to the right of Troy's central gates mentioned on p.539 below. But Paulcke (pp.4ff) has convincingly rebutted earlier notions that such uncertainties are due to the unfinished state of a work on which various shapes had been provisionally blocked out as a rough guide for later elaboration. On the contrary: parts of the table are sculpted in very great detail, as witness the ramparts and missile-slits on the walls of Troy, the pillars on the various temples, the individually delineated oars of Aeneas' ship, or the cunningly-
wrought armour on some of the better preserved warriors. The exasperating crudeness of outline which dominates so much of the rest of the table, is to be explained partly in terms of the extreme smallness of the artefact, partly in terms of the wear and contusion which was inevitably inflicted upon the surface of the soft material during its long burial under the earth.¹ Paulcke and Bruning are probably right to add that these difficulties have been further exacerbated by the disappearance of the colours which originally helped distinguish the minute figures one from the other, and prevented them from merging, as they do now, into a sea of monochrome "palombino", or rather Ca Co₃.

Most scholars have dated the Tabula Iliaca to the first century A.D. Sadurska (pp.35 and 37) prefers to place it in the last quarter of the first century B.C., using internal stylistic evidence, formal and iconographical analogies, and such historical criteria as the implied interest in the origin of the Gens Iulia. It is in fact a fragment: only about three quarters of it remain (see the accompanying fig. on p.530). The depiction of Troy's sack which occupies the centre of the table is bounded to the right by a tall pillar containing inscriptions which are intended to summarise the contents of Books 7 to 24

¹We are thus inconvenienced by the original artist's choice of a material of highly convenient softness, sculptability, and cheapness. Works in this genre were probably larger at first (so the parallels cited by Jahn-Michaelis suggest) and a reduction in size led to a reduction in price.
of the Iliad. (Actually the contents of Books 13 to 15 have been inadvertently omitted). Symmetry and common sense demand that the left-hand side of the sack was likewise bordered by a pillar, now lost, engraved with the contents of Iliad Books 1 to 6. The single word Τρωικός in large capitals which stands in the middle of the scene of Troy's capture and so originally at the centre of the whole composition, must be the title of the entire work.

1 An obvious difficulty is constituted by the inequality between the number of books summarised by the left-hand column (six books) and that on the right (fifteen). Jahn-Michaelis (p.4) suggest that the former also contained "aus grammatischer Gelehrsamkeit geschöpfte Notizen." But we know that carelessness of one sort has resulted in the omission of three books from the surviving column: a more venal carelessness might have caused an initial over-estimate of the space available on the lost column.

2 What noun are we to supply with this adjective? On the analogy of δ Τρωικός(λόγος) (Dio Chrysostom's fifth speech has this title: c.f. his Όλυμπικός (11), Λυκικός μοῦσος (5) etc.) we might expect πίναξ (first suggested by F. Vollner, de cyclo epico poetisque cyclicis (1825) p.4) which gives suitable sense and raises no awkward problems. The latter advantage is not possessed by the alternative supplement κυκλος (so Tychsen, Quinti Smyrnaii Post-homerorum libri XIV (1837): followed by many, including Wilamowitz, Hom. Untersuch. pp.333 and 360). This creates a phrase far too reminiscent of δ ηπικός κυκλος, to which, of course, the lyric S. did not belong. (Adolf Michaelis' perverse attempt (Jahn-Michaelis pp.95ff, Hermes 14 (1879) 481ff) to demonstrate that, on the contrary, Proclus' summary contains a fragment of S's Iliupersis all but the end of which has disappeared owing to the loss of a page from Venetus A, has been as disastrous a failure as is possible. Refutation from several scholars, most recently and magisterially A. Severyns, Recherches sur la Chrêstomathie de Proclos 3 (1953) ch.3.). However, even if we had no option but to supply κυκλος, we could still argue that S. had been temporarily intruded into the company of the epic poets because he had been the first (as Lesches and Arctinus were not) to deserve the attention of the table's purchasers by treating of Aeneas' occidental wanderings.
At the very bottom of the last-named scene we find the following enigmatic distich:

\[\text{ς.θ.ό.λ.ώ.ν. ο.α. β.ν. ω.ν. ο.η.ρ.ου.} \quad \text{δ.φ.ρ.α. δ.ε.λ.ς. π.ά.ς.η.ς. μ.έ.τ.ρ.ο.ν.} \quad \text{ε.χ.η.ς. κ.ο.φ.λ.α.}.\]

(This, together with all the other words on the table, may be found in Jahn-Michaelis 62ff, I.G. 14 (ed. Kaibel) 1284-1293, Sadurska 29ff). Between this couplet and the inscription Τρωικός occur, one directly after another, the names of the poems which are avowedly the sources of the whole picture:

'Ιλιάς κατα 'Ομηρον

Αλτιοπίς κατα 'Αρκτίνον τον Μιλήσιον

'Ιλιάς κατα μικρά λεγομένη κατα Λέσχην Πυρραίον

'Ιλίου Πέρσις κατα Στηνίχορον however, forms a two-line inscription just below the central gate of Troy and a little above Τρωικός. Above the scene of the sack of Troy, from left to right, stretch selected contents of the first book of the Iliad. These are succeeded, to the right of the above-mentioned pillar, by the contents of the same poem's twenty-fourth book. Beneath these, forming a row of equal length, selected events from Iliad 23, then a further row

---

1 For the various supplements which have been suggested at the hexameter's start c.f. Mancuso p.730, L. Lehnus, S.C.O.21 (1972) p.54 n.14, Sadurska pp.31-2. Θεοδόρος was first suggested by K.H. Lehrs, Rh. Mus. (1843) 354f. The identity of Theodorus is a knotty problem which need not detain us here. For an intelligent discussion of the possibilities see Paulcke pp.7ff (who concludes that Theodorus is the name of the man who first invented the type of relief exhibited by the Tabula Iliaca), and also Sadurska pp.9-10 (who supposes that Theodorus is to be identified with "le sculpteur producteur des tables et à la fois le propriétaire de l'atelier").
representing Iliad 22, and so on downwards as far as
Iliad 13, a sequence of rows all to the right of the
pillar, each summarising a book of the Iliad identified
by the appropriate book-letter (though Book One's illust-
ration is not designated by an alpha). Unless we are
very stupid we soon surmise that to the left of the
missing pillar once stood a similar succession of rows
depicting the action of books 2 to 12 which moved down-
wards in that order just as the rows on the right work
upwards from 13 to 24. In addition to all this, at the
bottom of the Trojan scene and under the distich, stand
two further rows bounded to the right by the surviving
twelve books of the Iliad: they show scenes from the
Aethiopis and the Ilias Parva respectively.
The precise contents of those parts of the table which
represent the Iliad and its two epic sequels are not
immediately relevant to us, though we shall have to return
to them later. But for the moment let us restrict our-
selves to a detailed examination of the Ἰλλοῦ Πόρεις
κατὰ Στησίχορον, which is thrown into such central pro-
minence by the architectonic scheme just outlined. At
first we may well panic because we fail to detect any
order in the milling and minute figures that have been
crowded into this portion of the table. But on closer
inspection a remarkably consistent symmetry begins to
assert itself.
The depiction of Troy's sack falls into two main parts,
the scene within the city which occupies roughly the top
two-thirds, and the scene outside the city taking up the remaining third. The city itself can likewise be divided into two regions, an upper and a lower half, and the numerous encounters which take place to a background of towers and walls, small buildings and larger temples, are thereby prevented from producing an excessively confused effect. In the upper half we find the temple of Athena to which Cassandra is clinging while Ajax seizes her hair. In the lower half stands the palace of Priam inside which the aged king and his family, clustering round an altar, are assailed by various warriors. Athena's temple is enclosed on three sides by a bigger building, as if the artist wished to create a structure large enough to balance Priam's palace below. For on both flanks of these two main buildings stand smaller edifices, in the upper half, on either side of the temple, numerous undefined houses, in the lower half two temples to the left and right of the palace, the temple to the right being identified as Aphrodite's. This symmetry can be detected in yet minuter details. In the upper half of the city, to the extreme left and right within the walls, two pairs are to be seen, each consisting of a Greek warrior attacking a Trojan man. These pairs are arranged chiastically: on the left, first the Greek, then the Trojan fleeing; on the right, the second Trojan sunk onto a knee, and to the right of him the Greek. A like arrangement is exhibited in the lower half of the city, which itself divides into two proportionate zones, the upper containing Priam's
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palace and the two temples mentioned above, while in the lower we find the flight of Aeneas and his family from Troy. And we see that as two pairs of combatants were grouped in the lower left and right regions of the upper half of the city, so in the lower half of the city two pairs are positioned in the upper left and right extremes. Only here the arrangement of figures is still more delicately balanced: starting from the left our eyes encounter first the temple noted above, then a Trojan woman by it, and next a Greek with fluttering chlamys who is attacking her. Continuing towards the right we see within Priam's palace a dead son, Neoptolemus, Priam, Hecuba, a further Greek warrior and a dead daughter. Then, moving ever rightwards, we encounter Menelaus with fluttering chlamys, Helen, and finally Aphrodite's temple. The chiastic ordering could not be more complete. In the lower half of the city we remain, but we descend now to its own lower area there to see Troy's central gate: 5 figures are arranged to the left of this gate, 6 figures to the right, while at the gate itself stands Aeneas and his family with Hermes before them. We now leave the city for the first time and venture out into the lowest third of the table which yet once more divides itself into an upper and a lower half. To the left of the former stands Hector's grave balanced by Achilles' tomb on the right extreme. To the left of the lower half, the ships of the Achaean fleet curve up into a little beyond the centre, below the inscription Τρῳῳς.
On the right Aeneas can be seen going on board his own ship.

So far we have, as it were, taken our bearings. We have made a preliminary exploration of the setting in which "the sack of Troy according to Stesichorus" takes place. Let us now return to examine the personages and events set therein in somewhat greater detail. As we have seen, each of the two halves of the city has at its centre three colonnades enclosing a scene of strife around an altar, and the interval between these colonnades and the city walls is occupied in the upper half by houses, in the lower half by temples. At the right-hand extreme of the upper half's scene of strife stands the famous ὕππος της θηρίων*. Scholars have produced contradictory answers to the question whether a Greek warrior actually is emerging from the monster's flank. (Luckily, this and several other similar problems are irrelevant to the central issue of whether the work derives from S. And we now know that

\[1\] Feodor's reproduction, which shows a helmeted warrior emerging from an open door in its belly, is a complete fantasy at this point. Jahn-Michaelis (p.33) rightly reject it, but in so doing also deny the presence of any warrior at all in this part of the horse's anatomy, for which they were criticised by, among others, Robert and Paulcke. From my own inspection I concluded that although the contusion at the top of the horse makes interpretation difficult, the marks and swellings at the edges of the contusion (which are hard to judge from reproductions) indicate that something or someone in relief once existed near the top of the horse. Furthermore either the ladder has been very clumsily incised or a leg (presumably belonging to the now-lost warrior) is on it. I cannot honestly say that I could detect the quadrangular door which Robert (p.108) thought he saw. Nor did I notice any helmet.
his Iliupersis did mention the Wooden Horse - as is hardly surprising: see p.612). What is certain is that a Greek warrior below is holding the ladder which leans against the horse's belly: he has been identified as Sinon (he seems to be wearing no armour) by numerous scholars. Nearby to the left, not far from a free-standing altar, a Greek has forced a Trojan onto the ground and is holding him by the head in order to deliver the death-blow. To the left of these appears a second pair of combatants. One - possibly a Greek - rushes with a raised spear against his opponent who sinks backwards on the ground. Again to the left, another warrior is holding by the hair his victim (he has fallen on his knees). Of these three pairs, the first two have the assailant on the left, his prey on the right: the last reverses this order. Between the penultimate and ultimate groupings is a further figure. Behind him, in the corner between the colonnade and the temple, a warrior whose outlines are exceedingly uncertain.\footnote{Jahn-Michaelis, for instance, think his right arm is crooked at the elbow and raised as if shaking a spear: they interpret as the curved edge of a shield what Paulcke and others take to be the outline of a bent bow held by an archer.} To the right of him is Cassandra apparently kneeling on the steps of Athena's temple and holding on to one of its pillars with her hand. A full-armoured \(\alpha(c)\) grasps her hair in his right hand which also clasps a naked sword; his left hand is supporting a large round shield. He is pulling his prey backwards, and we may be meant to
infer that he has just dragged her out of the temple. It is hard to tell, but it seems likeliest that Cassandra is not depicted as naked.

In the lower half of the city the three colonnades represent Priam's palace. On the central altar of Zeus Ἐπεκτος sits the king with a long beard, long garment, and a Phrygian cap. He is being leaped upon from the left by a full-armoured Neoptolemus, who holds a sword in his right hand and, as he jumps, places his foot on Priam's thigh. His left hand, which bears his shield, is grasping at the old man's head to drag him from the altar. To Neoptolemus' left a dying warrior, obviously wounded by Neoptolemus, is lying on the ground.¹ On Priam's right a woman, apparently clothed, sits and tries to cling to the helpless Priam with both hands. Who else can this be but Hecuba? To her right is a warrior² in full armour

¹Many scholars have been inclined to identify him with Polites, the son of Priam killed by Neoptolemus in Verg. Aen. 2.526ff. For a list of writers who take this view see Paulcke p.48.
Paulcke himself prefers to identify him with Agenor (described, together with Priam, as a victim of Neoptolemus on one of the reliefs (Jahn-Michaelis' D) related by style to our table: c.f. too Paus. 10.27.2 = Il. Parv. fr.16 Allen (p.154)) because Quint. Smyrn. 13.213ff includes Polites in a list of 5 sons of Priam killed by Neoptolemus but in the midst of battle, not before the altar where Priam is sheltering.

²Tentatively identified as Odysseus by Seeliger (p.37). But Paulcke rightly objects that his helmet renders him far too dissimilar to the two other securely labelled representations of that hero. His own suggestion is that the warrior represents Eurypylus (c.f. Paus. 10.27.2 = Il. Parv. fr.16 Allen (p.134): Ἀξίωνα δὲ παῖδα εἶναι Πρᾶμοι Δέσποις καὶ ἀποθανεῖν αἵτων ὑπὸ Εὐρυπύλου τοῦ Εὐαλύμονός φησὶ).
endeavouring to pull her off the altar by her head, which he holds with his right hand (which also contains his sword). His shield is in his other hand. Together this warrior and his regal victim form a group very reminiscent of Ajax and Cassandra.

Also to the right of Hecuba the body of a dead person lies practically under her feet. I use the substantive "person" advisedly, because scholars have disputed this figure's sex.¹

To the right of this whole scene we find a Τεπον Ἀποδίτης on whose left stands a fully-armoured warrior with a chlamys fluttering out behind him. Again, not every detail can be said to be clear,² but it is safe to say that his right hand is holding a sword, his left a shield and the hair of a woman who seems to be trying to escape.

¹Most early scholars supposed it to be female, and Welcker followed by Jahn (p.33 n.213) claimed it to be Medusa (c.f. 204 P and my note ad loc.). Paulcke protested that it is a dead man and identified it with the Axion mentioned by Hyginus fab. 90.5 and Lesches (sup. cit. p.534 n.2) claiming to detect the letters A and N in a subscription.

²As can be gauged by the scholarly dissension which has raged over various points. For instance, Robert (p.109) thought that Menelaus was looking back at a third person, and the analogy of several vases prompted him to excogitate a figure of Aphrodite as the object of his gaze. But stare as one may one cannot detect any such extra character and it is controversial whether Menelaus is in fact twisting his head backwards: his helmet's billowing crest obscures things here. Other scholars (c.f. Plather, Beschreibg. d. Stadt Rom 3.1.p.163) have again confounded gender by arguing that the figure identified above as Helen is in fact a man, and that the real Helen is to be found in the figure on the ground in front of the temple of Aphrodite.
him and may even be attempting to ward him off with her left hand. The garment she is wearing seems to have slipped down in the course of the struggle and so covers only her legs, and those only partially. Her back is turned towards us. It is difficult to say who this pair can be if not Menelaus and Helen.

Let us now move to the lower portion of this controversial work of art.

Here we find a row of figures interrupted in the middle by the central gate of Troy. Now to the right of this gate stand two warriors in full armour, one on either side of a female labelled AI)PA (as on Schulz's reproduction) rather than AIESA (so Feodor). The warrior to the left is identified as Δη(μοφῶν) so his companion on the right can hardly be anyone but his brother Acamas. Aethra allows her head to sink back as if she were exhausted, and she supports her aged frame by resting her arms upon her two grandchildren. It has been suggested\textsuperscript{1} that her locks have been shorn (c.f. Paus. 10.25.7 (in the survey of Polygnotus' Sack of Troy): ἐφαεξὲς δὲ τῇ Ἐλένῃ μήτηρ τε ἤ θησέως ἐν χορίῳ κεκαρμένη κτλ) but since we have a frontal view of her head, the apparent absence of any tresses might also be explained by supposing them to be hidden or tied up at the back of her head.

It is impossible to decide just which one of these.

\textsuperscript{1}See the scholars cited by Paulcke p.42 n.66.
possibilities the artist had in mind. To the left and right of the brothers extend several very uncertain lines: the figures they are supposed to constitute remain totally undecided. Suffice it to say that what some have taken to be the remains of a garmented figure has been interpreted by others as a piece of architecture.¹

To the left of Priam's palace we have a temple, in front of it an altar, and kneeling at this altar what seems to be a female figure assailed by a warrior with a fluttering chlamys who holds her by the hair and poises his sword for the death-stab. One is irresistibly reminded of the depiction of Menelaus and Helen on this self-same work of art, and indeed that parallel has persuaded some that the present pair do not represent any specific characters out of mythology - they lack inscriptions, as does the temple before which they are placed - but are rather intended as nothing more than an anonymous symmetrical balance to Menelaus and his erring wife on the other side of the

¹For instance, to the right of Acamas, Paulcke sees two women whom he would fain identify as Electra and Panthalis (c.f. Paus. 10.25.4: both stand next to Helen on Polygnotus' Iliupersis) servants of the nearby Helen. It is these two ladies whom Robert (p.108) among others would ungallantly degrade to the status of a ruined building. Hard though it is to believe it, scholars are even more bewildered by the figure above this morass of uncertainty. It appears to be a dying female, stretched along the ground, sloping backwards and propped up on her right elbow. Paulcke toys (pp 66ff) with the alternative identifications Laodice (c.f. Paus. 10.26.7: she is in Polygnotus' painting too) and Ilione (who, appropriately enough, is represented as a suicide by e.g. Servius on Aen. Verg. 1.654). That would explain the apparent combination of dying pose and absence of killer).
To the left of the central gate, we come across an armoured Aivnc* who is busily engaged in taking with both hands a casket from a man clad in a long robe who looks anxiously round in the course of his flight from the Greek warrior who pursues him with spear held ready.

The casket doubtless contains what Vergil calls the "sacra arcana" of Troy, and the man giving it to Aeneas is probably the priest in charge of their cult, although the object on his head should not be pressed into service as an argument in favour of this hypothesis: it is as likely to be another instance of the Phrygian cap so often worn on this work of art (see for instance Priam's) as the equivalent of the Roman priest's pilleus. Still, this object does conveniently refute the notion that its wearer is Anchises: on the two later occasions when Aeneas' progenitor definitely does appear on the table, he is capless. Furthermore the two letters ON which some have detected near our long-robed figure ought to be the termination of his name.\(^2\) We can at least conclude, then,

\(^1\)Paulcke's theory that the anonymous woman is Andromache is based on two suppositions: (1) that the temple behind her is Apollo's (c.f. Il.4.507, 5.445ff) and therefore a natural place of refuge for that god's daughter-in-law (c.f. 224 P and my note ad loc.) (2) that the lines at her side represent not (as some have thought) her lowered arm, but are really her son Astyanax clinging to her side. But (1) there is no proof that fr. 224 P occurred in the Iliupersis. (2) Andromache is explicitly labelled in her two other appearances on the table: why not here too?

\(^2\)Ucalegon (c.f. Il.3.148 and Verg. Aen. 2.312) and Pammon (c.f. Il.24.250 and Quint. Smyrn. 13.214) are names scouted by Paulcke, with a decided preference for the
that Anchises is again excluded.

A separate group is to be found near the gate and would seem to consist of a seated figure wearing a garment and beset by a man with a sword. Here the resources of even the most optimistic scholars have failed them and no identification has been attempted.¹

At the central gate of Troy, Atvnac* is led forth by 'Ερυν*.

The hero is in full armour and bears upon his left shoulder his father 'Αγχίνα* whose individual outlines are no longer clear, though he does hold the all-important casket in his left arm. With his right hand, Aeneas is leading the tiny 'Ακιάνα* (parvulus inter parvos) who is apparently portrayed as naked. Behind him is a barely discernible figure generally reckoned to be Aeneas' wife.²

We are now once more free of the city and at the plain

(contd...)

¹latter since he is more appropriate (a son of Priam killed by Neoptolemus according to Quintus) and his name would better fit the available space.

²This area of the table affords yet another titillating instance of scholarly division: Welcker (p.191) detected Aphrodite, Seeliger (p.38) would have Clymene, Begerus, (Bellum et excid. Troi. (Berlin 1699) p.58) was for Calchas. It is Paulcke (p.61) who professes to discern the body of the child Astyanax sunk onto his knees. But as the perceptive reader will by now have realised, it is impossible to be certain.

²Jahn-Michaelis p.36 n.236 and others have unfairly accused Welcker of inconsistency over this figure's identity. Welcker in fact is referring on p.191 to the figure next to Anchises and above Hermes (see n.1 above) and on p.194 he identifies the right figure as Aeneas' wife.

On the variant traditions as to her name see below p.564.
before it. To the left stands "Εκτορος τάφος*, a rectangular structure around whose two visible sides several Trojan women are seated on steps. The smaller side on the left is labelled Τοιχώβιος καὶ Τρωάδες* and depicts, apart from the herald of the Greeks, 'Ανδρομάχη*, Κασσάνδρα*, and "Πλενός*. I think those scholars are right who assert that Andromache is holding her baby son. Astyanax: she is propping her head in her crooked left arm, while her right arm is in her lap: the two interconnected globules there are likelier to be her babe's head and body than her own arm.

If this interpretation is right, we may be meant to understand that Talthybius is present in order to take Hector's son away to his death (c.f. Eur. Tro. 709ff).

Next to Andromache, Cassandra wearing a garment sits holding her face in her hands; directly opposite her is Helenus clad in Phrygian garment and staring in front of him. On the right and long side of the grave we see 'Οδυσσέως* at the end furthest to the right, in earnest conversation with "Ελενός* who sits facing him on the steps. Perhaps Odysseus has come to fetch Polyxena to her sacrifice. To the left of Helenus sits 'Ανδρομάχη* apparently weeping and certainly covering her head. There

---

1 Earlier scholars (see Jahn-Michaelis p.36 n.237, Paulcke p.43 for critiques) misunderstood the nature of the object which stands or is suspended in the middle of the tomb. A lion seems to be sculpted on the top of a mound there. Not that this matters one bit for the all-important question of the work's Stesichorean source.
is definitely no Astyanax with her now, and this absence may well be meant to convey a sinister import. Next we have Ἐκδήση with standing and holding a small (and therefore very young?) Πολυζένη with her right hand. Polyxena is covering her eyes with her left hand while caressing her mother’s.

Away now to the extreme right of this zone where we will find Αχιλλέως σῆμα, a square pillar before which Πολυζένη kneels on steps, her upper body naked, her garment knotted about her waist, her hands bound behind her back. Νεοπτόλεμος fully-armoured and with chlamys fluttering, holds her head back with his left hand in order to stab her in the breast with the sword he has in his right hand. Behind him stands a distinctly smaller figure holding what are presumably utensils for the sacrifice. To the right of the pillar sits Ὄδυσσεος wearing a shipman’s cap and a mantle about his legs: his pose, as he perches on a stone with his head propped on his right hand, might be interpreted as pensive. Next to him stands Κάλκας clad in a long mantle.

In the very bottom zone of the table we see at the extreme left the Greek fleet ναυσταθμοῦ Ἀχαῖων symbolised by 12 ships which are drawn up in a half-circle onto the

1 Earlier scholars entertained strange fantasies about what was at the top of this. (A summary of their views in Paulcke pp.52f). Instead of the supine figure of a man vel. sim. we have a less spectacular but more explicable decorative drum.
land.\textsuperscript{1} Σευγαλον is represented by a pillar (a grave monument?) surmounted by an ornament. Immediately to the right is the most sensational scene of the table: ἀπὸπλους Αὐνῆου\textsuperscript{*} is the superscription and a ship with oars in position and sails raised stands ready. The shields ranked in order at its side suggest that the ship has its full complement of sailors. On the plank that stretches from land to the vessel stands Aeneas, his chlamys fluttering; in his right hand is his son Ascanius, and in his left his father who as he steps on board hands his casket to a man standing inside the vessel\textsuperscript{2}:

'Αὐχεὶς καὶ τὰ ἱέρα\textsuperscript{*} the inscription confirms. Immediately to the left of Ascanius from the land towards the plank comes Μίκνυκος\textsuperscript{*} dressed in a short chiton: he holds a long trumpet\textsuperscript{3} in his left hand while his right is raised to his brow (in sorrow?) Αὐνῆς κύν τοῖς ἱδίοις ἀμαλών εἰς τὴν Ἐκπερίαν\textsuperscript{*} is the inscription for the whole scene.

Now how much credence are we to attach to the legend

\textsuperscript{1}Paulcke thinks that the first ship possibly had inscriptions upon its belly which are now too faint to read (p.45f). More probably these parallel lines are merely decorative.

\textsuperscript{2}Paulcke's identification of this figure with "fidus Achates" (p.76f) displays his anxiety to equip everyone in sight with a mythological name in its most virulent form.

\textsuperscript{3}For a bibliography of previous interpretations of this object see Paulcke p.46 n.73. It is a trumpet and not an oar because it is quite the wrong shape for the latter (specimens of which can be seen already in position at the side of the ship). It culminates not in an oar-blade but in a trumpet-bell. For Misenus as a trumpeter see below p.549f.
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"Ἅλλου Πέρςες κατὰ Στηνίχορον" as applied to the above contents? The intelligent reader will doubtless formulate an answer in terms something like the following: "The Tabula Iliaca purports to present us with events culled from four poems, the Iliad, the Aethiopis, the Ilias Parva, and S's Iliupersis. Of these, only the first exists in anything other than a highly fragmented form. Let us therefore compare what the table's pictures tell us of the contents of Iliad 1 and 13 to 24, with that poem's actual text. If they are reliable for this epic, they should be trusted as regards the more fragmentary works." To this opinion I am afraid I must give the cynical response "Easier said than done." There are two reasons for this. In the first place, various critics have attempted to assess the table's accuracy as a reflection of the Iliad and have pronounced wonderfully differing verdicts: preconceptions about the overall worth of the artefact seem to have coloured the minds of the investigating scholars. But even without this complication we would be rash if we supposed that our artist's ἀρχεῖα remained constant when he depicted the Iliad and S's poem. For the nature of these depictions is utterly dissimilar. As we have seen, the illustrations of the Iliad are disposed in rows, one for each book: they are almost the equivalent of the modern comic strip. The sack of Troy, on the other hand, is a free-standing composition of considerable complexity, in which the various figures are not merely ranked along a line, but are carefully arranged...
to form a series of subtle balances and symmetries. Thus constituted, it forms the centre of the whole work. To create these structural patterns, the artist might well have felt he had the freedom to depart more radically from S's poem than was necessary with the far simpler Iliadic designs. Conversely, the central position of the sack might have obliged him to follow his source more closely than on the work's edges. We cannot say; but we should be far more cautious in arguing directly from the Iliadic depictions to the Iliupersis than past scholars have been. Nevertheless, we cannot utterly despise the evidence they afford. But this section is already long enough without my adding a complete examination of the individual scenes from the Iliad. I can merely summarize the findings of previous scholars, and comment on the principles they have used. Different principles, of course, lead to different findings, hence the extreme polarities represented by the works of Konstas (a vigorous opponent of this relief's reliability as a reflection of any of its sources) and of Paulcke (a hardly less vigorous supporter of the table). I must say at once that many of the former's arguments seem to me to be based on totally mistaken premises. He finds fault with the Iliadic depictions for sins of omission and commission. But no-one who bears in mind the extreme smallness of the space available and the subsidiary function of these illustrations as fringe ornaments to emphasise the Iliupersis in the centre, will take the first objection very
seriously. And Konstas' pathetic complaints that the artist has failed to include some of his very favourite scenes - Achilles' conversation with Thetis, or Thetis' interview with Zeus in Book One for instance - will receive a very unsympathetic hearing from all but the most hopelessly unpractical.

Sins of commission are more difficult to evaluate. Let us examine a few of Konstas' instances. In the depiction of Book One's ἔποιες, Agamemnon can be seen already drawing his sword against Achilles, although Homer has him do no such thing. In Book 18's ὄπλονοια, Hephaestus, contrary to the epic narrative, works at Achilles' armour not in isolation, but with the aid of several supernumeraries whom one automatically identifies with the Cyclopes. And Thetis - another departure from Homer here - and a female figure probably representing Hephaestus' wife stand by as spectators. In the representation of Book 22's contents, Konstas objects that our artist has again abandoned his source in a most radical manner by making Achilles drag Hector round the walls of Troy, and by giving Achilles a charioteer whose existence is implicitly denied in the narrative of Il.22.400. Finally, the illustration of the last book of the Iliad depicts Hermes as present at Priam's interview with Achilles.

To call this selection of discrepancies a mixed bag would be excess of kindness. I say nothing of the misrepresentation of the action portrayed in the penultimate example
where there is no reason - or only a very partisan one - for supposing Achilles is actually driving round the walls of Troy, rather than heading away from those walls to the Greek camp in perfect accord with the Homeric narration (Il. 22.392ff). I say nothing of the total suppression of the phrase ἐλευέσθεν πρὸς ἔν πόλιος (Il. 22.464) which might well have inspired the artist if it could be proved that he is depicting what Konstas claims. But Konstas' complaints at the presence of Hermes or of Thetis and Charis in their respective rows (pp.25ff) betray a complete failure to grasp the fundamental principles and conventions of this type of art. How else could the artist indicate that Hermes had brought the old king to Achilles' tent and would thereafter lead him back again than by the device he has chosen? How else could he convey the rôles played by Charis and Thetis in Homer's poem and their relationship with each other and with Hephaestus?

No-one will want to make very much of the venal slip whereby Achilles is given an unwanted charioteer: most other Homeric heroes have them (c.f. C.A. Trypanis, Rh. Mus. 106 (1963) p.289 n.1) and this addition of a very minor figure is a phenomenon with which we are already familiar from other works of art. That Agamemnon is portrayed as drawing his sword should likewise not be made the basis for far-reaching conclusions. The gesture only departs a little way from Homer's text, and the resultant clarity and emphasis provide ample compensation.
At this point it will be convenient to draw attention to Brüning's article, which provides a very useful list of the table's apparent deviations and inaccuracies (pp.137 ff) and shows how various motifs in each scene can be paralleled from other works of art (pp.145ff). These motifs often include the apparent divergences from Homer's text (as witness Agamemnon's sword). "Aliae sunt leges poetae, aliae sculptoris", as Paulcke sagely observes (p.91) and it would hardly be surprising if our artist sometimes preferred to carry out his task with the aid of useful and perhaps only half-conscious iconographic formulae even when this process produced scenes somewhat divergent from his avowed source. This consideration will explain the anomalous presentation of the ὀμόμοια, (see Brüning pp 152ff for works of art depicting Hephaestus busy at his forge helped by his trusty Cyclopes).

And unless I am greatly deluded, this unimpressive instance is the strongest charge Konstas can level at our artist. The reader who suspects that I have made a misleading selection of discrepant scenes must be referred to the relevant pages of Konstas and the corresponding critiques of Brüning and Paulcke. There he will be regaled with

---

1 But there is no need to postulate a common source for the Tabula Iliaca and the artefacts mentioned by Brüning. Plastic artists will naturally develop certain convenient formulae - almost akin to short-hand - which may be regarded as common property rather than specific borrowings. Incidentally, one may add here that Brüning's notion that the table so often agrees with the Ilias Latina (a crude Latin translation (see RE 92 (1916) 1057)) against the Iliad that they must both share a common source in art, has been exploded by Paulcke (pp.13ff).
tales of how in Book 16's row a figure is labelled Διο-
μήδης instead of Διομήδη (for whom c.f. II.9.665), or how
in Iliad 13's the name of 'Αδάμας has been inscribed as
'Ανάμας, or how in the mêlée of 14 the two Ajaxes have
been confused. If he meets with anything more substan-
tial I will be most surprised.

What, then, have we learned that might help us in
evaluating the Stesichorean section of the table?
Nothing, certainly, that could justify any of the follow­
ing deductions: (1) The absence of a statue of Athena
coupled with the apparent presence of clothing on Cassan-
dra (see my remarks above p.534f) suggests that in S's
poem Ajax did not rape her or pull her from Athena's
statue. (2) Helenus' evident lack of concern (equanimity
is discerned on his face) at the fate of Troy implies that
S. portrayed him as a deserter to the Greeks. (3) The
lack of any servants to hold down Polyxena is an indica­
tion of her wish to die free as a princess. (The first
two of these examples derive from Paulcke, of whom they
are all too typical. The last is from the usually
reliable Mancuso (2)). This precise one-to-one equiva-
ience between table and poem is exactly the sort of thing
which the instances of the ἐρως and the διπλωματικα above
have taught us not to expect. And the acute lack of

1The lengthy battle-scenes with which the Iliad abounds
are obviously far better suited to verbal treatment
than for depiction within a very small space where
confusion is all too easy.
space and uncertainty of outline should rule out all speculation about the significance of the absence of expected figures, of the expression on any faces, and even of the presence or lack of clothing.

What we can expect by analogy with the Iliadic scenes is a generally faithful reproduction of the original poem's events, with a few minor details perhaps modified for technical reasons, but no large-scale inventions in the sense of additions by the plastic artist of events and persons not in the Stesichorean work. Here I will make a perhaps provocative comparison. The plastic version of the ἰησοῦς changes one minor detail by giving Hephaestus the Cyclopean helpers familiar in post-Homeric literature and art. But no major figure is added, nor is the whole scene something grafted on to the original source by the artist's whim. Now take the figure of Μίσενος in the lower right-hand corner of the Sack of Troy. He is portrayed there as Aeneas' trumpeter, and Perret¹ (pp.111ff) has devoted a vast amount of energy and ingenuity to demonstrating that "en dotant Misène d'une trompette, S. aurait commis une bêtise grossière."
The war-trumpet after all is severely excluded from Homer's narrative, and the notion that Misenus was Aeneas' trumpeter occurs nowhere in Greek authors, nor indeed in

¹He is following in the footsteps of Hubaux, Ant. Class. 2 (1933) 135ff.
Latin sources before the time of Caesar, if then (ap. Orig. gent. Rom. 9.6; c.f. Verg. Aen. 6.149ff etc.). Perret's argumentation strikes me as convincing and irrelevant. For the trumpet slung over Misenus' shoulder is precisely the sort of detail which I would expect our artist to add on his own initiative. Like the Cyclopes in the Ὑπλοποια it is a minor feature adopted from writers later than the poem being illustrated, and inserted to remove all doubts as to the identity of the main figure. There is no strong link between it and its bearer, and one can impugn its authenticity without casting the slightest shadow of suspicion upon Misenus. Indeed to question the legitimacy of an evidently major figure with an inscription of his own is to go far beyond the guidelines suggested by the analogous illustrations of the Iliad.

The scenes involving Aeneas are, of course, something of a special case, and we must consider them separately in a moment. Apart from these, most of the table's scenes, with one very important exception, provide exactly the sort of contents we would expect to find in S's Iliupersis. No-one would be surprised to learn that this poem mentioned the Wooden Horse, the slaughter of Priam and his family, or Ajax's seizure of Cassandra. The very multiplicity of scenes, which gave earlier scholars pause, can

---

¹See Klotz's Teubner text of Caesar under Fragmenta Spectac et Spuria (Vol.3 p.229: c.f. p.231 ad fin.).
²For instance Mancuso p 704f or Bowra GLP 2 p.106. The latter remarks that "there seem to be too many episodes for the compass of a single lyrical poem."
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now be seen to conform to our general picture of this most Homeric of poets. And the sad contrast between this presumed plenitude and the scanty remains we possess would explain, were explanation needed, why there are no impressive correspondences between the Tabula Iliaca and our fragments of S's poem. With the undeniably important exception mentioned above, there are no contradictions either, though opponents of the table have tried to manufacture them. They have spared us the syllogism (1) S. said 100 heroes were shut inside the horse (199 P); (2) the Tabula Iliaca does not show 100 heroes; (3) therefore the Tabula Iliaca cannot reflect S's poem. But is Konstas' complaint (p.42) that S's Clymene (197 P) does not feature on the table any whit more reasonable, when for all we know she may have been no more than a mere name in a long list? And who can suppress a smile when he notes that Konstas and others detect a contradiction between Hecuba's appearance on the table with other captives on the steps of Hector's tomb and the statement (198 P) that S. made Apollo transfer her to Lycia? Only someone who shares the arbitrary assumption that Apollo must have spirited her away at the moment when Neoptolemus had wrenched her from her husband, just before he set upon Priam. As if the nadir of Hecuba's fortunes, after the death of Polyxena, when the aged queen was about to be dragged off into slavery and concubinage did not provide an equally, if not more appropriate, occasion for rescue. No; there is only one incompatibility in this part of the
table with the remains of S's poem. But it is a crucial one, which in my opinion constitutes the strongest single obstacle to our taking the artefact as a reflection of S's poem. It is simply stated. The table shows, as we have seen above, Menelaus threatening Helen with a sword in front of the temple of Aphrodite. This is certainly the version followed by Lesches, Ibycus, and numerous works of art (see my note ad 201P (p.677f) where Helen's beauty soon causes Menelaus to drop his sword. It is most definitely not the version used by S, who had Helen almost stoned to death by the Achaean army (201 P). In order to avoid this open contradiction, defenders of the table have had recourse to a brand of special pleading quite as strained as the worst arguments of the other side. From Welcker onwards (Kl. Schr. 184, Alt. Denk. 193) they have tried to convince us that S's narrative contained both versions, first of all Menelaus' anger against Helen, and then, to form a climax as it were, the wrath of the whole Greek army against the ultimate source of all their sorrows. Sometimes, themselves unconvinced by this explanation, they add an alternative: two different Stesichorean poems are involved: the Iliupersis used the familiar tradition of Menelaus' anger, and it was the Nostoi which included the novel detail of stoning by the army.

This approach involves a very significant modification of the story we suppose S. to have retailed, and in my view the absolute silence of Z Eur. Or. 1287 on the point
renders it impossible as an explanation. As if our source for 201 P would omit to mention this important concomitant! As if he would forget to add "But S. did employ the conventional motif of Menelaus' attempt to kill his wife earlier on in the same poem", or "Incidentally, the better-known version occurs in another poem by S"! And I doubt if S. would burden a single work by having Helen escape death twice within a very short space of time in a remarkably similar way. I cannot improve on Bergk's pungent verdict (p.212): "plane ... incredibile Stesichorum ita exaggeravisse, ut Helena bis gravissimum discrimen effugeret, neque licet hoc perfugio uti, Stesichorum Menelai ultionem in Ilii excidio, Achivorum iram in Nostis enarravisse, nam schol. Eurip. Orest. [i.e. 201 P] dilucide testatur hunc poetam Menelai impetum silentio praetermississe neque Leschae exemplum secutum esse." Of course, driven by desperation to pedantry, we might insist that the table does not actually show Menelaus succumbing to Helen's beauty: he is not dropping his sword but brandishing it threateningly: S. must have made Menelaus meet Helen somehow in the sack. This argument removes the weight of stupidity from the shoulders of S. and schol. Eur. Or. and places it firmly upon those of our artist, who while trying to show us the scene as described by S. has accidentally reminded us of the version S. did not use.

If I now proceed to claim that our artist has deliberately reminded us of the non-Stesichorean version, I may be
accused of paradox-mongering. But it is high time that those who think this divergence a decisive indication of the table's unreliability tell us just how they themselves would have portrayed S's version on this tiny relief where so little space is available. How depict the whole Achaean army about to stone Helen? If we symbolise the entire force by two or three figures we may confuse the issue and the on-looker. He might take these representative outlines for specific characters and try to identify them with Menelaus, Odysseus, or the like. Far better, then, to exclude such misunderstandings by swelling the numbers of soldiers who represent the army to at least ten. But then there is no space for them! The fact is that S's version, while very effective within a poem, is not at all suitable for graphic representation. In literature S's variant displays even more powerfully than the alternative tradition the power of Helen's beauty: it can disarm not merely one man but a thousand. But on the tiny plaque which is the Tabula Iliaca, S's tale is impossible to portray coherently. Even with the aid of inscriptions there is too much risk of muddling the viewer about what precisely is happening. And I would suggest that the artist was aware of this, but, being reluctant to omit Helen entirely from the sack whose ultimate cause was herself, preferred the inconsistency of including a

---

1I see that Welcker (Alt. Denk. 193) remarks "Auf jeden Fall war die andre (viz. S's version of the threat to Helen's life) für die Zeichnung nicht brauchbar."
non-Stesichorean scene. I spoke above of the table's presumed fidelity to its sources "with a few minor details perhaps modified for technical reasons." The present instance is anything but a minor detail, I admit, but the influence of technical factors is the same, and there is no cause to suppose that the artist made similarly radical departures from S. in the other regions of the "Sack" where no such factors can have existed.

With this rather special exception, the only truly startling implication for S's poem which the Tabula Iliaca contains, is the embarkation of Aeneas and family in a ship bound for Hesperia. And yet it is possible to be excessively surprised by the news. In particular, I cannot understand why the a priori assumption that Aeneas cannot have been connected with Italy as early as S. has exerted such a pertinacious grip on scholars' minds. In Hes. Theog. 1008ff, the birth of Aeneas is immediately followed by that of Latinus, and as West observes ad loc. (p.432) this "may be a mere coincidence; it may on the other hand be an association suggested by the legend of Aeneas in Italy." This part of the poem is likely to be post-Hesiodic but not later than the second half of the

---

1For a survey of the early legends of Rome's founding and Aeneas' connection with them, see R.M. Ogilvie's Commentary on Livy 1-5 pp.32-5 (with short bibliography). See now, for an up-to-date account of these legends (with full bibliographical notes) T.J. Conell, P.C.P.S. 21 (1975) 1-32: "Aeneas and the twins: the development of the Roman foundation legend".
sixth century (see West p.393).

But we now possess stronger proof that Aeneas was linked mythically to central Italy by the end of the sixth century. This is provided by four artefacts usefully assembled and discussed by F. Bömer, Rom und Troia (1951) pp.14ff. Table 1 of that work contains photographs of all four in the following sequence: (1) a tetradrachm from Aeneia in Macedonia (Head, Hist. Num. 2 (1911) p.214 Fuhrmann AA 1941 425): Denkmälerlisten 3·25·1; (2) an Etruscan scarab intaglio (Cabinet des Médailles 276: Furtwängler, die antiken Gemmen (1900) 2·96; 3·18iff. Abb. Taf. 20·5: Denkmälerlisten 3·23·15; (3) an Etruscan terracotta from Veii (Fuhrmann AA 1940 405 and 1941 427); (4) an amphora from Vulci (Munich 1554 (J 1187): ABV 392·10 = Vasenlisten 3 387 (A) 12: this is the vase which Bömer illustrates, but he cites others, and more could be added: see below). These works of art can all be dated before 500. (2) is the only representation of Aeneas' flight from Troy which definitely portrays Anchises as holding the sacra (in his right hand as he perches on Aeneas' back). (1) is disfigured by a triangular gash that has removed a part of the coin which may also have depicted

1The first real recognition of the importance of these two artefacts was made by R. Texier, A propos de deux représentations archaïques de la fuite d'Enée, Revue archéologique 13 (1939) 12ff. (His reproduction of (1) incidentally (fig.2 p.17) is more reliable than Bömer's).

2Further investigation has shown that item (3) is in fact of fifth century date: it could however reflect an archaic original - see Schauenburg, Gymnasium 67 (1960) 177.
the sacra: at least we find emerging from the left of this gash to rejoin the left arm of Anchises two lumps which may represent the edge of the coffer which holds the sacra. But (2) is certainly older than (1) and constitutes irrefutable proof that over a hundred years before Hellanicus' Τούρεδ (P. Gr. Hist. 4 F 31) the sacra were a traditional part of Aeneas' flight. The Tabula Iliaca's strong implication that S's Iliupersis represented that hero as rescuing the sacra and carrying them into exile is no longer unacceptable; Galinsky's claim that the scenes exhibiting these sacra are due to the influence of Vergil's Aeneid most certainly is, especially since the investigations of K. Schauenburg, Gymnasium 67 (1960) 176ff and pls. 7-18 (c.f. ib. 76 (1969) 42ff and pls. 1-6) have re-inforced Bömer's findings. Schauenburg assembles and illustrates a vast number of vases depicting Aeneas' escape with father on back. They are closely related iconographically and all belong to the last quarter of the sixth century (particularly the last decade) and the start of the fifth. Almost all come from Italy, and specifically Etruria.

Can we tell exactly where S. located Aeneas' exile? We have two clues: the presence of Misenus and the inscription Αλήας κού τοῖς ἱδίοις ἀνάξων εἷς τῆν Ἑκερίαν. The former has generally suggested to scholars that Aeneas went at least as far as Campania: see e.g. Galinsky

1See R.G. Austin on Aen. 6·162 (p.88f).
PP.108f and n.11, West on Hes. Th. 1008 (p.432), R.M. Ogilvie, C.R. 21 (1971) 219: so first K.O. Müller, Class. Journ. 26 (1822). I see no obstacle to this view. As to Hesperia, that is of course a very common synonym for Italy in Roman authors (see R.G. Austin on Aen. 2.781 (p. 281f)), but we do not find it before Roman poets (first in Ennius Ann. then Vergil Aen. 1.530 = 3.163 etc.) and before then e.g. Herodotus and Thucydides always refer to 'Ἰταλία. Not that this need be a deterrent to our acceptance of the Stesichorean origin of this particular portion of the myth. We may derive small comfort from Dion. Hal. 1.35 = Hellanicus F. Gr. Hist. 4 F 111 (3) (τὰ δὲ πρὸ τοῦ ἐκθέσεως ἄριστου τῶν (scil. Heracles') arrival in Italy with the cattle of Geryon) "Ἐλληνες μὲν Ἐκτέρπαν καὶ Ἀὔστουν ἀντίκειται τὴν (scil. 'Ἰταλίαν) ἐκθέσεως but after all there is no reason to suppose the artist is representing the phrase εἰς τὴν Ἐκτέρπαν as a direct quotation from the Iliupersis, or to criticise him for

1 Perret's thesis that Misenus' appearance on the Tabula Iliaca is inspired by Verg. Aen. 6.169ff (so too e.g. Galinsky p.108) seems to me totally arbitrary. To have the slightest claim to plausibility, it would have to have proved that the Tabula Iliaca always agrees with Aeneid 2 and never contradicts that narrative. Although this is sometimes said to be the case (e.g. by Bowra GLP 2 p.106 as late as 1961) the open-minded scholar will conclude that if an artefact which shows Hermes escorting Aeneas and his family from Troy can be said to "tally with" Aeneid 2, then that verb clearly possesses a meaning he has not hitherto attached to it. If Sadurska's dating of the Table to the last quarter of the first century B.C. is correct (see above p.525) the whole theory flies apart since the Tabula Iliaca's composition may pre-date the Aeneid's publication!

the dishonesty of the ploy. By now we expect the content of such inscriptions to give an accurate reflection of the source; but I see no reason why the artist in this case should not have given Aeneas' destination in the form with which the Roman audience for whom his work was intended was familiar, irrespective of what S. himself had called it.¹

It is true that several scholars have made irresponsible use of this part of the table, exploiting it as a base for the most grotesque speculations about what S. did with Aeneas after bringing him to Italy. (Grisly instances collected by Konstas pp 9-10, Perret pp 84ff). The great Niebuhr's claim that S. sang of Aeneas' wanderings "fast wie Virgil" (Röm. Gesch. 1.201) is a paradigm of silliness. But so far I hope to have shown that the earliness of S's supposed conveyance of Aeneas to Italy would be no charge against it. Now if someone counters "It is not merely

¹It has been argued that the phrase είς τήν Ἑπειρίαν need not imply that Aeneas went any further than Sicily. The grounds for this thesis are no better than the following: (1) Thuc. 6.2.3 preserves a tradition that after the capture of Τρού τῶν Τράχων τινὲς διαφυγόντες Ἀχαϊόν τὸ λαοῦς ἀφικνοῦνται πρὸς τὴν Σικελίαν, καὶ ὑμεῖς ὑπὸ τῶν Σικελίων ὑκάκαντες θυμαπότες μὲν Ἐλευθερίαν, πόλεις δὲ αὐτῶν Ἐρυξαὶ τε καὶ Ἐγέρσα τοῖς ἔλεγον εἰς πόλεις ὧν ἔζευγεν S. himself was born in Sicily and spent much of his life there. (2) The cult of Aphrodite of Eryx might conceivably have influenced him. Of course S's link with Sicily is a datum relevant to the explanation of how and why this particular poet should have been the first to bring Aeneas to this part of the world generally. But the notion that S. was the prime inventor of Aeneas' connection with the Elymians is quite without prop or foundation: a more detailed refutation in Galinsky pp.109ff and nn.13-14. The association is found only in late authors.
the earliness but the isolated earliness that we object to", I cannot answer back. No-one can. The statement is literally unanswerable. But is it an objection? Perret gleefully marshals the evidence (pp 84ff) for the total silence maintained by antiquity about S's rôle in the development of the Aeneassage. This seems to have left absolutely no trace on the tradition in total contrast to his other mythical innovations. It is distinctly odd that our first definitely attested literary allusion to Aeneas in Italy should come with Hellanicus (Dion. Hal. 1.47-48 = F. Gr. Hist. 4 F 31) so very long after S., to whom he makes not the most fleeting allusion. It is odd that the Sicilian historians Antiochus of Syracuse (F. Gr. Hist. 555) and Timaeus (F. Gr. Hist. 566) should say nothing of their countryman. But let us be discriminating about what we accept as a silence. Let us not cite as conspirators in it any of the following: Polyb. 1.3.8: οὗτος τοῦ 'Ρωμαίων οὔτε τοῦ Καρχηδόνιων κοινωνικοὐ πολιτευόμενος πρόξειρός ἐστι τοῖς πολλοῖς τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἡ προγεγενημένη σύναψις ὤδ' αἰ πράξεις αὐτῶν. Dion. Hal. 1.4.2: ἄγνωστοι πάντως Ἐλλήνες ὅλιγον δεῖν πάσιν ἠ παλαιὰ τῆς Ῥωμαίων πόλεως ἱστορία. Ioseph. contra Ap. 1.12: τῆς Ῥωμαίων πόλεως οὔθ' ὁ Πολίστος οὔθ' ὁ Θουκυδίδης ὤδε τῶν ἂν τούτοις γενομένων οὔθ' εἰς ἔμνημόνευεν, ἀλλ' ὑψί ποτὲ καὶ μόλις αὐτῆς εἰς τοὺς Ἐλλήνας ἡ γνώμης ὄνειξις ὄνειξις. Each of these passages has been the cause of much head-shaking, especially the middle one,
Dionysius elsewhere displays a knowledge of S. In fact they are all irrelevant to our problem because they are talking about Rome, and as we have just reminded ourselves, no-one can seriously maintain that S. took Aeneas anywhere near there.

So which is the greater? The coincidence that all previous writers, including such conscientious historians and antiquarians as Timaeus and Varro, should have bypassed S's introduction of Aeneas into Italy? Or the impudence of this unknown artist in foisting upon his prospective clientele a manifest imposture by transferring the origin of the single most important Roman myth, quite without justification, to an archaic Greek poet?

"Few are prepared to assert on oath that the Tabula Iliaca represents S. "wrote Momigliano in 1945 (see above p.521) and far be it from me to assail such reasonable scepticism. But he rightly goes on to criticise Perret for jumping from "the slightest doubt ... to the most absolute denial" and that is an action characteristic of too many scholars who have treated our subject. The

\[1\] R. Wagner (Curiae Mythographicae (Leipzig 1891) p.239) suggested that Xenophon's reference to Aeneas' rescue of his father in Cyneg. 1.15 (Ἀγνεώς δὲ σῶσας μὲν τοὺς πατρῴους καὶ μητρῴους θεοὺς, σῶσας δὲ καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν πατέρα, δόξαν ἐυσεβεῖς ἐξηνέγκατο, διότι καὶ οἱ πολέμιοι μόνω σὺν τέκνοις δὲ ἵκρατησαν ἐν Τροίᾳ ἐδοσαν μὴ συληθήναι) derives from S's poem. But the last part of this is quite at odds with what we might deduce from the Tabula Iliaca.
majority of writings\(^1\) on the problem tend towards rejection of a Stesichorean source for the central zone of the table. I wish to have the balance sink slightly down in the opposite direction. It seems to me that the evidence at our disposal mildly supports the authenticity of the inscription 'Ιλίου Πέρσις κατὰ Ευησίχορον. Not that we must ever automatically assume this. It must be argued first, and I hope that the preceding pages have provided such an argument, or at least a useful guide for those who are wavering.

---

\(^1\)A useful list of supporters and opponents of the table's status as a reflection of S's Iliupersis is given down to 1897 by Paulcke pp.89-90 and n.199. This is conveniently supplemented up to 1960 by Sadurska p.33. The most significant attacks have come from Vürtheim pp 34ff (1919), Bowra (in both editions of CLP, the first (1936) pp 103ff, and the second (1961) pp 104ff), Perret (1942) in the book cited in the bibliography. Support has been forthcoming for its reliability from Mancuso (in both the works in the bibliography), Page (P.M.G. p.111), Lloyd-Jones, C.R. 14 (1964) 19, West on Hes. Th. 1008 (p.432), Galinsky p.108, Ogilvie, C.R. 21 (1971) 219, Conell, P.C.P.S. 21 (1975) p.20 etc. L. Lehnus, S.C.O. 21 (1972) 54-5 suggests that the Table's distich ... Θεοδώρου μάθε τάξιν Ὀμήρου | ὧφρα δαικτής πάσης μέτρου ἐχθρικος κοφλας, is an echo of the phrase δαικτή ... μέτρα τε καὶ κοφλαῖ, which crops up in a papyrus fragment of the Iliu Persis (S 89:7: see my note ad loc.). That is interesting and possibly true, but it need not affect the issue of the Tabula Iliaca's reliability either way.
APPENDIX

Apart from the journey to Hesperia, two further details in the table's depiction of Aeneas' escape become especially interesting if they derive from S's poem. In the first place the deity leading the whole family forth at the central gate is Hermes. Where else is he named as performing this function?1 The only passage in literature known to me which so much as alludes to the event is Marcellus of Side, in Regill.23ff(Kaibel Epigr. 1046 = I.G.14 (Kaibel) 1389)². αὐτὸρ ὁ (scil. ζεύς) ἀστερέστατα περὶ ἀφυά παιδί πέδιλα|δῶκεν ἔχειν, τὰ λέγουσι καὶ Ἑλμάωνα φορηναί| ἡμοι δὲ τ' Αἰνείαν πολέμου ἔξηγεν Ἀχάιων| νῦκτα διὰ δνοφερῆν. He is often represented in literature as rescuing mortals from such dilemmas: see Nisbet and Hubbard on Horace Odes 2·7·13 (p.115 f) and above p.400.

Triphiodorus (651) makes Aphrodite the leader (Αἴνειαν δ' ἐκλέψε καὶ Ἀγχίσιν Ἀφροδίτη|... τῆλε δὲ πάτρος Ἀδονίνην ἀπέναντες κτλ.) which is more easily explained.

Even more intriguing is the possibility that S. originated the tradition whereby Aeneas lost his wife during the evacuation of Troy. (c.f. Heinze, Virgil's epische Techik ³ p.58 n.2). For the mourning woman seen with husband and son and father-in-law at the gate is no

---

1He is said to have built a ship for Aeneas in Naevius' Bellum Punicum (Serv. in Aen. 1·170 (2·96 ed. Harv.) = Naev. 1·11 (p.19 Morel).
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longer with them when they are embarking upon the ship, although our artist has space enough at his disposal to include Misenus in the scene. The version whereby Aeneas' wife accompanies him into exile may be older (see Austin on Aen. 2.795 (p.287)) for all that its first literary appearance is in Hellanicus (F. Gr. Hist. 4 F 31 = Dion. Hal. 1.46.4). But even if we knew for certain that S. deprived Aeneas of his wife, that would be a very brief and feeble flash of light in a long and overwhelming darkness. We cannot say why he removed her. We cannot say how. (Some have suggested that Aphrodite spirited her away: compare the version of Hecabe's rescue by Apollo which we know (198 P) S. to have employed in the Iliupersis and note the tradition retailed by Paus. 10.26.1: ἐπὶ δὲ τῇ Κρεούσῃ λέγουσιν ὧς ἐκ θεῶν μήτηρ καὶ Ἀφροδίτη δουλεῖας ἀπὸ Ἐλλήνων αὐτῆν ἔφυσαντο on which see Austin on Aen. 2.788 (p.285)). We cannot even say what name he gave her. The authors of the Cypria (fr. 22 Allen (p. 124)) and the Ilias Parva (fr.20 Allen (p.135)) called her Eurydice. Apollod. 3.12.5 and Hygin. fab.90 mention Creusa as a daughter of Priam not Aeneas' wife: that tradition first occurs, to our knowledge, in Livy 1.3.2 and Dion. Hal. 3.31.4. Paulcke (p.74) suggested that S. was the first to make Creusa the wife of Aeneas in order to equip him with a more royal kinship, but Polygnotus did not think of Creusa as Aeneas' spouse (c.f. Robert, Die Iliupersis des Polygnot, pp.61f) and the invention may well be Hellenistic or Roman. See further R.G.
Austin on Aen. 2.795 (pp 237-9).
Lobel detected the presence of this poem on the scraps of papyrus assembled by him as P. Oxy. 2619 (ed. pr. Oxy. Pap. 32 (1967) pp. 34ff; partially re-edited by Page, P.C. P.S. 19 (1973) 47ff) because of such patently relevant words as ἀμα-οί and ὀ-ῖον (S 88 i 15 and 99·4), Τρὴος (S 88 ii 7) and Τρῳκός (89·11), Ἑλένα (103·5), Μυμμυζόν- (109·3), Ἐκλαμάνδριον (115·4), Ἀλακίς (116·2) and the more dubiously read Ποίλους (88 i 9: see my note ad loc. p. 615) and πριμίς (91·11). Fortunately, his gloomy statements to the effect that "not a single complete sentence or verse is recoverable ... The style and structure of the composition are quite unrecognisable" (p. 34) no longer hold true. Largely owing to the exertions of Mr. W.S. Barrett in joining frr. 1 and 47 together, as well as frr. 15 B, 30, and 31, we have two generous portions of fairly extensive text (S 68 and 89). Nothing quite as impressive as the Geryoneis or the latest find to be sure, but a far happier picture than previously prevailed and one which shows us that the famous Wooden Horse - for this in the Iliupsis see 199 and 200 P and 205 P - played a significant part in the poem here represented. And if, as I believe to be so, the mention of Epeius in 200 P = S 89·14-15, then we have at long last an all too brief manifestation of common ground.
between a Stesichorean papyrus find and a book-text quotation. Lobel's verdict that details previously known to us from the poem "are nowhere apparent" is repealed, but his identification of the papyrus is resoundingly confirmed.

Wonders have been worked in reconstituting the contents and structure of the Geryoneis with the aid of those fragments which preserve two adjacent columns, a single stichometric letter, the metrical scheme, and our consequent knowledge of the number of lines per column (see pp. 71 ff sup.). We are not quite so fortunate with the Iliupersis, but we can achieve a little more than is usually realised. The relative positions of strophes in S 88 i and ii (i 27 = ant. 4; ii 1 = ant. 5) suggest a column of 27 (or 53) verses. Since it is not quite clear whether one or two lines are missing from the top of col. ii and since the scribe's hand is not consistent in size, (contrast the script of the Geryoneis) we ought to allow a variation of one to two lines here. Then if we make some calculations based on the discrepancy between the respective lengths of triad (8 + 8 + 10 = 26 lines) and column, we shall find that each column should begin approximately one to two lines later on in the triad with something like the following sequence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLUMNS</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>first line</td>
<td>str.1</td>
<td>str.2/4</td>
<td>str.5/6</td>
<td>str.7/8</td>
<td>ant.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There seems to be no good reason against identifying 88 i (ant.4 - ant.5) with col.VII and 88 ii (ant.7 -ant.7) with col.VIII. What then is the relationship between this fragment and the only other whose top-most column we definitely possess, 105\(^A\) = 105\(^B\) (str.8 (?)/ant.1 - ep.10)? 4 times a column of (on average) 28 lines = 112, and 4 times a triad of 26 lines plus one complete strophe = 112 lines, which is why Mr. Barrett believes that 105\(^B\) 1 is the one hundred and thirteenth line of the poem and that its contents come from the second column before S 88 (see Page p.65 n.1, West (1) p.141). \(^1\) The first conclusion is confirmed by P. Oxy. 2803 (see below). But what little we can discern of the subject-matter in the two fragments under discussion leads me to expect the reverse sequence. 88 seems to me to contain a discussion of the fate to be meted out to the Horse before it has been brought into the city (see especially 88 ii 6 and my note ad loc.) and

\(^1\) Assuming that the line omitted between lines 6 and 7 was not added at the foot of the column or elsewhere within it.
105\textsuperscript{B} to be describing a situation in which the Greeks are capable of leaping out of the Horse. Barrett conversely thinks 88 is presenting a debate about the Horse's future which occurs after it has entered Troy (against this see p. 617 infr.) and supposes the other fragment to be dealing with an event during the demolition of part of the city walls to allow the brute in. It must be admitted that if 105\textsuperscript{B} comes after 88 it comes a very long way after, as the diagram above makes clear. Three hundred lines and over make a large space to cover the interval between the end of discussions over the Horse's future and the final emergence of the Greeks, even if we pack that interval with such familiar events as the intervention of Sinon, the sinister antics of Helen outside the Horse, the grim prophecies of Cassandra, and perhaps a catalogue of the hundred heroes lurking within their strange ambushade.

And so an alternative explanation of the proposed sequence 88-105 suggests itself. Mr. Barrett, realising that line 113 seems rather too early a stage in the poem for the Wooden Horse's entry into the city, supposes that this is merely the hundred and thirteenth line of an hypothetical second book.\footnote{Hence his contention that 133\textsuperscript{B}'s Ετής ἱππότις is the title of a book: see below pp.657ff.} One might adapt this notion and place 88 near the end of "Book One" (it might occupy roughly the same place there as ant.1 and following in col.XX above). By setting 105\textsuperscript{B} in col.V of "Book Two" one would preserve...
my sequence but whittle away by about half the number of
lines required to separate the two fragments. This hypo­
thesis - and of course it is nothing more than an hypo­
thesis - need not involve the interpretation of 133B as
the title of a second book.

Furthermore, we have good reason to believe that the Iliu­
persis is also represented on a second manuscript, namely
ff, partly re-edited by Page, P.C.P.s. 19 (1973 60ff).

Our grounds for this supposition rest on the apparent
contiguity of P. Oxy. 2619 fr.18 (= S 105A) with P. Oxy.
2803 fr.11 (S 143) to create S 105B, and I will consider
the validity of this conjunction in my commentary on the
latter (pp 643ff). Here I limit myself to remarking that
such names as S 135.5's Πολυέταιν- (if that is the right
articulation) and ηὗρως 'Αχιλλευῖ in S 137.3, together
with an ostensible reference to the sack of Troy like
\[\text{\nuώςας πόλιν\textsuperscript{(*)}}\text{ (137.6)}\] render the identification prima
facie plausible.

Now the text of P. Oxy. 2803, unlike that on 2619, does
give us a stichometric symbol: A in the margin of S 133
col.ii tells us that line 9 of that column was numbered
100. When the texts adjacent to which this marginal sign
stands are so nearly equivalent to nothingness, it is at
first hard to work up enthusiasm for this piece of
information. But however slight the remains of i 5 and
6, they are long enough to prove themselves (on the
grounds of line-length) str. or ant.3-4; and since we now
know (i) that the two lines directly opposite them in col. ii are 97-8 of the entire poem and (ii) that the Iliu-
persis was built up from triads consisting of 26 lines, we can deduce the number of lines in these two columns and the number of columns needed to reach the hundredth line of the poem.

133 i 5-6 must in fact be ant.3-4 of the work's second triad, since any other hypothesis produces impossible column lengths: e.g. if they were ant.3-4 of the first triad and lines 11-12 of the entire composition, col.ii's line 97 would have to stand 11 lines from the top of its own column whose first verse would have to be numbered 87. That would give us for col.i the fantastic length of 86 lines! i 5-6 must be ant.3-4 of triad two and lines 37-8 of the poem: 86 minus a triad length yields up c. 60\(^1\) lines for col.i. This itself is extensive enough in all conscience, but P. Oxy. 852, our source for Euri-
pides' Hypsipyle, has columns that average c. 60 lines and on occasion the number rises to 62 (Oxy. Pap. 6 (1908) p. 21). Compare too the text of Pindar's Isthmian 8 provid-
ed by P. Oxy. 2439 fr.1 (57 lines)\(^2\). Our column-length

---

\(^1\) To be exact, since West (2) p.264 and Barrett (ap. Page p.62) are right to suppose the marginal number attached to ii 9 (as against Haslam (p.34 n.57) who thinks it attached to 8). But given the irregularity of the hand we are dealing with, "c. 60" is the safest formulation.

\(^2\) If S 133 i 5-6 were ant.3-4 of the third triad, we should arrive at columns of 33 lines which, by leaving 8 lines over are inconsistent with the position of the sticho-
metric mark for 100. This is a further point against the hypothesis of Haslam refuted below p.572f.
will support 2 triads with 7-8 lines of a new triad into the bargain. Each successive column will begin 7-8 lines later in the now familiar manner: Col.I begins with str.1, col.II with str.6 (or ant.1), col.III with ant.7 (or ep.1), col.IV with ep.6 (or ep.9) and so on. This, and the above calculation that 105B 7ff represent lines 119ff of the poem (or book), point to a position at the top of col.III (or XXIX a cycle of 26 columns later) for S 143 (= 105B 7ff) and this is born out by the evidence of the papyrus.

Führer produces a more ambitious table of correspondences on the assumptions (R p.17f) (1) that S 102 is, in the words of Lobel (p.42) "probably but not certainly the top of the column" and S 116.1 (ant.6) the first or second line of a column (see my note ad loc. (p.653)) (2) that there were regularly 27 lines to a column. Of these apparently harmless assumptions the second is somewhat objectionable for the reasons rehearsed above, and I therefore refrain from copying out Führer's scheme, interesting though it is.

Haslam (pp 33-5) tries to improve on our knowledge in this sphere by combining S 133.1 with S 105B. Are lines 3-4 of the latter again represented in two manuscripts?

---

1The similarity was already noted by Führer (2) p.253, and treated in terms of his beloved "word-responsion". He has now repented (R p.22 n.218).
The sad answer is no. In the first place the events of 105 are thereby allotted to 11.35ff of the poem, which is quite at odds with the positions worked out for them by Barrett or myself on the basis of the column lengths in P. Oxy. 2619 (see above pp.5ff for these attempts). And S 105 (= P. Oxy. 2619 fr.18) which is the top of a column, can hardly begin with line 35 when S 88 has shown that the column lengths of this papyrus approximate to 27 or 28 lines. Most important, S 105B 3-4 and 133A i 5-6 though both exemplifying ant.3-4, each come from different parts of them: ΔΑΙωμακ (133 i 6) is the end of str./ant.4 and its final three letters can therefore be supplemented (with Barrett ap. Page p.64) as Κακ[ενθδ(-). Ματακα] occurs directly before that metrical point, as the combination represented by 105B shows and cannot be so supplemented. The two passages are only significant as providing an interesting example of what fortuitous coincidence can, from time to time, produce.

---

1It is also unthinkable that the events of 105B (whatever their exact interpretation: see pp.64ff below) should occur so early on in the poem. For Haslam's riposte and its inadequacy) see p.66c.
METRE

The bibliography here, as befits so complex a problem, is itself rather tangled. D.L. Page published in P.C.P.S. 15 (1969) 72-4 some preliminary probings towards a metrical scheme which he now (c.f. P.C.P.S. 19 (1973) p.58 n.2) quite rightly disowns. The real break-through came when M.L. West (with considerable help from W.S. Barrett) published a complete metrical scheme in Z.P.E. 4 (1969) 135-42 [West (1)]. R. Führer (ib. 5 (1970) 11-14) [Führer (1)] put forward some important modifications to this which West (ib. 7 (1971) 262-4 [West (2)] largely accepted, while adding a few modifications of his own. This latter article also proposes the conjunction of P. Oxy. 2619 fr. 18 with P. Oxy. 2803 fr.11. (The combination is represented by S 105). Führer independently suggested the same measure in the same periodical (Z.P.E. 7 (1971) 265-6) and a little later contributed several modificati­cions of West's metrical interpretations of P. Oxy. 2803 including several frank admissions of the metrical difficulties caused by supposing the two manuscripts to contain the same poem (ib. 8 (1971) 251-4) [Führer (2)]. These were as nothing however compared to the vigorous assault mounted by Sir Denys Page in P.C.P.S. 19 (1973) 47-65. He brought powerful objections both against the West-Führer metrical reconstruction and against their proposal to unite the two fragments mentioned above. He also reported several important conclusions by Mr. Barrett. Unfortunately, this contribution appeared too late for
Haslam to take adequate cognisance of it in his sensitive analysis of the poem's metrical structure (pp.24-35) and he could only append a rather superficial rejection of Page's complaints in the form of an addendum (p.57). So far, nobody has produced a proper answer to Page's criticisms.\(^1\) This will be attempted below.

Col.i of S 88 provides us with an unusually extensive column, and thus exceptionally rich material for the now familiar process of reconstituting strophe, antistrophe and epode from the distribution of long, short, or middle-sized lines and their partial correspondence. But since this column consists of nothing but line-ends and since other such helpful fragments as S 91, 102, 104, 105\(^2\) likewise fail to carry us back to the start of a line or tell us exactly how long any line was, we would seem to have reached a quandary. We are rescued from it very largely by Mr. Barrett's brilliant combinations of P. Oxy. fr.1 col.ii with fr.47 (in S 88) and frr. 30 and 31 with 15 (to form S 89).\(^2\) These provide us with the beginnings of several lines and some complete, and the metrical scheme thus brought near completion can be finally filled.

---

\(^1\)These words and this whole section were written before the appearance of Führer's exhaustive review of S.L.G. (in Göttinische Gelehrte Anzeigen 229 (1977) Iff, hereafter (R)) which includes a detailed reply to Page. Many of his arguments, I am glad to say, were independently arrived at by myself. I have incorporated those that did not occur to me in the following pages with full acknowledgements.

\(^2\)He has since proposed a further conjunction: S 115 + S 116 (+ S 114?).
out by guesses based on the line lengths of such Stesichorean works as the Geryoneis and now the Lille Papyrus, and our preconceptions about what is after all a very simple and repetitious metre. One welcome result of the scheme as established strikes us instantly: if the vacant spaces at the top and bottom of S 88 represent margins rather than exceptionally short lines, 1 and 27 are the topmost and bottommost lines. S 88 ii 15 should be the start of a strophe (it coincides with speech-end) and S 89. 12 is so very short that it looks like the end of a stanza. Call it the end of a str./ant.: in that case S 88 ii 15-22 should respond to S 89 5-12, and so they do. The reconstruction is, then, internally consistent. But this is about the only instance of such large-scale resposion that the reconstruction can boast, and a glance at the number of complete lines in these two passages will temper our enthusiasm for it. Moreover, the number of unmetrical corruptions to be supposed in our papyrus text if this scheme is right reaches an alarmingly high total.

---

1 This has important repercussions for the sequence of columns on the papyrus from which this fragment comes: see above pp. 567ff.

2 Though the remarkably short str.5 within the Geryoneis' stanzas should warn us off complacency here.
str./ant.
1 88 i 16, 24, i 19, 89·5, 91·3, 98·1
   101·4, 102·8, 103·7, 104·8, 16,
   105B·1, 107·8, 118·4, 135·7, 137·9
2 88 i 17, ii 16, 89·6, 91·4, 104·9,
   17, 105B·1, 135·8
3 88 i 18, 26, ii 17, 89·7, 91·5, 97·6,
   101·6, 102·10, 103·9, 104·10, 18,
   105B·3, 113·1, 118·6, 135·9, 137·3
4 88 ii 11, 19, 27, ii 18, 89·8, 91·6,
   97·7, 98·4, 101·7, 102·11, 103·10,
   104·11, 19, 105B·4, 113·2, 118·7,
   135·10, 137·4
5 88 ii 19, 89·1, 9, 91·9, 98·5, 103·
   11, 104·12, 20, 105B·5
6 88 i 3, 21, ii 20, 89·2, 10, 91·8,
   97·1, 98·6, 101·1, 104·13, 21,
   105B·6, 116·1, 118·1, 9, 135·12,
   137·6
7 88 i 4, 22, ii 3, 21, 89·3, 11, 91·1,
   94·1, 97·2, 98·7, 100·1, 101·2, 10,
   104·14, 105B·7, 111·7, 113·5, 116·2,
   118·2, 10, 135·13, 137·7, 139·4
8 88 ii 27, 89·4, 12, 94·2, 104·15,
   111·8, 139·5

ep.
1 (·) 88 i 6, ii 5, 89·13, 91·11, 94·3,
   - 577 -
| 2 | 88 i7, ii 6, 89·14, 91·12, 94·4, 98·10, 99·2, 100·4, 105·10, 111·4, 115·2 |
| 3 | 88 ii 7, 89·15, 91·13, 98·11, 100·5, 105·11, 111·5, 115·3, 138·1 |
| 4 | 88 ii 9, ii 8, 89·16, 91·14, 94·6, 99·4, 100·6, 102·1, 104·1, 105·12, 111·6, 115·4, 138·2, 139·9 |
| 5 | 88 ii 9, 89·17, 94·7, 103·1, 102·2, 105·13, 107·1, 123·1, 135·1, 138·3 |
| 6 | 88 iii, ii 10, 91·10, 102·3, 103·2, 104·3, 105·14, 107·2, 123·2, 138·4 |
| 7 | 88 ii 11, 103·3, 104·4, 105·15, 107·3, 123·3, 135·3 |
| 8 | 88 ii 12, 102·5, 103·4, 104·5, 105·16, 107·4, 123·4, 138·6 |
| 9 | 88 ii 14, ii 13, 103·5, 104·6, 105·17, 107·5, 123·5, 135·5, 138·7 |
| 10 | 88 ii 15, ii 14, 102·7, 103·6, 104·7, 105·18, 107·6 |
The line-references opposite the metrical scheme exclude those genuinely ambiguous fragments whose concidence with the West-Führer reconstruction might be merely fortuitous. All those passages whose metrical interpretation requires more than a moment's thought receive a more detailed discussion in my commentary ad locc. (594, 100, 103, 107, 109, 111, 123). The special problems of 105B are also treated separately, as are those of S 135, 138, and 139.

The fragments of the Iliupersis are fewer and worse preserved than those of the Geryoneis: its metrical scheme is correspondingly more open to doubt in a larger number of places. We have a concrete example of the type of balance of probabilities upon which the scheme rests in its very first line, the second half of which depends on: (a) the mysterious collocation κορυφαίωνος είσι in 104.16; (b) the supplement ἔκλεισε παρὰ καλλιρόους at 89.5; and (c) the choice between λέγω and λέγω at 104.8. Should we but read κορυφαίωνος- {τ} νάματι at the first place (as Barrett has suggested, supposing the simplest of corruptions) and produce an alternative supplement like πάσημενος ὡμορὸν δίνατι for the second, we should have line-end with all its important implications for the metrical pattern as a whole. It is not so much the inferior sense of the alternative supplement, as the decision that in (c) unparalleled epic correction is less acceptable.
than a freedom (\textasciitilde) attested in the Lille Papyrus - a poem metrically akin to ours in many ways - that prompts us in favour of the str.1 printed above. But by how slender a margin! As uncertain as str.1 or more so are:

West (2) p.262 is right to reassert the ambiguity of the evidence provided by 8\textasciitilde_\textasciitilde (103.8) despite the written trema. Therefore we cannot tell if the first position in the line allowed \textasciitilde for the - attested in the only other two instances: an argument against this licence below p.604.

Page (p.54) followed now by Führer (R.p.14 and n.138) prefers an extra anceps at the beginning of the verse. This supposition would create difficulties of space at S88 i 24.6 (see p.589) and the evidence of 88 ii 17 and 89.7 is neutral, since \textasciitilde in the first line might be interpreted as \textasciitilde \textasciitilde in the second as a monosyllable (courses originally advocated by Führer (1) pp.12 and 13). But in favour of the hypothesis are (i) the space required at the start of 104.10 and 18 and (ii), quite decisively, the metrical sequence at 103.8-9.

Führer (2) p.252 justifiably demolishes West's plea ((2) p.264) that \textasciitilde be allowed as a variation of \textasciitilde. Such a liberty is destructive of the whole basis of the reconstruction, and West's appeal to the end of the "strophe" in Alcman's Louvre Partheneion is quite beside
the point. West was trying to solve the undeniable metrical difficulty posed by S 139·9, for which there is a more appealing remedy: see p.596 below.

str.5

at the start is as likely as the supplement Kαc]εινωνα(-) at S 133A 6, but though Page accepts the plausibility of the latter (both in his article and SLG) he gives no indication of its consequences in his metrical schemes.

str.6 (the end)

with period-end (so Führer (l) p.13 n.19) or in synapheia with str.7 (West (l) p.156)? The latter would create the objectionable period (6/7) with the only instance in the scheme of an internal cut before rather than after the longum. Führer's interpretation on the other hand is backed by the brevis in longo of ὁπτηςνωνα's final syllable in 88ι. 21, and the fact that Barrett's Ψάλμος at 88ii 21 (str.7) about as certain as supplement as can be (see my note ad loc.) renders the preceding syllable long.

str.8

S 89·4 has this begin with ευκλοει [ .. .. ] [ ]; S 89·12 ends ....]v Ἐθήκαν. Führer (R p.123 n.123) suggests the misdivision ευκλοει between str.7/8 (See below p.594f).
ep.1

We have only two examples of its beginning. S 88ii5 Τονδ [ ].δ.[] υκλ[κτλ. is still undeciphered, but seems to respond to West's interpretation ———. As for S 111, West originally supposed this to represent str.7-ant.4, but the opening of 111.5 [()] χωναγει is impossible to reconcile with str.3's start (-γε-γε-) and should rather be taken (so Führer (l)p.13) as the beginning of ep.3 (——γεγεγε). Then S 111.3 gives us χαλαδαπαχ as the initial syllables of ep.1. How choose between the two possibilities? The length of lacunae to the left of the relevant lines (especially 89.13 and 105B.9)? Barrett's οοδε κουκεν in the latter instance (attractive on other grounds: see p.645f) favours the shorter form. The former perhaps tells the other way (see my note ad loc.) with ———γεγεγεγε.

ep.4

whether we suppose the middle section of this ran -γε- (as in ep.2) or ——— depends on whether we supplement Πάλινος or μαχημόνος in 88 i9: see my note ad loc.

ep.6

usually printed as ————. But Barrett's ———— is compatible with all the surviving attestations and is positively favoured by one of them (see below p.665).

ep.8

to say that the evidence for this hangs by a thread would be to exaggerate our state of knowledge. The line is
no-where fully represented and Führer's intriguing
represents a synthesis. As Mr. Barrett
points out to me, we could quite cheerfully restore our
most complete version of this line (88 ii 12) to produce
a far more orthodox dactylic rhythm with a single
epitrite confined near the end (c.f. str.3, ep.6) So:¹

`ءلى مل AAA`AA

Most occurrences
of the line would be compatible with this (e.g. the very
fragmentary 105B 16 and 107·5). But the relative
position of 102·5 suggests a shorter line, and 103·8 and
104·5 imply a wider distribution of epitrites through­
out the line. Führer may be right then, but in view of
the uncertainties here it would be sad to see his
interpretation becoming a dogma.

Evidence for and against period-end:

str.1/2

synapheia here on analogy with that between str.7 and 8?
The evidence of 101·4 ἡθεκατ and 137·9 Ἰακθοκαυν,
cited by Führer (2) p.251 nn.3-4 as compatible with this
notion, in fact tell against it by producing word-end
(καθεκατ Barrett; Ἰακθοκαυν an obvious articulation).
Certain word-end also at 88 i16, 88 i24, 88 ii15-16,
89·5, 103·7-8.

¹Barrett's ex gratia supplement. The adjective ἰακθοκατ would
be an ἀποκατ, though the form is by no means impossible.
word-end certain at the end of 88 ii16, 89·3, and 104·17, and probable at the end of 88 ii17 and 103·8. On the other hand, although lines ending in ἰδα (105Α=105Β 2) and ἱαο 135·8) which tell against period-end here are probably examples of false colometry (see p.595) their remedy likewise requires absence of period-end here. And it is difficult to supplement the start of 104·10 without presupposing synaphea between str.2/3.

brevis in longo at 105Β3 ἠποκα hints at period-end.

all three instances of its end (88 ii19-20, 89·1-2, 89·9-10) provide word-end.

synaphea proved by 88: 22-3, i13-4.

Our usual clues for detecting period-end are hiatus and brevis in longo. But because of the very nature of the epode's metrical structure we cannot tell whether S 88 ii7-8's ἐπικουροῖ | ἐλθετε represents (i) hiatus or (ii) epic corruption outside the dactylic colon (and thus short anceps) in ep.3. Impossible again to be sure that ἰππον | ἄγνοι in 88 ii9-10 is brevis in longo rather than short anceps at the end of ep.5.
ep.2/3
synaphea has been diagnosed here on the grounds of 88 i7 where the concluding words ἀγε δὴ make an unlikely period-end. (So Page p.52 n.2). In fact Führer has cannily produced (R p.19) a parallel for such a phenomenon: ἀλλ' δὲ δὴ at Bacch. 11.95. Not that synaphea is necessarily ruled out thereby.

ep.3
period-end suggested by hiatus at 88 ii7-8 ἐπικουροῦσιν ἐξετε. But appearances can be deceptive: see p.584 supr.

ep.4/5
a difficulty involving 139.9 makes it expedient to suppose synaphea here: see p.597 inf.

ep.6/7
synaphea deduced from 88 ii10-11. (Contrast the two instances of word-end: 88 ii1, 105 B 14).

ep.7
word-end in 103.3.

ep.9
88 ii4 has word-end ἐνων but 104.6's χἵπρογενής αὐθ should not be cited as another instance. It is desperately hard to devise a monosyllable supplement which would at one and the same time preserve period-end and make sense in this context (ἀν, αὖ, ἀψ all unattractive). And 'Αφροδίτα is now a very alluring supplement here (see ad loc.) In view of the above uncertainties it is tempting to follow Haslam in creating periods in the strophe which start from the
longum and end (except the first) with a single short
(so str.1-2, 3-6, 7-8) and in the epode which close
with .So ep.1-3,4,5-6,7,8,9,1). But against
period-end after ep.4 and 9 see above.

I would prefer to rearrange somewhat the arguments in
Page's characteristically eloquent assault upon the
metrical scheme of Iliopersis and the conjunction of
one fragment from P. Oxy. 2619 with another from 2803.
He complains that both features presuppose far too
many faults affecting metre. These faults might be
drawn up under the following headings:

(1) An impossible spatial relationship between lacunae\(^1\):
    i.e. in lacunae occupying roughly the same space and
    positioned one below the other, an abnormally large
    and then an abnormally small number of letters\(^1\) for
    the space available are required if the metrical
    scheme is to work.

\(^{1}\)Page reaches his conclusions about the normal number of
letters occupied by a given lacuna, in the only rational
way, by comparing the amount of letters required by
identical metrical sequences in dactylo-epitritic poems
by Bacchylides and Pindar. In the following discussion
I adopt the statistics reached by Barrett and Page
through this process without question. But we must
bear in mind the striking variations between maximum and
minimum which can lurk concealed behind a bland median.
Fuhrer (R p.11) is able to cite from the very manuscript
under discussion here the wild veering between the 10
letters (\(\alpha \iota \zeta \iota \omega \rho \omicron \epsilon \omicron \circ - 200 \cdot 2\) ) and 16 (\(\pi \mu \omega \iota \nu \gamma \tau \zeta \iota \pi \tau \rho -
\delta \gamma \varepsilon - S 88 ii19\)) that fill the beginning of str.5
(\(\epsilon - \epsilon - \epsilon -\)) . Compare likewise the wide range of letters
covered in practically the same space at S 88 ii 6-11
(the variation is from 11 (\(\delta \gamma \nu \omicron \nu \delta \gamma \omega \lambda \mu \alpha\) at 1.10) to 16
(\(\tau \rho \delta \varepsilon \pi \omicron \lambda \epsilon \varepsilon \xi \tau \epsilon \iota \nu \mu - in 1\cdot 7\))).
(2) Incorrect line-division
(3) The omission of a line
(4) The omission of a letter
(5) Miscellaneous corruptions.

That the above faults must be presupposed before we can accept either metre or combination is a matter of fact about which there can be no dispute. On the other hand it is equally a matter of fact that each and every one of the faults just listed can be paralleled from other papyri of poetic texts. Without moving very far from home we think at once of the mis-division of Geryoneis ep.7-8 which P. Oxy. 2617 perpetrates either at S 11 11-12 and 27·6-7 or at S 14 1-2 (see p.83 above); of the omission of a letter in the same papyrus at S 26·3 (ξρέςχενενεφη) and of the simple corruption πείθου for πείθευ in S 12·7. But these are isolated examples. When, in so short a sample of lines as P. Oxy. 2619 and 2803 supply, we must suppose so many mistakes if we are to accept metrical scheme and combination, surely that combination and scheme are at fault rather than the papyri? We shall see.

1 My rearrangement of Professor Page's objections in fact exacerbarates a tendency already inherent in his original treatment: the same difficulty will occur more than once under various guises (see for instance 2 ii (c) i (e); ii (b) 2 ii(d)) and the impression may be given that the obstacles to the scheme are more numerous than they really are. I hope the increase in clarity will compensate for the extra strain put on the reader's attention.
First however, let us examine one by one under their respective headings, the suspect passages. We shall start with those which display an impossible spatial relationship between lacunae, since this sinister and mysterious discrepancy between the number of letters needed to fill the same space seems to strike at the very heart of the metrical reconstruction. And granted the reservations mentioned above p.586 n.1) the existence of these discrepancies cannot be denied. But on examination we find that most of the individual instances can be subsumed under one of the other headings, and the question of spatial relationships loses its status as a separate problem. Every example is theoretically capable of explanation by the hypothesis of corruption of one sort or another, and in several cases we can actually specify the omitted letter or mis-divided line which would remedy the discrepancy. We shall then have to pass or to a review of the other unmetrical corruptions before finally deciding just how damning their apparent frequency is for the proposed metrical scheme.

(1) Impossible spatial relationships between lacunae
(i) to be supposed if the metrical scheme is correct;
(a)
S 88 i13 ep.8 [------]--
14 ep.9 [------]--
Two lacunae of almost exactly the same extent (one letter's difference). But the first one demands a supplement of on average 25 letters, at a minimum 21, while the second requires a supplement of on average 15 to 16 letters, with 18 as a maximum.

(b)

S 88 118 str.3 [⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯]
  24 ant.1 [⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯]
  26 ant.3 [⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯]

Here Page goes slightly astray and - an uncharacteristic lapse - gives the impression that the above facts constitute two separate problems - and therefore two discrete objections to the poem's metrical scheme - by repeating his complaint about 26 in two different places (p.52). When we have made the appropriate adjustments (as represented schematically above: for the extra anceps in str.1/ant.3 see p.579f) we will discover that there is only one difficulty, caused by the excessively long supplement needed for i26. This is filled by on average 26 letters (minimum 22) while the first two lines, though occupying lacunae of almost exactly the same extent (one or two letters' difference) are satisfied with an average of 15·7 letters (minimum 13): these latter figures taken from a sample of 100. The discrepancy will be explained, and Page's objection rendered harmless, if col i of S 88 suffered from the same progressively
leftwards slant as col.ii. This would allow line 26 about two letters more than 24. For another Stesichorean papyrus whose metre is affected by "Maas's law" see my note on 222 ii2 P.

(c)

S 88: 104 11 str.4 [---]-----[-----]

12 str.5 [-----]-----

The first lacuna requires supplementation by on average 7-8 letters (never 10) the second by on average 12 to 13 letters (only twice 10). The discrepancy can be remedied if in 104·12 we read ἄλλῳν ὄσον αὐτῷ instead of Diggle's ἄλλῳν ὄσον ἀὐτῷ, for then the lacuna in this line will only be [-----]----- which is quite consistent with 11's initial lacuna [---]. This interpretation of the first extant trace is perfectly possible: the cross-stroke may as well belong to an epsilon as to a gamma. On the legitimacy of postulating an omitted letter see below pp.597ff.

(d)

S 123·1 ep.5 [-----]

3 ep.7 [-----]

The first of these two lacunae presupposes a supplement of on average (out of 100 samples) 15·7 letters (minimum 13). The other needs an average of 9 letters (maximum
The discrepancy could be eased into tolerable proportions if we supposed that at the beginning of 123·1 one syllable had erroneously been carried over from the preceding line as in S 58 ii10 - 11 (ep.6/7).

(e)

S 105A 2 str.2 [------]

3 str.3 [-----]--

The first line requires a supplement too short for its lacuna. Yet this lacuna is the same size as that in the next line, where the supplement is two letters too long for its lacuna. Again the disparity can be remedied by supposing misdivision and the transference to the start of 3 of a syllable (Δαρ|δαν(ι)-) belonging to the end of 2 (a suggestion separately conceived by Barrett ap. Page p.57 and Haslam p.26 n.31 (on independent grounds)).

(ii) to be supposed if P. Oxy. 2619 fr.18 is rightly combined with P. Oxy. 2803 fr.11 to produce S 105B:

(a)

S 105B 11 ep.3 [-----]----

13 ep.5 [-----]--

The first line, projecting 9 letters beyond the margin, behaves in a perfectly normal manner. But the other line, though it should only be shorter by one long syllable, projects no number of letters beyond the margin, cannot be seen at all. In other words, this
second line looks as if it contained 7 syllables in a space where we would expect 12 or 13. We can hardly justify this state of affairs by demanding for the first line in toto the maximum figure of 24 letters (achieved only thrice out of 75 samples) and for the second in toto the minimum of 15 letters (achieved twice in 75 samples).

(b)
\[ S \text{ 105}^B \text{ 12 ep.4 } \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \]
\[ 14 \text{ ep.6 } \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \]
The first line is alright, the second requires a longer supplement in a lacuna a mere one letter longer. If we need a solution, premature division of lines in the latter (\( \pi\'\omega\lambda\nu | \Zeta\varepsilon\nu \)) may be considered. But since Page accepts exactly the same discrepancy in Barrett's treatment of 138 (see the next entry) he should tolerate it here.

(iii) to be supposed if P.Oxy. 2803 is from the same poem as P. Oxy. 2619!

(a) S 138
on West's interpretation, ((1) p.264 followed by Führer p.266) S. 138·7 ep.7 requires a shorter supplement than S 138 ep.4-6 in a lacuna one letter longer in space. Misdivision with ep.6 is an impossible explanation here. But if we prefer Barrett's alternative interpretation of S 138 as ep.3 str.1, and if ep.6 enjoys the freedom attested for str.3, viz ~ for - in ~~~~ then
the discrepancy between the supplements needed for 3 and 5 is not too great. See further my commentary ad loc.

(b)

S 139

here lines 4, 7, 9 require the maximum number of letters in their supplements (if they are str. 8 and 10, ant. 3) whereas 139.5 (str.9) needs a minimum number. But once more, this identification (West's again) is not the only possibility. Read 139.9 as ep.4 with Barrett (ap. Page p.04) and suppose it in synaphea with 139.10 and divided one syllable too early, and we circumvent both this and several other independent difficulties (see p.596 infr.).

So far, I think I have shown that most if not all of the apparent instances of impossible spatial relationships between lacunae can be explained by postulating fairly mild corruption in the papyrus such as the omission of a letter or the faulty division of lines. Maas' law can also be invoked in several cases. We may use these as the keys to unlock all the relevant passages, or we may choose to accept that in a very few places indeed there was an eccentric variation in the size of letters: the scribe's hand is notably irregular. What is clear is that we are now free of the long and gloomy succession of fragments where abnormally large and abnormally small letters were unconvincingly juxtaposed, a succession
which Page exploited to great effect to fright the hearts of believers in the West-Führer scheme. Of course I am not so stupid as to suppose that I have as yet disposed of this part of Page's argument. I have merely reformulated his objections in a new guise and in fresh terms. But these terms are far more favourable to those who accept the metrical reconstruction outlined above, for reasons which I shall unfold very shortly. First, though, a list of the numerous corruptions to be presupposed if we are to accept that reconstruction and the combination represented by S 105B.

(2) Incorrect line-division

(i) in P. Oxy. 2617

(a)

S 88 ii 10-11 ep.6/7 ωάραξ λύσωμεν

The scribe must be supposed to have carried one syllable over from 10 to 11 (so first West (2) p.262). The alternative approach of supposing the misdivision of c  διάκταν at 88 i 11-12 (ep.6/7) is rather ruled out by its prima facie position at line-end with pause.

(b)

S 103·6 ep.10

But 89·4 is either ep.10 as well (if it begins with ιμπλετει) in which case 103·6 cannot commence with or it is str.8 (and does not begin with ιμπλετει). This latter alternative would be the most convenient for the integrity of the whole metrical scheme and in its favour one might again invoke the hypothesis.
of mis-lineation (of i- μετωπ between str.1 ant. 7/8). Against this we must note that ep.9 as represented by 88 i 14 (Ιηςωυ) concludes with certain word-end and possible period-end.

To the above examples adduced by Page we should probably add some instances from the heading "Impossible spatial relationships between lacunae" above: i.e. (i)d and e.

(ii) in P. Oxy. 2619 and 2803 assuming they both represent the same poem
(a) S 103.6 and 135.7 should both begin one syllable earlier if ep.10 consists of ——— as West's interpretation of 135 as ep.2 — str.5 suggests. But those of us who prefer Führer's way of taking 135 (viz. ep.5 — str.7) will obviously see no obstacle here to the metrical reconstruction under discussion.

(b) S 135 8-9
Haslam follows Führer (see above p.589) in interpreting these two lines as str.2-3, but then quite reasonably baulks at the former's νομ as a period-end (which is strongly implied for this position by the evidence of other fragments: see p.584 supr.) and supposes (p.26 n.1) that a syllable after these three letters has been mistakenly carried over into the following line after
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the now familiar (though no less hypothetical) manner.

(c)

S 105\textsuperscript{A} 2-3

If 105\textsuperscript{A} 1-8 represent ant.1-8 (as its combination to form 105\textsuperscript{B} demands) there must be irregular line-division in 105\textsuperscript{A} 2-3 (see i (e) above) since 2 is excessively long in comparison with 3 (for the relationship we expect between the lengths of str/ant 2-3 see S 88 i 17-18).

(d)

105\textsuperscript{B} 12-14 (see above (ii)b) premature division of 14 conceivable.

(e)

S 139.9

a) On West's interpretation of this line as ant.3 we have line-end — or — for the scheme's — and must suppose for instance that ἡμῖν χαρίν has been divided one syllable too soon again.

b) On Barrett's interpretation of this line as ep.4 (Page p.64) it is in synapheia with 139.10 and has been divided a syllable too early to produce δέ χαρίν rather than δέ χαρίν[-].

(f)

S 133\textsuperscript{A} i 1

West (2) p.264 and Barrett (ap. Page p.62) read 133\textsuperscript{A} i 1-6 as str.7-ant.4, so that i 1 =str.7, and ἓν in that position is
distinctly odd. One of the remedies proposed by Barrett for this problem is that the word behind these three letters has been divided one syllable too late (e.g. σόλατοκ).

(3) The omission of a line

(i) In the combination of P. Oxy. 2619 and 2803 to form S 105B

A line must be supposed to have dropped out between 6 and 7 in P. Oxy. 2619 fr.18 (105A) equivalent to line 7 in P. Oxy. 2803 fr.11: this line represents ant.7.

(ii) S 135

Führer's interpretation of this fragment as ep.4 - str.8 will only work if we imagine that one line representing ep.9/10 has fallen out at 6.

(iii) S 139

Barrett's reading of this as antistr.6 - ep.4 (see p.664) necessitates not only the hypothetical misdivision of line 9 (= ep.4) but the omission of ep.1 at 6.

(4) The omission of a letter or letters

4 (a) S 105B14

Führer(p 265) requires --- to be supplied between ι and ... Whatever the exact reading here (see my note ad loc.) the lacuna cannot contain more than 4 letters at the most, and that is hardly enough to provide the sequence of two longa followed by a breve.
(b) Alternatively Barrett ap. Page p. 60 reads --λποχυιαν Ζεύς and hypothesises a three-letter lacuna, supposing in the first place the loss of 2 letters in the lacuna to the left of 14 so that its τν stands 2 letters further to the left than necessary, and consequently a like remedy for the lacuna on the right of the line.

S 104·12

λζελλαλεθοδοον is a less spectacular instance of an omitted letter if it represents the right approach: see above 1 (i) c.

S 88 ii 8 ep.3

Note that we must postulate the accidental addition of an extra letter here (δπωκον instead of δπωκ) for the metre to work here.

(5) Miscellaneous corruptions

(i) S 102·7 ep.10

West's μεγακό(1)p.139; the first letter is not to be read on the papyrus.

(ii) S 105B9 (ep.1)

In μεω[αοῦ]τος it is hard to accept the last three letters as an interpretation of the marks on the papyrus which would better be represented by-τας.
In the same line ωνίμου is a highly resistible supplement, as an inspection of the top of the extant πι's upright indicates.

These then are the various types of corruption which we must assume if metrical scheme and combination of papyri are to be maintained. Not all the instances given should be counted: some are alternatives one for another (2 (ii)d etc.) others operate in collaboration (e.g. 3 (iii) above). Nevertheless, the sum total is large, especially when we bear in mind the tiny number of lines from this poem which we possess. Are there too many hypothetical corruptions? Are they not rather the symptoms which must inevitably break out when an inaccurate metrical scheme is forced upon a resisting text? Corruption in excess of expectation is of course hard to gauge. Clearly there is more corruption than a scholar who prefers to operate within the bounds of certainty would like. It is more realistic to observe that the Geryoneis papyrus does not display anything like the level of corruption here presupposed. But all manuscripts do not have to behave in the same way. The density of unmetrical corruption will only be impossibly high if it turns out to be quite unparallelled. And here my constantly large debt to Mr. Barrett becomes even greater, since he has provided me with the statistics which show this is not the case. Each one of the
corruptions illustrated above can be matched in kind and frequency from other manuscripts. I begin with the most common:

Incorrect line-division

(i) In an unpublished papyrus of Pindar's Nemeans, so Mr. Barrett informs me, out of 131 cases where the line-division can be determined, there are 36 instances in which the traditional colometry involves the division between lines of a single word (33) or of a word-group with proclitic or enclitic (3). And in 6 of the 36 the division is made wrongly in the papyrus (at instead of •): 3.60: Λυκίων \( \text{τε} \) 4.92: \( \epsilon^{2} \) ιοκόντατα, 4.94: \( \alpha \pi \alpha \) λαυ \( \text{ς} \) \( \text{τος} \) 4.45: \( \text{ο} \) \( \text{ξοι} \) \( \text{τε} \), 10.24: \( \varepsilon \) \( \text{κύ} \) \( \text{νον} \), καυ \( \text{ς} \) \( \text{τε} \) \( \text{και} \) (10.35).

(ii) In Bacchyl. 5 (200 lines) there are 16 places where a word (and one where a word-group) should be divided between lines; in 4 of these the division is made wrongly: 14: \( \nu \) \( \text{κει} \) \( \text{νος} \), 35: \( \alpha \) \( \gamma \) \( \epsilon \) \( \omega \) \( \text{κοι} \), 75: \( \alpha \) \( \nu \) \( \text{πι} \) \( \text{ς} \) \( \text{α} \) \( \text{ς} \), 115: \( \kappa \) \( \alpha \) \( \tau \) \( \alpha \) \( \pi \) \( \text{φε} \) \( \nu \) \( \nu \) \( \nu \).

Mr. Barrett illustrates the other types of corruption hypothesised for the Iliupersis from the roll containing Bacchylides' Dithyrambs on which 330 lines are preserved. Corruptions marked with an asterisk have been corrected by a later hand, but this is irrelevant for the present purpose since (as Barrett observes) corruptions affecting the size of a lacuna affect it no less after correction than before.

\[^{1}\text{False division involving whole words is naturally rarer though even this sometimes occurs: Barrett compares Bacch. 17.52:} \mu \pi \tau \nu \nu \text{A,} \mu \pi \tau \nu \nu 0.\]
The omission of a line (or lines)
18.16*, 18.55-7*, 19.22* (all added at the head or foot of the column).

The omission of letters (at least two: the numbers given are of syllables left out)
15.55 (four*), 16.8 (in lacuna), 16.12 (one*), 17.62 (one), 17.93 (one), 18.39 (one), 18.48 (six), 19.5 (one).

Under the heading of "miscellaneous corruptions" we might list:
The addition of letters (at least two: the numbers again of syllables left out)
16.34 (three), 19.91 (one), 17.97 (one), 17.108 (one), 18.2 (one), 17.25-6 (one).

The transposition of words
15.3, 15.47.

Minor corruptions affecting metre (but not affecting space by more than a single letter)
It will be said that this papyrus roll¹ is untypically corrupt: true and beside the point. To refute Page one does not have to show that a large number of faults affecting metre is at all usual in papyri. Sufficient to show that it can occur in a second-century papyrus. And this is what these statistics have done.

One would naturally prefer – for simplicity's sake – a metrical scheme which did not have to postulate large-scale corruption in the text which is our sole source for the scheme in the first place. But there is nothing to be ashamed of in reluctantly acquiescing in the notion of corruption and the operation of Maas' law. To behave in any other way "comes dangerously near to treating the study of Greek literature as if it were a game with clear-cut rules. It is not a game; it is concerned with real people and real events, and the only "rule" is that nothing which is known to be relevant should be left out of account" (K.J. Dover, Aristophanes Clouds p.lxxviii n.3 on a different problem). We do not know that our papyrus was very corrupt, but apparent metrical discrepancies suggest it was and we are aware of manuscripts plagued by corruption on no less a scale. The same is true of leftwards sloping columns (see p.590).

¹Similar corruptions disrupting metre in the other papyri of Bacchylides are usefully assembled in the Teubner text's app. crit. at the beginning of each poem.
The hypothesis as a whole is no more implausible than Page's picture of two separate Stesichorean poems on the same topic. This idea involves a difficulty whose importance he seriously underestimates: two characteristically ample narratives, one on the Wooden Horse, the other on the Sack of Troy? How could the poor man ever have found anything to say in the second that he had not exhausted in the first?

It is all the more urgent to be sure we can defend most parts of the West-Führer reconstruction since it offers us what has a claim to be the most interesting and important poem of S. metrically speaking. In the course of the triad we witness an evolution from the dactylo-anapaestic structure of the Suotherae and Geryoneis, to a mixture of \( \frac{\text{-}}{\text{-}} \) and \( \frac{\text{-}}{\text{-}} \) that looks like an early form of dactylo-epitrite\(^1\). In strophe and antistrophe, for instance, we start with a catalectic run of eight dactyls. By the time we reach the final period we are in the world of Bacchylidean or Pindaric dactylo-epitrite with \( D|xD-e- \). It is fascinating to observe how smoothly the transition between the two states is accomplished, and Haslam's analysis (pp24ff) is generally convincing. It is only to be faulted in its under-estimate of the difficulties and uncertainties which attend some portions

\(^1\)"Dactylo-dactylo-dactylo-epitrite" is what West (1) p.143 calls it, but the description is too cumbersome to be satisfying, either as a metrical term or as a joke.
of the scheme and a certain inflexibility resulting from this failure. Thus, in the very first line, the freedom $\bullet$ attested for P. Lille, however surprising, seems the likeliest solution, as Haslam now accepts.

In the first period\(^1\) the consistency of word-end after line 1's fifth foot has long been remarked (first by West (1) p.136 all the instances listed above p.577; no counter example). The first verse is thus divided into two parts - the first a "rising", the second a "falling" sequence - and although the evidence is scarce, the little there is suggests that the Iliupersis was like the Geryoneis (see p.84) in its use of monosyllabic biceps after word-end to produce an especially emphatic recommencement. (This use is attested twice with certainty: 88 ii 16 and 896. $\delta\nu\tau\omega\iota$ in S 103·8 is ambiguous as we have seen: p.580 supr.). The surrounding bicipitics remain, in the strongest possible contrast, uncontracted: statistics show the first contracted 1:4, the second 0:10, the third 0:10, the fifth 0:3, the sixth 0:4. (for the relevant lines see my chart on p.610). The clausula of this period is blunt (- -).

The next period begins in exactly the same way and so continues until interrupted by an internal break at an earlier point, after the third longum, which makes a

---

\(^1\)Exceptions will be noted in their places, but generally speaking I accept in this section Haslam's identification of a period.
hemiepes of its opening sequence. (This cut apparent at 88 i 18, 89·7, 104·10 (see my note ad loc.) 118·6, 137·3). This cut is again followed by a biceps which tends to the monosyllabic (89·7, 118·6, 137·3: contra 88 i 18). And again we move from it into a rising clausula: but this time it contains a significant new feature, a single-short element. Haslam (p.26f) does well to point out the characteristics that differentiate this second period from the encomiologus proper of dactylo-epitrite (D|e) which in fact occurs later in this very poem at ep.6. These differences are (i) freedom of contraction for the first biceps; (ii) biceps (not anceps) as link-element.

Haslam (p.27) makes a single period of 4-6 for no very compelling reasons. If we interpret word-end at 5/6 as a sign of period-end (see p.584) we will have a unique instance of a period in this poem with rising opening. But the termination in \( \ldots \) (instead of \( \ldots \)) thus created is paralleled in 1-2. It is certain that the third period copied the second by beginning with hemiepes, and both its predecessors by switching to rising rhythm after its internal cut. The succeeding cuts can be thought of either as dividing the long period into three phrases (each amounting to \( \ldots \)) or (if we create a new period at 6) two phrases followed by a new period of exactly their shape. On either interpretation the last member has a single-
short clausula attached to it. So did period 2 but there the clausula was pendent (\(\sim\sim\)) here it is blunt (\(\sim\)).

The final period introduces a fresh surprise: the anceps element makes its début in the poem. But before we reach it we have yet another initial hemiepesis and an internal break that launches the following phrase into a rising rhythm. Only now, for the first time, the element after the break is not biceps but anceps.

The structure of the epode is more complex and interesting. But it starts off very simply in its first 5 lines which are constructed out of three closely related phrases: \(\sim\sim\sim\sim\sim\), \(\times\times\sim\sim\sim\), and \(\times\times\sim\sim\sim\sim\). These are all marked off by invariable word-end, and the first is used only to open a period, the second either to do the same or as a phrase (but not a clausula) within a period, the third as a close. The simplest of all the structures here is line 5 (probably an independent period) which combines the opening phrase with the clausula. Verses then may begin with either a rising or a falling rhythm, they invariably rise after their internal cut (as was the case in the strophe), and they end pendant. Very regular composition, it will be said; but we have been prepared for it by the hardly less regular structure of the second half of the strophe.
The evidence for 1-5 is scanty as to whether (as Haslam supposes (p.28)) anceps has by now universally replaced the strophe's biceps as the first element of rising openings. It has done so within the periods of 1-5: alternation between - and - is attested in the middle of 2 (and 4?) (e.g. 2:88 i 7 and ii 6:4: see p.518).

The only instance of ep.1's middle (105$^A$= 105$^B$8) gives us a short here, the only instance of ep.3's start (88 ii 7) a long$^1$. But the situation at the beginning of ep.1 and 2 is still quite obscure. Ep.1's initial longum in 88 ii 5 and 111·3 may be ambiguous: see above p.582; ep.2's initial element is long in both attested cases (88 ii 6 and 111·4). However, evidence from the rest of the epode rather points to the survival of biceps. It may be argued that the initial biceps of the last line of the epode need not suggest anything about an earlier stage; other evidence tells us that the epode's last two lines represent a conscious return to the metrical pattern of str./ant. (see below p.609).

But the single instance of contracted double-short provided by Íμερτον (107·1 =ep.5) implies that even when we have moved into the territory of dactylo-epitrite, the free contraction so characteristic of dactylo-anapaests was maintained. And Barrett's attractive interpretation of S 138 (see above p.592f) entails the same license for ep.6 as for str.3, that is w-w-w-w-w-w-w.

$^1$S 111·5 (ἀνωναφέλ) is undeciphered.
If Barrett is right, important consequences follow for what is in many respects the most interesting sequence in the poem (6-8).

These three lines witness the reappearance of the single-short units which up to this point in the epode had been conspicuous by their absence. Haslam (p.29f) sensibly marks two symmetrical periods:

6-7: two hemiepe embracing a single-short phrase;
8: two single-shorts enclosing exactly this same phrase.

But as he himself admits, 6's second anceps is so only by presumption and the same is true of the first. For all we know, each of Haslam's ancipitia may well be biceps. That would give us a slightly different pattern for 6-7, viz. two hemiepe enclosing \ldots\ldots\ldots. On either interpretation, the central single-short phrase will have lost the clausular rôle it possessed in the strophe in favour of a far closer integration within the period.

In favour of the return of bicipitia here, we might remind ourselves of ep.5's second element, and by choosing this alternative we still retain the emphasis upon 6-7's repeated hemiepes which Haslam's interpretation produces. We also avoid creating the only instance of a blunt-ended period in this stanza. It is no use arguing that word-end before a first "anceps" (102·3, 105B·3, 135·3) would be paralleled by the same cut in ep.1,2 and 4, since counter-examples show the break here to have been by no means constant. (After anceps:
It is sad that we are not able to be more confident about Führer's constitution of ep.8 (see above p.583). His sequence of epitrites looks very revolutionary and may even be right: certainty however is not to be had. But its clausula echoes the one at the strophe's end, which makes it all the more striking that the triad does not conclude here. Instead it has two further lines of a very epic flavour which almost seem to apologise for the novelties which have preceded them, and certainly echo (and simultaneously prepare for) the first part of the strophe. We return to the world of dactylo-anapaest, especially in the last line which in the one instance that preserves its opening (103.6) starts with a double-short: in appearance a paroemiac indistinguishable from Geryoneis str.1. Ring-composition on the metrical level no doubt.

Let us finally compare the component phrases whose manipulation in the Geryoneis (and Suotherae) and Iliupersis respectively makes up the internal articulation of the poem. We have already examined the second and third periods (str.2/3 and 4/5) of the first work (pp.588):

**GERYONEIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opening</th>
<th>Medial</th>
<th>Closing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Here is the equivalent information for the same parts of the present poem:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ILIUPERSIS</th>
<th>Opening</th>
<th>Mainly</th>
<th>Closing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Haslam (pp.31ff) has ingeniously pointed out (and devised an explanation for) a remarkable feature of S's use of the single-short clausula. Normally the biceps directly preceding the final \(-\mid -\) takes the disyllabic form (c.f. 244·1 P) to avoid blurring the rhythm. But S., in the places for which we have fullest evidence, strongly prefers the long form:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>str.3²</th>
<th>monosyllabic</th>
<th>89·7</th>
<th>κευ(ν[άς]c) 137·3 ἡ(ρως)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>disyllabic</td>
<td>88 i 18</td>
<td>πολέμου 104·18 παιδα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>str.6</td>
<td>monosyllabic</td>
<td>88 i 21</td>
<td>ἤ(ξήνορα)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>105·6</td>
<td>γαϊ(α[χου]) 116·1 -Ἰό(κακ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>118·9</td>
<td>(ἄνων[πους]) 137·6 -Ἰό(κακ)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Haslam's explanation of this phenomenon also accounts for the replacement of biceps by anceps at the beginning of a unit. Granted that S's poems were monodies accompanied on the lyre (a notion defendable on other, non-metrical, grounds) then in the course of performance double-shorts in that position would tend to coalesce into a single long and introductory bicipitia be given

¹I omit here the "run-in" to the strophe.
²Excluded as ambiguous is 118·6's Ἰποτ(ας.)
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less than their proper value. Hence the evolution of biceps into anceps, and the preference for uncontracted biceps before final anceps.